



Prifysgol Cymru
Y Drindod Dewi Sant
University of Wales
Trinity Saint David

BSc (Hons) Professional Police Practice

LEVEL 4 - 40 Credits

**Workbook title: Competency Based Workbook 1
(PCDA)**

**(SOUTH WALES POLICE, GWENT POLICE AND
UWTSD)**

Learner name: Connor Costello

**Learner's University Registration Number:
1920589**

FACULTY OF BUSINESS AND MANAGEMENT PUBLIC SERVICE PROGRAMME

Module title: Professional Police Practice 1 (PCDA)

Workbook Guidance

Please read these notes carefully; they provide essential information.

What is the workbook for?

The purpose of this workbook is to enable learners to demonstrate and provide evidence of how they meet the learning outcomes set by the College of Policing, for the BSc programme. Essentially, you are being asked to outline your experiential learning based upon your theoretical understanding in a range of operational situations.

Area of Professional Practice covered, (called elements in your module descriptor):

- Wellbeing and Resilience
- Communication Skills
- Managing Conflict
- Valuing Difference and Inclusion
- Criminal Justice
- Decision making, discretion
- Conducting Investigations
- Criminal Justice (Managing offenders)

You may wish to use the same incidents as you've outlined in the Occupational Competence Portfolio.

How should the workbook be presented?

Blank electronic copies can be found on Moodle of this workbook. You must submit this document electronically therefore it is important that you save your work regularly and upload the final typed version through Turnitin on Moodle.

Word count policy can be found in chapter 7 of the Academic Quality under section 7.7 (this applies to presenting work above and under the specified word count).

(https://www.uwtsd.ac.uk/media/uwtsd-website/content-assets/documents/academic-office/aqh-chapters/chapters---en/Chapter_07_Assessment-Taught_Programmes_Pages_72-79-UPDATED-05-11-2019.pdf)

Reflective practice is a core aspect for your workbooks and although there is a variety of useful resources on Moodle, there is one particular book, that is specifically based on reflective practice in policing, here is a link to one chapter from Selina Copley's Reflective Practice for Policing Students:

https://moodle.uwtsd.ac.uk/pluginfile.php/298870/mod_resource/content/1/Reflective%20Practice%20for%20Policing%20Students%20-%20Selina%20Copley%20Chapter5.pdf

How is the workbook assessed?

Advice and support about the completion of this workbook will be provided by university staff as part of your initial training day. Your tutor constable and in-force training staff will not be involved in assessing or marking your workbook after it has been submitted.

Dates of workbook submission will be made available during the initial training day and posted on Moodle.

Once submitted your workbook will be assessed and marked independently.

Confidentiality

It is important that no individual can be identified either directly or indirectly from the information in the workbook. Therefore, you must:

- adhere to guidance in the Student Handbook about unfair practice and plagiarism;
- not identify individuals including witnesses, victims or offenders by name;
- not write information that enables any individual to be identified indirectly through the description you provide. This includes references to names, colleagues, places (including hospitals, schools, town, villages, streets) specific incidents which were high profile and could be identified due to past publicity, other professionals or any other personal information including medical or other conditions;
- take personal responsibility for adhering to confidentiality rules.
- not include any dates of any incidents or anything that specifically identifies an actual incident.

NOTE

Your workbook will be submitted electronically via Turnitin on Moodle. Guidance on this is in the Student Handbook.

Remember that the workbook is YOUR responsibility you must not rely on the assessor or anyone else to pick up any confidentiality breaches as this is your work and you must accept full responsibility for confidentiality. Meeting all the confidentiality requirements is very important.

Dyslexia and other special circumstances

If you have any condition that you feel may affect your ability to deal with any part of the programme, please see the Student Handbook for further guidance. The University has a Student Services Unit that may be able to help but ***it is the learner's individual responsibility to contact them.***

Guidance:

- Your workbook must contain the items specified in the table below (clearly identified and in the order given);
- You should use this particular document to insert your text / answer within each section of this workbook;
- You should upload your completed document as a saved pdf of this workbook; if this is not possible then a Worddoc file is acceptable. Do not send a scanned file from a photocopier, an apple.dot file, or a Microsoft publisher file as Turnitin will not be able to assess them despite you being able to upload them.

