

# Best Value Review of Police Training

Force: Metropolitan Police Service

Date of Inspection: 15–18 February 2005



A Report by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary

ISBN 1-84473-519-2  
© Crown Copyright 2005  
Published 2005

# Context and Force performance

## Context

Population served by the Force	7,347,547	
Number of police officers	30,543	
Number of police staff	13,307	
Number of special constables	726	
Budget for training for the financial year:	Financial Value	Percentage of Overall Force budget
2003-04	Not asked	2.07%
2004/05	£62,533,000	Not available

## 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/mpsbaseline1004.pdf](http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/hmic/mpsbaseline1004.pdf)

Further details of the Force performance can be found at: [www.met.police.uk](http://www.met.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](http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/hmic/training.htm)

# Findings

Area Examined	Findings
<b>TRAINING STRATEGY</b>	<p>HM Inspector was encouraged to find that the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) has a three year training strategy which is very well aligned to relevant Home Office Circulars.</p>
<b>QUALITY OF COSTED TRAINING PLAN</b>  <b>NOTEWORTHY PRACTICE</b>	<p>The MPS has produced a thorough and broad ranging CTP following the requirements of the NCM, and relevant Home Office circulars. HM Inspector found this piece of work to be detailed and comprehensive and to be of note worthy practice.</p> <p>HM Inspector notes the difficulties experienced in producing the 2004/05 CTP in a timely manner, partly caused by software difficulties and partly by ownership issues of the NCM process. HM Inspector encourages the MPS to satisfy itself that sufficient resources are now allocated to this function and are located in the most appropriate business area.</p>
<b>MONITORING COSTED TRAINING PLAN THROUGHOUT THE YEAR</b>	<p>HM Inspector was encouraged to note the development and utility of the Quarterly Management Report (QMR), and the associated annual review. These documents provide regular performance updates from contractors, via Training Boards to the Training Management Board regarding performance compared to the plan. These are a recent procedural development, beginning in April 2004, and HM Inspector encourages the Force to continue to develop these reports, particularly in respect to the cost of training.</p> <p>However, although there appears to be a robust system to monitor the plan HM Inspector has concerns regarding the degree to which this is largely driven by corporate demands at the expense of local needs, to an extent that the latter do not get addressed in an appropriate proportion.</p> <p>During visits to Boroughs, HM Inspector was shown numerous examples of locally identified needs, specifically targeted towards operational performance improvements which had not been delivered to the extent required because of the need to ensure corporate training was met.</p>

Area Examined	Findings
<p><b>MONITORING COSTED TRAINING PLAN THROUGHOUT THE YEAR</b></p> <p><b>continued</b></p>	<p>HM Inspector encourages the Force to identify a means of ensuring a more appropriate balance between corporate need and local needs, or at least attempt to collate emerging local needs more dynamically throughout the year so that these might be addressed in a corporate or semi corporate way.</p> <p>HM Inspector was pleased to note the scrutiny shown by the PA via its HR Committee in respect to the CTP, and other associated aspects of MPS training.</p>
<p><b>TRAINING NOT INCLUDED IN THE COSTED TRAINING PLAN</b></p>	<p>The MPS believes its captures all established training within the CTP, and HM Inspector encourages the Force to continue to challenge any training proposals, which have not been subject to the NCM processes.</p> <p>Visits to Boroughs showed that there was a good deal of work being undertaken to identify local training needs. However, the resultant local plans were of a disparate nature, and the application of costs and other national guidance in relation to how they might be addressed was not evident.</p> <p>The CTP within the MPS, whilst comprehensive, is perceived locally to be entirely mandatory and as such takes precedence over locally identified training need.</p>
<p><b>CLIENT/CONTRACTOR ARRANGEMENTS</b></p>	<p>Training Boards and School Management Boards provide the strategic client groups within individual business areas of the MPS. A member of staff at ACPO rank or equivalent chairs these Boards. The Boards report on a quarterly basis to the Training Management Board (TMB), chaired by the Director of HR, which is the Force's senior client body. All chairs of the Training Boards are members of the Management Board, as is the Director of Training and Development. The Training Strategy sets out the roles and responsibilities of both clients and contractors. HM Inspector was concerned to find that there are inconsistencies in the function of these Boards, with some being more developed than others in terms of their ability to meet regularly and provide the standards of service required by the TMB. However HM Inspector was reassured to find that the TMB challenges these inconsistencies in an open and robust manner, and encourages this challenge to continue until the process for all meets service requirements.</p>

