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The Armed Forces are committed to a programme of continuous improvement in the way they train recruits and trainees. An essential element of this process is a requirement to strive for the highest standards of duty of care, consistent with the need to provide Service personnel who are tough enough to do a very demanding job.

The Ministry of Defence monitors performance in this area in a number of ways internally. However, there is value in external assurance: not only does this provide a different perspective, bringing with it the opportunity to consider best practice from outside the Ministry of Defence, but it also provides the public with confidence that their Armed Forces are:

- improving the training environment
- improving support to the individual
- reducing the risk to the recruit or trainee.

To this end, the Ministry of Defence has commissioned Ofsted to produce an annual report on the way in which initial training is conducted. This is the first of such reports and it focuses on assessing the provision of welfare and duty of care from recruitment to the point at which a trainee joins the trained strength. The report’s key strength is that it is independent. It is based on what the Ofsted inspectors saw and the evidence they gathered during a 15 month period of unit inspections. Ofsted has reported against three broad criteria and this year’s report concludes that the overall effectiveness of the welfare and duty of care provision is satisfactory or above in all establishments visited. Our capacity to improve is also judged to be satisfactory or higher in all establishments visited. The third category, self-assessment, is a relatively new concept for much of the Armed Forces and, whilst some establishments are assessed to be doing well and the vast majority are heading in the right direction, this category requires more attention than the others.

The report is largely positive and shows progress across a wide range of issues, but it is clear that there is still room for improvement in many areas. In addition, we should not be surprised that the pressures of conducting challenging and sustained operations at a level of intensity and commitment that we have not seen for some time are manifest in some of our training establishments. We must not be complacent; we must continue to improve and we remain committed to doing so. The Ofsted recommendations, together with the recommendations of our internal audits, will be fed into our forward action plan for this year, which has a particular emphasis on self-assessment within the overall continuous improvement programme.

I am grateful to Her Majesty’s Chief Inspector for this report. It makes a significant contribution to ensuring that recruits and trainees are treated fairly and supported effectively whilst being trained to operate in challenging and hostile circumstances.

Bill Rammell
The Rt Hon Bill Rammell MP
Minister of State for the Armed Forces
Preface

I am pleased to introduce this first Ofsted report on the Armed Forces’ exercise of their duty of care for recruits and trainees in training. The focus of this inspection on the experiences of recruits and trainees at critical stages in their career development is central to Ofsted’s purpose of raising standards, improving lives.

This is the third public report in a series undertaken by external inspectorates, and follows two reports by the Adult Learning Inspectorate.1

The earlier inspection reports focused on welfare and duty of care, with some references to recruitment practice. The first report highlighted that training and the duty of care were not sufficiently well managed. The second report noted significant improvements but it cautioned that there was still more to be done.

In this inspection, Ofsted was commissioned to report on the extent to which progress had been made against previous findings and recommendations. It was also asked to identify the actions needed to make further improvements to the care and support experienced by recruits and trainees and to strengthen the Armed Forces’ own arrangements for self-assessment and quality improvement.

Parents and carers reading this report will want to know if the Armed Forces’ arrangements for the welfare and care of their young people are what they should be. They will understand that no welfare system can provide an absolute guarantee that accidents and incidents will not occur, but they have a right to know that all reasonable and appropriate steps are being taken to avoid them.

I am able to confirm that our overall judgement is that satisfactory progress has been made. This judgement reflects the fact that there are aspects which are judged good, aspects which are at least of a standard we would expect, and a number of areas for improvement.

This report highlights the effectiveness of arrangements for the welfare and duty of care that are available to all recruits and trainees, 24 hours a day, seven days a week. Inspectors found a strong commitment from the majority of training personnel to provide recruits and trainees with a fair and challenging programme, while also taking due account of individual circumstances that might affect the health, well-being or progress of the individual. Most recruits reported that they felt safe and well-supported, and in the majority of establishments inspected, the welfare and duty of care arrangements were good and integral to the training process.

But there are also areas for improvement; these relate to the overall pace and sustainability of improvements, and the application of consistent practices across all services and establishments. A few concerns identified in this report echo some of the findings in the two previous inspections. In particular, there has been a lack of progress in improving recruiting practice. In some cases, this lack of improvement

---

1 Safer training, Adult Learning Inspectorate, 2005.
Better training, Adult Learning Inspectorate, 2007.
is due to a systemic failure at training headquarters level to recognise and address particular issues, or provide clear guidance to units. In other cases it is due to variations in the effective implementation of policy or practice at individual establishment level.

Each service has room for improvement in some key areas. However, inspectors identified more concerns relating to the Army’s recruitment and training provision than in the other services. This also reflects the balance of findings in previous reports. The Army constitutes nearly 60% of the UK’s total regular military services; however, its scale does not preclude successful organisation-wide improvement. The Army has made improvements across the board, but is making uncertain progress in particular aspects, such as self-assessment, which is the cornerstone of improvement and development.

Taken together, the findings in this report provide the Armed Forces with a clear agenda for action. Subsequent actions should be monitored by the Director Training and Education, paying particular attention to the way in which establishments develop their proficiency in the use of self-assessment as a route towards real and lasting quality improvement.

Finally, I should like to record Ofsted’s appreciation of the cooperative approach of staff in the Ministry of Defence and of those from across the Armed Forces during the course of our inspection. This has enabled us to gain at first hand the perspectives of recruits, trainees and instructors which have helped to inform our judgements and recommendations for improvement.

Christine Gilbert
Her Majesty’s Chief Inspector of Education, Children’s Services and Skills

---

1 Formerly Director General Training and Education – a post within the Ministry of Defence with responsibility for setting Defence policy for individual training and education
Key findings and recommendations

- Of the 12 training establishments inspected in 2008–09, 10 had good arrangements and two had satisfactory arrangements for the core elements of welfare and duty of care during training which were integral to, and supported, the training process.3

- Most recruits and trainees interviewed during inspections felt safe, secure and well-supported while in training. The immediate chain of command is used by most recruits as their first option for support.

- The range of welfare and duty of care support options available to recruits and trainees is extensive, effective and well-organised in almost all establishments.

- Recruit and trainee ‘at risk’ registers have been developed and used well in all training establishments to form a comprehensive record of recruits’ and trainees’ personal and professional issues. However, there is no service-wide agreement about the levels of confidentiality that should be adhered to when using the record.

- Procedures for selecting potential training instructors with the aptitude, attitude and expertise for the role are, in most cases, much improved.

- The programme to develop Army instructors’ professional training practice is effective, but instructors are not always able to complete the programme before they arrive at their training establishment.

- The Army’s progress in getting all relevant staff Criminal Records Bureau checked is too slow.

- Instructors’ workload at all phase 1 Army training establishments inspected is exceptionally high, particularly during the first six weeks of training.

- The recording and management of complaints of any incidents of bullying, harassment and discrimination have improved over time, but lack some consistency. Few recruits make formal complaints, and many are wary of some form of recrimination if they do.

- The provision of literacy, numeracy and language support during phase 1 training in the Army and Royal Air Force (RAF) is unsatisfactory. Staffing and resources are not sufficient to provide support for all who need it, concentrating only on those most in need.

- Recruit and trainee dropout rates from most Army initial training Regiments, the Royal Marines and the RAF Regiment are high - up to 45% in some cases. Recruiting and selection standards are not always being met.

- Insufficient progress has been made in improving the recruitment process. Quality management of the recruitment and selection service is unsatisfactory.

- Some Army recruiting teams focus on filling vacancies in specific trades or strive to meet broad targets irrespective of the aptitude and ability of the recruit.

- Too many applicants are being recruited to the Army who are physically unsuited, psychologically immature, and ill-prepared for Army service.

- Recruiting policy and practice are not always adhered to by recruiters dealing with overseas applicants; some key aspects of the recruitment of overseas applicants require urgent review.

- Progress towards implementing self-assessment is satisfactory overall, with substantial scope for further progress and improvement across the services.

---

3 The term ‘arrangements’ for welfare and duty of care refers to the general and immediate provision of support for recruits and trainees, specifically those practical aspects in place at the time of inspection judged sufficient to identify and support any recruits and trainees at risk. The term does not include broader aspects of operational duties or the strategic management and supervision of welfare and duty of care.
In order to establish full confidence in the duty of care arrangements, the Armed Forces need to ensure that:

- improvements are sustained following each handover of command to ensure continuity and consistency of good practice at every training establishment
- the backlog of Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) checks for relevant Army personnel is cleared as a matter of urgency, and safeguarding responsibilities clarified
- newly appointed instructors have a positive attitude to their role and arrive at their posting having already undergone the mandatory instructor training and CRB checks
- the workloads and working hours of all instructors and personnel involved in the initial training of recruits are managed effectively
- the underlying causes of high dropout rates in some establishments are identified, and appropriate strategies implemented to improve retention
- the collection and analysis of data on the impact of welfare and duty of care and training standards significantly improves at establishment level
- sufficient resources are available at the earliest opportunity during training to enable recruits to gain the literacy and numeracy skills to help them function well during training as well as in their subsequent job
- recruitment practices enable the right people to apply for appropriate roles and the arrangements for recruiting overseas recruits undergo major review
- recruitment practices are monitored and measured against a defence-wide code and standard of service delivery
- a culture of self-assessment and continuous improvement is embedded at establishment and training headquarters level.
The quality of welfare and duty of care for recruits and trainees

The Ministry of Defence’s definition of welfare and duty of care is: ‘… the duty to take reasonable care of the health, safety and welfare of applicants, recruits and trainees, which is placed on everyone involved in the management of their recruitment and training’.

This programme of inspections began in January 2008 and ended in March 2009. Inspectors focused exclusively on training for ‘other ranks’ and did not inspect any officer training.

Initial training is divided into two phases. Phase 1 is a general introduction to military life. Phase 2 covers the more technical and professional training skills required to become a specialist. The term ‘recruits’ is used to describe those undergoing initial training in phase 1; the term ‘trainees’ is used for personnel in phase 2.

Inspectors visited initial training establishments across all three services, Armed Forces Careers Offices and selection and acquaint centres. More time was spent in Army training establishments, reflecting the relative scale and size of the service in comparison to the Royal Navy and Royal Air Force (RAF). The programme allowed inspectors to cover the progress of an applicant’s initial enquiry at an Armed Forces Careers Offices, through to completing initial training and becoming a trained member of Her Majesty’s Armed Forces.

Some 1,000 recruits, trainees and potential recruits, and over 200 military and welfare staff were interviewed. Inspectors held meetings with senior-level service and Ministry of Defence personnel, responsible variously for initial training, recruitment and selection, course design, self-assessment, complaints and equality and diversity. Inspectors also met with the Service Complaints Commissioner for the Armed Forces. Each training establishment received no more than 24 hours’ notice of their inspection visit. Inspections lasted from two to four days. In total, around 100 inspection days were spent in training establishments, with a further 20 in Armed Forces Careers Offices, and selection and acquaint centres around the country.

Inspectors judged each training establishment’s progress in improving the welfare and duty of care arrangements since the previous inspection. Judgements were also made on each establishment’s progress in implementing a self-assessment process to achieve continuous improvement. Inspectors applied the principles in the Common Inspection Framework to guide the inspection process.\(^5\)

\(^4\) The Service Complaints Commissioner acts as an independent ‘watchdog’ for the Armed Forces’ complaints system.

\(^5\) The Common Inspection Framework sets out the principles applicable to the inspection of post-16, non-higher education and training and meets the requirements of the Learning and Skills Act 2000.
Welfare and duty of care in training
Welfare and duty of care in training

Overall, satisfactory progress has been made by the services in improving their arrangements for welfare and duty of care in recruit and trainee training, but there is room for further improvement in all the services.

Summary of progress

1. Over the past four years the arrangements for the support and care of recruits in initial military training have improved progressively. The extent to which recruits and trainees are supported and cared for is comprehensive and wide ranging. Welfare and duty of care provision in the majority of training establishments is mature, professionally delivered and more far-reaching than was evident from previous inspections. Whereas four years ago, military personnel tended to see welfare and duty of care as separate from the provision of initial and specialist training, these aspects are now integral to that training. The immediate and senior chains of command, and on-site welfare agencies, generally have a very good knowledge of individual recruit and trainee issues connected with personal matters or military training. The response and support provided is thorough and well considered. Recruits and trainees are generally confident about seeking support from the chain of command or an on-site welfare agency if they have a personal or professional problem. Good efforts are made to ensure that no individual is left unsupported.

2. Actions to bring about improvements in welfare and duty of care in some training establishments are not sufficiently robust, prioritised or embedded in the culture of training. In a very few cases, routine and regular changes in command and staffing have led to a deterioration in the effectiveness of welfare and duty of care arrangements, for example where incoming commanders have neglected or abandoned effective systems or introduced new priorities and arrangements not universally understood or adhered to within establishments.

3. The pace of actions to bring about some improvements has slowed between 2007 and 2009. While strengths identified in the previous reports remain in many cases, a number of previously identified areas for improvement have still not been successfully tackled or rectified. Areas for improvement remain in almost all establishments regarding the strategic monitoring of support for recruits. Few in-depth data on the impact of welfare and duty of care arrangements are available, or analysed, at establishment level. Army instructors routinely continue to work exceptionally long hours at the beginning of initial training; this potentially increases risks to recruits if instructors are over-tired.

4. Operational requirements frequently reduce instructor and command staffing levels, remove flexibility of staffing cover from the training environment and add to these pressures. The increasing number of recruits entering training, not all of whom meet minimum standards, also increases pressure on limited training resources and hard-pressed staff. While Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) checking of relevant staff is generally adequate in the Royal Navy and good in the Royal Air Force, the Army’s progress in completing CRB checks of new and existing instructor staff in the Army has been very slow and is largely incomplete, even in establishments training only under-18s.

Detailed findings

5. Recruits and trainees are well supported and cared for. Of the 12 training establishments inspected in 2008–09, 10 were judged to have good arrangements for the core elements of welfare and the exercise of duty of care during training, and two were satisfactory. Establishments make use of comprehensive and wide-ranging systems to support these arrangements. In most cases, these arrangements were broadly integral to the training process and culture of each training establishment. The arrangements were well planned, effectively monitored and competently executed. The two establishments judged satisfactory for welfare and duty of care were judged to be inadequate in terms of their overall effectiveness, due to other factors. In one of these establishments, once considered to be a beacon of...
good practice, subsequent changes in command staff, and command priorities, had reduced the overall effectiveness of welfare and support arrangements over time. A new command team has since managed to reinstate the establishment’s previously highly effective arrangements.

Both inadequate establishments were reinspected six to seven months later, by which time they had implemented new or improved systems and were then judged to be satisfactory overall. However, while the ability to reinstate effective arrangements is encouraging, it highlights the negative impact that a change in command can have on sustaining good practice, and underlines the need for a culture of continuous improvement through rigorous self-assessment. Training headquarters need to maintain a regular level of oversight of training establishment effectiveness and the quality of their systems and processes.

Leaving the service early is now easier for recruits and trainees who are unhappy with or unsuited to military service. While good efforts are made to encourage recruits and trainees to stay, the rules on leaving are applied in a more discretionary manner than in the past. Most commanding officers of training establishments ignore the minimum period of service a recruit or trainee is expected to serve before they can be considered for discharge. They take the view that if someone is determined to leave then they should do so. This also reduces the risk that the trainee can become a target for bullying or negatively affect the morale of others. Recruits who exhibit severe psychological problems, or who practise or threaten self-harm, are generally released from the services without delay. Anyone leaving the Armed Forces early receives appropriate advice, and in some cases referral to specialist agencies.

Much good work has been done to increase the involvement of, and contact with, recruits’ families or carers. Their intervention and involvement when a recruit or trainee is feeling uncertain about his or her future in the service is often very effective, and supports training teams’ work to retain recruits.

Support for recruits and trainees from their immediate chain of command is good. Support from instructors in the chain of command is both extensive and well considered. Most recruits interviewed during inspections stated that they felt safe, secure and well supported while in training. The immediate chain of command is used by most recruits as their first option for support. A very small number of recruits interviewed felt that gaining access to other welfare options was sometimes difficult, or might expose the fact that they did not want to raise an issue directly with their chain of command.

