



# Training Commissioning and Alteration Process Form 1

New Training

TCAP template: March 2014 version 5.0

**TCAP number: 0270**

**Title: Strategic command skills training:  
Level 3 Advanced Incident Command (development)**

# **Contents**

## **Stage One Submission of TCAP**

1. Milestone one Training request form
2. Milestone two Kick off meeting, Objectives confirmed

## **Stage Two Training options**

3. Milestone Three Training stakeholder group meeting/Options
4. Milestone Four Submission to C.S.T.

## **Stage Three Training preparation**

5. Milestone Five Training development

## **Stage Four Pilot**

6. Milestone Six Training piloted
7. Milestone Seven Post pilot meeting

## **Stage Five Final sign off**

8. Milestone Eight Final sign off

Version Control			
Version	Date	Author	Comments/Changes made (including section numbers)
1	8/11/16	Laurie Kenny	Form completed from old TCAP received from Babcock dated 26/10/16
2.0	10/03/2017	S.McLeggan	Updated and addition of scheduling section
3.0	13/03/18	S.McLeggan	Update to TCAP prior to TCAP WG 14/03/18
4.0	12/10/18	S. McLeggan	Addition of day 1 consolidation and post pilot discussions
5.0	13/02/19	M Remedios	Addition of day 2 consolidation and post pilot meeting notes

## STAGE 1: Submission of TCAP

### Milestone 1

*To be completed by PD project manager (from T.R. form)*

#### 1.1 TCAP Title

Strategic Command Skills Training: Level 3 Advanced Incident Command (Development)  
Level 3 Advanced Incident command Development

#### 1.2 Name of Commissioning Officer and their department

Peter Critchell - ORT

#### 1.3 Name of Client(s) and their department

Steve Apter – Director

#### 1.4 TCAP Stakeholder Group Members

*TSG members **must** be able to make decisions on their department's behalf. It is the responsibility of the TSG members to feedback to their management to ensure agreement with the decisions that are made. TSG members must be the single point of contact to ensure swift progression, or provide a substitute should they be unable to attend meetings.*

Peter Critchell - ORT

Richard Mills – Operational Policy

Craig Carter - Training Release Team

Sarah McLeggan

Doug Massey &- Babcock

Hannah Burak – Babcock

Cara Kelly – Babcock

#### 1.5 Subject Matter Expertise( LFB SMPA and Babcock SME)

Peter Critchell

Richard Mills



## STAGE 1: Submission of TCAP

### 1.6 Background/Context

Subsequent to the Initial Programme Course Review for Incident Management Training (July 2013) it was agreed by LFB that new incident command training is required for operational officers at the Deputy Assistant Commissioner role and above (Level 3 advanced incident command). This course is primarily for those new to the Deputy Assistant Commissioner role or for individuals nominated to attend by LFB to support their personal development.

*To be completed by Commissioning Officer*

### 1.7 Identify the existing training packages affected by this TCAP

No current Development course for newly promoted DAC's

### 1.8 Approval to submit TCAP to Babcock

*Please record below that the TCAP has been approved by relevant GM prior to submission to Babcock*

GM Kenny approved receipt of the TCAP from Dave Scott (Babcock)

Angela Hale approved TCAP to proceed to TCAPWG (14/03/18) for prioritisation to be established

### 1.9 Milestone 1 sign off

Approved by GM Kenny

12 /03/18 Angela Hale

## Milestone 2

*To be updated by PD Project Manager from Training request form*

**2.1 What do you want this training to achieve? What do staff need to be able to do following completion of this training?**

### Proposal

Course aims:

- Confirmation of Level 3 Incident Command skills through incident simulation

Course objectives:

To:

- Demonstrate the role of incident commander
- Demonstrate functional command support roles
- Demonstrate effective incident command skills

Performance Criteria:

- EFSM2: Lead monitor and support people to resolve operational incidents
- Level 3 Incident Command knowledge profile

The Level 3 Advanced Incident Command development programme supports development of competent command skills for the Deputy Assistant Commissioner role and above.

