Education, Training and Learning in Policing in England and Wales

Dr Cheryl Simmill-Binning

Dr Jude Towers

October 2017

Executive Summary

This report is a review of the literature on education, training and learning in policing and the findings from a set of in-depth, semi-structured interviews with one N8 policing partner organisation exploring their thinking on current and future education, training and learning needs as individuals and as an organisation within the context of the rapidly changing national picture, specifically the College of Policing, *Policing Education Qualification Framework* (especially the proposed Level 7 higher degree qualification) and the introduction by the Government of degree apprenticeships. It is intended to help inform future developments of the Teaching and Learning strand of the N8 PRP and to provide useful data to the N8 policing partners on the current training and learning practices and future considerations in this area. The driver behind the research project was the growing emphasis on the professionalisation of policing in the UK, exemplified by the introduction of the Policing Education Qualifications Framework (PEQF) by the College of Policing in 2016.

This report is structured around three sections:

1. a background and literature review
2. in-depth, semi-structured interview findings with one police force in the N8 PRP
3. conclusions

A review of the literature carried out at the beginning of the project mapped the field and identified issues relevant for the development of in-depth, semi-structured interviews with one N8 policing partner. This policing partner was selected based on evidence of significant engagement with training, Continuing Professional Development (CPD) and higher education (HE) at Level 6, Level 7 and above[1,2].

Literature Review

Professionalisation of policing has become an 'expanding discourse' (Green & Gates, 2014) in Western Europe, including the UK, in the USA and in other OECD countries. Higgs et al (2009) describe a profession as '…a self-regulated occupational group that has a body of knowledge and recognised role in serving society. Professions are self-regulated, accountable and under continual scrutiny and development. They are guided by a code of ethical conduct that is the foundation for practice decisions and actions. Membership of the profession requires completion of an appropriate (commonly degree-based) intensive educational programme' (Higgs et al., 2009: 102). Over the last 20 years healthcare, teaching and social work have all undergone a process of 'professionalisation'. In the UK,

---

[1] Note that the intention was to use the literature review and the interviews to devise a survey questionnaire to be sent to the relevant officer or staff member responsible for training and learning (or equivalent) in each of the other ten N8 policing organisations: the questionnaire was developed and reviewed by the appropriate staff member in one of the N8 police partner organisations and then distributed to the ten police partner organisations. However, data was only received back from four forces, and there was a considerable amount of missing data in the responses received. This means the data is not robust as representative of the N8 policing organisations. Thus for the purposes of this report, the literature review and interviews provide the data. The responses to the survey are available on request to the report authors.

[2] Note that the interview data is specific to the force and cannot be generalised across the N8 policing partner organisations

with the founding of the College of Policing and the recent development and introduction of the PEQF, policing is now also undergoing this process of 'professionalisation'.

The start of this period of professionalisation of the police can be identified as August 2010, when the Home Secretary commissioned Peter Neyroud, then Chief Executive of the National Policing Improvement Agency, to undertake a review of police leadership and training. At the end of the review and during a subsequent Home Affairs committee review, Neyroud stated the '…police service needs to move from being a service that acts professionally to becoming a professional service' (Neyroud, 2011: 129).   His definition reflected that of Higgs (2009) in calling for a professional body of knowledge. In concluding, Neyroud recommended 'a clear qualification requirement for senior management ('Senior Management in Policing' qualification (SMIP)). This should lie at level seven or masters level, and incorporate command as well as business skills and the evidence around effective policing' (Neyroud, 2011: 117-118). This qualification was to be supported by fellowship of a professional body.

This new qualification was to be a 'mixture of skills development tested by both academic and peer assessment' (Neyroud, 2011:117), with an emphasis on police officers taking responsibility for their own learning. The mechanisms of the current and future engagement of police officers in this professionalisation process, however, were less evident.

Neyroud's report contains multiple references to 'education and training' but no real exploration of the difference between these two, commenting only that it has been noted by many report authors over the years that there is a need to improve both in policing. The distinction between education and training, and importantly whether higher education (HE) qualifications are education or training, was unclear, and remains so in much of the grey literature. This is significant in considering the role Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) could play in the future professionalisation of the police in the UK (Holdaway, 2017).

Utilising a profession-specific body of knowledge as a marker of professionalisation indicates the need to develop relationships between policing and HEIs, whose core business is research and education. There are however significant challenges, including identifying the core difference between training, CPD and education, which of these is relevant, in what context, and how this will impact the (co-)construction of competencies and role profiles by police and HEIs for educational programmes that meet these policing objectives.

Interviews

The issues raised in the literature review informed the development of the in-depth, semi-structured interviews with police offices and members of support staff at one N8 policing organisation. Ten interviews were conducted, of which eight were with serving officers, from Sergeant to Superintendent, and two with senior police support staff from departments associated with Communications, Learning and Development, and Organisational Development.

The differences between training, CPD and education were explored and it became apparent that distinctions between these were not always clear in practice. In theory the difference was understood, but the distinction between the categories was often unclear when considering the potential to accredit training and/or CPD.

While engaging with HEIs was perceived to be one of a number of ways forward in order to develop Level 7 (master) provision, the exact nature of the content and indeed the co/design, co/delivery, procurement and/or partnership processes were much less clear.

HE was seen by some as relevant to their 'day job': when individuals had participated in degree or certificated education with HEIs they recognised its value and relevance. However interviewees also identified a need to ensure that such relevance was self-evident to participating (or potentially participating) officers in the future. There were also issues around who would and how should HE qualifications be delivered, with some reservations about delivery by those who were some distance from frontline engagement.

Motivation to engage in HE when a serving police officer was discussed in detail by the interviewees. For more senior officers there was an expectation that over time a new culture would develop where officers would be self-resourcing HE qualifications, rather than being employer resourced, although this was expected to be a gradual shift with perhaps a different set of expectations for current provision. Less senior officers viewed HE as a learning process that was of benefit to their employing organisation and therefore should be funded and otherwise supported by the employer.

The potential of HE to influence cultural change was identified by all interviewees, though there was some distinctions in what that future might looked like in practice. Indeed cultural change emerged as a highly significant theme in considering the place and impact of current and future training, learning and education.

Conclusions

Overall the literature review and the interview findings indicate that although the practical application of professionalisation through HE qualification is moving forward quickly there remain significant questions around the assumptions on which progress is being built: these are apparent in the discourse and language of the interviewees. While there is a narrative about the need for leadership and autonomous decision-making in policing organisations which would benefit from the critical thinking skills embedded in HE, the language being used to discuss should progress remains anchored in training and CPD, not in education.

This reflects one of the two main conclusions drawn from the project: accredited training is not the same as a HE qualification. There was much discuss in the interviews speculating as to whether current training and CPD could be accredited in ways which would enabled it to aggregate to a HE qualification, in this case specifically a Master's Degree. However, accredited training and CPD is not the same as the pedagogy underpinning HE. It may well be that a system of accredited training and CPD in *preparation for* HE study has utility, but the replacement of the Master's Degree with a portfolio of accredited training and CPD would be highly unlikely to meet the educational aims and objectives of a higher degree. Thus the question of the content and delivery for a Masters Degree in policing remains pertinent; as do the 'core' and 'optional' components and whether this is envisioned as taught postgraduate provision or research postgraduate provision. There is broad agreement in the literature and in current policy discourses of the need for leadership (and management) to be core to the policing Masters Degree; interviewees also identified the need for the option to follow specialisms as part of the qualification, for example in trafficking, CSE, cybercrime, etc. It has also been broadly acknowledged that one of the

aspects of a Masters Degree which sets it apart from training and CPD is the development and implementation of research skills. Thus it is arguable research skills should be a core component of a policing Masters Degree, along with leadership development. However, the interviews also highlighted the confusion between 'evaluation' and 'research': academic research is pedagogically different to service evaluation. This needs to be reflected in a policing Masters Degree.

