

Graduate Diploma in Professional Police Practice

LEVEL 6 - 40 Credits

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

(SOUTH WALES POLICE, GWENT POLICE AND UWTSD)

Learner name: Matthew JOHNSON

Learner's University Registration Number: 1910675

FACULTY OF BUSINESS AND MANAGEMENT PUBLIC SERVICE PROGRAMME

Module title: Policing in the Workplace 3 (DHEP)

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 Graduate Diploma 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)
- Problem Solving
- Evidence Based Policing
- Maintaining Professional Standards
- Public Protection.

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 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

Workbook	Area of Professional Practice	Word count
Task 1	Wellbeing and Resilience	1500
Task 2	Communication Skills, Managing Conflict, Valuing Difference and Inclusion	2500
Task 3	Criminal Justice, Valuing difference and inclusion	2500
Task 4	Decision making and discretion, Conducting Investigations and Criminal Justice (managing offenders)	2500
	Bibliography	
Task 5	Development Plan	Equivalent to 500 words
Task 6	Confirmation of the completion of your Occupational Competency Portfolio (OCP)	Equivalent to 500 words
	Confirmation of Confidentiality and Plagiarism <i>Confirmed by submission through Turnitin</i>	

Task 1

Relevant areas of the National Policing Curriculum: Developing Resilience

Guidance:

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

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

ANSWER:

Over the last 6 months, there has been many moments of stress and many moments of elation and humour. On joining the police, it was apparent there would be many hours of hard work ahead, and at times, this may be stressful. Stress is an inevitable emotion when starting a new job, and more so when joining the police. Stress can come from a number of factors, from catching up on revision, to preparing for exams, and memorising legislation. Resilience is an important attribute for a police officer, and how we cope with stressful situations is important.

During training I have tried to cope with stress while working, Borton (1970) developed a theory called the Development Framework. Which is based around 3 cue questions, namely: What? So what? And now what? I have used this theory to help rationalise problems I faced in training, and in doing so, break down problems into more manageable objectives, and in doing so, this made problems easier to manage, and easier to complete, and as a consequence, the problems became less stressful.

For example, during preparation for my exams, and in the build up to the first exam, using the 'What?' question, I broke down what I needed to do, and set my target of needing to pass my exam with a mark of at least 50%. With the next question 'so what?' I decided to set the target of doing at least 1 hour of revision a night in the week leading up to the exam. The final question, 'What now?' comes after the event, in which after the first exam, I scored only 40% in the first attempt, which I was disappointed with even though it is still a pass mark, as I wanted to do better than that.

On reflection, there are many factors as to why I scored so poorly in the exam, among which was the fact that I was unfamiliar with the exam layout, and that I was uncomfortable to write on the small desk for long periods of time. However, I found that the main cause for my poor performance was that I did not complete enough hours of revision. Therefore, my 'so what?' phase of this model, was to ensure I completed at least 1 hour of revision/study time a night to ensure I condensed my notes and revised the learning content from that day's learning. The result of this was that I drastically improved my performance in the next exam, scoring 54% exceeding my initial target.

To help cope with the stress of the training, exercise was a great alleviation of my stress, according to the NHS (2019) website, being physically active can cause chemical changes in the brain which can positively change your mood. I concur with the findings and found that a short walk or run for approximately 30 minutes a day, gave me enough time to clear my head and make sense of the stresses that were going on around me. This allowed me to carry on with my day in a much more relaxed and calm mood than before. Which meant that not only my physical health was improved, but also my mental health. Being physically fit is a requirement for the job, and leading a sedentary lifestyle whilst in training, meant I was also at risk of not meeting the requirement for the fitness test, which was also an added pressure.

However, this caused conflict with Borton's model, which was based more on a more task focused approach, compared to doing exercise which was based more on a physiological approach. The argument that was forming was that although exercise is good for you not just physically, but also emotionally, however, it was not actually helping me to solve the problem that was causing me stress, but it was helping my mental state, and if this was not in the right place, I would have been in no fit state to have been able to complete my work to the required standard. By trying to do both of these things, I was also neglecting my family life and my social life, as by the time I had completed my revision and gone for a walk, there was no time left in the day to socialise with my friends or my family, which added further pressure.

To solve the problem, and to achieve both of my objectives of improving my mental wellbeing, and improving my exam results, I decided on a compromise, I would alternate each day between revision and exercise. I felt this was a suitable compromise between the

two strategies as I could complete a suitable level of revision and I could still remain physically active. This compromise worked in my opinion, as I still saw an improvement in my exam results, and I had no problems with my mental health or fitness.

Using Gibbs' (1988) reflective cycle, it helped me to reflect on this situation. Gibbs' model is based around six key areas, these being: Description of what happened, personal feelings, evaluation, analysis of what happened, conclusions and what else I could have done, and an action plan for next time. Therefore using this model;

Description: there was a dilemma between doing revision and doing exercise, both were equally good for me, but both had very different outcomes. To make matters more complicated, there was also a conflict between those two activities and my existing commitments such as my family life.

My feelings: I felt that I was tied between the two, I needed to do both, but I couldn't physically do it. This added further pressure and stress to myself as I didn't know what I was meant to do. I felt that I was adding to a situation, rather than making the situation better. I felt that I needed to do something but I was struggling to know what to do. I felt that the best way forward was a compromise, and to balance out the two problems evenly.

