

Best Value Review of Police Training

Force: Gwent Police

Date of Inspection: 20–21 May 2004



A Report by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary

ISBN 1-84473-384-X
© Crown Copyright 2004
Published 2004

Context and Force performance

Context

Population served by the Force	552,428	
Number of police officers	1,400	
Number of police staff	670	
Number of special constables	135	
Budget for training for the financial year:	Financial Value	Percentage of Overall Force budget
2003/04	not asked	2.0%
2004/05	£1.8 million	1.8%

Performance

A baseline assessment of the Force was undertaken between September and December 2003.

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

www.homeoffice.gov.uk/hmic/gwenbaseline0604.pdf

Further details of the Force performance can be found at www.gwent.police.uk

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

Findings

Area Examined	Findings
TRAINING STRATEGY	<p>Whilst the training strategy is generally compliant with HOC 53/2003 in its layout it has no links with a HR strategy or with the wider Force objectives. Also, it lacks any mention of race, diversity or equality.</p>
QUALITY OF COSTED TRAINING PLAN	<p>There is no CTP that clearly links to organisational performance for 2004/05. Although some predictive costings have been done for external training requirements they are not completed using NCM methodology, and so cannot be used across the region for comparison.</p> <p>HM Inspector acknowledges that, at the time of the inspection, work was being undertaken to finalise the CTP, ensuring that it did link clearly to organisational performance for 2004/05.</p>
MONITORING COSTED TRAINING PLAN THROUGHOUT THE YEAR	<p>At present, there is no CTP, and therefore no monitoring. HM Inspector acknowledges that a CTP was being finalised by the Finance Department, together with the intention actively to monitor the plan during the forthcoming financial year.</p> <p>The training budgets are monitored by the Head of Training and their staff, although, as said above these are not currently NCM compliant.</p>
TRAINING NOT INCLUDED IN THE COSTED TRAINING PLAN	<p>HM Inspector was pleased to see the training plan does appear to have captured all training, including those training events at devolved training sites.</p> <p>There is no evidence that the PA is regularly requesting, reviewing or challenging the costs within the training plan.</p>

Area Examined	Findings
<p>CLIENT/CONTRACTOR ARRANGEMENTS</p>	<p>There is no clearly defined client/contractor structure in place within the Force to manage training. The training providers have a clear understanding of their role as the contractor, but this is not replicated by the client side. Whilst the Training Strategy Group (TSG) consists of a good representative group of heads of departments and BCU commanders there is still a lack of clarity regarding responsibilities. This has raised the issue of the Head of Training being 'outranked' by some senior managers in the group. There does not seem to be a process whereby any disagreements within the TSG can be adequately resolved. There is no ACPO representative to act as a final arbiter.</p> <p>HM Inspector was encouraged to see that the Force is reviewing its strategic management structures. The TSG is currently chaired by the Head of Professional and Ethical Standards Department, and over the past 12 months has met on a three monthly basis, with the last meeting having been held in March, 2004.</p> <p>HM Inspector acknowledges that the terms of reference for the group are clear but greater clarification and stronger leadership is required to ensure that this group connects effectively at COG level.</p>
<p>MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS FOR TRAINING</p>	<p>Within the Training Department the management arrangements for training are clearly defined:</p> <div style="text-align: center;"> <p>The Head of Professional & Ethical Standards (overall responsibility for training)</p> <p>↑</p> <p>Head of Training</p> <p>↙ ↘</p> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> <div style="text-align: center;"> <p>Training Department Mgr (core skills and IS training)</p> </div> <div style="text-align: center;"> <p>Performance and Development Mgr (co-ordination and admin of training, evaluation* and professional development of training staff)</p> </div> </div> </div> <p>* in absence of current postholder</p> <p>The Head of Training has full responsibility for all training conducted within the Force. Whilst specialist training remains outside the line management of the Head of Training, the training department aims to co-ordinate all training activities.</p>