‘At risk’ registers are used increasingly well by all services and at successively lower levels of command. These registers provide a formal record of individual recruit or trainee issues, whether personal or professional, and the actions being taken, and by whom, to support each individual. However, no Defence-wide criteria exist for the level of detail, format or use of the registers. The most effective registers are routinely updated and, when appropriate boundaries of confidentiality and detail, are accessible to all within the welfare and command chain. The least effective registers contain little detail, or are simply an administrative record. In some establishments, too great an inflexible adherence to absolute confidentiality severely inhibits the provision of support from all who could, or should, be aware of an individual’s concerns. The quality and breadth of communication about individual recruit and trainee issues between phase 1 and phase 2 training establishments is often insufficiently detailed.

The scope of the ‘at risk’ register is extended in some establishments to include training staff, particularly those who have returned from operations with personal, physical or emotional difficulties. In those establishments where this is the case, subsequent support arrangements are professional and sympathetic.

The range and effectiveness of the welfare chain are generally comprehensive and inclusive. Outside the chain of command, a comprehensive range of welfare options is provided in most establishments, and is used well by recruits. Such options include the WRVS; chaplains; Soldiers, Sailors, Airmen and Families Association (SSAFA); HIVE (a tri-service information network for service personnel and their families); Salvation Army; and medical staff.
The WRVS provides a good range of pastoral, leisure and welfare support facilities for recruits and trainees in the majority of Army training establishments. These are popular and well used. However, recruits’ access to this facility is initially restricted. In the first six weeks of Army initial training, recruits are normally required to ask their instructors to make appointments if they want to speak to the WRVS staff or chaplains. In this period, Army recruits are unable to use the WRVS leisure facilities without an instructor escort. This practice is not acceptable. Recruits need to be able to visit the WRVS or chaplains on a drop-in and confidential basis, and use the leisure facilities earlier in their training. In both the Royal Navy and the RAF, recruits are allowed to use on-site facilities without hindrance, once they have completed their daily duties.

In the majority of establishments, the welfare chain is wholly inclusive of all practitioners, whether civilian or military. Formal and informal links between the various welfare elements and the chain of command are good in most establishments. Communication is particularly effective in those establishments where individuals in the welfare chain work actively to maintain productive links with the chain of command, irrespective of the inevitable frequent changes in military personnel. Medical staff play an effective role in the welfare and duty of care chain, either in their professional roles as doctors, nurses, medics or other specialists, or through providing input to risk registers and the establishment’s overview of welfare and duty of care.

Most establishments have identified the need for greater clarity about, and focus on, their support arrangements. They have appointed designated staff with full-time responsibility for coordinating or delivering aspects of welfare and duty of care. Some of these staff had not been long in post at the time of inspection and their effectiveness could not be judged. Other establishments have well established and highly effective individuals or teams. These include groups of retired junior and senior non-commissioned officers who share their military insights direct with recruits. Late-entry officers have worked through the ranks to officer level, and are particularly effective at working with recruits. At the Royal Marines Commando Training Centre, a designated and professionally qualified care team, including social workers, provides good support for recruits and permanent staff, including those who have recently returned from operations.

Complaints by recruits and trainees are taken seriously and acted upon. Recruits and trainees are well aware of the complaints mechanisms, although few formal complaints are made and many believe that there will be some form of recrimination if they do.

In the case of a formal or informal complaint by a recruit or trainee about a peer a resolution is usually sought at the lowest level. If a complaint is upheld a recruit or trainee may be dismissed from the service, depending on the nature of the incident.

A formal or informal complaint about an instructor is taken very seriously by senior unit command. An initial investigation will take place immediately. If there are sufficient grounds, the instructor is normally suspended and removed from the training environment while further investigation takes place. However, the investigation process is unduly lengthy, frequently running well beyond the time the recruit or trainee is on site. Where inappropriate behaviour is proven, instructors are posted out of the training establishment or dismissed from the service. Most instructors believe that the system presumes guilt before innocence.

Recruits’ and trainees’ awareness, understanding and appreciation of equality and diversity issues within the training environment have improved. Equality and diversity briefings provide recruits with an insight into the subject, but equality and diversity themes are rarely evident in other aspects of training. All establishments now have equality and diversity advisers who have received appropriate training and are generally in a strong position to champion equality and diversity issues for recruits, trainees, and military and civilian staff. On joining an establishment all staff, recruits and trainees receive equality and diversity induction briefings. These clearly set out expectations of standards of behaviour and guidance on how to respond if unfair treatment is witnessed or experienced. In some cases the briefings successfully contextualise equality and diversity in terms of
the service’s core values, for example the RAF’s values of respect, integrity, service and excellence.

20 The Army’s initial training establishments have adopted an effective integrated approach to explaining the Army’s core values and relating them to equality and diversity themes through the use of a series of workbooks and seminars based on the Band of brothers television series.8

21 The Army’s recording and management of complaints about incidents of bullying, harassment and discrimination has improved, but is inconsistent. While some training establishments record all complaints on a designated database, others record only what are deemed to be narrowly defined equality of opportunity, bullying or harassment issues. Individual establishments have received insufficient guidance on how to use this database, and consequently it is not populated consistently or used to analyse trends.

22 The quality of the instructors’ selection processes and training has improved. It is increasingly the case that instructor staff are selected according to their aptitude, expertise and positive attitude towards working in a training environment. In some cases, subsequent promotion is now directly or indirectly linked to a posting at a training establishment. However, a small minority of Army instructors do not see any value in working in a training environment and are simply serving their time until their next posting. Inspectors have no evidence to suggest that such instructors implicitly represent a greater risk to recruits’ welfare or duty of care than others. However, it does highlight continuing inefficiency in the Army instructor selection system.

23 Particularly good attention is given to the development of non-commissioned officer instructors’ professional training practice. Initial and refresher training in coaching and mentoring techniques are effective and mandatory for all instructors. However, many new instructors arrive at training establishments without having attended the mandatory pre-training course (Defence Train the Trainer, or the Army Recruiting and Training Division Staff Leadership School). Courses are often oversubscribed and instructors can wait at least three months for a place. In such cases they are unable to train recruits without supervision, and are carried as a risk by the commanding officer. The Infantry Training Centre, Catterick has been able to ensure that most of its new instructors go through training prior to arrival. Such a proactive and successful approach is the exception within the Army. Despite the delays in getting onto the training programme, most training staff across all services now have a good awareness and understanding of the benefits of close support for recruits, and a wider range of effective strategies to deal with the many personal and professional issues faced by recruits.

24 Most commanding officers are able to attend relevant training when appropriate, but many experience significant delays in attending the Commanding Officers’ training course. In at least three establishments inspected the incumbent commanding officer and the second-in-command had not attended this course at the time of inspection. Completion of the course should occur prior to their posting.

25 CRB checking of all relevant staff in the Royal Navy is generally adequate and in the RAF is sound, but in the Army the checks are incomplete and too slow. The services undertake CRB checks on instructors working with recruits and trainees, although they are not required to do so in law. CRB checks have not been carried out or completed on all relevant Army training staff. Progress is very slow. In establishments training solely recruits aged under 18, only about one third of staff have had CRB checks completed. Staff in some Army establishments are not always clear where responsibility lies for CRB checking or know if they have been checked. In some army establishments, contrary to policy, there is no CRB officer. In the absence of Army CRB checks, Military Police records are used as an interim measure to provide information on whether an instructor has an unsuitable background or history, but these do not cover the same elements as a CRB check. Furthermore, the Army continues to place too great a reliance on self-declaration of unspent criminal records at the recruitment stage.

---

Too many recruits and trainees drop out of the service during training. There is a poor return on the physical, human and financial resources employed from careers offices through to training establishments. Training effectiveness is compromised in some cases as instructors can spend too much of their time supporting those who are unsuited to the service. Dropout rates for most Army initial training regiments, the Marines, the Infantry and the RAF Regiment are very high. At Infantry Training Centre, Catterick, around 35% of recruits leave at an early stage, and among Royal Marine recruits the figure is around 45%. Data from the RAF Regiment are unreliable, but the dropout rate is at least 30%. The dropout rate in the Army is consistently highest among recruits aged 17 and 18. While some recruits leave on their own account, others leave primarily due to pre-existing medical issues, injury, general unsuitability or immaturity. A few are dismissed from the service because of drug misuse while on leave which is subsequently discovered during unannounced compulsory drug testing programmes at training establishments.

Phase 2 establishments have not been immune to the problem of high dropout rates. At 25 Training Regiment (Deepcut) 17% of trainees left the service between April 2007 and March 2008 and a further 24% up to the reinspection in January 2009. At that point just under 80 trainees (12.5% of starters) had been recorded as absent without leave since April 2008, of whom four had not subsequently returned.

Initiatives to encourage recruits to stay in the service, once they have stated they want to leave, have had limited success. More immature recruits and those who are physically unsuited to the forces are now entering training; they quickly realise that they do not meet military standards. In most establishments good advice and guidance about civilian support agencies, accommodation and other support are available to anyone returning to civilian life.

Training establishments’ use of data to monitor dropout rates and to measure the impact of welfare and duty of care is poor. In most establishments data comprise, in the main, little more than pass and fail rates. Consequently, staff have no clear understanding of recruits’ or trainees’ performance by indicators such as cohort, age, gender, ethnicity, length on course or activity. At a strategic level, data are insufficient to provide a complete overview of the effectiveness of welfare and duty of care arrangements. While headline data are passed up the chain of command to service agencies or training divisions, little analysis or interpretation is returned to the training establishments as useful information. This issue was identified in previous inspection reports and no significant progress has been made.

The workload of most phase 1 Army training instructors is exceptionally high, particularly during the first six weeks of training. One establishment conducted a survey that identified that junior non-commissioned officers (JNCOs) work up to 16 hour days, including many weekends, in the early period of initial training. It was also calculated that these JNCOs cumulatively worked 78 nights annually to provide welfare cover. Almost no flexibility exists in the system for covering leave, sickness or training. The heavy workload impacts very negatively on some JNCOs, particularly medically and domestically, and increases the risk that over-tired instructors will not be able to provide consistently high quality welfare and duty of care. Some permanent staff in training establishments are being detached to operations, putting greater pressure on those remaining. Some establishments are consistently under-staffed (for example the Army Training Regiment, Winchester, and Army Training Centre, Pirbright).

Until recently, instructors’ workloads were also high at RAF Halton and RAF Honington, the RAF’s initial training establishments, but a recent improvement in staffing levels has rectified the issue. At the time of inspection, few RAF instructor posts were unfilled and very few staff were covering roles above their rank. Staffing levels and workloads at HMS Raleigh, the Royal Navy’s initial training establishment, are satisfactory.

Recruits’ and trainees’ understanding of what constitutes bullying or harassment during training is not always clear, particularly in the Army. Initial training is generally successfully conducted with a zero tolerance approach to bullying and harassment. Instructors, staff and recruits interviewed by inspectors were aware of what
is and what is not acceptable behaviour. The chain of command is generally quick to pick up and eliminate poor practice by recruits or instructors.

33 However, the understanding within the chain of command and by recruits of what actually constitutes bullying or harassment during training is not consistent.

34 For example, Army training is expected to be within the constraints of firm discipline, tough training and fair play, but the limits and characteristics of these are susceptible to wide interpretation depending on the stage of training being undertaken. Recruits in the very early stages of training are not in a good position to appreciate whether their training is robust, or constitutes an abuse of authority. Clearer guidance and examples need to be provided by Army Recruiting and Training Division on what constitutes ‘robust’ training and what is bullying and harassment. Further, there is a wide variation in many establishments’ approaches to correcting minor issues of discipline. In some cases blanket punishments are still used whereby all in a platoon or troop are inappropriately punished for the transgression of one person.

35 Pay as you dine (PAYD) for trainees is not appropriate, as currently implemented. The introduction of PAYD arrangements in phase 2 has, in the main, had a negative impact on the quality and quantity of food and too few trainees are opting for these meals. Trainees often lack the necessary financial management skills in order to manage PAYD to good effect. Inspectors identified evidence of meals being missed, including breakfast and dinner, particularly by younger soldiers. Portions are small. The quality of food has fallen, and portion size has been reduced since PAYD was introduced. In order to compensate, some trainees buy double portions. In the Army, physical training instructors provide some formal nutritional advice as part of the recruit training programme, but military catering staff, who are well placed to do so, do not.

37 More initial assessment is being undertaken at the recruitment stage to identify and support recruits with low levels of skill in literacy, numeracy and language. However, much of the provision available during initial training lacks impact. It is either under-resourced, afforded insufficient time within the training schedule, difficult to access or available only for those who have the most need. The response to meeting recruits’ literacy and numeracy skills needs varies too much between services and establishments. At RAF Halton insufficient resources mean that only those in most need are able to receive support.

38 Army recruits may move on to phase 2 training without achieving Entry Level 3 in literacy and numeracy. Inspectors found Army trainees in phase 2 training with literacy and numeracy skills still below the required level. For example, during the first inspection of 25 Training Regiment (Princess Royal Barracks, Deepcut), 15% of the new arrivals in week one from Army Training Centre, Pirbright, were below Entry Level 3. Many trainees had difficulties in reading the menu in the junior ranks’ mess, managing their finances or following the training given to them in using the online Joint Personnel Administration system.

39 A disproportionate number of overseas recruits fail key aspects of the military syllabus, such as skill at arms and drill, where a clear understanding of complex commands is essential. These recruits are consequently held back in their training programme. Language support for speakers of additional languages during phase 1 and 2 training is inadequate. No formal facilities exist for such training within those establishments with a high proportion of overseas recruits or trainees. In some cases, trainees from overseas constitute between 20 to 30% of those under training.

40 Progress in improving physical training has continued, but it has not been consistent across all elements of training in all services. Physical training in phase 1 is now more structured, progressive and better programmed by staff. Phase 1 training does not provide recruits with sufficient understanding of how to develop a personal training programme, or how to use cardiovascular or modular weight training equipment to improve and maintain their fitness. Physical training in three of the four
phase 2 establishments visited was judged to be an area for improvement. These establishments have not arranged the programme to include the required four or five sessions of physical training each week.

41. **The management of injured recruits continues to improve.** Training staff are more aware of the nature and most likely causes of injury, and many training programmes have been revised. Where recruits are removed from the training programme for recovery, their programme of rehabilitation is generally well structured and managed effectively. Most recruits return to training in good physical shape to complete their course.

42. **The Army’s approach to swimming training remains inconsistent.** Recruits to the Royal Navy and the RAF must pass the military swim test. However, not all Army Corps and Regiments require recruits and trainees to do so before passing out of phase 2. Recruits are often restricted to three or four swimming sessions during initial training, during which they will attempt the military swim test, receive some swimming coaching or use the session as a cardiovascular training session. Up to 20% of recruits in some establishments, including an increasing number of overseas recruits, do not pass the test.

**Recommendations for improvement**

- As a matter of priority, clear the backlog of CRB checks in the Army, and introduce arrangements to ensure that all checks are completed in a timely manner.
- Embed strategies to ensure that good practice in relation to welfare and duty of care is not adversely affected when there is a change of command.
- Promote and ensure more sharing of good practice among services and establishments in relation to welfare and duty of care.
- Ensure that clear guidance is given on effective methods to ensure confidentiality regarding recruit issues while maintaining effective and well-informed support.
- Adopt practices to ensure that recruits do not feel exposed to explicit or implicit criticism from staff or other recruits if they use welfare routes other than the chain of command to raise issues.
- Establish a consistent understanding across the services of what constitutes bullying and harassment as opposed to ‘robust’ training.
- Promote a much more positive view of the instructor/training role among JNCOs, particularly in the Army.
- Ensure that commanding officers and instructors who are designated to take up postings in training establishments are trained in a timely manner and certainly before arrival at the new post.
- Each training establishment should collate, record and deal with complaints in the same way.
- All levels of complaints data should be regularly analysed within establishments, as well as collated and analysed by each service and centrally by the Ministry of Defence.
- Make much better use of data to monitor the effectiveness and impact of welfare and duty of care systems at both a service-strategic level and an establishment-operational level.
- Review the outcomes and expectations of physical training programmes to focus on providing recruits and trainees with the skills to manage their own physical development and fitness for the future.
- The Army should review and clarify its requirement for recruits and trainees to be able to swim before they leave phase 2 training.
- Review the implementation of pay as you dine for phase 2 recruits.
- Ensure that literacy, numeracy and language support is timely, incorporated within the training programme, and well resourced.
Background to the recruitment and selection process
Ofsted evaluated the Services’ recruitment and selection process in order to evaluate the care and welfare provision during an applicant’s journey, and how these are linked to individual training success. This inspection activity followed up on findings in previous reports. This involved visits to Armed Forces Careers Offices, and acquaint and selection centres.

