



The Sheku Bayoh Public Inquiry

Witness Statement

Stuart Ord

**Taken by [REDACTED]
on MS Teams
On 5 September 2023**

Witness details

1. My name is Stuart Ord. My year of birth is 1967. My contact details are known to the Inquiry.
2. I'm currently employed as a support staff driving instructor with Police Scotland. My main duties are the provision of standard response driving to officers who are about two years' police service. It's a full-time role I'm doing just now.

Career Summary

3. I joined the then-Grampian Police on 16 August 1985 as a probationary constable, and I fulfilled operational policing duties for the first four/five years

Signature of witness..... [REDACTED]

of my service. I was then seconded to the then-Traffic Department of Grampian Police in Elgin, Banff and Aberdeen and fulfilled around six years of traffic patrol duties. I was then promoted to an operational sergeant role within the City of Aberdeen, and I fulfilled operational policing duties there.

4. In 2002, I was seconded to what was the then-Scottish Police College, to deliver road policing training, which primarily involved advanced driving and road patrol officer training. I remained in post there, also securing a promotion to inspector while at the college, delivering, overseeing and creating road policing training for the then-eight forces. I returned to Aberdeen, April 2007 as an inspector, performing operational duties. In 2010, I was promoted temporarily to chief inspector to lead a national project in relation to a road policing matter.

5. In 2011, I returned back to operational inspector uniform duties. In March 2013, I was promoted to chief inspector and seconded at that time to the Scottish Police College as head of probationer training. I remained in post as head of probationer training but, that post and the responsibilities within it changed markedly after the inception of Police Scotland through to my ultimate departure from the training environment in November 2014, when I was posted back to Aberdeen, as chief inspector within Resource Planning and Coordination. This was a national role of resource planning and deployment of officers. I worked as part that team for the remainder of my service, until retirement on 16 August 2015. I was chief inspector at the time of my retirement and retired with 30 years' police service.

6. After retiring from the police, I worked for a firm of solicitors in a property management role, from 2015 until November 2020, when I left that employment and returned to driver training as a support staff member within Police Scotland.

Signature of witness..... 

Qualifications

7. I completed a diploma in higher education (DipHE) in training and development at my first secondment to the Scottish Police College, from 2002 to 2007. I then went on to use the credit rating points to secure a BA in business operations management. I paid for that myself separate to the police.

Probationer Training Department Scottish Police College pre-May 2015

8. As outlined previously, I worked as a sergeant and as an Inspector within the Scottish Police College from 2002 to 2007. I returned to the College in March 2013, as Chief Inspector and in the role of head of probationer training. I was in this role for 18 months and moved on to a post outwith the college on 3 November 2014. I worked closely with Sergeant (now Inspector) James Young during that period until his transfer to Jackton in September 2014.

9. I have been asked to outline the hierarchy below me within the probationer training department at that time. There were two inspectors, four sergeants, and a team of approximately 22, made up of a mix of constables and support staff that delivered training. We didn't have a designated head of Officer Safety Training (OST) at that time. However, because Sergeant James Young was an officer safety trainer, he had line management for the physical education instructors (the PEIs) who were also officer safety trainers. They facilitated the training of OST to all new recruits on their initial 12-week probationer training course at the college. One of the inspectors below me had direct line management for Sergeant James Young. I relied on Sergeant James Young as my subject matter expert in terms of all matters of officer safety training.

10. I have been asked who my line manager was. On appointment to post, my immediate line manager was a Superintendent Thom Mcloughlin, who was based solely at the police college. With changes to the wider training

Signature of witness..... 

establishment following the creation of Police Scotland, [REDACTED] was appointed as interim lead for local training delivery, around November 2013. At this point, [REDACTED] became my line manager, and on his promotion to Superintendent, around January/February 2014, Alan Gibson became my immediate line manager. I should explain that Superintendent Gibson joined the training environment as a chief inspector and effectively acted as a support to [REDACTED]. My understanding of his role as a chief inspector was assisting [REDACTED] in the work involved in reviewing and amending the existing wider training establishment from the arrangements under the previous eight legacy forces, in order to ultimately meet the needs of the new single service. This work continued to develop throughout my time in the training post, as well as beyond I would imagine. On reflection now, Alan Gibson was ultimately promoted to Superintendent with responsibility for training, rather than merely operational training. This meant he had responsibility for operational training, detective and road policing training, as well as training at more local levels within the organisation. Anything which did not fall within specialist training, such as firearms, public order, custody etc.

Remit as Head of Probationer Training

- 11. At the commencement of my post at the college, my role was primarily focused on the 12-week initial training course for new recruits for the eight previous forces, and then subsequent further training touch points of their Probationer Training Programme (PTP). So that was my sole focus and responsibility in terms of recruit training. The terms probationer constables and recruits are effectively the same term, so if I use either term, I am referring to individuals joining Police Scotland and serving as probationary constables.

- 12. I have been asked if my role included responsibility for first aid training and officer safety training. Yes, it did; however, I did not receive this responsibility

Signature of witness..... [REDACTED]

until late 2013/early 2014. The OST and first aid training programmes utilised at that time were those that had been used by the previous legacy eight forces. In terms of OST recertification training oversight prior to my inheriting responsibility, this would have been covered by the existing arrangements in place within the previous legacy forces – so various officers across Scotland would have been involved in this. On inheriting the responsibility for OST and first aid, my main primary focus was in ensuring that sufficient training slots were available to meet the demands of OST recertification, which included Scottish Police Emergency Life Saving (SPELS) training, across the organisation. To this end, the previous force legacy arrangements were continued in that local trainers were involved in order to meet the training demand for OST recertification courses. This was effectively the OST and first aid training model up to the time when the wider review of OST under the supervision of Inspector James Young took place.

