Middlesex University London

A SIGNATURE PEDAGOGY FOR POLICE EDUCATION

Stan Lester, Darryll Bravenboer and Finbar Lillis

October 2021

CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION

All apprenticeship training providers are required to conduct regular tri-partite reviews by the Education and Skills Funding Agency (ESFA) as a matter of funding rules compliance. Tri-partite reviews, as the name suggests, involve three parties, the learner (apprentice), an employer representative who is supporting the learner and a tutor who is supporting the learner as a provider of apprenticeship training collectively reviewing learning progress. Since April 2021 Ofsted have undertaken responsibility for inspecting all apprenticeship training including apprenticeships at levels 6 and 7 (with the exception of apprenticeships related to initial teacher training). Ofsted's interest in tri-partite reviews is in their impact on the progressive acquisition and application of the knowledge, skills and behaviours in association with other factors of an apprenticeship (such as apprentice's own personal goals or the ongoing development of functional skills) which are identified at the start of the programme. Tri-partite reviews are used as an important source of evidence during Ofsted inspection because they are a key means of ensuring that the quality of provision is meeting the needs of both the apprentice and the employer. They help Ofsted (and most importantly, the provider) know that:

— an apprentice is making good progress in all aspects of the apprenticeship,

— that the apprentice is actively setting and resetting targets for their learning based on discussion and feedback,

— that the employer is engaged, supportive and ensures the apprentice receives their off the job learning time,

— that apprentices who are falling behind or need support at any point of their programme have a designated space and time to discuss it and for rapid action to be taken.

As an ESFA registered provider of apprenticeship training subject to Ofsted inspection, Middlesex University has consequently included the requirement to conduct tri-partite reviews within its apprenticeship regulations, which state that:

> Tri-partite progress reviews will normally be held every 12 weeks of the apprenticeship programme. Prior to the progress review, apprentices are expected to complete a pre-review questionnaire to evaluate on their performance and address objectives set at the previous review. The review features analysis of data taken from the apprentice's Aptem account, including off-the-job learning completed. Aptem data for every apprentice is also accessible by their employers to consult at any stage in their apprenticeship between tri-partite progress reviews. (Middlesex University, 2020)

However, the provision of tri-partite reviews is not solely a matter of compliance, it is also a key determinant of the quality of apprenticeship training. This research project is intended to contribute to the development and dissemination of good practice with regards to the provision of tri-partite reviews for the benefit of learners, employers and providers.

> where the "learning process, practices and products are the result of negotiation between trainee, mentor and university tutor facilitated by access to shared digital space" (Lillis, 2018, p19) this constitutes a signature pedagogy for degree apprenticeships.

WORK—INTEGRATED SIGNATURE PEDAGOGIES

Apprenticeships are at the most work-integrated end of the work-based learning continuum (QAA, 2019) as an apprenticeship is first and foremost a job with training, all apprentices are employed and the primary site of learning is the workplace. The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA) literature review regarding work-integrated degrees (Lester *et al*, 2016) and Middlesex University research on best practice in work-integrated learning for degree apprenticeships (Lillis, 2018) highlighted 'signature pedagogies' (Shulman, 2005) that underpin best practice. In particular, Lillis identified where the "learning process, practices and products are the result of negotiation between trainee, mentor and university tutor facilitated by access to shared digital space" (Lillis, 2018, p19) this constitutes a signature pedagogy for degree apprenticeships.

The facility to conduct tri-partite reviews digitally, for example via Zoom embedded within the Aptem learning management system, have provided a key means to conduct discussions between apprentices, workplace mentors and University tutors in the context of the pandemic. This has highlighted the pedagogic role of tri-partite reviews in structuring productive discussions and negotiations to promote and support learning development and progression.

At the same time, the requirements for the provision of tri-partite reviews constitutes a significant shift in emphasis for higher education practice that requires staff development, support and resource planning to ensure that high-quality is maintained at the same time as overall programme viability.

POLICE EDUCATION CONSORTIUM CONTEXT

The Police Education Consortium (the Consortium), which involves four universities (Middlesex, Cumbria, Portsmouth and Canterbury Christ Church), has contracts that entail the training of c4,000 police officers. This includes delivering the Police Constable Degree Apprenticeship (PCDA) and the Degree Holder Entry Programme (DHEP), for three police forces (Surrey, Sussex and Hampshire). While the provision of tri-partite reviews is a requirement for the PCDA, it has also been adopted for the DHEP to ensure that there is consistency of provision across the programmes.

Tri-partite reviews are scheduled in advance through Aptem (administered by Middlesex University) and are primarily delivered online via Zoom, which is integrated within the Aptem platform. The scheduling of tri-partite reviews during a given 12-month programme period has to date been designed to align with key milestones of the programmes, such as Independent Patrol Status. While tri-partite reviews have included police force staff operating in the role of workplace mentor, different forces have differing approaches to supporting student officers at different stages of programmes. The Consortium universities have agreed on a common approach to the provision of staffing resources to support tri-partite reviews. However, in practice, there

is some variability in approaches to delivering this aspect of provision. For example, while by design the Consortium had intended grade 6 workplace tutors to conduct tri-partite reviews, in some cases they have been carried out by grade 7 and 8 academic staff, or in some cases facilitated by grade 6 professional services and other staff.

With regards to the quality of tri-partite reviews, the 2021 Middlesex University Apprenticeship Quality Review, which included the PCDA, found that there were key areas for improvement:

> Tri-partite reviews do not sufficiently contribute to key aspects of the apprenticeship journey. For example, English and mathematics progress, progress towards an identified target grade for EPA, progress in the acquisition of skills, knowledge and behaviours and the provision of impartial careers advice. Reviews, and their subsequent recording on Aptem, do not enable the full evaluation of apprentices' progress, or the resetting of objectives to differentiate the programme. In addition, reviews are not of consistently high quality, and are sometimes irregular or carried out later than policy states.
>
> Too often, tri-partite reviews do not capture the full range of learning and skills development experienced by apprentices. Opportunities are missed to identify and support broader personal goals and objectives outside of the knowledge, skills, and behaviours through the tri-partite review process. (Middlesex University, 2021)

This research project is a key aspect of the action taken to address these areas for improvement in providing a reliable evidence base to support quality improvement and the enhancement of practice. It is intended that this is of direct benefit to learners, Consortium universities and police force employer partners.

RESEARCH PROJECT AIMS AND OUTCOMES

— To review relevant academic, professional and policy literature (including relevant Consortium and other university policies and procedures) to establish key aspects of best practice that underpin tri-partite review practice as a signature pedagogy for apprenticeships and police education

— To further examine and gather data and evidence from identified Consortium university and police force partner staff including existing student officers, regarding the practice of conducting tri-partite reviews across Police Education Consortium programmes and potentially other participant providers

— To analyse and evaluate the data and evidence gathered in the context of the key aspects of best practice identified through the literature review and to use this to inform recommendations for practice enhancement and quality improvement.

— To produce a project report that presents the findings and recommendations from the research.

2. METHODOLOGY

The data-gathering aspect of the project consisted of three phases: a literature review; a questionnaire survey; and analysis of tri-partite review records data. The literature review sought to ground the research within the relevant specialist fields of police education reform, work-integrated higher education and coaching. This provided productive themes to inform the development and the analysis of both the survey tri-partite review records data. The survey gathered the views of a range of stakeholders including employers and trainers from Surrey, Sussex and Hampshire police forces as well as those of provider staff from Middlesex, Canterbury, Cumbria and Portsmouth universities. The analysis of tri-partite review data provided access to evidence regarding the existing practice from the records of the discussions between learners, employer representatives and university provider staff.

The approach was designed to gather data that was both wide and deep from a range of sources that would each provide a specific perspective on the practice of providing tri-partite reviews. A strength of the mixed-methods research approach adopted is that it combined qualitative and quantitative methods to provide richer perspective on the complex issues regarding tri-partite review practice. Employing an embedded research design enabled the qualitative and quantitative strands to be incorporated in both a sequential and concurrent manner. For instance, the themes identified in the literature review informed the development of the research, the survey design and coding categories deployed in the analysis of the tri-partite review records data. This provided interface points for mixing methods during data collection and analysis, as well as the interpretation of the results.

LITERATURE REVIEW WITH UNIVERSITY DISCUSSIONS INCORPORATED

A review was undertaken between March and May 2021 using five sources of information:

— A search for material related to "police training reforms" and "police entry routes" to provide background material

— An examination of literature on work-based and work-integrated learning that had been reviewed in two previous studies, in 2016 and 2020 – for material relevant to (work-oriented) signature pedagogies, three-way partnerships, and the role of the mentor or supervisor in work-based learning

— A general search of several terms – "apprenticeship review", "three-way review", "tri-partite review", and "three-way agreement", the last three coupled with "apprenticeship", "apprentice", "trainee", "work-based learning", "work-integrated learning", "professional training", and "degree". Over 90% of the references returned were rejected on the basis of being too general (e.g. referring to review and evaluation of apprenticeships). Following examination of abstracts or summaries, items were only selected if they referred to progress reviews within apprenticeships or comparable programmes

— A search of "three-way" combined with "coaching" and "mentoring", with articles selected that referred to practices, processes and the dynamics of the three-way relationship

— Information provided by five universities. Given the shortage of literature specifically on three-way reviews, seven institutions were approached in order to solicit unpublished information. Two of these produced documentation, and three resulted in individual discussions with personnel responsible for Degree Apprenticeships. Relevant points from the discussions are incorporated in the findings.

Literature specifically discussing three-way reviews in apprenticeships and other work-integrated learning was limited to seven items. However, there is a larger body of literature that discusses the three-way relationship in these programmes and in other workplace learning contexts, which has a bearing on the conduct of tri-partite reviews and their place as part of the pedagogy of work-based learning.

THE QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY

Reflecting the findings from the literature review, a questionnaire survey (see Appendix A) was designed to focus on the following aspects of tri-partite review practice:

— Training and support for the provision of tri-partite reviews

— The roles and purposes of tri-partite reviews

— Tri-partite reviews as a vehicle for promoting learning

— The practicalities regarding providing tri-partite reviews.

The survey was administered via the Qualtrics platform and electronic links to the survey were distributed to police force employer partners (Surrey, Sussex and Hampshire) who circulated it to police training staff, police officer coaches and other police staff involved with the provision of the PCDA and DHEP programmes. The survey was also circulated to Consortium university staff involved with the provision of the PCDA and DHEP programmes.

The survey was conducted between 2nd and 23rd June 2021 and 38 people responded. These were made up of 21 university staff, plus 17 police staff (6 trainers, 4 coaches/mentors, and 7 with other development and assessment roles). The university staff were fairly evenly distributed across the four institutions in the consortium: 6 each from Middlesex and Cumbria, 5 Canterbury and 4 Portsmouth. Police were from Surrey (8), Hampshire (5) and Sussex (2) constabularies, plus two not stated.

> The survey gathered the views of a range of stakeholders including employers and trainers from Surrey, Sussex and Hampshire police forces as well as those of provider staff from Middlesex, Canterbury, Cumbria and Portsmouth universities.

TRI–PARTITE REVIEW RECORDS DATA

For the purposes of the research undertaken, the tri-partite review records constitute empirical data for analysis, which can provide evidence that is relevant to the research aims regarding the practice of conducting tri-partite reviews across Police Education Consortium programmes. The tri-partite review records data was analysed to identify textual instances that reflected themes, coded categories and key phrases used within the questionnaire survey, which were, in turn, drawn from the themes identified in the literature review (see Appendix B).

Tri-partite review meeting records are stored on the Aptem learning management system and are comprised of recorded responses to structured headings in a tri-partite review template that is intended to provide evidence of:

— compliance with ESFA apprenticeship funding rules, for example evidence that a minimum of 20% off-the-job learning time is being made available to apprentices

— effective monitoring of learning progression to inform individual learning planning

— the effective integration of on and off-the-job learning through the engagement in professional learning conversations between the learner, employer and tutor.

