



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

Graduate Diploma Professional Police Practice

LEVEL 6 - 40 Credits

Workbook title: Competency Based Workbook 2 (DHEP)

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

Learner name:

_____ **Joseph Pashley** _____

Learner's University Registration Number:

_____ **2029432** _____

FACULTY OF BUSINESS AND MANAGEMENT PUBLIC SERVICE PROGRAMME

Module title: Policing in the Workplace 3 (DHEP) - BMPP6001D

Workbook Guidance

Please read these notes carefully. They provide essential information. The documents you will use in developing your workbook are on the following pages.

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 Graduate Diploma in Professional Policing Practice. You are being asked to outline your experiential learning based upon your theoretical understanding in a range of operational situations.

- Well-being and Resilience
- Criminal Justice
- Conducting Investigations
- Decision making and discretion
- Maintaining Professional Standards
- Leadership and Team working
- Policing the roads
- Information and Intelligence

You may wish to use the same incidents as you have 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 is available to you. Please contact Kelly Andrews direct using k.andrews@uwtsd.ac.uk with any questions or queries you may have.

Dates of workbook submission can be located within the General information tile within Moodle.

Once submitted your workbook will be assessed and marked independently. You will be provided with individual feedback once the work has been marked.

Confidentiality

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

- adhere to guidance in the Candidate Handbook about confidentiality.
- 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.

Please be aware that any content that is deemed to be inappropriate, disrespectful, or abusive will not be tolerated. Following review of any content of this nature the information will be shared with the employer of the student responsible.

Should any health and well-being concerns be raised because of disclosures made by the student within this workbook, the employer of the student will be informed.

NOTE

Your workbook will be submitted electronically via Turnitin on Moodle. Guidance on this is in the Candidate 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 particularly 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 Candidate 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.***

Competency Based Workbook 2 - Learner Workbook

Guidance:

- Your workbook must contain items 1 - 5 below (in the order given).
- You should use the pro-forma to insert your text within each section.
- Note that this module has 2 components with each weighted at 50% of the overall 100% marks total.
- You should upload your completed document as a saved pdf file of this workbook; if this is not possible then a Word Doc 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

Component 1 50%	Area of Professional Practice	Word count
Task 1	Vulnerability and Risk Evidence-based policing	2000
Task 2	CHOOSE ONLY 1 OF THESE 'ADVANCED LEARNING AREA' OPTIONS. IT SHOULD BE ONE THAT HAS BEEN AGREED WITH THE FORCE TO STUDY IN YEAR 2.	All options are 2000 words
Task 2		2000
Option 1	Response Policing	
Option 2	Policing Communities	
Option 3	Road Policing	
Option 4	Information and Intelligence	
Option 5	Conducting Investigations	
	Bibliography	

Task 1

Relevant areas of the National Policing Curriculum: Vulnerability and Risk, Evidence-based policing

You must choose **a policing incident** in which you played a significant role with a victim of crime or anti-social behaviour 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.

Critically evaluate the appropriateness of different approaches (by professionals and the police) in supporting or managing vulnerable people or people at risk of harm.

Explore what works in relation to tackling repeat victimisation and repeat offending. Consider the use of evidence-based policing.

2000 words (+/- 10%: *include your actual word count at the end of each section*)

ANSWER:

For this task I will be looking at an incident I attended which involved two victims having been attacked and caused serious injury by a dangerous dog. When revisiting this incident in the context of vulnerability and risk, I will use the National Decision Model (College Of Policing, 2013) to guide my deconstruction of how I handled the situation and how I might have done better. In order to preserve the anonymity of the parties involved I will refer to them as follows: Victim 1 (V1), Victim 2 (V2), Subject 1 (S1) and Subject 2 (S2). I will begin by providing a summary of the incident in its entirety before reassessing with regards to the aforementioned considerations.

Myself and a colleague were asked to attend an incident which was initially reported as a dog bite. It is common for us to attend any incident where a dog has caused injury as, increasingly, there is a necessity to establish if there were factors in play that might have

avoided the incident occurring. These include but are not limited to; ownership of banned dog breeds, the flouting of muzzle and collar advice and an the intentional breeding by some parties of overly aggressive dogs as a status symbol or protection, particularly amongst the criminal community.