The other major conclusion from the project is that cultural change in policing is needed: and that the professionalisation of policing in England and Wales is part of this process. The literature, the interviewees, and the wider debates occurring in policing are in agreement that cultural change is under way, and is necessary in order for policing organisations to be fit for purpose in the rapidly changing environment of significant public spending cuts to both policing and to adjacent services, including health, social services and education. A deeper debate is engaging with the question 'what is that purpose' for policing under the current political, economic and social conditions, with an increasing emphasis in many forces on vulnerability, resource management, and evidence-based policing. It is clear that education, training and learning will have a key role to play in the process of cultural change and professionalisation: just how that will manifest in practice is not yet clear. The more substantive questions of the principles underpinning the process of professionalisation for policing also require further, continuing interrogation.

HE has a valuable contribution to make to cultural change because fundamentally HE (especially at Level 7 and above) should change the way an individual (a society) thinks, in particular the ability to critically evaluate the world from different perspectives, to make explicit underlying theories of change driving individual and organisational behaviour, and to engage in problem-based thinking: when the way individuals and (once at a critical mass is reached) organisations think changes then culture shifts fundamentally.

What also became clear is that policing organisations are more than just the servicing officers; a significant proportion of policing organisations are support staff. It is clear that support staff are not (yet) embedded within the understanding of organisational change and professionalisation of policing in England and Wales. This group of staff are currently being left behind, yet they potentially play highly significant roles within policing organisations. Better attention needs to be paid to the interactions between the different parts of policing organisations in order to ensure sustainable and effective change.

Contents

Introduction

This report is a review of the literature on education, training and learning in policing and the findings from a set of in-depth, semi-structured interviews with one N8[3] policing partner organisation exploring their thinking on current and future education, training and learning needs as individuals and as an organisation within the context of the rapidly changing national picture, specifically the College of Policing, *Policing Education Qualification Framework* (especially the proposed Level 7 higher degree qualification) and the introduction by the Government of degree apprenticeships. It is intended to help inform future developments of the Teaching and Learning strand of the N8 PRP and to provide useful data to the N8 policing partners on the current training and learning practices and future considerations in this area. The driver behind the research project was the growing emphasis on the professionalisation of policing in the UK, exemplified by the introduction of the PEQF by the College of Policing in 2016.

This report is structured around three sections:

1. a background and literature review
2. in-depth, semi-structured interview findings with one police force in the N8 PRP
3. conclusions

A review of the literature carried out at the beginning of the project mapped the field and identified issues relevant for the development of in-depth, semi-structured interviews with one N8 policing partner. This policing partner was selected based on evidence of significant engagement with training, Continuing Professional Development (CPD) and higher education (HE) at Level 6, Level 7 and above[4,5].

Background: The Professionalisation of Policing in England

Professionalisation of policing has become an 'expanding discourse' (Green & Gates, 2014) in Western Europe, including the UK, in the USA and in other OECD countries. Higgs et al (2009) describe a 'profession' as '…a self-regulated occupational group that has a body of knowledge and recognised role in serving society. Professions are self-regulated, accountable and under continual scrutiny and development. They are guided by a code of ethical conduct that is the foundation for practice decisions and actions. Membership of the profession requires completion of an appropriate (commonly degree-based) intensive

---

[3] The N8 Policing Research partnership **has been established to enable and foster research collaborations that will help address the problems of policing in the 21st century and achieve international excellence in policing research.** The Training and Learning strand, based at Lancaster University, is one of eight strands across the N8 university partners.

[4] Note that the intention was to use the literature review and the interviews to devise a survey questionnaire to be sent to the relevant officer or staff member responsible for training and learning (or equivalent) in each of the other ten N8 policing organisations: the questionnaire was developed and reviewed by the appropriate staff member in one of the N8 police partner organisations and then distributed to the ten police partner organisations. However, data was only received back from four forces, and there was a considerable amount of missing data in the responses received. This means the data is not robust as representative of the N8 policing organisations. Thus for the purposes of this report, the literature review and interviews provide the data. The responses to the survey are available on request to the report authors.

[5] Note that the interview data is specific to the force and cannot be generalised across the N8 policing partner organisations

educational programme' (Higgs et al., 2009: 102). Over the last 20 years healthcare, teaching and social work have all undergone a process of 'professionalisation'. In the UK, with the founding of the College of Policing (CoP) and the recent development and introduction of the PEQF, policing is now undergoing this process of 'professionalisation'.

The starting point for this professionalisation of the police in the UK was August 2010, when the Home Secretary commissioned Peter Neyroud, then Chief Executive of the National Policing Improvement Agency, to undertake a review of police leadership and training. The terms of reference included:

- how ACPO (Association of Chief Police Officers) can own and develop a shared vision in the service which engages practitioners, with Police and Crime Commissioners locally and nationally, with Government and other organisations such as the new National Crime Agency, for the standards of leadership and the development of the profession, building on learning from the Leadership Strategy;
- how to develop ACPO capacity to deliver leadership development, and assessment/accreditation, supported by the Superintendents' Association, the Police Federation and others, which brings a cohesive approach to the leadership landscape;
- how the leadership functions can be transitioned effectively in the context of the need for very substantial budget reductions;
- the need to respond to the Government's priority of reducing the unsustainable national deficit, including alternative funding models for leadership that both reduce and recover cost;
- the potential role of other providers in training delivery, including other public sector leadership academies, the private sector, and other institutions.
(Home Affairs Committee, 2011: 127)

At the end of this review and during a subsequent Home Affairs Select Committee review, Neyroud stated the '…police service needs to move from being a service that acts professionally to becoming a professional service' (Neyroud, 2011: 129). Like Higgs (2009), Neyroud also aligns professionalisation with a professional body of knowledge, expanding on this in his evidence to the Home Affairs Committee: 'there has been a great deal of work to make the service, for example, much better at investigating crime, much better at dealing with particular specialist functions, but, to be frank, none of those have been pulled together as a clear, single, professional body of knowledge yet' (Neyroud, 2011: 130).

Reactions by members of the police speaking with the Home Affairs Committee on the Neyroud report were mixed, with some support for professionalisation to bring the force in-line with other professions, while others expressed scepticism. Derek Barnett, President of the Police Superintendents' Association of England and Wales, said although he and his members supported the idea of a Professional Body in principle, he was less clear about how it would work in practice:

The difficulty appears to have been in the terminology, because nobody is quite clear what a "professional body" means in policing. The Royal College of Nursing, for example, is a trade union that acts in furtherance of the interests of its members. I think what Peter Neyroud is suggesting is something that is both regulatory but also membership-focused,

and that has caused us a bit of difficulty because it becomes a bit of a hybrid organisation (Home Affairs Select Committee, 2011: 133).

Nevertheless in-spite of these concerns a professional body was set up: the College of Policing (CoP). One of the tasks allocated to the CoP, in addition to guidance and standards, was responsibility for training. In his review, Neyroud referred to 'a transformation of the culture of learning in the police service' (Home Affairs select Committee, 2011: 160). He advocated 'moving away from in-house delivered programmes which have been largely classroom based to a new partnership with HE, building towards 'teaching hospitals' for policing, linking learning with practice' (Home Affairs select Committee, 2011: 124). Under Neyroud's proposals a 'teaching hospital' model would be adopted which would take the form of 'on the job' learning as well as the delivery of theory. One of the tasks of the CoP was to design and oversee the delivery of a *Policing Education Qualification Framework* (PEQF). The PEQF reflects the recommendation in the Neyroud report for '…a new professional qualification framework [which] will see managers and frontline officers developed and supported to keep their practice current and consistent with the best' (Home Affairs Select Committee, 2011: 161). The PEQF would take the provision of learning away from individual forces into Higher Education Institutions (HEIs), the private sector and other institutions. A further aspect was to place a greater onus on the individual to undertake continuous professional development (CPD) throughout their careers. Thus responsibility for police training and learning is to move from the forces themselves towards Further and Higher Education institutions (FEIs and HEIs). This shift was in keeping with a number of similar developments internationally, as police education and training expands globally (Cordner and Shain, 2011).

