

Best Value Review of Police Training

Force: Dyfed Powys

Date of Inspection: 14–15 September 2004



A Report by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary

ISBN 1-84473-400-5
© Crown Copyright 2005
Published 2005

Context and Force performance

Context

Population served by the Force	494,122	
Number of police officers	1166.74	
Number of police staff	523.1	
Number of special constables	151	
Budget for training for the financial year:	Financial Value	Percentage of Overall Force budget
2003/04	£1,844,331	2.3%
2004/05	£2,022,631	2.6%

Performance

A baseline assessment of the Force was undertaken between March and October 2004.

The findings of HMIC relating specifically to the HR area can be found at:

www.homeoffice.gov.uk/hmic/dpbaseline1004.pdf

Further details of the Force performance can be found at www.dyfed-powys.police.uk

For details of the rationale and methodology for the Best Value Reviews and inspection of police training please visit www.homeoffice.gov.uk/hmic/training.htm

Findings

Area Examined	Findings
TRAINING STRATEGY	<p>HM Inspector was encouraged to see that the Force Learning Strategy generally reflects the guidance contained in relevant Home Office Circulars.</p> <p>The strategy is specific in relation to the responsibilities of the various stakeholders and links with the policing objectives of the Force.</p> <p>However, the area of race and diversity is not detailed within the strategy and HM Inspector considers that this should be addressed by the Force as a matter of priority.</p>
QUALITY OF COSTED TRAINING PLAN	<p>HM Inspector was pleased to find that the NCM had been utilised to provide information in respect of all training provided by the Force. This is recorded within the CTP.</p> <p>HM Inspector was encouraged to see clear links between the plan and operational objectives.</p>

Area Examined	Findings
<p>MONITORING COSTED TRAINING PLAN THROUGHOUT THE YEAR</p>	<p>The Force Training and Prioritisation Group (FTPG) meets on a quarterly basis. The group prioritises and agrees changes to planned expenditure on training during the course of the year.</p> <p>However, HM Inspector found that the CTP was not formally monitored by the group and that variations to the plan consequent to the activity of the group or elsewhere within the training function are not recorded within it.</p> <p>Effectively, the CTP is created at the commencement of the financial year and remains a fixed document rather than a mechanism for the group to actively monitor Development Services performance in accordance with the groups' terms of reference.</p> <p>Similarly the CTP is formally agreed by the PA, but not the subject of further report or monitoring by them during the course of the financial year.</p> <p>HM Inspector would encourage the Force to ensure that future variations to the CTP are recorded within the plan and monitored by the FTPG.</p> <p>HM Inspector encourages the Force and PA to establish a formal mechanism to monitor the CTP on an ongoing basis. This should include the development of performance measures in relation to the delivery of the plan.</p> <p>A member of the PA has recently been invited to sit on the FTPG. The Force and PA are encouraged to review this situation, and to ensure that a member of the PA is formally incorporated into the membership of FTPG.</p>
<p>TRAINING NOT INCLUDED IN THE COSTED TRAINING PLAN</p>	<p>HM Inspector was encouraged to find that all training delivered by the Force is captured by the CTP.</p>

Area Examined	Findings
<p>CLIENT/CONTRACTOR ARRANGEMENTS</p>	<p>The Force has created FTPG. Composition of the group includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● ACPO; ● members of the senior command team of each division; ● Head of Crime Management and Reduction Department; ● Head of Operations; ● corporate services representative; ● representatives of staff associations and support networks; ● Force evaluator; ● Head of Development and Training; and ● Force Learning Manager. <p>There is a strong representation of the client side of the Force. However, the group is normally chaired by the ACPO lead for HR. In the interests of reinforcing the independence of the client side role, HM Inspector encourages the Force to ensure that the group is chaired by the ACPO lead on operational matters.</p> <p>HM Inspector is satisfied that the group acts in a corporate manner, and has regular scheduled meetings, which are well attended. HM Inspector considers that the group could be further strengthened by the formal inclusion of the PA, as referred to above.</p>
<p>MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS FOR TRAINING</p>	<p>The Force Learning Manager does not have overall control of all training within the Force. HOLMES training and divisional training officers are not included.</p> <p>HM Inspector is concerned that the Head of Training has only an ‘influencing’ role on other providers of training rather than one which absolutely ensures that standards, costs and planning are applied in a consistent manner across the Force.</p> <p>HM Inspector would strongly urge the Force to ensure that the accountability regarding standards, costs and planning for all training rests with the Force Learning Manager, irrespective of where in the Force or by whom it is provided.</p> <p>HM Inspector is concerned that the absence of any formal quality assurance arrangements in respect of divisional training officers in relation to TNA, design, delivery and evaluation will lead to a lack of corporacy.</p>