As a result, we attended the address of the report and were met at the scene by a Police dog handler and by S1, who had made the initial report to us. Speaking with S1 and the dog handler, they explained that V1 and V2 had been attacked by a dog that had been in the care of S1 on behalf of her son, S2. S1 explained that the animal had attacked two of her neighbours in a vicious unprovoked attack and that as a result, both V1 and V2 had sustained injuries requiring them to attend hospital. As a result of this, V1 and V2 were not present during our time at the address and could not be spoken to. As it was explained to me, after the attack, S1 had managed to coerce the dog into her flat, where she had locked it and and called the Police and S2. S2 arrived shortly after us and assisted the dog handler in removing the animal from the flat and into my vehicle. From there, the animal was taken to a local animal shelter where it remained until the conclusion of the investigation.

Once the animal had been removed from the address, it was my role to determine who, if anyone, was responsible for the incident and how we would proceed with the investigation. Dangerous Dog legislation is not especially straight forward and as a result, it took some time to determine whether S1, S2 or both would be considered responsible for the incident. What also became clear was that there were multiple factors that needed to be considered with regards to the vulnerability of the victims and subjects when advancing the investigation.

Having the opportunity to speak with both V1 and V2, I was able to gather more information and intelligence on how the incident occurred. What became apparent however, was that both

victims required additional support in terms of providing their evidence. I will layout the details of each in turn.

V1 was an elderly female who lived in the flat immediately adjacent to where the incident had taken place. When I visited V1 after her return from hospital, it very quickly became apparent that the typical method of obtaining a free-flowing statement from her would not suffice. V1 presented as having multiple health issues and explained that she had in the recent past suffered from a brain haemorrhage which had affected her mobility, speech and memory. I found that V1 frequently repeated herself and would often lose her train of thought, resulting in her being unable to fully comprehend what was being asked of her.

V2 also suffered from vulnerabilities as she was agoraphobic and had since the incident developed an extreme aversion to dogs. At the time of the incident V2 had been living with V1 in her flat, but had since vacated as she could not bear to be confronted with the location of the attack on a daily basis.

An unexpected insight from speaking with V1 and V2 was that they both explained that since the incident, they had been the target of anti-social behaviour from S1 who lived in the same building as V1. This was surprising as, during my initial attendance, S1 had been extremely helpful and as earlier mentioned, had been the one to contact Police in the first place. Since the incident, however, S1 had taken to shouting unpleasant names and abuse at both victims and banging loudly on the flat doors as she passed on her way out. This complicated the investigation into the dog attack as it was obvious that some degree of contact was taking place between all parties involved and animosity was building between them. Due to the vulnerabilities identified in V1 and V2, and the protracted nature of the investigation, I did consider speaking with S1 to try and arrange an alternative living arrangement, in order to

avoid further escalation of tensions between them. Having assessed the risk to the victims, this seemed like the most obvious first step. S1 is well-known to Police and as a result, I was able to gather further intel in relation to her to try and identify a strategy for separating her and the victims. During this review, however, I was presented with a further difficulty. I was made aware that S1 had warning markers attached to her Police record, indicating that she suffered from mental health problems and had previously self-harmed and threatened suicide. What this meant was that as well as considering the vulnerabilities of the victims, I also needed to consider the safety of S1 and the risk that moving her might have on her mental health and well-being.

Due to the extreme nature of the warning markers linked to S1, I decided to alter my course of action and reconsider the initial intention of having her reside elsewhere during the investigation. I determined that another course of action would be required.

I gave careful consideration to the powers available to me to impose some kind of restriction on contact between S1 and the victims. Due to the nature of the initial incident, S1 had not been arrested at scene and it was therefore not possible to impose any bail conditions upon her, but there were alternative restrictions that could be imposed upon her as a result of her anti-social behaviour. Prior to this incident, I had not dealt with many ASB incidents and felt therefore, that it was best to reach out to our Neighbourhood Policing Team to aid me in identifying options.