Evaluation and Analysis: I felt that the compromise was the best way forward, splitting both priorities meant that I was able to achieve both targets, albeit that I was not able to put all my effort into both objectives, however, I was able to attempt both targets. I felt I should have concentrated on my studies, given how important they are, and the consequences of another mediocre performance would have not been desirable. However, I also needed to ensure I was also physically fit, and the consequences of not doing so could have led to disciplinary action against me. Therefore, I had no choice but to attempt both options simultaneously.

Conclusion: I found that I created the situation for myself, which could have been avoided if I did better in my first exam. However, given that there was nothing I could do about the situation now that I was in it, I had to make the best of it, and felt that I reached the overall best conclusion that I could have done. Overall my exam results improved each time and I had no problems with any of the fitness tests.

Action plan: if I was faced with a similar situation, I feel there would have been several things that I would have done differently. The first being that I would have tried to have avoided the situation completely, in the sense that I would have done better in the first exam, which would have taken some of the pressure off of me. I would have also decided to priorities the topics of revision better, rather than learning everything that we were taught, I would have prioritised the key aspects of operational policing. This would have made it easier for me to revise and significantly cut down my workload.

I feel that I have managed to successfully complete my university exams, and I have been able to cope with the stresses that have come with it. I believe that I have been able to deal with the stress of the exams through the coping strategies I have deployed, I firmly believe that if I hadn't used the coping strategies I believe that I would have struggled to cope. I believe that neither Borton's or Gibbs' strategies are superior to each other, but work well together in partnership. I believe that both strategies are useful to break down a problem into its objective components, and in doing so, makes it easier for one to decide the best course of action. Using both of these models have allowed me to reach my goals and most sufficiently allocate my time.

Overall I believe that if I had not used the strategies, then I believe that I would not have been as successful academically nor physically. I believe that my performance has drastically improved due to the use of the reflective models. It has to be said however, that a great deal of my time was spent evaluating my choices, rather than doing them, therefore using the strategies could be considered a hindrance rather than a help. However, I believe that on balance the strategies have helped me greatly.

Word Count: 1,527

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.

Critically assess the incident including social and legislative contexts and any relevant cultural, ethnicity and language issues.

Reflect on your application of 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 a **critical evaluation** of 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.

2500 words (+/- 10%: include your actual word count at the end of each section)

ANSWER:

Managing conflict is part of being a police officer, which may be encountered through many different ways, with the need to protect the public, the situation and the subject need to be managed simultaneously. However the use of force by police officers is a potentially contentious issue.

The public perception of police when they use force can be negatively influenced when they have to use force, which to the officer may seem proportionate, however, to bystanders it may appear to disproportionate even though the officers has acted in a completely lawful manner.

There are 4 main laws which allow police to use reasonable force, these being The Human Rights Act 1998, which protects everyone's right to life and outlines their right to protect life.

Section 117 Police and Criminal Evidence Act (PACE) 1984 which allows a Police Officer to use reasonable force, however the onus for the use of force rests with the officer. Section 3 Criminal Law Act 1967 allows the use of force as is reasonable in the circumstances for the prevention of crime, or effecting an arrest on suspected offenders unlawfully at large. The final law that allows use of force in Section 76 Criminal Justice and Immigration Act 2008 sets out the provision for the reasonable use of force in relation to self-defence for the prevention of crime or making an arrest.

During Operational Safety Training, which is the basic self-defence training scheme all officers undergo, the 5 step communication model was taught to officers as a method of tactical communication, helping officers to communicate with subjects on a simple basis; let the subject say what they want, as long as they do what the officer wants them to do. The process works by starting at stage 1 and if this does not work moving on to stage 2 and carrying on until the subject is compliant with the officer. The 5 stages are;

1. The simple appeal – to ask the subject to comply with the officer's request.
2. Reasoned appeal – telling the subject why the request has been made, for example whether they have broken the law and what they have done to cause the officer to make the request.
3. Personal appeal – give the subject options and reminding them of the consequences of those options such as a fine and or arrest.
4. Final appeal – confirming the subject is not complying with the officer's requests, before giving the subject one final chance to cooperate with the instructions of the officer. This is where the officer cannot reasonably say or do anything make the subject comply with their requests.
5. Action – Time to act in whichever way the officer sees fit, the only option left may be to use reasonable force, which is up to the officer to decide.

It is apparent that in all four of the legislative texts, that the use of force must be reasonable and that use of force should come as a last resort to officers. Other methods should be considered beforehand, such as the use of tactical communication and reasoning with a subject. When an officer uses force, they must ensure they consider the Nation Decision Model that was constructed by the College of Policing (2014). This was to ensure that the force that Police use is proportionate to the situation, reasonable under scrutiny of the law and in line with the Force policy on use of force.

There is a mnemonic taught to officers which helps them to consider whether their actions are justified, this mnemonic is known as JPLANE, which stands for Justified, Proportionate, Legal, Accountable, Necessary and Ethical. This helps officers to consider whether their actions would stand up to scrutiny.

There have been circumstances in the 12 weeks where there has been a need for conflict management. For example, there was an incident we were called to where a male had an argument with his girlfriend over their relationship and in doing so had pushed her over and punched a bus stop. During the 999 call, the caller who was the male's auntie also said that he had now got into her car and refused to get out until his girlfriend said that they would stay in a relationship.

When we arrived at the scene we found the victim stood near the bus stop visibly distressed and several family members present as well, the male subject was still sat in the car and was also visibly upset at the break up in his relationship and was very irate at the fact Police had been called. I had to instruct the male to calm down as he was visibly becoming even more irate and distressed, he did so but when I asked him to explain what had gone on he became irate again. Using the reasoned appeal seemed too excessive at this stage and I felt that I may have escalated the situation as the male may have perceived me as being aggressive, therefore using the simple appeal seemed like the best method of communicating at this point.

