

Best Value Review of Police Training

Force: Warwickshire Police

Date of Inspection: 9–10 March 2005



A Report by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary

ISBN 1-84473-529-X
© Crown Copyright 2005
Published 2005

Context and Force performance

Context

Population served by the Force	512,680	
Number of police officers	1,011	
Number of police staff	595	
Number of special constables	181	
Budget for training for the financial year	Financial Value	Percentage of Overall Force budget
2003/04	Not asked	1.7%
2004/05	Not available	0.7%

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/warwicksbaseline1004.pdf

Further details of the force performance can be found at www.warwickshire.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>The Force have developed a training strategy which is well aligned to guidance contained within relevant Home Office circulars, and which is linked to the Force's people strategy.</p>
QUALITY OF COSTED TRAINING PLAN	<p>The Force has produced a detailed CTP adhering to the principles of the NCM. HM Inspector was encouraged to see the ongoing development of this plan, and the use of associated management information including regional cost comparisons.</p>
MONITORING COSTED TRAINING PLAN THROUGHOUT THE YEAR	<p>The training plan is monitored internally by the Strategic Training Board (STB), and by the PA, through its Training Panel (PATB), both on a quarterly basis. This monitoring takes into account actual places taken up by clients compared to projected targets, and includes spend compared to budgets for externally provided training.</p> <p>HM Inspector acknowledges that the introduction of the STB is a recent development and encourages the Force to review the effectiveness of this group within twelve months. The Force is encouraged to further develop the NCM so as to allow contemporaneous updating of the CTP, thus providing both monitoring bodies with further performance information.</p>
TRAINING NOT INCLUDED IN THE COSTED TRAINING PLAN	<p>Some elements of training have not been captured during the 2004/2005 costing process, for example, firearms and dog training, however these elements will be included in future years plans, and are included in the draft 2005/2006 CTP.</p> <p>HM Inspector was pleased to see such a broad ranging plan, but encourages the Force to develop local training plans for each department and BCU, which will enable locally provided training to be more effectively captured. HM Inspector acknowledges that such training is limited in scope and volume, but nonetheless, needs to be incorporated into the plan to allow the full cost of training to be seen and monitored.</p>

Area Examined	Findings
<p>CLIENT/CONTRACTOR ARRANGEMENTS</p>	<p>HM Inspector was concerned to find that no robust client/contractor relationship has been embedded within the Force. Whilst the introduction of the STB provides the mechanism to develop this relationship at a strategic level, the effectiveness of this group still remains untested. HM Inspector was encouraged to find PA representation on the STB. A review of the terms of reference for this group needs to be undertaken to ensure its role as the senior client group is underwritten, and also so that the role of the Training and Development department is clearly seen to be that of a senior contractor.</p> <p>At an operational level, between BCUs, departments and the Training and Development Department, further work is required to establish this relationship, and then to ensure it is embedded. Encouraging work has taken place within the Southern Area, which has seen the formation of a Prioritisation Panel, which meets quarterly. This model is one that the Force may wish to evaluate with a view to replicating it across all other departments and into the Northern area.</p> <p>The communication and consultation role performed currently by two Training and Development advisors in linking the centre to departments and areas is encouraging, but concern is raised about whether there is sufficient resilience within these portfolio holders to achieve tasks required from them.</p> <p>HM Inspector encourages the Force to develop policy and guidance, which will give support to emerging client/contractor processes.</p>

