

Present

Angela Hale

Lee Drawbridge

Sabrina Cohen-Hatton

Sarah McLeggan

Cara Kelly

Bruce Epsly

Doug Massey

1. Apologies for absence Laurie Kenny2. Matters arising

Policy amendments – SM provided a response from Jemma Ling explaining that only policies out for consultation are sent to Babcock for review. No policies are sent out once published they however they are marked as most recent policies on Hotwire. An additional action was requested to check if the draft policies can be share with Babcock. **SM to liaise further with JL with regards obtaining word documents with tracked changes as this will allow Babcock to trace the updates more effectively.**

Feedback – further feedback to be shared with stakeholders with regards delegates accessing the knowledge digest. **DM to ask Steve Homewood to distribute his feedback.**

Storage of records – a decision needs to be made regarding storage of records prior tot this process becoming electronic. AH said that this will need to be discussed at TSG to decide if we want to keep them and a further discussion with legal needs to take place regarding if these need to be kept. SCH said that this should be stored in the event of a post incident inquiry as their training records may be requested. Lee advised that a organisation called Sopra Steria could potentially be approached by Babcock to find a digital solution with storing these records. **SM to set up a meeting to discuss the storage of documents and invite a legal representative to confirm if we can or should hold records and how until an online solution can be achieved and add storage as an agenda item.**

SCH explained that she is looking at developing a feedback form for the revelation assessments where TNA will be used to drive further development. AH said that this should be discussed at TSG and mirror other referral processes.

3. Terms of Reference

All agreed the project board terms of reference.

~

Standing Items4. Action log review

N/A an action log will be developed after this meeting.

5. Status updates (Babcock)

- *Level 1 Development, Maintenance and Booster*

DM advised that all courses have all been piloted and are live. There is ongoing maintenance to create new scenarios and update the old graphics onto new canvases. 9 new scenarios are currently being developed which are due to be ready by the end of March. DM advised that there will be separation between what is covered on the Development, Maintenance and Booster courses due to track and trace developed at Beckton. Lee said this is true of Beckton but not Harrow. DM advised that there is no track and trace currently developed for training taking place at Harrow. Out of the 100 scenarios there are now 30 exercises which include the 21 core areas.

AH explained that in future it is intended for these to be signed off at course review board. Lee advised that as long as there is a formal ongoing commitment to continue to develop the materials then ORT will be more inclined to provide sign off for these TCAPs as long as this caveat is upheld. AH said that these TCAPs will be raised at CSB to approve all level 1 costs formally. **LK to arrange a course review board for the ongoing development and sign off for scenarios.**

- *Level 2 Development, Maintenance and Booster*

DM advised that the Development and Maintenance has been piloted and are now live. The initial booster was piloted and has since been withdrawn. A new TCAP for the level 2 booster has been developed and the design is ongoing. It is anticipated pilot date is May 25th at the latest to fit in with the expected promotion round. An eligibility and delegate place change needs to be enforced and TUs provided for CMG and CSB verification. **SM to arrange post pilot meetings for the Level 2 Development and Maintenance courses and to formally sign off the 9 new scenarios.**

Discussion resumed as to whether e-learning should be available through out rather than when delegates are booked onto courses. AH said she had concerns regarding the Babcock carrying out mass allocation as this has not been technically possible in the past. As such, any formal comms would need to be delayed until it can be tested to ensure that everyone is assigned. **DM to run further checks and confirm if mass allocation can be achieved and feedback to project board.**

- *Level 3 Development, Maintenance*

It was agreed that there would be no booster courses for levels 3 and 4. Following roll out, evaluations will be carried out to identify and gap analysis that may warrant a Level 3&4 booster.

DM said that the options paper he sent to LK needs discussing. In the meantime DM explained that the course seeks to focus on the strategic arrangements and decision control methods to highlight advanced incident command skills. Workshops will potentially look at previous incidents/case studies in order to review decisions made, identify lessons learned, encourage proactive thinking, overcome resourcing issues, and review outcomes.

- *Level 4 Development, Maintenance*

Much the same as above (level 3) however level 4 will prepare people for the strategic role, LFB arrangements, multi agency environment and response arrangements. It was agreed that there will be no MAGIC course. It is expected that design will conclude by the end of May.

SM to book in a TSG to discuss proposals for Level 3&4.

6. Revalidation (Sabrina Cohen-Hatton)

SCH raised her concerns about revalidation being pushed back further. CK advised that there are limited resources that will need to be considered and LFB will need to set the parameters as to what is required before this can be agreed. **SCH to confirm the requirements so that PD can submit a TCAP to Babcock to cover the revalidation training requirements.**

The delivery methods for revalidation assessments were discussed however agreement was not reached. These discussions included a separate revalidation assessment dates, formal revalidation assessment being formed as part of the MoS course and revalidation assessments replacing the maintenance of skills course for that year. Scheduling and costs will also need to be considered and agreed. Remote assessments were also considered whereby an LFB assessor can mark assessments without having to be there. It was also discussed that scenarios used for recruitment assessments could potentially be re-used as they can be fed into the current compliment of scenarios. **SCH to discuss these considerations with Steve Apter and directors and feed this information into a TCAP.**

CK asked if it would be possible to present the proposals for level 3&4 at the AC forum. SCH said that this team is disbanded but it would be useful to hold this meeting to ensure training is meeting the expected outcomes. **SCH to arrange a meeting with DACs and ACs and invite Babcock to present the level 3&4 proposals.**

7. Issues and updates from Working Groups

N/A Laurie was not available to provide an update.

8. Fit to train

BE explained that version 14 of FTT was originally intended to report on the existing levels and maintenance of incident command fit to train requirements. The difficulty now is that the list of courses no longer exist. BE explained that he regularly meets with Paul Hobbs and Deborah Riviere-Williams to ensure that trainers are competent. AH explained that Babcock needs to present FTT as part of the TCAP TSG meetings. Bruce asked whether this could be mitigated with train the trainer sessions and annual knowledge checks at the relevant level to confirm trainers competence. SCH suggested that command hours could be used as a guide however reinforced the need for currency and credibility. SCH raised further concerns about training potentially being scrutinised in a post incident inquiry. CK explained it would be difficult to do this for level 3&4 due to the small pool of trainers who were at this level but also have the ability to facilitate these sessions. **SM to include FTT discussions as part of the level 3&4 TSGs.**

9. Agree actions

All new actions were agreed.

10. Any other business

CK explained that Babcock are seeking IFE accreditation for incident command trainers and asked for board members thoughts. This was received well by all and AH asked that this be reported on in future project boards. The IFE have asked for permission to observe a level 1&2 course so that further support can be given to Babcock to confirm what they need to do to reach the professional standards. This was agreed by board members. **SM to add IFE accreditation as an agenda so that CK can provide monthly updates formally to the board.**

SCH asked what provisions Babcock have put in place as a means of selling the course to other brigades. AH said that if/when the courses are IFE approved they should make the training more marketable.

SCH asked if she could have sight of the options reports for level 3&4. AH explained that Dave Scott sent these to her in the week. **AH to distribute level 3&4 proposals to stakeholders for review.**

Close