

Impact case study (REF3b)

<p>Institution: Canterbury Christ Church University</p>
<p>Unit of Assessment: Politics and International Studies (21)</p>
<p>Title of case study: Professionalising Police Education and Training (PET)</p>
<p>1. Summary of the impact</p> <p>This case study describes the significant impact on police education and training in Europe initiated by applied research undertaken by UoA staff. The impact has been felt most keenly in the professionalisation of initial police training in the UK and through an increased capability of law enforcement agencies to maintain European cyber-security, impacts firmly positioned within the UoA theme of Conflict and Security. Further, it is argued that the impact of our research can be contextualised within a wider criminal justice sector strategic response to the increasing number of dynamic threats to the security of Europe.</p> <p>2. Underpinning research</p> <p>The professionalisation and governance of initial policing training within PET is a key strategic and political issue in the UK (Neyroud, 2011; Winsor, 2012) as exemplified by the decision of the Home Office to establish the College of Policing as the UK's first professional body for PET. Likewise, cyber-security has, according to stakeholder agencies (such as the EU and NATO), become a national and international security and governance challenge, not only for law enforcement agencies but also in a wider political sense. UoA staff research has led to a more comprehensive, robust and evidence-grounded basis to PET. The research derived its methodology from the 'participatory action research' tradition, noted for its 'practical' positioning in respect of organisational development, but our research was also situated within the approach articulated by Atweh et al. (1998) and others, where action research is used to develop innovation in education and training. Accordingly, the research process was a reflexive one, involving police trainers, academics and other key practitioners in the process of generating research outcomes.</p> <p>The underpinning research was undertaken by UoA researchers drawn from the Faculty of Social and Applied Sciences, and particularly from the Department of Law and Criminal Justice (DLCJ) and the Department of Computing (DC). Lead academics were Professor Robin Bryant (at CCCU since 1995), and Dr Tom Cockcroft (at CCCU since 2004), together with other researchers from the two departments.</p> <p>The underpinning research generated a number of important findings.</p> <p>First, the professionalization of policing requires a validated, verified but dynamic corpus of knowledge, capable of adapting to a rapidly changing global world. Hence it is important to design coherent PET curricula that incorporate abstract, conceptual learning alongside practical skills, abilities and attributes (see 3a).</p> <p>Second, this corpus of knowledge can only be derived through the engagement of the profession itself. This must be from a position of informed 'critical friendship' with the academic community. This has to be in line with developing mechanisms for ensuring that appropriate ethical and professional standards are incorporated into PET programmes (see 3b and c).</p> <p>Third, assessment and accreditation remain key issues for PET, ones that are yet to be fully reconciled with a professional status (see 3e).</p> <p>Fourth, the pedagogic requirements to support the professionalisation of PET (including specialist roles such as 'cybercrime investigator') have yet to be adequately delineated. There are difficulties when the two cultures of higher education and police training converge. These range from the level of the epistemic to the practicalities of conditions of service (see 3 d, e and f).</p> <p>Fifth, a robust PET is one of the essential requirements of countering emerging threats to security in Europe. However, nationally there is some inconsistency regarding PET. Links between the police and higher education have developed primarily on a local bilateral basis, resulting in a variety of approaches for PET (see 3 a).</p> <p>3. References to the research</p> <p>Three of these sources demonstrate our impact on initial police training and education in the UK:</p> <p>a) Bryant, R., Cockcroft, T., Tong, S. & Wood, D. (2013) 'Police Training and Education: Past,</p>

Impact case study (REF3b)

Present and Future' in J. Brown (ed), *The Future of Policing*, London: Routledge.

The chapter outlines the initial training and education requirements of policing in the UK and in 2013 also formed the basis of the UoA submission to the Home Affairs Committee Inquiry into Leadership and Standards in the Police and to the Independent Commission on the Future of Policing chaired by Lord Stevens of Kirkwhelpington. The chapter comprises an analysis of the relationship between the police service, higher education and the concept of professionalisation. The chapter allows for an informed analysis of the contemporary strategic issues facing police services. The chapter concludes by stating that three key points underpin the forwarded arguments. First, that police roles need to be built on a solid empirical base of knowledge. Second, that all police officers need to be inducted into this body of knowledge. Finally, that this body of knowledge should be available to individuals prior to entry into the police service.

b) Bryant, R., Bryant, S., Graca, S., Lawton-Barrett, K., O'Neil, M., Tong, S., Underwood, R. and Wood, D. (2013) *Handbook for Policing Students 2014*, 8th edition, Oxford: Oxford University Press. The Handbook has sold in excess of 35,000 copies and is a set textbook for most police forces in the UK, who supply a copy to all of their new recruits. It is also used extensively by universities and further education colleges that offer pre-join courses that lead to initial police training. Research conducted for the Handbook has resulted in the establishment of a corpus of knowledge for initial police training. Of particular note is the underlying research that resulted in chapters 3 ('Policing'), chapters in Part II ('Qualifications and Training') and chapter 23 ('Intelligence').

