



The Sheku Bayoh Public Inquiry

Witness Statement

Alan Gibson

Taken by [REDACTED]

At the Scottish Police College

On 13 September 2023

Witness details

1. My name is Alan Gibson. My year of birth is 1972. My contact details are known to the Inquiry.
2. I'm have 29 years' police service. I am currently a Chief Superintendent with Police Scotland.

Career Summary

1. I joined what was Strathclyde Police in May 1994. I completed my initial training at Tulliallan and thereafter the two-year probationary period. I was based in Saracen Police Station in North Glasgow, and I was there for about nine years in response and community policing and laterally Safer Communities, from memory. I then came on promotion to a training role at

Signature of witness.....

[REDACTED]

the Scottish Police College in 2003 as a Sergeant within Safer Communities Training. I stayed there for three years, which was generally the tenure that you stayed at the Scottish Police College for at that time. In 2006, I returned to Strathclyde Police as a uniformed Sergeant, again to Safer Communities at Stewart Street Police Station, Glasgow. I was promoted to Inspector in 2008 and undertook a range of Inspector roles within Greater Glasgow. I was a Response Inspector at Stewart Street, then Cranstonhill, as it was named then, then Partick. I then became the Communities Inspector for Drumchapel.

2. I then became the Area Commander, a temporary Chief Inspector at Partick Police Station for two years. I did that role, and was promoted in that role I think, from memory, and I did that as we entered Police Scotland in 2013. So when Police Scotland came to be, I was a substantive Chief Inspector, I think the Area Commander at Partick. I then undertook a short period as the Partnership's Chief Inspector for Glasgow, which was effectively the lead for local authority liaison and liaising with our strategic partners in Glasgow. I then took up a role as a Chief Inspector based in training on 9 December 2013. I was primarily based at Jackton in East Kilbride but did on occasion work from the Scottish Police College at Tulliallan. Then I was promoted in February 2014 to Superintendent within training, and I effectively stayed in that Superintendent role till June 2016.
3. Then in June of 2016 I was given a temporary promotion to temporary Chief Superintendent, head of what was then called TLD – Training, Leadership and Development. Its name has since changed to Learning, Training and Development (LTD). I undertook that role for a year as a temporary Chief Superintendent. That's effectively the role that I currently do today. In summer of 2017 I moved to Dumbarton as the Support and Service Delivery Superintendent for Argyll and West Dunbartonshire Division. I spent a year there and then I transferred to the Scottish Crime Campus at Gartcosh. I spent a year there as a Support and Service Delivery Superintendent for

Signature of witness.....

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of the witness.

Specialist Crime Division. I sat within Specialist Crime Support, and I had a range of different responsibilities.

4. After that, I was promoted from Gartcosh to Chief Superintendent and took up post as Head of Governance, Audit and Assurance based here at Tulliallan, and I undertook that role for six months from May of 2019 to December 2019. In December 2019 I was took up post as the Local Policing Commander for Forth Valley - the Divisional Commander responsible for the policing operation for Forth Valley Division. I did that for three years before being asked to return to the Scottish Police College in January 2023 to take up post as Head of LTD.

Remit of training role pre-May 2015

5. My training record (PS18785) refers to me starting a post as Chief Inspector “HR training” at Jackton in TLD on 9 December 2013. I have been asked what this role encompassed. For the first two or three months, I was effectively working to my manager who was referred to as the Head of Training Delivery. The Head of Training Delivery was a member of police staff named [REDACTED], who was the former head of training for Strathclyde Police. At that point in time, and to an extent still to this day, there are various different functions which sit under the Head of Training Delivery, so for example, operational training, operational safety training, ICT training, crime training, driver training and the list goes on. She had responsibility for training delivery across the whole of the organisation. There was quite an extensive list of training that was undertaken under that particular role. It is worth noting that were some elements of training delivery that did not sit under that role, such as firearms training. That is still the case today.
6. Back at that point the management structure was a little bit clunky and needed some refinement. The legacy organisations had not long come

Signature of witness.....

[REDACTED]

together, and all the legacy training arrangements were still pretty much in place. Effectively, there were eight different police services who had different arrangements for police training. Plus, you also had the Scottish Police College, which had in legacy arrangements sat under the SPSA, as it was called at that point in time. So you had all those structures in place in the latter part 2013 when I arrived, and the early part of 2014; there was no single head of training. There were five interim heads who jointly led training at that point in time, so there was work to be done to streamline the structure and better define the leadership roles.

7. Of the five interim heads, they were all members of police staff. None of these individuals were police officers. [REDACTED] was Head of Training Delivery and responsible for the delivery all the aspects of training. Another interim head was Head of Quality Assurance, another one was the Head of Leadership Training, and so on. So different people had different remits and they all came together. The single person who oversaw them was the Director of People and Development, [REDACTED]. He had a range of other responsibilities other than just LTD. I don't remember all the names, but there was five people who effectively led the function together under the direction of the People and Development Director.

8. I was part of the senior management team, overseeing the training delivery that took place at that point in time. I reported into [REDACTED], firstly as a Chief Inspector, and then when I was promoted in February 2014, as a Superintendent. In terms of my role, the focus centered around supporting our staff, overseeing the delivery of our training products and working with internal partners. In the early days a large part of my workload was driven by direct tasking from [REDACTED] in terms of training delivery. While there was a specific role, it wasn't as defined as it later became.

9. The reference to "HR training" in relation to my role, I think, comes from the fact that training at that time sat under the wider remit of People and

Signature of witness.....

[REDACTED]

Development. The terminology can be a little misleading within the Scope system. So the early days of my role as a Chief Inspector I was really just trying to settle into that role as those interim heads that I described earlier were leading an organisational change piece for the TLD function. They were endeavouring, to take all the legacy arrangements that had been in place and create a plan and structure to move the whole function forward under one set of common principles and approaches. As I began my Chief Inspector role, that's what was taking place. A lot of the design of the function was being built and consulted upon as I commenced in the function, and I later became involved in staff information sessions and conducting one-to-ones for some of the members of police staff across the country. We were changing structures, changing role profiles, etc. to try and align the organisation of training for Police Scotland into one unit, as opposed to lots of disparate units who were potentially doing different things in different ways.

10. I worked on behalf of [REDACTED] and I initially line managed a range of Inspectors and staff equivalents to deliver those training products. When I was promoted to Superintendent in February 2014, I then line managed a range of Chief Inspectors and staff equivalents. Just for clarity though, [REDACTED] left the organisation in late 2014 and I thereafter assumed her role as the Head of Training Delivery as a Superintendent. So it wasn't a promotion; effectively that staff post was removed and the Superintendent became the Head of Training Delivery. At times it could be quite difficult to discern who was responsible for what between the two of us. I very much reported into [REDACTED], but at a Superintendent level you're supposed to be a key decision maker and somebody who takes strategic responsibility and provides clarity and direction. That was diluted somewhat by the fact that I reported directly into [REDACTED] on most everything I undertook. So that post was streamlined to be one individual rather than a Superintendent and a member of police staff.

Signature of witness.....

[REDACTED]

11. I have been asked whether, in my role of reporting to [REDACTED] whether I had responsibility for OST training in any way. When I started in my role as a Chief Inspector I did not directly, however I did on promotion to Superintendent in February 2014. I reported to [REDACTED] and when [REDACTED] left the organisation in late November 2014, responsibility for probationer training all sat with me under my direction as Head of Training Delivery from then until May 2015.