Contents:

Workbook	Area of Professional Practice	Word count
Task 1	Wellbeing and Resilience	500
Task 2	Communication Skills, Managing Conflict, Valuing Difference and Inclusion	1500
Task 3	Criminal Justice, Valuing difference and inclusion	1500
Task 4	Decision making and discretion, Conducting Investigations and Criminal Justice (Managing offenders)	1500
	Bibliography	
Task 5	Development Plan	This plan and the signed O.C.P. is equivalent to 1000 words
Task 6	Recognition and confirmation of the progress of your Occupational Competency Portfolio (OCP)	
	Confirmation of Confidentiality and Plagiarism <i>This is confirmed by submitting through Turnitin</i>	

Task 1

Relevant areas of the National Policing Curriculum: Wellbeing and Resilience

Guidance:

Focussing on your initial 6 months of learning and since being attested as a Police Constable, outline the coping strategies you have applied to develop resilience and minimise stress.

500 words (+/- 10%: include your actual word count at the end of each section)

ANSWER:

Multiple people that already hold the position of police constable have informed me organisation that the initial training of six months is a very intense and gruelling affair for recruits, which can lead to developing stress issues and high levels of anxiety. I believe that I had a unique experience of this training as I completed it through the recent COVID-19 pandemic. This placed heavy restrictions on fellow students and myself in regards to where and how we could learn.

Most of my training was home based via recorded panopto lectures (Patterson 2009) followed by a skype call which contained many other people. The most difficult part of this was the lack of interaction with the person delivering the information, I initially struggled with this as I learn better through my own and other people's experiences. The inability to ask questions during the panoptos was extremely stressful for myself. I would right down anything that I did not understand and try to clarify them in the skype calls but more often than not, the trainer hosting the call would not be the trainer that recorded the topic we were covering that day. I found this to be challenging as trainers have different styles of teaching and I would get conflicting information. I identified this as a problem so I attempted to find a solution myself before seeking advice from the trainers. The solution I arrived at was to still note down any information that I did not understand fully and instead of addressing them in the skype calls, I would go and find the trainer who recorded the panopto when I was next present at my training centre and clarify the information with them. This method had functioned well for me so I continued to follow it until the end of my training, this lead to a positive side effect of building different levels of rapport with all of the trainers, which is fundamental to success in learning (Hamre, Pianta, 2006). This method enabled me to overcome the challenge I identified early in training and minimised the confusion I had previously experienced.

Another coping strategy I developed with a fellow officer was introducing peer learning as I have previously found this to be effective in learning experiences. We would interact via skype multiple times a week to develop a deeper understanding of recent topics and reinforce the knowledge that was already in place from previous lessons. I found this method helped not just with my knowledge but also was a critical outlet for my stress levels as the tone of the skype calls was extremely relaxed. I was able to learn alongside someone whose situation was identical to

mine. We would identify each other's weaknesses so the next time we interacted, the elements covered would be tailored to the weakness identified. Due to the circumstances of working from home, this introduced key structure to my learning and actively encouraged work ethic as I was not only learning to develop my own understanding of my new role but also supporting another's.

(506)

Task 2

Relevant areas of the National Policing Curriculum: Communication Skills, Managing Conflict, Valuing Difference and Inclusion

You must choose a policing incident involving conflict in which you played a significant role with an offender/service user/victim and reflect on what happened.

Give a brief description of the incident including social and legislative contexts and any relevant cultural, ethnicity and language issues.

Review the fundamental elements of effective communication used (verbal, non-verbal, active listening skills, open and closed questions, building rapport and negotiation skills).

Describe the process for determining whether the use of force was necessary in a conflict situation (including any theories or models underpinning the causes of conflict within policing interventions – e.g. Betari's Box, The Drama triangle, Emotional versus rational brain) and provide a reflection on the outcome of the incident.

Your reflection must illustrate your understanding and application of core principles of ethics, equality, diversity and human rights, as well as any relevant Code of Practice considerations, culturally sensitive practice and language preference.