The recruitment process can take from a few weeks to several months before an applicant enters an initial training establishment as a recruit. The majority of applicants already know which service they wish to enlist with, but most are not clear about the specific corps, trade or branch they want to join.

Applicants have one or more general discussions with a representative of the service they wish to join. The families or carers of applicants under the age of 18 are encouraged to attend these meetings. Applicants fill out a detailed application form and they receive printed and digital information with general and service-specific details on life in the service, trade roles and initial training. Much of this material is professionally produced, of good quality and updated regularly.

Applicants complete written or online tests of their aptitude, literacy and numeracy skills. The intensity, range and difficulty of the tests vary by service, trade and branch. Some trades require much higher levels of literacy or numeracy than others. All tests are designed to measure general trainability, and academic and vocational skills.

Successful applicants spend from 36 hours to up to four days at a service-specific selection centre undergoing a wide range of tasks to test their suitability for the service. This includes physical testing such as a timed run.

If applicants are successful at all stages they are accepted and given a start date to attend their training establishment. Attestation, the process by which a civilian becomes a member of the armed services, takes place on arrival at the relevant training establishment.

Inspectors’ findings on recruitment and selection are presented in the following two sections, followed by a single set of recommendations.
Recruitment

While some progress has been made in improving recruitment practice, inspectors judged that the rate and scale of progress is insufficient. The overall quality management system for recruitment and selection is unsatisfactory.

Summary of progress

50 Most recruits to each of the services have at least an adequate, and in some cases, a very good experience of recruitment and selection, but a significant number do not. Some of the deficiencies in the process are longstanding and were mentioned in previous reports. These include the provision of poor information and advice for some applicants, and instances of steering applicants inappropriately to trades where there are vacancies (known as ‘gaps’ or ‘pinch points’) and for which they may be unsuited or over-qualified.

51 Some key aspects of the Army’s arrangements for the recruitment and selection of overseas recruits require an urgent review of practice. Evidence provided during interviews with overseas recruits in the UK suggests that it is common for applicants to be steered directly to the infantry or to a particular trade in the Royal Logistics Corps, such as drivers or chefs, without sufficient consideration of each applicant’s aptitude, ability or prior qualifications. Some of the policies and practices for assessing overseas applicants’ language and communication skills are not being followed consistently.

Detailed findings

52 Most applicants receive at least satisfactory information and guidance from recruiting staff at Armed Forces Careers Offices. For these applicants, the information and guidance provided is sufficient to enable most of them to make sound decisions about which service, trade or branch to join. Most recruits and trainees interviewed in training stated that they were in the service, branch and trade of their own choosing and to which they felt reasonably well suited. However, some of those interviewed were not positive about their experiences of Armed Forces Careers Offices and had very different experiences. Young Army recruits in particular frequently seek to change trade once they enter initial training, or during specialist training. Neither the infantry nor other Corps and Regiments recruit only to the minimum standards required; however, a few infantry recruits interviewed by inspectors had been steered to the infantry to fill a gap in recruitment even though they had achieved an initial aptitude test score at their Armed Forces Careers Office well above the minimum needed to join the infantry. Many of these recruits planned to leave the service. One recruit interviewed was leaving the Army after 10 weeks of training to join the Royal Navy, which was always his preferred destination. Some Army applicants are accepted when too old to take non-commissioned officer courses and are not sufficiently aware that they have no promotion prospects.

53 Most recruiters provide satisfactory advice and guidance. In most cases, recruiters provide satisfactory explanations about relevant aspects of service life such as lifestyle, managing money, living in shared spaces, ironing, cleaning, homesickness, teamwork and discipline. An appropriate focus is placed on the services’ zero tolerance approaches to bullying, harassment and drugs misuse. Operational deployment is usually covered well and a realistic view of life in the services is presented.
However, there are not enough representatives of all specialist trades available in, or accessible to, all of the Armed Forces Careers Offices. Difficulties have been identified across all services in recruiting to the careers service. In the Royal Navy, for example, financial disincentives, such as abatement to pension and short-term contracts, are seen by some as a barrier to careers service recruitment.

The Royal Air Force (RAF), Royal Marines and Royal Navy make good use of their recruiting websites. A good range of information helps to direct applicants to the right trade or career. These sites also provide direct interaction between serving personnel and potential applicants. The Army’s recruiting website has been under construction for some time and does not provide sufficient content or up-to-date information.

All recruits for all services receive detailed joining instructions, some of which are inaccurate. While equipment lists from the Royal Navy and RAF are accurate and helpful, those for Army recruits, produced by the Army Recruiting Training Division and also by some Army training establishments, sometimes specify items that recruits do not need to purchase. Many Army recruits in phase 1 training report spending up to £300 on equipment that was supplied free of charge on arrival in training, such as trainers, sweat shirts, sweat pants and ironing boards.

Good guidance is given by Armed Forces Careers Office staff on improving applicants’ fitness before joining the service, but few recruiters have either the appropriate qualifications or sufficient time to assist all applicants. Some good opportunities are provided to improve fitness levels, such as weekly running clubs at a local athletics track or sessions at a local barracks. Applicants who attend a barracks have their fitness levels assessed and receive good advice from recruiters on healthy eating and weight loss. Such sessions are not routinely scheduled and depend on the availability and goodwill of local recruiting or physical training staff. The introduction of a foundation course for women at the Army Training Centre, Pirbright is proving to be a useful way of reaching an appropriate level of fitness before attestation.

Fitness assessments for the Royal Navy are inadequately monitored. Assessments are carried out at a national chain of fitness centres and involve running 2.4 kilometres on a treadmill. Instructors rarely offer fitness advice. Treadmills are not set to replicate an outdoor run. Candidates attending the Royal Navy Acquaint Centre (RNAC) who have successfully completed these assessments often fail to reach the required times in the RNAC pre-joining fitness test run.

Some Army recruiting teams focus on gaining the maximum number of recruits rather than those who are most suitable. Recruit and trainee dropout data from Army training establishments indicate that the number of recruits arriving for training who are too immature or physically unsuited to service life is rising. Some recruits to the infantry arrive with serious, unresolved, personal or psychological issues.

Some key aspects of the Army’s arrangements for the recruitment and selection of applicants from overseas require an urgent review of practice. Overseas recruits have a range of motives for joining the UK Armed Services. In some cases, a soon-to-expire visa or a lack of clarity about roles and options can prompt a decision by the applicant to take the first available job offered.

However, many overseas recruits already have good levels of education including high level accredited qualifications equivalent to UK qualifications. Despite
this, inspectors encountered many who appeared to have been steered to Corps and Regiments irrespective of their ability, experience or qualifications. In interviews, some overseas recruits in training, and some trained NCOs from overseas stated that they had been advised to join the infantry or some of the lower skilled trades in the Royal Logistic Corps, as a ‘default’ option, irrespective of their sometimes high aptitude test scores. Recruiters had told them to plan to change Corps or specific trade later. Not all overseas recruits are clear about what alternatives are realistically available to them. Not all have the aptitude or expertise to be considered subsequently for an alternative trade, but are not aware that they have limited options. The quality of advice on, and support for, changing trades is inconsistent within and between training establishments. This affects many recruits and trainees, not just those from overseas.

61 The initial assessment of overseas recruits’ English language skills is inadequate. There are contraventions of recruiting policy and practice in the assessment of overseas applicants’ language and communication skills. Many overseas recruits encounter some difficulties with English language comprehension and communication within a military environment where shouted and abbreviated commands and a range of UK regional accents are commonplace. Within Armed Forces Careers Offices and overseas recruiting teams, official overall guidelines for assessing language and comprehension, and determining who should not be recruited without further language development, are not used consistently. Specific language and comprehension tests are not always conducted according to policy. Applicants are in some cases selected in or out by recruiters on the basis of subjective criteria. Different criteria are used by different Armed Forces Careers Offices. One recruit explained how his English language capability was assessed as being poor by one Armed Forces Careers Office, and his entry to the Army delayed until he had undertaken an appropriate language course. The recruit then approached a different Armed Forces Careers Office, where he was accepted without objection.

62 Most overseas recruits come from Fiji, the Caribbean islands and African countries, for example Ghana. The number of trained staff in the armed services from overseas rose from 6,300 in April 2008 to 7,490 in December 2008, just over 90% of whom are in the Army.9 Of these, 3.6% are officers and 85.6% hold the rank of private or lance corporal, which is disproportionate to the overall proportion of privates and lance corporals in the field Army (55% of the total, excluding overseas soldiers). Overseas recruits will undergo training at the Infantry Training Centre, Catterick or Army Training Centre, Pirbright, where they constitute 20% and 14% of recruits, respectively.10

63 A minimum period of UK or Commonwealth residency is a requirement for entry to the services, in order that security checks can be undertaken. The Army’s UK and Commonwealth residency eligibility requirements are minimal for most of its trades. The RAF requires applicants for most trades to have a minimum UK residency of five years. The Royal Navy requires UK residency of three years for most of its trades. The RAF and Royal Navy have a very low percentage of trained staff from overseas, currently 0.2% and 1.8%, respectively.11 Overall, serving minority ethnic soldiers in the Army (including from overseas, who represent the majority of this grouping) represent 3% of officers and 10% of other ranks.

---

Progress in improving the selection process and resources is satisfactory.

Summary of progress

The services have made reasonable progress in acquainting potential applicants with the realities of service life, and their arrangements for assessment and selection. The Royal Navy now has Royal Navy acquaint centres in Rosyth and Gosport; the Royal Marines a Potential Royal Marines Course at Lympstone; the RAF a centre at RAF Honington for its Potential Gunners Acquaintance Course and RAF Halton for all other recruits. The Army has development and selection centres at Lichfield, Pirbright, Glencorse and Belfast. All candidates attending are provided with travel warrants, food and accommodation.

Detailed findings

Selection centres are an effective means of selecting for the services by physical and mental aptitude. Applicants are assessed through observations, physical tests, team tasks and individual interviews. The process works well for most recruits and provides them with suitable information and an introduction to their chosen service. The Royal Navy Acquaint Course confirms with each applicant what the job they have selected will entail, and provides good opportunities for potential recruits to look at other jobs and other Royal Navy branches. The Potential Royal Marines Course and Potential Gunners Acquaint Course focus on the physical expectations of the service, with numerous physically demanding tests. The Army Development and Selection Centre Course is focused on selection, with no formal scheduled development or guidance activity.

Candidates are left in little doubt as to what will be expected of them in training. Physical testing and team-based tasks challenge applicants effectively to demonstrate their suitability for service life. Physical assessments identify whether they have the body mass and structure to cope with the demands of training. Boots and socks are issued by the Potential Royal Marines Course and Potential Gunners Acquaint Course to anyone selected to join the service at the end of the course so that these items can be broken in before training begins. Applicants for the Infantry are expected to be of a similar physical entry standard to the Royal Marines but their selection process at selection centres is not as physically demanding as that for Royal Marines.

Welfare and duty of care is managed well during the selection and acquaint process. Good attention is given to the fact that applicants are civilians and not subject to military law or expectations until recruited. Selection centres have clear procedures to manage incidents, illness and sickness, with careful attention being paid to managing applicants below 18 years of age. Clear and appropriately focused supervisory care directives are in place. The ratio of staff to applicants is good. Care is taken to ensure that all applicants receive feedback on their performance, whether they pass or fail, and a follow-up discussion from the staff in their local Armed Forces Careers Office.

Medical assessments completed at selection centres do not adequately identify pre-existing and potentially disqualifying medical conditions. This was identified as an issue in previous reports. Existing medical conditions may preclude recruits from joining the services. The percentage of recruits being discharged from the service for this reason is high, at between 5 and 10% of new recruits in most establishments. More rigorous medical assessments are required by the Royal Navy and the Army in particular. Some improvement has been made by the Royal Marines and the RAF Regiment in the identification of some issues. However, not enough is done to offset the poor availability of information available in medical records through visual assessments of gait, bio-mechanics and muscular-skeletal condition.

The management of the transition of overseas applicants from the Army development and selection centres into the Army is poor. For many, the experience of their arrival in the UK is not managed well. For example, some overseas applicants arrive at the selection centre in Pirbright and are initially accommodated in a very poor facility that doubles up as a television lounge for other candidates during the day. Some overseas candidates
who successfully complete the selection process are accommodated in the centre prior to starting phase 1 training even though they are not yet military personnel, and, as such, are not subject to military regulations or policy.

70 Accommodation at the Potential Royal Marines Course and the Royal Navy Acquaint Centre is generally good and accurately reflects the accommodation and experiences of initial training, but this is not the case service-wide. The Army Development and Selection Centre buildings visited are uninspiring and do not provide a good introduction to Army accommodation. The selection centre at the Army Training Centre, Pirbright is particularly poorly maintained. Potential recruits attending the Potential Gunners Acquaint Course at RAF Honington are placed in very poor accommodation in another RAF establishment, with insufficient ventilation, washing and shower facilities.

71 Overall, the quality management of recruitment and selection is unsatisfactory. This persistent issue was identified in both previous Adult Learning Inspectorate reports. No overall defence-wide code of practice is in place against which to measure the standards of recruiting and selection practice. Each service has its own quality assurance arrangements that include audits and observations of recruiters conducting interviews. Satellite Armed Forces Careers Offices receive regular monitoring visits from their regional office. New recruiters are monitored closely until deemed competent to work alone. In at least one centre, potential recruits to the Army are interviewed by a second recruiter to ensure that all relevant points have been covered. Feedback is received from phase 1 training establishments about recruits who drop out of training. Although observations of staff and other audits take place, the information is not used effectively to assess the quality of the provision. None of the information from these activities is drawn together in an evaluative document and used to help improve the service overall. Little effective target-setting is undertaken for recruiting at a local level. Insufficient data are available to identify dropout rates from the recruiting process, either overall or by Armed Forces Careers Office, although performance is monitored and anomalies investigated. The chain of command for Armed Forces Careers Office staff is particularly complex. In the Army, the recruiting operation is partly managed by Army Recruiting and Training Division, Recruiting Group and the Commander, regional forces. Selection centres are managed by Initial Training Group.

72 Taken together, recruitment and selection present a very mixed picture of progress. A higher rate of progress is more clearly discernible in selection than in recruitment. The lack of defined minimum standards and codes of conduct in recruiting practice is a significant area for improvement, not least as a basis for quality management. It is regrettable that there are still instances of poor information and advice for some applicants and some others are being inappropriately steered to Corps and Regiments for which they are unsuited or over-qualified.

Recruitment and selection

Recommendations for the improvement of recruitment and selection

- Some key aspects of the Army’s recruiting practice for overseas applicants require an urgent and fundamental review.
- Introduce a Defence-wide recruiting charter which defines the code of contact for recruitment practice.
- Introduce a quality management system for the recruiting and selection process as a basis for quality improvement.
- Make the role of recruiter more attractive in respect of career development and conditions of service.
- Clarify and ensure conformance with specified recruiting practice for all overseas applicants whether this is undertaken in the UK or overseas.
- Ensure that all applicants are supported to join the trade to which they are best suited by attitude, aptitude and expertise, particularly in the Army.
- Facilitate better applicant access to specialist trade recruiters in Armed Forces Career Offices.
- Improve and update the Army Recruiting and Training Division training and recruitment website, including functions to develop and maintain contact with all potential recruits and their families or carers.
- Ensure appropriate and effective monitoring and quality assurance of subcontracted activities, such as medical assessments and fitness tests.
- Review the accuracy and content of equipment lists produced by Army Recruiting and Training Division and training establishments.
- Devise appropriate and well-planned accommodation arrangements if overseas applicants need to be accommodated prior to starting training.
- Urgently improve the accommodation in the Army development and selection centre at Pirbright and Potential Gunners Acquaintance Course at RAF Honington.
- Ensure that all Army development and selection centres provide clearer, more detailed information on trade and job roles available within the services.
- Provide selection courses for infantry candidates which specifically assess their fitness and suitability as infantrymen.
- Improve the quality and effectiveness of the medicals and muscular-skeletal screening carried out in the selection centres to reduce subsequent dropout from training.
Background to self-assessment
Background to self-assessment

In 2007, Better training set the services the challenge of introducing a culture of continuous improvement in training establishments built on a systematic and thorough process of self-assessment.