13. I was responsible for training delivery to probationer constables that had joined the previous eight forces prior to 1 April 2013, the inception date for Police Scotland, and, from August 2013 onwards, also those individuals that joined as a recruit to Police Scotland, so had not hitherto joined one of the previous eight forces.

14. There were slight differences to their training regimes because recruits that joined the previous eight forces would visit the police college twice: once following an induction element to their previous parent force, then they would come to the police college for 12 weeks. They would return to their force for some further force training. They would then return to the police college for a further training element, which incorporated some assessments.

15. This training programme was modularised. Module one was effectively induction at the relevant legacy force and the initial 12 week training course at college. Module two was delivered at the relevant legacy force, previous to

Signature of witness..... 

the single service. Module three was the operational deployment. Then, at about a year service, the officers would return to the college for module four, which included a summative assessment debriefing with them on a portfolio of evidence that they had been gathering with their line manager at their respective station, which detailed the operational deployments they'd been involved in. This was called the Operational Module Assessed Debrief (OMAD).

16. Module four, also included an oral exam, where they were interviewed on a question-and-answer basis in relation to their knowledge and understanding of police procedures, as well as legislation, and that was also a summative assessment that they needed to pass. Thereafter, and this is the batch of officers that I'm describing that joined the previous eight forces, they would return to their respective station and continue their probationary period until being signed off under the governance of their line management structure, wherever they may be. At the culmination of two years, they would be confirmed as a constable provided they had fulfilled all the requirements of their training programme and had been discharging their duties effectively as a constable.

17. The difference with recruits that joined Police Scotland post 1 April 2013, was that they were inducted at the police college. Their very first day of police service was at Tulliallan, because we were the one organisation at that time. There was no previous induction element at the various respective eight forces across the country. So once they'd been inducted at the college, they were then straight on to their 12-week initial training course. On conclusion of that module one, they would attend their module two training, where local trainers at the territorial division that they would be serving in Police Scotland would provide them with a degree of module two training – in the same way as officers whom had joined the previous eight forces.

Signature of witness..... 

18. They would then go for their module three operational deployment, but the module four was delivered at a training centre local to their territorial division – which differed from those officers whom had joined the previous eight forces. Once they had completed module four, they would return to their respective station to conclude their two-year probationary period until confirmation as a constable, in the same way as the officers whom had joined the previous eight forces. So, for example, an officer who had joined ‘A’ Division, post April 2013, and may have been stationed in Aberdeen City, instead of them coming back to the police college at Tulliallan in Fife for their module four training element, they would go to Nelson Street in Aberdeen, which was the recognised training environment for officers of the former Grampian Police. This meant that some work had to be done by my team to upskill or cascade train the trainers that were stationed within the training establishment at Nelson Street, so they could deliver the module four element, containing the oral exam and OMAD, which hitherto had only been done by the trainers based at the Scottish Police College.

19. The requirement to ensure that the trainers at the local training establishments across the country could deliver the module four element (oral exam and OMAD) was in order to ensure that the credit rating of the Probationer Training Programme could be met through verification and quality assurance; so that there was confidence that the officers who had gone through the Probationer Training Programme had achieved all the assessable elements they were provided. In order for the officers to gain a certificate in policing, which sat at Level 7 of the Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework, there was the requirement to ensure that the quality assurance of the training was properly recorded and audited. Hence, the reason we had to provide cascade training to the trainers at the local areas that would be providing module four (oral exam and OMAD) for probationer constables.

Signature of witness..... 

20. I also had responsibility for special constable recruits. Prior to the inception of Police Scotland, there was a chief inspector leading up a work stream through all the work streams that were moving towards the creation of Police Scotland. There were various work streams in place prior to Police Scotland, effectively trying to get the organisation ready for the first day of Police Scotland. As the previous eight forces had differing training regimes for their special constables, there was a work stream in terms of special constable training to align it to the elements of the Probationer Training Programme, to ensure that if an individual joined Police Scotland as a special constable, they would be provided with training similar to that of a regular police constable from day one.

21. It wouldn't be on a full-time basis because it recognised that these individuals had other employment. So, it would be on a part-time basis but, it met the same requirements of the modularised elements of the Probationer Training Programme, so that if that individual then chose or selected to join as a regular constable, they wouldn't have to undertake an entirety of training again. So there was a drive towards providing that training materials and support for special constables.

22. After Police Scotland commenced, the chief inspector who was leading up on that training was returned to an operational role, so the responsibility for the creation of those training materials effectively fell to me as head of probationer training. I had a full-time constable working on that with the support of a sergeant, and myself providing oversight and some direction and governance. So the special constable training was also an element of training that I was responsible for when I commenced, beginning March 2013, right through to the time when I left the training environment in November 2014.

23. I have been asked whether any of the training undertaken locally to the probationers outwith the police college, both before the creation of Police Scotland and afterwards, would have included any training of an OST or first

Signature of witness..... 

aid type nature. To my understanding, there was no initial OST or first aid training delivered to new probationer officers locally prior to Police Scotland, and all probationers post the creation of Police Scotland definitely received their initial OST and first aid training at the police college.

- 24. The initial training course contained OST and first aid training in the form of the SPELS and OST initial training programmes. That would be their OST and first aid training during their commencement of their probationary period. Subsequent to that and, approximately a year later, they would undertake a one day recertification training in OST and SPELS, because there was a requirement to re-certify in officer safety training, which also included an online Moodle (an online electronic learning platform) refresher of SPELS.
- 25. SPELS would be conducted at the recertification training, or the officer would be required to complete the SPELS Moodle platform before attending the one-day officer safety training recertification. That then continued on an annual basis, certainly in Grampian Police days. I know that the other forces did something similar. I think one other – maybe Tayside – recertified on a biennial basis but, I know Strathclyde, one of the larger forces that did have a full-time cadre of officer safety trainers, they recertified on an annual basis. But the initial OST and first aid training that was provided to probationary officers was always done at the Police College to my understanding rather than at the previous eight forces.
- 26. With the very first batch of police recruits that joined Police Scotland as a single service on 5 August 2013 (date of first ever intake of Police Scotland recruits), then, yes, every one of them was provided with initial OST and first aid training at the Scottish Police College at Tulliallan, provided by or under the guidance of Sergeant Young and the physical education instructors, David Agnew, Philip Briggs and [REDACTED], as they were in post at that time. There were also some other constables within the training establishment

Signature of witness..... [REDACTED]

based at the Probationer Training Department at the police college who were also officer safety trainers, and they assisted in the training of the student officers, the probationary officers at Tulliallan.

