

Best Value Review of Police Training

Force: Humberside

Date of Inspection: 5–7 April 2004



A Report by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary

ISBN 1-84473-387-4
© Crown Copyright 2004
Published 2004

Context and Force performance

Context

| | | |
|---|-----------------|------------------------------------|
| Population served by the Force | 900,000 | |
| Number of police officers | 2218 | |
| Number of police staff | 979 | |
| Number of special constables | 224 | |
| Budget for training for the financial year: | Financial value | Percentage of Overall Force budget |
| 2003/04 | not asked | 0.45% |
| 2004/05 | £ 2,973,870 | 2.1% |

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/humbbaseline0604.pdf

Further details of the Force performance can be found at www.humberside.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>The training strategy is not compliant with HOC 53/2003. Work is underway to address this concern but it is likely to take at least six months to come to fruition. The strategy needs to be demonstrably implemented and communicated to the rest of the Force.</p> |
| QUALITY OF COSTED TRAINING PLAN | <p>There is no evidence of a CTP linked to organisational performance, although HM Inspector is aware that arrangements are being made to produce a plan for 2004/05.</p> <p>The Police Authority has not been involved in the preparation of the CTP.</p> <p>At the time of inspection the training budget had not been based on actual training needs, nor had it reflected growth elsewhere in the Force. A total NCM figure for training has not yet been produced.</p> <p>Virtually no training needs analysis takes place in relation to the training plan contents.</p> |
| MONITORING COSTED TRAINING PLAN THROUGHOUT THE YEAR | <p>As there is no training plan in existence, there is no capability of monitoring.</p> |
| TRAINING NOT INCLUDED IN THE COSTED TRAINING PLAN | <p>The costing activity in Force is capturing the majority of training sites across the Force. However, this activity has yet to be integrated into the training planning cycle to produce a CTP.</p> <p>HM Inspector was encouraged to see that the costing exercise is attempting to adhere to the spirit of the NCM despite a lack of direction from the Training Department.</p> |

| Area Examined | Findings |
|--|---|
| CLIENT/CONTRACTOR ARRANGEMENTS | <p>There is no effective client/contractor relationship in existence. The Head of Personnel sits on the Force Strategy Group but this is felt to be wholly ineffective.</p> <p>HM Inspector acknowledges that a more structured client/contractor framework is being discussed but there are no formal plans at the time of inspection. In any case the arrangements need to be better defined and articulated to all levels in the Force.</p> |
| MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS FOR TRAINING | <p>The management arrangements for training are fragmented. The ACC (support) has overall responsibility for training and development. He is reported to by the Head of Personnel through a Superintendent, who is in turn reported to by the Force Training Manager.</p> <p>The Force Training Manager has no 'strategic input' into the management of the training function.</p> <p>There is no group or body in existence through which training issues can be debated or developed.</p> <p>Head of Training has no effective control or influence over operational training. HM Inspector strongly encourages the Force to place all operational training under the control of the Training Department to achieve consistency in performance, planning and the professional development of the trainer resource across the Force.</p> |
| IMPLEMENTATION OF: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Managing Learning • Training Matters • Diversity Matters • Foundations for Change | <p>There are no structured implementation plans in relation to any of these reports and it appears that current HMIC recommendations have not been integrated into Force IPs. HM Inspector acknowledges that some work has been done in relation to FfC but the action taken so far, or planned to be taken, is not clearly defined.</p> |
| CURRENT IMPROVEMENT PLAN | <p>The current IP needs to be strengthened by underpinning work activities and clear milestones. Currently, it is difficult to see how the plan will be effectively monitored.</p> |

| Area Examined | Findings |
|---|--|
| <p>MONITORING THE IMPROVEMENT PLAN</p> | <p>The PA acknowledges that the IP is inadequate and unacceptable in its current form.</p> <p>There is a system for monitoring the IP, but this is immaterial, as the IP itself is not in a format that makes it possible to monitor.</p> <p>HM Inspector notes the intention of the PA and Force to achieve regular and active engagement on the future progress of improvement.</p> |
| <p>QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESSES</p> | <p>The Force training centre has Centrex QA approval and liP status. Operational training has neither. However, the necessary training structures and systems that may have been in place at the time Centrex approval was awarded were not recognised during the HMIC inspection. There also needs to be a performance regime developed across all training delivery sites in the Force to achieve a common standard.</p> |
| <p>EVALUATION OF TRAINING</p> | <p>HM Inspector was encouraged to see that there is a full-time evaluator who reports directly to ACC Operations.</p> <p>The evaluation process is well documented and focused.</p> <p>Evaluation of those courses which meet the criteria for inclusion appears reasonably sound but the process for implementing and monitoring recommendations is weak.</p> <p>The majority of training is not evaluated at all, beyond Level 1.</p> |
| <p>COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT IN TRAINING</p> | <p>There is good evidence that the community are involved at delivery level across a range of training courses, for example through victim groups and other agencies.</p> <p>There are future intentions at the strategic level to integrate the community view into the training planning process but this is not reflected in the training strategy.</p> <p>HM Inspector was encouraged to hear that the 'Quality of Life' policing strategy aims to develop community consultation, which in the longer term aims to inform the training planning requirement for Humberside.</p> |