All phase 1 and 2 military training establishments have been expected to undertake an annual process of self-assessment that honestly and critically evaluates the effectiveness and impact of all the elements of a recruit’s journey through training. Self-assessment should identify what works well, what is satisfactory and what needs to be improved. A quality improvement action plan should then be produced identifying what steps will be taken to make improvements, and by whom, within a specific timescale. Self-assessment is a comprehensive approach to improving organisational effectiveness. Intrinsic to the process is gathering the critical views and ideas of a wide range of people involved in the training process, of all ranks and including recruits and trainees.

The framework of self-assessment is built on the five key questions of the Common Inspection Framework: how well recruits and trainees achieve; the standard of teaching and learning; the suitability and range of training programmes; support for recruits and trainees; and overall leadership and management of recruitment and training.

The overall judgement for self-assessment is satisfactory in respect of the progress made by each service and establishment in developing self-assessment from a more or less standing start. However, in all but one case (the Royal Marines) there is substantial room for improvement in ensuring that self-assessment has a tangible and positive impact on outcomes and is an effective basis for continuous improvement.

Detailed findings

Commando Training Centre (Royal Marines) understands and fully facilitates the self-assessment process, which is sufficiently evaluative, and has some clear improvement outcomes. This is in stark contrast to most other establishments. Good use is made of recruits’ views. These are cross-referenced against the outcomes of the monthly independent recruit and trainee survey, operated by Ipsos Mori, which is completed in all training establishments. Very good use is also made of a wide range of data. These are routinely collected, analysed and monitored, and the findings communicated widely.

Elsewhere, self-assessment reports, or similar documents, are primarily descriptive rather than evaluative. Too often they tended to be a checklist of the existence of, and general conformance to, policy rather than an evaluation of the impact and effectiveness of policies.

Too many self-assessment reports reflect only the views of senior ranks. The views of all those involved in the training process, including recruits and trainees, were not always sought or incorporated routinely. The value of carrying out the self-assessment process was not always clear to all who were required to be involved.

Overall, policy direction and guidance on self-assessment practice to units from training headquarters are inconsistent. Too often, establishments were trying to work out for themselves how best to proceed. In this respect, HMS Raleigh had made an encouraging start to the process but still has some way to go before self-assessment becomes a useful improvement tool. The Royal Air Force’s approach to self-assessment varied substantially in depth and quality between its two training establishments, and was partly undermined by insufficiently thorough data collation and analysis. The Army’s approach to, and understanding of, self-assessment is not consistent between Corps and Regiments. The prescribed structure of the Army’s self-assessment process is lengthy and overly complex, with the outcome too audit-orientated and insufficiently evaluative.
Training establishments are not prioritising systematic continuous improvement. In many establishments progress in implementing self-assessment is hindered by a lack of priority given to systematic continuous improvement over immediate operational requirements. Lower staffing levels and a raised operational status also place greater strains on training establishments’ resources. Overall, quality improvement planning is still generally weak. While the quality improvement plan is often a useful account of what needs to be done to improve, much of this consists of short-term actions of which too few are specific, measurable or their impact capable of being fully evaluated on completion.

Recommendations for improvement

- Significantly improve the training headquarters-level guidance and direction to units on the practice, value and outcome of self-assessment as a key part of continuous improvement.
- Develop a culture of establishment-led continuous improvement supported by oversight and data from training headquarters.
- Simplify the Army’s self-assessment process.
- Ensure that initial training establishments have sufficient access to a wide range of up-to-date data to enable starting points to be identified and progress monitored.
- Improve commitment and support through the chain of command to make the process more inclusive.
- Improve the sharing of good practice between all establishments to stimulate self-assessment and continuous improvement practice.
- The comparative performance of different recruit and trainee groups should be recorded and monitored and appropriate actions planned.
The quality of welfare and duty of care for recruits and trainees
Summary reports
Summary reports

25 Training Regiment, Deepcut

Date of inspection: 29 April–1 May 2008

| Overall effectiveness: inadequate | Capacity to improve: satisfactory | Self-assessment: insufficient progress |

**Context**

81. The Princess Royal Barracks and St Omer Barracks are part of the Deepcut Garrison in Surrey where the Army’s 25 Training Regiment is located. The Princess Royal Barracks is the headquarters of the Defence College of Logistics and Personnel Administration, and provides training for phase 2 trainees and phase 3 soldiers. Phase 2 trainees are part of 25 Training Regiment which has three training squadrons and a headquarters squadron specialising in handling transfers, discharges and re-joiners. Each squadron has two troops. Most trainees come to the establishment from the phase 1 Army Training Regiment, Pirbright.

82. At the time of the inspection (April 2008) trainees were working towards trades including driving, pioneering, supply, postal and catering. Around 40% of the phase 2 trainees are drivers. Training courses operate in overlapping cycles. New groups of trainees are inducted into the barracks each week.

83. 25 Training Regiment has 131 military and 92 civilian staff, plus a contingent of 63 staff from the military provost guard service, who provide guard services to the Princess Royal Barracks. During the inspection not all of the 442 trainees were based on the site. Around 17% are from overseas countries and 14% are women. Facilities on site include a gymnasium, sports fields, two bars, a medical centre, a learning centre, a shop and a social centre run by the WRVS. In the period April 2007 to March 2008, 17% of starters were discharged from the service, with a further 24% leaving up to January 2009.

84. Since the previous visit in February 2006 many changes have taken place among senior staff at 25 Training Regiment. There have been three changes in command, including the current Commanding Officer and Regiment second-in-command, who have been in post four and five weeks, respectively.

**Effectiveness of the provision**

85. Insufficient progress has been made by 25 Training Regiment in developing or maintaining its arrangements for welfare and duty of care since the previous visit by inspectors in February 2006. Previous changes in senior command brought changed priorities. Some aspects judged as strengths, or as satisfactory, in 2006 had subsequently diminished in effectiveness. Thirteen areas for improvement were identified during the 2008 visit. Some areas for improvement relate to aspects over which 25 Training Regiment did not, and still does not, have direct influence or control, such as recruiting and selection practice.

86. Two key elements of the welfare and duty of care system at 25 Training Regiment are functioning effectively, and are satisfactory. These are: the basic arrangements for trainees’ welfare and duty of care by military and civilian staff, which are in place and effective; second, arrangements for identifying and monitoring trainees seen as being at risk in any way are strong, with improvements in the way such trainees are identified and supported at troop or squadron level. Overall, trainees report that they are well supported. Areas for improvement include the selection and training of instructors; too many are posted reluctantly into service at 25 Training Regiment.

87. Good practice is not shared well within the establishment. The collection and use of data were satisfactory in 2006, but are now non-existent. The continuation training programme for trainees awaiting the next stage of their programme is no longer sufficiently developmental. Insufficient opportunities or facilities exist to help trainees relax and socialise. Trainees’ fitness is low, generally deteriorating during driving training at the Defence School of Transport in Leconfield. Trainees are reluctant to take responsibility for maintaining or developing their fitness. A recently introduced pay as you
dine system is inappropriate for phase 2 trainees. Too many trainees are either too immature or ill-prepared to make appropriate decisions on nutrition, where direct payment is involved. There is evidence of meals being missed, including breakfast and dinner, particularly by younger soldiers. The dropout rate from training is very high. Between April 2007 and March 2008, 223 (17%) trainees left the service during phase 2 training. Of these, nearly 70% were drivers. Of 74 starters since April 2008, 24% had left. The highest wastage is among 17–18-year-olds (44%). A small number of trainees wilfully challenge some basic aspects of discipline. Non-commissioned officers still work unacceptably long hours and are over-tired.

**Capacity to improve**

The capacity for 25 Training Regiment to improve is satisfactory. Despite the new senior command team having been in place for only a short period of time, a rapid assessment of actions needed to improve has been carried out. An initial analysis of the establishment’s strengths and areas for improvement was carried out through audit and a useful summary document was produced. A quality improvement plan identifies a range of appropriate actions, although many are very broad in scope at this stage and need to be more focused.

**Self-assessment**

Arrangements for establishment-wide self-assessment are at a very early stage, and progress is insufficient. Self-assessment is currently contributing little to any coherent process of continuous improvement. A process has been adopted, under direction from Army Recruiting and Training Division, which involves analysing a range of key aspects over time with a view to producing a full self-assessment report in May 2009. At 25 Training Regiment the self-assessment process, its outcomes, use and value are not yet fully understood by staff or trainees.
Summary reports

25 Training Regiment, Deepcut – Reinspection

Date of reinspection: 22–23 January 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall effectiveness:</th>
<th>Capacity to improve:</th>
<th>Self-assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>satisfactory</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
<td>satisfactory progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Context of reinspection

The purpose of the reinspection was to inspect the progress made against 13 areas for improvement identified at the earlier visit in April 2008. Since the previous inspection the establishment has carried out a considerable restructuring. 25 Training Regiment is no longer just a holding and support regiment. The number of phase 2 trainees has decreased by about 66%, from over 700 to around 250. Most of the decrease is due to the relocation of the driver training squadron to the Defence School of Transport in Leconfield, near Hull. Of the original nine training troops only four remain, managed through the two training squadrons.

Effectiveness of the provision

The overall effectiveness of welfare and duty of care is now satisfactory. Significant progress has been made in reducing the workload on corporal instructors. This has not only improved instructors’ general well-being and morale but also the time available for and quality of the welfare and duty of care of trainees. The reduced number of trainees and the more focused deployment of all staff to cover squadron welfare duties and the role of Regimental orderly corporal, means staff now only cover two duties each month. Social facilities for trainees have improved. Access to sports and the gymnasium has increased. Permanent staff now act as sports representatives, organising a good range of sports and activities. Trainees represent 25 Training Regiment in a number of sports, with some playing for a combined forces team.

Reasonable progress has been made in mitigating some of the problems with the pay as you dine arrangements identified at the previous inspection, primarily through raising awareness and improving trainees’ knowledge of the system. Effective work is now ongoing with the contractor to improve the delivery and quality of food. The welcome pack and induction information given to phase 2 recruits on arrival reinforces the need to manage their money wisely. Closer working with the phase 1 establishments has improved information flow, and recruits who visit 25 Training Regiment during week 7 of their phase 1 training are made aware of pay as you dine. Each trainee now receives a helpful and concise booklet about how they should manage finances and the financial support available for those who get into difficulty. Advisory posters to reinforce healthy eating messages have been put up in the restaurant and gymnasium. The number of trainees requiring support from the ‘hungry soldier’ scheme has reduced since October.

Reasonable progress has been made in the management of continuation training. It is better managed, with fewer trainees held on site between courses. The total number has reduced from around 200 in March 2008 to around 30 at the time of inspection. Few trainees remain in continuation training longer than two weeks. Each squadron has a small team which plans the training programme to provide appropriate training for anyone not otherwise engaged in trade training. Training is now better tailored to meet individual and group requirements.

Reasonable progress has been made in improving the flow of information. Formal links and communication with phase 1 establishments have improved, particularly with Army Training Centre, Pirbright which supplies the greatest number of trainees to 25 Training Regiment. Operations meetings with phase 1 establishments help identify numbers and allow for more effective planning and preparation.
Capacity to improve

The capacity to improve remains satisfactory. A regimental audit of 25 Training Regiment’s systems and processes has now been established. Quality improvement plans have been developed at HQ and squadron levels. The collation and analysis of data have improved. A broad range of data are now collected and used to analyse trainee performance and trends. Quarterly meetings are used effectively to discuss findings and set actions.

Significantly reduced trainee numbers, with most training now delivered directly to trainees who live on site, makes managing training more efficient. Regular headquarters and squadron-level internal inspections and auditing have identified some good practice. Best practice is now being shared.

Self-assessment

Satisfactory progress has been made in establishing and promoting the self-assessment process. The original timescale set by Army Recruiting and Training Division and the Defence College of Logistics and Personnel Administration for completion of a self-assessment report by May 2009 remains. Some good preparatory work has been done as part of the self-assessment process. However, all these aspects are currently work in progress and not yet part of a concerted and systematic approach to self-assessment. 25 Training Regiment is awaiting further direction from the Defence College of Logistics and Personnel Administration on the self-assessment report format and specification. At first sight, the draft format and specification would appear to be overly detailed and unnecessarily complex.
The quality of welfare and duty of care for recruits and trainees

Summary reports

Defence Medical Services Training Centre

Date of inspection: 20–21 May 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall effectiveness:</th>
<th>Capacity to improve:</th>
<th>Self-assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>inadequate</td>
<td>inadequate</td>
<td>satisfactory progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Context

The Defence Medical Services Training Centre is the tri-service medical training centre based at Keogh Barracks in Ash Vale just outside Aldershot. The unit was part of the Defence Medical Education and Training Agency until April 2008 when the Agency was disbanded and restructured as the new Joint Medical Command. The Joint Medical Command had no organisational structure at the time of inspection and was going through a setting-up process towards full operational capacity by September 2008. The Defence Medical Services Training Centre has an annual throughput of approximately 8,500 phase 2 trainees.

Trainees join the establishment after completing their initial service-specific phase 1 training. At the Defence Medical Services Training Centre they complete a common core course to train as medical assistants, consisting of a 12-week programme of academic theory training, followed by six weeks of work placements at military and civilian locations. The largest proportion of trainees comprises soldiers joining the Royal Army Medical Corps. Trainees return to the Defence Medical Services Training Centre to complete their final, single service-specific training. The common core element is managed on a tri-service basis. In addition, the Defence Medical Services Training Centre also trains qualified soldiers as Regimental Combat Medical Technicians, who retain their existing cap badges as Rifles, Guards and so on, but are trained to the same standard as the Royal Army Medical Corps Combat Medical Technicians. During the inspection 147 trainees were on site.

The Defence Medical Services Training Centre has been anticipating relocation during the past 10 years and maintenance and repair to buildings and infrastructure has been minimal in that time. Despite a postponement of the move for a further six years, there is no evidence of planned investment in the infrastructure and buildings, which are of a very basic standard. Pay as you dine has been in place for a year. The Defence Medical Services Training Centre has 128 staff responsible for some aspects of training that interact directly with trainees. No post of unit welfare officer exists.

Effectiveness of the provision

Although the Training Centre has some effective processes to manage the welfare and duty of care of trainees, these are fragile and rely on the commitment of staff over and above their normal duties. Many of these are key senior staff who are due to leave the establishment soon. Specific personnel with roles to manage the welfare and duty of care for trainees are not in post.

Some trainees, mostly Army, arrive at the Defence Medical Services Training Centre without Criminal Records Bureau clearance and have to wait in holding for clearance. During the inspection week this equated to 31% of the new intake. Trainees’ time in the holding troop is poorly used. The Training Centre’s staff management of trainees on work placement is inadequate. Blanket punishments are commonly used when individuals make a mistake in class and the whole class is punished. Accommodation is poor; much of the trainee accommodation has been allowed to deteriorate and has not received sufficient regular maintenance to keep it above a barely usable standard. There are few facilities for the trainees on site at weekends. Quality assurance of teaching and learning is poor. Pay as you dine does not meet the needs of phase 2 trainees under training. Many trainees do not eat meals in the cookhouse and prefer to buy food from local supermarkets. Some younger trainees do not have the financial skills to manage their budget to ensure they can eat appropriately throughout training.
Capacity to improve

104 The Defence Medical Services Training Centre demonstrates an inadequate capacity to improve. While some well-established and effective improvement systems are in place, these rely for implementation on the goodwill of staff. Insufficient staff are available to effectively manage the welfare and duty of care of trainees. Tri-service policies do not focus on the management of trainees at risk, or subsequent support once they leave the Training Centre to go to operative units or work placements.