Pre-Police Scotland work streams

27. I have been shown a Design Specification for Probationer Training Programme. It is version 8 and dated April 2014 (PS12350). At pages 5 and 6, it states:

“In September 2011, the Scottish Government set out its plans for the formation of a single Scottish Police Force – the Police Service of Scotland - and the subsequent reform of Scottish Policing included a review of Probationer Training. As part of the reform process, a working group was established within the Probationer Training Department of The Scottish Police College in September 2012, tasked with reviewing the two-year Probationer Training Programme. The group were given an open remit to provide recommendations to standardise and improve the quality and efficiency of the two-year programme.

Following consultation with the existing eight forces and PTOUG¹, and considering probationer feedback from previous course evaluations, PTD Instructor feedback and existing policing priorities, the working group recommended a new design for the Probationer Training Programme that included a single course delivered at the Scottish Police College. The proposed recommendations incorporate the Induction phase (previously Module 1 carried out at the legacy forces), the relevant components previously included in Module 2 and Module

¹ Footnote appears in original document “PTOUG refers to the ‘Probationer Training Operational Users Group’ which consisted of representatives from each of the legacy forces respective Training Departments. This was disbanded in April 2013 with the formation of the Police Service of Scotland. In April 2014, The ‘National Training Practitioners Group’ was formed to undertake an equivalent role.”

Signature of witness..... 

4, and are adaptable enough to meet future policing demands and priorities.

In February 2013, the recommendations were presented in a Briefing Paper to the Police Scotland Senior Leadership Board, which subsequently carried the proposal and committed to the introduction of the revised Probationer Training Programme.”

28. I have been asked whether I was aware if the Probationer Training Programme officially had a work stream prior to the commencement of Police Scotland. I am aware of the Design Specification for the Probationer Training Programme (PTP). Design specification documents were widely used throughout the various training departments at the police college, as they were a source document for quality assurance and verification purposes. The working group referred to within the design specification was part of reform work streams towards the single police service. To my understanding, as I was not involved in training at that time, this consisted of staff based within the Probationer Training Department at the college. The existing PTP, which had served the previous eight forces, and which was fully credit rated, has been explained earlier in my statement in paragraphs 14 to 16 and the findings of the working group retained the PTP, but recommended amendments be made. The working group’s main recommendations to the Police Scotland Senior Leadership Board, were to establish an induction element to be conducted at the Scottish Police College for new recruits joining Police Scotland, as well as have module four of the existing PTP completed at a training venue locally, as opposed to having the probationary officers return to the police college for this training.

29. I am aware of the mandate by the Police Scotland Senior Leadership Board, in February 2013, to carry the proposals for the revised PTP, as this effectively became my responsibility when I took up post in March 2013. The

Signature of witness..... 

delivery of this senior leadership board mandate became my primary focus during summer 2013, as the amendments to the existing PTP required to be in place prior to the first recruits coming into the new organisation. Although the mandate had been provided in February 2013, no real work had been done to instigate an induction element at the police college prior to my taking up post, so this work fell entirely under my responsibility. I created and led a short-term working group to deliver the amendments to the PTP, with a huge amount of work being required to complete full induction processes at the police college, and was able to successfully conclude this work prior to the first Police Scotland recruits joining on 5 August 2013.

National Officer Safety Training Review and Evaluation Report

30. I have been shown Sergeant Young's National Officer Safety Training and Review and Evaluation Report dated April 2015 (PS11533). I was aware that Sergeant Young was undertaking this review. However, his report was produced after I had left the college. At page 5, the report states *"Although a national standardised core programme was developed and delivered to student Police Officers at PSC - Tulliallan, this core programme was not always replicated at the annual refreshers, with some Legacy Forces maintaining their own programmes and techniques. This has led to a disparity of approach to training and supporting processes. There has been no national review since the programme was introduced and since the inception of Police Scotland."* I have been asked whether, during my time in post at the College, I was aware of the disparity between what was trained at annual refresher and what was trained to probationers for OST.


31. From anecdotal evidence gained from Sergeant Young and the PEIs, they effectively made me aware that they believed there was disparity at the local training centres. I didn't have responsibility for officer safety training nationally in my role as head of probationer training when I commenced working in the

Signature of witness..... 

college in March 2013 and that did not fall to my post until late 2013, early 2014. I cannot clearly recall the exact date.

32. During late 2013/early 2014, my role as head of probationer training changed through to more of a national training role, entitled chief inspector of operational training, as it ultimately became. This was part of a tranche of work that considered the wider establishment of training across Police Scotland at that time, and this work was driven by my superiors in relation to confirming a future establishment for training across Police Scotland to deliver operational training. So, as my role morphed into chief inspector operational training, I was advised that officer safety training and first aid were deemed to be operational matters of training, so they came into my core area of responsibility. As stated, as far as I can remember, that was late 2013/early 2014.