The Aptem tri-partite review template headings are as follows:

— Date, time, location

— Wellbeing and welfare

— Learning progress (NB: this section provides Aptem progress data at the date of the tri-partite review)

— Progression

— Functional skills

— Individual support needs/requirements

— Short and long term goals

— Feedback

— Any other business

CONSTRUCTING THE TRI–PARTITE REVIEW RECORDS DATA SAMPLE

In conducting the research, the aim was to construct a representative sample of the tri-partite review records stored within Aptem that would:

— Represent at least 10% of the total

— Closely reflect the profile of student officers by police force, Consortium university and programme

— Closely reflect the profile of student officers by protected characteristics including gender, age, ethnicity and disability.

At the date of constructing the sample (19th May 2021), there were 866 police student officers in total undertaking Police Education Consortium programmes, including 703 on the Police Constable Degree Apprenticeship (PCDA) and 163 on either the Degree Holder Entry Programme (DHEP) or the Detective pathway of this programme (DtDHEP).

A representative sample of the tri-partite review records was produced based on the most recent record at the date of constructing the sample. In seeking to construct a 10%+ sample that was representative of the whole student officer group and reflected the balance of learners across Consortium universities, police forces, programmes (PCDA, DHEP/DtDHEP) as well as protected characteristics, it was necessary to add 12 records to the sample. This resulted in an uplift in the representation of DHEP/DtDHEP student officers and a total sample of 100 tri-partite review records as constituted in the following tables:

Sample by university

University[1]	PCDA	10%	Sample	DHEP/DtDHEP	10%	Sample
MDX	142	14.2	14	75	7.5	8
CCCU	200	20	20	26	2.6	6
UoC	224	22.4	23	14	1.4	4
UoP	137	13.7	14	48	4.8	11
Total	703	70.4	71	163	16.4	29

Sample by police force employer

Police Force	PCDA	10%	Sample	DHEP/DtDHEP	10%	Sample
Surrey	179	17.9	19	63	6.3	11
Sussex	163	16.3	16	26	2.6	7
Hampshire	361	36.1	36	74	7.4	11
Total	703	70.4	71	163	16.4	29

PRIVACY AND DATA CONTROL

One nominated member of the research team, who had been previously 'vetted' to meet police security requirements[2], had access to all data collected for the study. This 'firewall' was designed to restrict circulation of and protect apprentices' personal data. The research report authors had no access to personal data; all data sets were anonymised.

One nominated member of the research team, who had been previously 'vetted' to meet police security requirements, was solely responsible for communicating with identified lead contacts in each police force and Consortium university, who sent out survey invitation letters and reminders to identified staff (as described above). The invitation letters included a generic rather than a personalised link to the survey as a further means to maintain respondent anonymity.

Two nominated members of the research team had access to the sample of tri-partite review records. Both nominated members had been previously 'vetted' to meet police security requirements. No other members of the research team had direct access to the sample of tri-partite review records.

Other security measures included, consent form completion required within the survey; participants' rights to withdraw prior to completion of the study; destruction of correlated personal data, including any correspondence, once the study was completed. All data was stored (until destruction) on Middlesex University OneDrive; secure survey software (Qualtrics) was used to conduct the survey, Middlesex University acting as formal custodian of the data for the duration of the study.

Middlesex University research ethics committees (RECs) scrutinise and approve research proposals. The 'Tri-partite reviews: A signature pedagogy for police education' research project was approved by the Middlesex University Education REC on 10th May 2021.

1. MDX = Middlesex University, CCCU = Canterbury Christ Church University, UoC = University of Cumbria, UoP = University of Portsmouth
2. Non-police personnel vetting clearance 2

3. LITERATURE REVIEW

POLICE TRAINING REFORMS AND THE INTRODUCTION OF THE PCDA AND DHEP

A need for reform of initial police training – i.e. to become a fully-trained constable – has been recognised from at least the turn of the century, with some changes being implemented initially to give more responsibility for training to individual forces. However, there were concerns that these reforms were leading to a fragmented approach to initial development and had failed to challenge undesirable aspects of police culture that were being perpetuated by residential training (Ramshaw and Soppitt 2018). Following reviews of policing by Flanagan (2008) and Winsor (2011), the influential Neyroud report advocated a common structure to police education and training with oversight by an institution modelled on a chartered professional body (Neyroud 2011). Although graduates accounted for 27% of the police workforce by 2010 (Winsor 2011), there was little agreement at this point about the level of initial training needed for the constable role; Winsor for instance advocated a minimum qualification at level 3, and a new qualification at this level was introduced as late as 2010 (Schohel et al 2020).

The College of Policing, essentially the body advocated by Neyroud, was set up in 2012 as an arm's-length agency of the Home Office, partly as a successor to the National Policing Improvement Agency. In 2016 the Association of Police and Crime Commissioners and the National Police Chiefs Council published Policing Vision 2025. This document included a call for a "workforce of confident professionals able to operate with a high degree of autonomy and accountability and... better able to reflect its communities" (APCC/NPCC 2016, p3), along with an evidence-based approach to policing and a common code of ethics. In parallel, the College of Policing introduced plans for a Police Education Qualification Framework (PEQF), with three principal entry-routes, all at degree level; this framework was implemented in 2020. The routes consist of:

— The Police Constable Degree Apprenticeship (PCDA), a three-year programme for non-graduates leading to completion of initial training and an honours degree in professional policing

— The Degree Holders' Entry Programme (DHEP), a two-year programme covering similar ground to the PCDA and leading to a Graduate Diploma in Professional Policing at level 6

— An approved pre-entry Degree in Professional Policing followed by a two-year period of on-job training.

All three routes include an initial period of full-time training followed by experience in different aspects of policing, with key milestones including attestation as a constable and achieving independent patrol status. Advanced standing is also available for entrants who have completed training as a Police Community Support Officer (PCSO) or Special Constable.

The rationale for a graduate workforce has largely been made in terms of the complexity of modern crime, including organised crime, cybercrime and terrorism, and the challenges this poses for policing (Flanagan 2008, APCC/NPCC 2016, Ramshaw and Soppitt 2018, Schohel et al 2020). However, there is also acknowledgement that the context of policing is inherently complex. Wood (2018), following Waddington (1999), comments that in order to carry out their duty of protecting and serving, the police also need to coerce and restrict, creating a dilemma in which the police officer needs to act as a moral agent and reflective practitioner rather than simply following orders as a subordinate. Schohel et al (2020) echo this in discussing the need for policing to professionalise in the modern sense, with officers having a high degree of autonomy and independence of judgement rather than being reliant on a line-of-command mentality. Leek (2020) argues that police forces need to become 'learning organisations' in the tradition of Senge (1990) in order to embed this kind of professionalism.

THE IDEA OF A SIGNATURE PEDAGOGY

Different professions tend to have distinct 'signature pedagogies', essentially dominant theories and practices of education and training, that according to Shulman (2005) become a pervasive and routine feature of education for the profession. Shulman describes signature pedagogies as having surface structures (the type of teaching and learning activities used), deep structures (the assumptions about how best to impart knowledge and develop skills), and implicit structures (beliefs about professional values, attitudes and dispositions). Discussions of police training indicate that its traditional signature pedagogy has been top-down, instructor-led and operationally-oriented, concerned with learning and applying a knowledge-base and set of procedures, and consistent with a command-and-control culture in which autonomous judgement comes with experience and seniority (Wood 2018, Schohel et al 2020). The policing reforms discussed above have brought recognition of the need for a pedagogy that is aligned with a modern professional paradigm, based on practice-based learning and reflection, and designed to aid new recruits to develop independent judgement more rapidly (Wood 2018, Schohel et al 2020).

Dalrymple et al (2014) apply the idea of a signature pedagogy to work-based learning (WBL) in general. The cornerstones of the approach that they describe are that the learner is treated as an active agent and creator of meaning; the workplace is regarded as a legitimate site of learning and knowledge generation rather than principally as a site where classroom knowledge is applied; and learning objectives, processes and products are negotiated between learner, employer and institution, leading to a 'triadic learning endeavour' (discussed more fully in the next section). These basic principles are underpinned and expanded on in a substantial body of work that treats WBL as a field in its own right, dating back to the 1990s; this includes studies and practice reports by among others Stephenson (1998), Graham et al (2006), Graham and Rhodes (2007), Moore (2007), Rhodes and Shiel (2007), Lester and Costley (2010), Major et al (2011), Kettle (2013), Gordon (2014), Helyer (2016) and Bravenboer and Workman (2016). Key principles from the literature include helping learners to identify and act on their needs and aspirations, become active in managing the learning process, develop critical reflection and enquiry, identify and work with ethical issues arising in the workplace, make effective use of workplace resources (including colleagues) for learning, and develop and use (rather than simply apply) academic skills in the workplace. Processes supporting this include recognition of previous learning by various means; two- or three-way agreement of learning goals, learning processes, assessment activities and to a greater or lesser extent the overall programme or curriculum; support that takes the form of facilitation, coaching or process consultancy; and periodic reviews of progress. In summary, Lester and Costley (2010) describe this trend as a move from an expert or delivery model of education to a partnership or facilitative one.

A criticism of some discussions of WBL pedagogy has been that it can assume that the learner is independent and self-directing, with enough experience to negotiate a programme of learning that responds to a specific work context or individually-driven career aim. This perspective, for instance, largely underpins Lester and Costley's paper. Brown et al (2007) provide a useful distinction between an 'affirmative' or curriculum-led programme, designed for new entrants in order to support development to a point of proficiency, and a 'transformative' or more open-ended one geared to experienced practitioner development and supporting the goals of individuals and local communities of practice.

More recently, pedagogies have been discussed specifically in relation to work-integrated degrees and Degree Apprenticeships by Lester et al (2016), Lillis (2018), Lillis and Bravenboer (2020), Rowe et al (2020) and Lester and Bravenboer (2020). These studies indicate that the principles and practices of WBL pedagogy are as applicable to these 'affirmative' programmes as to more 'transformative' ones, the differences being largely of degree. Consistent with work on early-career learning such as that of Eraut (2008) and Allen et al (2015), there is also recognition of a need for new entrants to move more quickly to a point of independent professional judgement and decision-making than has been the case with traditional models of professional training. The key principles identified for work-integrated learning pedagogy are:

— Recognition that the work environment, supported by other sources for instance from the educational institution or online, is the primary site of learning and knowledge generation

— Negotiation of learning objectives and processes between learners, employers and institutions, resulting in co-created curricula or individual programmes defined by learning agreements

— Recognition and incorporation of prior learning as a platform for professional development

— Induction into and use of appropriate methodologies for reflective practice and professional enquiry

— Flexibility of learning including 'pace, place and mode', favouring blended approaches of various kinds

— High-quality mentor support, aiding growth from reliance on intensive facilitation to learner-managed and learner-directed learning

— Assessment methods that are valid and appropriate in relation to working practices.

A potential barrier to developing work-integrated learning arises if there is a conflict between the underlying pedagogy of the field concerned and that of work-based learning. A good alignment is apparent in fields where the signature pedagogy is already essentially practice-based, such as social work (e.g. Boitel and Fromm 2014). On the other hand Lucas (2016) comments that it is possible to integrate a practice-oriented approach into the pedagogy of engineering, despite the field being dominated by a technical orientation based in a physical sciences paradigm. Different signature pedagogies can also exist in parallel, for instance in medicine where Dornan et al (2007) note a traditionally academic science-based approach for biomedical aspects alongside a reflective, work-based one for patient care. In policing, while the traditional pedagogy is one of instructor-led knowledge transmission, the recent reforms are described by Wood (2018) as entirely consistent with a practice learning approach, even if (analogous to Dornan's description for medicine) a need remains for a more procedural approach to learning some aspects of police protocol.

PARTNERSHIPS IN WORK–INTEGRATED LEARNING

The literature is in broad agreement that work-integrated higher education is a "triadic learning endeavour" (Dalrymple *et al* 2014), supported by "tri-partite relationships underpinned by formal arrangements between employers, higher education providers and [learners]" (QAA 2019, p6). The main exception is where the learner is fully self-directing, for instance as a senior manager or autonomous professional (Nixon *et al* 2008, Lester and Costley 2010), more commonly encountered in postgraduate continuing development programmes. A distinction can be made between the strategic aspects of partnership, generally involving the university and employer (and sometimes a third party such as a professional body) and geared to agreeing business objectives and overall programme aims; tactical concerns such as the design of programmes, putting in place frameworks, agreements and personnel for supporting and assessing learners, and agreeing who contributes to which parts of the programme; and individual learning, learner support and assessment, where three-way relationships are most in evidence (Lester and Costley 2010, Lester *et al* 2016, Minton and Lowe 2019, QAA 2019, Lillis and Bravenboer 2020).