Area Examined	Findings
<p><b>CLIENT/CONTRACTOR ARRANGEMENTS</b></p> <p>continued</p>	<p>The client/contractor relationship at BOCU and department level was less defined. However, HM Inspector was encouraged to see, in some BOCUs, the development of fledgling processes. Further exploration of a corporate process to establish this relationship at all levels of the training and development function needs to be pursued by the Directorate of Training and Development (DTD). HM Inspector encourages the Force to consider adopting an emerging process from either Lambeth or Newham, both of which were able to demonstrate note worthy practice in terms of a developing client/contractor process.</p>
<p><b>MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS FOR TRAINING</b></p>	<p>The Director of Training and Development (DoTD) does not have overall control of all training within the Force, however all training providers are required to comply with the standards of training delivery that have been set by him. DoTD has the responsibility to oversee training standards at every delivery site and for all training providers. To this end the Training Standards Unit (TSU) was established in 2003, as a result of the Best Value Review of Training.</p> <p>The Training Boards and TMB provide the management structures to allow these standards and processes to become embedded. HM Inspector is encouraged by the role and remit of TSU, but found that the requirement of the unit to “join up” MPS training into a cohesive whole, still has some way to go particularly in terms of QA and evaluation.</p> <p>The MPA, via the HR committee, provide an appropriate level of oversight for training and development, and there are good and regular links via liaison members for the MPA and the DTD.</p> <p>The Director is supported by a well qualified member of police staff at a senior position. Both police officers and members of police staff chair training Boards thus providing a good balance between operational experience and professional expertise.</p>
<p><b>IMPLEMENTATION OF:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Managing Learning</b></li> <li>• <b>Training Matters</b></li> <li>• <b>Diversity Matters</b></li> <li>• <b>Foundations for Change</b></li> </ul>	<p>HM Inspector found that the MPS have used the principles contained within <i>Managing Learning</i> within their Best Value Review, and the subsequent re organisation of the training and development process within the Force. The MPS have established an IPLDP programme Board, and an Implementation Working Group aimed at addressing the issues raised in <i>Training Matters</i>, and is currently one of five forces taking part in a current pilot project for probationer training.</p>

Area Examined	Findings
<p><b>IMPLEMENTATION OF:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Managing Learning</li> <li>• Training Matters</li> <li>• Diversity Matters</li> <li>• Foundations for Change</li> </ul> <p><b>continued</b></p>	<p>In 2003 the MPS position was assessed against the recommendations contained within <i>Diversity Matters</i>. This was reported to the MPA. In addition the MPS conducted a thematic review of race and diversity which reported in March 2004. Actions from this review are monitored by the MPA. HM Inspector encourages the MPS and MPA to reassure itself that all recommendations from <i>Diversity Matters</i>, relevant to the Force, are either finalised, or continue to have action taken in respect to them and are monitored by both bodies, and that this process can be clearly seen.</p> <p>The MPS have addressed key issues from <i>Foundations For Change</i> via their Training Standards Unit (TSU) and a strategic work plan exists to monitor MPS and regional activity. HM Inspector encourages the MPS and MPA to develop a clear monitoring arrangement for this work.</p>
<p><b>CURRENT IMPROVEMENT PLAN</b></p>	<p>HM Inspector found the Best Value review to be thorough and wide ranging, resulting in an IP which is now mostly complete. Three items remain outstanding, and require continuing action. Now that this process is coming to an end HM Inspector is encouraged to find a draft overarching IP, which includes many recommendations, which apply to training and development regardless of where or by whom they arose.</p>
<p><b>MONITORING THE IMPROVEMENT PLAN</b></p>	<p>HM Inspector found good historic monitoring of the BVIP by the MPA to have taken place and current monitoring to be by exception reporting the MPA. HM Inspector is encouraged to note the intention for the new IP to be monitored regularly by the TMB, and by the MPA.</p>
<p><b>QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESSES</b></p>	<p>Within the TSU a QA team is established with responsibility for overseeing this function across the MPS. The information they collate is produced on a regular basis via a performance report to the TMB, and is available via the intranet. This QA department is currently responsible for carrying out a series of targeted QA audits across the MPS, however this function is a recent development and to date only three such audits have taken place.</p>