12. I have been asked who had responsibility for OST recertification from 2013 to May 2015. CI Stuart Ord was Head of Probationer Training and that would have included OST Training as part of that, I believe. In terms of him having a wider remit for recertification of OST, I would need to double-check that just to make it exactly sure. Initially, in 2013 when Police Scotland came to be and when I came into the function, there was effectively different delivery models for OST. Every probationer that came through the police college would get OST. I believe it was a five-day OST course. It was delivered onsite at the Scottish Police College and still is to this day. When you went out to the local policing divisions effectively, and if you overlaid that with the legacy force arrangements, from my memory there was only one organisation that actually had a dedicated full-time unit, which was Strathclyde Police. They had a cadre of OST instructors who sat at Jackton, and their full-time role was to deliver recertification training for OST to the 8,000 police officers of Strathclyde.

13. The other seven organisations, from memory, all had a different delivery model, which was they had qualified OST instructors (OSTIs) who worked in a range of roles and who could be called upon to deliver OST depending on the needs of that organisation. However, and as stated, I believe most invariably had another role in the organisation of the legacy force, so they would be potentially response officers or community police officers. On occasion, they would come in and they would deliver OST training, and again the models for

Signature of witness.....

[REDACTED]

that were different around the country. So, for example, certain legacy organisations, as I understood it, trained in certain identified months. From memory, Strathclyde trained all year long, every month of the year, but some other legacy organisations would train at certain points of the year, predominantly when there weren't annual leave spikes, so avoiding the summer, avoiding the Christmas period and when it was particularly busy operationally. So there was definitely a mixed model of how it was delivered, but what I would say is the OSTIs were all trained to the same standard, but the delivery methodology was different across the country, but not necessarily the content. A subject matter expert in OST would be best placed to comment on that.

14. There was a change in the nomenclature in around 2016; the nomenclature changed from officer safety training to operational safety training. It's a really important point to note in the Inquiry about that change of nomenclature and why it was changed. Through the research that James Young undertook, which was vast, in terms of the whole reframing of OST, we wanted to get away from the concept that it was just the safety of the officer that mattered, that actually everybody's safety was important, the member of the public that you're interacting with, the staff, if it's a member of police staff. There's also a relatively small cadre of police staff members who are afforded OST because of the roles that they undertake. Invariably, they work in a custody setting. At that point in time, it was voluntary. They didn't have to undertake it, but obviously we strongly recommended that they did, whereas for police officers it was and still is mandatory. You would not be deployed operationally unless you'd completed it, as well as your annual refresher training.

15. I have been asked who was responsible for first aid training at that time. It'd be the same team of people, so they delivered first aid training as part of the OST programme. There was also standalone first aid training which was delivered at various parts of the country for specific roles. Again, staff in a

Signature of witness.....



custody environment would get specific first aid at work training courses delivered to them, and other specific roles that required that for example individuals within the firearms world, etc. who needed specific first aid training.

16. I have been referred to the National Officer Safety Training Review Report by James Young, dated April 2015 (PS11533) at the bottom of page 5: *“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’”.*

17. I have been asked whether I have any awareness of the decision not to have a separate workstream to standardise OST training. I wasn't involved in any of the preparations per se of what Police Scotland was going to look like. I was in an operational command role within G Division, Glasgow area. I was aware of the general preparations that were being made for the transition and the fact we were aiming for a go live date of 1 April 2013. I remember the specific communications and the narrative around about the key issue to make sure the public saw no difference in the levels of service come 1 April, and that if they phoned 999 and sought assistance the day before and then the day after we transitioned, there should be no dilution of the service. In terms of actually looking at reform work for the OST, even when I came into the role, I wasn't sighted on anything that had been done to put any of that in place in terms of a standardised way to deliver that.

18. That said, obviously I was aware that the instructing staff, as I mentioned, were all trained to the same standard, but obviously the delivery of standardised programmes around the country, I couldn't be certain whether

Signature of witness.....

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of the witness.

that was done in exactly the same way in Aberdeen as it would be in Dumfries, to be honest, so that was one of the significant challenges that we came across. That wasn't unique to OST, though. There were multiple products across the training world which were probably in a very similar space, whereby they were delivered in legacy arrangements and still were when we transitioned into Police Scotland. So there was a massive exercise in trying to work through all of our training products - from crime training to driver training and so on. There were a range of different products, probably into the hundreds, that needed to be looked at, including OST.

19. I have been asked whether I was aware of any of the discussions around standardisation of probationer training generally. Probationer training was standardised because the one thing every probationary officer across Scotland had in common, and still has in common, is they all attend the Scottish Police College for their initial training. The number of weeks has changed over the years, but the first period of an officer's training at Tulliallan has remained standardised for many, many years, well before Police Scotland came into being. There are elements of probationer training that are delivered in a local setting over the 2 year probationary period. Whilst there's absolutely key elements of standardised delivery, we were still using some legacy products. So ICT is a key example whereby only now are we getting a single electronic crime system in place for the organisation, so if you turned the clock back a year or so ago, you'd have to send probationers back to local training areas purely to get localised training which is relevant to their local context, primarily because some of the IT systems were still legacy systems, if that makes sense.

20. I have been asked whether probationer training had its own standardisation workstream prior to the commencement of Police Scotland. I don't know. I recall that there was a project called "Pathways to Policing" when I was here in the early days, and that was looking at modernising probationer training. A

Signature of witness.....

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of the witness.

number of people were involved in the delivery and the development of that work, and I don't know if that's perhaps relevant.

21. I have been referred to a design specification to the probationer training programme, dated April 2014 (PS12350). At page 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. [...]

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."

22. I have been asked what the purpose of this working group was. I'm not sure.

It's the first I've seen it or heard about it. From the footnote there, the PTOUG seems to have come to a hard stop in April 2013, perhaps with the formation of the new organisation. What I do know was there was still an appetite to

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."

DocuSigned by:

Signature of witness.....



look at the probationer training programme from end to end, so they instigated a programme called "Pathways to Policing" and there were various different leads for that. I wasn't directly involved in it, but I had knowledge of it, and they were looking at everything to do with the probationer training programme, the two-year programme, and how to modernise that and bring it up to what the organisation and what the public needed going forward. So that was probably in the 2014-16 period when I was working at the Scottish Police College.

23. The Scottish Police College was effectively an entity to itself prior to Police Scotland. It sat under the SPSA (Scottish Police Services Authority). It was an umbrella body who looked after some of the national functionality of policing. From memory, they were a standalone organisation. They weren't a police force *per se* or a police service. They were an oversight body. The SPSA oversaw the Scottish Police College and the SCDEA, the Scottish Crime and Drug Enforcement Agency, which was the precursor to Specialist Crime Division and the facility at Gartcosh. So there are 10 organisations that formed Police Scotland: eight police services and then the two central services. So the Scottish Police College sat under there. The governance route of the college was into the SPSA; not the eight police services. From memory the SPSA had a whole leadership structure above it, including a director, and a deputy director, so it was very much its own entity.

24. I have been asked whether in my training role, commencing in December 2013, I was aware of any discussions about the need to standardise OST training, whether within probationer training or recertification training? I have been specifically asked about any discussions taking place at a more senior level than Sergeant James Young (as he was at that time). I can't recall anybody specifically asking or directing me to do that. It doesn't mean that that didn't happen, to be fair, but with the passage of time I can't recall. I remember the review work that was then pushed through and pushed on by

Signature of witness.....

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of the witness.

James Young. Again, there was just so many different workstreams being progressed at the time and officer safety through the use of force structures was very much one of them, but there were many other ones as well. I can't actually recall the genesis, other than I do know that we had a range of different workstreams that were all about trying to bring commonality to delivery across Scotland. As time progressed we built a governance and decision making structure led by the Head of TLD, initially Chief Superintendent [REDACTED].