| Area Examined | Findings |
|---|--|
| COLLABORATION – EXTERNAL ORGANISATIONS | <p>Joint investigation training with the social services has continued and there is some evidence of other collaborative arrangements around crime training. HM Inspector encourages the Force to clarify the collaborative arrangements and intentions of the Force in the training strategy.</p> <p>The Force has clear intentions for collaboration in the emerging learning and development strategy to exploit opportunities for collaboration with other training providers.</p> |
| COLLABORATION – OTHER POLICE ORGANISATIONS | <p>There has been some exchange of information across the north-east regional group around the FfC areas of TNA and design. Shared probationer training, Stage 2, is being explored across the region in addition to joint working with West and South Yorkshire to develop the IPLDP role on a pilot basis in January 2005.</p> |
| ADOPTION OF NATIONAL GUIDANCE | <p>There has been recent agreement at the north-east regional meeting to adopt the national guidance, but only within the Force training centre and not across all Force training.</p> |
| MAIN AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF THE FORCE | <p>To develop a strategic group for training and an environmental scanning process.</p> <p>To improve the robustness around training prioritisation and appropriate resourcing.</p> <p>To review the need for a recognised Head of Training who takes responsibility for being the strategic head of all training and the lead for professional development.</p> <p>To develop alternative learning strategies.</p> |
| APPLICATION OF THE 4Cs SINCE THE REVIEW | <p>There is no evidence that the concept of Best Value has been integrated into routine training management.</p> |
| IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INTEGRATED COMPETENCY FRAMEWORK | <p>ICF has not been introduced across the Force; however, the Force is now considering the most appropriate software to transfer from the Kent model to the full integration of the ICF.</p> |

| Area Examined | Findings |
|--|--|
| <p>MONITORING PROCESS AND COMPLETION OF PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT REVIEWS FOR POLICE OFFICERS AND POLICE STAFF</p> | <p>The PDR monitoring process has produced significant improvement in the completion of PDRs since they were aligned to threshold and competency related payments.</p> <p>The target is set for 100 per cent completion on time. Completion rates for 2003/04 were 87 per cent overall, with an increase also in the rates for special constables. In addition, routine dip sampling has been introduced as a qualitative measure.</p> |
| <p>BUSINESS PLANNING FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF TRAINING</p> | <p>The business planning process for training is fragmented, not cohesive or connected to the corporate planning cycle.</p> |
| <p>PRIORITISATION MODEL FOR TRAINING</p> | <p>There is no strategic training prioritisation model for training that represents both client and contractor sides.</p> |

Recommendations

Recommendation 1

HM Inspector recommends that the Force continues to develop and produce a training strategy and Plan that encompasses all training across the Force and utilises the National Costing Model

Recommendation 2

HM Inspector recommends that the Force places the control of all training provision in the Force in the hands of a recognised Head of Training and Development who takes responsibility for being the Strategic Head of all training

Recommendation 3

HM Inspector recommends that the Force reviews current proposals/actions in relation to both *Training Matters* and *Diversity Matters* and aligns these to the developing improvement plan – together with the underpinning monitoring mechanisms

Recommendation 4

HM Inspector recommends that the Police Authority engages directly with the Head of Training and Development to identify useful performance indicators that can be applied to all training in Force. The Police Authority, in turn, should thereafter encourage their regional counterparts to work in partnership to develop a mutually acceptable suite of comparators

Recommendation 5

HM Inspector recommends that the Force undertakes assessments of its current training provision to identify where, in the 'training cycle', communities are presently involved. Having identified gaps, the Force should put in place actions to address them

Recommendation 6

HM Inspector recommends that the Force undertakes a review of the communication strategies in place to ensure management decisions that are made are communicated efficiently and effectively

Recommendation 7

HM Inspector recommends that a client/contractor structure is developed with clear terms of reference to ensure training drives performance and meets customer requirements, thus giving Basic Command Unit commanders formal access to developing the training specification

Judgements

Judgement 1:

The management of training is not approached in a structured way and lacks strategic planning. There is no evidence to show the training delivered is linked to organisational performance or indeed that training is the driver of performance. The training function appears to remain disconnected from the rest of the Force.

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

Judgement 2:

Training management is fragmented across the Force and has largely worked in isolation from the Police Authority. The improvement plan produced at inspection was viewed as inadequate but it is being revisited to ensure that there are clear activities and milestones with effective high level monitoring. A revised client contractor framework with a better structured Training and Supervision Board and Training Delivery Board is being developed. Police Authority engagement is improving with participation in working groups allied to both Boards.

However, until the new arrangements in a revised improvement plan are implemented uncertainty remains as to their likely impact.