**2.2 Who do we need to train?**

Deputy Assistant Commissioner (and above) who are will be notified/mobilised as monitoring officer and/ or incident commander (in accordance with Mobilising Policy 412).

**2.3 When do we need this training? Please provide justification for any deadlines provided**

TBC

**2.4 Are there any pre-requisite skills and/or training required by staff attending this training?**

Delegates must have been nominated by LFB. Individuals who are required to carry out advance incident command roles and/or functions

**2.5 Policy Consultation via Brigade joint committee for health and safety at work (BJCHSW)**

*For those TCAPs initiated as a result of the creation of new/significant change to existing policy, please record below that the policy has been consulted on via BJCHSW. This consultation process **MUST** been completed prior to any TCAP being passed to Babcock.*

YES

NO ☒

## STAGE 1: Submission of TCAP

### 2.6 Is this a one off training intervention?

YES

NO ☐

If NO Please complete section 2.7

### 2.7 Detail the expectations relating to the frequency of refresher training or maintenance of skills.

This course is primarily for those new to the Deputy Assistant Commissioner role or for individuals nominated to attend by LFB to support their personal development.

Separate TCAPS for:

1. Yearly Maintenance of skills
2. Strategic Command Skills Training (Assistant Commissioner) – frequency as required by LFB
3. Revalidation (every 2 years) Not yet formally requested by LFB

Will support the on-going maintenance of skills and revalidation of command skills at Level 3 Advanced Incident Command.

### 2.8 Training Development Constraints *[please detail anything that Babcock should be of aware of prior to commencing development of training, for example there may be release issues associated with some staff groups]*

Releasing officers from operational rotas will need to be considered

### 2.9 Milestone 2 sign off

Angela Hale 12/03/18

## STAGE 2: Training Options

### Milestone 3

#### Training Stakeholder Group Meeting

*To be completed by Personal Development Team*

##### 3.1 Kick off meeting arranged

Date: 21/03/17 to discuss proposals

##### 3.2 Options received from Babcock and sent to stakeholder group

Yes

##### 3.3 Details shared with Representative bodies

Date: N/A Senior Officers

##### 3.4 Comments received prior to TSG

Initial discussions at Incident Command Project Board. There are monthly meeting to discuss proposals and updates with Peter Critchell and Richard Mills

##### 3.6 Note of any key decisions made, issues raised, etc at TSG

- TCAP 0270 Level 3 Development
  - Day 1 Level 3 Consolidation
    - Consolidation course content has been agreed to form the basis of day 1 of the development course. This is to be facilitated by an individual who has undertaken FRS incident commander and command support roles at DAC/AC level in the operational and training

## STAGE 2: Training Options

environments

○ Interim Measures:

- During the development of this course the commissioning department took a strategic decision to update the course sequentially starting with the day 1 consolidation course

- Masterclass

in order to ensure there is training for the intervening period leading up to completion of level 3 and 4 development & MoS, Babcock proposed a Masterclass to provide DACs, ACs & relevant HoS additional strategic input. This is agreeable to all stakeholders.

- Development of Day 2 and 3 will be complete following the delivery of day 1 (consolidation)

### 3.6 CMG Options report

*Full details of options will be available on request/held on SharePoint*

#### Part 1 Options received (D&T)

Outline Proposal:

To support and compliment the approach adopted at Level 1 & 2 Incident Command training, Level 3 follows the same format, with the focus on advanced incident command skills, consisting of:

- Level 3 incident command digest (technical knowledge)
- Level 3 incident command e-learning (to aid context and understanding)
- Incident command exercises (confirmation of skills)
- Technical workshops (confirmation of understanding)

Anticipated Duration:

- 25 hours of delegate led pre-course learning (Level 3 Incident Command digest and e-learning)
- 3 day facilitator led development course (DTF Beckton or RTF Harrow)
- ½ day individual confirmation of incident command skills

Proposed 3-day development course class size - Min/Max figures: 2 – 3. Start/Finish times: 09:00 – 17:00

Proposed ½-day individual confirmation of incident command skills class size immediately following the 3 day development course – Min/Max: 1 delegate. Start/Finish times: 4-hour nominated time slot (between 09:00 – 17:00).