An aspect at the tactical level that is seen as important is the creation of an effective learning culture in the workplace (Engineering Professors Council 2018, Minton and Lowe 2019, Lester and Bravenboer 2020). This is described as including activities such as ensuring appropriate staff are in place to support learners, ongoing dialogue and development activity between university and employer staff, shared use of digital platforms, and co-design of the workplace learning programme, but also ensuring that the workplace provides an 'expansive' environment (Fuller and Unwin 2008) for the learner. This latter can include activities such as negotiating alignment between work and learning goals, developing a shared awareness of workplace dynamics and how they may affect learning, ensuring that learners become actively involved in an occupational community of practice, gaining the support of work colleagues not directly involved in the programme, and making sure that supervisors are aware of the need for time away from operational pressures (UVAC/SDN 2017, Lillis 2018, Lester and Bravenboer 2020). There is evidence that without this, operational matters can work against effective learning and get in the way of three-way discussion between learners, supervisors and tutors (Rowe *et al* 2020).

The final aspect of the 'triadic endeavour' is the relationship between the individual learner, work-based supervisor or mentor, and the university tutor. This relationship has been described as central to constructing the individual learning programme, claiming credit for prior learning where appropriate, negotiating learning targets and the means of achieving them, supporting reflection and self-evaluation, and reviewing progress on a regular basis (Lester *et al* 2016, Lillis 2018). The importance of having appropriate personnel supporting this process is widely emphasised, as is the need to agree respective roles and responsibilities in advance. For the university this means someone focussed on individually-centred learning (Rowe *et al* 2020), and comfortable in a facilitative, coaching role and "both nurture- and challenge-type scenarios" (Hughes and Saieva 2019, p233). Discussions with universities confirmed that university staff responsible for apprenticeship learning are typically recruited separately from subject academics, and they either have current or recent experience in the area of work concerned, or are generalist work-based learning tutors. In some fields, particularly nursing and to a large extent policing, this is reported as working well and bridging between subject-oriented staff and employers. In others, including engineering and more so management and leadership, instances have been reported where a gap in communication and perception opens up between the employer and (workplace-oriented) tutor on the one hand, and the academic department on the other.

THE MENTOR: ROLE, TRAINING AND SUPPORT

For the employer representative, the most widely-used term in the literature is 'mentor', regardless of whether the person is the learner's direct supervisor or someone specifically designated to support learning. The importance of a mentor in the work organisation is widely discussed in the literature on work-based, work-integrated and apprenticeship learning, regardless of field. Lester *et al* (2016) quote among others Major *et al* (2011) and Dalrymple *et al* (2014) in the context of work-based learning generally, Ofsted (2015) for apprenticeships, and in relation to specific fields Benefer (2007) for engineering, Dornan (2005) for medicine, Marshall (2012) for midwifery, Knight *et al* (2015) and Kubiak *et al* (2010) for healthcare assistants, and Henderson (2010) for social work. Drawing on Dunne *et al* (2008), Evans *et al* (2010), Roberts *et al* (2019) and QAA (2019), the role of the mentor has been described as:

— providing an insight into the workplace

— signposting and ensuring access to learning opportunities and resources in the workplace

— mediating between the learner and managers or other colleagues

— acting as a coach or sounding-board

— helping the learner to recontextualise knowledge gained from a classroom or similar setting

— helping the learner balance learning with other commitments

— acting as a bridge between the workplace and the university

— working with the learner and the tutor to review progress, encourage reflection and agree future objectives

— and supporting the learner to become more independent in managing their learning.

Who is most appropriate to perform the mentor role is the subject of some discussion, and may depend on the practicalities of the workplace; pragmatically, Arnold *et al* (2011) suggest that as with other roles in work-based learning this needs to be decided on the basis of "who is best placed, most expert and has capacity" (p146). In most instances, the mentor will be in fairly close contact with the learner, though s/he need not be the learner's direct supervisor or manager and there can be an assumption against a supervisory relationship; in some programmes, mentors are more experienced colleagues in the role that the learner is training for (Lester *et al* 2016, Engineering Professors' Council 2018, Roberts *et al* 2019, Lester and Bravenboer 2020). On the other hand, operational pressures can mean that front-line staff have little time to give to the mentoring role (Kubiak *et al* 2010, Henderson 2010, Lillis 2018) and alternative solutions can be used such as finding a mentor from a different part of the work organisation (e.g. in an HR or training role), from another organisation, or from a professional or similar body (Lester *et al* 2016). Less commonly, academic tutors may cross over into the workplace to support trainees in a mentor-type role (e.g. Brown *et al* 2015 in teaching).

Challenges relating to rotational training programmes – where the learner is placed in different departments or locations over the course of their training – are not widely discussed in the literature, although they are mentioned by research participants in several reports, principally in relation to nursing and other health occupations (e.g. Lillis 2018, Lester and Bravenboer 2020). One benefit of mentoring can be to provide continuity and connection between placements, but this may be difficult to resource and maintain, and as the programme progresses, a distant mentor offering nominal continuity may be less relevant to the learner than a good relationship with a local practice supervisor. In nursing for instance, recent changes from formally-trained mentors to practice supervisors recognise that continuity can be provided by good record-keeping and handover between supervisors rather than a single mentor throughout the programme (Nursing and Midwifery Council 2018, p12). Similarly, Rhodes (2018) notes that the manager or mentor may change between review points, and the academic tutor needs to be able to brief the new person.

Discussion with universities supported these points, and added that continuity is usually easier to maintain in large employers where there is a co-ordinator who oversees apprentices across the organisation or relevant part of it. This was reported as working particularly well in hospitals, and increasingly in police forces; continuity was seen as more of a problem in smaller firms and when the learner's manager leaves or moves job without planning how the learner will continue to be supported.

Training, development and support for workplace mentors is widely reported as important to enabling them to carry out their role effectively (Lester *et al* 2016). In relation to Degree Apprenticeships, the QAA states that:

> Higher education providers should work with employers to ensure that workplace mentors have appropriate training, drawing on a variety of skills in order to effectively support the apprentices' learning. They should have a good understanding of the apprenticeship programme and how the knowledge, skills and behaviours are integrated within the programme structure, together with an understanding of the expectations of a higher education programme. The workplace mentors should have a clear understanding of the fundamentals of mentoring and coaching, supporting the transfer of tacit knowledge and understanding how to facilitate the learning process within the employer organisation. (QAA 2019, p14).

Lester *et al* (2016) note that compulsory formal training for workplace mentors has been uncommon and generally limited to health and social care along with teacher training. Several universities have developed short certificated or credit-rated programmes for mentors of work-based learners (e.g. Cambrook and Lyddon 2011, Bromley *et al* 2012), and there is widespread recognition of the benefits of formal training and support (Rowe *et al* 2017).

Recently, attention has started to move to other means of training mentors than through off-job courses, with Minton and Lowe (2019) commenting that these need to be relevant to the work context, and processes such as informal meetings, use of a handbook and digital resources, and joint activities with the learner may be more appropriate than a formal course. Lillis (2018), in the context of social work training, discusses how (work-based) practice educators train in parallel with apprentices, supported by an academic tutor. Lillis also notes the benefits to both mentor development and integration of learning for the apprentice or learner when mentors and tutors work together, share content and cross between their respective settings. The culmination of this is development of the practitioner-academic role (Lester *et al* 2016, Lillis 2018), although there is acknowledgement that this is not an appropriate aim for more than a proportion of mentor or practice supervisor staff, particularly where learner support starts to become an expectation of all qualified staff (e.g. Nursing and Midwifery Council 2018).

The university discussions generally support these points, and highlight the difficulty, at least in some instances, of getting mentors and supervisors to take part in training. In one case, an online briefing had been set up backed by tutor contact, but there were suspicions that employer staff were logging in but not engaging with the content. In another, the use of a handbook and tutor support (now both online) was described as successful but providing them required additional resources to those provided by the apprenticeship funding.

INSIGHTS FROM COACHING

Three-way relationships (generally coach, learner and learner's manager) are well-established in coaching (Bower 2012, Turner and Hawkins 2016), and because of the similarities to the tutor – learner – mentor/supervisor triad in apprenticeships offer some insights for the tri-partite relationship and review process in work-integrated programmes (Minton and Lowe 2019). Four-way relationships, where there are two organisational representatives involved such as the learner's manager and a separate mentor or an HR person, are also described (Clutterbuck 2015, Burger and Van Coller-Petter 2019). Similar to the apprenticeship review process, coaching has been described as goal oriented, focussed on the future, having the objective of personal and professional development (Bjarnadottir 2018), and geared to supporting self-directed learning (Cox and Jackson 2010). Bjarnadottir also notes that while the mentor or manager is generally an expert in the learner's area of work, this does not need to apply to the coach. Most coaching literature refers to situations outside of higher education or other accredited programmes and therefore tends to focus on learning, the dynamics between the parties involved, and the organisational context, free from any requirements of accrediting, awarding or quality monitoring bodies.

Managing three-way coaching meetings has been described as '(not) always easy' (Lawrence 2018), and the importance of setting up the coaching contract and relationship appropriately is discussed by several authors. Burger and Van Coller-Petter (2019) discuss the need for a systemic perspective, where coaching fits within team and organisational systems, with multi-stakeholder contracting to align goals, enhance synergy and ensure a sense of purpose. Clutterbuck (2015) views the purpose of contracting as setting a sense of direction and purpose for the coaching relationship; ensuring that expectations are aligned; and providing a practical basis for reviewing progress. He goes on to consider the psychological aspects of the contract (relationships, motivations, and the environment in which coaching will take place), outcomes (both intended and unforeseen), and systems (engagement with the contexts in which coaching is located, including forces that support and hinder the achievement of objectives, what external support is needed by the learner, and how it might be secured). On the other hand both Cox and Jackson (2010) and Bjarnadottir (2018) caution against having too fixed a framework for the coaching process. The former emphasises that shared understandings can be more important than specific objectives and measures, while the latter comments that learner and coach need space to create a relationship of trust, both between themselves and with the manager or organisational representative.

The need to manage power dynamics in the coaching relationship is noted by Newsom and Dent (2011) and discussed in more depth by Lai and Smith (2019). The latter describe three-way coaching as "a triangular political space generating power relationships" (p1) which can be empowering or disabling for the learner. Clutterbuck (2014) also comments on the possibility of disruptive relationships developing where either the mentor and the learner's boss 'gang up' on the learner, or the mentor takes the side of the learner against the manager. To help manage this kind of dynamic, Bjarnadottir (2018) recommends that the role of the mentor or manager in tri-partite meetings is defined carefully and in a way that promotes trust. Lai and Smith (2019) discuss the importance of both the initial contracting process to create procedural fairness and transparency, and the role of the coach as an integrator or moderator. The coach (cf. tutor), being external to the work organisation, is able to take a neutral, non-judgmental but empathic stance. Clutterbuck (2014) notes that the three-way conversation can be more difficult for the mentor or manager than the coach, and along with Burger and Van Coller-Petter (2019) comments on the value of the coach effectively coaching the manager or mentor at the same time as the learner.

For the three-way discussion itself, Lai and Smith (2019) comment that the learner rather than the coach or mentor should take the central position in the meeting. In his practical commentary, Clutterbuck (2015) indicates that the manager (or mentor) needs to provide active support and encouragement to the learner, accept that as the discussion progresses goals are likely to be revised, and recognise positive change as it occurs. He also notes that the coach needs to be able to reconcile differences in opinion between the learner and the manager on the learner's progress, and also comments that meetings should not be confined to progress review and goal-setting, but also review the coaching relationship and system (or context) itself (Clutterbuck 2013).