While the Neyroud report speaks of productive new relationships with FE and HE the exact nature of these is not explored. Discussions with the Higher Education Forum for Policing and others in HE identified there is no systematic engagement and while there have been good relationships between individual forces and HE providers these were, 'ad hoc, inefficient and of variable standards' with a 'tendency to use HE to provide accreditation for in-house provision rather than partner with HE to deliver learning' (Neyroud, 2011: 56). This situation was seen to 'restrict the development of an effective market and alternative provision' (Neyroud, 2011: 56) and to have resulted in the relationship not being an 'embedded partnership' unlike those in medicine and education (Neyroud, 2011: 81). In order to progress through the career structure in nursing, health care, teaching and social work, gateway HE qualifications had been established. To achieve this professional qualifications had been created, situated within a professional development framework. A similar process was envisaged for policing: thus the College of Policing (CoP) was set up as the professional body for policing. The CoP is currently in the process of developing the PEQF as both the gateway HE qualifications for policing (Level 6, introduced June 2017and to be mandatory from 2020) and further HE qualifications as the gateway to specific ranks (still under development).

However, the distinction between education and training in the context of the new PEQF is still unclear, for example even at Level 7 the 'Senior Management in Policing Qualification' (required as a pre-qualification for Superintendents) is still referred to as 'training', rather than education (Neyroud, 2011: 117). Thus there remains a significant question as to whether the gateway and progression qualifications in the PEQF are, at their core,

'education' or 'training'. If training rather than education, this raises fundamental questions about the role and type of provision that HEIs can offer and the relationship between policing organisations and HEIs in the co/design and co/delivery of the PEQF. While the debate has not yet comprehensively engage with the question of education or training, or education as training, it is likely to become increasingly relevant (Holdaway, 2017) as demonstrated by the interviews with one N8 policing organisation (see below).

Literature Review

This review of the literature considered the role of higher education (HE) in police professionalisation in the twenty-first century and was additionally utilised in the development of the in-depth interview schedules. The review covers three key areas: the relationship between HE and police education/training/CPD; the role of the HE sector in delivering police education/training/CPD; and the difference between education and training.

The literature on police and policing is international and stretches back many years; what is notable about this body of literature is the contrast between the USA (and elsewhere) and the UK (specifically England and Wales) in the development and depth of co-operation between policing organisations and HEIs: in England and Wales this appears to be developing much more slowly than elsewhere in the world (Hallenburgh and Cockcroft, 2014) along with the lack of a 'clear research base' for police education and training (Paterson, 2011).

Relationship between Higher Education and Police Education

Reviews of recent past delivery of HE to police has raised questions. Paterson identified the key one of these as what 'added value' do HEIs bring to police training and education (Paterson 2011)? Perhaps one answer to this is that the value of HE lies not in the direct application of the knowledge gained, but rather in the development of critical thinking skills. Indeed Lee and Punch (2004) argue even a generic HE qualification '…is a valuable option in developing high potentials and in combating the "group think" process' (Lee and Punch, 2004: 249). There is also evidence that graduate police officers identify further personal (as well as professional) benefits, including enhanced confidence and self-esteem, broadened outlooks and greater tolerance for divergent points of view (Smithers and Hill, 1990). Research has also found it is not the specific degree subject that cultivates this more ethical and culturally aware attitude, but rather the overall HE experience (Roberg, 1978).

Nevertheless there is debate about the role of HE in the delivery of education for police organisations and individuals. It has been argued that there is very little evidence that educated police officers are more effective crime fighters or that education has a significant influence on police officer behaviour (Wimshurst and Ransley 2007; Paoline,Terrill and Rossler, 2015). Paoline et al argue 'the precise attributes that it [HE] would bring to policing were never fully delineated' (Paoline et al., 2015: 51). However, there have been some challenges to these findings, for example Lee and Punch (2004) find the key is clear objectives, the identification of core curriculum content and the adoption of an appropriate method to facilitate the transition from a law enforcement focus to a community focus. Thus while there is some evidence in the literature of the need for and the value to police officers of these 'deeper skills' and 'flexibility' which HE can facilitate, further research is required to consolidate the evidence that this is best achieved through education.

The Role of Higher Education

The exact role of HE has been a challenging question in many countries. In the USA questions have been raised about both the role, and the difference between perceptions and actuality as well as the relationship between the professionalisation of policing and HE, and whether research or other forms of working partnerships between policing and HEIs could

deliver more effective change than enrolling officers as students   (Paoline, Terrill & Rossler, 2015; Baro and Burlingame, 1999). After all, as Hallenburgh and Cockroft (2014) argue policing organisations and HEIs have very different cultures. Hallenburgh devised a schematic to summarise what they perceive to be the significant differences:

Academia	Police
theory	practice
research	experience
analysis	management
long-term	short-term
interest-led	needs-led
formal learning	informal learning
independence	collectivity
originality	loyalty

(Hallenberg, 2012: 167).

The 'culture of policing' is a theme which repeatedly emerges in the literature, in policy and internally, for example the in-depth interviews discuss this theme extensively (see below). Hellenberg and Cockcroft (2014: 7) argue much of police training is needs-led, and in spite of its formalisation 'a lot of the learning still takes place through the socialisation processes' and that this contributes to the culture of policing. There is a growing consensus that the culture of policing needs to change and that a fundamental part of this is a shift in the way police officers learn and think. This is a key site for debates on the nature of education and training and the distinctions between them, for the development of training or education provision.

In 2004 Kratcoski emphasised the importance of the distinction between education and training in policing. They defined education as developing the ability to conceptualise and expand the theoretical and analytical learning process whereas they defined training as gaining the skills needed to accomplish the immediate tasks and goals of police operations. While these definitions are contested, the debates on the nature and purpose of education and training do not appear to be a substantive element of the discussions on developing the professionalisation of policing. Indeed there is little evidence of a reflexive conversation on the purpose of a higher degree and the relationship of HE with policing and policing organisations taking place in the current context of police professionalisation through HE qualification.

Research-led Education

HEIs in the UK typically practice, to a greater or lesser extent, research-led teaching, such that students and teachers are engaged with the state of the art research knowledge, as well as the classical foundational knowledge. This generates a distinct 'complex body of knowledge'. It is the interaction in research-led teaching between researchers, teachers, and students which is as much about substantive knowledge as it is ways of thinking about the world, critically drawing on theory and empirical evidence, that could be argued to constitute the core difference between education and training, and thus the unique contribution HEIs can make to the police professionalisation agenda. Thus by taking the requirement for a profession specific body of knowledge as a marker of professionalisation and the unique contribution of HEIs to engage, and support research and to deliver research-led teaching,

the core difference between training, CPD and education is established. However, how this relates to the 'clear objectives' that Paterson (2011) concludes are necessary, with the construction of competencies and role profiles by police and for HEIs to identify relevant teaching strategies in order to meet police objectives, has yet to be evidenced in practice.