**It was later agreed that this course would be developed in stages starting with day 1 consolidation.**

## STAGE 2: Training Options

**Part 2 Three options received (D&T)**

N/A

**Part 3 Rationale ( D&T)**

Only 1 option required

**Part 4 TSG preferred option (D&T)**

Only 1 option required

**Part 5 CMG comment/ recommendation (CMG)**

13/06/18 costs for the 1 day consolidation course were approved.

<b>3.7 Preferred option sent to CPMB for approval</b>
---

Yes
-----

<b>3.8 Milestone 3 sign off</b>
---------------------------------

13/06/18 – for 1 day consolidation
------------------------------------



## Milestone 4

*To be completed by Learning and Development Team and Babcock*

### 4.1 Option approval received from CPMB

Yes - 13/06/18 – for 1 day consolidation

### 4.2 Approved option communicated to Babcock for design

Yes

### 4.3 Milestone 4 sign off

13/06/18 For 1 Day Consolidation Course



## STAGE 3: Training Preparation

### Milestone 5

#### 5.1 Story board received

Date: N/A

#### 5.2 Storyboard TSG arranged

Date: N/A

#### 5.3 Fit to train requirement

Received from Babcock Date: 18/05/18

Approved by TSG date: 24/05/18

#### 5.4 Storyboard/ Training materials Approval TSG

16/07/18 – Consolidation

#### Additional Storyboard/ course materials approval TSG ( if required)

16/07/18 – Consolidation

#### 5.5 Course resource template

Completed Date:

Sent to Scheduling working group: N/A CRT developed by Matthew Geake – Consolidation course

## STAGE 3: Training Preparation

### Scheduling

<b>General information:</b>	
Are you creating a new course? If Yes complete this section If No enter NA and move on to next section	Yes
By creating this new course, does another course need to be deactivated?	No
If yes, please provide the Course code & course title:	N/A

<b>Core Course Details:</b>	
Course Name	Strategic Fire Command Skills Training Development
Course Code	SFCSTD
Class Minimum	
Class Maximum	
TU per course	25 TUs for 3 delegates
Tradability	
Course Duration	4 days
Start and Finish Times	
Venue/s	Beckton/Harrow
Number of delegates to be trained in current financial year	
How often training refresher is required?	
Is course "On Demand"?	YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>
Is the course delivered via PROP,SR or Neither (N)?	
Provide the details of the class allocation rules	
Level 1 Evaluation	YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>
Level 2 Assessment?	YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>
Is there an eligibility Report?	

<b>5.6 Milestone 5 sign off</b>

## STAGE 4: Pilot

### Milestone 6

#### 6.1 Pilot date

19/07/18, 22/08/18, 30/08/18 – consolidation

Additional dates: 13/12/2018, 21/12/2018 and 18/01/2019

#### 6.2 Quality assurers

Booked: Peter Critchell observed all consolidation pilots

#### 6.3 Milestone 6 sign off

13/07/18

## STAGE 4: Pilot

### Milestone 7

#### 7.1 Pilot feedback collated

Yes – Consolidation

#### 7.2 Post pilot meeting confirmed

10/08/18 – Interim consolidation post pilot meeting (following 19/07/18 pilot)

02/10/18 – Consolidation Post pilot meeting

13/02/19 – Consolidation post pilot meeting

#### 7.3 Post pilot meeting outcome

Consolidation pilots deemed a success

Consolidation feedback

##### Delegate Feedback Summary for SCSL3C

##### 19/07/18

Pre Course Learning	Training materials used during course	Venue	Overall standard of training delivery	Trainer (s) that delivered the course
X	4	4	4	4
X	5	5	5	5
X	5	5	5	4