Speaking with our local Neighbourhood Beat Manager, he suggesting having Police Community Support Officers visit in the first instance to provide suitable words of advice to S1 and advise her that continued ASB could result in her receiving a Community Protection

Notice (CPN). A CPN provides instructions to a subject on what they can and cannot do and a breach of these rules can result in arrest.

Based on this advice, action was taken to try and quell the unrest between S1, V1 and V2. I arranged for PCSO's to visit with S1 and in addition she was issued with a CPN warning letter, explaining to her that any further reports of ASB would result in a CPN being issued to her.

I was conscious that a threat of arrest could trigger mental health issues in S1, but felt that under the circumstances it was an appropriate course of action to take; informing her that her behaviour was unacceptable, but without going to the extremes of having her move home or risk an escalation that resulted in her arrest.

In addition, I made the decision to visit with V1 and V2 in person every 28 days, rather than maintaining contact via telephone as is my usual method. I felt that they may benefit from a visible Police presence, the intention being that S1 would be consistently aware of my involvement and in may discourage any ASB on her part whilst also reassuring the victims that progression was being made. I also took the unusual step of maintaining contact with S1 over the same 28 day period to keep her informed of the progression of the investigation. Whilst this is not a common approach, I felt that uncertainty might lead to a deterioration in S1's mental health, so I wanted to take adequate steps to avoid this.

What I found, was that by maintaining contact and a visible presence; combined with the words of advice and potential for a CPN, the Anti-social behaviour that had been developing ceased with immediate effect. V1 and V2 explained that they had heard nothing from S1 and on the rare occasions that they crossed paths, S1 exchanged pleasantries but little else.

As well as dealing with the victim and S1 solely from a Police investigation viewpoint, I also submitted a Public Protection Notification as a result of their individual vulnerabilities. It was important to me that this be done, in order to keep partner agencies abreast of what was going on and to engage with them in developing a strategy going forward. In particular, it was vital that the mental health team be up-to-date with S1's condition and any potential for risk in future as a result of the investigation. Additionally, I felt that by involving the local council, we may have been able to develop a strategy for relocating some or all of the persons involved as they were all residents of a social housing development. Ultimately, I feel that the actions I adopted resulted in the best possible outcome for all involved. I was able to limit the risk to S1 and her mental health, whilst providing the additional protections V1 and V2 required as vulnerable persons. What's more, I was able to do this whilst developing my knowledge of how to address anti-social behaviour and maintain the standards and values of South Wales Police.

Ultimately the anti-social behaviour having ended, meant that both V1 and V2 felt they were happy to proceed with a less harsh outcome to the initial dog attack report. They were satisfied that if the owner, S2, agreed to sign a contract drafted by our Dog Legislation Officer agreeing to muzzle the dog when in public, they would drop any further action and a court appearance would not be necessary. What this meant was that we were able to come to a satisfactory conclusion for everyone. We, as Police, were able to use our powers to ensure that justice was done on behalf of the victims and this was carried out without risking any serious escalation in tensions between the victims and S1, which avoided any of them becoming the target of repeat victimisation. What I was able to learn from this situation was that it is often worth considering the plethora of evidence relating to the

individuals involved in an incident, rather than taking a “cookie-cutter” approach to resolving it. If I had taken steps to conduct my initial plan of moving S1 elsewhere, there is a very real possibility that, rather than defuse the situation, we would instead of ended up with an escalation of anti-social behaviour, as S1 may have blamed V1 and V2 for her being forced from her home. By instead, assessing all the evidence available to me from our systems, I was able to tailor my approach and achieve the best possible outcome.

Word Count - 1952

Task 2 Option 1:

Relevant areas of the National Policing Curriculum:

Response Policing

A core part of the policing mission is to prevent crime and disorder. Domestic abuse causes both serious harm and constitutes a considerable proportion of overall crime

You should choose **a domestic abuse incident** that was of a complex nature, in which you played a significant role in providing a response.

Critically assess the challenges associated with a domestic abuse incident that you have attended, and the strategies developed for effective policing in such challenging situations.