In much 'vocational' education there is the additional dimension of the practice in HE of employing ex-practitioners to teach on policing specific modules and programmes, thus these police practitioners are engaged by HE to 'develop and deliver police-specific academic programmes to prepare the next generation and edify serving offices for specialisms and leadership roles.' (Green and Gates, 2014: 87). The role and impact of such practitioner-teachers is complex but significant and requires further research – especially given their significance in influencing the attitudes of serving police officers as demonstrated in the N8 interviews below.

Interviews with police officers and support staff at one N8 policing organisation

Ten in-depth, semi-structured interviews were conducted with members of one N8 police organisation to consider their perspectives on the potential and the challenges in considering engagement with a Level 7 HE qualification. Eight of the interviewees were police officers, having served between eight to over 20 years at the time of interview, from the rank of Sergeant to Superintendent. Some of the officers were operating at divisional levels while others were based at the organisation's headquarters. Several officers had just moved from front facing work at divisional level to head-quarters after promotion from Sergeant to Inspector. In addition two interviewees were long serving, senior members of police support staff. Most of the interviewees were educated to degree level (n=7), with four holding or currently undertaking postgraduate qualifications[6].

All of the interviewees were, in some way, involved in the delivery or development of learning within the force. Below is a summary of their current learning engagement:

- In-house training for specialist IT systems use
- Organisational Development
- Service transformation - Divisional Level
- Organisational development - Divisional Level
- Learning and development
- Recruit training
- Organisational development - Headquarters
- Corporate development
- Communications – Headquarters

What is Training?

Currently the training and CPD delivered by the organisation cannot contribute toward a Masters Degree and is not generally accredited in any specific way, to any particular ends. Most of the training is delivered in-house by police officers. The experience of delivering training had in some cases engendered an interest in learning and thus encouraged people to think about the possibility of formalising their knowledge and skills. However the difference between training, CPD and education was, for some of the interviewees, at times, difficult to explain. The boundaries between training and CPD appeared clear to most people but the concept and delivery of learning in HE and the relationship between training, CPD and education was less clear.

One interviewee offered the distinction between training and education as 'a deeper understanding. It is about you, not buttons to press' (Interviewee 3). Another interviewee stated that 'training' delivered core police training to initial recruits to enable them to do their job. These include: crime training, specialist skills, recorder training, officer training, IT specialist police systems training. In addition, officers would also be expected to undertake additional or annual training in public order, driving, leadership and management and fire arms (Interviewee 1). Although the CoP was noted to deliver specialist elements of training,

---

[6] Note that the findings from these interviews cannot be extrapolated across all 11 policing partner organisations in the N8.

most of this type of delivery was in-house, especially after the financial cuts over the last few years.

What is Continuing Professional Development?

Continuing Professional Development (CPD) is anything over and above mandatory training, for example first aid. This has just been launched at 35 hours per year (recommended by the College of Policing) recorded locally by logging hours (Interviewee 7).

Like training, CPD was also seen as in-house delivery, in some instances facilitated through on-line and attendance at conferences or presentations. CPD was rarely formally recorded and none, at the time of writing, was accredited. Interviewees raised the issue of a gap around CPD between the input new recruits get and that for higher ranks. Certainly at the higher levels (inspector and above) individuals were considered to have more options through CoP and other leadership courses (including some delivered by HEIs). This was a cause for concern, for example Interviewee 2 said 'It [CPD and options for learning] does need to get down to the ground. It is a bit all over the place and could be coordinated a bit better. Now people are choosing to go on things, but is it at the right place and time and good people are not going on it because they don't know about it!'

In addition it was felt that CPD should not be confused with other forms of learning as there was no quality control, 'I don't see CPD as training it is more conferences, there are no learning objectives that you can then test. I think we [the police service] confuse CPD and training. Just because you have people sat there it does not mean they take anything away. Just getting a certificate for CPD is not enough' (Interviewee 4).

The advantages of education, as opposed to training and CPD were recognised by some of the interviewees, 'If you talk about the difference between training and education people say 'oh we don't get that' (training or education) whereas this is part of the cycle of learning. I think it is the link between training and education that helps us get better at what we do. It needs a whole person approach and more than jumping through hoops, reflection, asking "what do I want to do" and keeping track on where you are going in your career' (Interviewee 3). Interviewees identified that often guidance on training and education was largely dependent on line-managers, their ability and knowledge about what is available and identifying the best opportunities for more junior officers, 'You are dependent on your supervisor to do that. If they don't then it is up to yourself and I look back and if I had not done it [engaged with 'good quality' CPD and higher education] I would have plateaued. It has shaped my career path' (Interviewee 3). Nevertheless there was caution 'You need to do something differently but not lose touch with the front line, for the support and your credibility' (Interviewee 3).

Accreditation

None of the interviewees thought they had received formal accreditation for any training or CPD they had undertaken while in the police force unless they had undertaken formal HE qualifications. However, the interviewees recognised they were operating in a changing world and that if they wished to progress in their career or leave the force, the need for accredited delivery was becoming a pressing issue, 'telling people how their skills [police officer skills] were transferable was no longer enough. As people retire and go on you see what their skills transfer into. But it is not always visible immediately' (Interviewee 4). This

point was supported by others, one of whom noted that 'It is not a 30 year career any more. You need accreditation of learning because there is more movement…. It's a scary world out there. They want to see a NVQ Level 5 in this or that and other accreditations' (Interviewee 3), another interviewee stated, 'Yes accreditation is needed for the courses, for the training. At the moment it is not acknowledged. You need something that is transferable to outside the organisation' (Interviewee 2).

The requirement for more accreditation was seen by most of the interviewees as the result of rapid changes both in the external world where formal accreditation opened doors into other professions and also in their own careers, where HE qualifications were increasingly seen as necessary. However, as noted by one interviewee, one pertinent question now is whether current training should be accredited as a means to gradually 'building' a Masters Degree or as a means of acknowledging the training in and of itself. In reality it is likely to be both but this, as discussed by interviewees, will raise further questions about the value and level of accreditation and its equivalence in other organisations, including HEIs.

Engagement with Higher Education

One of the interviewees had experience of working with the HE sector in the past and considered themselves to be an 'early adopter' (Interviewee 8) of working with local HEIs, including participating in research. This interviewee had actively looked for ways to engage the local HEI in order to support decision making around vulnerability, risk and criminality. They contacted heads of research at the HEI, forming a group with academics interested in evidence-based policing. The interviewee considered this to have been 'quite a success and has pushed the boundaries with evidence-based policing' (Interviewee 8).

The experience of other interviewees, especially those recently promoted to the rank of Inspector, was quite different. In the past these interviewees had been forward facing, having very little engagement with HE or indeed any education or even training or CPD beyond the compulsory training (public order, diversity and officer safety) and 'a little CPD' (Interviewee 9). These interviewees felt below the rank of Inspector and away from detective work, there was 'very little opportunity to step back and undertake self-development' because, 'everyone is busy on the frontline' (Interviewee 9). This interviewee went on to say, 'Most frontline officers are not aware of what is out there and tend to crack on and get the job done. Neighbourhood policing, response, they are very skilled but it tends to be through the personal characteristics that they had when they joined and their ability. It is trial and error. Education is not very popular with frontline staff. The people you have spoken with today may not know this [members of senior staff]. If I went out there to the immediate response team they would ask "how would that help the public?"' (Interviewee 9). However, this interviewee also went on to say, 'It is important to get it right. But it is really, really important that it cascades to the frontline. If Masters Degrees do not improve the frontline delivery of services then what is the point?' (Interviewee 9).