THE TRI-PARTITE REVIEW: PRACTICALITIES

Regular tri-partite reviews are a requirement for apprenticeships, and have also become common practice in some other work-integrated programmes such as the police DHEP (Schohel *et al* 2020). The employer representative in the review is generally recommended to be a person with a close working relationship with the learner, "such as a supervisor, mentor or [workplace] course tutor" (Skills Development Scotland 2020). The review has multiple functions including providing administrative and compliance information, reviewing, planning and contributing to learning and development, enabling dialogue between mentor or supervisor and (university) tutor, and contributing to programme review and quality assurance (QAA 2019, ESFA 2021). The current ESFA requirement is simply that reviews are 'regular', although following earlier guidance a frequency of 12 weeks, or four times a year, has become common (e.g. Middlesex University 2020). The university discussions also indicated that this is the norm, with some variations where for instance reviews are fitted to the timing of placements. In one instance reviews were carried out three times a year, at the beginning, middle and end of the placement, this being considered sufficient if they were done to a high standard.

Guides to review content are provided by UVAC (Rhodes 2018) and Skills Development Scotland (2020), the latter geared to apprenticeships in general. In summary, reviews are expected to cover:

— progress to date, with views from all parties, a summary of what has been achieved (including but not limited to the formal requirements of the programme), what remains to be done, and the reasons if this differs from expected

— the learner's reflection on progress

— emerging challenges to progression along with any pastoral or similar factors

— a summary of evidence of academic and workplace learning, with any areas needing follow-up identified

— a check that the '20% off-the-job' learning (required in apprenticeships) has been accounted for

— an action/development plan and set of goals for the next review, ensuring expectations and on-the-job experiences are clear and agreed.

There is little discussion of the dynamics of tri-partite reviews in the literature, but the information that does exist suggests that there is a challenge involved on the one hand in meeting the administrative and quality assurance requirements of multiple agencies (Schohel *et al* 2020), and on the other in enabling, in a short meeting with a potentially crowded agenda, a frank and open learning discussion. This latter can need to review and support achievement, deal with challenges, and address issues such as learners' work, life and study demands, while also ensuring that there is a balance between immediate, pragmatic learning and deeper, more

academically rigorous exploration (Hughes and Saieva 2019). The review forms and guidance produced by different agencies and universities suggests that some approaches to review are more administrative and records-oriented, while others favour more in-depth discussions. The university discussions indicated that the quantity of administration needing to be done at reviews can be frustrating, and particularly if the tutor is 'audit-oriented and not very WBL-savvy' – perhaps coming from an assessor or verifier background – administrative aspects can dominate. Participants' strategies for improving the richness of discussions include relevant training for tutors, and ensuring that administrative tasks are dealt with beforehand where possible.

Rhodes (2018), Hughes and Saieva (2019) and Schohel *et al* (2020) are in agreement that the key to successful reviews is an effective relationship between academic staff and employer representatives, with the university tutor taking the lead but also ensuring that there is employer commitment from the outset. This is particularly stressed when there are practical difficulties involved in arranging reviews, such as operational pressures and remote locations. The university discussions indicated that timetabling employer participation is essential, with a need to set this out in advance in the same way as programmed learning sessions. Employer commitment to reviews was reported as best in organisations and professions where there is a clear training structure (such as the health sector, law, and, increasingly, policing), and poorest in less structured professions particularly where apprentices are experienced workers without active manager support.

Rhodes (2018), writing before the coronavirus pandemic, indicates that while videoconferencing can be a useful way of facilitating reviews it will not suit all learners or mentors. However, the university discussions indicated that the advantages of online reviews are starting to become apparent; they are reported as more straightforward for the tutor to co-ordinate, easier to get the employer's participation, more cost-effective and time efficient, and participants are on average better-prepared. An initial face-to-face review was however seen as beneficial, and there was recognition of the need for all participants to use the technology effectively (typically Teams, Skype for Business and virtual learning environments, sometimes in combination), with the tutor being sufficiently adept to set up the software and manage any technological glitches. To date, the use of asynchronous reviews was reported as limited: one participant commented that preparation was increasingly being done in advance, e.g. an e-portfolio completed by the apprentice and reviewed by the tutor before the meeting, and another was considering introducing learner/tutor, learner/employer, then 3-way meetings in sequence.

Other practical points mentioned by Rhodes (2018) include spacing different requirements across the year rather than raising them at every review, having a central check that reviews have been completed, checking the quality of review records, and having an escalation point for any issues that can't be resolved at the review.

4. FINDINGS

This section will present summarised findings from the literature review as well as findings from the questionnaire survey and the analysis of tri-partite review record data. As indicated in the methodology section, the research design and process has enabled emergent themes from the literature review to inform and structure the analysis of the findings from the questionnaire survey and the analysis of tri-partite review record data. This has provided the means to present findings in accordance with coherent emergent themes as the research has progressed.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS FROM THE LITERATURE REVIEW

The findings from the literature review can be summarised as follows:

Underpinning principles

— The need for policing to professionalise in the modern sense, with officers having a high degree of autonomy and independence of judgement rather than being reliant on a line-of-command mentality

— The need for organisational change to promote the ongoing development of an effective learning culture in the policing workplace including the explicit valuing of reflective practice and professional enquiry

— The recognition that the work environment is the primary site of professional learning and that work-integrated learning is a triadic learning endeavour, requiring the committed engagement of employers, learners and providers

— The importance of tri-partite reviews as a driver of individual professional learning and effective organisational learning

Underpinning relationships

— Effective relationships between employer representatives and tutors are the key to supporting learners and promoting the integration of on and off-the-job learning

— It is important that all parties ensure that expectations are aligned through establishing clear 'contracting' relationships at the outset and that these are reviewed throughout

— The learner is in the central 'empowered' position in professional learning discussions and employer representatives and tutors undertake a facilitative and coaching/mentoring role

— The employer representative should play an important role in mediating between the learner and their line managers in seeking to establish a supportive occupational community of practice in the workplace

— Employers and tutors should identify clear escalation points for issues that cannot be resolved within the tri-partite review meetings

Workplace mentoring

— High-quality workplace mentor support for learners requires high-quality mentor training by providers

— Workplace mentor training needs to establish a clear understanding of the fundamentals of mentoring and coaching

— Effective professional learning requires employer commitment to consistency of workplace mentoring

— Where changes in workplace mentor staffing occur, good record-keeping and effective handover between mentors mitigates negative impact on professional learning

Promoting learning

— To promote reflection on future learning objectives as a platform for professional development in the context of organisational priorities

— To provide the opportunity to negotiate alignment between work and learning goals to balance learning with other work commitments

— To identify and secure access to learning opportunities and resources in the workplace to support and promote independent professional learning

— To provide a bridge between the workplace and the university to recontextualise and integrate learning gained on and off-the-job

— To provide insight into the workplace context to establish a shared understanding of workplace requirements and dynamics through mediated discussion

Structure and practicalities

— Scheduling of tri-partite review meetings to appropriately align with key programme milestones

— An explicit commitment by all parties to prioritise attending tri-partite review meetings once scheduled notwithstanding operational pressures

— All parties review learning progression and off-the-job learning data in advance of tri-partite review meetings to inform professional learning discussions

— Administrative tasks are dealt with in advance as far as possible to maximise time for professional learning discussion

— Conducting tri-partite review meetings online significantly enhances flexibility of scheduling

— Prompts that guide and structure the professional learning discussion raises quality and consistency of practice

— A centralised system to check that tri-partite reviews have been completed with appropriate actions to communicate non-completion with all parties

— An annual review of tri-partite review records to report on quality and consistency of practice to inform quality monitoring and enhancement

Drawing on the above summary, the further analysis of the findings from the questionnaire survey and the analysis of tri-partite review records data has identified four key aspects of tri-partite review practice: training; promoting learning; progress monitoring and support; structure and practicalities. These key aspects have been deployed to structure the findings below.

FINDINGS FROM THE QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY

Training

Respondents were asked if they had had adequate training to conduct tri-partite reviews. Nineteen (50%) agreed or strongly agreed, 8 (21%) neither agreed nor disagreed, while 11 strongly or somewhat disagreed (29%). While university staff tended to agree that they had had adequate training (71%), for police respondents this dropped to 24%, and 47% strongly or somewhat disagreed. On balance this indicates that training on tri-partite reviews was not perceived as adequate, particularly by police staff.

In relation to the type of support they found most useful, respondents were asked to rank five items (four plus 'other') in order, as below. 'Other' principally referred to support from within the police force, or other comments about the use of tri-partite reviews. The results were weighted and aggregated; the figures shown are the proportions of the maximum score available.

Table 1	
Preferred support methods	*weighted and aggregated scores*
Ongoing support from a consortium university tutor	**0.57**
Peer support	**0.55**
Formal induction to the role	**0.53**
Access to online support and materials	**0.53**
Other	**0.19**

There is little difference in the scores for the listed items, although it is notable that the highest-scoring items are those involving one-to-one support. This is consistent with the more recent literature on supporting mentors and tutors, which emphasises one-to-one means, where relevant backed by resources. The training needed was not explored, although some of the areas for improvement can be seen from later questions. These include managing the reviews to ensure that they are efficient and focus on learning, managing the ICT and connectivity aspects (in the literature and discussions generally seen as principally the responsibility of the university participant), and moving more quickly into deeper learning matters.

Promoting learning

A major theme from the literature and university discussions, backed by guidance from Ofsted (2015), is that tri-partite reviews should not be seen as a principally administrative exercise but should be geared to promoting ongoing learning. As the main (or only) point when learner, university and employer representatives have a joint discussion, tri-partite reviews provide an opportunity to develop a three-way learning conversation.

The function of tri-partite reviews in promoting learning

In principle, the function of the tri-partite review in promoting learning was well endorsed. Participants were asked to rank five roles within tri-partite reviews, giving the following:

'Supporting learning development' is clearly most significant (it was also ranked first or second by 80% of respondents), and the associated comments also supported this, for instance:

Table 2	
Tri-partite review roles	*weighted and aggregated scores*
Supporting learning development	**0.67**
Coaching student officers	**0.37**
Managing performance	**0.36**
Assessing professional competence	**0.31**
Providing the employer/student officer/ university tutor perspective	**0.26**

❝
"Supporting students to succeed / be the best version of themselves is vital".

❝
"Their progress and performance are important however this can only be achieved if the students feel supported and guided through their learning. That can be academic and operational".

❝
"A tri-partite review is a good opportunity to address [student] concerns from a university perspective. I often find myself educating students about the course through the questions that they raise in the tri-partite review".

❝
"Learning development is the main goal, followed by the review conversation from individual perspectives. Coaching third."

❝
"The tri-partite review is in the main about supporting and developing the student. ... It is nothing to do with assessment other than to check where they are and if they are struggling".

❝
"For me it is about the student and maximising their progression and support through the programmes."

Getting into more detail, respondents were asked to rank 11 items in order, producing the following:

Table 3	
Functions of tri-partite reviews	*weighted and aggregated scores*
A way to check on individual progress	**0.82**
An opportunity to identify and address potential barriers to professional learning	**0.80**
A way to make sure all parties have common expectations	**0.63**
A way to encourage Student Officers to manage their own learning	**0.48**
A way to identify learning opportunities in the workplace environment	**0.47**
To stimulate and motivate future professional learning	**0.43**
An opportunity for an informal catch-up	**0.42**
An opportunity to reflect and learn from workplace experiences	**0.40**
A way to relate on and off-the-job learning	**0.36**
Opportunities to provide formal feedback	**0.36**
Opportunities to set new and review previous targets	**0.32**

It is notable from this list that while the items ranked as most important are learning-related, the emphasis is on more straightforward learning conversations – checking on progress and identifying barriers – with the more complex items consistent with an in-depth professional learning conversation appearing lower down the ranking.

Promoting and supporting learning

Two sets of questions asked how tri-partite reviews contributed directly to learning. In the first, participants were asked whether student officers were encouraged to use the tri-partite review to contribute to their learning. Seventeen (61% of those responding) replied yes, 11 (39%) no, with a slightly more positive balance from university respondents. In terms of how the tri-partite review is used to contribute to learning, three main themes emerged:

— Setting and reviewing goals and objectives and how they will meet them (the strongest theme, mentioned by 9 participants)

— Reflecting on operational and academic progress, ranging from reviewing progress, identifying "any types of incidents they feel they haven't had chance to deal with", through to identifying blocks to learning

— Encouraging students to identify issues, ask questions, and gain access to further support and resources, from "explain[ing] how they are able to access additional learning support in order to help them individually and tailor this support to their needs" to "directing them to online resources / offering advice on up and coming assignments [and] study plans etc".