Area Examined	Findings
<p>IMPLEMENTATION OF:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Managing Learning • Training Matters • Diversity Matters • Foundations for Change 	<p>The Force has produced IPs in respect of <i>Managing Learning and Training Matters</i>, which are regularly reviewed by the Force Learning Manager in conjunction with the Head of HR. The Force has also produced an IP for <i>Diversity Matters</i>, which is monitored by the Equality of Service Delivery Group.</p> <p>HM Inspector acknowledges the work that is being done in respect of these areas, but had some difficulty in establishing exactly what activities were underway. This was due to the format of the plans. HM Inspector encourages the Force to use a format for implementation plans that is more robust in terms of describing specific activities and milestones.</p> <p>HM Inspector found encouraging developments in relation to FfC, under the auspices of the Wales Learning and Development Strategy Group. The Force has made a significant contribution to the work of the group. The Force Learning Manager is the chair of the Wales Region Learning and Development Tactical Group. The Force was informed that further detailed examination would take place during future regional inspection work.</p>
<p>CURRENT IMPROVEMENT PLAN</p>	<p>The Force possesses a BVR IP, which relates to the recommendations flowing from the BVR and which are currently being pursued. HM Inspector was informed that this IP or performance matrix was formulated on a new Force template, created after the BVR of Training was completed. Generally it does not contain target dates or milestones and is therefore incapable of effective monitoring.</p> <p>HM Inspector considers that the IP should be amended to include targets and milestones as a matter of urgency.</p> <p>HM Inspector encourages the Force to incorporate the recommendations from this inspection within their IP together with those recommendations in the reports referred to above, as they relate to training issues.</p>

Area Examined	Findings
<p>MONITORING THE IMPROVEMENT PLAN</p>	<p>The IP is the subject of a monitoring process whereby the Force Learning Manager updates the performance matrix every six months and submits to the Best Value Programme Board, which has PA and ACPO representation and the PA Best Value and Scrutiny Committee.</p> <p>For reasons outlined above regarding the lack of targets and milestones, HM Inspector found it difficult to identify how the plan could be effectively monitored and encourages the Force to address this.</p>
<p>QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESSES</p>	<p>The Force operates a Quality Assurance (QA) strategy within development services. HM Inspector acknowledges that the Department has Centrex QA recognition. Good evidence exists of QA activity in relation to trainers benefiting from the trainer development officer system and the regular review of course material.</p> <p>The QA processes do not extend to divisional training officers. Some QA activity is taking place in this area due to the good efforts of the divisional trainers themselves, but it is ad hoc, lacking in corporacy and not readily auditable.</p> <p>HM Inspector strongly encourages the Force to introduce a corporate QA strategy and procedures, which formalise, develop and extend existing arrangements to all training and trainers, as a matter of priority.</p>

Area Examined	Findings
<p>EVALUATION OF TRAINING</p>	<p>HM Inspector found a comprehensive evaluation strategy in place, and resourcing for one evaluator. Regular evaluation takes place to Levels 1 and 2 in accordance with the strategy.</p> <p>However, the Force acknowledges that no Level 3 or 4 evaluations have been completed during the last 12 months. (One Level 3 evaluation is currently being undertaken). This is due to the long-term absence of the evaluator.</p> <p>HM Inspector was encouraged that a temporary full time evaluator had recently been appointed.</p> <p>HM Inspector also found that the programme of evaluations is agreed each year between the evaluator and Force Learning Manager. The evaluator is based within development services and reports to the Force Learning Manager.</p> <p>HM Inspector is concerned that the evaluation function is located within development services. The Force is encouraged to ensure that line management / accountability for evaluation is placed in the control of the client side of the function. Further that the Force develops a mechanism to ensure the monitoring of recommendation implementation in a form capable of ready audit.</p>
<p>COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT IN TRAINING</p>	<p>The Force has set up a local Criminal Justice Board Inter-Agency Group. HM Inspector was encouraged to learn of the agreement that has recently been reached to use this forum as a Training Advisory Group.(TAG)</p> <p>The Force provided good evidence of community engagement with development services but this has been restricted to elements of delivery except in respect of probationer training.</p> <p>HM Inspector encourages the Force to build upon the agreement for the TAG by developing a strategy for engaging communities in all aspects of the training cycle.</p>