The victim who spoke to my colleague disclosed that there had been an assault by the male on her, by pushing her over, this is contrary to Section 39 Criminal Justice Act 1988, more commonly known as Common Assault. When this had been communicated to me, I said to the male that he was under arrest, at this point the male ran away from me and small foot chase ensued, I caught up to the male who cornered himself between a fence and a tree, I tried to use tactical communication and tried to use the Personal Appeal to get the male to calm down and comply with me, reminding him of the consequences of not complying with us and that he was going to make things worse by trying to run away.

The male became even more distressed, his face becoming red with anger and would not listen to my commands, he started hitting out at me and my colleagues, not striking us but

coming very close to us, at this stage I used the final appeal and told the male that this was his last chance to comply with me, he chose not to, which is where I moved to the Action stage. Under Section 76 Criminal Justice and Immigration Act 2008 I saw it fit to use self-defence to deal with the male's outbursts and to effect his arrest, which is where I used an arm lock to hold him while my colleagues got handcuffs onto the male. I had to ensure that the force I used was reasonable, which I can justify by the threat and risk of harm that was posed by the male.

Once the male was in handcuffs he calmed down considerably but was still distressed and was not fully compliant with officers. I had to assertively tell the male to stop pulling away from me several times when escorting him to the van, when I would consider to be a simple appeal. Once at custody, the male was still distressed and had to be spoken to by the custody sergeant about his behaviour, and had to be put under constant observation due to the risk he posed to himself. The male was interviewed a short time after, and since there was no statement from the victim, no further action was taken due to a lack of evidence, and the incident was dismissed by the custody sergeant.

There is a theory known as The Drama Triangle developed by Karpman in 1968, English (1976) writes about the drama triangle, and the relationship that the victim, the rescuer and the persecutor have. Applying the drama triangle to this situation, each individual has a clear position in the triangle, for example the male subject would be classed as the 'Persecutor', the female would be the 'Victim', and I would be the 'Rescuer'. During the situation, the male subject possibly saw himself as the rescuer of the female, as he thought he was helping her, even though he ended up assaulting her. Karpman says that the persecutor is rigid and autoreactive in their stance, which given the behaviour of the male I would suggest is an accurate description of him.

Karpman describes how the victim lives their life feeling oppressed, powerless helpless, and that the victim must learn to help themselves and not look for someone else to look after them. Which I would suggest is accurate of the victim in this case, and she did not act on the suggestions made by Karpman in helping themselves, since they did not want to make a statement to police, instead she looked to officers to resolve the matter without her involvement. However, if they made the statement they would have helped themselves, but

they didn't, which means they remain in the victim position, rather than moving to the rescuer position and saving themselves.

The Rescuer position is described by Karpman as seeing themselves as the helper, and look for someone to 'rescue' and they will help someone even if their help is asked for or not. Karpman says that a 'Rescuer' needs to develop self-awareness and accountability to acknowledge that they are fulfilling their own self-actualisation needs by helping someone, rather than genuinely helping someone. I believe that this is a difficult and complex situation for a police officer to be in, since there are several pressures that compel them to act, even though taking action may aggravate a situation. For example, in a domestic violence situation, the Force policy is that positive action must be taken, even when the victim does not want police involvement, which is the scenario I found myself in. This helped me realise that not everyone can be helped, and that there needs to be a degree of acceptance of the help, rather than forcing it upon the 'victim'.

The Drama Triangle has helped me understand the relationships that each party has with each other and their own personal characteristics, and that I need to be aware not only of other people's characteristics, but also my own. In future situations, I can apply the drama triangle and use it to benefit from understanding how each party may react.

Considering my actions into the JPLANE mnemonic, I would consider my actions to be justified in arrest the male and using reasonable force as he is an offender unlawfully at large, and the use of force is covered under S.117 PACE 1984. He has also tried to run off from us which escalates the need to apprehend him before he potentially offends again. I would consider my actions to be proportionate as I have used force just enough to effect the arrest, and when this has happened I have let go of the male stopping the use of force. My actions were accountable as submitted my use of force forms which make me accountable for my actions as per police regulations and the legal requirement to do so.

I felt that my actions were necessary as the victim is deserving of justice, the arrest had to be made as the male was technically no fixed abode due to his complicated family relationship which meant he was not eligible for a voluntary attendee interview and that actions of this nature cannot go without consequences. Also it was ethical to arrest the male as the incident needed to be investigated before it turned into a more violent incident, and

the use of force was ethical as it was used to control the subject from hurting officers and/or himself.

Through using Gibbs' (1998) model of reflection my feelings about the incident are that it could have escalated into something far worse than it was, even though the subject was aggressive and distressed, everyone came away from the incident unharmed, including the male subject. Using the Betari's Box Model written about by MindTools (2020), I believe that my attitude effected my behaviour that day, I believe that because I had other stresses going on, my attitude was not what it should have been, which meant that my behaviour was effected that day. This meant that it had an impact and effected the attitude and behaviour of the male subject, and may have potentially escalated the situation since he was already in a distressed state.

In reflection I feel that I had improved my attitude and behaviour that day, the outcome may have been different, if I had a more relaxed attitude that day it may have reflected on the male subject, and it may have resulted in him not running away from us and removed my need to use force on him. In future incidents of a similar nature, I would consciously make an effort to review my attitude before engaging with a subject, ensuring that I was in the right frame of mind to deal with the incident. This would lead to less chance of the subject becoming violent and uncooperative with me.