Participants who saw tri-partite reviews as not contributing to learning were asked why not. They either saw tri-partite reviews as an administrative exercise, or as simple progress reviews (e.g. "I don't see it as a place for professional discussion and there is no time for this"), with learning aspects dealt with in other fora both in the university and within the police force.

A second pair of questions asked respondents in what ways tri-partite reviews contribute to professional learning. 22 contributed to this section, with varying views. A minority (23%) thought they were of little value in this respect, e.g. "they do not" or "of no great value", or that they are less important than other aspects of the programme such as the reflective assignments or Aptem

logs. Similar to responses to the earlier questions, the two major themes were around (a) establishing progress, goal-setting and review, and (b) identifying any areas of concern or support needs. Other responses included encouraging reflection, developing methods of learning, and enabling the university to reconnect with students.

Two (university) respondents were more positive about tri-partite reviews as learning conversations. One indicated their value in helping integrate academic and work-based learning: "without some method of bringing these two together for a student their professional development can be significantly impeded and not appropriately developed". The other listed a range of benefits including encouraging reflection and review, understanding expectations, discussing challenges, celebrating successes, and discussing different approaches and ways to look at situations.

When asked how tri-partite reviews could be improved as a professional learning conversation, several respondents mentioned organisational matters such as reducing the number of tri-partite reviews, improving timing, recording the conversation, and improving engagement particularly from the police force. More guidance on the tri-partite review discussion and less of a 'tick-box' approach was also mentioned. More developmentally-oriented suggestions included having one person "that is consistently following the student ... for continuity of support", giving more attention to student officers' longer-term goals in the force, and having a one-to-one discussion with the university representative.

In summary, there appears to be a fair level of recognition that tri-partite reviews should be used to promote learning, but in practice they are used much more to address immediate concerns and provide signposting than to start deeper learning conversations and help integrate academic and practical learning. This largely agrees with the literature and university discussions, which suggest that while tri-partite reviews should be concerned with reflection and deeper learning, this can be squeezed by the need to cover a large range of topics and complete administrative requirements. Later discussion on the organisation of tri-partite reviews and online tri-partite reviews suggest how some of these topics and requirements might be reduced.

Progress monitoring and support

A major function of tri-partite reviews is to review and aid learner progress. This was widely acknowledged by participants, as indicated in Table 2 where 'a way to check on individual progress' was given the top score out of 11 possible functions of tri-partite reviews.

However, when asked how tri-partite reviews are used to track students through their training, only ten out of 38 survey participants responded. Three were unsure, while others indicated that they were used to record and share information about progress (e.g. "catch up with the university to see how they are progressing on the policing side as they do not use Onefile and we do not use Aptem"). Two added further identifying learning needs and barriers to learning. Respondents were also negative or uncertain when asked if tri-partite reviews contributed to evidencing progress or competence; some saw tri-partite review records as providing evidence of progress, but not of competence.

The value of tri-partite reviews in supporting learners to overcome barriers to progress was also widely recognised, both in Table 2 where it was the second most highly rated item, and when respondents were asked about it specifically. Three main themes emerged here:

— Listening to and responding to student concerns. This included ensuring the tri-partite review was a safe environment to air concerns, the university or police staff taking action to provide further support or advocating to ensure (for instance) sufficient time for learning in the workplace. Responses indicated that tri-partite reviews were being used at least in some instances to address tensions between operational pressures and learning needs, both by university and police staff

— Providing support for time management, planning, and coping strategies. Several respondents saw time management as a key issue, for instance encouraging student officers to use their time wisely, work smarter, and request additional time where needed

— Referring to, or organising, additional support, from simple signposting to online resources and support services, to one-to-one sessions or additional training. One university tutor also used an additional session after the tri-partite review to provide support for academic work, referring back to the PDAO (police assessor) if concerns were operational or role-related.

Respondents were also asked who takes responsibility for recording student officers' progress. Ten replied, of whom eight regarded it as the responsibility of the university. One saw it as initially down to the (police) training school, then transferring to "the coaching unit but still under the banner of training and development", and the final respondent as the responsibility of all three parties. In the final section of the questionnaire, asking for additional comments, one respondent suggested having a more dynamic tri-partite review recording form that enabled for instance goals to be carried over to the next meeting.

The main themes here appear to be developing a common understanding of how reviews should work in terms of monitoring and supporting progress and ensuring consistent recording and communication (including for instance through use of a common learner management system).

Structure and practicalities

Respondents were asked to select any of five statements (plus 'other') relating to the practicalities that should be considered when organising tri-partite reviews.

Table 4	
Respondent selection of items relating to the practicalities of organising tri-partite reviews (can select more than one item).	
Making sure all three parties are present	**63% of total respondents**
Timing between tri-partite reviews	**55%**
Conflicts between operational demands and fitting in tri-partite reviews	**53%**
Making sure the same people are involved in every tri-partite review	**24%**
Organising arrangements for face-to-face tri-partite reviews	**13%**
Other	**11%**

'Other' principally elaborated on timing and operational demands. Additional points were making students aware that they could initiate tri-partite reviews, and ensuring students had a confidential space and adequate IT and connectivity.

Respondents were also asked to state any practical improvements that could be made in arranging tri-partite reviews. Two areas attracted the most comments:

— Reducing the number of tri-partite reviews and spacing them appropriately, e.g. "4 in the first year and 3 in subsequent years", "fewer of them, four feels excessive", "the last tri-partite review is far too close to the first in the next year", "have them focused on the key timings in the student officer's journey". One participant commented that having too many tri-partite reviews encouraged a tick-box approach

— A consistent, standard booking process across all forces and universities, making sure that they fit in with operational timetables, e.g. "WBAs provide target dates, forces populate and return to the HEI". One commented that arranging the next tri-partite review at the current one wasn't working well, and another noted that effective communication was key to getting all parties to attend.

Other suggestions included enabling students to request additional tri-partite reviews and having a more robust method of ensuring that the relevant people attend the tri-partite reviews.

A further question asked whether the tri-partite review approach fits with the overall design and delivery of the programme. This was intended at least in part to have a pedagogical dimension, but the comments (below) suggest that it was interpreted in terms of organisation and structure. Twenty-six respondents replied to this question, as follows, suggesting that on balance it was endorsed by university staff but less so by police (see table 5).

When asked if this alignment could be improved, the major theme was to reduce the number of tri-partite reviews, typically to three per year for later stages of programmes, but make sure they align with other components of the programme such as "the availability of academic results and Force assessment meetings". Supplementary strategies included completing parts of the tri-partite review asynchronously (including for assessors to complete records where there are no issues), and enabling the force, university or student to call an additional meeting if needed. Other suggestions included increased consistency between universities and individual staff, training on tri-partite reviews, and tracking and support outside the tri-partite review to help students achieve goals.

These comments are largely consistent with the literature and university discussions, with the additional provision for enabling learners to initiate additional tri-partite reviews. In particular there is an indication that fewer (e.g. 3 per year for later stages of programmes) but higher-quality tri-partite reviews can be as or more effective, provided that they are linked with key points on the programme. The low priority given to 'making sure the same people are involved in every tri-partite review' is echoed in the literature in the sense of recognising that mentors can need to change as the learner progresses through the programme, although the assumption is that the current mentor (or equivalent assigned person) should attend the tri-partite reviews. The need for commitment from all three parties to tri-partite reviews is however seen as a fundamental necessity, aided by a good working relationship between provider (Consortium university) and employer.

Table 5			
Response to the statement 'Does the tri-partite review approach fit with the overall design and delivery of the programme?'.			
	all respondents	university	police
Definitely yes	**19%**	**29%**	**0%**
Probably yes	**54%**	**65%**	**33%**
Might or might not	**11%**	**6%**	**33%**
Probably not	**11%**	**0**	**33%**
Definitely not	**4%**	**0**	**0**

The move to online tri-partite reviews

The first cohorts on the PCDA started in December 2019/ January 2020, meaning that all except the earliest tri-partite reviews have been conducted online as a consequence of the requirements due to the Covid 19 pandemic. Respondents were asked to rate the statement 'Conducting tri-partite reviews online has worked well'. Twenty-nine responded to this question, as follows, suggesting that on balance it was endorsed by 73% who agreed (strongly or somewhat) that online tri-partite reviews have worked well:

Table 6	
Response to the statement 'Conducting online tri-partite reviews has worked well'.	*of respondents*
Strongly agree	**52%**
Somewhat agree	**21%**
Neither agree nor disagree	**17%**
Somewhat disagree	**10%**
Strongly disagree	**0**

In relation to the benefits and positive aspects of conducting online tri-partite reviews, three major, related themes emerged:

— Efficiency, enabling more reviews to be completed in a day, and enabling batches of reviews to be completed in a shorter timeframe. This was seen as saving staff time and making cancellations less of a problem. On the other hand one respondent commented that conducting too many reviews in a day was mentally exhausting

— Removal of the need to travel between sites and ensure that all three parties can be in the same place at the same time

— Flexibility, for instance fitting around shifts and making it easier to arrange times and dealing with cancellations.

Other benefits that were noted included a tendency for students to be more confident, open and honest, and the ability to make notes while screen sharing.

Two downsides were also reported:

— The less personal nature of the meetings, with greater difficulty in reading non-verbal communication and potentially the dialogue not flowing as easily, "diminishing the effectiveness of how we communicate with each other"

— Lack of full attention from participants, typically because they are trying to fit the meeting around operations, e.g. "from park benches, in police cars, and from a busy and noisy office". This can also lead to privacy issues and "their ability to share what we would like is somewhat hampered".

Connection and IT issues were occasionally reported. Individual respondents also commented that participants (mainly but not only students) were missing the appointments, and the online format tends to encourage "longer and more meetings than are required".

These responses suggest that the move to online reviews have largely been a success, with some disadvantages and teething problems. The literature has little to say on online reviews, but the university discussions indicated that they are generally regarded as successful, as well as being gradually improved with scope for further enhancement. Areas that are 'in progress' are better use of asynchronous elements for advance preparation and administrative elements and use of a combination of two- and three-way meetings.

Summary

The survey indicates that tri-partite reviews are currently being used principally as an administrative tool and as a conversation about immediate learning concerns, such as identifying progress against objectives, identifying and initiating support or signposting for specific learning needs, and overcoming operational and similar barriers to learning. Some appreciation of the potential of tri-partite reviews as deeper learning conversations is apparent, but the opportunity for this to be realised appears largely stymied by the need to cover other matters, perceptions of tri-partite reviews as a formality or administrative requirement, and potentially lack of training and support.

There are also practical matters highlighted by the survey such as integrating tri-partite reviews into the structure of the programme, gaining commitment from participants, organising them, and moving matters better dealt with in advance or in a one-to-one meeting outside the tri-partite review. The indication is that getting these things right would enable a better focus on learning. Remote tri-partite reviews seem to have been successful, with a possible proviso of including an early face-to-face meeting early in the programme, but better use could be made of the online format particularly by covering more aspects asynchronously.

On balance, the survey is consistent with the literature and university discussions in its illustration of tri-partite reviews as a valuable learning tool but needing further refinement – both practically and in terms of participants' understanding and approach – to work effectively in promoting learning conversations.

FINDINGS FROM THE ANALYSIS OF TRI−PARTITE REVIEW RECORDS DATA

Overall standard of completion

The representative sample (100 records) of tri-partite review meetings was analysed initially to ascertain the overall standard of completion. The criteria used to indicate the standard of completion was as follows:

— Good = all relevant sections completed, informative and helpful feedback evidenced that is consistently sufficiently detailed to support progression and future learning

— Requires improvement = most sections completed, some helpful but insufficiently consistent feedback to support progression and future learning

— Inadequate = several sections left blank and not updated, perfunctory feedback that is unhelpful regarding progression and future learning

The outcome of this was that 7% of the records met the 'good' criteria, a significant majority of 77% 'required improvement and 16% of tri-partite review records were inadequate. This is a significant finding with regards to the standard of practice in both documenting and providing tri-partite reviews as the record is not only an indicator of practice but also an important resource to support learning. In itself, this would seem to indicate the need for further training and support for those facilitating and recording the outcomes of tri-partite reviews to raise the standard of practice.