Area Examined	Findings
<p>MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS FOR TRAINING</p>	<p>The Head of Training and Development (HoTD), a member of police staff reports to the DCC. The HoTD is not responsible for all training within the Force, with firearms and dog training under the management of the Operations Department. Nor is HoTD professionally responsible for the standards and quality of training carried out within this department. HM Inspector encourages the Force to empower the HoTD to assume professional responsibility for all training in the Force irrespective of where or who undertakes it, and for this to be explicitly articulated in a policy or service level agreement.</p> <p>HM Inspector found that a recent departmental review had taken place and that the change process still was causing concern for some managers. Some staff felt that management responsibility within the department was not evenly distributed and some doubt and confusion arose with regard to the level of management responsibility held by the project advisor and training evaluator. HM Inspector encourages the Force to embark upon further stakeholder dialogue in order to address these concerns, and to ensure the resilience of the training management team.</p> <p>HM Inspector was pleased to note the inclusion within the STB of members of the PA, and was also encouraged to hear of regular contact between the Force and PA with regard to training matters, through the mechanism of the PATB.</p>
<p>IMPLEMENTATION OF:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Managing Learning • Training Matters • Diversity Matters • Foundations for Change 	<p>The Force has gone some way to utilising guidance within <i>Managing Learning</i> to underpin their emerging training planning and prioritisation processes. A number of issues within <i>Diversity Matters</i> are being addressed within the Force, particularly through the Diversity Development Group. However HM Inspector was concerned to find little or no monitoring of specific actions within any HMIC documents, or the ability to easily audit trail any resultant work.</p>

Area Examined	Findings
<p>CURRENT IMPROVEMENT PLAN</p>	<p>The Force has incorporated into their 2005/06 draft training plan a process improvement plan. The development of this plan has only recently taken place and has yet to conform to SMART principles. Furthermore, the plan does not encompass a number of Force wide development issues that will need attention to ensure a climate of continuous improvement exists for training and development activities across the Force.</p> <p>HM Inspector found that the Strategic Development Department had undertaken a recent review into outstanding recommendations arising from the BVR of training. A number were found still requiring action, however a decision was taken, and agreed by the PA to draw a line under this process to allow for the main focus of energy to be placed into the FfC programme. How and why this situation arose does not allow for full consideration within this report; however HM Inspector encourages the Force and PA to review in detail these outstanding recommendations. Those that can still add value or improve the training function must be included within the new process improvement plan.</p>
<p>MONITORING THE IMPROVEMENT PLAN</p>	<p>The Scrutiny Panel of the PA (now known as the Performance Panel) undertook regular reviews of the progress of the IP, as did the Force via its post implementation review process owned by the DCC. The Strategic Development department on behalf of ACPO now undertakes this Force process.</p> <p>To date no monitoring of the draft Process Improvement Plan has taken place. The Force expects to monitor the plan through the STB. HM Inspector is concerned to find that the Force does not have a current SMART well monitored IP. While the Force may be focusing on Foundations for Change, this is not a barrier to internal continuous improvement, and encourages the Force to review its current IP as a matter of priority.</p>

Area Examined	Findings
<p>QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESSES</p>	<p>The Force does not have a QA policy, nor does the HoTD have forcewide professional responsibility for the QA aspects of training.</p> <p>While some elements of QA practise were evidenced HM Inspector found these to be inconsistently applied and often undertaken as a result of professional diligence by trainers and managers, rather than required by a formal, and audited process.</p> <p>HM Inspector found on many occasions that the pressure of demand driven training outweighed the priority given to establishing a quality framework.</p> <p>HM Inspector encourages the Force to develop policy and guidance around all aspects of QA, including trainer observation and subsequent action plans, lesson planning and consistency, version controlling and the linkage of lesson plans to National Occupational Standards, and that policy to extend to all training, wherever it is carried out.</p> <p>HM Inspector was also concerned to find the Force has not yet supported the instigation of Tutor Units or Professional Development Units.</p> <p>HM Inspector did find an NVQ strategy for the Force, supported by the Open University, and through this route the Force plans to roll out national qualifications over the next five years to police officers and staff.</p>
<p>EVALUATION OF TRAINING</p>	<p>The Force has an evaluator working within the Training and Development department and has an evaluation strategy, which is a recent piece of work, and links well to the national strategy.</p> <p>Investment in an evaluation software system has given the Force the potential to expand its lower level evaluation activity, which to date has been very inconsistent in terms of coverage.</p> <p>PDR can not yet be utilised to check individuals knowledge transfer to the workplace, and the Force are encouraged to pursue this aim utilising its software system.</p> <p>A number of sponsor driven level three evaluations have taken place, and the Force recognises that these need to be co-ordinated and prioritised, and that subsequent recommendations are monitored by the STB in future.</p>