On evaluation, I think overall the incident could have been handled better initially, however, the incident came to a safe conclusion with the use of force minimised. The good points of the incident were that the male was talked down and didn't harm himself or anyone else. Also, since the incident was classed as a domestic incident due to the fact that the male and the victim were in a relationship, we needed to take positive action to safeguard the victim which we did by arresting the male and taking him away from the situation. Although she did not want to make a statement to police, the situation was defused which allowed both parties time away from each and time to calm down.

However there were some things I feel I could have improved on and were a detriment to the situation. For example, giving the opportunity to run away added distress to the situation for the victim seeing police chase after her partner, and posed further risks to the officers chasing, and the male since there was a risk that they could potentially fall over, or run into

the road with traffic oncoming. There was further risk from the subject, as we did not know how he would react when confronted by police. I would have also got hands on the male sooner, which I would have been justified to do since he was under arrest, stopping him from trying to hit us.

In conclusion, during incidents of a similar nature, there are several things I would potentially do differently. For example I would have separated the two individuals sooner, and taken the male somewhere more secure where I could have more control over him, such as sitting him in our car therefore controlling his movements more closely, which would have not given him the opportunity to run away from us.

I would have also tried to be more persuasive with the victim to make a statement, which would have added more evidence to the case and probably resulted in a charge being brought against the male. Even though the prosecution could have gone ahead as a victimless prosecution since it was domestic related, the victim did not want to pursue a complaint against the male, and since the police are governed by the consent of the public, we must respect the wishes of the public.

Word count: 2,564

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.

Critically assess a relevant incident including social and legislative contexts and any relevant cultural, ethnicity and language issues.

Consider 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.

2500 words (+/- 10%: *include your actual word count at the end of each section*)

ANSWER:

Valuing differences and inclusion are integral parts of being a police officer, and it forms the basis of the code of ethics and standards of behaviour that all police officers, regardless of their Force or department, they must abide by the same rules. Following these rules allows a police officer to act with the integrity of knowing that they are leading the general public by example. It also allows officers to be seen doing the right thing, in the right way.

The code of ethics was written by the College of Policing (2014). It sets out the 10 standards of behaviour that is expected for an officer to follow, and loosely follow the same principles that Sir Robert Peel laid out when he developed his vision for the Metropolitan Police. The 10 standards of behaviour as set out by the College of Policing are: 1. Honesty and integrity, 2. Authority, respect and courtesy, 3. Equality and diversity, 4. Use of Force, 5. Orders and Instructions, 6. Duties and Responsibilities, 7. Confidentiality, 8. Fitness for Work, 9. Conduct, 10. Challenging and reporting improper conduct. Failure to meet these standards can result in disciplinary action taken against the individual.

Equality and Diversity is also covered by legal protection under the Equality Act 2010 which replaced several pieces of legislation and encompassed them into one Act of Parliament. The new Act gave unprecedented protection to 9 characteristics, from all types of discrimination, especially to groups who may have faced persecution in the past. The 9 protected characteristics are, 1. Age, 2. Sex, 3. Gender reassignment, 4. Disability, 5. Race, 6. Religion, 7. Marriage and Civil Partnerships, 8. Pregnancy and Maternity and 9. Sexual Orientation. During policing incidents, a police officer must exercise their judgement ensuring there is justice for the victim, but also that the code of ethics must be abided by, and if necessary they must consider the Equality Act.

There have been instances in the last 12 weeks where there has been a need to recognise that there are differences, which are covered by the Equality Act 2010, and it must have a conflict of interest with pursuing criminal justice. It could be argued that criminal justice should not always take precedent over an individual's needs, as long as there is not a public interest to pursue the offender, which is based on the severity of the crime. However, there is also a need to go beyond the needs of the victim and their wishes to manage the incident in the interests of difference and inclusion.

For example there was an incident that we were called to where an elderly couple called 999 saying that their son was at the address, heavily intoxicated and was causing damage inside the house. The elderly female was suffering from terminal leukaemia and was exacerbated by other ailments brought on through old age. This meant that both victims were covered by the Equality Act on several factors even if not all of them applied, such as Age, Disability and Marriage.

On arrival at the address, the male had left the property and his whereabouts were unknown, on taking a first account from the victims, it became apparent very quickly that the mother did not want to make a complaint and wanted to be left in peace due to her terminal illness, but the father was unhappy at what happened and due reoccurring incidents involving his son and his alcohol fuelled violence, he was happy for police to take action. Not only were the victims vulnerable due to their age and illness, they were also repeat victims, which added further complexities to the situation. It was clear that action needed to be taken, but

there was conflict of opinion from the victims, which made things even more difficult since the offender was their son.

On the subject of vulnerable victims, the College of Policing (2012) said “The key to dealing with vulnerability is to understand the link between a person’s vulnerability and their situation.” Which can be encompassed into Problem Orientated Policing (known as POP Policing) which was developed by Arizona State University, Scott & Kirby (2012) write about POP Policing saying “Police agencies should be run in a manner that maximizes their ability and fairly prevent and control threats to public safety”. In effect getting to the source of the problem, rather than dealing with the consequences afterwards. Which is what I had to do with the male to safeguard the victims and their best interests.