Analysis of the tripartite review records data sample

Subsequent to this initial analysis, a coding matrix was used to structure the analysis of the data sample. This reflected the areas covered in the questionnaire survey and the key aspects of: training; promoting learning; progress monitoring and support; structure and practicalities. The richest source of relevant phrases within the sample of tri-partite review records by far was the key aspect of 'promoting learning', with 485 instances in total, followed by the aspect of 'progress monitoring and support' with a total of 199 instances. The emphasis on 'promoting learning' and 'progress monitoring and support' is in alignment with expectations of the purpose of tri-partite reviews in the survey findings and directly relevant to the pedagogical emphasis of the research project.

The key aspect of 'training' only provided one relevant instance and this is perhaps unsurprising as the focus of the meetings is on the learner and their learning progress, rather than the preparation/support provided to the employer or tutor. No significant data was identified with regards to 'structure and practicalities' with a total of one negative instance recorded in this aspect, which concerned the consistency of staff participation in tri-partite reviews. However, the data from the sample also indicates that 20% of tri-partite review meetings did not have all three required participants (learner, employer, provider) present and yet meetings went ahead and were recorded. This is a significant

finding as it indicates that the university staff facilitating the meetings deemed that the meetings could fulfil their purpose without the involvement of all required participants. It contrasts with the finding from the survey, which indicated that most (63%) respondents selected 'making sure all three parties are present' as the area to be considered when organising tri-partite reviews. This may suggest that while police and university staff recognise the importance of full participation, this is not consistently applied in practice.

It is interesting to note that the data does not indicate significant findings with regards to the structure and practicalities of tri-partite reviews, as it is possible that comments regarding this aspect could be relevant to the arrangements for tri-partite reviews and the preparation for future meetings. This also stands in contrast to the findings from the questionnaire survey, where a significant number and range of responses were provided in this area. However, it does seem to indicate that beyond the single comment within the data sample regarding the lack of consistent staffing for the meetings, participants did not generally comment significantly on this aspect of tri-partite reviews during meetings.

Promoting learning

By far the most significant finding regarding 'promoting learning' is that 36% of the instances recorded indicate that tri-partite review meetings are providing an opportunity for an 'informal catch-up' rather than a more in-depth discussion concerning learning. This aligns with the finding from the questionnaire survey that tri-partite reviews are currently being used principally as an administrative tool and as a conversation about immediate learning concerns.

Other aspects of learning that make up the remaining 64% are fairly evenly distributed across the sample, each constituting relatively small numbers of instances. For example, key phrases such as 'set expectation for learning' and 'identify/ support future learning' are only reflected in 8% and 7% of instances respectively. This is surprising, given that one key purpose of tri-partite reviews is to ensure that the learner is 'actively setting and resetting targets for their learning based on discussion and feedback'. The lowest number of instances relate to phrases concerning 'reflect on work experience learning' (4%), 'tri-partite reviews contribute to learning' (3%) and 'identify barriers to learning' (3%). Again, the low number of instances where the tri-partite review is itself identified as contributing to more developmental aspects of learning may indicate that the current emphasis in practice on administrative and more immediate matters.

Table 7		
Instances of key phrases regarding promoting learning		
	No.	**%**
informal catch-up on learning	175	36%
manage own learning	47	10%
reflect on/review previous learning	47	10%
identify learning opportunities in the workplace	45	9%
check learning progress	40	8%
set expectations for learning	39	8%
identify/support future learning	34	7%
relate on and off-the-job learning	26	5%
reflect on work experience learning	19	4%
tri-partite reviews contribute to learning	14	3%
identify barriers to learning	13	3%
Total	485	100%

Progress monitoring and support

The most significant finding regarding 'progress monitoring' is that 45% of instances in this aspect are concerned with evidencing professional competence. This includes 31% referring to progress towards Independent Patrol Status (IPS) and a further 14% referring to progress towards Full Occupational Competence (FOC). This stands somewhat in contrast to the questionnaire survey finding (identified above) that responses from employer and university staff tended to be negative or uncertain with regards to the role of tri-partite reviews in monitoring progress towards professional competence. However, it could indicate that while professional competence is a common topic of discussion during tri-partite reviews, employers and/or university staff do not see tri-partite reviews themselves as a vehicle for developing it.

24% of instances that relate to progress monitoring are concerned with 'evidencing ongoing progress' and 'tracking progress through training' but only 2% are concerned with 'overcoming barriers to progress'. However, 15% of instances identify specific learner achievements as evidence of progress. Given the key role of tri-partite reviews for all apprentices to ensure that the 'the apprentice is making good progress in all aspects of the apprenticeship', it is

surprising that 'evidencing ongoing progress' and 'tracking progress through training' is not more consistently evidenced in the sample. Similarly, the role of tri-partite reviews in ensuring the providers know 'that apprentices who are falling behind or need support at any point of their programme have a designated space and time to discuss it and for rapid action to be taken', it is again surprising that only 2% of instances relate to 'overcoming barriers to progress'.

55% of tri-partite review records from the sample include identified goals/actions but only 9% include 'SMART' goals/actions. As indicated above, considering that tri-partite reviews are intended to ensure 'that the apprentice is actively setting and resetting targets for their learning based on discussion and feedback', this means that 45% of the sample do not include identified goals/ actions, which seems to fall short of good practice.

Twenty-nine of the instances that relate to progress monitoring concerned 'ensuring enough off-the-job learning time' with over half (seventeen) recording negative comments. Whilst this represents only 9% of the progress monitoring instances, it is still significant as off-the-job learning time is a legal entitlement.

Summary

The findings from the analysis of tri-partite review records indicates that there is insufficient understanding with regards to the minimal requirements for good practice. This includes the university staff who are facilitating the meetings and producing the tri-partite review records. A further implication of this is that the employers and learners who are taking part in meetings are not being adequately and consistently advised by university staff regarding expectations of good practice in conducting tri-partite reviews.

There is evidence that professional competence is a common topic of discussion but the findings indicate that the perceived purpose of tri-partite reviews is to provide an 'informal catch-up' rather than a deeper discussion to promote professional learning. On the one hand, this is consistent with the findings from the questionnaire survey, in that it indicates that tri-partite reviews are not currently being used as a vehicle for a focussed learning discussion. On the other hand, the findings may seem to contrast with the those of the survey, which indicate that tri-partite reviews are not generally considered relevant to developing professional competence. However, this may also indicate that 'professional competence' per se may not be currently understood as something which is achieved through learning discussions.

Generally, there is limited evidence of discussion of future learning opportunities and the key relationship between on and off-the-job learning and minimal evidence of discussion of how barriers to learning and progression might be overcome. Learning goals are not consistently set and where they are, they are very rarely SMART.

5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CONCLUSIONS

It is clear from the research undertaken that for tri-partite reviews to operate as a signature pedagogy for police education, for apprenticeships and for work-integrated higher education more broadly, the underpinning principles identified in the literature need to be both understood and effectively enacted by all participants. While the differences in perspectives afforded by learners, employers and providers has the potential to make tri-partite reviews a unique and rich experience that drives professional learning, a lack of shared purpose can significantly undermine the effectiveness of the activity. The starting point for this required shared understanding is establishing effective triadic working relationships that place the learner at the empowered centre of an occupational community of practice.

To avoid a lack of shared understanding of the respective roles that learners, employers and providers must play to deliver effective tri-partite reviews, providers have a key role in facilitating a 'contracting' process with all parties. Similarly, while the employer must commit to effectively support the learner through consistent workplace mentoring, the provider must also deliver high-quality workplace mentor initial training and ongoing support. Without this, the effective integration of on and off-the-job learning opportunities will be significantly undermined. However, findings from the survey suggest that police employers have not found the training provided to prepare for engagement with tri-partite reviews adequate, which suggests a need for improvement in this aspect of provision. The need for training is also evident with regards to provider (university) staff, given that the standard of completion of 77% of tri-partite review records required improvement and 16% were considered inadequate, while 20% did not include all three required participants.

While it is clear from both the literature review and the survey findings that tri-partite reviews have a very significant role to play in promoting learning, this role is not consistently understood by employers in relation to matters of developing professional competence. Furthermore, while the potential for tri-partite reviews to provide an in-depth discussion that seeks to identify and develop learning opportunities in the workplace, to consider how on and off-the-job learning inter-relate and integrate and also to drive future professional learning is evident, it is not consistently evidenced in practice. The survey and tri-partite review records findings indicate that in practice to date, the emphasis has been on administrative matters and a more informal check on learning progress, rather than an opportunity for a focussed deeper discussion that drives professional learning. The evidence from the meeting records indicates that in practice

the current contribution that tri-partite reviews make to promoting future learning is also likely to be inhibited by an inconsistent approach to setting learning goals. In the best examples, tri-partite reviews do evidence an in-depth learning discussion from which SMART learning goals/actions have arisen but this practice needs to be applied much more consistently as an outcome of the meetings.

The literature suggests that the effective organisation of more administrative tasks, ideally mostly in advance of the tri-partite review meeting, is required to create the 'space' required to hold more productive and in-depth learning conversations. However, as indicated above, it is also clear that all participants need to have shared commitment and understanding that the focus and primary purpose of tri-partite review meetings is to promote and generate professional learning through discursive engagement. Conceived of in this way, tri-partite reviews align with the work-integrated signature pedagogy as a 'triadic learning endeavour' but this requires structured, in-depth, reflective, constructive and proactive engagement, by all parties, in productive learning conversations.

Generally, the findings from the survey indicate that the tri-partite review approach is considered well aligned to the work-integrated nature of the programmes, although police force employers are more ambivalent about this. It is also considered beneficial to align the scheduling of tri-partite reviews with key milestones of the programmes to maximise learning impact and this could result in some reduction in the number of meetings each year. For example, from four each year to four in the first year and three in subsequent years for the PCDA. It is possible that this view may reflect the perception of the value of current practice in conducting tri-partite review meetings. This may be on the basis that if tri-partite reviews are presently not sufficiently driving professional learning, reducing the number of meetings will create resource for other forms of more productive engagement. However, there seems to be some consensus around the idea of a focus on raising the quality of tri-partite reviews by reducing their frequency, although it is clear that reducing frequency alone will not be sufficient in terms of maximising learning potential.

The benefits of conducting tri-partite reviews online are significantly, if not universally, acknowledged. Furthermore, if efficiency and flexibility of administration are key to opening up space for deeper learning focussed conversations, then it would seem reasonable to suggest that the benefits of organising synchronous tri-partite reviews online outweigh any perceived deficits in relation to in-person contact. The facility to asynchronously conduct required administrative

progress monitoring checks online may also serve to allow for greater focus on professional learning discussions during scheduled synchronous tri-partite review meetings. Progress monitoring checks such as, confirmation of sufficient off-the-job learning time, programme module completion and progress towards professional competence could all be completed online and in advance. Where all parties have a role in confirming the accuracy and completeness of this kind of information, it would also serve to ensure that learners, employers and providers are all appropriately prepared to inform deeper learning discussion.

As indicated above, tri-partite reviews are a requirement regarding the provision of all apprenticeships and an emerging practice for some other forms of work-integrated provision. While this is to some degree a matter of compliance from an apprenticeship funding perspective, the consideration of how tri-partite reviews are meeting Ofsted expectations will significantly inform judgements about the quality of

practice. As a relatively new form of practice for providers, employers and learners, it is clear from the research undertaken, that there are inconsistencies in practice and a lack of a shared understanding of the purposes of tri-partite reviews. There are also significant challenges in balancing the administrative and operational requirements with the need to focus on the facilitation of triadic professional learning discussions. If tri-partite reviews are to deliver on their potential to play a major role in contributing to learning development, there is a need to resolve these challenges, improve practice and address the barriers that are currently inhibiting the realisation of this potential.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are drawn from the research undertaken and are intended to contribute to the enhancement and quality improvement of the practice of conducting tri-partite reviews:

1. Occupational communities of practice - Systematise the establishment of an 'occupational community of practice', from the outset of engagement with employer partners, that encompasses a clear process of 'contracting' with regards to roles and responsibilities for conducting tri-partite reviews.

