



CHIEF CONSTABLE OF NORTH YORKSHIRE

HR Training

REVISED FINAL

Internal Audit Report: 1.16/17

26 August 2016

This report is solely for the use of the persons to whom it is addressed.
To the fullest extent permitted by law, RSM Risk Assurance Services LLP will accept
no responsibility or liability in respect of this report to any other party.



CONTENTS

1 Executive summary	2
2 Detailed findings	4
APPENDIX A: SCOPE	9
APPENDIX B: FURTHER INFORMATION	11
For further information contact	12

Debrief held	11 July 2016	Internal Audit team	Dan Harris, Head of Internal Audit Angela Ward, Senior Manager Philip Church, Manager Evgeni Dimov, Auditor
Draft report issued	12 July 2016		
Responses received	2 August 2016		
Final report issued	3 August 2016	Client sponsor	Paul Kennedy, Acting Deputy Chief Constable Rosie Holmes, Head of Human Resources and Training Claire Bean, Training and Development Manager
Revised final report issued	26 August 2016		
		Distribution	Rosie Holmes, Head of HR and Training Claire Bean, Training and Development Manager

As a practising member firm of the Institute of Chartered Accountants in England and Wales (ICAEW), we are subject to its ethical and other professional requirements which are detailed at <http://www.icaew.com/en/members/regulations-standards-and-guidance>.

The matters raised in this report are only those which came to our attention during the course of our review and are not necessarily a comprehensive statement of all the weaknesses that exist or all improvements that might be made. Recommendations for improvements should be assessed by you for their full impact before they are implemented. This report, or our work, should not be taken as a substitute for management's responsibilities for the application of sound commercial practices. We emphasise that the responsibility for a sound system of internal controls rests with management and our work should not be relied upon to identify all strengths and weaknesses that may exist. Therefore, the most that the internal audit service can provide is reasonable assurance that there are no major weaknesses in the risk management, governance and control processes reviewed within this assignment. Neither should our work be relied upon to identify all circumstances of fraud and irregularity should there be any.

This report is solely for the use of the persons to whom it is addressed and for the purposes set out herein. This report should not therefore be regarded as suitable to be used or relied on by any other party wishing to acquire any rights from RSM Risk Assurance Services LLP for any purpose or in any context. Any third party which obtains access to this report or a copy and chooses to rely on it (or any part of it) will do so at its own risk. To the fullest extent permitted by law, RSM Risk Assurance Services LLP will accept no responsibility or liability in respect of this report to any other party and shall not be liable for any loss, damage or expense of whatsoever nature which is caused by any person's reliance on representations in this report.

This report is released to our Client on the basis that it shall not be copied, referred to or disclosed, in whole or in part (save as otherwise permitted by agreed written terms), without our prior written consent.

We have no responsibility to update this report for events and circumstances occurring after the date of this report.

1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 Background

We carried out an audit of HR Training as part of the agreed internal audit plan for 2016/2017. As part of this audit, we reviewed how the Force ensures that all officers and staff are sufficiently trained in order to undertake their duties.

The Training and Development team consists of the Head of Human Resources and Training, Training and Development Manager, two Training Managers, Training Evaluator, five support officers and four training teams: personal safety training, driver training, IT training and corporate training.

The management team are responsible for creating a Costed Training Plan (CTP) each year for the training requirements of all staff at the Force. Interpretation of the training and legal requirements of officers to discharge their role is undertaken by the Skills Working Group (SWG) who will present their findings to the Training Commissioning Group (TCG) to ensure that training requirements are appropriately risk assessed and prioritised.

This is the second year the CTP has been in place, and the Training and Development team has started to see a positive shift in the culture of the Force towards departmental ownership of training from the previous reliance on a centralised Training and Development team lead. The CTP was approved by the TCG, who made the final decision on what training was to be included in the CTP based on legal and Force requirements, and what training could be deferred.

1.2 Conclusion

Our audit confirmed that there are adequate controls in place around the HR Training processes at the Force. However, we have identified three 'medium' priority management actions in relation to staff training profiles, Return on Investment and third party attendance communication.

Internal Audit Opinion:

Taking account of the issues identified, the Chief Constable of North Yorkshire can take **reasonable assurance** that the controls in place to manage this area are suitably designed and consistently applied.

However, we have identified issues that need to be addressed in order to ensure that the control framework is effective in managing the identified area.