During the incident, the male had absconded and an area search was undertaken to locate him, however despite our best efforts, on a cold, dark, wet and windy night, which made it easy for him to hide, he somehow went undetected and appeared back outside the address and a further call was received by police notifying us that he was outside and he was banging on the front door. On arrival at the address the male was saying that he wanted to talk to his parents, before he was taken to custody however we did not allow him to do this due to the fear that he may try and intimidate them into not cooperating with police.

The male was arrested and taken to custody, he was disruptive and tried to provoke a reaction from officers, and during interview he denied the offence of criminal damage and said he had leant on the wall whilst having a heated discussion with his parents, and the damage was down to a poor repair job from previous damage to the wall.

Despite my best efforts, the female victim did not want to make a statement to police about what had happened, which is understandable as she wanted to be left alone due to her condition, and did not want to pursue proceedings against her son. In hindsight I believe that little else could have been done to persuade a dying woman to change her mind, but nonetheless she needed safeguarding, even though she was not willing to support police action. It was clear from looking at police systems the male was not learning his lesson nor was this a one off incident, since he had over 50 incidents linked to his person record.

Taking into account the victim's vulnerabilities, I sought to place specific conditions on the male in order to safeguard the victims, including for him not to contact his parents directly or indirectly and not to enter the street on which they lived. This is part of the victim and witness support which should be offered in every occurrence. In reflection I think this was a wise decision, and also one I made consciously after reading a report by the Ministry of Justice (2011). The report highlights the options open to help accommodate victims and witnesses, in efforts to achieve what is known as 'best evidence'.

Even though I explained to the victim about the measures available to her, that the Police apply for and are granted by the Crown Prosecution Service, which would have potentially made it easier for her to give evidence in court, and would have ensured equality based on reasonable adjustments for the victim and her conditions, such as being able to give evidence through a video link from her home, or if she was intimidated by the appearance of the Judge and Barristers, adjustments could have been made for them to remove their gowns and wigs in the court room. However, despite the possible adjustments, she declined and the victim refused to make a statement.

Despite the restrictions and bail conditions placed on the male, where if he breached the conditions, he would go straight to prison for breach of bail. He still breached his bail conditions and made contact with his parents which was unwanted by his father. This made me feel like I had failed the victim. I failed to adequately put safeguarding measures in place that protected the victims, resulting in the offender getting to them, this could have had any number of implications, from witness intimidation to further damage being caused to the property.

Through using Gibbs' (1988) model it has helped me reflect on the situation and help me make sense of what happened. My feelings were simple, I felt that I had not sufficiently protected the victim through the criminal justice system. Even though there were measures in place it was apparent that the offender was still going to return to the address despite there being restrictions in place in attempts to stop him.

On speaking to my superiors, I explained the situation fully, and honestly, it would have been easy for me to have elaborated on the truth to try and mitigate my responsibility in the situation. However, if I had done that I would have contravened the first rule in the standards

of behaviour; honesty and integrity, which would not be the standard expected of a police officer. However, I remained truthful and explained what had happened. On reflection with my superiors they were happy that nothing further could have been done to safeguard the victims, the consequences of returning to the property had been fully explained to the male subject and it was his choice to break his bail conditions, and that I had fully fulfilled my responsibilities which meant I met the standard of behaviour.

In evaluation of the incident, there were several positives about the incident, the first being that the male was removed from the area, initially just for the evening, protecting his parents from his drunken and violent behaviour. Which given that they were both elderly and his mother was especially vulnerable. Another good point was that we were able to remand the male subject, meaning he was kept in police custody until he appeared before the next available court, which gave the victims further protection. This probably wouldn't have happened if the victims were not as vulnerable as they were, but it helped add protection to them, some could suggest this would be positive discrimination, which I would agree with, and would suggest that it was necessary.

There are areas as well that I think could have been improved on, despite the fact that a positive result was obtained through a conviction, it would have probably added more weight to the case if a statement was obtained from the female victim, as the entire case relied on the one statement from the male victim. Even though he was vulnerable himself, his wife was the more vulnerable victim. Also I feel more could have been done to safeguard the victims, such as involving Social Services, and Victim Services sooner, which could have put target hardening support in place to protect them better. In reflection when completing the initial account from the victims, I should have emphasised the support that victim services such as Connect Gwent can offer, and if they had accepted these services, they may have been things they could have done for them, which could have protected them more.

In future incidents of the similar nature, I have learnt several lessons from this incident that I can take forward. For example, I have learnt the importance of safeguarding victims and that even though we can put measures in place in attempts to safeguard them, we cannot always predict the actions of an offender. I have also learnt the importance of understanding

an individual's disabilities, and individual needs, and how we must try to cater for those needs in order to pursue equality.

During this incident I have kept to the policing values throughout the investigation, for example, I have kept to honesty and integrity throughout the investigation, with the victims and my peers too, I ensured I explained the process truthfully to the victims and hid nothing from them, explaining exactly what was going to happen. It would have been easy for me to tactfully omit certain details about the process in order to persuade both victims into agreeing with my recommendations. However, I didn't, I kept myself truthful and let them make their own decisions in the name of equality, respect and courtesy, I respected the wishes and views for the victims even when I would have hindered the investigation. Even when the decisions of my superiors did not appear to be the most logical decision to make, I still followed their orders.

When it came to use of force, I ensured that it was only used when necessary, as when it came to arresting the male, handcuffs were only used to effect his arrest. Even though at the time I felt like I failed to carry out my duties and responsibilities, on reflection I feel like there was not much more we could have done to have protected the victims. In terms of confidentiality, I ensured that the matter remained private for the family, especially since there was significant interest from the neighbours who wanted to know what was going on at the property.