105 Succession planning for the management of welfare and duty of care is poor. There is no unit welfare officer. The evaluation of teaching and learning is inadequate. No formal process exists to ensure that teaching staff, or trainees on work placement, are effectively observed, evaluated and supported. The management of complaints is satisfactory and in line with expectations. However, very few complaints have been recorded.

106 Trainees’ accommodation is poor. Recreational facilities are minimal and the gym is not open at weekends. On-site retail and social facilities are inadequate at weekends. Despite the continuation of training at Keogh barracks no budget or plans are available to improve facilities and resources.

Self-assessment

107 Arrangements for an establishment-wide self-assessment are still at an early stage of development, but progress is satisfactory. The importance of the self-assessment process has been acknowledged by senior staff and some useful work has been done in establishing an initial draft of a self-assessment report. The identification of strengths and areas for improvement is in hand. However, insufficient staff will be available to complete the process until later in the year. A quality improvement plan has been produced and is based on a number of previous inspection visits.
Summary reports

Defence Medical Services Training Centre – Reinspection

Date of reinspection: 12–13 February 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall effectiveness:</th>
<th>Capacity to improve:</th>
<th>Self-assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>satisfactory</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
<td>satisfactory progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Context of reinspection

At the inspection of Defence Medical Services Training Centre in May 2008, overall effectiveness and capacity to improve were both judged inadequate. There has since been a change in senior staff and a restructuring of roles and responsibilities across the Training Centre. The new commandant started in post in September 2008. A commanding officer, with responsibility for the quality of education and training, is in place at each of the training schools. The Officer Commanding of the phase 2 school is now able to manage the journey, training and welfare of all phase 2 trainees in training and on placement. This reinspection focused on the progress made by the Defence Medical Services Training Centre in tackling the areas for improvement identified at the previous inspection.

Effectiveness of the provision

The overall effectiveness of the Defence Medical Services Training Centre in managing welfare and duty of care and the self-assessment process is currently satisfactory. The Training Centre now has some effective processes to manage the welfare and duty of care of trainees. These processes are supported by committed staff with specific roles to manage the welfare and duty of care for trainees.

The number of staff has increased. A dedicated welfare team has been appointed. The post of unit welfare officer has been established. A team of six unit welfare advisers is now in place. A good range of welfare forums is held weekly and monthly, which provides good awareness and monitoring of trainees at risk professionally, personally and academically.

The management and monitoring of trainees on work placement is significantly improved. A particularly good set of risk assessments has been carried out of each work placement site, identifying all aspects of potential risk.

Trainees under the age of 18 only go to local placements and continue to live on site at Keogh Barracks. The type and range of placements are carefully considered to provide appropriate gains in knowledge and expertise and also to create independence on the part of trainees. The number of trainees in holdover is much reduced, and purposeful military training activities are now part of an established programme.

The accommodation used by trainees is undergoing significant refurbishment with many additional facilities planned, such as kitchenettes and wi-fi enabled study areas in each accommodation wing. Good work has been done to re-establish leisure activities and sports at weekends. On-site retail and social facilities are now available at weekends.

Significant progress has been made in ensuring that trainees are aware of the remedial action and minor sanctions systems. Briefings are effective in introducing non-Army trainees to a system they have not experienced before.

The quality assurance of teaching and learning is much improved. The management of training is now better focused on learner performance. Management of sub-contractors has improved.

Productive efforts have been made to establish an effective performance management system for the learning programme for phase 2 trainees.

Self-assessment is now used more effectively as a tool to identify, manage and plan improvements. Pay as you dine remains inappropriate for phase 2 trainees, with many trainees still reporting routinely missing meals and poor-quality food. The Defence Medical Services Training Centre has made reasonable efforts to encourage trainees to use the facility. The contract is now very closely monitored, and actions are taken quickly if issues arise.
Capacity to improve

On the basis of the effective welfare and duty of care arrangements now in place, the Defence Medical Services Training Centre demonstrates a satisfactory capacity to improve.

Self-assessment

Arrangements for an establishment-wide self-assessment are still at an early stage of development and progress remains satisfactory. The Defence Medical Services Training Centre is working towards the creation of a self-assessment report during February 2009. Different strands of self-evaluation and reporting are to be combined to provide a comprehensive overview of phase 2 and phase 3 training, and the trainees’ progress through it. These are not all sufficiently well developed. A range of assessment and evaluation activities is used at different stages of completion and there is no consistency in the way they are implemented or their results evaluated.

The common core school self-assessment process for phase 2 trainees is the most developed. It contains sufficient description and identification of strengths and areas for improvement, although it is insufficiently evaluative. A quality improvement plan provides a useful forward plan of action. A good, comprehensive and very detailed action grid is maintained by the commandant, identifying action and progress in addressing areas for improvement against previous inspection outcomes. The action grid identifies timescales for start dates and completion of tasks very clearly. A related establishment-wide quality improvement plan is managed well to ensure that all aspects of improvement are monitored continually.
Context

120 HMS Raleigh is located at Torpoint, in Cornwall. It is the Royal Navy’s only new-entry training establishment for ratings. The establishment also comprises phase 2 units: The Royal Naval Submarine School and The Royal Naval School of Seamanship, and phase 3 units: The Naval Military Training School, and The Defence Maritime Logistics School. HMS Raleigh’s command is also responsible for phase 2 training in the submarine escape tank in Portsmouth and the submarine qualifying course at Faslane, which were not included in this inspection.

121 Phase 1 recruits undertake an initial nine-week phase 1 Naval general training programme. New intakes start each week, comprising around 60 recruits. Of the total 2,800 recruits in 2007–08, 17% were women and approximately 4% from minority ethnic groups. Recruits are aged between 16 and 37 years and come from a range of backgrounds.

122 Recruits’ academic attainment ranges from no qualifications to degree level. All recruits’ literacy and numeracy skills are assessed by completing a basic skills initial assessment.

123 Most phase 2 courses are aligned with phase 1 completion dates and holdover time is short. On completion of phase 1, over 80% of recruits move immediately to their phase 2 schools. Trainees are phase 2 learners undergoing further trade or branch training before they can be deployed to the Royal Navy’s trained strength.

124 Up to 60 recruits are managed and accommodated in Divisions. The divisional system forms the backbone of the Navy’s welfare and duty of care system. Divisional officers manage teams of non-commissioned officers who in turn manage recruits and trainees.

125 Recruits are given accurate pre-joining instructions and can use a website for information on fitness, discipline, equipment and Naval requirements. Recruitment is now the responsibility of the Captain of Naval Recruiting. Many recruits attend the Royal Navy Acquaint Centre at HMS Caledonia in Rosyth and the Maritime Warfare School at HMS Collingwood in Gosport. All recruits must have security clearance before joining HMS Raleigh. During training, recruits complete various assessments including several fitness and swimming tests.

Effectiveness of the provision

126 HMS Raleigh has some very effective processes to manage the welfare and duty of care of recruits and trainees. The establishment has a good overview of all trainees regarded as being at risk. The Divisional system provides a solid basis for welfare and care. Recruits and trainees are well supported by staff and instructors. Staff are aware of, and use well, the individual case conferencing facility to bring together all parties who may help to support a vulnerable individual. An effective Carers’ Forum meets at least twice each term and brings together all parties across the establishment who may be involved in support for others. Good records are discretely maintained to monitor individuals and keep senior staff informed. Criminal Records Bureau checks are being undertaken for staff working with recruits, but this is not consistent across the establishment. Recruits with learning support needs receive good support.

127 The phase 1 programme is short and individually tailored basic skills training is provided only to those who can attend during the evenings. Areas for improvement include dull and poorly facilitated classroom training. Some aspects of recruitment are unsatisfactory. Several recruits complained they were provided with misleading information by staff in the Armed Forces Careers Offices.
Some aspects of physical training are inadequate. For example, phase 2 trainees in the seamanship school have inadequate access to the minimum five structured physical training sessions each week. The gymnasium is operating at 75% staff capacity with five gapped posts. Staff regularly operate with ratios exceeding the maximum of 16:1. No remedial physical training instructors are in post. Some of the cardiovascular equipment in the gymnasium is broken.

Capacity to improve

HMS Raleigh has good capacity to improve. Across HMS Raleigh operational staff are clearly directed and informed through effective communications. An effective process has been established to undertake an inclusive self-assessment. Welfare and duty of care is well managed and much good work is undertaken to ensure that appropriate systems and management are in place to assure the welfare and safety of staff, recruits and trainees. Information and data are used well to undertake trend analyses and to support change. Teams work effectively and the Captain has a good oversight of developments and issues across the establishment.

Self-assessment

The self-assessment process is satisfactory. Reasonable progress has been made towards producing an effective quality improvement plan. HMS Raleigh has recently initiated an appropriate process for the development of a self-assessment report. Staff at all levels across the establishment are involved and have all contributed to identifying strengths and areas for improvement that have been integrated into a quality improvement plan. The Common Inspection Framework has been used to structure the review and evaluation of all aspects of provision. A wide range of information has been used to provide supporting evidence for the findings.
Summary reports

Army Training Centre, Pirbright

Date of inspection: 9–12 June 2008

Overall effectiveness: satisfactory
Capacity to improve: satisfactory
Self-assessment: satisfactory progress

Context

131 Army Training Centre, Pirbright is based in Surrey, and was established in its current configuration on 1 June 2008. It was previously structured as a single Army Training Regiment. However, during the past 18 months it has been progressively restructured. Now consisting of two Army training regiments (1 Army Training Regiment and 2 Army Training Regiment), plus an HQ regiment, it has doubled in size, with staff redeployed from the Army Training Regiment at Lichfield.

132 Army Training Centre, Pirbright is now the largest single phase 1 recruit training establishment for the Army with a planned annual throughput of up to 5,300 recruits in 2008–09. Around 3,500 recruits trained there in 2007–08. Recruits undertake the 14-week common military syllabus, standard entry.

133 Army Training Centre, Pirbright conducts the initial training of recruits for the cap badges of the Royal Regiment of Artillery, the Royal Logistic Corps, the Royal Corps of Signals, the Intelligence Corps, the Army Medical Service and the Adjutant General’s Corps. Female soldiers comprise just over 20% of the total intake and are trained and accommodated separately from men. Recruits are aged between 17½ and 33 years, with the majority aged 18 to 24. Approximately 12% are from current and former commonwealth countries.

134 Recruits are organised into sections and troops within companies, squadrons or batteries depending on cap badge. Sections are commanded by corporals, reporting to junior officer and senior non-commissioned officers within the troop and sub-unit chain of command. Each training regiment contains recruits from a spread of cap badges; no single badge dominates either of the two training regiments. A Defence Dental Centre, Army Primary Health Care Services and Medical Reception Service are on site to provide direct support to the training units.

135 At the time of inspection 1,130 recruits were in training. Of the 963 male recruits, 153 were under 18, and of the 167 female recruits, 28 were under 18. Army Training Centre, Pirbright is currently understaffed, particularly in respect of corporals and captains. At the time of this inspection the Training Centre was established for 288 training staff, of which 256 were in post. Welfare staff comprise five military staff, including three chaplains, and four non-military WRVS, with two more WRVS due to be in post by mid summer.

Effectiveness of the provision

136 The overall effectiveness of Army Training Centre, Pirbright is satisfactory. The fundamental aspects of welfare and duty of care are in place and effective but require further development. This is clearly recognised by the centre’s commanding officers.

137 Key elements of the welfare and duty of care for recruits include effective arrangements for risk assessing and monitoring recruits from regiment to section level. Recruits interviewed during the inspection feel well supported and safe. Permanent staff are well motivated and enthusiastic about their roles. Aside from section commanders and their immediate chain of command, most recruits currently raise any concerns or problems formally or informally with one of the three chaplains.

138 Recruits’ food is of good quality and quantity and the contract is managed effectively by the HQ regiment. A good range of additional, free or very low cost activities is provided for recruits, particularly in the early weeks of training. Most recruits are accommodated in new barrack blocks which are of good quality. Army Training Centre, Pirbright has benefited from a high level of investment in facilities for recruits. The accommodation available for permanent staff and their families is often very poor, reflecting a long-term lack of investment. It acts as a disincentive for posting to the establishment.
The cycle of physical training for recruits is well planned and appears to meet their military and personal needs. The number of injuries incurred during physical exercise is currently low. A new assault course does not meet required standards, is not fit for purpose and cannot be used.

Areas for improvement include filling the vacant post of Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) unit officer; no CRB checks on instructors have taken place. The recruit dropout rate is high, between 22% and 28%. At up to 62 hours a week, the workload on junior non-commissioned officer instructors is very high. Almost no flexibility exists in the system for covering leave, sickness or training. Staff, particularly female staff, are routinely moved between activities and events to provide specialist expertise and basic cover. A lack of staff continuity and stability at all regimental levels, but notably within training sections, is an ongoing problem.

Too little focus is placed on moving recruits with literacy skills at entry level 2 up to level 3.

Recruits from current and former commonwealth countries frequently struggle with communication and understanding of English, particularly shouted orders or technical language. A disproportionate number of overseas recruits fail aspects of their course and are consequently back-classed. Within Armed Forces Careers Offices and overseas recruiting teams specified procedures to assess overseas recruits’ language capability are not being used consistently. Different careers offices apply different criteria and therefore there is a risk that applicants are not assessed – or treated – consistently.

Overall data collection and usage are poor. Ultimate responsibility for equality and diversity at the Training Centre is not clear and the promotion of equality and diversity is insufficiently coordinated.

Capacity to improve

Army Training Centre, Pirbright’s capacity to improve is satisfactory. No comparative judgement of progress against the outcome of the previous visit is being made, as the organisation, scale and structure of the Training Centre are now completely different.

A range of new and evolving systems within and across the three Training Regiments to manage welfare and duty of care is not yet fully embedded. A combined council of commanding officers has been established to provide a stable platform for cross-establishment implementation and action on various issues. Each of the three commanding officers has experience of welfare and duty of care systems and processes within training establishments, but it is too early for them to have agreed the protocols and detail of a coordinated approach. A supervisory care directive has been in place since September 2007 and is not up to date.

Although resource and under-staffing issues seriously impact on the Training Centre’s ability to implement all the strategic directives and plans to which it is subject, its capacity to deal with operational matters is satisfactory.

Over the past 18 months senior staff have dealt effectively with, and very significantly reduced, the number of historical disciplinary cases involving permanent staff and recruits, many involving either actual or alleged instances of bullying. No cases had been recorded between April 2008 and the time of inspection.

Self-assessment

Progress in self-assessment is satisfactory. The self-assessment process is at a very early stage of development. However, some good initial work has been completed to identify key strengths and areas for improvement, some of which were confirmed by inspection findings. A spreadsheet of issues, and their relative weight of importance, has been compiled, but is incomplete. The overall methodology for self-assessment and the depth and range of issues to be included have yet to be finalised. A coordinated, high-level approach to self-assessment involving senior staff is planned to begin towards the end of June 2008.
Summary reports

RAF Halton, Recruit Training Squadron

Date of inspection: 26–27 June 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall effectiveness:</th>
<th>Capacity to improve:</th>
<th>Self-assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>satisfactory</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
<td>satisfactory progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Context

Royal Air Force (RAF) Halton offers phase 1, 2 and 3 training to over 20,000 airmen and airwomen each year. Several other training centres use RAF Halton’s premises but are separate from the main training activity.

Phase 1 training is for all recruits to the RAF, with the exception of RAF Regiment gunners, who are trained separately at RAF Honington. Phase 1 recruits at Halton complete an initial nine-week training course.

The phase 1 school, known as the Recruit Training Squadron, consists of 12 flights covering mainstream training, with 15 to 25 recruits in each flight, a rehabilitation and development flight, the airmen’s development flight and its own administrative element. It currently expects to train up to 2,800 recruits in 2008–09.