33. The anecdotal evidence I gained from conversations with Sergeant Young and the PEIs did allude to the fact that they believed that there was certainly confidence in the level of officer safety training provided to probationary officers during their time in the police college. But Sergeant Young and the PEIs could not say with the same level of confidence that OST recertification training was delivered to the same standard. That if an officer was attending their recertification training – having concluded their officer safety training and their probationer training course at college – that they get the same level of techniques and level of detail of training if they then went to, say, Stornoway or Dumfries or Jackton. We couldn't say with a degree of confidence that the techniques were trained to that same level. The situation at that time was that the trainers providing the officer safety recertification training at the forces training centres, and other places, were primarily involved in delivering OST training on a part-time basis, as they had other core roles, but they had been trained in officer safety practices previously. So they weren't really full-time trainers, however, we did not have a sufficient cadre of full-time officer safety

Signature of witness..... 

trainers across the organisation that could deliver the officer safety training recertification to the officers that required it. We had to rely on territorial divisions providing their officers on an as-and-when basis to provide the officer safety training recertification.

34. What I recognised through conversations with Sergeant Young was that there wasn't a single source document that could be relied on in relation to ensuring that a standardised approach to OST training delivery was in place across the organisation. When Sergeant Young shared that with me, I was aware of the Officer Safety Training Practitioners' Group that was in place prior to Police Scotland. In the absence of any other wider governance of officer safety training matters in Police Scotland, I saw that as a suitable medium at that time to try and encourage and drive through the standardisation that was desired.

Officer Safety Training Practitioners' Group.

35. The Officer Safety Training Practitioners' Group had existed prior to the inception of Police Scotland and consisted of OST trainers considered to be subject matter experts from the previous eight forces and had previously been chaired by one of the inspectors in probationer training. However, when I was advised that I was taking responsibility for officer safety training matters within my area of responsibility also, I chaired one or two of those meetings and introduced an action and decision log because I considered that there wasn't a great deal of accountability or transparency to that meeting prior to that point. I wanted to have greater confirmation of what was agreed and discussed. My first priority was to have everyone agree to a single source document because, again, through anecdotal discussions with Sergeant Young, I believed there were trainers across the organisation that were using old source material – some trainer notes that not everybody had cognisance of.

Signature of witness..... 

36. Through the Officer Safety Training Practitioners' Group, I sought to ensure that one standard manual was confirmed as the source document. My recollection of the time was that during the latter stages of 2013, we agreed that the 2013 student training manual that was used to deliver the officer safety training programme to probationer constables at the police college would be used as that source material. It would have to be underpinned and supported by trainer notes and lesson plans, but I saw the confirmation that there was one single source document as a commencement of the starting point for work towards wider standardisation of officer safety training across the organisation.

37. I have been asked when I became the chair of the Officer Safety Training Practitioners' Group. I have been trying to remember this and, regrettably, I can't, however, it would certainly have been late 2013/early 2014 following my inheriting responsibility for OST training delivery. I kept daybooks during my time at the college but on retirement from the service there was no means to record or store these securely and they were destroyed following my retirement. Had I had my daybooks, I'd be fairly confident I would have been able to give precise dates. They were effectively a hardback A4 notebook that I kept for my own purposes and noted down various meetings and things like that. However, there may well be minutes, or certainly the action and decision log of the Officer Safety Training Practitioners' Group, because I was very, very keen that the inputs/outputs of that meeting were recorded. These documents may still exist and could reflect the exact time when I became chair. In relation to the recording of minutes and the actions/decisions of the group, the support functions at probationer training had two staff members who provided administrative support within probationer training, so capturing minutes and booking classrooms and other administration functions. I ensured that I had one of these staff members present to minute or at least accurately record an action and decision in relation to the activity of that group because I was minded that there were probably minutes in the past, but I

Signature of witness..... 

didn't have a great deal of confidence that there were any actions coming out of them.

38. What I wanted to see in place was a record of the date of the meeting, who was present and what was discussed by way of an action from the chair. Because there would be various discussions about a particular topic, and then the chair would detail an action to an individual to go and carry out a piece of work and bring it back to the next meeting, and then once it was collectively agreed, it would be accurately recorded as a decision of that group. My recollection from the time was that at one of those meetings we secured agreement that the 2013 probationer manual (PS10938) would be the single source document and, I would have ensured that that was recorded as a decision, so that moving forward from that point we would know that as of that time and date this was the source document to be used. I saw this as the start of the process towards wider standardisation.

39. In terms of when I started chairing the meetings, although I did not receive the responsibility for OST training provision nationally until late 2013/early 2014, I chaired some of the meetings prior to then. I wanted to ensure that there was agreement on that single source document to support what I was hearing from Sergeant Young in terms of that wider disparity of trainers in different places using different techniques. Prior to me receiving responsibility for officer safety training, it was more of a collaborative approach I had to adopt. Even after that, it was still a collaborative approach because I was acutely aware that the individuals who were providing training nationally did not fall within my line management. We had to collaboratively work with the territorial divisions in order to secure training venues and trainers to provide the recertification process because there was no national OST unit at that time. The larger forces prior to Police Scotland, Strathclyde Police for example, had a full-time unit and there were some full-time staff members in my own parent force, Grampian, but the position of the other forces are as detailed within Sergeant

Signature of witness..... 

Young's review report. There was a different picture of training provision across the country provided by the previous eight forces.

40. There was always a desire from me to look towards a standardisation of officer safety training across the country, but I didn't have the responsibility for officer safety training provision nationally at that point in my post at the college. As previously stated, I recall securing the agreement of the Officer Safety Training Practitioners' Group to use the 2013 probationer manual (PS10938) as the single source document and I chaired at least two or three of the Officer Safety Training Practitioners' Groups, prior to me ultimately receiving responsibility for the national provision of OST training.