In terms of conduct and challenging improper behaviour, I felt I did this to its fullest extent, for example when booking the male subject into custody he was trying to provoke a reaction from me, however I remained professional and did not react to him. In terms of challenging improper conduct, I ensured that the family was treated fairly, and their needs were taken into account. Since there times where the investigation became hard because of the victim's medical needs, it would have been easy at times to close the investigation stating that there was not a public interest to pursue a family dispute, however, since I recognised the need to be an advocate for justice on the family's behalf, since they could not always represent themselves. I kept the investigation going.

Overall I feel that I handled this situation well given that there were many complexities to the investigation, and many points to consider, especially when it is taken into account that this

was one of my first investigations. There have been learning curves in the investigation, especially when it came to ensuring that there was equality for the victims and ensured that they were treated fairly despite their condition.

Word count: 2,367

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.

Critically assess 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. **Evaluate** the role of discretion in the decision-making process.

Determine 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 assessment** of the potential impact of bias on the decision-making process.

2500 words (+/- 10%: include your actual word count at the end of each section)

ANSWER:

Decision making is an important part of being a police officer, there are times where decisions have to be made where lives can depend on the decision, and lives can be changed based on the outcome of decisions. That is why it is important to ensure the right decision is made every time, however the process behind making the decision, and rationalising it to others not involved in the situation can be difficult.

The College of Policing (2013) developed the National Decision Model (NDM), which is a nationally used approach for officers in rationalising a decision in the operational field. The NDM has six components to it, with the Code of Ethics at the centre of it influencing each stage of the decision model. The first stage is to gather information and intelligence where the officer in question should work out what has happened. The second stage is to assess the threat and risk, and develop a working strategy; where the officer can assess whether action needs to be taken immediately, based on the threat and risk of harm posed to themselves and others around them, or whether it is more beneficial to wait and develop a

plan more appropriate to dealing with the situation. The third stage is to consider the powers and policies available to them, where there may not be a need for police involvement at all, but if there is, what method of disposal is best suited for the to use. For example whether an arrest may not be appropriate, but a community resolution may be better suited to the situation in question.

The fourth stage is to identify the options and contingencies open to the officer. The College of Policing (2013) says: "This stage involves considering the different ways to make a particular decision with the least risk of harm." This is especially important as plans are not always as effective as desired, or may not even work at all, therefore it is important to have a contingency plan. The fifth stage is to take action based on the findings from the previous steps, and then review what happened as is best practice with everything.

Decision making is a fine art where sometimes decisions made in a dynamic and rapidly changing situation may not stand up to criticism and scrutiny once this incident is over. Therefore, using the NDM helps contextualise decisions, and apply logic to the decision which helps the officer to verbalise their decision making in a way that will stand up to scrutiny. For example, if a complaint was received from the member of public over a decision that was made by an officer, then being able to explain their decision through the NDM would likely mitigate that complaint.

There have been times where there have been needs to make decisions and use discretion in the context of which those decisions were made. For example, on one night shift, my team were on a plain clothes burglary operation following a spate of burglaries that had gone on in the area. Whilst on mobile foot patrol, a male on a bicycle rode past me and my colleague, he appeared to be smoking something and there was a heavy smell of Cannabis coming from his direction. Whilst watching the male to see where he went, he conveniently stopped and went into a corner shop not far from where we were, upon the male's exit from the shop, I challenged the male and he admitted to me straight away that he had been smoking Cannabis. I carried out search on him under Section 23 Misuse of Drugs Act 1971, and found the remnants of a joint and other paraphernalia linked to the consumption of Cannabis.

There were several options available to me at this stage, varying in severity, since the male had Cannabis on his possession, he could have been arrested for possession of a controlled substance. Other options open to me were to give him a fine, a community resolution, a Cannabis warning, or for no further action to be taken and the cannabis confiscated from him.

Assessing my thought process through the NDM, I first gathered all the information I could about the male through asking him questions and running the male through PNC, I found that he had not been in trouble with the police for this type of incident before, and that his record with the police was relatively minor. Since the Code of Ethics influences each stage of the decision model, at this stage I ensured I followed the Code of Ethics by treating the male with respect and courtesy, likewise reciprocating the respect he was giving me, and despite the fact that he had broken the law, I did not treat the male any differently to any other member of the public that I would deal with.

At this stage I needed to ensure that I was not impacted by my own personal bias, which could influence my decisions. Bias is defined by the Cambridge Dictionary (2020) as “the action of supporting or opposing a particular person or thing in an unfair way, because of allowing personal opinions to influence your judgement”. Bias as a police officer can be damaging, not only for the individuals in question in a particular incident, but for the police force and society as a whole.

Evidence of this can be seen following the Brixton riots of 1981, where there was a disproportionate racial bias by police officers in London against young black men, and many, possibly illegal stop searches were carried out based on the racial prejudices of the police officers, which led to 2 days of rioting across the borough of Brixton. Subsequently the Scarman Report was published later that year investigating the actions that led up to the riots.

According to Neal (2003) the Scarman Report called the police “institutionally racist”, which is not only damaging to the reputation of the police force, but also the relationships that officers have with those within the community. The impact of this can be damaging and far reaching beyond the necessary day-to-day policing duties, but can impact sectors such as intelligence and neighbourhood policing through a lack of desire to cooperate with the police

due to the actions of a small number of officers. Furthermore it led to sweeping changes in legislation with the introduction of the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984, which changed the way the police operated and changed the guidance on how stop searches can be carried out.