25. We were trying to do two things effectively. Put simply, we were trying to get the structures right and get, I guess, the training structures sorted so we knew how we were going to deliver it. Also equally important is getting delivery consistent across the country because we knew there were inconsistencies. We knew there were things that were getting delivered in slightly different ways, slightly longer, slightly shorter, slightly different content, so we understood that there was a real need to try and make sure the products were consistent up and down the country, because again the organisation's positioning was that the organisation will give equity of service across the country to the public. Whether you're in Orkney or you're in the Scottish Borders, you should receive the same level of service and professionalism. So we very much saw the training role as critical in ensuring that staff were adequately equipped with all the right skills and knowledge to do what they needed to do, so there was variances in different products across what we did.

26. In terms of standardisation with OST specifically, it was something that came up relatively quickly when I came into the role, but I can't remember when and I can't remember the genesis of how. But I think the very fact that we had a different delivery methodology and that we had part-time instructors and full-time instructors, that didn't sit well with any of us. Again, trying to create a new model across the organisation quickly would be difficult because it would

Signature of witness..... [REDACTED]

mean leaning in and creating additional staff posts. As an organisation, we're in a different place now, but back then we were just trying to organise ourselves fully. The use of force as a strategic theme sat and still sits, with the Assistant Chief Constable for Operational Support.

27. I have been referred to Police Scotland's Position Statement 8 (SBPI-00358) at para 22 which states *"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 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."* I have been asked to comment on whether it was normal for someone at a fairly low level within the organisation, in this case a Sergeant, to bring to Police Scotland's attention that there is a lack of standardisation and a risk to the organisation.

28. Firstly, I don't recognise the terminology Operational Training Unit Tasking and Coordinating Group. It would be unusual for that terminology to be used for Operational Training as traditionally the tasking and coordinating function in policing would be led by the Head of Department. As such I think it more likely that it was the LTD Tasking and Coordinating Group. The timing – November 2014 – matches with the arrival of Chief Superintendent [REDACTED] [REDACTED] taking up post a Head of LTD. [REDACTED] put this governance structure in place which somewhat mirrors what was in place in territorial policing divisions. Given that forum I would suggest that it is likely that this was brought to the forum for oversight and approval. That would not just be James Young, but his line managers who would speak to that.

Signature of witness.....

[REDACTED]

29. That said, James is a line manager with specialist knowledge and subject expertise and, as such, I would expect him to identify issues and escalate the need for work to be undertaken. The nature of my role is such that I would not routinely see or scrutinise the delivery of the product up and down the country, whereas in the role that James Young was in, he had the hands-on responsibility for it. So he would see the delivery. He would hear about it. He would get feedback from the instructors. He would get feedback from the students as well. Therefore, he would gather all of that information and then report that in through the chain of command. My experience of OST would be what's reported into our meeting structures about how it's been delivered, how effective it is, what compliance looks like and any risks associated with it, but it would also be my own personal experience of undertaking OST training. That would be my suggestion as to why James would be in a position to identify that because he would be so close to the detail. He would see it and raise issues worthy of exploration, and that happens to this day in various different business areas.

30. I have been asked whether I recall being at a meeting in which the decision to authorise James Young's review of OST was made. I may well have chaired a meeting of that kind, but as advised, not under the name "Operational Training Unit Tasking and Coordinating Group". I would suggest that it was probably the LTD Tasking and Coordinating meeting chaired by [REDACTED]. To be clear, James Young wouldn't just go ahead and do that kind of review. He would need authority from me, or the Head of LTD and/or ACC [REDACTED] to do it, and it's not that we would say, "You cannot do this," but James would absolutely seek authority to do it because obviously that's a time intensive, resource intensive piece of work which would take him away from his day job *per se* of delivering and supporting his staff. The escalation would allow progress to be tracked and additional resourcing to be considered.

Signature of witness.....

[REDACTED]

31. I have been asked whether tasking and coordinating group meetings would normally be minuted. Yes. Usually, there's also an action / decision log. The Use of Force Monitoring Group, as an example, always has minutes taken because of the nature of the content and the criticality of the decision making. In some of our meetings details of the discussions can be seen as less important, but actual decisions and actions are always recorded. Some meetings are just decision logs and action logs, but I'd be really surprised if we didn't have access to them. It's just a matter of what the relevant meeting was. My best guess is it's the LTD Tasking and Coordinating Group, but it could be the Use of Force Monitoring Group.

32. The interim head model that I described earlier I had concerns about, and I reported those concerns into the executive via my line management. Allied to that, there was a piece of work done to review the college, the Scottish Police College specifically, and consider its form and functionality and what the leadership of that looked like, because I think a five heads of department model is not a desirable approach to support clear decision-making, accountability and responsibility. So there was a decision taken by the organisation to put one Head of Leadership, Training and Development in place. Based on the review of the college, the organisation opted to put a Chief Superintendent in place as Head of LTD, a visible uniformed police officer in charge of the entire function. That post still exists to this day, and I currently occupy it. So in November 2014/December 2014 [REDACTED] left the organisation. I was asked by the newly appointed Head of LTD, to step into that role of Head of Training Delivery in the tail end of 2014. There would have been a Head of LTD in place 19 November 2014. It would have been Chief Superintendent [REDACTED], who's since retired. He was the first uniformed police officer Head of LTD at that point in time, as appointed by the Executive team. It took a while, through the end of 2014 and into early 2015, to get the strategic structures of LTD in place, and operating in a more organised and efficient manner.

Signature of witness..... [REDACTED]

Internal process for review of OST training – Pre-May 2015

33. I have been asked if during my time in the training role pre-May 2015, whether I was aware of any process in place for regular review of OST training – for either probationer or recertification training. Every training course that we have in the organisation should go through a quality assurance process at the design stage. This involves creating a design specification which describes what the programme aims to achieve, what the outcomes are and how it is delivered. There should be a change log for changes and a pre-determined review period. Our colleagues in Quality Assurance, who are effectively independent arbitrators, will have a timetable of inspections for programmes where they will expect the staff there to review them and will then inspect them for quality assurance purposes. It varies depending on the type of programme, and whether it is credit rated. We're a SCQF credit rating awarding body and have been for a long time. So some of our programmes are credit rated, so they come with specific levels of scrutiny and a specific timetable for review. Every officer or staff member involved, or responsible for a programme, needs to update the change log with any amendments they make to the delivery of the programme, the content, and the rationale for why that's done. In terms of the specific question, I cannot recall the specifics of what was in place in 2015, however I would expect that the probationer programme would have been subject of such process, however I am unsure about the approach undertaken in our local training hubs.

34. I have been asked whether these quality assurance colleagues would also be reviewing the content of the programme and updating it in line with development in knowledge about safety of techniques or understanding through academic research. No, they're not subject matter experts (SMEs) in the given subjects. They may well explore what benchmarking and research has been undertaken, but they're not SMEs, for example, in operational safety training. Their role is fundamentally to examine whether the programme is

Signature of witness.....

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of the witness.

being delivered against the design specification. So the SMEs design the programme under the guidance of the quality assurance team to make sure that we're designing it as per expert practice and policy. Staff go through a formal training qualification to become a trainer or enter the function with one.

35. Essentially, the QA staff are not SMEs, but they will make sure that the rigours of the programme are being delivered as per the design. If the design specification is done properly, the design specification is the route map as to how you should be delivering the programme and you should be adhering to that. So, in terms of the actual construct of the programme, that's up to the SMEs to go away and to benchmark, look at academic research, and all these other elements of how you create a programme based on experience, knowledge, and shared learning from other organisations. One other element that our QA team leads on is evaluation. They will either oversee or conduct evaluations of programmes. That can be directed by a pre-determined schedule of evaluation, or at the request of a business area. There are different scales of evaluation dependant on what depth of analysis is required.