Area Examined	Findings
<p><b>QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESSES</b></p> <p>continued</p>	<p>Within DTD QA processes were found to be generally good, however managers within Professional Development and the Extended Police Family Training Departments both acknowledged that activity had been reduced in response to increased demand placed upon them. Outside of DTD QA practices were found to be significantly less rigorous at Boroughs and departments.</p> <p>Whilst it is acknowledged that the function of the TSU is improving training and development functions across the service, HM Inspector was concerned to find that such QA processes still are not effectively established, and therefore there can be no guarantee that corporate standards are being achieved across the MPS.</p>
<p><b>EVALUATION OF TRAINING</b></p>	<p>A team of five evaluators is located within the TSU. Higher level evaluations are the responsibility of this team, and clients, via a service level agreement commission these. Prioritisation of these is agreed upon by the TMB. HM Inspector notes the requirement for the client sponsor to be sufficiently placed in the organisation to take action in respect of any recommendations made, and that evaluation reports are published on the intranet.</p> <p>HM Inspector was pleased to note that this team is physically removed from the DTD management team, and report directly to sponsors with their reports, which are also published on the MPS website. A dual reporting system allows reports to go to both the sponsor and the DoDT. HM Inspector found the necessary level of independence within this team. Further work is required by to ensure that a clear audit trail of action in respect of recommendations is available for TMB. Presently this is actioned informally by the evaluation team.</p> <p>Level 1 and 2 evaluation work is the responsibility of training providers, which will be audited by the evaluation team in a rolling programme over the next 4 years.</p> <p>HM Inspector was pleased to note the MPS have an evaluation strategy well aligned to Home Office Circulars, and that a prioritisation matrix to help risk assess the order of evaluation work is applied and sanctioned by TMB. HM Inspector found that evaluation activity is also planned by other departments, for example, Crime Academy and Boroughs, and encourages the MPS to review this activity to ensure a suitable level of independence is built into the process.</p>



Area Examined	Findings
<p><b>COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT IN TRAINING</b></p>	<p>HM Inspector was pleased to see the development of an IAG to assist in community involvement in training. This is a recent innovation and has yet to become embedded. The service is encouraged to ensure it meets the requirements of Home Office circular 4/2005, and the associated APA report.</p> <p>HM Inspector was made aware of a recently mandated programme of training for domestic violence issues to be delivered locally. Part of the training design was the inclusion of local representative groups. This is a good example of where a generic training need can be disaggregated and applied to the specific communities within which the training is to be applied after delivery. HM Inspector encourages the Force to further develop this area so that a conscious decision is taken at the point of delivery to ensure inclusion of specific communities within the generic training need, and ensure that their particular issues are addressed within the general context of the training as designed.</p>
<p><b>COLLABORATION – EXTERNAL ORGANISATIONS</b></p>	<p>Collaborative work takes place with many other public bodies including the London Fire Brigade and Ambulance Service, particularly in relation to joint emergency training. Also work is in hand with the Immigration Service. Many other examples were also found.</p> <p>HM Inspector encourages the DTD to incorporate such activity within its evaluation schedule to satisfy itself that all such training is effective and efficient.</p>
<p><b>COLLABORATION – OTHER POLICE ORGANISATIONS</b></p>	<p>The MPS have a number of regional and international collaborative arrangements with other police organisation, including training with Japan, Italy, South Africa and Russia.</p> <p>Collaboration is taking place in relation to the design of the IDLDP and PIP programmes.</p> <p>Representatives from MPS chair the SE Region training committee, which provides a forum for discussing collaborative ventures.</p> <p>Very little evidence of collaboration between boroughs was found.</p>