Therefore, when undertaking operational policing, it is imperative that a concerted effort is made to ensure that there is no racial bias made by officers. Since the Scarman Report was published, the Code of Ethics has been updated and stipulates that officers must act with fairness and impartiality, and that they will not discriminate unlawfully or unfairly.

In this particular incident, bias did not have a significant impact on the decision making process, however there was a possibility that bias could have influenced the decision making if the situation presented itself differently. For example instead of dealing with a subject from a different ethnic background, an unconscious bias could have impacted the disposal chosen to deal with them. Had this been the case, it could have been considered a breach in the Code of Ethics, since the male would have not been treated with equality and fairness, it could also be considered a breach under conduct, since if the public were to find out, it would probably cause a public backlash.

The next stage of the NDM is to assess the threat and risk to develop a working strategy. The risk posed by the male was relatively minor, he had admitted he had Cannabis on him at the first opportunity, and the amount of Cannabis in his possession was minimal and was clearly for personal use. Whilst deciding how best to proceed with the male, he did not pose any further risk to myself or those around me as he was handcuffed.

Considering my options, there were risks in taking action against the male, since I was on an undercover burglary operation, pursuing action against him, would remove me from the operation and decrease the overall operational effectiveness of the objective that the team set out to achieve, it would not have been in the public interest to pursue custodial proceedings against the male for a minor amount of Cannabis. Therefore, it appeared that the best course of action was to go for a disposal that did not involve taking the male into custody.

Considering the powers and policies available to me, there were several options available, I could have given the male a fine for possession, however this seemed to be disproportionate to the quantity of Cannabis in his possession. A Cannabis warning, which stays on Police systems but does not show on a DBS check, could have been issued to the male, which seemed more proportionate, however the problem with issuing one of these was that the time taken to issue it on the side of the pavement, would take me away from other duties. The final possibility would have been not to have taken any action against the male, however this would have been against the Code of Ethics since I would have not fully exercised my duties and responsibilities, and I would have not acted with honesty and integrity in that situation.

Therefore, the best option I identified through the NDM was to issue a Cannabis warning, which required then male to admit his possession, and if this failed, my contingency would have been to arrest the male, and deal with him in custody. I took this course of action, and in review of my actions, I believe I took the right course of action that was justifiable and proportionate to the situation. In hindsight, it may have been justifiable to have issued a fine for the possession, however this would not have been proportionate, especially since the male admitted his possession at the first opportunity.

In terms of provisions made by the Criminal Procedure and Investigations Act 1996 (CPIA), there are several provisions which may have applied to this incident, for example S.6.1 CPIA 1996, where a voluntary disclosure is offered by the accused. This applied where the male disclosed he had Cannabis on him, and in the hypothetical situation where he was arrested and summonsed to court, he may also give a defence statement to the prosecutor.

When making decisions under the CPIA 1996, a test for the public interest must be met under S.14 CPIA 1996, where a court must decide whether it is in the public interest to proceed with the case. Applying S.14 in the incident in question, and my findings when applying the NDM to my decision making, it would probably be found that it was not in the public interest to proceed with the case, given that the amount he had in his possession was minimal, however, in reflection, if he had a larger amount in his possession, it could be argued that it would be in the public interest in that instance.

In terms of gathering and retaining information gathered from the individual which is governed under S.23 CPIA 1996, says that any information that is relevant to the investigation is retained and recorded. The only information gathered from the male during this incident was his name and date of birth to ascertain his PNC record, and then the details of the Cannabis warning issued. It could be argued that the CPIA 1996 is not applicable to this incident, however, there is a need for fairness and equality when conducting investigations in line with the Code of Ethics, I felt it was my responsibility to record and retain all information about the male, which not only was I duty bound to do so by the CPIA 1996, but also through the Code of Ethics, under several counts, including ensuring that the manner in which I act does not bring discredit to the police, and a reckless management of the information could be suggested to be in contravention of this code of practice.

Overall, in reflection on my application of the NDM in this situation was sufficient, however in reflection there are several areas where there could have been improvements, not just in the initial incident and the disposal, however also following on from the incident. For example, I could improve on my personal knowledge prior to the incident, as deciding on the disposal method was difficult as I was not sure on the method that was the best course of action. However, despite my hesitation, I think that the best disposal was chosen, as it was proportionate to the offence committed.

I also feel that more could have been done following the incident, for example, an intelligence submission could have been made, in order to make other officers in the local area aware that the male had been stopped and to keep an eye out for him to see if he offends again. I could have also revisited the area myself in the following days to see if the same male was in the area, however this may have not have been in the public interest to pursue another stop search on an individual with possession of a small amount of Cannabis. In future incidents I feel that I would have improved the general stop search procedure, my knowledge of disposals in relation to the Misuse of Drugs Act 1971, through this essay, I feel I have been made more aware of the potential for bias to impact decision making even when using the NDM, and have made a concerted effort not to let bias to impact my decision making.

Word count: 2,298

Task 5

Personal Development Plan / Individual Learning Plan

The second learning outcome identified in the accompanying module descriptor (BMPP 6000D) asks that you formulate and implement a personal study programme to further enhance the development of your professional police practice. A template has been added for a personal development plan that you can use for this task.

500 words equivalent. Please note that this is not the actual number of words used in completing the table, the count reflects the thought and research behind it.

It will count towards the overall equivalent word count of 10,000 words equivalent total for this module.