Area Examined	Findings
<p>IMPLEMENTATION OF:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Managing Learning • Training Matters • Diversity Matters • Foundations for Change 	<p>HM Inspector was pleased to see clear and evidenced knowledge of many of the recommendations from <i>Managing Learning</i> and <i>Training Matters</i> within the Training Department, but there is no structured approach to implementation or monitoring or audit trail of achievement to date. Consequently, trainers were unable to state where the Force was in relation to previous HMIC recommendations or how they have been implemented.</p> <p>There is a Diversity Matters Steering Group, held bi-monthly, with clear terms of reference, purpose and membership. There is also a comprehensive training matrix for the <i>Diversity Matters</i> recommendations, with action managers identified, and regular updating of progress to date.</p> <p>Gwent are progressing all 19 elements of the FfC and are the regional lead on six of them.</p> <p>The Wales region has been one of the most vigorous in terms of setting up regional groups and there is a detailed plan to implement the FfC.</p>
<p>CURRENT IMPROVEMENT PLAN</p>	<p>There is one all encompassing BV IP for the training department with clear and detailed actions and milestones. However, it does not include any links to previous HMIC reports.</p> <p>The Force needs to ensure that the IP becomes a standing agenda item at the TSG meetings to ensure continued regular monitoring and to inform other TSG members (especially client side staff) of the strategic direction of the training function.</p>

Area Examined	Findings
<p>MONITORING THE IMPROVEMENT PLAN</p>	<p>There is sound evidence of implementation and monitoring meetings, showing monthly monitoring since November 2003. There is also a BVR Board meeting (every quarter) where progress on the IP is discussed. It is clear that the Police Authority have had some impact on this process. This is evidenced by the comment in the minutes highlighting the importance of involvement and attendance at meetings of the Police Authority as critical friends.</p> <p>There is a local implementation and monitoring meeting system, arranged within the training function, with monthly meetings to check progress and drive the BVR Board meeting process. Action at both strategic and tactical levels is being achieved.</p> <p>The current plans show the owners of actions and give a status report on progress to date. The current IP claims 13 recommendations have been completed.</p>
<p>QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESSES</p>	<p>There are no QA processes presently in place to ensure the quality of the training function. HM Inspector acknowledges that work is being undertaken by the Training Manager to rectify this.</p> <p>All training staff are Centrex qualified (and encouragingly always qualified before being posted to the training function). Trainers have been 'quality checking' each other but there is no professional development programme.</p> <p>All training and development managers hold CIPD qualification (diploma) or equivalent.</p> <p>The achievement of liP is one IP recommendation but the COG does not currently class this as a high priority. A two-year time frame is anticipated.</p> <p>HM Inspector was pleased to see that the Training Department are developing performance indicators in relation to trainer usage (contact time) and non-attendance (wastage).</p>

Area Examined	Findings
<p>EVALUATION OF TRAINING</p>	<p>The evaluation strategy in place is embryonic and is planned to be developed following the imminent selection of a Force evaluator. The Force is interacting at regional level in this respect.</p> <p>There are independence issues raised with the current evaluation strategy and HM Inspector recommends that, in the longer term, the taking of, and reporting from, evaluation function should be placed outside of the Training and Professional and Ethical Standards Departments.</p> <p>Trainers instigate Level 1 and 2 evaluations and these are completed for each course. Trainers then assess whether to amend/alter lesson plans for their own information.</p> <p>There is currently no clear evidence of any Level 3 or 4 evaluation of training provision being conducted.</p>
<p>COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT IN TRAINING</p>	<p>No evidence of pro-active engagement with the community across the training function could be found. However, the Training Manager (Service Delivery) is a member of the Regional Work Group, who are collaborating in this area as part of the regional IP.</p> <p>Some crime training links in with community bodies (for example, social services) and there is a developing IAG that will in the longer term be consulted.</p> <p>HM Inspector was encouraged to hear ideas to interact with other parts of the community in the future, especially around the PCSO and special constables' training, but there is no formal plan in place to achieve this.</p>
<p>COLLABORATION – EXTERNAL ORGANISATIONS</p>	<p>There is good evidence that collaborative arrangements within the Welsh region are in place. There are collaborative partnerships within crime training, linking with several local service providers. There are also links with local colleges for the provision of NVQ opportunities. Gwent is an approved centre with the awarding body OCR, and has a partnership with Torfaen training.</p>