##### 22/08/18

Pre Course Learning	Training materials used during course	Venue	Overall standard of training delivery	Trainer (s) that delivered the course
X	5	5	5	5
X	5	4	5	4
X	5	5	5	5

## STAGE 4: Pilot

30/08/18

Pre Course Learning	Training materials used during course	Venue	Overall standard of training delivery	Trainer (s) that delivered the course
X	5	5	5	4
X	5	4	5	N/A
X	5	4	5	4
X	5	5	5	4

### Combined average scores

Pre Course Learning	Training materials used during course	Venue	Overall standard of training delivery	Trainer (s) that delivered the course
<b>X</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>

### TCAP 0270 Level 3 Incident Command Development (Consolidation part 1) Post Pilot Meeting

#### Present

Peter Critchell, Richard Mills, Sarah McLeggan, Brigitte De Shong, Justin Ali, Tim Frost, Doug Massey, Cara Kelly, Aaron Watson

#### Apologies:

Gary Reason, Craig Carter, Matthew Geake, Andy Holcombe

#### 1. Introductions

SM led the introductions and advised stakeholders of the structural changes in her team. SM advised that she will be working in a different team and another project manager will be allocated to work on Incident Command TCAPs in due course.

#### 2. Feedback

##### a. Delegate

SM provided a review of delegate feedback relating to the documentation collated following the three pilots. DM advised that the changes were made to allow changes of role for each inject following feedback from the 1<sup>st</sup> pilot and advised that this has been positively received.

SM raised comments with regards queries surrounding the absence of the knowledge profile that are due to supplement the course to be used as refresher material. CK advised that the content has been completed however it needs formatting before being uploaded to Big learning. SM advised that the content has not been reviewed by the commissioning department as yet. RM advised that Rachel Wetheridge will also need to be aware of the content in order to cross reference with NOG. CK said that she will liaise directly with RW. RM asked whether accessing the knowledge digest would trigger reports that could be used as evidence of completion if requested. CK explained that the knowledge digest can only show who accessed the package, for how long and how many times. CK asked if it would be worth considering a more auditable e-learning

## STAGE 4: Pilot

style package. All agreed it would be.

**CK to ensure that the reading materials are formatted and shared with PC and RM for review by the end of October.**

SM raised additional queries/statements raised by delegates relating to suggested content of day 2 & 3. DM advised that proposals for the content of days 2 & 3 comprising of workshops, command exercises and observations are almost ready to be shared with LFB.

b. SME

PC advised that there was consistency throughout the 3 pilots and that the courses were very well received. PC explained that there was excitement amongst DACs and pilots evolved to where they needed to be.

c. Training delivery team

DM explained that it was decided collectively not to implement the 02 scenario to allow for the Heathrow example to be fine-tuned. The 02 scenarios was therefore to be used for contingency in case candidates sped through scenario 1. As a result there are no final changes to be made to the Heathrow scenario.

It was agreed by all that for the remaining sessions the 02 scenario would be piloted following the same format of SME observation with the exception that RM and potentially other ACs would observe the sessions assuming there was no objection from delegates. CK said that they would deploy track and trace so that details as to who completed which scenario could be reported if necessary in future.

CK explained that Steve Hamm made a suggestion to ensure a wire diagram of the landscape document is made available for the duration of the training to be used as a reference tool. All agreed this was a good idea.

**DM to ensure a large landscape document is in place as a visual aid for future courses.**

PC explained that the last pilot had an additional delegate present and asked if this could be applied for future courses. After further discussion it was agreed that the maximum number would remain at 3 however Babcock scheduling team would be asked to confirm if a note could be added to the scheduling rules to include a 4<sup>th</sup> delegate in exceptional circumstances.