2. Training and support - Review and revise materials and arrangements for the preparation, training and ongoing support of employer workplace mentors to re-emphasise the key role of tri-partite reviews in promoting professional learning. Tailor training and support materials to meet the specific needs of employer, provider and learner audiences. Re-design the template for recording the outcomes from tri-partite review meetings to include clear guidance prompts that support consistency of practice.

3. Asynchronous progress monitoring - Establish a robust and flexible system for scheduling tri-partite reviews, aligned with key programmes milestones. Develop the facility to conduct all administrative progress checks online, asynchronously and in advance of scheduled meetings. Build in the requirement for all three parties to confirm the accuracy and completeness of progress check information, prior to scheduled meetings, to ensure all participants are appropriately informed at the point at which tri-partite reviews take place.

4. Online protocols - Establish protocols for conducting tri-partite reviews online that maximise the efficiency and flexibility benefits while mitigating the potential deficits of not meeting 'in-person'. This should include clear expectations for engagement in asynchronous, pre-meeting activity for all parties as well as expectations for synchronous triadic inter-action during meetings, to support consistency of practice.

5. Good practice guide - Develop a 'good practice guide' for tri-partite reviews, which establishes triadic, professional learning focussed discussion as the signature pedagogy of this practice. The guide should draw on Ofsted expectations for high-quality tri-partite reviews, work-integrated pedagogic principles and related triadic practices, such as coaching and mentoring.

6. Develop and disseminate the research to contribute to the wider discourse regarding enhancement and quality improvement of tri-partite review practice, for the benefit of learners, employers and providers including those operating in other sectors and professional practice areas.

REFERENCES

Allen, H., Magnusson, C., Horton, K., Evans, K., Ball, E., Curtis, K. and Johnson, M. (2015), "People, liminal spaces and experience: understanding recontextualisation of knowledge for newly qualified nurses", *Nurse Education Today*, 35 (2), 78-83.

Association of Police and Crime Commissioners/National Police Chiefs Council (APCC/NPCC) (2016), *Policing Vision 2025*. https://www.npcc.police.uk/documents/Policing%20Vision.pdf, downloaded March 2021.

Arnold, L., Warr, L. and Cowap, C. (2011), "'Courtship Underpinned by Audit': challenges and solutions in quality assuring employer responsive provision", pp. 140-150 in Dhillon, B., Edmonds, T., Felce, A., Minton, A. and Wall, T. (eds). *Making Employer and University Partnerships Work: Accredited Employer-Led Learning*. Faringdon: Libri Publishing.

Benefer R. (2007), "Engaging With Employers in Work-Based Learning", *Education + Training* 49 (3), 210-217.

Bjarnadottir, L. (2018), *Executive Coaching as a value creating tool for Organizations*. Master's thesis submitted to Reykjavík University School of Business.

Boitel, C. and Fromm, L. (2014), *"Defining Signature Pedagogy in Social Work Education: Learning Theory and the Learning Contract"*, Journal of Social Work Education 50 (4), 608-622.

Bower, K. (2012), "Leadership Coaching: Does It Really Provide Value?" *Journal of Practical Consulting* 4 (1), 1-5.

Bravenboer, D. and Workman, B. (2016), "Developing a Transdisciplinary Work-Based Learning Curriculum: A Model for Recognising Learning From Work", in Keppell, M., Reushle, S., and Antonio, A. (eds.) *Open Learning and Formal Credentialing in Higher Education: Curriculum Models and Institutional Policies*. Hershey, PA: IGI Global.

Bromley, M., Minton, A. and Moss. C. (2012), "Developing Capacity and Infrastructure: Support for Those Supporting Higher Apprenticeships", *Higher Education, Skills and Work-Based Learning* 2 (3), 271-284.

Brown, B., Harte, J. and Warnes, A-M. (2007), "Developing the Health Care Workforce: A Comparison of Two Work-Based Learning Models", Education + Training 49 (3), 193-200.

Brown, T., Rowley, H. and Smith, K. (2015), T*he Beginnings of School Led Teacher Training: New Challenges for University Teacher Education – School Direct Research Project Final Report*. Manchester Metropolitan University.

Burger, Z. and Van Coller-Petter, S. (2019), "A guiding framework for multi-stakeholder contracting in executive coaching", *SA Journal of Human Resource Management* 17, a1114, 1-11 (doi.org/10.4102/sajhrm.v17i0.1114).

Cambrook, F. and Lyddon, P. (2011), "Cathedrals Leave No Stone Unturned", pp. 23-31 in Dhillon, B., Edmonds, T., Felce, A., Minton, A. and Wall, T. (eds). *Making Employer and University Partnerships Work: Accredited Employer-Led Learning*. Faringdon: Libri Publishing.

Clutterbuck, D. (2013), "Managing allegiances in the coaching relationship", David Clutterbuck Partnership, https://davidclutterbuckpartnership.com/managing-allegiances-in-the-coaching-relationship/, downloaded March 2021

Clutterbuck, D. (2014), "The three-way conversation in coaching and mentoring", David Clutterbuck Partnership, https://davidclutterbuckpartnership.com/the-three-way-conversation-in-coaching-and-mentoring/, downloaded March 2021

Clutterbuck, D. (2015), "Managing the three-way contract in executive coaching and mentoring", David Clutterbuck Partnership, https://davidclutterbuckpartnership.com/managing-the-three-way-contract-in-executive-coaching-and-mentoring/, downloaded March 2021

Cox, E. and Jackson, P. (2010), "Developmental coaching", in E. Cox, T. Bachkirova and D. Clutterbuck (eds)., *The Complete Handbook of Coaching*. London: Sage, pp. 217-230.

Dalrymple, R., Kemp, C. and Smith, P. (2014), "Characterising Work-Based Learning as a Triadic Learning Endeavour", *Journal of Further and Higher Education* 38 (1), 75-89.

Dornan, T. (2005), "Osler, Flexner, Apprenticeship and 'the New Medical Education'", *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine* 98, 91-95.

Dornan, T., Boshuizen, H., King, N. and Scherpbier, A. (2007), "Experience-Based Learning: A Model Linking the Processes and Outcomes of Medical Students' Workplace Learning", *Medical Education* 41, 84-91.

Dunne, L., Goddard, G. and Woolhouse, C. (2008), "Mapping the Changes: A Critical Exploration into the Career Trajectories of Teaching Assistants Who Undertake a Foundation Degree", *Journal of Vocational Education + Training* 60 (1), 49-59.

Education and Skills Funding Agency (ESFA) (2021), *Apprenticeship funding rules for main providers*. Version 5. Manchester: ESFA.

Engineering Professors Council (EPC) (2018), *Experience enhanced: improving engineering degree apprenticeships*. Godalming: EPC.

Eraut, M. (2008), Learning from other people in the workplace, in K. Hall, P. Murphy and K. Soler (Eds.), *Pedagogy and Practice: Culture and identities* (pp. 40-57). London, Sage.

Evans, K., Harris, D., Guile, J. and Allen, H. (2010), "Putting Knowledge to Work: A New Approach", *Nurse Education Today* 30 (3), 245-251.

Flanagan, R. (2008), *The Review of Policing*. London: Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary.

Fuller A. and Unwin, L. (2008), "Change and continuity in apprenticeship: the resilience of a model of learning",. *Journal of Education and Work*. 22(5) 405-416

Gordon, N. (2014), *Flexible Pedagogies: technology-enhanced learning*. York: Higher Education Academy.

Graham, S., Helyer, R. and Workman, B. (2008), "Accreditation of In-Company Training Provision: An Overview of Models and Issues", pp. 43-55 in *Work-Based Learning Workforce Development: Connections, Frameworks and Processes*. York: Higher Education Academy.

Graham, S. and Rhodes, G. (2007), "Critical Reflection in the 21st Century Workplace: towards an interactive discussion area for practitioners", in *Work-based Learning Futures*, ed. J. Garnett and D. Young. Bolton: University Vocational Awards Council.

Helyer, R. (2015), *Facilitating Work-based Learning: A Handbook for Tutors*. London: Palgrave.

Henderson, K. (2010), "Work-Based Supervisors: The Neglected Partners in Practice Learning", *Social Work Education* 29 (5), 490-502.

Hughes, C. and Saieva, G. (2019), "Degree apprenticeships: an opportunity for all?", *Higher Education, Skills and Work Based Learning* 9 (2), 225-236.

Kettle, J. (2013), *Flexible Pedagogies: Employer Engagement and Work-Based Learning.* York: Higher Education Academy.

Knight, A., Parker, J., Carmichael, H., Esser, A. and Aspden, C. (2015), "Shaping the Future Assistant / Associate Practitioner Workforce: A Hampshire Case Study". *British Journal of Healthcare Assistant*s 9 (3), 144-149.

Kubiak, C., Rogers, A. and Turner, A. (2010), "The Learning Experiences of Health and Social Care Paraprofessionals on a Foundation Degree", *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 29 (3), 373-386.

Lai, Y-L and Smith, H. (2019), "An investigation of the three-way joint coaching alliance: a social identity theory perspective", *Applied Psychology* 70 (2), 489-517.

Lawrence, P. (2018), "Line manager meetings", Centre for Coaching in Organisations, https://www.ccorgs.com.au/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/WhitePaperLineManagers.pdf, downloaded March 2021.

Leek, A. (2020), "Police forces as learning organisations: learning through apprenticeships", *Higher Education, Skills and Work-Based Learning* 10 (5), 741-750.

Lester, S. and Bravenboer, D. (2020), *Sustainable Degree Apprenticeships*. London: Middlesex University.

Lester, S., Bravenboer, D. and Webb, N. (2016), *Work-integrated degrees: context, engagement, practice and quality*. Gloucester: QAA.

Lester, S. and Costley, C. (2010), "Work-Based Learning at Higher Education Level: Value, Practice and Critique". *Studies in Higher Education* 35 (5), 561-575.

Lillis, F. (2018), *Best practice in work-integrated learning for degree apprenticeships*. London: Middlesex University.

Lillis, F. and Bravenboer, D. (2020), "The best practice in work-integrated pedagogy for degree apprenticeships in a post-viral future", *Higher Education, Skills and Work-Based Learning* 10 (5), 727-739.

Lucas, B. (2016), "Never Mind the Quantity, Feel the Depth", pp. 61-76 in Way, D. (ed.) *A Race to the Top: Achieving Three Million More Apprenticeships by 2020*. Winchester: Winchester University Press.

Major, D., Meakin, D. and Perrin, D. (2011), "Building the Capacity of Higher Education to Deliver Programmes of Work-Based Learning", *Higher Education, Skills and Work-based Learning* 1 (2), 118-127.

Marshall, J. (2012), "Developing Midwifery Practice through Work-Based Learning: An Exploratory Study", *Nurse Education in Practice* 12, 273-278.

Middlesex University (2021), A*pprenticeship Quality Review*, Middlesex University

Middlesex University (2020), *Middlesex University Regulations for Apprenticeship Provision 2020/21*. London: Middlesex University.

Minton, A. and Lowe, J. (2019). "How are universities supporting employers to facilitate effective 'on the job' learning for apprentices?" *Higher Education, Skills and Work-based Learning* 9 (2), 200-210.

Moore, L. (2007), "Partnerships and work-based learning: an evaluation of an opportunity to pioneer new ways to care for the older people in the community", *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education* 32 (1), 61-77.

Neyroud, P. (2011), *Review of Police Leadership and Training*. London: Home Office.

Nixon, I., Willis, K., Major, D., Young, D., Tongue, A., Costley, C., Abukari, A., Biddle, P., Graham, S., McClenaghan, K., Helyer, R., Beadsmoore, A., Karuk, V., Siara, B. and Urwin, P. (2008), *Work-based learning impact study*. York: Higher Education Academy.

Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC) (2018), Practice supervision. https://www.nmc.org.uk/supporting-information-on-standards-for-student-supervision-and-assessment/pdf-download-page/, downloaded April 2021.