Area Examined	Findings
<p><b>ADOPTION OF NATIONAL GUIDANCE</b></p>	<p>HM Inspector found limited knowledge of the national guidance contained within the <i>Centrex Models for Learning in the Police Service</i> document. The MPS is encouraged to disseminate the information contained in this document to all those at which ever level have responsibility for training and development. At a local level there was effectively no knowledge of this document, or of any other appropriate reference tool.</p>
<p><b>MAIN AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF THE FORCE</b></p>	<p>Balancing expectation for training against prioritised need.</p> <p>Better national understanding of demand and supply for training leading to the above situation.</p>
<p><b>APPLICATION OF THE 4Cs SINCE THE REVIEW</b></p>	<p>Good application of the use of Best Value methodology was found in relation to the use of driver training. However HM Inspector encourages the MPS to consider the manner in which it can routinely use the principles of Best Value when considering all new training events. There is no routine comprehensively applicable mechanism to apply these principles, particularly at borough level.</p>
<p><b>INTEGRATION OF THE INTEGRATED COMPETENCY FRAMEWORK</b></p>	<p>All staff now have role profiles allied to the ICF. All promotion, selection and recruitment procedures are based on role profiles, and/or ICF behaviours. A corporate induction process includes familiarisation with role profiles and PDR. NOS are used in the design of new training. PDR processes have yet to mirror the national requirements, however the ambition remains to do so.</p>
<p><b>MONITORING PROCESS AND COMPLETION OF PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT REVIEWS FOR POLICE OFFICERS AND POLICE STAFF</b></p>	<p>PDR processes are in place for all staff. These are monitored locally by HR Managers and are subject to HR reviews. The information contained within these reviews is made available for the HR Training Board, TMB, and MPA. However, HM Inspector was concerned to find a recurrent theme of disillusionment with PDR across the Force, which appeared to arise from regular alterations and changes to the process, and a feeling that the document served no real effective purpose for staff.</p>

Area Examined	Findings
<p><b>BUSINESS PLANNING FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF TRAINING</b></p>	<p>HM Inspector found business planning for training which can be described as a “bottom up” process, building upon client requirements, prioritised by TMB, and when ratified, submitted to the MPA for endorsement. HM Inspector encourages the MPS and MPA to review this business planning process to allow NCM figures to be considered at an early stage to facilitate the development of a need based budget. Whilst this planning process was found to be ratified by TMB, in respect to a final specification of training need, the Force must satisfy itself that this process is not exclusively contractor driven, and the role of Training Boards is given key status with regard to agreeing specification.</p> <p>HM Inspector found that Boroughs have been given a corporate Business Plan template to complete, however was surprised and concerned to note that there is no requirement for, or mention of, training within this template. Such consideration will encourage a more robust and locally owned training plan to be developed.</p>
<p><b>PRIORITISATION MODEL FOR TRAINING</b></p>	<p>HM Inspector was pleased to see a prioritisation model in existence in relation to training. This model provides a systematic risk assessment process for managing supply and demand conflicts within training and development for the MPS. This model is applied by TMB to meet their strategic target level.</p>

# Recommendations

## **Recommendation 1**

HM Inspector recommends that the Force reviews the resources required in order to provide a timely completed Costed Training Plan. That review will cover the specific relationship required between the Directorate of Training and Development and the Human Resource Directorate in respect of financial support and expertise

## **Recommendation 2**

HM Inspector recommends that the Quarterly Monthly Report is further developed to incorporate contemporaneous cost information for training delivered compared to that planned

## **Recommendation 3**

HM Inspector recommends that a review is conducted to identify and rectify difficulties encountered by some Training Boards preventing them from meeting on a regular basis, and providing the required management information to the Training Management Board

## **Recommendation 4**

HM Inspector recommends that a corporate client contractor relationship is designed, marketed, and applied across all Territorial, Operational and Crime functions of the Force, able to feed into the current Training Board function

## **Recommendation 5**

HM Inspector recommends that the role and remit of the Training Standards Unit is reviewed in order to strengthen and accelerate its ambition to monitor and raise performance and standards across all training and development functions, particularly in relation to quality assurance and evaluation

### **Recommendation 6**

**HM Inspector recommends that the Force reinforce the role of the evaluation team to all training providers. The function of the evaluation team should include details of a mechanism for actioning evaluation project recommendations**

### **Recommendation 7**

**HM Inspector recommends that the Force and Police Authority satisfy itself that all recommendations contained within Diversity Matters have been, or continue to be monitored and responded to**