41. I have been asked how frequently the Officer Safety Training Practitioners' Group met. It was probably quarterly, but there was also the opportunity to bring forward meetings, but my recollection would be a quarterly meeting. Minutes – and following my involvement actions and decisions – were recorded and these would be shared with the participants of the group for ultimate onward cascading to trainers within their locality. So, for example, in the former Grampian Police, we had a full-time support staff member who was officer safety and fitness coordinator for the force. They attended the meetings. They would receive the minutes once they had been compiled and it was incumbent on them to ascertain if anything required to be cascaded out to the trainers within their area that they were relying on to provide the training. The same happened elsewhere. But, through the conversations with Sergeant Young, I was also aware that the minutes tended to get bogged down into a level of minutiae, a detail about how to do a particular open-hand technique or something. I wanted to ensure that I moved away from verbatim minutes because sometimes the meetings would go on for a good few hours, I was led to believe.

Signature of witness..... 

42. The anecdotal evidence I was receiving from Sergeant Young and the PEIs was that sometimes it would end up in a discussion between certain individuals from across training centres about, "Well, we do it this way and this is why we do it." I wanted to start moving away from that to a more collaborative and an inclusive discussion about, "Well, what is the actual requirements of the single service for Scotland?" Not what was previously done by Strathclyde or Grampian or Dumfries and Galloway. We needed the training standardised to be fit for Police Scotland, so I had to get attendees to start thinking as Police Scotland officers now, not previous force officers. We needed to start thinking and moving forward as a collective unit, and hence the reason I started an action and decision log. Individuals attending the meeting would be actioned with a particular piece of work, and would be asked to report back to the next meeting. If it was then agreed collectively and we felt that that particular aspect of the tasking would go into the programme or otherwise, or whether it needed to be wider circulated to the individuals providing the training, we would agree on that, and the attendees were expected to go back to their local areas and cascade that particular decision. So, it formed more an action and decision log output – inputs and outputs – rather than a long minute, as I felt the staff member capturing the minutes would often lose the thread of the discussion because it got into minutiae detail.

43. I have been asked when I stopped being the chair of the Officer Safety Training Practitioners' Group. It would have probably been at the time when I moved out of the training environment and was posted back up to my role in the resource planning and coordination in Aberdeen in November 2014. There were occasions, however, when, through other commitments, I couldn't actively chair the particular meeting. So, occasionally the other inspector would deputise or, in fact, I'm fairly sure I started empowering Sergeant Young to do so because he had the level of detail in terms of subject matter

Signature of witness..... 

and expertise to cut through a lot of the discussion that would often happen at these meetings.

44. I have seen Inspector James Young's supplementary statement (SBPI-00362). I have been referred to paragraph 7 which states *"The Chief Inspector of Tulliallan initially chaired the OST practitioners group and had responsibility for the annual refresher training. However, this was later devolved to an Inspector who had no experience of OST. Through this OST practitioner group it became apparent what was in the refresher programme was contradictory to the probationer OST training programme. There was also a disparity in terms of actually what was trained, as well, between the former legacy forces. The refresher training programme lacked quality assurance, lesson plans and risk assessments (all of which were present in the probationer OST programme). There was also lack of governance and quality assurance within the OST refresher training. When I say a lack of governance, I mean a lack of management by senior staff. I have been asked whether there was a head of training at this time who had overall responsibility for OST. At the time I became involved with OST, I believe the Head of Training was [REDACTED]"*

45. I don't recall who became chair of the the OST practitioners group when I left the college. However, in terms of his point in relation to the new chair didn't have any experience of officer safety matters, neither did I. I wasn't an OST trainer or a first aid trainer. So I had to rely on the input from Sergeant Young and other subject matter experts around me, and that was maybe just the geographical nature and the formation of the team at the police college at that time. Not everybody was an expert in everything. So, I didn't really have a wider knowledge of officer safety training myself from a training perspective, other than being the recipient of the training as a police officer.

Signature of witness..... [REDACTED]

46. I have been asked to describe the management structure in relation to OST recertification training, and whether I agree with Inspector Young's comments that there was a lack of governance and quality assurance within OST recertification training. In relation to the management structure for recertification training, from late 2013/early 2014, ultimate responsibility for this would lie with the local training delivery lead, [REDACTED], was supported by the superintendent, Superintendent Alan Gibson, and also myself as operational training chief inspector.

47. I was assisted by training inspectors, based at the police college (initially two inspectors, but this later dropped to one) and two inspectors aligned to the territorial divisions' outwith the police college. Governance of the OST recertification training at that time was carried out by myself and the two inspectors' outwith the police college and primarily focused on ensuring that sufficient trainers and venues were in place to meet the training demands of the force – i.e. recertifying the officers whom were due their annual recertification so they remained operationally deployable. The officer safety training programme was the one already utilised by the previous eight forces and was in place at the inception of Police Scotland. There was no work stream to reform OST training prior to Police Scotland so this was the model we required to use on day one and beyond. As I alluded to previously, this was a collaboration with the territorial divisions and departments outwith the training establishment, and we relied on their part-time trainers for the delivery of the recertification training. I would tend to agree with Inspector Young's comments and his observations regarding a lack of quality assurance of OST recertification training outwith the police college, however, as I allude to above, there was a requirement to ensure existing training demand was met using localised trainers. Although I was aware of the feelings of Sergeant Young and the PEIs in regard recertification training, I considered that the work of the Officer Safety Training Practitioners' Group was a move forward in

Signature of witness..... [REDACTED]

trying to secure wider standardisation of techniques across the country until such times as a wider review of OST could take place.