Ofsted (2015), *Apprenticeships: Developing Skills for Future Prosperity*. Manchester: Ofsted.

Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA) (2019), *Characteristics Statement: higher education in apprenticeship*s. Gloucester: QAA.

QAA (2018), UK Quality Code Advice and Guidance: Work-based Learning, Gloucester, QAA.

Ramshaw, P. and Soppitt, S. (2018), "Educating the recruited and recruiting the educated: can the new Police Education Qualifications Framework in England and Wales succeed where others have faltered", *International Journal of Police Science and Management* 20 (4), 243-250.

Rhodes, G. and Shiel, G. (2007), "Meeting the needs of the workplace and the learner through work-based learning", *Journal of Workplace Learning* 18, no. 3: 173-187.

Rhodes, R. (2018), A practical guide to apprentice assessment and review. Bolton: Universities Vocational Awards Council. https://uvac.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/UVAC-reviews-DD-mar2018.pdf, downloaded March 2021.

Roberts, A., Storm, M. and Flynn, S. (2019), "Workplace mentoring of degree apprentices: developing principles for practice", *Higher Education, Skills and Work-Based Learning* 9 (2), 211-224.

Rowe, L., Moore, N. and McKie, P. (2020), "The reflective practitioner: the challenges of supporting public sector senior leaders as they engage in reflective practice", *Higher Education, Skills and Work-Based Learning* 10 (5), 783-798.

Schohel, M., Uddin, G., Parker-McLeod and Silverstone, D. (2020), "Police Education in the United Kingdom: Challenges and Future Directions". In Nugmanova, M. (ed.), *Education, Human Rights and Peace in Sustainable Development*. IntechOpen. https://www.intechopen.com/books/education-human-rights-and-peace-in-sustainable-development/police-education-in-the-united-kingdom-challenges-and-future-directions, downloaded March 2021.

Senge, P. (1990), *The Fifth Discipline*. New York: Doubleday.

Shulman, L. (2005), "Signature Pedagogies in the Professions", Daedalus 134 (3), 52-59. Skills Development Scotland (2020), *Apprentice progress review exemplar guidance*. Glasgow: Skills Development Scotland. https://www.skillsdevelopmentscotland.co.uk/media/46651/apr-guidance-document-2122.pdf, downloaded March 2021.

Stephenson, J. (1998), "Supporting student autonomy in learning". In *Capability and Quality In Higher Education*, ed. J. Stephenson and M. Yorke. London: Kogan Page.

Turner, E. and Hawkins, P. (2016), "Multi-stakeholder contracting in executive/business coaching: an analysis of practice and recommendations for gaining maximum value". *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring* 14 (2), 48-65.

Waddington, P. (1999), *Policing Citizens*. London: UCL Press.

Winsor, T. (2011), *The Independent Review of Police Officer and Staff Remuneration and Conditions*. London: Home Office.

Wood, D. (2018), "Embedding learning and assessment within police practice: the opportunities and challenges arising from the introduction of the PEQF in England and Wales". *Policing: A Journal of Policy and Practice* 14 (2), 374-382.

APPENDIX A — SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

TRI—PARTITE REVIEWS: A SIGNATURE PEDAGOGY FOR POLICE EDUCATION

Thank you for agreeing to contribute to this research project, the outcomes will enable the Police Education Consortium to continue to enhance the quality of our provision in partnership with our police force partners.

We need you to help us gather evidence about how tri-partite reviews (TPRs) are operating, what is working well, what we can improved and how we can maximise their professional learning potential.

This survey is for: University staff members, Police trainers and Police coaches/mentors. The questions in the survey have been tailored to each role. TPR records are also being sampled anonymously across police forces and universities. The sample will be reviewed using the same question themes in the survey.

Tri-partite Reviews are conversations between three parties: a Police force employer representative; a Student Officer; and a Consortium university Tutor. They are a legal requirement for all apprenticeship programmes and an important aspect of the delivery of our Police Constable Degree Apprenticeship and Degree Holder Entry Programmes. They are intended to ensure:

— Student Officers are making good progress in all aspects of their apprenticeship/programme

— that Student Officers are actively setting and resetting targets for their learning based on discussion and feedback

— that the employer is engaged, supportive and ensures the Student Officer receives their off the job learning time

— that Student Officers who are falling behind or need support at any point of their programme have a designated space and time to discuss it and for rapid action to be taken.

Your answers will only be accessible to members of our small team. Data is encrypted and stored securely. Reports from the survey data and any stories you tell us will be anonymised in our report. We will ask for your consent to access and use your data on these specific terms, when you respond to the survey.

Feedback is always considered within Data Protection Laws and according to the guidelines of Middlesex University.

Consent description

The researcher requests your consent for participation in the Tri-partite Reviews: a signature pedagogy for police education study. This consent form asks you to allow the researcher to use your survey responses to enhance understanding of the topic. Participation in this study is completely voluntary. If you decide not to participate there will not be any negative consequences. Please be aware that if you decide to participate, you may stop participating at any time and you may decide not to answer any specific question.

The researcher will maintain the confidentiality of the research records or data, and all data will be destroyed on 01/12/2021. By submitting this form you are indicating that you have read the description of the study (previous slide) and that you agree to the terms as described. If you have any questions, would like to withdraw after completion of the survey, or would like a copy of this consent letter, please contact me at s.berry@mdx.ac.uk. If you would like to withdraw your answers, you will need to make your request by 23/06/2021.

Consent

I grant permission for the data generated from this survey to be used in the researcher's publications on this topic.

Yes / No

I agree to participate in the research study. I understand the purpose and nature of this study and I am participating voluntarily and no information will be disclosed that could identify me personally. I understand that I can withdraw from the study up until 23/06/2021, without any penalty or consequences.

Yes / No

Which title best describes your role?

— University staff member
— Police Trainer
— Police Coach or Mentor
— Other

If other, please specify your job title
and employer organisation

Which HEI do you work for?

— Middlesex University
— Canterbury Christ Church University
— University of Portsmouth
— University of Cumbria

Which force do you work for?

— Sussex
— Surrey
— Hampshire

Preparation and training

I feel I have had adequate training on TPRs

☐ Strongly agree
☐ Somewhat agree
☐ Neither agree nor disagree
☐ Somewhat disagree
☐ Strongly disagree

How do you see your role in the TPR process?

Please indicate which of the following roles you think are
important by ranking them from most to least important:

— Providing the Employer/Student Officer/
  University Tutor perspective

— Managing performance

— Supporting learning development

— Coaching Student Officers

— Assessing professional competence

Please explain why you selected your
top 3 roles as most important.

How effective are any of the following in preparing you to support Student Officers' learning through TPRs?

☐ Extremely effective
☐ Very effective
☐ Moderately effective
☐ Slightly effective
☐ Not effective at all

— Access to online support and materials

— Formal induction to the role

— Ongoing support from a Consortium university Tutor

— Peer support

— Other (please identify below)

If you selected other, please specify the
kind of preparation and/or support:

The Purpose of TPRs

**Please rank the following from most to least
important: (click and drag items into desired order)**

— An opportunity for an informal catch-up

— A way to check on individual progress

— A way to make sure all parties have common expectations

— An opportunity to identify and address
  potential barriers to professional learning

— A way to identify learning opportunities
  in the workplace environment

— An opportunity to reflect and learn
  from workplace experiences

— A way to relate on and off-the-job learning

— To stimulate and motivate future professional learning

— A way to encourage Student Officers
  to manage their own learning

— Opportunities to provide formal feedback

— Opportunities to set new and review previous targets

TPR practicalities

**What are the practicalities that should be considered
when organising TPRs? Click all those relevant.**

— Timing between TPRs

— Making sure all three parties are present

— Making sure the same people are involved in every TPR

— Conflicts between operational demands and fitting in TPRs

— Organising arrangements for face-to-face in-person TPRs

— Other

If you selected other, please state.

Are there any practical improvements that you
think could be made in arranging TPRs?

Conducting TPRs online has worked well.

☐ Strongly agree
☐ Somewhat agree
☐ Neither agree nor disagree
☐ Somewhat disagree
☐ Strongly disagree

What are the positives to conducting TPRs online, if any?

What are the negatives to conducting TPRs online, if any?

Please add any other comments you would like to
make about the experience of TPRs online

TPRs and Student Officer learning

**Are Student Officers encouraged to use the
TPR to contribute to their learning?**

Yes / No

If yes, how?

If no, why?

Student Officer progress and achievement

How are TPRs used to track Student Officer
progress through their training?

How do you support Student Officer to overcome
any barriers to progress and achievement
identified, anticipated and overcome – both in the
workplace and in the TPR? For example, ensuring
enough time for on and off-the-job learning.

How do the TPRs contribute to
evidencing ongoing progress?

How do the TPRs contribute to evidencing
developing professional competence?

How do the TPRs contribute to evidencing final
assessment of professional competence?

Recording outcomes of the TPR

Who takes responsibility for ensuring the TPR records
Student Officers' progress throughout the programme?

What is your role in the actual recording of the TPR?

Are there any issues to report? For example, does the record
reflect the TPR discussion and agreement on actions? Does
filling in the form distract from or help the TPR process?
Could parts of the form be pre-completed by participants?
Are there any improvements you could suggest?

The value of TPRs for professional learning

**Does the TPR approach fit with the overall
design and delivery of the programme?**

☐ Definitely yes
☐ Probably yes
☐ Might or might not
☐ Probably not
☐ Definitely not

Could this alignment be improved? If so, how?

**In what ways do TPRs contribute to the
development of professional learning?**

**Do you have any ideas about how TPRs could be
improved as a professional learning conversation?**

Other aspects of TPRs

Is there anything else you would like to say about TPRs?

Are you willing to do a 20 minute follow up interview? We
would focus on one or two specific survey questions.

If yes, we may email you to arrange.

Yes / No

Please provide your name and email address

Thank you for participating in this Tri-partite Reviews:
a signature pedagogy for police education survey.

You contributions will support with the continuous
improvement to the tri-partite process.

APPENDIX B —
TRI-PARTITE REVIEW
RECORDS CODING MATRIX

Overall standard of completion	**Good** = all relevant sections completed, informative and helpful feedback evidenced that is consistently sufficiently detailed to support progression and future learning
	Requires improvement = most sections completed, some helpful but insufficiently consistent feedback to support progression and future learning
	Inadequate = several sections left blank and not updated, perfunctory feedback that is unhelpful regarding progression and future learning
Coding categories *Informed by the literature review*	**Key phrases** *Reflecting the survey questions and as indicators of how tri-partite reviews are being used*
Training	training and support for conducting tri-partite reviews
Promoting learning	informal catch-up on learning
	manage own learning
	reflect on/review previous learning
	identify learning opportunities in the workplace
	check learning progress
	set expectations for learning
	identify/support future learning
	relate on and off-the-job learning
	reflect on work experience learning
	tri-partite reviews contribute to learning
	identify barriers to learning
Progress monitoring and support	evidencing ongoing progress
	tracking progress through training
	overcoming barriers to progress
	specific achievements identified towards progress
	ensuring enough off-the-job learning time to support progress
	developing professional competence independent patrol status (IPS)
	progress towards full operational competence (FOC)
	agreed goals/actions to support progress
	agreed SMART goals/actions to support progress
Structure and practicalities	tri-partite reviews fit with the overall design of the programmes
	timings between tri-partite reviews
	all three parties present
	consistent staff involved in tri-partite reviews
	conflicts with operational demands
	face-to-face in person tri-partite reviews
	online tri-partite reviews
	suggested practical improvements

APPENDIX C —
RESEARCH PROJECT TEAM
AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

RESEARCH TEAM

Professor Darryll Bravenboer
Lead Researcher and Project Manager, Middlesex University

Dr Stan Lester
Principal Research Consultant, Middlesex University

Dr Finbar Lillis
Research Consultant, Middlesex University

Colin Bryce
Research Assistant, Middlesex University

Diana Tamics-Bahadoor
Research Assistant, Middlesex University

Steph Berry
Research Assistant, Middlesex University

PROJECT ADMINISTRATION

Diana Tamics-Bahadoor and Steph Berry
Centre for Apprenticeships and Skills, Middlesex University

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS AND THANKS

MDX.AC.UK