36. Looking at research for OST specifically, there are limitations in terms of benchmarking outside the United Kingdom because many of the police service organisations are not constructed in the way we are, apart from our English, Welsh and Northern Irish colleagues. If you look overseas, many of the services carry firearms, for example. It changes a number of the dynamics around about how you would create an OST programme where, primarily, your officers are not carrying firearms. So when you start to match it against the PSNI, for example, there are differences there because of the operating environment and because of the type of other OST implications they have got of carrying a firearm. Our staff are skilled at looking at practice around the world and across the UK to see what we can learn from other agencies and also bring in academic opinion when it's appropriate. But,

Signature of witness.....

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of the witness.

again, it depends on what they can bring to the discussion in terms of knowledge and experience.

37. I have been asked to clarify if this answer relates to 2015 and to the process for regular review of the content of the OST training. Due to the passage of time I don't know, to be honest. What would have happened is the content invariably changed based on learning and feedback. Use of force monitoring takes place across the organisation via SCOPE submission and the OSTIs study these submissions and consider changes to the programme in terms of what is taught and what is included based on what works and what doesn't work, and what our officers and staff tell us works and doesn't work. So the programme, the OST programme, has changed, probably not through a timeline per se but based on lived experience of officers and staff over many years in terms of techniques and approaches that work and don't work, and also changes in equipment.

38. There's been very much a journey of development on OST over many years based on equipment changes, and based on the lived experience of the officers and staff of what techniques and approaches work and what doesn't work. It is widely recognised that some techniques were perhaps too complicated or too difficult to remember when you're actually in a difficult, volatile and violent situation. As such the OST programme has without doubt evolved over the years

39. So what they have tried to do over the years, from my understanding of speaking to both James Young and others, and it's still the same to this day, is try where they can to simplify the techniques, to the techniques which have the greatest effectiveness and can be easily remembered by the staff, and obviously allow them to lawfully deal with the situation that they're dealing with. It wouldn't be wrong to say that in the early days of OST, back in that period of time, in the late 90s and in 2000s, my experience in Strathclyde

Signature of witness.....

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of the witness.

Police was there were a lot of the techniques that were quite complicated and difficult to remember. There was a lot of positioning techniques involved in officer safety training, as it was then called, but there's been much simplification over the years. It was a period of continuous improvement based on the feedback.

40. With every use of force, an officer must submit a Use of Force form on our SCOPE system. Officers from the OST department scrutinise that form and look for learning which may help the programme or the officer. They read every single one that comes into the organisation and still do to this day. So they can understand what force was used, what equipment was used, and how effective or otherwise it was.

41. Pre May 2015 there wasn't any Use of Force Monitoring Group. I have been asked to clarify whether the use of force reporting, such as it was at that time, would have been reviewed. I understand from Position Statement 9 (SBPI-00359) para 10 that use of force reporting was available on the SCOPE system since August 2014. My memory tells me one of the problems that we had was, again, the different organisations recorded use of force in different ways. So, in Strathclyde, we would have recorded it on the SCOPE system and there was a template which you would complete with date, time and everything in terms of the techniques you've used, etc. There wasn't a single instance of SCOPE right away in the organisation, and I can't recall what other legacy organisations did in terms of recording use of force. My understanding is they all did, but how they recorded and how that fed in, I can't recall. I know that once a single instance of SCOPE came about, there was an ability then to put the form onto the SCOPE system to allow the whole organisation to submit it. So I know, certainly from Strathclyde, that they reviewed every single SCOPE submission, but I would be wrong to say that I can remember what every other organisation of the other seven precursor organisations did in the early days of Police Scotland.

Signature of witness.....

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of the witness.

42. That was obviously a learning process as well because the use of force form was upgraded as the years went on and we realised that there was more that could be gleaned from that, and that actually it didn't include vital details that we should know about. So, if I give an example, spit hoods. Spit hoods didn't feature in the early days of use of force. So, if we deployed a spit hood onto someone, then there was no means in that form to record that. Again, that became difficult when we were asked, for example, in FOIs or probably any sort of questions that came in from the government about your instance of the use of spit hoods. We had no real means of actually recording that, so it made it a really difficult question to answer. We've since remedied that. There's been a range of learning over the years which have helped to develop systems and thinking to make sure that we're as accurate as we possibly can be in terms of what we record relative to the use of force.

43. I have been referred to the National Officer Training Review report (PS11533) pages 4 and 5. This summarises the background leading to the formation of a national OST review project in 2008 which was that: *"a disparity in the way that OST was being delivered across the different legacy forces was identified, and as a result concerns were raised by the Scottish Police Federation at the ACPOS General Interest Committee."* This led to the introduction of the national programme in 2010. The National Officer Training Review report continues at page 5:

"Since the introduction of the National Programme, there have been a number of practitioner/development group meetings. These consisted of a Representative from each Legacy Force, usually at Constable or Sergeant Level. Although these meetings were minuted and decisions made, there appeared to be no clear lines of communication and many practitioners were and are unaware of what was agreed. Many members of these groups have since moved on and much of what was agreed was never implemented by the respective Legacy Forces."

Signature of witness.....

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of the witness.

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.”

44. It has been suggested to me that this suggests that there is a history of disparity of OST training over a number of years. Consequently, I have been asked whether this disparity of training across the former legacy forces was something that would have been or should have been well known in Police Scotland. I think it's a wider answer than just training. What is described here is some of the challenges of the previous arrangements of ACPOS. There's no secret to the fact that it could be difficult at times to get the ACPOS constituent organisations to agree on key issues and decisions. The organisations all had a Chief Constable, and a command team who very much saw themselves, and probably rightly so, as the decision-makers for their own organisation because they all had responsibilities to their own individual policing boards and communities. So they took decisions which affected them and they thought were in the best interests of their organisation. To answer the question against that background, yes I think it was apparent in coming together as a training function that there were a number of products, which were delivered in different ways, with different content, with different length, using different delivery methods – across a number of different subject areas. I was not close enough to the detail to confirm that included local OST training across the legacy police services, but what I would say is that every probationary officer on their initial training at the Scottish Police College received a standardised OST product.

Signature of witness.....

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of the witness.

45. There was a range of products across a range of different kind of specialisms where we had to make sure that we were delivering in a common way, so as to ensure we were providing consistency. Was it known specifically as regards OST? I can't recall the detail of it being known. It likely would have been amongst a range of products we were having to standardise and get comfort that we were delivering in the right way with the right content, and that was right for the organisation, while also restructuring at the same time.

46. I have been asked if there was a need for standardisation across a number of products, whether it was a case for the management within Police Scotland to prioritise which of those should be dealt with first and in what order. I can't remember an order being set for all different our products, however I would have thought each business area lead would have considered to address that based on the feedback from the relevant Police Scotland business area. I can't remember how many products that we inherited in total , but it was probably well into in three figures.. Every constituent organisation created courses and development events for their own needs, with their own titles. So we had a huge deconfliction process to tackle. Taking Public Protection and Sexual Offences Liaison Officer training course as a key example: it was delivered up and down the country in different ways, with varied content. It's a critical role as you are dealing with people in a time of crisis and real challenge, and you're trying to do the very best to take forward an investigation and support somebody who's been through a very traumatic experience. Essentially, there were a range of products that needed absolute prioritisation in terms of standardisation and benchmarking, and OST was a key product amongst other key products.