1500 words (+/- 10%: include your actual word count at the end of each section)

ANSWER:

The police incident involving conflict I will talk about involves a single vehicle driven by an offender where the offences of driving whilst unfit through drink or drugs (Section 4 Road Traffic Act 1988) and Assault an Emergency Worker (S1 Assault on Emergency Workers Act 2018) were present. The incident has no cultural or ethnical challenges but there were communication issues present as the offender I encountered appeared to be under the influence of alcohol and had been subject to PAVA spray.

Towards the end of an evening shift, I was completing the relevant updates for my tour of duty when a report was received of a single vehicle road traffic collision. The location was at the top of a hill with a high gradient close to the Police Station so my entire shift attended. An officer equipped with an X2 TASER and I were first on scene. As the police vehicle travelled up the hill, a vehicle could be seen with damage to the front end and the offender was exiting via the driver's side door and running towards the police vehicle. The officer I was with gave chase down the hill as I secured the vehicle. As the officer had gained distance on the offender, the offender decided to charge the officer and they both fell down a set of three concrete steps. The offender and officer then got back to their feet, the offender started making off again in the same direction

of travel. As they did this, the officer deployed his X2 TASER which was ineffective. I then pursued the offender a short distance down the hill, providing clear instruction to stop but as further officers were making their way from the bottom of the hill, the offender stopped and turned towards me. The offender was aggressive towards myself and responded to tactical communications by balling his fists. After multiple attempts to engage with them, they advanced towards myself so I deployed PAVA spray, which caused the offender to drop to the ground and cover their eyes with their hands. The offender then started actively resisting officers attempting to gain control of them on the ground by lying on their arms but after obtaining an arm and performing a wristlock, I was able to handcuff the offender to the rear with help from fellow officers. The offender was then searched under Section 22 of the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984 and conveyed to custody. During the drive to custody, the offender was still aggressive towards another officer and myself so I decided to attempt to calm the situation by talking about the offender's life, which gave the desired outcome of reducing hostility and this was the initial start of my attempts to build rapport with them. While in custody, I accompanied the offender to the evidential breathe analyser where they failed to provide a specimen of breathe and escorted them to a police cell. I did this as the offender would only engage with myself initially while at while being booked in to custody.

Reviewing the fundamental elements of effective communication during this incident, I have identified that the incident can be deconstructed into three different sections. I have identified these sections as initial attendance up to the offender stopping, the offender stopping to departing for custody, departing for custody to the offender being placed in a police cell.

The initial attendance of the call showed communication between officers failing between police and the person in question. As I was not the first officer for the offender to have contact with during this incident and first contact was hostile, this hostile interaction is why I believe communication failed. I provided loud and clear verbal commands for the offender to stop running but these were ignored until they noticed that officers were advancing on their position from both directions. The offender then listened to my commands but also turned to face me.

After they stopped and faced me, their body language portrayed hostility and aggression. The offender had balled their hands into fists, the muscles in the hands and arms appeared to be tensed. Their eyes appeared widened and their nostrils were flared. I directed a loud and clear command to calm down while presenting both of my palms towards the offender so it was clear that I was not holding anything. The reason I decided to show that both of my palms were empty is because I wanted to communicate to the person that I was not currently in possession of anything that could be perceived as a threat towards them. This attempt to deescalate the hostile behaviour present failed and only served as an opportunity for the offender to escalate their behaviour towards officers. I was still in a defensive stance with my palms present but the offender came to the decision to start walking towards me while maintaining eye contact. I slowly stepped backwards while still holding the defensive stance and gave clear instruction to stop advancing or I would be deploying PAVA spray, the offender did not listen to the command and kept advancing so I deployed said spray. While on the ground communication between the offender and officers failed again as

they refused to listen to instruction but due to the effects of PAVA spray and multiple officers shouting at them, this was the behaviour I expected.