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

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 during the course of the HMIC (P&T) inspection. A summary of their findings is shown below:

Achievement and Standards

- Data about pass rates on courses delivered is not routinely collected or reviewed Force-wide. On most courses, pass rates are monitored or reviewed by the trainers responsible for delivery. Thorough records are kept of pass rates for courses undertaken in driving, first-aid, firearms, and other areas governed by legislation.
- In HOLMES 2 training there are mid-course assessments to provide learners with measurable evidence of their performance. Where learners are identified as needing support, additional coaching is provided before final assessments. In driver training, there is thorough verbal feedback and clear written feedback on learners' attainment and achievement.
- Practical detention officers' training and first-aid training involve regular and effective informal assessment of learners' understanding and skills development. There is informal assessment of learners' attainment in most of the observed training, but little formal assessment of attainment or identification of prior achievement.

Quality of Education and Training

- The quality of training is good. Seventy-five per cent of observed sessions were good or very good, and there were no unsatisfactory sessions. Practical training is consistently good and learners are well supported in acquiring and testing new skills and understanding. Sessions are well planned and learners are given clear guidance about session aims and objectives. Trainers in all observed sessions made regular checks on learners' understanding and spent time with learners who experienced difficulties.
- In both theory and practical training, the ratio of trainers to learners is good. In the majority of sessions (75 per cent), there were two trainers with each group. Trainers work together effectively to deliver information and demonstrate techniques or applications for learners. In IT sessions and firearms practical sessions, the paired trainers made effective use of the available time by simultaneous demonstration and informal assessment of learners during each activity. There is a maximum of twelve learners to two trainers in NSPIS Command and Control training and HOLMES 2 indexer training and learners are able to receive considerable individual support during sessions.

- In first aid training there were effective connections made between practical activities and theoretical medical elements of the course. Learners made good progress and were able to join in discussions of complex medical conditions without difficulty. In driver training theory sessions learners were involved in well paced and carefully managed discussions of their own concerns about training and learning.
- Training staff are very well qualified and have good experience in the operational areas for which they provide training. The minimum qualification for staff to deliver training sessions at Courtland Road is the relevant national training instructors' certificate in each occupational area, for example the ICT Instructor's Certificate or the National Driver Training Certificate. In addition, of 40 training staff and managers, 32 have Centrex trainer qualifications, with 4 more registered to undertake certificate courses during 2004. All firearms training courses and trainers are validated by Centrex.
- The Force encourages trainers to undertake educational and training qualifications, and trainers are given time during working hours to undertake assignments or complete coursework. There are currently 18 trainers who hold certificate in education or equivalent qualifications, and there are 8 who hold either graduate or postgraduate level qualifications in education.
- In observed sessions, trainers were able to make effective use of up-to-date operational knowledge and experience to place elements of training in a context familiar to learners. ICT trainers have a good knowledge of the software and hardware used across the Force by officers and staff.
- Resources are good at the Force's main Courtland Road training centre. Classroom accommodation is spacious and well suited to training activities. Classrooms contain modern and well-maintained audio and visual aids to training. All rooms have PowerPoint projectors, television and video or DVD playback facilities, and many have computer smart-boards or projection tablets. IT classrooms are suitably furnished and have sufficient workstations for learners, however some rooms are poorly ventilated. There is good ICT hardware for training, with most workstations providing flat screen monitors and networked PC units loaded with up-to-date software and networked to provide learners with access to live training data where appropriate.
- Some firearms training resources are poor. There are no vehicles dedicated to firearms training. Trainers have to hire vehicles or use the Force armed response vehicles (ARVs) for training exercises involving vehicles. Hired vehicles are easily damaged during training and ARVs are not always available when needed. Trainers spend a lot of time securing Force or hire vehicles or negotiating with hire companies after damage has occurred to vehicles. There are no indoor range facilities available for firearms training, and the outdoor range lacks adequate support facilities. Two metal lorry container units are used for classroom and social spaces at the outdoor range, and these do not have adequate lighting, heating, furniture or ventilation for their purpose.

- Formal assessments are used to monitor progress or establish individual learning needs during courses, but there is inadequate initial assessment of learner need. Some learners are sent on some courses for which they are ill-prepared or for which they do not have necessary technical knowledge and skills. For example, in HOLMES 2 indexer training there is no initial assessment of ICT skills or experience at divisional level before learners are sent on training. The training manager for HOLMES is not involved in the divisional selection process for learners, and aptitude and logic tests devised by trainers to assist the selection process are currently unused.
- Informal assessment takes place on most courses, and varies appropriately according to the type of course. There is frequent review of techniques covered in each part of training sessions and learners are given plenty of opportunities to check their own understanding and abilities.
- There is good support for learners during practical and theory sessions. ICT and HOLMES trainers knew their learners very well and had developed individualised strategies to support learners who were experiencing difficulties. Trainers in most areas gave learners support and advice on the operational impact of their training, and there were many useful discussions of the benefits of training to serving staff and officers.
- There is insufficient access to information on training opportunities for all staff and officers. Many would welcome the chance to undertake further training but are unsure of the processes for applying, or do not apply because they feel that their requests will be turned down by managers or supervising officers.



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

www.homeoffice.gov.uk/hmic