2000 words (+/- 10%: *include your actual word count at the end of each section*)

ANSWER:

For this task I will be reviewing an incident I attended which involved a repeat victim of domestic abuse. As part of the process for reviewing this particular incident with regards to assessing the challenges and strategies employed throughout the investigation, I will refer to the National Decision Model (College Of Policing, 2013) to guide my answer. So that I can maintain the privacy of the parties involved, I will refer to the victim of the incident as AA and the subject as BB from this point forwards. Before going into details of the challenges that I came across during this incident, I will begin with a brief summary of the call placed to Police.

During a morning briefing, I was asked to attend this incident as it had been reported to Police late during the night before and officers had been unable to attend due to demand. I was asked to attend as a matter of urgency as it was a domestic-related incident and the persons involved had a number of previous linked occurrences for high risk domestic calls. The call that came in to Police was one of domestic violence & harassment with malicious communications where the female victim (AA) was being persistently harassed by her ex-partner (BB).

Prior to Police involvement, AA had reached out to other services for support but felt that they were not supportive enough of her. Many agencies offered very limited help without a Police report being made and this was a cause of concern for AA as she felt that reporting BB to the Police may make the situation worse as it would lend further credence to his belief in having been 'betrayed'. AA was classified as vulnerable due to her being a repeat victim of domestic violence and it was unfortunate that other agencies outside of the police did not consider this disclosure sufficient when offering support.

BB was arrested shortly after the initial call was made to Police, but despite this AA's initial thoughts were to consider alternatives to formal Police action. I explained that we could not force her to support prosecution and as we were victim led, we would do as she requested. I explained the options that were open to her and how they might play out but made the benefits and pitfalls of them abundantly clear. I explained that the lowest level course of action available to us was to offer words of advice to the suspect. I did however explain that whilst it may be seen as appealing due to it being fairly informal, the previous lack of success with partner agencies prior to Police involvement seemed to indicate that words of advice would not provide said agencies with a baseline from which to work & AA could end up

feeling like nothing had changed. I explained what we could put in place to offer protections without the support of partner agencies & that as a vulnerable person we could submit a PPN and request critical markers and target hardening be applied to her home, but further explained that without further support this course of action could only achieve so much.

AA asked for my personal opinion of what should be done and I explained that I felt there was adequate evidence for an arrest, which would in all likelihood lead to BB being given bail conditions that could protect AA. Additionally, I explained that with an arrest and possible court appearance, AA would likely see a significant uplift in the level of support she received as a vulnerable person, including the possibility of special measures being put in place to protect her and put her at ease during court proceedings.

I explained that often if a suspect is not arrested, many often see it as an excuse to continue their behaviour, knowing that the victim will be in fear enough or give them the benefit of the doubt enough to continue their behaviour. We talked with AA about prior reports of a domestic nature and made a point of explaining that she was at risk of becoming a long-term repeat victim if significant action was not taken to address it. I explained that we would provide as much support as possible to see AA through both the trauma of a criminal investigation and the steps necessary to ensure she was not a statistic of repeat victimisation.

We discussed the importance of gathering as much evidence as possible to support prosecution, and explained that this was sometimes uncomfortable for the victim as it often meant taking drastic steps such as downloading content from the victims and suspects phones, which many people consider to be an invasion of their privacy.

With AA seemingly closing in on being onboard with supporting Police action, I took the step to try and gather more information with regards to this particular incident and the nature

of the relationship between AA and BB in the past. Once I had done this, my next step was to speak with neighbouring properties and from doing this I was able to gather that whilst little had been heard by neighbours in relation to the reported incident, they were aware of ongoing issues between the pair and often heard arguing and fighting from within the address. It was at this point that I was also confronted with my first challenge. A large proportion of the work required in building a successful case in domestic incidents relates to being able to gather best evidence to prove a pattern of behaviour on the part of the aggressor. Unfortunately, whilst the neighbours I spoke with were able to provide me with a decent amount of detail, they all declined to give statements, many of them explaining that they did not wish to get involved. This is often something of an issue in aggressive situations. Many times, neighbours fear repercussions or worry they will need to attend court and as a result they decline to give any information in writing. It is unfortunate that this is the case because a great deal of the burden of proof can often be laid at the feet of witnesses so when they refuse to participate, it can make proving a case extremely difficult.