### **Recommendation 8**

**HM Inspector recommends that the Force and Police Authority develop a clear audit trail of local and regional activity in respect to *Foundations for Change***

### **Recommendation 9**

**HM Inspector recommends that the Force review the PDR process. This review will incorporate the development of PDR to better link with training planning and evaluation**

### **Recommendation 10**

**HM Inspector recommends that the Force incorporates training and development functions into its locally based business planning processes**

# Judgements

## Judgement 1:

Training and development processes were found to be increasingly more valued by members of staff across the Force. Structures reinforced, and built from new, after the best value review have started to become effective across more business areas, particularly at the centre where the service was found to be, at least, good. Good development of a strategy and costing model for training has taken place, however the effective use of these key areas needs to evolve to fully utilise their potential, particularly at borough and departmental level, where currently little effective use is made of information available. At this level staff were found to be unable to prioritise or respond to local need, and felt only able to react to centrally mandated training. The key strategic cornerstones for effective prioritisation and planning are in place through Training Boards but these need to develop in a consistent manner, to fully satisfy organisational goals.

The Force must look closely at its PDR mechanisms and the use of national guidance across all training functions, to ensure staff receive timely and quality training. Significant development has taken place since the Best Value review of training and much still needs to be done to ensure that this good work becomes established and interwoven throughout all training providers and processes. Many of the changes that have occurred as a result of the Best Value review have yet to be embedded across the whole training function, particularly in relation to cost, planning and standards.

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

## Judgement 2:

A good best value review led to a number of key changes to the training and development functions of the Force. The Police Authority have shown themselves to be thorough in their monitoring of these developments, and actively engaged in the process. A draft Force-wide improvement plan has been developed by the MPS. This document will provide a pathway for future improvements in training and development, and is underpinned by a robust monitoring mechanism.

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 (LINK)**

# Adult Learning Inspectorate

## Summary of Findings

### Achievement and Standards

- All operational training courses include some form of on-going assessment carried out by the tutor. Most courses also include formal examinations at regular intervals. All learners are required to meet specific achievement criteria in order to pass the course and gain certification. It was not possible to gather data on retention or pass rates. However, observed standards of performance by advanced drivers were satisfactory to good, and by dog handlers were good or very good. In classroom sessions, learners showed satisfactory to good understanding and knowledge.

### Quality of Education and Training

- Most training is very good, and some, notably the advanced driver training, is outstanding. Learners make good progress in developing new knowledge or skills or consolidating existing ones. All courses are particularly well planned. Tutors use a good mixture of open and targeted questions to draw out learners knowledge and previous experience. In a very few classes, some of these questions are too heavily “pointed” so that it is obvious how the learners are expected to answer. There are good links to previous work in all classes, and to other units or components of the training programmes, such as relevant legislation, or key risk assessment activities in classes primarily designed to develop operational skills. There is appropriate attention to both learner safety and the safety of the public in all sessions, but especially driving, public order and officer safety training.
- Most lessons make use of case studies and scenarios. These are used well. Tutors reveal the scenarios in small stages, and there is plenty of discussion to draw out the key learning points each time. Learners use copies of real forms and documents during the scenarios, and they keep these afterwards to help as study aids. In some cases, individual boxes from important forms are scanned onto presentation slides and completed on-screen to emphasise key points. Most tutors include small-group work in their lessons. These activities are clearly introduced in most cases, and learners enjoy the discussions. Findings from these groups are shared and learning points drawn out effectively.