Successful recruits either leave the Recruit Training Squadron to go straight to phase 2 professional training at other establishments, or stay at RAF Halton to train for the logistics or catering trades provided on site by units. Recruits can also be held temporarily in the Recruit Training Squadron’s airmen’s development flight until they take up phase 2 training places. The average stay for recruits in this flight is currently six to seven weeks.

RAF Halton is commanded by a Group Captain with responsibility for two training wings and a command group. The command group is responsible for a range of estate and communications functions. A support wing is responsible for aspects such as the medical and dental services and RAF police.

Of the 393 recruits at the Recruit Training Squadron at the time of inspection, 311 were men. Some 60 men and 17 women were under 18 years of age. Female recruits make up approximately 20% of the total intake over a year and around 60% of all recruits are aged 18 to 22. Recruits are housed in barracks in an area separate from other military trainees’ accommodation. Most military training takes place during the day in an area in a lower part of the station. The establishment was unable to provide data on the number of recruits from minority ethnic backgrounds.

At the time of inspection the Recruit Training Squadron was close to its established strength of 74 military training staff. A very good proportion of corporal instructors (39 of 42) have completed the Defence Train the Trainers course. The Recruit Training Squadron is staffed with military personnel and two military chaplains.

Effectiveness of the provision

The overall effectiveness of the Recruit Training Squadron is satisfactory. The arrangements for the support and welfare of recruits are extensive and effective. Recruits are motivated and secure, and respect the support provided by their instructors and the padres. The overall pass rate is high. Permanent staff are well motivated and provide good role models for recruits. All the corporal instructors are volunteers. In the past two years a range of actions has reduced pelvic stress injuries incurred through physical training among female recruits.

Many aspects at the Recruit Training Squadron are satisfactory, including the self-assessment process. Medical facilities, food, accommodation, staffing levels, working hours for permanent staff, staff selection and training and activities for recruits in rehabilitation or awaiting further training are all satisfactory.

Principal areas for improvement include: formally evaluating the overall effectiveness of welfare and duty of care processes and systems; conformance to policy in the recording and collation of informal equality and diversity-related complaints; and expanding provision to support all recruits with basic skills needs or specific learning difficulties.
Medical screening and fitness testing in the Armed Forces Careers Offices are poor.

Capacity to improve

The Recruit Training Squadron’s capacity to improve is satisfactory. The squadron has made reasonable progress in its arrangements for welfare and support for recruits since the previous inspection. A key factor has been the reinstatement of an overall supervisory forum, involving senior staff, providing oversight of all aspects of welfare and duty of care at RAF Halton, including the Recruit Training Squadron. An equivalent forum had been discontinued by a previous senior commander. Additional forums are now in place to provide more detailed and timely monitoring, for example of the level and type of injuries to recruits. The quality and commitment of permanent staff are high and support the delivery of effective welfare and duty of care. Inadequate coordination between the recruit and military training squadrons is hindering coordinated improvement.

Self-assessment

Progress in self-assessment is satisfactory. An extensive self-assessment report has been produced. The commander’s risk assessment is thorough and forms the basis for much of the self-assessment. The role of this risk assessment in the self-assessment process is not clear. The self-assessment report is overly descriptive: it includes some identification of strengths or areas for improvement, but is insufficiently evaluative. Self-assessment is not providing a sufficiently clear and focused identification of what are and are not critical actions to enable continuous improvement overall or in any specific aspects of training and welfare. Action-planning is not sufficiently specific, measurable or timely.
The Defence School of Transport is located at Normandy barracks near the town of Beverley in Yorkshire. It is a school within the Defence College of Logistics and Personnel Administration, but is also within the Army’s 2 Division Regional Command. The Defence School of Transport is located on a former airfield with a 778-acre training area.

The school provides driver training, road transport management, combat service support and signals training for phase 2 and 3 trainees from all three services. Approximately 83% of the phase 2 trainees are from the Army. All phase 2 trainees arrive at the Defence School of Transport from phase 1 with between seven and 14 weeks’ military experience, depending on training establishment and military service. Approximately 40 trainees join the establishment each week. Trainees range in age from 17 to 29 years. Most phase 2 trainees work towards large goods vehicle category C (lorry) and lorry + trailer category E licence training and testing. Subsequently they convert to service driver. Trainees undertake licence acquisition at their own pace according to ability under a system called Fixed Mastery Variable Time. Most driver training is delivered by civilian instructors, around half of whom are ex-military personnel.

The Defence School of Transport is established for 168 permanent military staff. Most corporal roles are supervisory rather than instructional. There are 778 civil service personnel and an annual intake of trainees of around 12,300. Ministry of Defence Guard Service and Military Provost Guard Service provide the guarding resource for the establishment but do call upon trainees for supervised guard duty during weekdays, weekends and holiday periods.

During the week of inspection there was a total of 1,205 trainees on site, 6% of whom were women and 11% from overseas. Phase 2 trainees numbered 704, of whom 8% were women.

Effectiveness of the provision

The overall effectiveness of the welfare and duty of care provision for phase 2 trainees is good. Very effective systems are in place to identify and manage those deemed to be at risk. Trainees identified as vulnerable are well supported. Regular and productive management meetings bring together all organisations and individuals across the establishment who are involved in the management of trainees. Those aged under 18 years are accommodated separately from other trainees; men and women are also accommodated separately and have appropriate support mechanisms. Welfare and duty of care military staff liaise and work very closely with civilian instructors. A ‘student focus team’ plays a particularly effective role in linking professional training and pastoral care. This is a particularly strong aspect of this provision, typified by very good communications between the key aspects of delivery at the school. Data are collected and used well as an evaluative and progress monitoring tool.

Capacity to improve

The Defence School of Transport’s capacity to improve is satisfactory. The overall focus at the School is clearly directed to supporting and managing each trainee through their training programme. Much has already been achieved in identifying training support needs and putting in place support structures and facilities. The commanding officer’s supervisory care directive is well written and provides effective identification of the critical factors affecting welfare and duty of care at The Defence School of Transport. It provides a very good framework for the management of welfare.
The arrival of additional trainees from 110 Squadron, Princess Royal Barracks has been planned well. However, staff have identified that some facilities may be stretched beyond their capacity. The likely impact of significant delays in implementing new and minor building work may severely affect the school’s ability to further improve welfare arrangements and facilities for trainees. The school is further restricted from expanding its current driver training programme by constraints and delays around the employment process for civilian driving instructors.

**Self-assessment**

Progress in self-assessment at the time of the inspection is satisfactory. The overall self-assessment process is still immature but some good work has been done to collate and analyse previous reports. Strengths and areas for improvement have been identified, but these have not yet been formally drawn together as part of a quality improvement plan. More involvement of, and consultation with, operational staff at all levels is essential. Quality improvement planning is reasonably well established in the School.

The commander’s risk assessment is thorough and forms the basis of the self-assessment report but the role of the risk assessment in the self-assessment process is not well defined. The self-assessment process does not provide a sufficiently clear and focused identification of critical actions to enable overall continuous improvement in any specific aspects of training and welfare. Action planning is not sufficiently specific, measurable or timely.

The school has received a directive from Defence College of Logistics and Personnel Administration to produce a self-assessment report for May 2009. Such a timescale would appear to be insufficiently demanding. An active and focused quality improvement plan and report need to be produced promptly.
The quality of welfare and duty of care for recruits and trainees

The Royal Air Force (RAF) Regiment is tasked to deliver and sustain ground force protection operational capability. The training wing at RAF Honington is responsible for most of the Regiment’s training including the course for trainee gunners, conducted by Regimental Training Squadron (Basics). The Regiment only accepts men for training.

Trainees are accepted with the lowest airman selection test score but over 80% are at or above level 1 in literacy and numeracy. Over the past year there has been a significant increase in numbers being trained, with 600 targeted for 2008–09 compared with 270 in 2006–07. At the time of inspection, 250 trainees were on site and 66 away on ranges or exercises. Currently 68 trainees are aged under 18. Trainees arrive in groups of approximately 60. For administrative and support purposes they are divided into five flights. Each flight is managed by two sergeants and a junior officer. Five sections make up a flight. Each section consists of about 12 trainees and is led by a corporal. The Regimental Training Squadron (Basics) consists of seven flights, including the remedial and rehabilitation flight.

Training has recently been reorganised to run from the phase 1 recruit stage, to trainee gunner in phase 2 and field gunner in phase 3. The combined training from phase 1 to phase 3 now lasts 32 weeks compared with 45 weeks at the time of the previous inspection in 2006. Phase 1 and 2 training in the Regimental Training Squadron (Basics) is the focus of this inspection.

The officer commanding the Regimental Training Squadron (Basics) reports to the station commander RAF Honington through the officer commanding the training wing, who also commands RTS Advanced, RTS Continuation and the HQ squadron.

Total military training staff number 67 against an establishment of 75. Due to a very recent increase in staffing levels, only 34 of these members of staff have completed the Defence Train the Trainer course.

RAF Honington also hosts a Potential Gunner Acquaint Course, which runs over three days. All applicants to the RAF Regiment are required to attend this course following which, if they remain interested, a recommendation on whether they should be accepted is passed to the relevant Armed Forces Careers Office.

The overall effectiveness of the Regimental Training Squadron (Basics) is satisfactory. The overall arrangements for welfare and duty of care are good. This was also a strength in the 2006 inspection. The chain of command pays good attention to trainees’ welfare and duty of care at all times. The systems and processes underpinning welfare and duty of care continue to be well supported by staff at all levels. A clear and effective reporting and recording chain is in place. A newly appointed senior non-commissioned officer provides a good focus for the welfare provision. Good contact is maintained with trainees’ parents and guardians. The arrangements for supporting trainees aged under 18 are appropriate and well organised. Two padres provide good support to significant numbers of trainees.

Particularly good support is provided for trainees with specific learning difficulties or those who need to improve their literacy or numeracy skills. This aspect was a strength in 2006. Trainees speak positively about the good teaching they receive and their achievements in literacy and numeracy. The Potential Gunner Acquaint Course continues to be a strength of the overall provision. A standard timetable of events provides a good and broadly similar introduction to the Regiment for all participants.

Attendees’ welfare is managed appropriately. The overall development and coordination of the training
programme is good. The overall length of the course has been reduced and the timing of some military training activities brought forward to maintain trainees’ interest and enthusiasm.

181 Many aspects of the provision at the Regimental Training Squadron (Basics) are satisfactory. Coordination of activities and support in the remedial and rehabilitation flight was originally an area for improvement, and has now improved. Instructor selection is satisfactory. The arrangements for instructor training and support were cited as a strength in 2006, but are now judged satisfactory as they are broadly consistent with practices currently found in most training establishments.

182 The quality and quantity of food available to trainees in the junior ranks’ mess, and accommodation, remain satisfactory. Military staffing levels were originally an area for improvement but are now satisfactory. Two additional areas judged as satisfactory are the effective and appropriate use of corrective training as a tool to manage the development of trainees, and the management of formal complaints.

183 The main areas for improvement include the lack of a strategic overview of welfare and duty of care. This was an issue in 2006. Although the day-to-day practice of welfare and duty of care is good, there is no forum or mechanism to identify and monitor the impact of welfare and duty of care across the Regiment. At squadron or executive level there is too much emphasis on verbal communication and verbal decision-making.

184 The dropout rate from training remains high and this continues to be an area for improvement, although it is difficult to ascertain the exact rate as there is no consistent or agreed set of data available for use within the Regimental Training Squadron (Basics).

185 New areas for improvement include the poor collation and use of data. This was previously a strength. Senior staff do not have a clear understanding of trainees’ performance achieved by using an adequate range of measures. The recording of, and response to, informal complaints is not carried out in accordance with policy. Facilities and resources for physical training are inadequate to cope with demand. The medical assessments undertaken at Armed Forces Career Offices are insufficiently robust to identify some significant issues that subsequently cause recruits to drop out of training. There are not enough staff available in RAF Honington’s medical centre to cope with demand.

**Capacity to improve**

186 The Regimental Training Squadron (Basics)’s capacity to improve is satisfactory. Satisfactory progress has been made in developing its arrangements for trainees’ welfare and support since the previous inspection. On balance, the maintenance of key aspects and progress to date outweighs those areas which have not improved or deteriorated, such as the strategic overview of the impact of welfare and duty of care, or the collation and use of data to monitor and assure this impact.

187 Recent changes to the length, structure and timings of key aspects of the course have been well thought through. Meeting the needs and interests of trainees has clearly played a significant part in this change process. A recently appointed senior non-commissioned officer has a key role in welfare matters and is increasingly effective. The support for trainees with specific learning difficulties and skills for life needs was good and has been further improved. The links between the Potential Gunner Acquaint Course and the Regimental Training Squadron (Basics) have been strengthened, and there are clear plans to develop and improve them further, including the provision of medicals during the Potential Gunner Acquaint Course instead of at Armed Forces Careers Offices. Recently staffing levels have improved significantly.

**Self-assessment**

188 Progress towards self-assessment is insufficient. The Training Squadron is at an early stage in the development of a methodology or process for self-assessment. No formalised framework for the development of self-assessment has been devised, although it is recognised that some elements are immediately available such as previous reports from inspections.

189 The commandant’s risk assessment, which could provide an initial basis for self-assessment, is comprehensive but insufficiently evaluative. It contains few specific or measurable actions to improve. Most impact measures in the assessment simply identify the negative outcomes of a failure to conform to policy.
The Army School of Ammunition, Kineton

Date of inspection: 29–30 July 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall effectiveness:</th>
<th>Capacity to improve:</th>
<th>Self-assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>satisfactory</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
<td>satisfactory progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Context

190 The Army School of Ammunition is based in Kineton, Warwickshire. It is co-located on a site owned by the Defence Storage and Distribution Agency.

191 Among other courses, the Army School of Ammunition runs a basic training programme for phase 2 and 3 trainees: the Ammunition Technician Class 2 course. This covers ammunition systems, handling, storage, movement, surveillance and repair, and munitions disposal. Attendees on this course include phase 2 trainees and trained phase 3 soldiers who are changing trades. Trainees are normally referred to as students while at the establishment.

192 All students complete an extensive three-stage selection process for the Ammunition Technician Class 2. The course lasts six months in total, beginning with an introductory five-week phase at the Defence College of Management and Technology, Shrubham. On successful completion of this course, graduates are posted to the field army with the rank of lance corporal.

193 Two courses were running during the inspection, one with 14 students, the other with 16, all based on site. Of the 30 students, four were women, one was from a minority ethnic group and eight were changing their trades. Trainees are normally referred to as students while at the establishment.

194 The Army School of Ammunition is organised into four wings under a headquarters function. The phase 2 training takes place within the land service ammunition training wing. This wing also runs all arms storage and movement courses as well as ammunition technician class 1 upgrading, and ammunition technical officer courses. The improvised explosive device disposal training wing delivers tri-service training to trained soldiers.

195 The current phase 2 students underwent initial training at the Army Training Centre, Pirbright or Army Training Regiment, Winchester and then initial phase 2 training at 25 Training Regiment, Deepcut. The phase 3 soldiers, training for a new trade, come from a variety of regiments, trades and backgrounds, often with many years of experience, including operations, and already have the rank of corporal. Phase 2 and 3 soldiers train together, but are billeted in separate rooms in the same barrack blocks. Women live three to a room, and men five or six, on separate floors of the same block. Secure female accommodation is provided.

196 The school currently has 18 training staff, including four civilian instructors, against a total establishment of 26. The site guard force is provided by the Military Provost Guard Service.

197 Facilities on site include The Hub, a pay as you dine facility that incorporates the soldiers’ restaurant, junior ranks’ bar, snack bar and station shop. In addition there is a HIVE, church, hairdresser and gym. 14

Effectiveness of the provision

198 The overall effectiveness of the Army School of Ammunition is satisfactory. The welfare and duty of care arrangements are good. Welfare and duty of care issues are generally minor. Students are focused, self-confident individuals, carefully selected according to their aptitude and potential. Students interviewed have a good understanding of, and enthusiasm for, the ammunition technician trade. In the period April 2007 to March 2008 the overall completion rate, effectively a first-time pass rate, for Ammunition Technician Class 2 was 71%. The wastage rate, including students back-classed but who subsequently complete, is 16%.
The welfare and duty of care system comprises complementary formal and informal arrangements. Instructors provide very good informal technical and pastoral support for students. The ratio of instructors to students is very high at around 2:1. The formal arrangements and systems for welfare and duty of care and relevant staffing are strong and generally effective. The course senior role, whereby the most senior student is given some authority to liaise with senior staff, requires review and change. The system is based solely on seniority which does not automatically confer competence, and also denies the opportunity to others to develop basic command skills.