Area Examined	Findings
<p>COLLABORATION – OTHER POLICE ORGANISATIONS</p>	<p>Gwent have just completed a regional TNA for tutor constables' courses, backed up by sound documentation. The regional strategy meetings have not been attended by ACPO following regional agreement. But this decision is being re-considered by Gwent. PA representation at regional level has been very positive.</p> <p>Evidence was found of firm links between Gwent, South Wales and Dyfed-Powys police in a number of areas.</p>
<p>ADOPTION OF NATIONAL GUIDANCE</p>	<p>There is evidence that the national guidance has been adopted within Force and is practised at all levels.</p> <p>Centrex packages are generally used, but mostly only the aims and objectives. Training methodologies are adapted to suit the trainees' needs.</p>
<p>MAIN AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF THE FORCE</p>	<p>ACPO leadership/representation at Training Strategy Group level.</p> <p>Need for improved dialogue between client and contractor in planning of needs and in refining training delivery (abstraction rates and non-attendance at courses). HM Inspector acknowledges that a prioritisation model exists that can be used to engage both the client and contractor sides.</p> <p>Development of the use of NCM.</p> <p>Review lack of Police Authority involvement in the monitoring of the IP.</p> <p>Review lack of an evaluator within the evaluation unit.</p> <p>Review lack of a QA framework and process for the training function.</p>
<p>APPLICATION OF THE 4Cs SINCE THE REVIEW</p>	<p>There is some evidence that the concept of BV has been integrated into routine training management, particularly in the Training Department and the approach to collaboration. However the lack of a clear specification of the training requirement makes planning difficult and increases the exposure of the Force to risk.</p>

Area Examined	Findings
<p>IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INTEGRATED COMPETENCY FRAMEWORK</p>	<p>The ICF has only recently been integrated into the PMDRs for the Force and this new scheme is currently being ‘rolled out’ commencing with chief superintendents & superintendents. It is not clear how the PMDR process will link to the training plan, although HM Inspector acknowledges that this issue is being considered within the Force PDR implementation plan.</p> <p>HM Inspector was concerned to find that there is no HR strategy to inform the training planning process.</p>
<p>MONITORING PROCESS AND COMPLETION OF PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT REVIEWS FOR POLICE OFFICERS AND POLICE STAFF</p>	<p>Divisional personnel officers monitor PMDR completion.</p> <p>The Head of Training and Performance and Development manager monitors PMDRs for the training department staff.</p>
<p>BUSINESS PLANNING FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF TRAINING</p>	<p>The training business planning process is fragmented and not cohesive or connected to the corporate planning cycle.</p> <p>There is no clear business plan for the whole of the training function.</p>
<p>PRIORITISATION MODEL FOR TRAINING</p>	<p>Although there is a strategic prioritisation model for training that engages both the client and contractor sides there is no ACPO involvement at TSG effectively to arbitrate prioritisation issues where agreement cannot be reached.</p>

Recommendations

Recommendation 1

HM Inspector recommends that the Force develops a more distinct client/contractor arrangement that ensures that the client has a clear role in the commissioning and evaluation of training and the contractor is held accountable for delivery

Recommendation 2

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

Recommendation 3

HM Inspector recommends that the Force develops a costed training plan that is aligned to the guidance given in relevant Home Office Circulars

Recommendation 4

HM Inspector recommends that the Force training plan is developed to ensure that it captures all training in the force irrespective of where or by whom it is provided

Recommendation 5

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

Recommendation 6

HM Inspector recommends that the Force develops structured implementation plans in respect of the reports referred to in this report and that these are regularly monitored through to completion

Recommendation 7

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 8

HM Inspector recommends that the Force develops a clear strategy in respect of collaboration with external organisations together with protocols for agreements concluded

Judgements

Judgement 1:

The training management within the Force has shown a drive and commitment to achieving continued development of the overall quality of training, and deserve praise for re-dressing the balance after a period of apparent inactivity. However, there are some fundamental gaps in key strategic areas, namely around ACPO representation, strategy, costing, Quality Assurance and monitoring of plans. Recognition is made of the progress made so far by training management.