47. I have been referred to the National Officer Training Review report (PS11533) at page 23: *"It is strongly felt that OST is given a low priority, not only by many senior officers but by divisional officers also."* I've also been referred to Inspector Young's supplementary statement (SBPI-00362) at paragraph 19:

Signature of witness.....



which quotes the part of his report outlined above and then *states* “*I have been asked how I became aware of this. It was partly through response to the questionnaires. It was also something that was heard during the focus groups through speaking to officers and also through my own experience and working operationally at divisions. I would go as far as to say for most police officers that there’s a strong dislike of OST. It was known as, at that time, ‘the worst day of the year’ in relation to your OST day.*”

48. I have been asked if that was something I was aware of when I worked in training pre-May 2015. No. I certainly don’t recognise that narrative. I do know that for many officers it’s the only day of physical training or face to face training officers would receive in a year. It depends on your role clearly, but for most officers in a response or in a community policing type role that is **likely**. Obviously, I can’t really comment on James’ perceptions or experience. I would dispute that it was given a low priority by senior officers in my time in LTD and I would ask for specific examples to provide comment on. I recall James spending time with both myself and ACC Higgins in terms of the OST review work so I am somewhat surprised by his comments, but perhaps it has a different focus.

49. Inspector Young continues at paragraph 20 in that same supplementary statement: “*I tried to peel back the reasons for that as part of my research for the report. From focus groups and speaking to officers, one of the reasons for this was that many officers, if they had been in the police for say 15 years, they’d been turning up and doing the exact same thing for 15 years. They didn’t see it as operationally relevant to their role because we were asking them to do techniques that were very difficult and that officers weren’t using in practice.*”

50. I wholeheartedly agree with that. This reflects my comments earlier in this statement about the complexity of some of the techniques taught in OST. I’m

Signature of witness.....

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of the witness.

not an OST instructor, but as a recipient of the training over the years it was, at times, overly complicated in the early years and lots of it you wouldn't remember. I think it was a thirst to try and give you as many techniques and tactics as you could use. But, by doing so, I think what we lost is the ability to remember a small number of effective simple techniques. Fast forward to recent years when I've completed OST, it's very much now more about simpler techniques which are far easier, far more like muscle memory, to remember and recall. There were some techniques, without getting into the detail of it all, where you had to stand in a certain way, you had to create certain positions and do this, that and the next thing to achieve success. For some, it became difficult to memorise those and, particularly when you're in a time of stress, to do it properly, and again to get the effect that you're trying to achieve, but I can understand why people would say that. I think that sounds reasonable in historical terms, however again I would like to underscore the significant development that has taken place in recent years to examine the programme and learn from operational incidents and ensure the product constantly evolves.

51. The other point I'd make about suggestion that OST was a low priority or strongly disliked, is that this may be due to attendees who dislike role playing. That came up as a thread I'd heard about, and experienced, when we introduced this approach at one point. I think it's now far, far different, but there was role playing introduced at OST training, which some people don't engage well with in my experience. It depends on the period of time that James' referring to and when he undertook the research. I wonder if it correlated with those types of elements of the programme. Also, if there is an element of repetition to it, you could also understand that too - if I'm going to come and not learn anything new. I know it's significantly different now because they adjust the programme continually based on the feedback and the experiences of what we learn operationally. I can't comment about the timing of that. It depends when James took that view, but it might play into

Signature of witness.....

A black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of the witness.

how the programme was delivered at that particular time and how it made people feel. It feels like that could be relevant.

52. Additionally, we should bear in mind it's a "must attend" course as well. Most courses in the police, people tend to want to go on them; they volunteer or make a request to be selected, whether it's a firearms course or a high-speed driving course. This one is mandatory and so must be attended whether the individual wants to or not. So perhaps there's a bit of psychology in there. It is also a course where you probably do not know the other participants, which may play a part in their engagement levels.

53. I have been referred to Police Scotland's 11th position statement (SBPI-00355) at paragraph 10: *"As a result of his review of the OST programme and his research in 2014/2015, Inspector Young considered that changes were required to the national OST programme and that the guidance in the OST programme and OST manual was outdated, inadequate and needed to be revised. This was particularly in respect of (i) de-escalation strategies/ tactics and conflict management, (ii) mental health issues, (iii) ABD and (iv) dealing with subjects with disabilities."* I have been asked, in terms of my own knowledge of the programme at that time, whether this was that something that I was aware of or whether my understanding of that came following the review. It would be the latter. Again, going back, I'm not an OST instructor or an SME, so my position at that time, as a senior officer in the training function, was to make sure there was sufficient governance, oversight and it was appropriately staffed. I wouldn't be knowledgeable enough to know whether something's the best tactic or if there was a better tactic. My own experiences tend to be grown from my own requalifications, and I'm conscious that was and am very much removed from frontline policing. At that time, I would go out occasionally in operational roles. But from my own experience of OST training, there definitely was techniques that I warmed to

Signature of witness.....

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of the witness.

more than others, but I'm not qualified to say as to what the right techniques are. To this day I wouldn't either.

54. I have been asked whether it is correct to say, that in my training role pre May 2015 and at the present date that I am reliant on those below me that have that expert knowledge of their training area to guide and inform me and my role. Yes, that is correct as at pre-May 2015 and now. Inspector David Bradley is effectively performing the role in relation to OST training as did James Young in the period pre-May 2015. So I rely upon David Bradley through his line managers because there's a number of layers of management between David and I. David and his staff are SMEs. The SMEs go away and do research, speak to others, benchmark, take advice and provide rationale for change. To give an example, I was with David a couple of weeks ago and I chair the Use of Force Monitoring Group now. But he showed me, through Use of Force Monitoring Group related data, that we have become aware that baton strikes are seemingly less effective than we'd want them to be. So through evidence and through feedback from officers, David is examining all elements of baton strikes, as if we're going to use a baton, it needs to be effective.

55. Essentially, I rely upon David for his expertise, and his team. There are many different subjects that sit under my remit, I couldn't possibly know the content details of them all. For example, I'm responsible for the delivery of all driver training. However, I'm not an advanced driver. I couldn't assess somebody as to whether they're capable and should pass or fail an advanced driving course, but I rely upon SMEs within driving training to do that. In terms of answering questions about the detail of what officers are taught in relation to first aid, and details of probationer training and the OST programme, those are really questions for the SMEs, which for OST is David Bradley. I have a general overview of these products.

Signature of witness.....

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of the witness.

56. I do get generalised feedback, which will come in from senior officers, which helps me give feedback to the individuals responsible for the content of the programmes. It also ensures I am fully aware of how our products are received and if there is a need for a review or adjustment, or indeed praise.

57. A recent example of this was an email I received from a senior clinician in the NHS who spoke about the actions of two officers. From memory it was two officers in Q Division, which is Lanarkshire, who had used advanced life-saving skills that they'd learned on the OST programme and used the kit that we've recently invested in. We have invested heavily in the kit, in terms of tourniquets and other key first aid products. The clinician commented that their actions had without doubt saved two people's lives; this led the clinician to say that if those officers had not had that training and that kit, those people would have died in the street.

Use of Force Monitoring Group

58. I have been asked about my role with the Use of Force Monitoring Group. I am currently the chair of that group and chair it in tandem with the Head of OSD Specialist Services. We report in to the ACC, Operational Support Division. I've only just taken this role on in the last 3 to 4 months. I've chaired one meeting which took place on 2 August 2023. Superintendent Chris Stewart was the chair immediately prior to me taking it over. Historically, the Use of Force Monitoring Group sat with the ACC Operational Support, specifically, as I recall, ACC [REDACTED]. I would go to that group as a member in the various roles that I was in, either as Head of Training Delivery or as Head of TLD. I can't remember which one - probably Head of Training Delivery - and I would go there, invariably, with colleagues from OST to discuss OST, including James Young.