Perception of Higher Education

Learning by doing was a strong theme which emerged from the interviews, for example 'I got so much more out of a training session when it is hands on. It's theory with the experience. Cops very quickly switch off. It has to be relevant' (Interviewee 8); another long serving interviewee said they had 'worked their way up from front desk' by ' learning by observation,

workshops, learning from others, and my knowledge base is born out of the work roles' (Interviewee 10). Thus informal learning and the holding of tacit knowledge are also important themes in considering the generation of knowledge in policing.

When asked to consider the current role of HE in policing, interviewees typically regarded HEIs as providers of undergraduate degrees or organisations to be commissioned for specific pieces of work, for example evaluations, although other models were also discussed. For example one interviewee discussed their experiences of partnerships with academics/academia, including student placements, embedded academics within the force, and building research capacity within the organisation itself. However, none of the interviewees viewed relationships with HE as a way to acknowledge the tacit knowledge that officers and others already held. Indeed tacit knowledge was seen to contrast starkly with HE delivery.

The understanding of HE was typically of the presentation/delivery (one-way) of explicit knowledge in a classroom or lecture theatre environment. Related to this was a concern that the tacit knowledge held by officers would be dismissed as irrelevant, therefore confirming that much of what had been learnt in the past was of a lower value than formal HE qualifications. The interviewees also made a distinction between level 6 undergraduate degrees and level 7 master/postgraduate degrees. For many of the interviewees, the step up to master-level qualifications was viewed as something 'other', although the exact nature of the 'otherness' was not immediately identifiable and thus tended to be set against that which individual interviewees had already experienced, 'I do not see any training in the Masters – it is more around the understanding and applying' (Interviewee 5). This boundary between 'something other' and the desire to maintain close connections with practical policing was explored in some detail by one interviewee, 'There is something about it being a more technical learning because at the end of the day that is the environment they operate in. I did work with [a specific university] and they did ethics, and did it through public order policing. So you can do that in a classroom but you can also do it as a training exercise. So there is something about flexible learning, learning and applying. Some Universities will not understand policing so how can you work with officers if you do not have credibility. So it is about understanding that situation, applying it, discussing it. So there is something about getting out of Universities and into policing to make it credible. It is not a theoretical qualification it is a very practical qualification' (Interviewee 8).

Thus there remains a discourse around the practical application of knowledge and the possibility of building a Masters Degree by accrediting training and CPD. As one interviewee commented, 'It would have to be relevant to the job. To see it *all* [original emphasis] as relevant to progression on the job' (Interviewee 1). The one element that was seen to 'lift' the Masters Degree above training and CPD was the undertaking of research. However this was frequently seen in terms of undertaking an evaluation of a service or intervention rather than original research.

Policing Education Qualification Framework and a Masters Degree

The interviewees expressed a certain level of enthusiasm for a Masters Degree that was interconnected with policing activities, envisioning this as a process by which not only were the police and HE providers working in partnership but the delivery itself was also connected both with training and with HEIs delivering and translating theory into practice. However the

language around both of these activities lacks definition. At times 'partnerships' with HEIs were understood as the co-production of degrees, whereas in a different context (but in the same interview) there would be an emphasis on procurement: what could be offered by which HEI and at what cost: 'procurement that is a partnership. It is a procurement first but then it has to be a partnership arrangement' (Interviewee 8).

There was also uncertainty about which HEIs would be involved at the Masters Degree level. Indeed some of the interviewees raised questions about the need for HEIs to be involved in the traditional format. Several interviewees noted that modules or programmes could be delivered at police headquarters, possibly engaging police from other forces as both students and delivery staff, along with others from different professional backgrounds (social workers and health in particular), with HEI staff contributing to a system of co-produced provision, 'You cannot underestimate the peer to peer learning and the inter-collaboration across forces. At a senior level it is all about people. You break down the boundaries, picking up ideas so in a hub to come together you will probably find people up for that' (Interviewee 2).

The question of who would/could deliver HE qualifications was repeatedly raised by the interviewees. Currently most of the training and CPD is either delivered in-house or by the CoP. HE is contributing through individual programmes of postgraduate certification or existing Masters Degrees or individual PhDs. When considering how a Masters degree in Policing could be developed interviewees who had recently worked on the front line were in agreement that the delivery needed to be credible, to have validity in the content, the way it was delivered and also in the people who delivered the course, module or programme of study. It was argued that as officers' progress they lose touch with front line delivery and all that it entails. Their experience was argued to lose relevance the longer they were away from active duty and thus although they did have something to contribute around person management and leadership skills, they were seen to be disassociated from the specialist knowledge and skills needed to undertake forward facing activities, 'Ex-senior officers delivered at [a specific university]. They are "proper old school" but what would be their realistic recollection of front line delivery. It is an issue of credibility. The same people deliver things over years and have lost touch and this loses credibility. So is it just about getting through the gateway or ensuring it is relevant?' (Interviewee 9).

Similar arguments around credibility of academics were made by other interviewees. Nevertheless there was also clear acknowledgement that this could be addressed, especially by non-policing academics because they were not a part of policing culture, 'I can see using [policing] peers but all the benefits get lost quickly as you lose the credibility, when away from front line roles. They could be replaced by academics as long as there is the input from the front line' (Interviewee 4).

Those interviewees who had attended post graduate courses which removed them from police environments had found the experience useful as it not only brought them into contact with others but it also was considered to enable freedom of thought, 'My personal experience it adds gravitas to it. It was amazing to be out of this environment, to be at [a specific university], it lifted your thoughts and spirits' (Interviewee 8). Thus blended learning was considered to be the way forward as it would allow for officers to remain in post but still attend sessions in HEIs. However, there was one note of concern from an interviewee who had recently moved away from frontline policing, they argued individuals who were engaged

in HE while still undertaking front line work could become distant and detached from that day to day frontline work.

While the PEQF for level 6 is progressing and for level 7 is now beginning to be developed, there appears to be little strategic discussion of educational provision (or professionalisation) of policing support staff. Training for support staff has also been very limited, especially since the public sector spending cuts. This is of concern: not only does it mean policing staff are not able to upgrade basic training, or their training in specialist areas, policing staff report remaining outside of the awareness of those re-structuring degree routes. Many support staff feel marginalised, 'I have not seen the non-officers going for Masters. I have seen the officers being encouraged to go for leadership type courses at [specific university] but no one has come to me offering XYZ. I have no idea how you get a Masters so I would not know how to offer it to other staff. We do not have the connectivity to offer this, or to know about it' (Interviewee 10).

Content of a Level 7 Masters Degree

Determining the content of any policing related degree at present was felt to be difficult because of the rapidly changing landscape as the CoP PEQF comes into effect. However, as police organisations are to have input into the content and delivery of a Masters Degree, it is clear from the interviews they would wish to do so through engagement rather than simple consultation.

While acknowledging that presently there is little information available on the potential content of a higher apprenticeship Masters Degree, the interviewees did have comments to make on what they felt would be relevant. There is a clear desire for it to relate closely to the work undertaken by the police as an organisation (management) and also as a service i.e. frontline delivery. Below is the list of the topics the interviewees considered to be relevant:

Organisational leadership

- Leadership
- Organisational development, organisation and cultural change
- Systems thinking
- 'Incoming challenges' relating to budget cuts
- Command

Research

- Early intervention
- Wellbeing of people (officers and the public)
- Criminology
- Problem solving and not prevention
- Communities

Substantive

- Technology and the police (digital/IT)
- Protest and public order
- Vulnerability
- Counter terrorism

- Cybercrime
- Modern day slavery and human trafficking
- Firearms
- Disorder
- Child sexual exploitation
- Hate crime

Concerns around the current topics related to the need for a comprehensive understanding of the challenges faced at the frontline and also for any delivery to be up to date, reactive and 'fresh'. It was noted several times that it currently took considerable time for the identification of arising issues and even longer to 'pull together' a response. It was also argued that delivery needed to be closely associated with the tasks they undertake. There was particular emphasis on the need for officers to understand the situations they found themselves working with for example relating to vulnerability, mental health and previously 'unseen' crimes such as child sexual exploitation, 'We need systems thinking, giving people tools to make decisions themselves as officers. We need leadership at *all levels* [original emphasis]. We need to enable and encourage officers to speak up about their ideas and discuss them with their sergeants rather than waiting for the sergeants to do it for them. To help individuals to flourish' (Interviewee 3).