Area Examined	Findings
<p>COLLABORATION – EXTERNAL ORGANISATIONS</p>	<p>HM Inspector found a variety of examples of collaborative work undertaken both at a Force level and divisional level.</p> <p>A Public Sector Working Group – the joint delivery of training regarding project management, and conflict management.</p> <p>A locally driven divisional initiative has resulted in collaborative work with a county council regarding the provision of domestic violence training through their domestic violence Co-ordinator.</p> <p>Working with Social Services in the provision of child and adult abuse training. This collaborative arrangement included the joint TNA, design and delivery of a course.</p>
<p>COLLABORATION – OTHER POLICE ORGANISATIONS</p>	<p>The Force works closely with the other forces in the Welsh region. Public order and some firearms training are provided collaboratively. A current project is the development of an all Wales region tutor constable's course.</p> <p>HM Inspector encourages the Force to further develop these initiatives.</p>
<p>ADOPTION OF NATIONAL GUIDANCE</p>	<p>The Force has formally adopted <i>Models for Learning and Development in the Police Service</i> and the inspection revealed that training practitioners were aware of the product.</p>
<p>MAIN AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF THE FORCE</p>	<p>The main areas for improvement identified by the Force are:</p> <p>The provision of an IT solution with NCALT which will assist in the provision of blended learning.</p> <p>Accreditation of courses to provide learners with transferable qualifications.</p> <p>Implementation of the Professionalising the Investigation Project (PIP) will necessitate the need to train and assess staff in its requirements.</p>
<p>APPLICATION OF THE 4Cs AND OPPORTUNITIES IDENTIFIED</p>	<p>HM Inspector was unable to validate claims that the principles of Best Value are applied in respect of newly commissioned training events.</p> <p>HM Inspector would encourage the Force to develop a more robustly documented process to evidence the application of the 4Cs that is capable of audit.</p>

Area Examined	Findings
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INTEGRATED COMPETENCY FRAMEWORK	<p>The Force maps all new courses against the ICF, but has not undertaken a similar exercise in relation to existing courses.</p> <p>HM Inspector encourages the Force to ensure that all training programmes are mapped against the framework.</p>
MONITORING PROCESS AND COMPLETION OF PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT REVIEWS FOR POLICE OFFICERS AND POLICE STAFF NOTEWORTHY PRACTICE	<p>Personal Development Reviews (PDR) are monitored both at a devolved stage and at Force level.</p> <p>The Force has recently introduced an online PDR system, which incorporates the ICF. This is allied to an online TNA package and will be subject to formal evaluation. Initial feedback would indicate considerable benefits attached to the use of the new system in the identification of training needs, the potential for evaluation and a significant increase in the level of PDR completion.</p>
BUSINESS PLANNING FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF TRAINING	<p>Each October, the Force Learning Manager consults with stakeholders as to their training requirements. The PDR process including individual TNA commences in November.</p> <p>The combined TNA and organisational requirements are linked to produce the draft CTP, which through the prioritisation process results in the final plan.</p>
PRIORITISATION MODEL FOR TRAINING	<p>The training requirement is formulated as related above and then prioritised by the FTPG based upon the strategic priorities of the Force. This is a largely subjective process and HM Inspector would encourage the Force to develop a more objective and structured approach that utilises an agreed 'risk assessment' criterion.</p>

Recommendations

Recommendation 1

HM Inspector recommends that the Force develop a training strategy that is aligned to the guidance given in relevant Home Office Circulars

Recommendation 2

HM Inspector recommends that the Force ensure that future variations to the costed training plan are recorded within the plan and monitored by the Force Training Prioritisation Group

Recommendation 3

HM Inspector recommends that the Force and the Police Authority establish a formal mechanism to monitor the costed training plan on an ongoing basis. This should include the development of performance measures in relation to the delivery of the plan

Recommendation 4

HM Inspector recommends that the Force Training Prioritisation Group should formally include Police Authority membership in order to assist the authority in carrying out its' monitoring function

Recommendation 5

HM Inspector recommends that the force ensures that the Force Training Prioritisation Group is chaired by the ACPO lead on operational matters

Recommendation 6

HM Inspector recommends that the Force develop a mechanism to ensure that accountability for standards, costs and planning for all training rests with a single source, irrespective of where in the Force or by whom it is provided

Recommendation 7

HM Inspector recommends that the Force ensures that the improvement plan is amended to include targets and milestones as a matter of urgency

Recommendation 8

HM Inspector recommends the Force to incorporate the recommendations from this inspection within their improvement plan

Recommendation 9

HM Inspector recommends that the Force and the Police Authority develop a more robust means of monitoring the improvement plan

Recommendation 10

HM Inspector recommends that the Force develops a comprehensive Quality Assurance process for all training, irrespective of where or by whom it is provided. The Quality Assurance process should be regularly monitored

Recommendation 11

HM Inspector recommends that the Force develop a robust evaluation function for all training, with a tasking and reporting process independent of Development Services. This should include a clear mechanism for commissioning and actioning evaluation projects and their recommendations

Recommendation 12

HM Inspector recommends that the Force develop a robust strategy for effectively engaging communities in all aspects of the training cycle

Recommendation 13

HM Inspector recommends that the Force develops a mechanism which ensures that the principles of Best Value are applied to all new training initiatives and that these are capable of audit

Recommendation 14

HM Inspector recommends that the Force ensures that all training programmes are mapped against the Integrated Competency Framework

Judgements

Judgement 1:

There is a significant amount of positive activity being undertaken by the Force in relation to training and HM Inspector acknowledges the work undertaken by the Force and Police Authority in order to respond to these changes. The Force has a robust Learning Strategy underpinned by demonstrable application of the National Costing Model.