After control of the offender was gained and he was placed in the cell of a police vehicle, I sat in the rear to monitor the person's welfare for the journey. The offender was shouting obscenities and complaining about eye pain so I decided to use this as an opportunity to build rapport with the person. I told the offender not to touch their eyes as this makes the effects more painful and informed them that if they looked down the pain would pass soon, the offender thanked me for this information. This was the first time the person had engaged with officers so I immediately asked the offender the closed question 'DOES TILTING YOUR HEAD DOWN HELP WITH THE PAIN?' to which they responded 'YES'. Now that I knew the person was willing to engage I asked them an open question about their physical and mental state lately. The reason I asked this was to engage in active listening to develop a rapport. The offender stated that their mental condition had not been healthy and due to actively listening to the person by making sounds to show I was listening, paraphrasing the events that were affecting them and asking questions about them, I was finally able to communicate effectively with the offender.

By the time we arrived at custody, the offender was compliant and in good spirits after our conversation in the vehicle. I informed them we had arrived and they requested that not the driver but myself accompany them for the custody process, I believe this was due to the rapport I had cultivated during the journey. I accompanied them to the custody desk and then to the breath analysis machine. They initially refused to engage with the officer conducting the test so I encouraged them to speak, this led to them conversing with the officer but refusing to undergo the test so I escorted the offender to a police cell.

When determining whether use of force is necessary, I will always conduct the national decision making model. The information I was in possession of was that the offender had just assaulted an officer, they were continuing to make off from myself and they were aggressive towards me. Moving into the risk assessment, I knew that there was low risk to myself as long as there was adequate distance between the person and myself that kept me out of their arm's reach. I had a legal power to use force to arrest the offender but I decided to use tactical communications first. These did not work and the person walked towards me so I re-applied the national decision model. As the risk was now high and I had powers to use force and the offender was thinking with an emotional brain and in regards to the drama triangle (L'Abate, Cusinato, Maino, Colesso, Scilletta, 2010), the offender fell into the category of persecutor as they stated they had not done anything and blamed police for their actions. Due to tactical communications failing, I deployed PAVA spray, which was effective in stopping the offender.

On reflection, the only other possible course of action would be to deploy my asp and take a defensive stance but I believe this would have appeared as a challenge and there is potential for significant damage to a person if an asp is used against them. Due to the above circumstances and decisions, I am satisfied that not only the use of force but the method of force was also justified as this gave the lowest possible risk of injury to both the offender and myself. (1491)

(1490)

Task 3

Relevant areas of the National Policing Curriculum: Criminal Justice, Valuing difference and inclusion

You must choose **a policing incident** in which you played a significant role with an offender/service user/victim and reflect on what happened.

Give a brief description of a relevant incident including social and legislative contexts and any relevant cultural, ethnicity and language issues.

Explain and reflect on your responsibilities and procedures in line with the relevant Codes of Practice to support victims and witnesses through the criminal justice system.

Illustrate how policing values were engaged, as well as any other considerations including culturally sensitive practice and language preference.

1500 words (+/- 10%: include your actual word count at the end of each section)

ANSWER:

The incident I will be writing about is a hate related public order offence where I dealt with both the victim and the offender, the hate related aspect comes from the offender making slurs at the victim in regards to their sexuality. I was on mobile patrol with my tutor constable when my sergeant assigned us to make contact with the victim who was claiming that their neighbour had been making comments about their sexuality from the street. We attended the location and entered the victims address to speak with them.

The victim stated that they were living with their partner and partner's child at the address and had on going neighbour issues, which had their roots in parking. The victim told us that because the street of the address was considerably narrower than the average street and a dead end, if residents parked their cars on both sides of the road they would obstruct said road and vehicles already in the street would be unable to leave. The offender had parked their car outside their own address, which lead to the street being obstructed so the victim had messaged the offender through social media to inform them of the obstruction and requested the vehicle to be moved to allow access for others. The offender did not reply to the message but instead left their address and attended the home address of the victim. The victim stated they answered

their front door and the offender who they described as aggressive and hostile was questioning why they had been contacted by social media and refused to move the vehicle. The offender then began to make their way back home but while outside the front gate on the public road, they shouted abuse and obscenities at the victim, which included the offender shouting slurs about the victim's sexual orientation. The victim then went inside their home address to report the incident to police.