48. I have been referred to page 5 of the National Officer Safety Training and Review and Evaluation Report (PS11533) at the final paragraph of that page *“During the transition to Police Scotland most areas of business had a reform work stream including Public Order and Firearms Training. OST did not have its own reform work stream to review and standardise the programme. It became apparent that many areas of OST required to be reviewed to mitigate risk to personnel and the organisation, to introduce an effective and standardised training programme and to maintain the organisations focus of ‘keeping people safe’”*. I have been asked why OST training didn’t have its own work stream prior to the creation of Police Scotland. I don’t know. It’s my understanding that those kind of decisions would have been made at Executive Level. What I mean by that is at an ACPOS (Association of Chief Police Officers’ Scotland) level, so chief police officer. This is just my understanding, but I would believe that the various work streams that were in place prior to the inception of Police Scotland would have been discussed and agreed at the chief constable executive level of the previous eight forces, and probably driven by the appointment of the first Chief Constable for Police Scotland, Sir Stephen House. I would imagine that under his governance a lot of these work streams would have commenced, but it would have been at strategic level in terms of who decided on what work stream was required and what the terms of remit would be to prepare for the single service.

49. But I think as well, in reality, with the timeline that was provided for the creation of the single service, there may have been a prioritisation for certain elements of work streams to ensure that the organisation was fit for purpose for day one. So probably front-line, public-facing, and operational delivery of a policing service may have been prioritised over some other elements of, say, training provision. I mean, I can’t clearly talk for what decisions were

Signature of witness..... 

made, but that would be my thought process: a degree of prioritisation of certain elements of the work required to ensure that on 1 April 2013, the communities of Scotland had a functioning police service to continue to discharge a policing service for them.

Processes for review of the OST programme pre-May 2015

50. I have been asked what processes there were for review of the OST programme pre May 2015. During my time in post, reviews of training would generally be driven by the Learning Support Division based at the police college, Tulliallan in collaboration with subject matter experts in the training subjects. Prior to my posting as head of probationer training, the Probationer Training Programme (PTP) had been devised by subject matter experts in the delivery of the training, and had also been mandated for revision by the Police Scotland Senior Leadership Board in February 2013. The PTP had been credit rated by the then Scottish Police College, which was a credit rating body under the auspices of the Scottish Qualifications Authority. This signed off that the training delivery met quality assurance processes, and the training programme was externally verified and moderated by members of staff, that had awareness of the subject matter material. So they could come in and dip sample and confirm that the training records correctly reflected that officers had been provided with this level of training.

51. That was from a quality assurance perspective to confirm that the training programme as designed, and documented within the design specification for the Probationer Training Programme was being delivered. So that the police college could comfortably evidence to the University of Stirling, which provided the certificate in policing to those individuals that completed the Probationer Training Programme at that time, that the training that was contained within the programme had been delivered. In terms of verification of the Probationer Training Programme, I was trying to remember whether we had verification visits from members of the Learning Support Division during

Signature of witness..... 

my time at the police college from March 2013 through to November 2014. I think we did but, I must admit, I can't recall to what level of detail that entailed.

52. In terms of the wider review of the Probationer Training Programme, I did have curriculum officers in place, and their job was to continually review, through an environmental scanning PESTELO (Political, Economic, Social, Technological, Environmental, Legal, and Organisational) model approach the training subject matter material, not the subject itself, as to whether the content required amending or updating. The curriculum maintenance job was to ensure that the training delivered was reflective of the needs of the organisation, as well as the communities we serve and, as best as possible, to ensure it was current and up to date. So we had an ongoing review process, and that was tasked to one of the inspectors and the curriculum maintenance officers. There was a constable and a support staff member who were involved in confirming that the subject matter material was accurate and up to date, so that we weren't teaching officers historic subject material. So, from that perspective, although the wider programme was not subject to review, it was reviewed on an ongoing basis to make sure everything was current and as up to date as possible.

53. I have been asked whether as head of probationer training, was there any requirement for me to have awareness of what the training was for probationers elsewhere within the UK or whether there was any sort of benchmarking against other police forces' training. During my time as head of probationer training, there was no formal benchmarking taking place. As previously covered in this statement, the Probationer Training Programme had been previously devised and fully credit rated. During its creation, some benchmarking would probably have occurred. At the time when I was in post, there was huge, huge transitional change for the organisation going from eight forces to one and following the mandate from the Police Scotland Senior

Signature of witness..... 


Leadership Board to revise elements of the PTP, a primary focus of my work was ensuring that the PTP included the induction element. So, there was no wider benchmarking of English and Welsh forces.

54. However, during my time as head of probationer training, the head of operational training for the Ministry of Defence Police carried out benchmarking across the country and came to Police Scotland for this purpose. The Ministry of Defence Police had experienced a hiatus in recruitment, however, were embarking on a new recruitment drive which entailed training their new officers. They recognised the quality of Police Scotland's Probationer Training Programme, and the fact that it was fully credit rated gave rise to them seeking to adopt the model for delivery of training to their new officers. I worked very closely with their chief inspector in order to assist their adoption of our PTP, which, following some amendments in terms of legislation elements to suit their own requirements, they ultimately engaged in a collaborative partnership with the police college and delivered their version of the Police Scotland PTP for their own recruits.

55. So, there was not benchmarking that we were going to other forces, but other forces were coming to us to recognise the standard of professionalism of our training product. As previously stated, any benchmarking for the Probationer Training Programme would have occurred at time of creation of the programme. I was involved in making sure we had an induction element fit for purpose for the new recruits starting on 5 August 2013, so a lot of my activity was driven around that. So there was no wider benchmarking of other forces in my time in post. It was a huge, huge time of unprecedented change at that time.

Review of the OST training programme pre-May 2015

56. In relation to the review of the OST programme specifically at the time I was in post, my position would be, again, to rely on the subject matter experts -

Signature of witness..... 

Sergeant Young, and the PEIs at my base of operations. Also, through the Officer Safety Training Practitioners' Group, if anything was identified as requiring to be updated or refreshed then that would be the mechanism for that. A wider review, commissioned at a higher level than myself was not in place, however, as already stated, my desire was to have a closer focus of officer safety training to make sure that it was standardised across the country.