59. My experience of the Use of Force Monitoring Group is mostly as an attendee and to discuss OST. My understanding is that the chair – I think at some

Signature of witness.....

[REDACTED]

point in the past – transferred from the ACC to Chief Superintendent level within OSD, and it's obviously at some point moved to Chris Stewart, as a Superintendent.

60. I think there is a shared belief it needs to sit at a minimum of Chief Superintendent level, if not at ACC level. So I said I was happy to chair it and take it forward. We had one meeting just three/four weeks ago, which I chaired, alongside [REDACTED], who is a Chief Superintendent in Operational Support Division. Her remit includes Public Order, Firearms and Taser. So, between us, I chaired it and she sat alongside me as the vice chair. [REDACTED] briefs the ACC Operational Support accordingly through their governance structure.

61. I've been referred to Position Statement 11 (SBPI-00355) at paragraph 54(d): *"In May 2016, a Use of Force Monitoring Group ('UoFMG') was set up. Significant changes to the OST programme following Inspector Young's national OST review, including the subsequent reform of the OST programme and the introduction of the new OST Manual in December 2016 (including the addition of new guidance and training on ABD, mental health crisis, de-escalation and conflict management), were presented to the UoFMG. The UoFMG comprises members from across key business areas and includes staff associations, staff unions, PPCW and PSD."* I have been asked which representatives would attend these meeting. We would ask the Scottish Police Federation to attend, and also the Trade Unions – so Unison and Unite, typically. We also invite representatives of local policing, East, West and North; a representative from Health and Safety within Police Scotland; the Association of Scottish Police Superintendents (ASPS) - that's the body who represents Superintendents and Chief Superintendents. You would have the Professional Standards Department (PSD). Professional Standards would speak to information that they've come across within investigations or trends that they're seeing that are relevant to use of force. You've got custody and

Signature of witness.....

[REDACTED]

criminal justice - CJSD. Also, PPCW, which is our partnerships and preventions portfolio. Finally, analytical colleagues who help us interpret the use of force data and a range of staff from my own business area, such as David Bradley etc. and [REDACTED] that I mentioned, Head of Specialist Services in OSD.

62. Paragraph 54(d) of that position statement goes on to state that *“The stated purpose of the UoFMG is (i) to provide a means to monitor to what extent and how effectively use of force is employed within Police Scotland and (ii) to monitor the overall direction and management of operational safety within Police Scotland. The UoFMG is responsible for the interrogation and review of recorded use of force to identify national and regional trends and to direct appropriate action.”* I have been asked by what means the UoFMG monitors the extent and effectiveness of the use of force. We have analytical colleagues who help us interpret the use of force data. They look to identify trends and suggest areas worthy of further exploration. We then discuss issues identified and I consider the need to task further analysis and investigation. Such are the good relationships, that much of that work is pre-empted before we meet and brought to the table with clear thought and preparation.

63. There are certain trends that we see that repeat themselves, such as assaults on officers in police vehicles, particularly when you put people in and take people out of cell vehicles. Also, in custody settings, such as the back charge bar area and cell areas, as well as more traditional areas where you’ll see violence such as in the public domain. So, we’re using analytical products, dashboards and the like, looking for specific geographical challenges as to where things are happening consistently so that we can then target interventions as to how best we train and or equip our officers, or change the environment.

Signature of witness.....

[REDACTED]

64. Using the cell vehicle as an example, David Bradley is currently exploring how we use a cell vehicle in OST. Currently, they use gym halls and that type of thing to simulate training in this scenario, but what we're going to do is to start to try and bring the training to life in the environment where we're seeing violence spiking and the need for officers to consider using force. The approach being to try ensure officers are best equipped to deescalate the situation and if they have to resort to the use of force, they can use effective techniques which they have practised in a relevant environment which minimises the risk to them and maximises the safety of the subject. So, it's trying to use evidence based on the dashboards and the interpretation from analytical colleagues to try and work out what the trends are and where the opportunities may lie to improve what it is we do. It's also the cleaning house for changes to the programme. If there's changes to the programme, all the different techniques that are included in the programme. If there's something that needs to get added in or taken out, it comes to that group for discussion, debate and decision. Invariably, David, as he did in the last meeting, will explain techniques where they are either proven to be hardly used, ineffective, or no longer appropriate, and a rationale would be provided as to why they should come out and what it would either be replaced with or, if there's nothing, why they won't be replaced.

65. They will also bring forward new techniques where we've identified a technique through research or benchmarking, whereby a new technique should be inserted into the programme and the rationale for that goes in. Again, they would discuss it and a decision taken as to whether we ratify that or we don't, or if we want more work done on it. So, that's a key purpose of the group - to walk through those worked, real life trends and examples and make changes and authorise changes to the programme, to ultimately to improve the product at the other end.

Signature of witness.....

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of the witness.

66. I have been asked whether the use of force reporting includes reporting on injuries to officers and injuries to subjects. It doesn't go into the microscopic detail of all that. It will just talk generally about trends, but it will report on officer and subject injuries. However, it doesn't identify individuals. There are other forums where we focus on that too. There is the Your Safety Matters Group which is led at Deputy Chief Constable level. That group focuses in on everything to do with safety, which includes use of force matters but includes health and safety in its broadest sense, but a large part of that is a focus on the safety of officers and staff in the operating environment. So, there is an overlap between the two groups, but I would suggest it's a healthy overlap because it means that we're doubling down and focusing on people's well-being at work but also the well-being of the population that we provide a service to as well.

67. Some other elements of the group will be looking at equipment. Again, scrutinising challenges with equipment which maybe need to be escalated. We will hear from David Bradley and others about items of equipment where we're seeing there's an effectiveness issue, for example. We'll then task David or whoever's the most appropriate individual to go away and research what the options are to take that issue forward in terms of improvement, which is what David's doing with batons at the moment. So we will instigate work and direct any further remedial action or reports that need to be done to address issues that are coming to light.

68. I have been asked, if the statistics that we are reviewing at the UoFMG reflect a concerning trend of injury, for example, how then do we drill down into the detail of that. It's difficult to explain this for the purposes of a statement without having the documentation in front of me. However, effectively our colleagues in the analytical world will present to us, and they'll do the drilling down for us. We have talented members of analytical staff who assist in drilling down into those trends and pinpointing the key elements we need to

Signature of witness.....

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of the witness.

consider. We also use our own professional knowledge and judgement in policing to add to the analysis. Should we identify a notable trend, we will look to put measures and mitigations in place to tackle it. We will then keep the issue under review.

69. For example, it could be the time of year. It could be the day of the week. It could be the weather conditions. So, again, police officers are not analysts, but we have analysts who will dig down and give us the information we need to then examine it to try and work out what the contributing factors are to the spike that we see. Is it the day of the week? Is it the weather? Is it the equipment we've used in this particular scenario, or is it something we can't avoid or something we can't mitigate against? It's invariably about the analysts giving us the information, telling us to ask the question, then we'll probe into it. So, we will do that ourselves, but very much aided and abetted by, in this case, our analyst, who gives us that analytical deep dive which, is crucial.

70. There's some obvious things. For example, you may have a trend of assaults on officers on a Saturday night in Glasgow city centre, so there are certain things that are predictable to everybody in the room. You don't need an analyst to tell you that more officers will be assaulted on a Saturday night in Glasgow city centre than there will be on a Sunday morning at eight o'clock. Other things you see are unexpected; it is a trend or challenge which has not been anticipated. Whichever it is, we have a duty to try and mitigate that and drive that down as best we can. So we ask ourselves how do we make the environment even safer for everybody? And that's our real focus. It's for everybody; it's not just for the officers or staff.