The interviewees frequently reflected on the increasing complexity of delivery and the demands this made upon individuals. For example one interviewee noted there was a need to consider if they, as a service, should be delivering preventative services or if this was best left to others (Interviewee 6). Several interviewees commented that they experienced the worst of both worlds as they had become the last port of call for all, thus being asked to respond to situations they were not trained, or indeed educated, to deal with. This complexity at the frontline was at times contrasted to the more straightforward task of managing a medium to large organisation.

Therefore the content of a Masters Degree has to be closely related to 'the job', with a core set of skills that were central to whatever role the officer was to undertake in the future, yet the challenge of this was recognised, 'It has to be a range because there is not one core skill. It is specialism with a policing element but we need to be clear on the modules you need' (Interviewee 5).

A number of interviewees highlighted the offer had to be related to specific learning outcomes as defined by the CoP, with core modules and also a range of specialisms, 'There needs to be the commonality for future promotions and thus different activities. Possibly in leadership, ethics. Certainly leadership, as a lot of current officers manage but they do not lead' (Interviewee 7).

While the CoP is seen to be taking a lead on these issues, there was also a desire for high quality consultation with Forces and providers of HE to ensure there was buy-in across the board. The need for this level and type of process is apparent, but to some extent clashes with the potential procurement process in which there remain questions around partnership or procurement between forces and HEIs, 'In research I feel as though there are a lot of academics asking for the use of the data and you need to manage that relationship. When we do go out to ask for a Master or a PHD student it will be commissioned but, as also in terms of the learning and training, I don't think the relationships have been explored'

(Interviewee 8). 'Some universities have to wake-up to procurement including some of those in the N8' (Interviewee 5). One interviewee argued 'For me this is a partnership… I think it should be a partnership with a number of academic institutions. I don't think that we should have a preferred provider. Universities are a public service provider and a place to build relationships as well as procurement processes' (Interviewee 8).

Thus there remain a number of issues and challenges to be addressed around the design and delivery of programmes at Masters Degree level. In part, the discourse is around co-production and working in partnership within a context of procurement.

Current and Future Funding

A number of issues emerged as interviewees discussed how education and training should be paid for in the future. Many members of the organisation who were operating at a relatively high level stated that each individual should pay for their own development as it contributed to their career. The conclusion was quite the reverse for those who were operating closer to the front line. At this position it was felt that if the organisation was benefitting from the training and/or education then the organisation should fund the process, 'If the organisation benefits then it is fair for it to pay. It's the organisation investing in their staff. But there are resource constraints that the Force is currently under and thus it is unlikely [that they will fund individual development]. What about government grants? Other funding routes? But if it is mandatory then I still think the organisation should pay' (Interviewee 1). Several other interviewees made similar comments, often adding that it would depend on individual circumstances but, as a principle if it was for the benefit of the organisation then the employer should fund it. Interviewees also identified there would be issues other than funding which would need considering, including an individual's commitment to responsibilities outside the organisation. In these cases the organisation was understood to need to offer support and other types of resource, such as time to study. It was also felt that if individuals were to undertake their own career development then, to some degree, they want guidance but also control over the direction that could take.

Some degree of change was seen as inevitable, from a process where the organisation determined and delivered training or part funded education to one where the individual took more control/responsibility. In particular two features of change were identified: one, the arrival of new officers who had already funded their first degree and might then be expected to pay for a further HE degree; two, it was possible that in the future officers may be moving in and out of the service more fluidly and therefore wish to shape and take greater control of their own development looking not only at a career in the police force.

Interviewees saw this debate as reflecting different generations of officers, with the current and older members of the force expecting training to be provided and education to be partly funded, but with the perception that officers of the future would be different, 'It's a changing culture, from the current culture where things are done for people, to people doing it for themselves that is seeing what they need and arranging it. I see that in the future this will change because they have already paid for accreditation as they walk through the door. As older people they say "it is not of any benefit for me so I am not paying for it" (Interviewee 2). 'How would you sell self-funding to some officers? You won't get paid [more if you do]. You won't get sanctioned for it if you don't. It needs to be incentivised by the role. If you can see the benefits then you would do it' (Interviewee 8).

The situation is rather different for members of the support staff where there appears to be very limited funding for training or education. Interviewees speculated whether the introduction of apprenticeship funding will have a further negative affect on an already difficult situation, 'The apprenticeship comes along and that is a change of strategy and the other funding will dry up' (Interviewee 5).

Motivation

Undertaking study on top of the 'the day job' was seen to be challenging, 'It is a massive commitment and everyone is in different circumstances. It is about me squeezing that learning and work into a busy day job. Married with three kids and they come first. It is a big commitment' (Interviewee 3). The interviewees identified a number of challenges to engagement with education, including:

- Time
- Life choices
- Caring responsibilities and other commitments
- The need for a work-life balance.

The motivation to undertake such a commitment was seen by several of the interviewees to be based more on their desire to undertake the education/training rather than it being compulsory, 'It is motivation for me. It is not about me pushing myself forward for promotion it is more of a challenge, something I want to do for my development' (Interviewee 2); 'You can get bogged down doing the job but there is never a good time. There is a whole culture in the police of just doing the job and getting on with it but that is changing now and we look at things in a bit more detail. You have to start a culture change rather than telling people' (Interviewee 3).

The interviewees identified a difference between police officers undertaking HE because they wanted to do it, the current model, and those who will have to do it in the future if they wish to progress in their careers, 'It is not the be all and end all having a degree but what it has done for me is enable me to balance my workload, take in a large amount of data quickly, skim reading, work-life balance, having a social life and my studies and understanding the literature because it can feel like almost a foreign language. So I am glad that I did my degree because it gave me a deeper understanding' (Interviewee 3).This was particularly true for higher degrees such as Masters Degrees, 'If you're going to do a Masters then it has to be something you enjoy' (Interviewee 5). Alternatively, if the degree was a part of the job that you had to do then there was a difference of opinion between higher ranking interviewees and more junior interviewees: the higher ranking interviewees felt increasingly staff members would have to take responsibility for their own career development including undertaking postgraduate study and this would become the norm, 'I think we have tipped the balance for people who think it [further study] is just normal business' (Interviewee 8), while more junior interviewees argued if education/training was to benefit the organisation rather than being primarily of interest to the individual then it should be overtly supported, in terms of time and funding, by the organisation.

Interviewees also argued the need for understanding why changes are being made and what they would add to serving officers professional lives, 'It's the buying what you are going to do and why you are going to do it, "Things need to change because" and then tell them

why. It is the why, the how and the what. This is the training [and the same applies to HE] but also this is why we are doing it. There is so much training, you wonder why you are doing it, just being told to do it different is not enough. So it's underpinning the understanding behind the training' (Interviewee 1).

Doing it Differently

There are notable differences between the requirements of daily policing tasks and those of education. To help with the transition, especially for current serving officers, a process to build towards education was seen to be needed. One interviewee who had returned to study stated, 'It helps if you are built back into that mind set. It brings critical analysis on what you are doing' (Interviewee 3), they also identified the need to build towards engaging with education especially for officers who were unfamiliar and not confident in their abilities. There was seen to be a need for substantial support.