After hearing the victim's account and coming to the conclusion that offences had been disclosed to officers, I offered the victim the full range of options of how to continue with this incident. I explained that the three options currently available to them. The victim chose the option of restorative justice so I obtained a statement from the victim and a signed pocket book entry saying that they were happy to follow the agreed approach. I then explained the next steps would be speaking to the offender and I left to do that. The offender did not answer their front door or reply to any messages left to them. After two weeks of actively avoiding officers, I contacted the offender's parent and I was provided with a new contact number for the offender. Through this number, I arranged to meet the offender to discuss the incident where they also agreed to the restorative justice approach after having it explained to them.

As soon as the offence was disclosed to me, I had multiple responsibilities and force policies to adhere to as this was classed as a hate related offence. I explained this to the victim and then talked the victim through their options. The first option explained to them was that they could not give a formal complaint and just have officers speak to the offender with words of advice. The second option I explained was restorative justice; I informed the victim that if they agreed to this approach then I would just need to take a signed pocket notebook entry from them to document their willingness to partake in the process. I explained the process by saying the offender would have to admit to the offence they were accused of, they would write an apology to the victim and the offender would be recorded in our database as having this out of court disposal so they could not receive another over a defined period. The third option I explained was that they could provide a formal complaint and take the matter to court.

Due to this incident being a hate crime, I carried out both a victim needs assessment and a hate crime risk assessment at the scene. The victim needs assessments showed that they were entitled to an enhanced victim service from the police due to the nature of the crime and due to the victim codes of practice. I explained that this meant that the victim would be updated within one day of any major event in the case, a referral to South Wales Victim Focus would be made with their consent but the victim refused this. The victim was also informed that they had the right to review their case if the Police or Crown Prosecution Service decided that there would be no further action taken at any point. The Hate Crime Risk Assessment found that the victim was at medium risk so I made sure the relevant policing units were informed for awareness. South Wales Police policy states that a statement should be obtained from the victim in all hate crimes and when the victim was informed of this, they were happy to provide one but still objected to court and wanted to pursue the restorative justice approach. The victim was also offered the opportunity to provide police with a victim personal statement due to them not only being a victim of crime but also being entitled to an enhanced victim service by police. I explained that court is a formal affair and only take into account the facts of the case they are dealing with. The victim person statement

allows the victims to offer a window into their emotions of how the crime has affected their mental state and is an opportunity to provide the court with any physical impacts they have seen in their everyday lives. The victim chose not to provide police with a victim personal statement and as South Wales Police are victim lead, the victim's wishes were respected. I also set in motion a Hate Crime Action plan that outlined the steps I now needed to take concerning positive action and who to make aware of the incident. I informed the victim that I would make contact with them within ten days or whenever there was an update in the process. I contacted them after ten days to explain that I was still attempting to make contact with the offender. After multiple attempts to contact the offender, they were spoken to and initially reluctant to admit to the offence but eventually did so the restorative justice approach could be completed. After the process was completed, I contacted the victim by telephone and stated that their desired approach to this incident had been successful. I did this within one day as to adhere to the victim codes of practice. The victim thanked myself for the taking the time to carry the process out and stated that they were happy with the outcome achieved by police.

The college of policing states that the four principle values required for a police officer is Integrity, Impartiality, Public Service and Transparency. I believe that not only are they present in this incident but also in every other involving police as they are the defining qualities shown in police officers and if you did not possess them, you would not have been selected to hold the title.

Integrity is held throughout by upholding the expectation of an officer to maintain the highest level of professionalism and deliver a quality service with confidence to the public. Impartiality is present as I myself felt that the victim should go to court over this matter and should have provided a victim personal statement but I respected the victim's wishes and pursued the course of conduct that they were the most comfortable in following. Transparency is always present during police incidents as the need for clarity in my decision-making rational and clear communication of the next course of action are crucial to any police incident. All options were thoroughly explained to the victim and after a desired plan was selected, the steps were explained and the victim was updated when these steps were complete. Public Service was shown in this incident as I treated the victim with respect throughout the incident. I tailored my style of communication when speaking to both parties involved and understood that the victim was acting in their own best interest, as even though this was a hate crime, they did not wish to cause tension between themselves and their neighbour by providing a formal complaint and following the process of court. (1427)

Task 4

Relevant areas of the National Policing Curriculum:

Decision making and discretion, Conducting Investigations and Criminal Justice (Managing offenders)

You must choose **a policing incident** in which you played a significant role with an offender/service user/victim and reflect on what happened.