71. In terms of the UoFMG monitoring the overall direction and management of operational safety training within Police Scotland, this is covered somewhat by my previous answers. It's a meeting in which we have all the key people

Signature of witness.....

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of the witness.

around the table to instruct whatever needs to be done in their particular bit of the business. So, as long as we're represented by the key areas of business where use of force is a matter under scrutiny all the time, I think we are well covered. Part of that is to have those discussions, come up with those findings, broadcast the findings and the learning and then make sure it's implemented in terms of the different bits of the business because when you're dealing with a big organisation with lots of moving parts, it's important you get that consistency of message out. This is achieved through the people in the group and using our Intranet and other mediums in the organisation to make sure things are well known, such as a specific operational safety issues which need to be known across the organisation.

72. Paragraph 54(d) of that position statement outlines the UoFMG's terms of reference, one of which is *"To receive reports of officer assaults, identifying trends and, where appropriate, recommend improvements in procedure and training."* I have been asked whether that information comes only through the use of force reporting, or whether there are other sources of information that would be considered, for example a report from PIRC or a determination from an relevant FAI. Yes. They will take recommendations as a group from PIRC, HMICS and the like, regarding specific investigations, or a public inquiry or FAI. Although, I can't recall off the top of my head specifically how often we do that, but I've definitely seen reporting coming from, predominantly, PIRC from my memory of things. There are other scrutiny bodies that can feed into that as well.

73. I have been asked about another of the terms of reference of the group: *"to ensure that the national OST programme is being delivered effectively as per national guidelines."* I have been asked how the group does this. It goes back to reviewing the programme, and that's done by the subject matter experts, led by David Bradley, etc., and taking in those elements of feedback, continuous improvement and the like. So, that's presented to the group by

Signature of witness.....

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of the witness.

David Bradley and his colleagues. They give us an update regarding where we're at with OST training and where improvements need to be made, where feedback's being played in and, obviously, that comes back to that document set that I referred to earlier on where we talk about changes to the programme based on feedback and based on experience and based on analytics.

74. I have been asked what the source of information is of the feedback from OST training staff - where would they get that information from whether its feedback forms at the end of probationer or recertification training for example. So our staff will collect feedback from a number of sources including feedback forms sent to all participants, discussions with participants and formal evaluations.

75. I have been asked to explain how the content of the current programme is reviewed now and what the procedures are for this. Every course of students attending an OST refresher receive a link to complete a level one evaluation survey on CitizenSpace. This survey is refreshed monthly, with each monthly report reviewed by OST Supervisors, prior to sharing with the National Operational Safety Team, to allow them to see first-hand how their training is being received by their peers.

76. Within the survey, respondents are asked how well the course met their expectations, gives opportunity to demonstrate how confident they feel in discharging specified techniques, allows students to identify content they wish to see added/removed, and also share what changes they'd like to see.

77. As explained, the quality assurance staff are not the experts in the delivery of the product, but they are there to make sure that the design specification is adhered to and the change logs have been fully adhered to as any changes to the programme need to be documented with the reasons why and when it was done.

Signature of witness.....

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of the witness.

78. For example, there's a range of recommendations that have come from the Manchester Arena terrorist attack which have a direct implication on OST. So, for example, first aid training. We've significantly overhauled both the provision of kit and the provision of face-to-face training in that space. So we've implemented that on the back of those recommendations, and we track those recommendations

79. I have been asked what those procedures state in terms of how it is done and how often. To my knowledge, it doesn't detail what you will and you won't look at. The expectation that I would have is that staff would go and look to benchmark with other like organisations because OST is such a specific subject. There are relatively few business areas that we can benchmark against it. Again, I know they have recently spent time with colleagues in England and Wales looking at what they are doing because they have been through a lot of change in terms of their OST programme and how they are delivering it and the different elements of content. So, we will look to that, and we are not wedded to what another organisation does. We endeavour, like all of our training products, as best we can, to deliver something which is unique to our organisation and works best for our staff and for our officers. There are certain things that are interoperable across the UK. OST is not one of them, albeit we work very closely with England and Wales, and we will review what they do and implement changes if needed. They'll also look at us and do exactly the same.

80. We'll also take learning from elsewhere. So, again, the OST team are particularly used to doing both desktop research but also speaking to those in other jurisdictions. For example, there's been a long-standing relationship with American police when looking at use of force, whereby we've discussed and debated ways in which they have went about use of force. The use of the term "de-escalation," seems to have come about from interaction with

Signature of witness.....

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of the witness.

American colleagues where we have maybe moved away from “tactical communication skills” to “de escalation” as a terminology.

81. You can see a lot of that research and discussion points coming across from international relationships, UK relationships, desktop research and looking at what works and what doesn't work. The American one is probably the most obvious one because it's very well documented on open source. In November 2015 there a delegation of 25 American police chiefs came to Tulliallan to examine use of force in terms of their challenges and operating environment, and it really made us open our eyes as to how we could perhaps share learning.

82. At that particular time in 2015, from memory, about a thousand people died by police firearms each year in the US. About a third of them weren't armed with a firearm. They were perhaps having some sort of mental health episode and were armed with something other than a firearm, such as a knife or baseball bat. So, American colleagues came here to consider whether there was a different approach to dealing with such circumstances which would have a better outcome for everyone.

83. There was a lot of discussion which myself, James Young, and ACC [REDACTED] [REDACTED] were involved in, in terms of showing how we go about doing what we do and how we endeavour to inject de-escalation tactics and effective communication skills into our training to try and make sure that we give the most appropriate response to somebody who is potentially violent, or is violent, but potentially isn't posing a lethal threat. So, i.e. adhering to our obligations to act because the public expect us to but also making sure that we also adhere to Article 2 and the other various articles of human rights legislation. It was a fascinating journey which was thought provoking and no doubt shaped the work that James and I and others did to try and make our OST programme as effective as it could possibly be.

Signature of witness.....

[REDACTED]

84. I have had sight of a document called Guiding Principles On Use of Force report (SBPI-00356), which is published by the Police Executive Research Forum (PERF). I have been made aware that this contains details of the American group's visit to Tulliallan in November 2015, which I have referred to earlier. Pages 99 to 101 outline PERF's takeaways from the scenario based training and discussions with Police Scotland. In relation to tactics, at page 100, it states *"Consider the nature of a threat, not just the weapon itself: Police Scotland officers are trained to look not solely at the weapon a subject may possess, but also at the threat it poses. Is the knife being swung about, and if so, is it being done offensively or defensively? (A person with a mental illness may see others as aggressors, and so he might swing his knife in a defensive manner to keep people away.) The threat posed by the weapon, and not just the presence of the weapon itself, helps determine the specific tactics that are employed."*

85. I have been asked if this reflects the thinking in the current OST programme. I believe so, because it's certainly the organisation's position. David Bradley would be the best person to comment on this. Certainly, it's my understanding that It's about assessing every individual situation on its own circumstances and merits. It depends on the nature of what it is we're dealing with. It could be somebody who we can deal with very effectively and competently without escalating things and putting assets in place which are maybe not proportionate to the circumstances. I'm aware every day that we deal with knife incidents in a way which is done through threat assessment, and it depends on the circumstances. A threat assessment is considered through that NDM, and there are occasions when we will choose to use unarmed officers to engage with a subject who has a possession of a bladed article. That happens but, equally, there are occasions when the threat assessment is such that we will deploy armed officers to try and safely resolve the situation. You're always trying to find the safest way to deal with the particular

Signature of witness.....

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of the witness.

circumstances that you find yourself in: safe for the subject, safe for the officers involved, and safe for the public in the vicinity of the incident. So these are the sorts of considerations that you're continually going through.