1.3 Key findings

The key findings from this review are as follows:

- We reviewed the minutes of the SWG, responsible for analysing and interpreting police training and qualification requirements, for January to March 2016 and confirmed that the Group had discussed the skill requirements for the roles within the Force to ensure compliance with the National Police Coordination Centre (NPoCC). Discussions with the Force Training Evaluator indicated that this was a relatively new process and that the process of reviewing all NPoCC guidelines and aligning these with specific role profiles would be complicated. It was estimated the alignment process would take in the region of three to five years to complete.
- For a sample of 20 staff we found in 13 cases the detail recorded in the CTP aligned with the training requests submitted by the department. In three cases, the training courses were added to the CTP in meetings or over the phone between the Training and Development team and Head of Department. In the remaining four cases we identified training requirements from the previous year's CTP had been carried forward.
- CTP submissions were made in October / November 2015 by Heads of Department. This allowed for the CTP to be constructed by the Training and Development team and approved by the TCG in January 2016. This is to allow for a three month period to book courses and to ensure staff and officers have adequate cover to attend. The formal start date of the CTP is the 1st April in-line with the Force's financial and budget year.

We confirmed that details of the timeframes are available to the Training and Development team, as well as guidelines provided by the Acting Deputy Chief Constable (and Chair of the TCG) on the prioritisation and requirements for collating the CTP. We have also confirmed that there are details of the discussions and approval of the CTP within the TCG minutes.

- We confirmed that the training commissioning request process, which details all the additional training requests outside of the CTP, was in place and a total of 215 requests had been received since March 2015. Our sample testing of 15 training commissioning requests confirmed the requests had been approved by the TCG.
- Sample testing of 10 training courses provided by a third party indicated that in nine cases the procurement process was restricted by the number of available providers for the specific training need. In the one case, where multiple suppliers were available to provide the training, evidence was obtained and confirmed that the required three quotes had been achieved.

1.4 Additional information to support our conclusion

Area	Control design*	Compliance with controls*	Agreed actions		
			Low	Medium	High
HR Training	1 (13)	2 (13)	0	3	0
Total			0	3	0

* Shows the number of controls not adequately designed or not complied with. The number in brackets represents the total number of controls reviewed in this area

2 DETAILED FINDINGS

Categorisation of internal audit findings

Priority	Definition
Low	There is scope for enhancing control or improving efficiency and quality.
Medium	Timely management attention is necessary. This is an internal control risk management issue that could lead to: Financial losses which could affect the effective function of a department, loss of controls or process being audited or possible reputational damage, negative publicity in local or regional media.
High	Immediate management attention is necessary. This is a serious internal control or risk management issue that may lead to: Substantial losses, violation of corporate strategies, policies or values, reputational damage, negative publicity in national or international media or adverse regulatory impact, such as loss of operating licences or material fines.

This report has been prepared by exception. Therefore, we have included in this section, only those areas of weakness in control or examples of lapses in control identified from our testing and not the outcome of all internal audit testing undertaken.

Ref	Control	Adequate control design (yes/no)	Controls complied with (yes/no)	Audit findings and implications	Priority	Actions for management
Area: HR Training						
1	The Force has role profiles in place for all positions with the responsibility of maintaining and updating the profile requirements undertaken by the Head of Department.	Yes	No	Discussions with the Training and Development Manager indicated that the Force has an electronic training directory in place that provides a catalogue of courses available to staff and officers. The Training and Development Manager confirmed that the addition of exact training requirements (i.e. the qualifications and skills required for each role and grade) to role profiles is a recent project and is currently in development. The discussion indicated that updated role profiles would be created and used to inform the CTP. The updated role profiles will be communicated with the	Medium	NYP's Job Description Library will be the single repository to articulate the exact training and accreditation requirements for each generic and portfolio role.

PROTECT MANAGEMENT

Ref	Control	Adequate control design (yes/no)	Controls complied with (yes/no)	Audit findings and implications	Priority	Actions for management
-----	---------	----------------------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------------------	----------	------------------------

The role profiles are based on the requirements of the PPF (Policing Professional Framework) and NPoCC.

relevant Heads of Department, where changes have been made, to ensure that the annual training submissions are up to date and include any additional training that may be required as a result of the role updates.

Discussions with the Training and Development Manager indicated that this was work in progress and only a limited number of roles had been fully profiled to date. The Skills Working Group will continue to identify exact training requirements for specific roles and role profiles will be updated by HR.

Responsible Officer: Head of HR & Training

Implementation date: 1st August 2017

Risk Exposure*			Root causes		
The lack of a complete profile directory could result in the Force not meeting College of Policing or NPoCC requirements.			The recent shift in training culture and move towards profiling role training requirements has resulted in a significant amount of work which will be undertaken on an on-going basis.		
Probability	Financial	Reputational	Operational	Legal	Rating
Unlikely	Negligible	Significant	Minor	Minor	5:10

* The rating of risk (probability, financial, reputation, operational, legal) has been undertaken by the area owner based on the Force's risk matrix.