The Force Learning Manager has a clear and challenging vision for the future of training in the Force, and is proactive in both local and regional development initiatives. There is a clear commitment at all levels within the Force to improve performance through training.

However, it is also evident that there are a number of areas that need to be strengthened. These include the extension of a formalised Quality Assurance process to all training provided by the Force, and the extension of accountability for all training to the Force Learning Manager in order to ensure corporacy. Similarly there are issues with the perceived independence of the evaluation function.

HM Inspector considers that the Force needs to ensure the recording of variations to the Costed Training Plan and pro actively use the plan as a management tool. In particular the Force and Police Authority need to set milestones for the Improvement Plan and ensure that it is robustly monitored.

HM Inspector concludes therefore that the quality of service is **'fair'**.

Judgement 2:

HM Inspector considers that the Best Value Review process was appropriately undertaken, and was regularly monitored by the Police Authority.

The PA and Force have demonstrated their commitment to bring about improvement in the training function at both a local and regional level and to respond positively to the recommendations made in this report.

HM Inspector was encouraged to find a number of planned improvement activities in existence. These include the development of an environmental scanning process and the introduction of an online PDR system, which is linked to a training needs analysis capability.

HM Inspector concludes therefore that the prospects for improvement are **'promising'**.

For further information on the judgement criteria refer to Appendix H/Annex A of the below document.

BEST VALUE AND PLANNING GUIDANCE FOR POLICE AUTHORITIES AND FORCES.

Adult Learning Inspectorate

Summary of Findings

The Adult Learning Inspectorate undertook an assessment of several training sessions in May 2004. The Inspector observed training sessions, interviewed learners and staff, and studied a number of documents. A summary of their findings is shown below:

Achievement and Standards

- All courses include some form of continuous assessment, and many have a formal assessment at the end. Most assessments are based on a competence framework. Learners' attainment in taught sessions was at least satisfactory and often good, based on tutors' reactions to skills demonstrated and responses to questions.

Quality of Education and Training

- Taught sessions were generally good or better. They were well planned, following the Centrex guidelines with some variations to suit local needs. Sessions have a good variety of activities and learners are actively involved throughout. Practical sessions are well linked to background knowledge and theory, such as important points of law or particular police procedures. Tutors give very good feedback and plenty of encouragement to learners, particularly in the driving sessions.
- Physical resources are good, with comfortable, well-equipped rooms, and sufficient specialist equipment, occasionally supplemented by equipment hired to meet particular areas of a syllabus. Learning materials are good, professionally produced and available in hard copy and computer versions. Tutors are appropriately qualified and experienced, and most demonstrate good teaching skills.
- Most arrangements for assessing and monitoring learners' progress are good, especially in the probationer training and the driving courses. Assessment procedures on these courses are very well documented, and most learners have a very clear understanding of how, when and by whom they are to be assessed. Learners also have a good understanding of how well they are progressing.
- Learners training needs or aspirations are identified during the annual performance reviews. Access to training courses is more difficult for those on late or night shift work, but these shifts are arranged several months ahead, and learners are expected to alert their supervisors to potential difficulties. Some courses are available through the medium of Welsh.

- Guidance and support for probationers is very good. While in the centre, they are supported by personal tutors who meet them regularly, sometimes weekly, to assess their progress, check their portfolios and help with any problems. Throughout the first 10-week assignment to their division, they are attached to a tutor-constable who gives continuous feedback and debriefs after each operational shift. While they attend courses in the Centrex centre in Cwmbran, they are given tutors' contact details and encouraged to call them.
- Advice and guidance for other learners is more varied. In particular, pre-course information is often minimal, and for PNC learners it is inadequate. Apart from on the probationers' course, there is insufficient attention to initial assessment of learners' existing skills or additional needs, and some tutors only find out that a learner has a particular need on the first morning of a course. At the very least, this creates embarrassment for the learner, but it may also mean that the tutor cannot make arrangements to meet their needs in the time available.
- Tutors do evaluate their courses and use feedback from learners to make improvements, but these are limited to basic likes and dislikes on a particular course. There are no mechanisms for checking that training has actually improved the operational performance of learners, as opposed to helped them to achieve a qualification.
- There are considerable variations between divisions in how training is given and tutors are supported. For example, in one division, a tutor regularly has time allocated to prepare materials and lessons for courses, but this does not happen to equivalent tutors on other divisions. Some courses differ in duration between divisions. Tutors have insufficient opportunities to share good practice and develop improvements as a team.



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

www.homeoffice.gov.uk/hmic