86. I have been asked about the Mental Health Stop Search Options paper (PS 12168). I can see that I am listed as the author/contact. There are two aspects: stop and search and mental health. I have been asked about the mental health training described in paragraphs 2.1 to 2.6. The training is not described; however, it states that:

"This training is not intended to supplement clinical knowledge and skills, rather provide a level of knowledge, awareness and confidence appropriate to our role.

This training need has been highlighted through internal reviews, PIRC, the National Strategy for the Prevention of Suicide and Police Scotland National Policing Priority for Protecting People at Risk of Harm.

The senior leadership board approved the delivery of bespoke mental health training intervention in October 2014. Due to the significant impact i6 and the Criminal Justice (Scotland) Act training would have introduced to the organisation, the decision to postpone the delivery of Mental Health training was taken.

As the delivery of any training associated with i6 in the short term is unlikely, coupled with the significant progress in delivering the CJ(S)A, this training can now be reprioritised."

87. I have been asked if I can recall the name of the training or the content of the package. I can't remember. While this document has my name on it, it doesn't read like anything I've ever written, so I believe that somebody, has written this and put my name upon it as the contact; that happens and is fine – but I can't remember the package and I likely wouldn't have been aware of the content of the package, again at Superintendent level, it's unlikely I would be.

Signature of witness.....

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area of the witness.

I wouldn't get into the nuts and bolts of that. If I was going to present on this, as I may have done, I would bring a practitioner with me to describe it.

88. Paragraphs 3.1 to 33 outline the various options open to Police Scotland for training delivery. I have been asked if I have any recollection as to what happened with this training. I don't recall. The paper talks about i6. When we came together on day one of Police Scotland, all the existing ICT systems in each legacy area were in place. So if you reported a crime in Aberdeen, it would be a completely different crime recording system to that in Glasgow. The systems also didn't talk to each other. You couldn't, in Aberdeen, look at what was happening in terms of crime in Glasgow. You couldn't link anything, and that was across a range of different systems. i6 was proposed to be the technological solution to all of that and from memory, it was a £60 million IT project to, effectively, put in a single crime recording system in place for Police Scotland, as well as other components. Unfortunately, it was not delivered. The company who were behind it, could not build the system that we expected or specified, and it got to a point where both parties walked away from the project. The relevance of this, from a training perspective, was I was asked to deliver i6 training, which was, I think, three days for every individual in the organisation. So, 23,000 times three days. That is clearly a huge delivery. I had to do it in a really short period of time and, basically, I remember presenting to the force executive up to and including Sir Stephen House, the Chief Constable, in terms of the challenges and options to achieve this.

89. I have been asked whether, in my current role as Head of Learning, Training and Development whether I am in charge of probationer training. Ultimately, yes, I am. I have been asked about my knowledge of the content of the probationer training programme. It's a significant programme. It's 12 weeks of intensive training with a wide range of content and practical application, including knowledge checks and exams.

Signature of witness.....

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of the witness.

Lessons Learned Process

90. I have been asked if I am aware of any lessons learned process within Police Scotland following the death of Sheku Bayoh and how was this prompted. From my personal perspective, I've been fortunate enough to hear about the progress and initial reflections of the Inquiry. I can only speak for my own business area, but I've sat in numerous meetings now where we've talked through certain things that happened and it's made me think about key areas of our training. For example, there was a discussion about delivering death messages, and it made me really reflect upon, "How do we do that?" because I didn't know. I sat there in a room thinking, "Are we doing it properly? How better could we do it?". I am also aware that there is a formal group in place which looks at learning from the Inquiry and one of my colleagues sits on that group to bring the learning back into our business, and ultimately the programmes we deliver. I am happy that we are fully engaged through our internal structures to gather lessons relevant to our training and examine our approach, introducing change wherever needed.
91. To answer the question, yes, from a personal perspective, much of what I've heard has made me reflect a lot, not necessarily because I think always that we've done something badly or wrong, but just could we do it better. My staff are focussed on continuous improvement in all that they do, and that's probably the two words I use most often in my management meetings. There are clearly lessons that we can and should learn from the material presented in the Public Inquiry.
92. On a related point, and not related to the Inquiry, but there's an ongoing review of probationer training, but it's not just about delivery of the content. It's about the staff that we have delivering it; it's about the environment we do it in; it's about the signs, about the symbols; about the techniques that we use

Signature of witness.....

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of the witness.

and employ; it's about some of the things that we hold dear and perhaps need thought and reflection on. So, what the Inquiry has made me do is start to reflect on all these different things – some directly and some indirectly – to think about continuous improvement. So, that would be my view on it.

93. I have been asked about the learning from Sheku Bayoh's death as an organisation. I believe this is taking place in a number of forums, but for me personally within the PRG. I can only speak about that forum because I sit in it, so there's lots of learning coming out of that forum, lots of helpful, useful and insightful discussion, which I'm then able to reflect upon and take back into our environment. I'm not a fan of waiting to be told to do something late in the day. I would rather be directing improvements and change now because it helps people now. Nobody wants the improvement to be made in a year's time. So, there may well be other forums, there may be other opportunities that I'm not aware of, but certainly the forums that I am part of, that's the way that I approach it.

94. I have been asked, in the event of a tragedy of some kind, for example, a death in custody or a death following police contact, whether some kind of lessons learned process normally follows from that and if so, what triggers it. There can be a number of different triggers. It could be PIRC or HMICS. It could come from the Crown Office and Procurator Fiscal Service. There's not many, if any, tragedies that don't have a learning implication. Most of them, in some shape or form, have a learning and development angle to it. If you take the Manchester Arena Inquiry, which I have mentioned, there's lots of material in there that we that we need to reflect on and act upon as an organisation.

95. A percentage of its learning and development, not all of it, but there's a strong percentage of it. So, there's different routes in, and then we, invariably, as an organisation, sit and pull together a short-life working group of key stakeholders who will look at and ask "What is it this is telling us? What is it

Signature of witness.....

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of the witness.

we need to do, and how are we going to achieve what it is, and how do we measure the impact and success of it, or otherwise, and what's the timeline for delivery?" So, there's various different groups that I sit on right now which encompass learning from a range of matters that have happened, such as incidents, events, etc.

Miscellaneous

96. I have been asked about Police Scotland's lead medical advisor for the OST programme and how that lead medical advisor used? I don't have any dealings directly with Dr Stevenson. I'm aware of his existence because when I was in role in the 2015/16 period, we were having to engage his services to look at our programming. However, I've had no interaction with him. I'm aware that we currently employ his services and I'm aware he was consulted with, but the extent of the consultation with him on OST materials or the programme as a whole, I can't really comment on.

97. I have had sight of a chain of emails dated 6 May 2015 between officers from Police Scotland (PS03246). I can see the first email is from [REDACTED] to Alan Seath at 08:48 stating *"Sgt James Young has asked me to email yourself with this request. I'm not sure if Nicole is back at work yet but I would be obliged if a Use of Force form and a CS/PAVA discharge form could be submitted."* I understand that Nicole Short was one of the officers that was involved in incident involving Sheku Bayoh. Thereafter the email is forwarded to Nicola Shepherd, and thereafter to Mike Stevens. The final email in the chain is from Superintendent Andrew Edmonston who states *"Supt Alan Gibson is going to deal with this and hopefully ensure there is no ongoing expectation on us to complete a PIRC notification in this instance given the circumstances and PIRC involvement."* I have been asked if I have any memory of a discussion regarding the use of force or CS/PAVA discharge forms. I don't. I can see that I haven't been copied into any of the emails in

Signature of witness.....

[REDACTED]

this chain. However, I can't recall any detail to allow me to comment any further.

98. 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..... November 2, 2023 | 4:10 PM GMT

Signature of witness..... 