PROTECT MANAGEMENT

PROTECT MANAGEMENT

Ref	Control	Adequate control design (yes/no)	Controls complied with (yes/no)	Audit findings and implications	Priority	Actions for management																								
2	<p>Missing Control</p> <p>Return on Investment is considered for non-essential training and training that is requested outside the CTP.</p> <p>The Training Commission Request form requires the requester to detail the value add / mitigating risk which acts as the ROI reason.</p>	No	-	<p>Discussions with the Training Manager indicated that there are difficulties in determining the Return on Investment for some training and that this is a known issue. We confirmed that there is currently no process in place for quantifying Return on Investment and the Force is currently piloting a Training Evaluation Approach (TEA).</p> <p>The Return on Investment process will be driven by the TEA and this will be based on the Kirkpartick model of assessing the impact and return of training undertaken.</p> <p>Discussions with the Training Manager also indicated that the evaluation and feedback will be sought from individuals attending the training which will be used to determine the Return on Investment for a course.</p>	Medium	<p>Qualitative ROI will be developed to detail the cultural changes as well as the skill and knowledge levels that would be delivered by the training.</p> <p>Responsible Officer: Training and Development Manager</p> <p>Implementation date: 31st March 2017</p>																								
				<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Risk Exposure*</th> <th colspan="4">Root causes</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="2">Failure to capture ROI could result in qualitative measures not being captured and evidence of transfer to front line policing will not be documented.</td> <td colspan="4">The complex nature of concluding ROI has meant that this has not been undertaken in previous years.</td> </tr> <tr> <th>Probability</th> <th>Financial</th> <th>Reputational</th> <th>Operational</th> <th>Legal</th> <th>Rating</th> </tr> <tr> <td>Unlikely</td> <td>Negligible</td> <td>Negligible</td> <td>Negligible</td> <td>Negligible</td> <td>6:2</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Risk Exposure*		Root causes				Failure to capture ROI could result in qualitative measures not being captured and evidence of transfer to front line policing will not be documented.		The complex nature of concluding ROI has meant that this has not been undertaken in previous years.				Probability	Financial	Reputational	Operational	Legal	Rating	Unlikely	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	6:2		
Risk Exposure*		Root causes																												
Failure to capture ROI could result in qualitative measures not being captured and evidence of transfer to front line policing will not be documented.		The complex nature of concluding ROI has meant that this has not been undertaken in previous years.																												
Probability	Financial	Reputational	Operational	Legal	Rating																									
Unlikely	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	6:2																									

PROTECT MANAGEMENT

PROTECT MANAGEMENT

Ref	Control	Adequate control design (yes/no)	Controls complied with (yes/no)	Audit findings and implications	Priority	Actions for management
3	<p>Training Administration System (TAS) is part of the wider People Management System and forms part of Origin. All departments have access to TAS to update attendance for training events.</p> <p>The Tactical Training team provide feedback on attendance of training that is not recorded directly on the TAS system, such as firearms training, which is managed through the Mercury system.</p> <p>There is no automatic / direct reconciliation between the Tactical Training team system (Mercury and Chronicle) and the TAS.</p>	Yes	No	<p>We selected a sample of 24 staff that had attending training and reconciled this to the CTP. Our testing identified the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In 14 cases, we confirmed attendance details had been recorded on the TAS. • In nine cases, the courses that had not taken place as at the time of the audit and therefore the TAS had not been updated. • One case related to a new course but no dates had been agreed for delivery and therefore was not detailed on the TAS. <p>For a sample of 10 internal training events we confirmed the Course Attendance Forms from the training course matched the details on the TAS system for all courses. In seven cases, the attendance had been updated within the expected two working days of the course ending. In three cases it took five to nine working days to update the TAS system.</p> <p>For a sample of 10 external courses we tested to confirm the attendance had been updated on the TAS. Our testing identified the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In five cases the course was due to start after June 2016, therefore an invoice was not available for review. • In the remaining five cases, we confirmed in three cases the TAS had not been updated in a timely manner. The courses had been attended in October 2015, April 2016 and May 2016. The attendance for these three courses had not been updated as an invoice had not yet been received by the Force. • In the remaining two cases, the details had been updated on the TAS in a timely manner. <p>Our testing was extended to a further five courses and we identified in four cases when the Force had received an invoice the TAS had not been updated in a timely manner.</p>	Medium	<p>Third party training providers will provide an attendance list within two working days of the course ending, so that TAS can be kept up to date with all external training.</p> <p>Responsible Officer: Training and Development Manager</p> <p>Implementation date: 31st October 2016</p>