ANSWER:

As part of your reflective process, please use this table to aid you in identifying the next steps for development. (To be completed at the end of workbook completion)

Area of Development	How it will be achieved	Who can provide support	Timeline
Stress Management	I will look to achieve this through developing my stress coping skills through following the scientific advice and research available. I will also on personal level, I will try not to take things personally, as I find that when undertaking projects, I feel that it personally reflects me, and I should learn not to take it to heart.	Advice for this can be found online, from NHS online, and forums online for swapping methods for coping. Help can also be found through the university, and my employer who have their own schemes for helping officers cope with the stresses of the job. I could also confide in a select group of family members who will be able to help me cope.	I will look to start this as soon as possible and this is a perpetual target with no end date, but I will hope to see a noticeable difference in myself in the next 6 months, it will be considered complete when I am happy that I can cope with stresses in my own way that I believe work for me.
	There are several ways in which I will look to achieve this, through reading legislation on Gov.uk, and	Help for this can be found through reading legislation available online on Gov.uk, but also through the	I will look to start this as soon as reasonably practicable, however, due to pressures for

Knowledge of the Misuse of Drugs Act 1971	reading the Blackstone's manual for policing students which has advice for student police officers. I can also seek advice from my peers, colleagues and my superiors, who can help me learn through their own knowledge and experience.	university's online library. I can also use the online resources available through my workplace, where there are online continuous professional development packages available for me to partake in. I can also seek advice from my colleagues and superiors who will be able to advise me on situations through their own experiences.	completing my workload, I am likely to start this in the coming months, and hope to develop my knowledge over the period of approximately 3-4 months.
Develop my knowledge and understanding of the Code of Ethics and how it can be applied to day-to-day policing.	I will look to consider the code of ethics during every incident, and applying it in a holistic sense before I take any form of action, even if this means writing it out on an NDM where the code of ethics applies. This will help my understanding, and develop a better application of my knowledge to incidents	I can develop this through reading the College of Policing website, as well as reading the force intranet for articles that show good application of the Code of Ethics. I will also look to apply it through each incident by writing down an NDM after dealing with each incident and writing in where the code of ethics would apply, or where it should be considered.	I will look to starting this as soon as possible, and apply it to each incident where I have time. I will continue doing this until I am confident that I am familiar with the Code of Ethics and can apply it to a situation without having to consciously think about it.

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.

Borton, T. (1970,) Reach, Touch and Teach. London: Hutchinson. Cited in Jasper, M. (2003) Beginning Reflective Practice. Cheltenham, UK: Nelson Thornes

Cambridge Dictionary, (2020), Bias, date accessed: 21.06.2020,
<https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/bias>

College of Policing, (2012), Supporting Forces in Responding to Vulnerability, date accessed: 19.06.2020, <https://www.college.police.uk/News/Blogs/Pages/Vulnerability.aspx>

College of Policing, (2013), National Decision Model, date accessed: 20.06.2020,
<https://www.app.college.police.uk/app-content/national-decision-model/the-national-decision-model/>

College of Policing, (2014), Code of Ethics, date accessed: 19.06.2020,
https://www.college.police.uk/What-we-do/Ethics/Documents/Code_of_Ethics.pdf

College of Policing, (2014), National Decision Model, Authorised Professional Practice, date accessed: 01.06.2020, <https://www.app.college.police.uk/app-content/national-decision-model/the-national-decision-model/>

Criminal Procedure and Investigations Act 1996

English, F, (1976), Differentiating Victims In The Drama Triangle, Transactional Analysis Bulletin, vol.6, issue 4, p.384-386. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F036215377600600406>

Equality Act 2010

Gibbs, G (1988), Learning by Doing: A guide to teaching and learning methods. Further Education Unit. Oxford Polytechnic: Oxford.

Human Rights Act 1998

MindTools (2020), Betari Box, Linking Attitude and Behaviour, date accessed: 11.06.2020, https://www.mindtools.com/pages/article/newCS_82.htm

Ministry of Justice (2011), Achieving Best Evidence in Criminal Proceedings – Guidance on Interviewing Victims and Witnesses, and Guidance on Using Special Measures. https://www.cps.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/legal_guidance/best_evidence_in_criminal_proceedings.pdf

Neal, S. (2003), The Scarman Report, the Macpherson Report and the Media: How Newspapers Respond to Race-Centred Social Policy Interventions. Journal of Social Policy, vol.32 (1), pp.55-74, <http://oro.open.ac.uk/4545/1/download.pdf>

NHS (2019), 5 Steps to Mental Wellbeing, date accessed: 02.04.2020 <https://www.nhs.uk/conditions/stress-anxiety-depression/improve-mental-wellbeing/>

Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984

Scott, M. & Kirby, S. (2012), Implementing POP, Leading, Structuring, and Managing a Problem-Oriented Police Agency, The U.S Department of Justice, ISBN: 978-1-932582-61-1. https://popcenter.asu.edu/sites/default/files/implementing_pop.pdf

Section 117 Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984

Section 3 Criminal Law Act 1967

Section 23 Misuse of Drugs Act 1971

Section 76 Criminal Justice and Immigration Act 2008

Section 39 Criminal Justices Act 1988

Task 6

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

By signing the section below you are acknowledging your continuing progress on O.C.P. This is recognised by the university as work that is fully supporting this module BMPP 6000D; Professional Police Practice 3 and in signing it will be equivalent to 500 words towards the 10,000 words equivalent total for this module.

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

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

Signed: M JOHSON _____ (Learner – electronic signature accepted.)

Date: 21.06.2020