Area Examined	Findings
EVALUATION OF TRAINING <i>(continued)</i>	<p>HM Inspector notes that the full potential of the software system has yet to be met. One barrier to this is the limited ability to input the necessary volume of data into the system in order to obtain full and regular coverage of events. HM Inspector encourages the Force to review the resources currently involved in the function, with a view to achieving wider coverage and therefore broader management information.</p> <p>Currently the evaluator reports to the HoTD and therefore there remains the potential for a conflict of interest to arise between contractor and sponsor. HM Inspector encourages the Force to review these management arrangements as to negate any potential conflict.</p>
COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT IN TRAINING	<p>HM Inspector notes that only limited work has been undertaken to date by the Force in relation to community involvement. This is limited to training delivery around probationer training, diversity training, and vulnerable witness training. There is no such involvement in training needs analysis or design. The Force acknowledges that further work needs to take place and has signalled its intention to utilise the APA document, <i>Involving Communities in Police Learning and Development</i> to aid and support this work.</p>
COLLABORATION – EXTERNAL ORGANISATIONS	<p>The Force have limited collaborative arrangements with non police organisations at present, although an established relationship with the RAF at Cosford regarding public order training demonstrates the benefits to be had by exploring further opportunities. HM Inspector is encouraged to note the current activity being undertaken by the Force in relation to exploring joint opportunities with Centrex at Ryton.</p>
COLLABORATION – OTHER POLICE ORGANISATIONS	<p>HM Inspector was pleased to find a database highlighting intra force collaboration, which links to Home Office code classification, regional collaboration and FfC.</p>
ADOPTION OF NATIONAL GUIDANCE	<p>HM Inspector notes the use of <i>Centrex Models for Learning and Development</i> by the Training and Development Department, and found that the document had been issued to trainers within the department. There was only limited understanding about the use of such documents, and as courses are infrequently developed or adapted there is little evidence of this document having a real impact.</p>

Area Examined	Findings
<p>MAIN AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF THE FORCE</p>	<p>The Force has identified that their environmental scanning processes are in need of enhancement, and to that end are in the process of appointing a post holder on a short term basis to begin more work in this area.</p> <p>Leadership training has been identified by the Chief Constable as an area for development within the Force. A Chief Superintendent is currently leading a project reviewing this work.</p>
<p>APPLICATION OF THE 4Cs SINCE THE REVIEW</p>	<p>The Force has applied the principles of Best Value to their Citizen Focus programme which ran within the Force Communications centre. Whilst this demonstrates application in principle of the 4C's there is no explicit requirement within policy or procedure which requires such consideration in relation to any new training events. HM Inspector encourages the Force to consider a mechanism whereby this can be achieved with relatively little bureaucratic accompaniment.</p>
<p>IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INTEGRATED COMPETENCY FRAMEWORK</p>	<p>HM Inspector was pleased to find the Force has approached the integration of the ICF in a systematic manner through the creation of a project team.</p> <p>The Force have adopted the national PDR but made slight changes to the form in a bid to reduce bureaucracy. All role profiles have been produced and are available electronically.</p> <p>The Force are still working to version 4 of the PDR document, although the project team are now looking to update to version 7 and the integration with NSPIS HR. Recruitment and selection processes are also based upon the ICF.</p>
<p>MONITORING PROCESS AND COMPLETION OF PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT REVIEWS FOR POLICE OFFICERS AND POLICE STAFF</p>	<p>Personnel teams on areas and departments are responsible for monitoring PDR completion rates for quantity and quality. HM Inspector was concerned to find that the regular Area reviews carried out by ACPO do not explicitly feature PDR issues, nor is there a central monitoring function undertaken by Human Resources in relation to qualitative standards.</p>