Instructor selection and support is satisfactory. Instructors usually volunteer for the posting, and are well motivated and enthusiastic. Students’ accommodation is generally satisfactory. Not enough washing machines and dryers are available. Maintenance is satisfactory. Physical training is satisfactory. A significant majority of students improve their levels of fitness while at the school. Medical and dental facilities and resources are satisfactory.

New instructors’ access to and attendance on the Defence Train the Trainers course is poor. Only half of the practising instructors at the Army School of Ammunition have been able to get onto the course. Students note the positive impact of the course on instructors’ teaching technique. No central system exists for recording informal complaints. Pay as you dine is not improving the quality and quantity of food. Too few activities are available at weekends for students. Access to the internet is poor.

Self-assessment

Progress towards self-assessment is satisfactory but very much a work in progress. A quality improvement plan has been produced but is not yet complete. The Army School of Ammunition recognises that its current approach to self-assessment requires significant development, but the current quality improvement plan provides a reasonable starting point for improvement. However, it does not have sufficient evaluation of impact, or areas for improvement. In particular, the plan does not identify specific, measurable and timely action planning to improve, or individual or collective responsibility for that improvement.

The Training Quality Audit and Advisory Team has very recently undertaken a welfare and duty of care audit on behalf of Defence College of Logistics and Personnel Administration. The Army School of Ammunition has responded positively to the outcomes and recommendations of this audit and taken some appropriate actions. The Audit and Advisory Team’s findings were based around conformance to policies and not on the qualitative aspects of managing and improving performance. Some of the conformance issues identified were not historically or currently relevant, such as under-18s policies and practice.

Capacity to improve

The school’s capacity to improve is satisfactory. The unit’s blended approach to welfare and duty of care is good and appropriate for a small, technically focused trade centre serving highly motivated individuals. The technical instructors play a key role in supporting and developing students. The instructors are highly motivated and skilled.
Summary reports

Commando Training Centre, Royal Marines

Date of inspection: 9–11 September 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall effectiveness:</th>
<th>Capacity to improve:</th>
<th>Self-assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>good progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Context

Commando Training Centre, Royal Marines is located at Lympstone, near Exmouth in Devon. It provides ‘through career’ training for Royal Marine officers and other ranks through three training wings. The 95-acre camp on the banks of the River Exe was originally established in 1939.

Commando Training Wing provides the Marine recruit training. The course lasts 32 weeks. Phase 1, from weeks 1 to 14, instils basic military skills and knowledge. In phase 2, from weeks 15 to 32, the emphasis changes from individual skills to pairs, fire teams, section and troop tactics. This period also involves the culmination of physical training, which is mainly assessed through rigorous commando tests. Other elements of the course include welfare, equality and diversity, and a national vocational qualification with some computer training. At the end of the course recruits will have reached their designated operational performance standard and will be sent directly to operational units. Commando Training Wing comprises four companies. One, Hunter, is for recruits who require extra time to complete training, either because of physical injuries, or because they have failed to reach the required standards.

New troops of between 50 to 55 recruits join every two weeks, with 16 troops under training at any one time. Each has a troop commander, a sergeant and a team of corporals. These corporal instructors deliver most of the training, coaching and mentoring to recruits. The recruit/instructor ratio is in the region 10:1.

Women are excluded from serving in the Royal Marines. On average, some two thirds of Royal Marine recruits are aged 16 to 18 and 3% belong to minority ethnic groups. The maximum age for joining the Royal Marines is a recruit’s 33rd birthday. No formal educational qualifications are required but potential Marines must pass an eligibility check, formal recruiting test, selection interview, medical assessment and a three-day Potential Royal Marines Course.

During the week of inspection, a total of 769 recruits were on site, of whom 10% were under 18 years of age and 1.5% were from minority ethnic groups.

Effectiveness of the provision

The overall effectiveness of the welfare and duty of care provision for recruits at the Training Centre is good. The Potential Royal Marines Course is good. It is very effective in introducing potential recruits to the Royal Marines. A good range of tasks effectively test recruits’ physical endurance and mental preparedness. Welfare and duty of care is managed effectively and also takes into account the risks associated with dealing with civilians.

Commando Training Centre, Royal Marines has maintained, refined or further developed a number of the strengths identified during previous inspections and has addressed the areas for improvement. The Training Centre’s commitment to continuous improvement is long-standing and productive. A wide range of data are routinely collected, analysed and shared. A report on the identified top 10 quality control issues is produced on a regular basis.

The overall arrangements for, and practice of, welfare and duty of care are good. A balance is generally maintained between the delivery of robust military training and instructors’ support for individual trainees’ professional and personal issues. A team of core carers, including non-military staff, is highly professional, well used by permanent staff and recruits, and very effective.

Good use is made of internal surveys to check recruits’ awareness and understanding of welfare and duty of care systems. The views of training staff are also gathered. The most recent survey identified that under-age drinking is not prohibited effectively. Appropriate improvement actions were put in place.
Corporal instructors are carefully selected and well trained. They receive a good range of training which covers teaching, coaching and mentoring techniques. All instructors have attended the Defence Train the Trainers course.

The two-week foundation period for all new recruits is well managed and well established, although data are not used sufficiently to help analyse ways to improve the foundation period. During the foundation period, recruits develop the fundamental skills and knowledge required to complete training, including cleaning, ironing, personal administration and understanding military systems and rank. Rehabilitation and remedial instruction in Hunter Company are good. Recruits experience good individual support. Around 80% of those who enter Hunter Company resume training.

The promotion of equality and diversity is good. Equality and diversity themes form a key part of senior management forums and meetings. As part of its continuous improvement strategy, the Training Centre has developed a comprehensive equality and diversity action plan. An equalities action group continues to meet regularly to discuss and plan actions relating to relevant issues.

Arrangements for the provision of basic skills and support for learners with specific learning difficulties are satisfactory. Some assessment takes place early on in training but no formally timetabled support is available until week 9. Good support is provided for recruits with specific learning difficulties such as dyslexia.

The quantity and quality of food available to recruits is satisfactory, with four meals daily. Menus are varied. Longer-term recruits complain about a lack of variety and, sometimes, the quantity served. Most recruits have little time to eat and few are nutritionally aware.

The Commando Training Centre, Royal Marines’ dropout rate remains very high. The average loss per month is 38 recruits, with most leaving during the first 14 weeks. The completion rate for the period April 2007 to March 2008 was 52%, a rate comparable to the past six years. A variety of reasons cause this level of dropout.

Significantly, 11% of leavers annually are known to leave due to pre-existing medical conditions which render them unfit for service and which are not identified during initial assessments at Armed Forces Careers Offices. Medical examinations at the careers offices are insufficiently thorough.

The Training Centre’s rehabilitation facilities require improvement. The overall environment works against continuous improvement. Facilities for physiotherapists within gyms do not reflect contemporary practice or standards.

**Capacity to improve**

Commando Training Centre, Royal Marines’ capacity to improve is good. Its well-established approach to continuous improvement has already generated improvement over time. Self-assessment is an important contributory factor. Senior staff are committed to further improving the recruits’ experience, and producing the best possible trained marines for service.

**Self-assessment**

Commando Training Centre, Royal Marines has made good progress in self-assessment, linked to the process of continuous improvement. Self-assessment is playing an effective part in this process. It is sufficiently analytical and evaluative and not based merely on assessing conformance to policy, but there are insufficiently strong links between areas for improvement and the core self-assessment report. A wide range of input and assessment from the Training Centre’s departments provides a thorough evaluation of the establishment’s overall effectiveness. Sufficient attention has been paid to identifying areas for improvement and associated actions in the action plan, but the core self-assessment report is too relentlessly positive in tone.
The quality of welfare and duty of care for recruits and trainees

Summary reports

Army Training Regiment, Bassingbourn

Date of inspection: 21–23 October 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall effectiveness:</th>
<th>Capacity to improve:</th>
<th>Self-assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>satisfactory</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
<td>satisfactory progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Context

224 The Army Training Regiment, Bassingbourn is one of four initial Army training establishments. It is based on an 850-acre site near Royston in Cambridgeshire. Since August 2008 the Training Regiment has provided senior entry courses for men only. Before this date it provided junior entry courses aimed at recruits aged under 17 and a small number of senior entry courses.

225 The current Common Military Syllabus Senior Entry lasts 14 weeks with some elements, including live firing, adventure training and swimming, taking place off site. The Training Regiment trains soldiers destined for the Household Cavalry, Royal Artillery Corps, Royal Engineers and the Royal Electrical and Mechanical Engineers.

226 The Army Training Regiment, Bassingbourn is organised into four recruit training companies and a headquarters company. Each training company has up to six training sub-units, with dedicated training teams. The sub-unit chain of command is a troop commander, sergeant and a team of corporals. The corporal instructors provide the training. The recruit remedial, rehabilitation and discharge platoon, Shackleton Company, is part of the headquarters company, which also takes responsibility for all the other administrative functions.

227 Recruits are billeted in barracks with 10 recruits to each room. The main blocks are well-established brick buildings, but the remedial and discharge platoon is based in temporary accommodation. The site has extensive facilities including a large gymnasium, sports fields, dry ski slope, medical and dental facilities, 100-metre and 30-metre ranges and a rough training area. An estate development plan, to improve and modernise many of the facilities, is in place but work is not expected to start for a further two years.

228 The establishment is still building up to its full training capacity of around 800 phase 1 recruits. During the inspection there were 685 recruits in training. Around 100 new recruits arrive every two weeks. On average, 25% of the recruit population are 17 years of age, most of the remainder are aged 18 to 21 and 12% are from minority ethnic groups. The maximum age for a recruit to enter training is 32 years. At the time of inspection no new recruits had passed out since the new regime started.

Effectiveness of the provision

229 The overall effectiveness of the welfare and duty of care provision for recruits is satisfactory. The fundamental aspects of welfare and duty of care are in place but require some further development. This is clearly recognised by senior staff. An effective database is used well to record and monitor recruits’ progress, performance and welfare issues. All key elements of the welfare and duty of care for recruits are in place, including effective arrangements for risk assessing and monitoring recruits. Recruits interviewed during the inspection felt well supported and safe. Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) checks are being undertaken but the process of completing them is very slow.

230 Permanent staff are well motivated and enthusiastic about their roles, but they work very long hours. Significant numbers had not completed all elements of their instructor training before joining the establishment.

231 Recruits’ food is of satisfactory quality and quantity, but the choice is poor. Recruits live in satisfactory accommodation that is adequately maintained. Accommodation for permanent staff and their families is satisfactory. The cycle of physical training for recruits is well planned and meets their military and
personal needs, although training to develop swimming skills is not sufficient. The promotion of equality and diversity is satisfactory.

232 The Army Training Regiment has some staffing issues, with some significant posts unfilled, although the ratio of staff to recruits during the inspection was satisfactory. The collection and use of data on recruit performance against the revised Common Military Syllabus Senior Entry is underdeveloped.

233 A Criminal Records Bureau officer has been deployed for some time but there is still a backlog of staff awaiting their completed CRB checks. The process is often lengthy and, for many new staff, is not initiated before arrival at the Training Regiment. Consequently, Military Police records are used to identify staff with records who may be a potential risk to recruits. This process is reasonably effective but it does not identify the same aspects as a CRB check.

Capacity to improve

234 The capacity of the Army Training Regiment, Bassingbourn to improve is satisfactory. No comparative judgement of progress against the outcome of previous visits is being made as the current recruit profile and training syllabus are significantly different, with the delivery of an entirely senior entry Common Military Syllabus.

235 Many of the original command and organisational structures are still in place and provide a satisfactory platform on which new initiatives and revised protocols can be built. The new senior staff have already identified aspects for improvement. Staff across the establishment have participated in a study day to identify what is working well and what needs to change. A supervisory care directive has been in place for some time and requires updating.

236 The Army Training Regiment, Bassingbourn's capacity to deal with operational matters in the context of current staffing levels is satisfactory. Since the start of the Common Military Syllabus there has been a considerable reduction in the number of complaints and disciplinary and corrective actions.

Self-assessment

237 Progress towards self-assessment at the Training Regiment is satisfactory. One outcome of the recent changes to command management and delivery of the Common Military Syllabus has been a focus on improving performance. There have been effective actions to identify aspects in need of improvement. Some elements of the current syllabus are not functioning effectively, such as the overemphasis on field exercises in the last five weeks of training. Reorganisation of the syllabus is already underway. A recent Commander Initial Training Group audit will be helpful in refocusing staff on self-assessment.
Summary reports

Army Training Regiment, Winchester

Date of inspection: 4–6 November 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall effectiveness:</th>
<th>Capacity to improve:</th>
<th>Self-assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>satisfactory</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
<td>satisfactory progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Context

238 The Army Training Regiment, Winchester is one of four Army initial training establishments. It is based at the Sir John Moore barracks just outside Winchester in Hampshire. In September 2008 the focus of training switched from senior to junior entry only. Recruits now enter training aged between 16 and 17 years. The Training Regiment trains soldiers destined for most corps and regiments in the British Army.

239 The current Common Military Syllabus – Junior Entry lasts 22 weeks at present, rising to 23 weeks in 2009. No junior entry recruit cohort has yet passed out from the Training Regiment in Winchester. Most training takes place in the immediate area.

240 The Regiment is organised as three recruit training squadrons and a headquarters squadron. Each training squadron has either five or six sub-units divided into troops, each with a dedicated training team. The corporal instructors provide the majority of recruit training, coaching and mentoring. The student/instructor ratio is generally in the region of 10:1 or 12:1. The remedial, rehabilitation and discharge troop, known as Fox, is part of the headquarters (HQ) squadron. The HQ squadron also takes responsibility for welfare and some administrative functions.

241 Recruits are accommodated in barracks with around 10 recruits to each room. The barrack blocks are modern brick buildings and generally in good condition. The site has extensive facilities, including sports pitches, an orienteering course, squash and tennis courts, a gym and a large WRVS leisure facility.

242 The establishment is still building up to its full operational capacity. During the week of inspection there were 484 recruits in training, of whom 30 were women; these recruits are mustered in a single troop. In the period from the start of the Common Military Syllabus to the date of inspection, data supplied show that no new recruits from minority ethnic groups enrolled on programmes; however, UK recruits from minority ethnic backgrounds are in training. No overseas recruits are in training at this Regiment.

Effectiveness of the provision

243 The overall effectiveness of the welfare and duty of care provision for recruits is satisfactory. The Regiment has developed a very effective risk register which is a detailed, regularly updated narrative on individual recruits’ welfare issues, squadron by squadron. The register forms the key discussion and action-planning component of the formal monthly welfare meetings.

244 The overall arrangements for recruits’ welfare and duty of care are good. The chain of command has a thorough awareness of each recruit in training. Recruits comment that training teams and welfare staff respond very well to their welfare and general needs. Any recruits whose behaviour is poor are generally identified and dealt with quickly. Data are not used to provide deeper insight and analysis of the comparative performance of different groups of recruits.

245 Leisure facilities in the WRVS area are extensive and well used by recruits; however, recruits are not always allowed to use the leisure facilities unsupervised. They cannot always gain access to confidential WRVS welfare support on a drop-in basis in the first seven or eight weeks of training. This practice requires review and change.

246 The implementation and development of the Common Military Syllabus (Junior Entry) are satisfactory. The syllabus and structure are regularly reviewed by senior staff and improvements are identified.
Basic skills support is satisfactory. Many recruits enter training with low levels of literacy and numeracy. All recruits undertake some skills development, although not all require basic skills support. Section and troop commanders are encouraged to sit in on basic skills lessons. Medical and dental arrangements, the quality and quantity of recruits’ food, and maintenance and repair are all satisfactory.