Thinking of 'different ways to do it' (Interviewee 8) was seen to be the way to motivate existing and future officers to engage with education. For example, the quality control and accreditation of in-house training was felt to be a means to 'start to shift that culture that there is something worthwhile and come out with accreditation. Then going further for a Masters, it would shift the culture. Individuals taking ownership of their own learning' (Interviewee 2). Mentoring and peer support were both felt relevant to enable officers and others to return to education. Mentors in particular, it was felt, did not have to be within police organisations as there was understood to be some benefit in working across sectors: thus factors more than just the means of delivery were considered to be important in the motivation to engage.

Organisational and Cultural Change

Organisational buy-in and the building of support and advice for career trajectories were all seen to contribute to embed rather than merely add-on HE, 'It is seen as "I did not get the opportunities so why should you?" If you are at the bottom of the chain it is making it more difficult to do. It is the wider culture. If you want to shift the culture it has to be spread out, down the chain, buy in from the top. It needs organisational change, it is the culture that needs change' (Interviewee 2). This was seen to be a challenge by some interviewees reflecting on the current position of the force, and policing in general, due to the financial cut backs, 'We could do more because of the pace of change it has all become a bit negative at the bottom of the line. All we can see is constant change' (Interviewee 3). The impact of this change may well be seen to have contributed to a caution about the extent and degree of organisational commitment based on the evidence of the last few years.

Other interviewees identified difficulties as longer-term and more embedded in the policing culture. In order to get support, one needed to be more than simply interested in education, one had to find the 'right person', a 'critical friend' to help and advise, but this could be challenging because of individuals, the system, and underlying everything, the policing culture. Finding the supportive individual could be demanding and time-consuming. Interviewees discussed that unless your line-manager had an appropriate interest in their staff, held the knowledge and had access to the necessary resources it was unlikely that anything would happen. Thus officers not interested in education were left behind as they were not actively encouraged to consider their long term career trajectory. This situation was

compounded by many officers feeling that it was enough 'to do the day job', without taking on additional work. Further, engagement with HE could be viewed as not 'real policing' by many officers at the frontline.

Those interviewees who were interested in participating in HE had worked hard to be able to engage with education. At times this engagement was not felt to be appreciated, or even recognised by their colleagues or line-managers. Indeed there was felt to be a culture of demotivation around education compared to training which had to be engaged with, while CPD was seen as undemanding: only those really interested in a particular aspect of policing were likely to engage in HE.

For police support staff similar issues were identified, plus additional challenges specific to their roles positioned outside the police officer career structure. In keeping with the police officer experience of change over the last few years, support staff have also been experiencing considerable change, 'There has been churn and change for years in the organisation; ups and downs. Staff have the skills to do the job but the constant change is undermining an organised process. There is long term planning for police officers [the rank structure] but not for police staff' (Interviewee 10).

Support staff require training, CPD and education in their own specialist areas rather than being tacked onto the existing police officer courses which are not seen to be specifically relevant, 'It is a specialist set of needs not general management that we need' (Interviewee 10). As the support staff are a large proportion of the employees of individual police forces (c. 45% of the workforce in this organisation), there is likely to be implications for the organisation as a whole if their engagement with education lags behind that of officers. A lack of career trajectory for support staff may also become an issue as people increasingly move between sectors and employers rather than remain long-term with a single employer. In addition, it was argued changing grades, redundancies, short term employment and other similar issues, have not had a positive effect on the perception of the organisation as an attractive place to work for support staff, 'The contract is a really interesting one as people are proud to work here and have an attachment. Officers may not realise that it is a life choice for us as well as them. The difference is that the officers are getting, and will get, acknowledgement for their work. This is not the same for support staff. Young people will move around because they do not have the attachment. There is also a need for resilience here with poor wages, high demand and high stress, difficult working conditions with little support. We ask a lot of our people' (Interviewee 10). The need to ensure that 'committed people' are 'kept fresh, up-to-date' and therefore able to give the best service to the organisation was hampered by a reducing and limited training budget. The idea of an education budget akin to that for the officers was not seen as viable, 'It is around career progression, career lines. What do you aspire to and the roles are seen as interchangeable [with police officers] and they are not' (Interviewee 10). Thus, unlike police officers and the changes taking place to their career pathways, support staff could be argued to be regressing in terms of training and educational opportunities.

The culture of policing and cultural change underpinned much of the discussions with interviewees, 'It comes back to culture' (Interviewee 2); 'Do what you have always done and you get what you have always got. You have to do it differently if you want to change the organisation and the culture' (Interviewee 10).

What is the Aim of Introducing Level 7 as a Standard Offer?

What underlies the national drive toward HE qualifications? Several interviewees identified the main driver as a need for the police to professionalise. However this then raises questions of why professionalisation is important now? Interviewees discussed several possibilities: so individuals feel their work is recognised (a 'lump of sugar' (Interviewee 5)); to encourage participation and engagement in training and learning; and the establishment of a new route through the policing career. Overall, can professionalisation be seen as the way to, 'Raise the understanding of the whole workforce' (Interviewee 5)?

The interviewees recognised that to some extent skills need to be introduced or improved, for example IT skills, but these are largely understood as training, not education, and thus should continue to be developed and delivered via training and CPD. Several interviewees noted the need for leadership at all levels and ranks of the police force, including support staff. In the past leadership has often been seen as something that officers need when they rise through the ranks, rather than something that is required from day one, 'A police officer walking through the door is a leader. They need to be as autonomous as they can be' (Interviewee 2). Developing this leadership and autonomy could be argued to underpin the CoP PEQF at Level 6? Professionalisation via HE may also be seen to equip officers and policing staff for careers which are not confined to the police service, but support a more fluid in-taking and out-going of human resources.

.

Conclusion

The literature review and the interview findings indicate that although the practical application of professionalisation of policing through HE qualification is moving forward quickly there remain significant questions around the assumptions on which progress is being built: these are apparent in the discourse and language of the interviewees. While there is a narrative about the need for leadership and autonomous decision-making in policing organisations which would benefit from the critical thinking skills embedded in HE, the language being used to discuss progress remains anchored in training and CPD, not in education.

This reflects one of the two main conclusions drawn from the project: accredited training is not the same as a Masters Degree. There was much discussion in the interviews in particular speculating as to whether current training and CPD could be accredited in ways which enabled it to aggregate to a HE qualification, in this case specifically a Masters Degree. However, accredited training and CPD are not the same as HE; the pedagogy underpinning these are distinct and separate. It may well be that a system of accredited training and CPD in *preparation for* HE study has utility, but the replacement of the Masters Degree with a portfolio of accredited training and CPD would be highly unlikely to meet the educational aims and objectives of a higher degree. Thus the question of content and delivery for a Masters Degree in policing remains pertinent; as do the 'core' and 'optional' components. There is broad agreement in the literature and in current policy discourses of the need for leadership (and management) to be core to the policing Masters Degree; interviewees also identified the need for the option to follow specialism as part of the qualification, for example in trafficking, CSE, cybercrime, etc. It has also been broadly acknowledged that one aspect of a Masters Degree which sets it apart from training and CPD is the development and implementation of research skills. Thus it is arguable research skills should be a core component of a policing Masters Degree, along with leadership development. This raises the question of whether the policing Masters Degree is envisioned as taught postgraduate provision or research postgraduate provision. In addition, the interviews also highlight the confusion between 'evaluation' and 'research': academic research is pedagogically different to service evaluation. This needs to be reflected in a policing Masters Degree.