My next step was to assess the full extent of risk to AA and try to develop a working strategy for ensuring her safety. It was clear from the volume of previous reports to Police and the nature of them that she was an extremely high risk domestic abuse victim and needed additional protections put in place during the length of the investigation. My plan in the first instance was to consider options to protect AA in the long-term whilst also using the powers available to me to limit the damage achievable by BB. With BB in custody, I had multiple possibilities at my disposal to impose restrictions upon him. Initially I considered whether we had the grounds to remand BB in custody, but after speaking with the custody inspector, it was decided that a more suitable approach was to bail him with strict conditions, whilst we completed the investigation. This option was chosen largely due to the complex nature of the

offence and the lengthy time over which it had occurred. Remanding BB for the length of time needed to fully review all of the facts was impractical.

I revisited AA after considering our options and found that when AA was informed that BB would likely be bailed, she was extremely apprehensive. She explained to me that she did not believe he would abide by the conditions put in place and was fearful of what might happen. Her first thought which she put to me was that she was considering withdrawing her support for the investigation because she feared what BB might be capable of if he saw that she was supporting Police involvement.

With this in mind I laid out the facts as I saw them to AA and explained how we could support and protect her during the investigation. I put all the information to her and explained how we could build a strategy going forward that supported prosecution whilst also delivering on keeping her safe. I was careful to limit her expectations whilst simultaneously giving her valuable information on all the options we had at our disposal.

One factor that I felt was extremely important in gaining the trust and support of AA was to ensure that when speaking with her, she was alone or had supportive people around her. In the past I had found that often times when other persons are present in these situations, they attempt to influence or coerce the victims into taking a certain course of action & I wanted to ensure that what the victim told me was what she wanted done. Whilst the reason for family or friends being involved is often with the best of intentions, it can nevertheless become problematic as the victims are more likely to listen to people they know rather than strangers, even if those strangers are Police officers.

Finally, I revisited neighbours who had earlier declined to provide statements and spoke with them at greater length in the hopes that I could encourage them to assist Police. In order to

achieve this, I explained options for special measures and similar support to offer them a degree of protection during the process. Thanks to this, whilst I did not get statements from all the neighbours, I did have some success in collecting statements from several neighbours to help build a file in this case.

Another major obstacle that was identified when speaking with AA was that in the past, she had found communication from the Police to be infrequent and she often felt like she never saw the same officer twice. In order to address this, I explained that I would be acting as her point of contact going forward and offered my work telephone and email so she could get in touch at any time. Additionally, I arranged to speak with AA at least once every 10 days to ensure she was kept up to date and so that I could get a handle on any issues before they became overwhelming to her.

As the investigation proceeded I made sure to visit AA often to discuss how she was feeling about the progress. I had been able to put some safeguarding measures in place, such as submitting the earlier mentioned PPN to involve partner agencies including Women's Aid. In order to put greater protections in place, we also had our Target Hardening team install alarms on AA's windows and doors and place a marker on her house to prioritise attendance to any future calls.

Once all of the above was put to AA and she was further informed of all the action that the courts could take to protect her, in the form of special measures, she seemed to become a lot more willing to support prosecution. I found that in time she opened up a lot more to me and was much more vocal about how BB had treated her during their relationship and the impact

it had had on her. In fact, this openness was extremely beneficial in drafting a victim personal statement which I felt would carry significant weight during prosecution.

All of the above proved to be extremely important in bringing this case to trial and with special measures utilised, the victim was able to deliver her evidence in person in court. Whilst what was imposed upon BB was not as strong as I felt was deserved based on what was disclosed by AA; we were nevertheless able to get a successful outcome with him receiving a restraining order which meant AA could be protected and begin to rebuild her life. I felt we had a great deal of success in addressing the frequently occurring challenges that result from domestic-related calls and achieved a positive result for the victim.

Word Count - 2001

Bibliography

College of Policing (2013) *National Decision Model* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.app.college.police.uk/app-content/national-decision-model/the-national-decision-model/> (Accessed 09th September 2022)