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

Judgement 2:

There is a revised improvement plan that clearly illustrates the actions that will be taken in the medium to long term to improve the Gwent training function. They reflect the Force, regional and national requirements. A systematic monitoring and review framework that has the full support of both ACPO and the Police Authority supports the substantive plan. The weaknesses around quality assurance, the costed training plan and monitoring are being addressed.

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

For further information on the judgement criteria refer to Appendix H/Annexe 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 prior to the HMIC (P&T) inspection. A summary of their findings is shown below:

Achievement of Standards

- Most training courses include regular assessment carried out by the course tutor. Some courses also include formal examinations. All learners are required to meet specific achievement criteria on accredited courses in order to pass the course and gain certification.
- In the lessons observed, most learners showed good knowledge and understanding of the course material. They were able to accurately recall information from previous training courses, link this information to their current course, and apply their knowledge to the workplace. Most learners are developing good analytical and interpersonal skills. They are motivated to learn and demonstrate their understanding by asking a wide range of questions relating theoretical issues to practical situations.

Quality of Education and Training

- The training observed was either satisfactory or good. There was no unsatisfactory training. Course and lesson planning are detailed, but there is sometimes an insufficient emphasis on meeting the individual needs of all learners. In the better lessons the objectives of the training were made clear to learners.
- Presentations on ICT courses were particularly clear and supported by good IT and paper-based resources. In most lessons the tutors made very effective links use of learners' work-related experience to enliven theory lessons and to enhance the effectiveness of learning. Tutors made frequent reference to the importance of the training for effective police work.
- Most tutors have good working relationships with learners and make them feel that their contributions to lessons are valuable. Tutors make some good use of short written tests, verbal questions, practice activities and case study scenarios to assess learners' understanding of the course material. There is little variety in teaching methods in the theory lessons and some insufficient use of targeted questions to involve all participants and check the understanding of individual learners.

- Learning resources are satisfactory. Tutors are appropriately qualified and experienced. All tutors have a basic trainer qualification from Centrex and some also have teaching qualifications. Some tutors make very effective use of their experience within the police to illustrate key points during training and to provide good advice and guidance to learners.
- The training accommodation is satisfactory. Learning resources are of good quality and are used effectively by tutors. Learners have satisfactory access to ICT facilities. Learners report that the police Force intranet is a useful source of relevant information.
- Assessment arrangements for courses are satisfactory and are generally well understood by learners. Most courses are assessed by regular tests of learners' knowledge, understanding and practical skills.
- On most courses, learners receive regular feedback on their performance, particularly on driver training courses. Learners on probationary courses have a useful progress review with their supervisor once every 15 weeks, but there are few formal progress reviews on other courses. Many of these courses are less than one week in duration.
- All new recruits go through an initial assessment and selection process, and the results are recorded in their personal file. However, tutors make insufficient use of this information and initial assessment is not used in course planning.
- There is a satisfactory range of courses available to learners. Over 200 courses have been offered in 2003-04. Most courses are made up of standard units or components, designed to ensure that all learners reach the same level of knowledge and understanding.
- Tutors on the probationary courses have a good awareness of the training delivered by Centrex and plan their own courses to complement the Centrex training. The annual training plan is amended to respond to requests for additional or alternative training events. There is very little use of alternative learning methods, such as e-learning and distance learning.
- The quality and accessibility of information, advice and guidance to learners in relation to courses and programmes is satisfactory. Induction arrangements enable learners to understand their rights and responsibilities and to be aware of the demands of the course or programme. Assessment of individual learning needs is satisfactory, but there is insufficient attention paid to the needs of some learners when planning and delivering training. Tutors provide good support for learners both in and out of lessons. There are effective arrangements for providing relevant support for learners on personal issues.



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

www.homeoffice.gov.uk/hmic