57. I do recall that, during 2014, the full-time sergeant at Jackton, which was a full-time officer safety unit, regrettably encountered some ill health and had to take extended leave, and I saw an opportunity for Sergeant Young to become more widely involved. I discussed it with him in terms of a relocation, and on his agreement, commissioned his transfer to Jackton, which I effectively saw as an opportunity for Sergeant Young's knowledge of officer safety training delivery to recruits to start a move towards a wider standardisation and wider assurance of the OST recertification training delivery nationally.

58. As I have stated earlier, when I inherited the governance of the delivery of recertification training, I had to rely on two operational training inspectors, one based at Fettes and one based in Dumfries, as conduits for me to ensure that there was sufficient officer safety training trainers in place and venues to provide the training commitment that the force required. That primarily was the main aim in meeting the requirements of the training requirement at that time, as opposed to trying to do a wider review of the officer safety training package in entirety. In conversations with Sergeant Young, this was a desire he held as well as I did, but I think he has also confirmed there was no formal work stream for the review and wider reform of officer safety training leading into Police Scotland. So we were using the product that had hitherto been in place within the eight forces.

59. With the conversations I was having with Sergeant Young, I was very minded that we needed a standardised officer safety training package to meet the

Signature of witness..... 

needs of Police Scotland, I saw the transfer to Jackton that I commissioned for Sergeant Young as a step towards that ultimate process because he had the subject matter knowledge. He'd been a trainer for several years, he knew about quality assurance having completed the diploma in higher education training and development (DipHE) himself. I saw him as a professional trainer, and it allowed him to start operating with line management of some of the full-time trainers in the largest training centre at Jackton, which also became the Police Scotland College at Jackton in the wider training establishment review. So it was the second biggest training campus next to Tulliallan, and I saw that as an opportunity to start driving forward the standardisation work stream within officer safety training that ultimately came to fruition, with Sergeant Young's report receiving mandate at executive level for a wider review and through the fulfilling of the recommendations that Sergeant Young's report makes.

60. Working with the staff that I had available to provide ongoing OST recertification training was challenging, given the numbers involved. So I didn't have opportunity to remove a small team to carry out that wider review of officer safety training. I consider that Sergeant Young's transfer to Jackton was the first step towards that wider review taking place, however, this was ultimately after my involvement, unfortunately.

61. I have been asked whether I was aware of any directive or request for standardisation or review of the OST programme, being made from more senior levels than Sergeant Young. Not to my knowledge, no. When I inherited the OST programme, in late 2013/early 2014, I considered that was something that I was keen to have in place but, on reflection now, I don't think I put anything on paper to suggest such a review. As previously advised, the primary focus was in relation to delivering the training and making sure training demand was met, first and foremost, without having luxury of resource to conduct a full-time review of OST at the time that I was in the

Signature of witness..... 

operational training environment. So, that was probably late 2013/ early 2014, through to my leaving the training environment in November 2014, that I had responsibility for delivery of officer safety training.

62. In terms of resource, at that time, I lost two members of staff from the team that I commenced with. This happened through the various training establishment reviews which had to happen. These members of staff were never replaced. That was understandable to me, because there was wider training implications that had to be met elsewhere, but from an executive level or certainly my line management, there was no desire to conduct a wider review of officer safety training. It was more a case of making sure that we had sufficient trainers in place to provide the training commitment at that time.

63. I have seen Inspector James Young's supplementary statement (SBPI-00362). I have been referred to paragraph 8 which states *"At that time [working as a training support sergeant], I had no responsibility for the content of the OST probationer training or refresher training programmes. However, my concerns about the situation prompted me to speak to managers and suggest that a review should be undertaken as there was a risk to the organisation if there wasn't one standardised programme. I had a number of conversations with CI Stuart Ord at that time and he appreciated that there was a need for a standardised national refresher training. As there was definitive contrast between the probationer OST Training and then what officers received at refresher training back at their forces."*

64. I have been asked if I was aware of him making that request for the review to be authorised and if so, whether I have any recollection of this. I had several conversations with Sergeant Young where he articulated that he believed a review was required. I don't remember him being as specific as talking about risk to the organisation, but I did agree with him that I also desired a wider review to ensure standardisation, so yes, I would have also recognised this as a risk that would require escalation to be reflected in the training risk register.

Signature of witness..... 

65. In terms of forwarding this as a risk, I'd have to reflect on how I delivered this up to my managers, because that's what would have happened. In recognising any risk to the organisation that Sergeant Young was taking to me, I would certainly have actioned this by escalating it to my managers. I would have discussed it with my superiors, [REDACTED], interim head of training delivery and, depending on the time that Sergeant Young is referring to here, also Superintendent Alan Gibson.

66. From my recollection, Superintendent Alan Gibson, came into the training environment first as a chief inspector in late 2013, but in early 2014 – I think January/February time – he became the superintendent for training, with responsibility for the delivery of training matters across the organisation. I would have more than likely discussed the desire for review of OST verbally with [REDACTED] or Superintendent Gibson. Whether or not I put that on paper and put it forward as a risk, I can't fully recall, but as there was a wider training risk register that captured risk to the organisation, I'm confident that I articulated the issue and escalated that to Superintendent Gibson and [REDACTED]

67. I have been referred to Police Scotland's Position Statement number 8 (SBPI-00358) and to paragraph 21 and 22: *"21. On the creation of the Police Service of Scotland on 1 April 2013, responsibility for the OST programme was adopted by Leadership, Training and Development ('LTD'). For the transition to Police Scotland, some areas of business had a reform work stream including Public Order and Firearms Training for compelling operational reasons. OST did not have its own reform work stream to review and standardise the programme initially. There had been no national review since the inception of Police Scotland.*

22. It became apparent that many areas of OST required to be reviewed to mitigate risk to personnel and the organisation, to introduce an effective and

Signature of witness..... [REDACTED]

standardised training programme and to maintain the organisation's focus of "keeping people safe". Consequently, at the Operational Training Unit Tasking and Coordinating Group of 19th November 2014, authorisation was given to undertake a full national review of OST provision. The review was carried out by Inspector James Young, commencing on 1 December 2014 and concluding on 1 March 2015, with the report being produced in April 2015."