The main conclusion from the project is that cultural change in policing is needed: and that the professionalisation of policing in England and Wales is part of this process. The literature, the interviewees, and the wider debates occurring in policing are in agreement that cultural change is under way, and is necessary in order for policing organisations to be fit for purpose in the rapidly changing environment of significant public spending cuts to both policing and to adjacent services, including health, social services and education. A deeper debate is engaging with the question 'what is that purpose' for policing under the current political, economic and social conditions, with an increasing emphasis in many forces on vulnerability, resource management, and evidence-based policing. It is clear that education, training and learning will have a key role to play in the process of cultural change and professionalisation: just how that will manifest in practice is not yet clear. The more substantive questions of the principles underpinning the process of professionalisation for policing also require further interrogation.

HE has a valuable contribution to make to cultural change because fundamentally HE (especially at level 7 and above) should change the way an individual (a society) thinks, in particular the ability to critically evaluate the world from different perspectives, to make explicit underlying theories of change driving individual and organisational behaviour, and to engage in problem-based thinking: when the way individuals and (once at a critical mass is reached) organisations think changes then cultural shift occurs.

What also became clear is that policing organisations are more than just the service officers; a significant proportion of policing organisations are support staff. It is clear that support staff are not embedded within the current understanding of organisational change and professionalisation of policing in England and Wales. This group of staff are currently being left behind, yet they potentially play highly significant roles within policing organisations. Better attention needs to be paid to the interactions between the different parts of policing organisations in order to ensure sustainable and effective change.

With the introduction of the College of Policing PEQF it is arguable the recommendations of Neyroud for the professionalisation of policing are becoming manifest. There remain questions around the delivery mechanics, especially that of co-design, co-production, partnership, and/or procurement between policing organisations and HEIs. But perhaps the most fundamental question is whether (at level 6 and level 7) this new future is 'education' or merely hyper-training? Much of this will be determined by the pedagogical approaches, the programme content, the delivery mechanisms and the assessment priorities: we do not yet have enough of the specifics of the PEQF to make a judgement.

References

Baro, A. and Burlingame, D. (1999) 'Law Enforcement and Higher Education: Is there an Impasse?' *Journal of Criminal Justice Education,* 10(1): 57–73.

Cordner, G. and Shain, C. (2011) 'The changing landscape of police education and training'. *Police Practice and Researcher: An International Journal*, 12(4): 281-285.

Green, T. and Gates, A. (2014) 'Understanding the process of professionalisation in policing organisation'. *Police Journal: Theory, Practice and Principles,* 78: 75-91.

Higgs, J., McAllister, L. and Whiteford, G. (2009).'The Practice and Praxis of Professional Decision-making' in Green, B. (ed.) *Understanding and Researching Professional Practice*. Rotterdam, Sense: 101–20.

Hallenberg, K.M. and Cockcroft, T. (2014) *Police and Higher Education. Research Report.* Canterbury Christ Church University.

Holdaway, S. (2017) 'The re-professionalisation of police in England and Wales' *Criminology and Criminal Justice*: http://journals.sagepub.com.ezproxy.lancs.ac.uk/doi/full/10.1177/1748895817690214

Home Affairs Select Committee (2011) 'New Landscape of Policing', Fourteenth report of Session 2010-12, HC 939. https://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201012/cmselect/cmhaff/939/93906.htm

Jaschke, H. and Neidhart, K. (2007) 'A modern police science as an integrated academic discipline'*, Policing and Society*, 17(4): 303–320.

Kratcoski, P. (2004) 'Police education and training in a global society: A guest editor's introduction'. *Police Practice and Research: An International Journal*, 5(2): 103–105.

Lee, M. and Punch, M. (2004) 'Policing by degrees: Police officers' experience of university education'. *Policing & Society*, 14(3): 233–49.

Neyroud, P. (2011) *Review of Police Leadership and Training: Volume One* https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/118222/report.pdf

Paterson, C. (2011) 'Adding value? A review of the international literature on the role of higher education in police training and education'. *Police Practice and Research*, **12** (4): 286-297.

Paoline III, E., Terrill, W. and Rossler, M. (2014) 'Higher Education, College Degree Major, and Police Occupational Attitudes' *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 26(1): 49-73.

Roberg, R. (1978) 'An analysis of the relationships among higher education, belief systems, and job performance of patrol officers'. *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, 6: 336–344.

Smithers, A., Hill, S. and Silvester, G. (1990) *Graduates in the Police Service.* Manchester: School of Education, University of Manchester.

Werth, E. (2011) 'Scenario training in police academies: developing students' higher-level thinking skills'*. Police, Practice and Research*, 12(4): 325-340.

Wimshurst. K. and Ransley, J. (2007) 'Police Education and the University Sector: Contrasting Models from the Australian Experience'. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 18(1).

Appendix I: Interview Methodology and Question Schedule

Interviews

The interview aimed to capture the type and frequency of training and learning activities currently taking place within a practice example organisation and also perceptions of the current and future gaps in such provision.

Methodology

Semi-structured interviews took place on a one-on-one basis and lasted a minimum of 50 minutes, with an option for a rest after 25 minutes. Interviewees were selected by the policing organisation with reference to the issues and areas that the interviewer was interested to explore. Respondent backgrounds varied and included serving officers (from newly appointed Inspectors to Superintendents) and also members of the senior civilian support staff. Anonymity and confidentiality was maintained to enable a free flow of response. These conditions were agreed with the senior members of staff and the interviewees in advance of the engagement and confirmed by Lancaster University's ethics committee during the ethical approval process.

Data plans complied with the Data Protection Act, 1998, including encrypted lap tops and pen drives. The interviews were audio recorded. After the data had been transferred to a secure medium it was wiped from the audio recorder.   Data will be destroyed at the end of the N8 PRP project in 2020 in accordance with Lancaster University protocols. Guardianship of the data will initially sit with Dr Cheryl Simmill-Binning. When the research post finishes prior to the end of the N8 PRP project in 2020, guardianship of the data will pass to the N8 PRP acting lead for the Training and Learning strand.

Questions

The interview questions were based on the requirements of the N8 Training and Learning strand and focused around the question:

- What do you currently deliver and how?
    - What type and level of accreditation do you enable?
    - How does this influence practice?
    - What does this look like in implementation?
    - How is it monitored?
    - Looking to the future – how will it be delivered, implemented?

Below is a list of issues that informed the questions during the semi-structured approach.

• Current training/Continuing Professional Development output

How are these different types of delivery being defined by the interviewees (with examples)?

What is the perceived difference between 'training', 'education', CPD (issues: skills building and critical analysis/ tacit knowledge and explicit knowledge)?

What is the aim of each type of activity?

• What type of delivery - training, CPD and education – is currently taking place?

Please can you describe examples of each delivery?

How are these services commissioned?

Who has access to what type of delivery?

How is the outcome monitored (are objectives set in advance?)

- What are the topics that are being delivered within policing organisations?

What is seen as the most relevant topics to be delivered and why?

- How the delivery is taking place?

Which organisations are supplying what types of delivery (in-house, CoP, Institutes of education/higher education, other)

What motivation do people have to undertake training, CPD or/and education?

Are there factors that demotivate people from engaging with training, CPD or education?

- What are the current accreditation levels and types available?

What type of accreditation are valued?

What is the role of HE in this process?

Who is responsible for the planning and funding of training, CPD, Education?

Implications and impact upon career pathways?

- What are the organisational plans for future delivery?

Considering the intended PQFE how is the future of police organisation education understood and theoretical and practice terms?

What is considered to be the likely impact of the introduction of the policing degrees?

Are there currently identified gaps in provision?