- Tutors are well qualified and experienced for their roles. Most have a basic trainer qualification from Centrex and several have recognised teaching qualifications as well. All tutors who work in the main training department, known as the directorate, are supplied with very good learning materials from a core support team. These materials include lesson notes and case study or scenario documents for the learners, and PowerPoint presentations and guides for the tutors. The notes, which clearly set out the aims and objectives of each unit, are given to students in advance of the relevant lesson to allow time to study them. Where external speakers are invited to contribute to training programmes, or visits have to be made, the core team also makes all the arrangements. However, tutors who provide the officer safety training do not have access to this central support team. This means that they prepare all their own learning materials.
- Most tutors have sufficient access to computer and projector equipment with the exception of those based in Keston. Most of the training accommodation is satisfactory, although some classrooms are unappealing as learning environments, particularly in Keston and in some of the buildings in Hendon.. The new large-scale public-order training facility in Gravesend is outstanding, and provides simulations of buildings, streets, shops, trains and housing estates.
- Assessment arrangements for all courses are good and well understood by learners. Most courses are assessed by a mixture of continuous evaluations of learners' performance together with summative tests and examinations at regular intervals. Officers who apply for advanced driver training are first assessed by an instructor in their own division or borough. These instructors are visited by verifiers from the central driving school to ensure that they apply common standards across all the divisions. Learners receive regular feedback on how they are progressing and what they need to do in order to improve. There is a well-developed procedure to support learners who fail an assessment. This includes opportunities to be assessed by their peers or an intensive tutorial support programme with a manager, depending on the number of assessments failed. New recruits who fail assessments can be transferred to a different programme running about five weeks behind, to give them opportunities to re-take units or components. Learners have a clear understanding of how this support works and what they need to achieve in order to pass the course. All new recruits go through an initial assessment and selection process, and the results are recorded in their personal file. However, tutors do not receive any of this information before the start of a course. In some cases, this means that a tutor may become aware of a specific learning need only when the learner fails their first assessment.
- Most courses are made up of standard units or components, designed to ensure that all learners reach the same level of knowledge and understanding. However, all tutors adapt these standard packages to meet the needs of their learners as much as possible. In some courses, learners can omit elements or components where they already have competence or have previously attended similar training. For example, on the 2-day public order training, which all officers have to carry out twice a year, they are required to take part in a basic introductory exercise only on the first such course.



- Tutors provide very good support both in sessions and outside. New recruits and police community support officers have regular tutorial sessions when they can deal with any concerns and discuss their assessment results and overall progress. Tutors organise a weekly study club after the formal training sessions, when new recruits can take part in a workshop in more relaxed surroundings. These clubs provide a very good opportunity for learners to share concerns or experiences with one other as well as the tutors. For those recruits in Sunbury, who are not residential during the 18-week course, this is also an important opportunity to socialise.
- Training is well managed and there are formal arrangements for monitoring the quality of the teaching. Tutors are visited twice a year and given feedback on their performance. There is a strong emphasis on health and safety in all aspects of the training, and all courses pay appropriate attention to equality and diversity issues. For example, in a course on child protection, learners were encouraged to take into account different attitudes and life-styles before making a decision about the safety of the children concerned.
- Responsibility for training is shared between a number of departments or business groups. Tutors who are part of the main training school are well supported by a core team, particularly with administration. However, this support is not extended to tutors in other groups such as the officer safety training team.
- The scheduling of dog-handling courses and officer safety training means that there are currently several occasions when courses are run back-to-back, giving tutors insufficient opportunity to review and evaluate their work. Dog-handling training is also sold to other organisations on a commercial basis, but this does not apply to driver training or officer safety training. This inconsistent approach, coupled with a shortage of dog-handling tutors, means that the workload for tutors varies across units and sections. The facility at Gravesend is impressive and could be a potential source of income generation, but it is currently fully used by the MPS for its own training needs.
- Recruitment is the responsibility of a separate unit from initial training. Tutors do not receive information about recruit performance at interview or in any selection tasks early enough to enable them to make arrangements to support learners with particular needs. Tutors respond well when they become aware of such needs, such as in providing learning materials in a different type-face, or providing a reader for examinations in the case of dyslexia for example, but the delay can mean that a learner has to fail an assessment before their need is noticed.

- The new model of recruit training, in satellite centres such as Sunbury, has many advantages over the traditional model, and recruits like the smaller classes, more adult treatment and opportunities to meet their managers very early in their course. Most also enjoy the fact that the course is not residential. However, a few recognise that this means that they miss out on an important opportunity to socialise and share experiences with their peers. Some also commented on the lack of access to some specialist equipment or facilities which they are aware is available at Hendon. While recruits are able to choose whether to train in Hendon or elsewhere, this is not a serious issue. However, if all the training is to be re-organised in the same way, these concerns would need to be considered.



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

[www.homeoffice.gov.uk/hmic](http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/hmic)