Give a brief description of the situation including social and legislative contexts and any relevant cultural, ethnicity and language issues. **Reflect** on how you applied the National Decision Model (NDM) to assist in resolving this incident. **Consider** the role of discretion in the decision-making process.

Explain your responsibilities with regards to the provision of the CPIA when conducting this investigation including when managing the offender and suspects and recording and retaining significant information.

Illustrate how policing values were engaged particularly through an **analysis** of the potential impact of bias on the decision-making process.

1500 words (+/- 10%: include your actual word count at the end of each section)

ANSWER:

This incident relates to a breach of the peace where an offender threatened to damage their ankle monitor if police did not take them away from the address of the original call. While on mobile patrol during a night shift there was an emergency call allocated to my tutor constable and me, where a victim had called police to state that their partner (offender) and them had been consuming alcohol together at the victim's address and described a disturbance now taking place. The victim would not specify the exact details of what had happened, describing only a verbal argument and only stated that the offender had been asked to leave the address but was refusing to do so. While in the process of travelling to the location, information was relayed to me over the police radio about the offender's warning markers on the police database. The warning markers were for violence, concealing weapons about their person and mental health problems. With this information, other officers from my shift also began to make their way to the property. Before arrival, we were updated that the offender had learnt that police were going to be attending the location so stated that they were going to hurt himself and made off from the address.

I arrived at the location and informed that the offender had not returned to the address. Due to this an area search was conducted to sight the offender as there was a threat of self-harm but this search was extremely difficult due to the area being by an open field and visibility was poor due to the time of night. While searching, a person matching the description provided made off from police and due to the high risk of the

person to themselves and the public, the offender was tackled to the ground, placed in handcuffs and brought back to the police vehicle to be searched and for officers to ascertain the details of the incident. The victim held the stance of refusing to provide police with any details of the disturbance and now wished for the offender to be left at the address with them. The offender was informed of this but after being released from handcuffs and seeing their partner upset from the current situation they then refused to go back into the house and requested officers take them to custody. After the offender was notified that officers would not be conveying him to custody, the offender then claimed they would start to damage their ankle monitor if officers did not arrest them. I tried to communicate with the offender that this course of conduct was not in their best interest as they would be incarcerated in prison if they were arrested but due to the offender's current state of intoxication through alcohol, they refused to listen to my words of advice and started to attempt to damage their ankle monitor. The offender was then arrested for breach of the peace due to them about to be committing damage to property that they did not own. The offender was then conveyed to the custody suite and left in the care of custody.

I used the national decision multiple times during this encounter. The model started while on route to location by gathering all the information and intelligence available to myself before even exiting the police vehicle. The initial warnings passed from the control room played a key factor in my decisions as the victim could not tell us if the offender was in possession of any item that could harm themselves or other members of the public so I graded this offender as a high risk during my risk assessment. The police powers and procedures available to me at that time were limited, as no offences had been identified so the power I chose in that moment was the power to detain the offender under section one of the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984. This relates to a stop and search to identify if they were in possession of any item as mentioned above. This is when I sighted the offender making off across the field. I decided on using tactical communications by shouting clear and direct instructions to stop while also making it known that I was a police officer. Reviewing this option, it had failed so I proceeded through the national decision model again. With the new information that the offender was failing to stop and tactical communications also failing, I still assessed the risk to be high and identified that the same grounds as previous still held for detaining the male. After reviewing my options and contingencies, I came to the conclusion that I would tackle the male to the floor when I caught him. I decided this because not only would it stop the offender from making good their escape but also allowed the opportunity for other officers who were also in pursuit to make up the necessary distance needed to assist with detaining the offender. This option also minimised risk to both them and myself, as the ground was wet grass that would not cause injury when there was contact made with it. I carried out this action and on review, I was happy with the result which was the offender being safely detained and no other persons being injured.