PROTECT MANAGEMENT

PROTECT MANAGEMENT

Ref	Control	Adequate control design (yes/no)	Controls complied with (yes/no)	Audit findings and implications	Priority	Actions for management																								
	TAS is maintained via manual communication.			<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3">Risk Exposure*</th> <th colspan="3">Root causes</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="3">Failure to update the TAS in a timely manner could result in the delay of staff deployment and ultimately return on investment to the Force in the short term.</td> <td colspan="3">Third party training providers do not provide attendance lists / registers until the invoicing process has taken place.</td> </tr> <tr> <th>Probability</th> <th>Financial</th> <th>Reputational</th> <th>Operational</th> <th>Legal</th> <th>Rating</th> </tr> <tr> <td>Unlikely</td> <td>Negligible</td> <td>Negligible</td> <td>Minor</td> <td>Negligible</td> <td>6:2</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Risk Exposure*			Root causes			Failure to update the TAS in a timely manner could result in the delay of staff deployment and ultimately return on investment to the Force in the short term.			Third party training providers do not provide attendance lists / registers until the invoicing process has taken place.			Probability	Financial	Reputational	Operational	Legal	Rating	Unlikely	Negligible	Negligible	Minor	Negligible	6:2		
Risk Exposure*			Root causes																											
Failure to update the TAS in a timely manner could result in the delay of staff deployment and ultimately return on investment to the Force in the short term.			Third party training providers do not provide attendance lists / registers until the invoicing process has taken place.																											
Probability	Financial	Reputational	Operational	Legal	Rating																									
Unlikely	Negligible	Negligible	Minor	Negligible	6:2																									

PROTECT MANAGEMENT

APPENDIX A: SCOPE

Scope of the review

To evaluate the adequacy of risk management and control within the system and the extent to which controls have been applied, with a view to providing an opinion. The scope was planned to provide assurance on the controls and mitigations in place relating to the following area:

Objective of the area under review

The Force must ensure that officers and staff are sufficiently trained to enable them to undertake their duties safely and amply.

When planning the audit, the following areas for consideration and limitations were agreed:

Areas for consideration:

Our review has considered the following:

- How the Force has identified essential or critical training requirements and scheduled these appropriately in accordance with the Force's requirements.
- An assessment of the development of the Costed Training Plan and the involvement of Heads of Department.
- How specific roles or individuals are being mapped to the essential training and at the required level. We considered the work undertaken by the Skills Working Group. This included how the Force prioritises training and determines the rationale for which Officers should complete what training and at what level.
- Whether additional requests for training are compared to the training schedule to ensure that training is not provided unnecessarily and that the schedule is kept up to date with Officer training needs where these may previously have been missed.
- We have performed substantive testing of the following areas:
 - Training delivered by third parties and whether the Force has achieved Value for Money;
 - Additional training outside the Costed Training Plan has been appropriately approved; and
 - The approach for measuring Return on Investment (ROI).
- How the Force ensures that the Training Administration System (TAS) was kept up to date including the timeliness of updates. This included whether the central database has been utilised by all areas of the business or whether specialist areas use separate databases/spreadsheets.
- Monitoring and reporting of training delivery against schedule, including how non-attendance and gaps are followed up.

Limitations to the scope of the audit assignment:

- We have not provided an opinion on the quality of training that has been provided.
- We have not provided an opinion on the type of training being procured or the categorisation of training as “mandatory” or “discretionary”.
- We have not provided an opinion on the appropriateness of training spend or adequacy of training identified or delivered.
- Testing has been completed on a sample basis and we have not confirmed all staff have completed mandatory training or it will be delivered by year-end.
- Our work has not provided any guarantee or absolute assurance against material and/or other errors, loss or fraud.

APPENDIX B: FURTHER INFORMATION

Persons interviewed during the audit:

- Head of Human Resources and Training, Rosemarie Holmes
- Training and Development Manager, Claire Bean
- Training Manager, Mark Richardson
- Training Manager, Wendy Dodsworth-Houlston
- Training Services Officer, Vicky Rooney
- Force Personnel and Training Evaluator, Mark Godwin
- Senior Support Officer, Jonny Quinlan

Documentation reviewed during the audit:

- Training Procedure (Draft)
- Training Policy (Draft)
- Training Commissioning Group Minutes
- Skills Working Group Minutes
- People Strategy

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT

Dan Harris, Head of Internal Audit

Tel: 07792 948767

Daniel.Harris@rsmuk.com

Angela Ward, Senior Manager

Tel: 07966 091471

Angela.Ward@rsmuk.com

Philip Church, Client Manager

Tel: 07528 970082

Philip.Church@rsmuk.com