Area Examined	Findings
BUSINESS PLANNING FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF TRAINING	<p>Business planning for training follows the Force business planning cycle and falls into line with the Force strategic planning process for the purpose of budget bidding. The specification of the training requirement is arrived at after prioritisation by January, and subsequently agreed and signed off by the PA in March. At present the budget setting process has yet to be influenced by the developing CTP work. HM Inspector encourages the Force to consider how it can best review the current budget setting process to take into account the specified real cost of training in future.</p> <p>Consideration needs to be given to amending the business planning process for training so that it is better able to respond to Area and Departmental plans. The timing of PDR processes also requires further consideration in order to systematically collate individual training requirements.</p>
PRIORITISATION MODEL FOR TRAINING	<p>HM Inspector was pleased to note that the Force have adopted a prioritisation model designed originally by PSSO. This model will now be applied by STB in order to arrive at a risk assessed training specification. While this model allows for a systematic and explicit process, the Force are encouraged to consider how best client concerns regarding each years specification content can be addressed. A separate business case process needs to be developed in tandem to the prioritisation model to allow consideration of special or exceptional perceived training needs. The Force must remain aware to retaining a well balanced training profile.</p>

Recommendations

Recommendation 1

HM Inspector recommends that the Force develops local and department training plans which will allow for all costs to be captured within the costed training plan

Recommendation 2

HM Inspector recommends that the Force produce policy and guidance to reinforce the contractor/client arrangements across the Force. The terms of reference for the Strategic Training Board must explicitly highlight its role as the senior client group within the Force, and that of the Training and Development department as a contractor

Recommendation 3

HM Inspector recommends that the Force develop a mechanism whereby a client/contractor relationship is established within areas and departments in relation to training, and is explicitly defined within a policy or procedure

Recommendation 4

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 5

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 6

HM Inspector recommends that the Force develop a single Improvement Plan which captures all locally identified improvement actions as well as those, which result from this or other previous HMIC reports. The improvement plan should also capture any improvement actions which have resulted from other relevant sources having an impact on training, specifically to include those not actioned and still relevant, from the Best Value Review of training

Recommendation 7

HM Inspector recommends that the Force and the Police Authority regularly monitor this new improvement plan via the Strategic Training Board and Police Authority Training Panel

Recommendation 8

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 is to be regularly monitored

Recommendation 9

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

Recommendation 10

HM Inspector recommends that Force develop its evaluation function so that it has a tasking and reporting process independent of the Training Department. This will include a clear mechanism for commissioning and actioning evaluation projects and their recommendations. The Force must review the current level and nature of the resources dedicated to the evaluation function

Recommendation 11

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

Recommendation 12

HM Inspector recommends that the Force includes within its prioritisation policy the ability for senior client representatives to submit to the Strategic Training Board business case plans for training events to be included within the annual specification of training, previously excluded by the prioritisation model

Recommendation 13

HM Inspector recommends that the Force further develop its collaboration matrix to include internal and external collaborative activity

Judgements

Judgement 1:

The Force have produced a good training strategy, are using to good purpose the costed training plan, and are working regionally and nationally to further develop this tool. The development of the Strategic Training Board, whilst overdue is an encouraging development, as is the inclusion of members of the Police Authority on this group. However, the Force needs to review further the management arrangements for training. Currently the Head of Training and Development does not have professional responsibility for the function across all Force areas, nor is there full confidence within the department that function and responsibilities are adequately organised at present.

There is no overarching quality assurance strategy in place, nor are there the resources in place to enable such activity. There have been insufficient responses in relation to previous HMIC reports. Evaluation activity is inconsistently applied, with limited management utilisation, and the potential present within this area is not being utilised effectively. There are however well established connections between training and the Police Authority, and in many respects the Force is “pushing at an open door” in respect to any future attempts at change. This can be seen by the recent inclusion of cost data from operational departments into the Costed Training Plan.