As the victim had disclosed that the offender had been in the victim's home address and lockdown was in place at the time, there was a breach of COVID-19 regulations present during this incident and more information about this was disclosed. Due to neither party involved having any symptoms and the current events that had just unfolded, I decided to use my discretion and only issue them with a verbal warning. It was within my powers to issue a fixed penalty notice to both but as the breach was

now over and both the victim and offender had been partners for a long time, I was satisfied with a verbal warning.

Due to the offender being arrested for breach of the peace and had nowhere else to go other than custody, there were not many responsibilities with regards to the CPIA. If the victim had communicated with police about the exact events of that night then the incident would have unfolded differently. I will know talk through my responsibilities if the victim disclosed an offence and was willing to make a formal complaint to police. I would have arrested the offender but my use of legal powers would not be oppressive and would be proportionate to the criminal offence being investigated. An investigation would take place and a case file would be built by myself to be sent to the Crown Prosecution Service. In this case file, I would disclose any material to the defence that would either assist the defence or undermine the prosecution to keep in order with the CPIA. If the victim appeared vulnerable or intimidated then I would take all reasonable steps to ensure that the specific needs of the victim would be met by explaining special measures that the court can implement so that the process of giving evidence is as comfortable as possible for the victim.

Having a bias opinion of the offender in this particular situation would have a massive negative impact on this incident. Due to the offender having extensive and dangerous warning markers, there was potential to build an image of the offender before even making contact with them. If I had formed this biased opinion, I believe that I would assess the risk as higher than currently present. With this elevated risk, my options and contingencies would have been disproportionate to the circumstances of the incident and could have created another scenario where I would have made use of my appointments that have the possibility to cause harm to the offender. Impartiality played a key role in this as due to the call being allocated to officers as possible domestic violence, if I had instantly decided that this was the case without gathering the relevant information and intelligence then my view on the entire incident would become skewed and this would greatly affect the outcome of the incident.

(1368)

Task 5

Personal Development Plan (PDP) / Learning Plan.

As part of your reflective process, please use this table to aid you in identifying the next steps for development. This is equivalent to 500 words. Please note that this not the actual number of words you need to use, the wordcount reflects the thought and research you put into it.

Identified area for development	How it will be achieved	Who can provide support?	Timeline
Statement Taking, I am not entirely comfortable with this process and I wish to improve with this.	I have been informed that the only way to improve your statements is repetition so I will offer to take statements when they are outstanding.	My tutor constable will be able to support me through this but also my sergeant as they have had a previous role in one of the HUBS of South Wales Police	I believe that an achievable timeline is the start of April as I will have been operational for exactly six months
Comprehensive OEL Updates	I will continue to place comprehensive OEL updates on Police Systems for other's involved to understand the key elements of incidents I attend	My working shift will be able to support me in this as they all have more experience in this area.	I believe that as stated above, the start of April will be a realistic timeline.
Understanding of policy at certain incident.	I will research current policy when involved with incidents that I am not familiar with.	My sergeant will help me follow these policies and they can be found on our police website.	September 2021 as this is one year after my start date.

Bibliography

The bibliography should only include sources referenced within the workbook using the Harvard referencing system. Information about referencing in written assignments and how to avoid plagiarism can be found on Moodle. It is important that you are aware of the importance of ensuring that the work submitted is your original work.

1. J Patterson - Proceedings of ASCILITE, 2009, Citeseer
2. BK Hamre, RC Pianta, 2006, psynet.apa.org
3. L'Abate L., Cusinato M., Maino E., Colesso W., Scilletta C. (2010) Model¹⁴: A Pathogenic Drama Triangle. In: Relational Competence Theory. Springer, New York, NY. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-5665-1_16

CONFIDENTIALITY and PLAGIARISM – Will be confirmed through Turnitin
--

Recognition and Confirmation of the progress on the Occupational Competency Portfolio (OCP).

By signing the section below you are acknowledging your progress on O.C.P. This is recognised by the university as work that is fully supporting this module and is equivalent to 500 words towards the overall wordcount.

I confirm that I am progressing with the Occupational Competency Portfolio (OCP) in accordance to the regulations.

Signed: Connor Costello (Learner - Electronic signature or type name)

Date: 09/11/2020