**SM to liaise with Babcock scheduling to check if notes could be added on the system.**

3. Equipment/Venue/ IT

N/A

4. Scheduling

The following actions regards scheduling were set:

**SM to confirm that ITRs have been updated and that staff on 24s the day prior to the course (and therefore excluded from the reports) have been retrospectively completed on the system.**

**DM to provide availability of the facilitator as well as the briefing room at Beckon**

**PC/RM to provide availability of ACs (to observe courses) and remaining DACs to be trained (following the above action).**

5. FTT

SM asked DM for an update on the evidencing of trainers credentials. DM explained that one trainer has returned their evidence however he will need to chase the other two.

**DM to provide the FTT evidence for all three level 3 & 4 trainers.**



## STAGE 4: Pilot

### 6. Review of costs (TUs)

SM asked if there were any revisions to be made to the costs. CK said there would be additional development costs with respect to developing trainers.

**CK to send BD & SM the development costs for CMG review.**

### 7. Review of risks and issues

SM raised the availability of DACs/their release as a risk.

CK asked if after the consolidation course the course will not be rolled out should be raised as an issue. PC explained that the course will be used as an acquisition course for new level 3 commanders and that elements would morph into the maintenance of skills programme.

### 8. Any other relevant business

PC explained that he was asked by Phil Foster whether attendance on the consolidation course should be deemed as DACs being viewed as in ticket under Health and Safety terms. All agreed that this is not the case and that the maintenance of skills would provide 'in ticket' status with the incident command observation being used as the assessment every other year.

**CK to liaise with Phil regards proposals as to what is deemed in/out of ticket (CK to draft some words for stakeholder review).**

### 9. Agree new actions

All new actions agreed.

*Close*

## 7.3 Post pilot meeting outcome – 2<sup>nd</sup> post pilot meeting day 2 course.

Consolidation pilots deemed a success

Consolidation feedback

### Delegate Feedback Summary for SCSL3C

**13/12/2018**

Pre Course Learning	Training materials used during course	Venue	Overall standard of training delivery	Trainer (s) that delivered the course
X	5	5	5	5
X	5	5	5	5
X	5	5	5	5

Babcock QA

- First session / PowerPoint took 1 hour and 45min, moving quite quickly on the last 3 slides as delegates were

## STAGE 4: Pilot

experienced and knowledgeable, it will need longer on groups that are new to the information.

- First PowerPoint presentation of 17 slides, is text heavy. The introduction of flow charts or diagrams will help some delegates linking information more meaningfully.
- Slide with diagram on Strategic Coordination Group Structure is not clear and readable on the screen or on the print out.
- Some inaccuracies on course injects, it needs to be amended:
  - Time when IC3 arrives on the first inject says 23:59 when it needs to say 22:59
  - Situation of the RVP2 is mention as Edmund Halley Way except on one occasion is named as Edmund Hilary Way.

21/12/2018

Pre Course Learning	Training materials used during course	Venue	Overall standard of training delivery	Trainer (s) that delivered the course
X	5	5	5	5
X	5	5	5	5
X	5	5	5	5
X	5	5	5	5

Babcock QA feedback

- Second observation of the SCSL3C pilot course.
- QA report reflect the views of 4 more candidates, with a total of 7 between both courses observed.
- Really positive feedback from all delegates, re: experienced facilitator and designed scenario to put in practice the theory and skills aimed to be developed.

18/01/2019

Pre Course Learning	Training materials used during course	Venue	Overall standard of training delivery	Trainer (s) that delivered the course
X	5	2	5	5
X	5	4	5	5
X	5	4	5	4
X	5	4	5	4

Babcock QA feedback

A more mixed feedback than on last pilot course, however the comments from all delegates when I asked at the end of the course were: that they enjoyed the course, it met their expectations and one delegate said he would like to attend the same course in 6 months with other delegates in the room to share experiences.