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

Judgement 2:

The Force has begun to look at opportunities to improve the training function. It has produced a Process Improvement Plan within the draft 2005/06 training plan. The Force acknowledges that more detailed work needs to be undertaken, and that regular strategic monitoring of the actions will be required. The embryonic Strategic Training Board, including the Police Authority, is the appropriate place for such monitoring to take place. The Improvement Plan must include recommendations from a wide variety of sources, which impact upon training and development for it to reach its full potential. At present, there are no formal, ongoing or embedded plans which encourage optimism for continued performance improvement however HM Inspector recognises the commitment, energy and innovative approach being applied by the force through the new Deputy Chief Constable in seeking an improved and fit for purpose training function.

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

Achievement and Standards

- It was not possible to judge achievement of qualifications as the Force do not keep summary statistics of student performance. In observed sessions learners showed good attainment. They demonstrated a clear understanding of their subjects and all participated fully in recap sessions. In practical session learners quickly and effectively demonstrated their understanding of the subjects, and were able to make positive and effective contributions to the lessons.

Quality of Education and Training

- Teaching and learning is very good. No lessons observed were unsatisfactory. 85 per cent of observed lessons were good or better and 71 per cent were very good or better. Good use was made of a wide variety of styles, to maintain learners' interest. Teaching staff are well qualified and used their experience very effectively to highlight key issues and provide a wide range of practical examples. Lessons were lively and challenging with the learners making significant contributions and always fully involved. Reasoning questions were particularly well used to develop learners' understanding. Good use is made of learners' previous knowledge and experience.
- Monitoring of learners' progress is rigorous and effective. Some courses have pass or fail examinations. However, most are based on learners achieving competency which is assessed by the teacher. There are very good debriefs in practical lessons. Other feedback provided is clear and effective. In lessons, learners' progress is effectively monitored with good use of questions and answers to check understanding. Learners are effectively challenged to demonstrate their attainment and, in many cases, take part in good debates. Written proforma are used well to check and confirm that learners have achieved all the required competencies.
- Most of the training is to meet corporate need. However, teaching staff make adequate reference to individual learner's situations to ensure that, where possible, the lessons cover the particular needs of the learner. The support provided during lessons is satisfactory. In practical sessions there is a good staff to learner ratio and there is clear reference to health and safety issues. In other lessons staff are attentive to learners needs.

- Training accommodation is poor. The training department has moved into the main house at the headquarters, which is a listed building. Soundproofing between classrooms is very poor and adjacent courses distract each other. Usable space within each room is limited due to fireplaces, mantles, decorative bay windows and other limitations. In one room an old style rollerboard is used as a screen for OHP and Powerpoint projections. There are severe limitations on installing other training equipment, such as ceiling mounted projectors. The gymnasium used for personal safety training is small and crowded. The ceiling is low with even lower beams that are a hazard when carrying out some physical activities.
- Courses are planned according to the Force need. There is clear analysis of the requirement and a detailed plan produced. Staff are fully involved in this detailed planning. The analysis of the requirement is good. Recording and analysis of course take up and attendance is rigorous. The Force has a very detailed picture of how take up of places relates to original requirement. However, this information is not used fully as part of the strategic planning. The Force intends to include this process in their planning.
- Communications are good. Staff within each section meet regularly to share good practice and discuss training courses. These meetings are used effectively to have informal course reviews and consider and plan additional training required. For example a training course for control centre staff about controlling pursuits. Communications between the force and sub-contractors staff are good. These staff are regularly kept informed of changes and always aware of course details, including location and planned attendance.
- There is no use of learner performance data to monitor provision. Individual course results are kept by some departments. However, there are no summary statistics produced at section or department level. The Force do not review learner achievement at any strategic level. They are aware of this issue and have plans to start producing summary statistics.
- Due to the time constraints it was not possible to gather specific evidence to make other judgements on leadership and management issues. However, the following points were noted for further work by HMIC staff:
 - Some courses have been evaluated and the evaluation reports are thorough and detailed. However not all courses have been evaluated. The Force is aware of this and has a programme of evaluations planned.
 - Staff, including external trainers are observed; however, the programme of observations is not yet formal and detailed.



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

www.homeoffice.gov.uk/hmic