68. I have been asked what I recall about the request for authorisation for a review of the OST programme in terms of how it was done. This meeting took place after I finished working at Tulliallan. So I wasn't present at that specific meeting and did not have sight of the minutes arising. I previously did attend some tasking and coordination meetings that were held at the college prior to the inception of Police Scotland. The Operational Training Tasking and Coordinating Group (TCG) was a body that would effectively provide executive-level decision, so anything that, at my level, we'd require support on or direction and guidance on could be escalated to the TCG. The fact that the meeting on 19 November 2014 provided authorisation meant that something had to have been tabled as an input to the TCG, prior to that date. So this is what I was referring to earlier. I can't fully recall if I provided a position paper to Superintendent Gibson, or whether my conversations with him had resulted in Superintendent Gibson providing the paperwork to support that decision coming out of the TCG but, as stated earlier, an input had to go into that group in order to provide the authorisation to conduct the review, so the fact that the review was authorised and actioned confirms that such an input to the TCG had occurred.

69. I consider that this may have been as a result of the escalation to my managers of Sergeant Young's concerns and my own observations gathered anecdotally, that a wider review of OST training was required, but without the output of the decision from that group (TCG), I'm unsure if any additional resource was allocated to the review process. Ultimately, the terms of

Signature of witness..... 


reference and remit of that decision is captured in Sergeant Young's OST review document (PS11533).

70. The fact that it was in such close proximity to the authorisation does lead me to consider that my position was the conduit for escalation of observations being made at the PEI and Sergeant Young's level, enabling me to capture that and feed it up the mechanism. My understanding and memory of how I went about my business in those days was very much a collaborative and inclusive leader of the team that I had and, if any of my team came forward with suggestions that I felt credible, then I would certainly have escalated them.

Miscellaneous Aspects of Probationer Training Pre-May 2015

71. I have been asked whether, in my time as head of probationer training, whether there was any training for probationers in relation to equality and diversity. Yes, there was equality and diversity training for all probationer officers delivered within the initial 12-week course. It was delivered by equality and diversity trainers who had received training in the subject matter material and were deemed subject matter experts in the training delivery. My understanding is that the training was delivered over three days and it was driven by the recommendations of the MacPherson report. Along with officer safety training, equality and diversity training was delivered at quite an early stage of the 12-week course. This was particularly for ensuring that the officers were fully cognisant with the Equality Act; conscious and unconscious bias; protected characteristics; values; and race and gender and other topics contained in the Equality Act. So, that was provided as subject matter material as training for them, yes.

72. I have been asked whether there was any training or guidance in relation to death in custody or following police contact as part of probationer training or elsewhere with Police Scotland pre-May 2015? From memory, there was no

Signature of witness..... 

specific training in relation to a death in custody, or following police contact, provided to probationer officers. There was training provided to them in connection with dealing with deaths, and also investigative skills – including completion of police notebooks; statements; interviewing of witnesses; as well as training provided in regard to the importance of accurately recording and preserving evidence – which would ultimately feature within any investigation into a death in police custody, or following police contact. All probationer officers were also addressed by officers from the Professional Standards Department to define their role in relation to any investigations into police conduct, which included interactions with members of the public.

73. I consider there would have been Standard Operating procedures (SOPs) in place, which detailed the necessary steps for officers to follow when faced with such an incident, however, this would not have been specifically trained to probationer officers. Senior leaders within the organisation would have received training in dealing with critical incidents and there would have been accompanying SOPs for this subject as well. Custody officers would also have received training in dealing with deaths or other serious incidents while in police custody. The previous eight forces would have had their own procedures, which would likely have resulted in officers from one of the other forces being brought in to conduct an independent investigation into the circumstances. With the creation of Police Scotland, the Police Investigations & Review Commissioner (PIRC) was also created, with a remit to conduct independent investigations involving Police Scotland. I would surmise that specific training for the immediate aftermath of a death in custody, or following police contact, would have been embedded within firearms courses, leadership courses, and custody officer courses, as these officers, would be more likely to be involved in such incidents, or be required to conduct the initial stages of any investigation until the involvement of PIRC.

Signature of witness..... 

74. I have been asked whether there was any training in the Probationer Training Programme, about delivery of a death message to a family. From my memory, I wouldn't be able to say whether the probationer officers received specific training in this subject. It's a question for one of the trainers who actually delivered the programme at that time.

75. I have been asked whether I recall any training for probationers about interactions with the area control room and the use of the radio, specifically in relation to the training given about feeding back information to the control room. The only training or experience that probationers would receive at their initial 12 week course was in the skills-based development exercises. This entailed them being teamed up with a partner and they would patrol, effectively, the college grounds encountering various skill base assessable elements where they would have to use the theoretical knowledge that they'd been provided with to deal with that particular incident. They did have radios for that purpose to call in for, for example, for a person check and receive messages about whether it be a suspicious person that may be in a particular area.

76. The probationer officers were therefore required to utilise the airwave radio to communicate back and forth. They received instruction on the airwave terminal and how to operate it. There was always the underlying instruction regarding messages "Keep it accurate, keep it brief and keep it clear: ABC. Making sure you get the point across and keep it succinct, but relay pertinent information back to the control room so they can make supporting decisions for you. That existed certainly when I was a young officer, and the use of the radio, the airwave network, was covered within the 12-week initial course, but I can't recall if it went into levels of detail about specific interactions with the controller.

Signature of witness..... 

77. I believe the facts stated in this witness statement are true. I understand that this statement may form part of the evidence before the Inquiry and be published on the Inquiry's website.

Date..... October 12, 2023 | 7:56 AM BST

Signature of witness..... 