Instructors’ motivation for, and commitment to, their duties is generally good. However, the perceived positive status, value or career benefit of the instructor role is not high for all cap badges.

The rehabilitation and remedial support available in Fox troop is good. Fox staff work very closely with the training squadrons to return recruits to training as soon as possible.

Too many instructors arrive without having completed the Army Recruitment and Training Division staff leadership school course. Of 14 new staff who have joined since September 2008, only three have completed the course. Instructors’ workload is very high. Working hours of up to 16 hours a day and seven days a week are common. This increases the risk that over-tired instructors will not be able to provide consistently high levels of welfare and duty of care. No flexibility exists in staffing levels to cover staffing gaps during the initial weeks of training.

A large number of recruits ask to change trades or cap badges after arrival. Incorrect kit lists include items that do not need to be bought in advance. The medical assessment of recruits before arrival is frequently poor. Many recruits are classed as ‘defect on enlistment’ on arriving at training. A Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) officer is in post, but CRB checking is too slow. Only 32% of the checks had been completed at the time of inspection, and only a further 5% four months later.

Capacity to improve

The capacity of the Army Training Regiment, Winchester to improve is satisfactory. No comparative judgement of progress against the outcome of previous visits is being made as the current organisation, recruit profile and syllabus are significantly different to the past regime.

Staff are developing and maintaining good standards of training, welfare and duty of care. Many of the improvements are work in progress, as would be expected in the early stages of a new course with a new entry. The risk register provides a full overview of recruits’ welfare issues and has capacity for further refinement and development. The general attitude to welfare and duty of care is proactive and the experience of recruits at The Army Training Regiment, Winchester is positive.

Self-assessment

Progress towards self-assessment and continuous improvement is satisfactory. The current commanding officer has identified some key areas for improvement and has consequently initiated projects such as the co-location of all welfare personnel within the WRVS facility.

The first self-assessment was undertaken this year in preparation for a visit by Initial Training Group in June 2008. Key personnel were involved in the process, which judged most areas to be good, some outstanding and a very small number inadequate. The process has resulted in a quality improvement plan, although the change from senior to junior entry has meant that some actions are no longer appropriate. It is too early to judge the overall effectiveness of the self-assessment process.
Context

The Infantry Training Centre, Catterick is situated at Catterick Garrison in North Yorkshire. It comprises two adjacent barracks, Vimy and Helles, and is the only establishment that trains senior entry infantry recruits. All recruits are men.

The Infantry Training Centre, Catterick now comprises two training battalions. The first and second battalions (1 ITB, 2 ITB) are responsible for carrying out training. A Headquarters Company provides support and general services, including the rehabilitation and discharge companies.

1 ITB trains line infantry. 1 ITB recruits are organised into five companies, each divided into platoons and further sub-divided into sections of about 12 men. 2 ITB trains Gurkhas, Parachute Regiment and Guards and runs the short course unit, Anzio Company.

Recruits follow the combat infantryman’s course which lasts 26 weeks. This is the framework for all infantry recruit training and combines phase 1 and 2 training. Most recruits are preparing to join line infantry regiments and follow the combat infantryman’s course. Recruits intending to join the Foot Guards, the Parachute Regiment and the Gurkhas have additional training, around two further weeks, to meet the needs of those regiments. Recruits move directly to the field army when they leave ITC Catterick.

Effectiveness of the provision

The overall effectiveness of the welfare and duty of care provision for recruits is satisfactory. The overall arrangements for welfare and duty of care are satisfactory. The senior and sub-unit chain of command have an adequate overview of recruits’ general progress and well-being. Recruits have access to and use a good range of welfare contact and support agencies outside of the chain of command. Too great an emphasis is placed on the maintenance of confidentiality and this sometimes has a negative impact on effective communication between all in the welfare chain. The quality of arrangements for identifying and supporting recruits identified as being at risk is adequate overall, but they are much more developed in one training battalion than the other.

Instructors’ selection, training and development are good. Most instructors are able to attend the Army Recruitment and Training Division staff leadership school before joining the Infantry Training Centre, Catterick. The approach of training teams to recruit training is particularly positive. Training teams’ experience of the realities of combat operations is used well to contextualise recruit training. Training teams are strongly focused on producing the best possible infantry soldier for the field army. Recruits interviewed by inspectors were very complimentary about the quality of their training teams, and the junior non-commissioned officers in particular.

Basic skills assessment and support are satisfactory. Basic skills support is provided through an intensive course after recruits have passed out. Remedial training discipline is managed appropriately. Physical training is satisfactory. Medical and dental facilities and resources are satisfactory. The quality and quantity of food is satisfactory. Accommodation is satisfactory overall.

The recruit dropout rate is high and has been so for a number of years. The rate varies significantly between the two battalions. The collation and use of data are poor. Data are not used sufficiently well at senior or other appropriate levels to identify and monitor the quality of aspects of performance, or to measure subsequent improvement. Too few Criminal Record Bureau checks have been completed on new or existing training staff.

Date of inspection: 25–27 November 2008

Overall effectiveness: satisfactory
Capacity to improve: satisfactory
Self-assessment: insufficient progress
Instructors’ workload is very high. They work very long hours. For many, this has a negative impact on their personal lives. It also increases the risk that high standards of welfare and duty of care may not be maintained. Higher numbers of recruits are now entering infantry training. Many do not have an adequate minimum mental robustness or physical quality to become infantry soldiers. Key aspects of the recruiting practice for recruits from overseas are poor. Some current recruits and permanent staff have been steered directly to the infantry without an alternative being offered. Overseas applicants recruited to the infantry in the United Kingdom are frequently over-qualified for infantry roles. The Infantry Training Centre, Catterick makes insufficient provision for the language development and cultural integration of overseas recruits.

Capacity to improve

The Infantry Training Centre, Catterick’s capacity to improve is satisfactory. ITC clearly identifies those areas for improvement it is in a position to tackle directly. It uses its current frameworks for assessing the quality of its programmes adequately to identify what needs to be improved and the actions that need to be taken. Staff are keen to ensure that improvement takes place, although they are not always entirely sure where to direct their energies. Insufficient data are available to help focus improvement strategies.

Self-assessment

Insufficient progress is made in self-assessment. The Infantry Training Centre, Catterick has made little progress in the self-assessment process to date. Its initial attempt at a detailed analysis of the quality of its delivery, and how well its systems and processes impact on recruits, is largely based on a compliance or checklist approach. This is not sufficiently evaluative, and relies far too heavily on an assessment of whether or not a policy is in place rather than judgements on the impact it has in practice. There is no overall summary of strengths, satisfactory aspects or areas for improvement.

The fundamentals of the self-assessment process are not well understood by staff. The intrinsic value or outcome(s) of the process are also not well understood, nor are they communicated well by Army Recruitment and Training Division. The current framework and structure for self-assessment as determined by the Division is too long, and complex, with new elements being added that further complicate the process.
The quality of welfare and duty of care for recruits and trainees
Appendix 1.
Glossary of terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADSC</td>
<td>Army Development and Selection Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFCO</td>
<td>Armed Forces Careers Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALI</td>
<td>Adult Learning Inspectorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART(D)</td>
<td>Army Recruitment and Training Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASLS</td>
<td>Army Staff Leadership School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC(P)</td>
<td>Army Training Centre, Pirbright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATR(B)</td>
<td>Army Training Regiment, Bassingbourn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATR(W)</td>
<td>Army Training Regiment, Winchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better training</td>
<td>Report published by the ALI in April 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIF</td>
<td>Common Inspection Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS</td>
<td>Common Military Syllabus (SE: Standard Entry; JE: Junior Entry)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNR</td>
<td>Captain Naval Recruiting: the department responsible for recruiting in the Royal Navy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Commanding Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRB</td>
<td>Criminal Records Bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTCRM</td>
<td>Commando Training Centre, Royal Marines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCLPA</td>
<td>Defence College of Logistics and Personnel Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEMSS</td>
<td>Defence Explosives Munitions and Search School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DGT&amp;E</td>
<td>Director General Training and Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHALI</td>
<td>Defence House of Commons, Adult Learning Inspectorate report findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHALI B</td>
<td>Defence House of Commons, Adult Learning Inspectorate, Blake report findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMSTC</td>
<td>Defence Medical Services Training Centre, Keogh Barracks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSDA</td>
<td>Defence Storage and Distribution Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DST</td>
<td>Defence School of Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIVE</td>
<td>Known only by acronym – primarily a support service for recruits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITC</td>
<td>Infantry Training Centre, Catterick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITG</td>
<td>Initial Training Group (Army)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ipsos MORI</td>
<td>External organisation collecting recruits’ and trainees’ views of training on a monthly basis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JNCO</td>
<td>Junior Non-Commissioned Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPA</td>
<td>Joint Personnel Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MST</td>
<td>Military Swim Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCO</td>
<td>Non-Commissioned Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC</td>
<td>Officer Commanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ofsted</td>
<td>Office for Standards in Education, Children’s Services and Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERSEAS</td>
<td>Foreign and Commonwealth recruits and trainees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAYD</td>
<td>Pay as you dine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGAC</td>
<td>Potential Gunners Acquaintance Course – a course undertaken by anyone wishing to join the RAF Regiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>The first part of initial training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>The second, more specialist part of initial training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRMC</td>
<td>Potential Royal Marines Course – a course undertaken by anyone joining the Royal Marines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>Physical Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTIs</td>
<td>Physical Training Instructors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QIP</td>
<td>Quality improvement plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAF</td>
<td>Royal Air Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruit</td>
<td>An individual undertaking initial training in phase 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RN</td>
<td>Royal Navy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RNAC</td>
<td>Royal Navy Acquaint Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safer training</td>
<td>Report published by the ALI in 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAR</td>
<td>Self-assessment report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SATT</td>
<td>Soldiers/sailors awaiting trade training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCC</td>
<td>Service Complaints Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-assessment</td>
<td>A process of identifying and evaluating performance, conducted by staff within an establishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNCO</td>
<td>Senior Non-Commissioned Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNUT</td>
<td>Soldiers/sailors not under training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SpLD</td>
<td>Specific learning difficulty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSAFA</td>
<td>Soldiers, Sailors, Airmen and Families Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUT</td>
<td>Soldiers/sailors under training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainee</td>
<td>An individual undertaking the second part of initial training phase 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TQAAT</td>
<td>Training Quality Audit and Advisory team – part of DCLPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRVS</td>
<td>Formerly Women’s Royal Voluntary Service – now known by acronym only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2.
Summary of overall inspection judgements

The outcomes of the individual inspection visits are summarised in the following table. The judgement relating to self-assessment indicates progress made to date.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Establishment</th>
<th>Overall effectiveness</th>
<th>Capacity to improve</th>
<th>Progress in self-assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HMS Raleigh</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commando Training Centre, Royal Marines</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army Training Regiment, Winchester</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army Training Regiment, Bassingbourn</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army Training Centre, Pirbright</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infantry Training Centre, Catterick</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
<td>insufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Training Regiment, Deepcut*</td>
<td>inadequate</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
<td>insufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army School of Ammunition</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAF Halton</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAF Honington</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
<td>insufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defence School of Transport</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defence Medical Services Training Centre*</td>
<td>inadequate</td>
<td>inadequate</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Reinspected January/February 2009:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Establishment</th>
<th>Overall effectiveness</th>
<th>Capacity to improve</th>
<th>Progress in self-assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 Training Regiment, Deepcut</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defence Medical Services Training Centre*</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3.
Descriptors used in report text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proportion</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>97–100%</td>
<td>Vast/overwhelming majority or almost all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80–96%</td>
<td>Very large majority, most</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65–79%</td>
<td>Large majority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51–64%</td>
<td>Majority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35–49%</td>
<td>Minority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20–34%</td>
<td>Small minority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4–19%</td>
<td>Very small minority, few</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0–3%</td>
<td>Almost no/very few</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4.
Establishments visited

Ofsted inspectors carried out one-day inspections of the following Armed Forces Careers Offices:

- Blackheath
- Bristol
- Cardiff
- Chatham
- Coventry
- Crawley
- Nottingham
- Plymouth
- Shrewsbury
- Stoke-on-Trent
- Strand
- Torquay

Ofsted inspectors visited the following individual service selection centres:

- Army Development and Selection Centre – Lichfield
- Army Development and Selection Centre – Army Training Centre, Pirbright
- Royal Navy Acquaint Centre – HMS Caledonia, Rosyth
- Potential Royal Marines Course – Lympstone
- Potential Gunners Acquaintance Course – RAF Honington

Inspectors visited 12 initial training establishments to assess the impact of developments in training and delivery on those receiving and delivering initial training, with return visits to two establishments:

- 25 Training Regiment – Princess Royal Barracks, Deepcut
- HMS Raleigh – Torpoint
- Army Training Centre – Pirbright
- Recruit Training Squadron – RAF Halton
- Defence School of Transport – Leconfield
- RAF Regimental Training Squadron – RAF Honington
- Army School of Ammunition – Kineton
- Commando Training Centre, Royal Marines – Lympstone
- Army Training Regiment – Bassingbourn
- Army Training Regiment – Winchester
- Infantry Training Centre – Catterick
- Defence Medical Services Training Centre – Aldershot
Appendix 5.
Ofsted’s terms of reference for the inspection

The Inspectorate will:

- Determine the extent to which progress has been made in addressing issues of care, welfare and support for recruits and trainees during initial training in the Armed Forces including examination of the self-assessment process.
- Evaluate the effectiveness of the strategic and operational management of the care, welfare and support for recruits and trainees during initial training in the Armed Forces.
- Use the Common Inspection Framework (the national framework for inspection of post-16 education and training) to comment on the standard of initial training in the Armed Forces.
- Take account of the national care standards and safeguarding where relevant.
- Make judgements on the strengths and areas for development of the initial training.
- Visit training establishments, Armed Forces Careers Offices, acquaint and selection centres and service training headquarters.
- Inspect establishments identified by the Director Training and Education as priorities.
- Liaise with the Director Training and Education on the schedule of visits to optimise inspection effectiveness.
- Provide a bi-monthly oral progress report on inspection outcomes to the Director Training and Education.
- Publish a report, subject to security considerations, to include the observations and findings from individual units in respect of the self-assessment process and findings from inspection of the recruitment and selection process.

Related activity will include the following:

- Inspection of training establishments including some not previously inspected by the Adult Learning Inspectorate.
- Pilot inspection of Ministry of Defence (MoD)/Learning and Skills Council jointly funded provision.
- Inspection preparation workshops.
- Participation in senior level briefings and dissemination events.
- Assistance in the development of good practice.
- A programme of training events for appropriate MoD staff.
- Providing a report which comments on the care and welfare provision in place to support those joining and undergoing initial training in the Armed Forces.

The MoD seeks to achieve the following:

- The implementation of quality assurance arrangements which guarantee high standards, meet MoD requirements and add value to the expenditure of public money and at least match the quality of comparable civilian learning programmes.
- The ability to have access to the national learning community to share good practice and benchmark Defence Training and Education.
- The ability to maintain and update professional skills through continuous professional development activity in order to support the lifelong learning agenda and skills development in the MoD.
- The introduction of independent inspection, reinspection and oversight of Defence learning provision, including the duty of care and welfare provision, within an agreed programme, to complement the internal quality assurance and improvement procedures of the armed services and the MoD.

To these ends the parties will work together to develop appropriate working arrangements to facilitate a suitable training and inspection programme that will complement existing audits against the Defence Systems Approach to Training Quality Standard.
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The Office for Standards in Education, Children’s Services and Skills (Ofsted) regulates and inspects registered childcare and children’s social care, including adoption and fostering agencies, residential schools, family centres and homes for children. It also inspects all state-maintained schools, non-association independent schools, pupil referral units, further education, initial teacher education, and publicly funded adult skills and employment-based training, the Children and Family Court Advisory Support Service (Cafcass), and the overall level of services for children in local authority areas.

If you would like a copy of this report in a different format, such as large print or Braille, please telephone 08456 404040, or email enquiries@ofsted.gov.uk.

You may copy all or parts of this document for non-commercial educational purposes, as long as you give details of the source and date of publication and do not alter the information in any way.