Tong, S. and Wood, D. (2011) 'Graduate Police Officers: releasing the potential for pre-employment university programmes for aspiring police officers' in: *The Police Journal*, Vol. 84, (1), 69-75. The paper set out the arguments for higher education engagement with the professionalisation of initial police training in the UK. This article highlights the trend, evident since the 1970s, of British universities partnering police services in the design and delivery of educational programmes for police officers. A variety of curricula and new partnerships have evolved but there is little evidence of the contribution of these developments or whether these 'new' approaches differ significantly from traditional training regimes. Similarly, there remains resistance from some quarters towards involving universities in the learning and development of police officers.

The research of the UoA has also led to three significant publications concerned with cyber-security and cybercrime investigation, based on original research:

c) Bryant, R.(ed). et al. (2008) *Investigating Digital Crime*, published by John Wiley and Sons Ltd. which has become a set book for Masters' programmes in digital investigation. The book also laid the foundations for a new publication by UoA staff (*IPolicing Digital Crime*, published in January 2014 by Ashgare Publishing). Research conducted for the first publication included not only an extensive literature review but also semi-structured interviews with key practitioners in the field. Particularly important are chapter 1 ('The challenge of digital crime') which sets out the theoretical background to cyber-security and chapter 12 ('Criminological and Motivational Perspectives') which synthesises criminological and digital investigative theory. The book describes a set of findings that demonstrate that digital crime presents unique challenges to law enforcement agencies. These challenges are best met with comprehensive PET, located firmly within an evidence-based approach to investigative enquiry.

d) Bryant, R., Cockcroft, T. and Dileone, N. (2012) 'Cybercrime Investigation – developing and disseminating an accredited international training programme for the future', ISEC Project JLS/2008/ISEC/FP/C4-077, European Commission. This was a major report authored by UoA researchers and the Europol lead on digital crime, based on high-quality original evaluation and action research to propose a new strategy for development and delivery of cybercrime training in the European Union. In particular, it drew attention to the importance of assessment strategy, accreditation and professional standards. In terms of assessment, the evaluation drew attention to a number of challenges. For example, it was unclear whether passing a training course is a reliable indicator of competence in the workplace, and vice versa. Similarly, issues such as cultural differences and 'special arrangements' were difficult to engage with within the existing delivery model. With respect to accreditation, it was found that this can take a number of forms and result in some confusion. Accreditation can also mean simply the award of academic credit, for example through successful completion of a course or through the 'Accreditation of Prior (Experiential) Learning', AP(E)L.

Impact case study (REF3b)

e) Irons, A., Stephens, P. and Ferguson, R. (2009) 'Digital investigation as a distinct discipline: a pedagogic perspective' in: *Digital Investigation*, Vol. 6 (1-2) 82-90. The authors outline why the debate over whether Digital Investigation is a distinct discipline is a significant one in terms of its consequences for professional standards, quality control, academic and personal accreditation. The paper emphasises the differences in the way digital investigation is taught in comparison to computer science covering theory, practice; the interdisciplinary nature of the subject, a problem solving and problem based approach, and the need to emphasise professionalism and ethics. This research paper argues that digital investigation is a distinct discipline in its own right, and not simply a branch of computer science. Following on from this, the paper sets out clearly the teaching and learning circumstances required to enhance cyber-security through PET.

Quality of Research

- **Review:** The journal articles, reports and book chapters have all undergone a process of review before publication: this includes peer review, editorial revision and professional oversight (in the case of b) by a total of 20 reviewers over eight years).
- **Funding:** The underpinning research outlined in a) to f) above was also supported both directly and indirectly by a number of grants, awarded during 2001- 2012. Direct support occurred in terms of funding for the secondment of UoA staff to a number of European Commission projects: the 'Falcone' project JAI/2001/Falcone/127 (£20,000), the 'Agis' project JLS/2005/AGIS/133 (£40,000) and the 'ISEC' project JLS/2008/ISEC/FP/C4-077 (£104,800). Indirect support has come more latterly in the form of participation in two further ISEC projects (totalling 1,425,133 Euro).
- **Academic scrutiny:** A number of the reports cited above have previously been presented at leading national and international conferences, involving practitioners, academics and professionals in the field. Professor Bryant's publication cited in b) has been reviewed and ratified by the University of Oxford.