**Combined average scores**

Pre Course Learning	Training materials used during course	Venue	Overall standard of training delivery	Trainer (s) that delivered the course
<b>X</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>

**TCAP 0270 Level 3 Incident Command Development (Consolidation part 1) Post Pilot Meeting**

**Present**



## STAGE 4: Pilot

DAC Peter Critchell – Operational Policy & Assurance (PC)  
Michelle Remedios – Personal Development (MR)  
GM Mark Simons – Central Operations (MS)  
Doug Massey – Babcock (DM)  
Andy Holcombe – Babcock (AH)  
Matthew Geake – Babcock (MG)

### **Apologies:**

Craig Carter – Central Operations (CC)  
Dave Martin – Training Programming (DM)  
Kieran Dunn – Training Programming (KD)  
Barry Moses – Babcock Planning (BM)

### **1. Introductions**

It was agreed that the focus of the post pilot meeting was on the pilots held with the second scenario. These were 13-12-2018, 21-12-18 and 18-01-19.

### **2. Feedback**

#### **a. Delegate & Babcock QA**

The feedback overall was very positive.

The inaccuracies in the narratives raised by delegates & the Babcock QA, was amended and changed for the second pilot.

The point raised about the number of powerpoint slides was discussed and whilst it was agreed there were a lot of slides, it contains technical information and is invaluable.

It was agreed that handouts could be provided to delegates.

**Action: DM/AH to look at whether anything can be done to help the powerpoint presentation.**

There was a question around the timings for new DACs. AH said the course covered new and existing DACs and that he felt there was enough time. The timings can be adjusted, depending on the audience.

Pre-course learning was raised, however there are knowledge profiles for level 3 and level 4.

#### **b. SME**

PC felt it was a positive experience and DM said he felt success was due to support.#

PC said the knowledge profile needs to be in place for the next course.

It was discussed whether it was beneficial to have an AC as part of the discussion group. It was suggested that it could be left as an option for the AC to attend the develop/ maintenance courses.

#### **c. Training delivery team**

Nothing further to add.

#### **d. Training Assurance QA**

The discrepancies in the presentations was raised and covered earlier.

The QA raised the point that there was a drawing regarding the O2 scenario, however this would be hand drawn on the Command Unit and is a snapshot of what would be drawn.

## STAGE 4: Pilot

Overall the feedback from the TA QA was positive.

### 3. Equipment/Venue/ IT

**Action: DM to look at the possibility of giving handouts on the course.**

Venue – It is held at Beckton, but could be anywhere.

### 4. Scheduling

The CRT needs to be reviewed for the development course.

Need to review what rooms require for the 3<sup>rd</sup> day pilot.

### 5. FTT

Need to check FTT Requirements.

### 6. Review of costs (TUs)

No change.

### 7. Review of risks and issues

None

### 8. Any other relevant business

None raised.

### 9. Agree new actions

All new actions agreed.

It was agreed that the two scenarios would be day 1 and day 2 of the course. Day 3 is still to be developed.

Maintenance of Skills – One of the scenarios could be used for this.

**Action: MS to look at how delegates could be notified of the course.**

*Close*

## 7.4 Pilot successful

Yes – Consolidation – Heathrow scenarios

Yes – Consolidation – O2 scenarios

The third day is still to be piloted. Day 3 presentation from Andrew Prichard took place on 25<sup>th</sup> September 2019, concept agreed in principal by Dom Eliis. This is to be discussed further decision provided at Project Board on the 10<sup>th</sup> October.

No if no do the amendments require the course to be re-piloted? Yes/no

## Milestone 8

### 8.1 Confirmation of post pilot amendments

### 8.2 Publication on LMS confirmed

### 8.3 Course guide updated

### 8.4 TRT eligibility reports completed

### 8.5 Final sign off

# **Appendix I - Consultation with Representative Bodies**

*To be completed by PD Project Manager*