4. Details of the impact

The impact of the research has **reached** communities, individuals and organisations that play key roles in PET. This impact has also been highly significant in terms of improving practice in PET in the UK and in particular, changing PET policy and practice within both initial police training and European cybercrime investigation. Through the impact of our research at a strategic level (such as the Higher Education Forum for Learning and Development in Policing and the European Cybercrime Training and Education Group), we have been able to influence the direction of debates around issues of professionalization at both UK and pan-European levels. At a practitioner-based level, we have been able to assess the training requirements and develop the materials needed to provide a more coherent and uniform approach to PET and to, subsequently, impact on the professional standards of practitioners in this area (see 3b) above). At the level of *reach*, this research has impacted on a number of groups, agencies and stakeholders across the UK and Europe. The reach of our research on initial police training as part of the UK's PET is illustrated by a number of examples. Our report for the Higher Education Academy ('ASC 547 Higher Education and Policing') has reached all higher education providers in England and Wales. At the practitioner level, over 70% of the police forces in England and Wales use our Oxford University Press publication 'Blackstone's Handbook for Policing Students' (see 2b) above), authored by UoA staff to support the initial training of police officers (to date, over 32,000 copies of the textbook have been sold). In terms of the reach of our research into international cybercrime investigation training, 200 practitioners from more than 30 European countries have benefitted by undertaking 14 innovative and high quality cybercrime investigation training courses, designed by UoA staff and others. Practitioners were drawn from European law enforcement agencies (for example, the national German police), and during the span of the projects included investigators from every national state in the European Union. The courses have also been delivered beyond Europe (particularly Africa and the Middle East) by international organisations such as the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (the OSCE), extending the reach of our research yet further. Most recently, the reach of the impact of our cybersecurity research can be seen in the establishment of England's new Cybercrime Centre of Excellence Network for Training, Research and Education. Our partners in this project are the College of Policing; ACPO e-Crime

Impact case study (REF3b)

Training, the PcEU; nine UK universities and four commercial companies.

At the level of **significance**, the impact of our PET research can be seen in a number of arenas. First, there is our significant engagement with debates around initial police training in the UK. In 2012 we were invited to contribute to the Independent Commission on Policing, chaired by Lord Stevens of Kirkwhelpington and this has resulted in a chapter on the future of initial police training and education in the 2013 Routledge publication (see 2a above). Earlier staff within the UoA authoritatively set out the current and likely future direction of initial police training for the Higher Education Academy. Finally, written feedback to the publisher on the impact of our Blackstone's publication from police trainers in the UK is overwhelmingly positive, one remarking in 2013 that the Handbook 'makes a unique contribution to the training of policing students' and others noting that it had become the de facto textbook for the profession.

Our research and pedagogic evaluations within cybercrime investigation training were central to the development of European-wide training courses that meet urgent cybercrime investigation needs. A good example of this is the new Mac Forensics course designed as part of an ISEC project that our research supported. Up to this point there was no Mac operating system forensics course that was common to law enforcement agencies in Europe.

UoA staff are taking a lead on the development of the EU's joined-up response to cybercrime by making a comprehensive and up to date training package (developed with experts from throughout the EU) more attractive to member states than their own often uncoordinated efforts. By internationalising the delivery of these courses we also provide the training within an environment predicated upon cross-border relationships.

Within the UK, the research of UoA staff has influenced a number of national policy developments. A notable example is the new (March 2012) Association of Chief Police Officer (ACPO) Good Practice guidelines for Digital Evidence. UoA staff were also instrumental in establishing the British Computer Society Cybercrime Forensics Specialist Group which, to date, has over 1450 members in 44 countries.

Further tangible evidence of the significance of the research includes the establishment of the European Cybercrime Training and Education Group (ECTEG) based with Europol in Den Haag. When the new European Cybercrime Centre (EC3) was being established consultations were held with ECTEG concerning the new agencies remit.

The significance of our impact is on-going, as demonstrated by a number of research projects in cybersecurity that have since started and that have arisen from the partnership developed with Europol and others.

5. Sources to corroborate the impact

Documentation

1. http://create.canterbury.ac.uk/11297/1/CCCU_HAC_final_submission.pdf (Home Affairs Commons Select Committee Inquiry into Leadership and Standards in the Police)
2. <http://www.zoominfo.com/#!search/profile/person?personId=587389034&targetid=profile> (Chair, Higher Education Forum for Learning and Development in Policing)
3. <http://www.esa.uk.net/PoliceLawandCommunity/WhatisPLC/tabid/417/Default.aspx> (Blackstone's Handbook for Policing Students, core reference material for pre-join).
4. <http://library.npia.police.uk/docs/acpo/digital-evidence-2012.pdf> (ACPO Good Practice Guide for Digital Evidence, March 2012, p. 22)
5. <https://www.europol.europa.eu/ec/ec3-board> (ECTEG membership of Governance Board of the European Cybercrime Centre).

People

1. Wolfson Professor of Criminology, Institute of Criminology, University of Cambridge, **(contact I.D. 1)**
2. Co-Director of the Mannheim Centre for Criminology, London School of Economics. **(contact I.D. 2)**
3. Seconded National Expert at the European Police College (CEPOL) **(contact I.D. 3)**
4. Chair of ECTEG, Head of Cybercrime Investigation, Europol. **(contact I.D. 4)**
5. Head of Cybercrime Investigation Training, National Crime Agency **(contact I.D. 5)**