

Robert Crepinko - André Desenfants - Wolfgang Ebner - Zoltan Kovacs - Zoltan Nagy:
How can training improve police leadership
and common professional standards in the future ?³

Preamble

Training for law enforcement agencies in Europe is still a complex and very actual issue. On European level a lot of initiatives were already and are still taken in this matter. One of the last and most important ones comes from the European Commission: in response to the mandate of the Stockholm Programme and inspired by the Internal Security Strategy, the Commission is developing a vision of the future of EU police training policy. The purpose is to develop a European Training Scheme (ETS) for EU law enforcement officials.

This is why our group had to reflect on the assignment received to set a precise scope of our work. We wanted to avoid redundancy with the Commission's initiative, but thought that our reflections have to fit in the Commission's framework.

So we came to the conclusion that it would be worth concentrating on future training and on common professional standards for police leaders; they will namely play a key role providing police work a real European dimension by giving the good example and by encouraging good initiatives in cross-border matters.

But even if the police leaders are the focus group of our work, some recommendations we make will also be relevant to other groups.

³ The study is made under TOPSPOC 2011 CEPOL courses

1. COMMON FUTURE

1.1. Why is it important to prepare the future?

The 21st century ties on, where the last century ended. We live in a fast and dynamic world. The mobility of the citizens increases while the world is shrinking. Technologies are changing very quickly and they are influencing our lives in every field. Every day we are introduced to new gadgets, software and mobile phones. For example, learning how to handle new computer systems has become part of our daily routine.

These dynamic developments have changed our way of thinking, our behaviour, our world of work, consequently our whole society. For most Europeans it is hard to imagine living without cash machines, online bookings or internet trade. The web has become our “second world”. We live in the real, the physical one, but the virtual one has turned into the major and most prevailing administrative, economic and cultural framework. It is obvious that such a tool needs a legal basis, which has not been completely established yet. Rules and procedures for the use of the internet were implemented long after its inception. At the same time the competences for authorities and consequently for police as well came only very slowly. Criminals already have used all possible ways in cyberspace, when investigations were very complex and often ended at a national border. Within this changed environment also police leadership has changed.

Considering all the other new challenges police force and within that system police leadership have to cope with, the fast and dynamic world wide web embodies the most dominant changes and therefore probably requires the main focus of police work.

1.2. What are the consequences on leadership?

The field of duties of police-leadership has changed a lot and citizens in the EU deserve the best police service wherever they are. Nowadays police are confronted with challenging new crimes, new and additional tasks and has become far more complex within the last years. Today criminals are more aggressive and often younger. Sometimes there is not even a rational motivation behind some criminal energy. In many countries the structure of police organizations changed too. New tasks, the need for saving money and limitations of resources forced police management to rethink procedures and organizations.

Cybercrime, cyber-terrorism, as cross-border crime challenge police systems. Organised crime tries to hide its traces in different states. This fact makes it quite tricky to see organised crime structures. Police have to enforce cooperation and cross-border investigations. To reach that goal, leadership represents the essential feature.

The web challenges police leadership in a completely new and different way. We just have to imagine how *modi operandi* change in the virtual world. At the beginning of the common use of the internet, there were not even enough clear offences in penalty codes for most of these crimes, which made it impossible for police and prosecutors to track down criminals first hand. The virtual area is not only less physical, it is furthermore not dedicated to one country, one geographical area. Today, criminals change their behaviour very quickly. They hide in space, which is not completely regulated. Criminals, e.g. paedophiles are using servers located in distant countries, where there is the least risk for their criminal prosecution. The national law systems, as well as international investigations have to catch up with these developments and combat these new forms of criminality. A need for a deep analysis on how to prevent and fight cybercrime is one main function of police leadership.

1.3. What about the future challenges?

As already mentioned above, the environment and circumstances of police work changed a lot. The world became dynamic – simply very fast. Information and the exchange of information go within seconds. News, messages can be sent and received in “real-time”. We are using all these technologies and its medium - the internet - day by day and, moreover we get used by it. The possibilities are larger and wider than ever before. However, criminals are using these new technologies for their purposes and they are usually ahead, they take advantage of this unregulated space. This fact represents the necessary need for police to join the same velocity. Otherwise police work will always lag behind the present.

One reason for the problem many police organizations face is the fear of a “police state”, of too much of control. Data protection is one of the most fundamental rights claimed by citizens. That is why laws usually do not come with the same speed like criminals already use them.

Besides these technological developments, mass criminality and cross-border crime represents new challenges for the police forces. When lifting borders and easing free

movement, mass criminality found new targets. This phenomenon does not only affect one country. It is a European problem and a clear issue for police cooperation. Organised crime works like a multinational business enterprise with branches in lots of countries.

Globalization – a term that once opened horizons and promised the end of all borders - brings us the whole world directly to our premises, to our lives. Unfortunately, these developments led not only to wealth. By the globalisation of our societies social conflicts can become more and more contagious. In some countries, the lack of a social equilibrium means a vast breeding ground for criminality. Poor people see rich ones and feel the imbalance. They suffer and consider their fate unfair.

The more people feel disadvantaged, the more will come together to make their own, quick and dirty “business”, one of the motivations for organised crime, as well as mass criminality. And concerning offences against property it is quite comprehensible that these groups go to places, where wealth, political and social stability is available. That is why organised crime is acting over borders in various countries.

As we detect that many countries in Europe face similar phenomena and problems, international cooperation is inevitable and at the same time this is one of the most difficult challenges of the future.

Different cultures and languages, different legal systems based on a specific historical events, or simply the geo-political position of a country can cause difficulties when working together. Difficulties are furthermore sometimes a lack of communication between member states, as well as a lack of inter-reliability.

Still today, we see differences and problems in respect of police cooperation and the whole law enforcement area. Evidences are not the same in each country. Procedures, for example, when arresting a suspect are regulated in different ways. This does not seem to be a problem at first glance, but when documents are shared among various countries, the problems and imbalances become visible. There is sometimes a clear lack of balanced evidences and investigations as a whole.

To find common ground, there were only bi- and multilateral meetings and a small exchange of know-how and experiences in the beginning. The intensity in this respect gradually grew. Today we have a European agenda on security. Programs, like the

Stockholm program give us the guidelines, where to go with our cooperation and integration. It is much easier to live cooperation today.

To come to more comparability and in the end equality, there are various initiatives on European levels. One of these is the PEP-project (Police Equal Performance), which is an initiative born in Austria and now supported by other European countries as well as by EUROPOL. The idea of PEP is to bring more balance to investigations and procedures in Europe. Hot spot for this initiative is clearly the Western Balkan region.

As stated above, we are living in a common future in Europe, with common challenges and common tasks for our society. On the way to our common future we have to face different obstacles.

1.4. What are the consequences of the future?

In order to cope with the challenges of the future, police systems and police structures the way we find them in most European countries need to be adapted. With the given resources, image in the public, legal constraints, and hierarchical structures the fight will be hard to win. We need to learn to think in different ways and open horizons – nationally and internationally. There is no getting around thinking and acting globally.

Hierarchical structures are often considered more important than teamwork. However, teamwork turns out to be the only efficient way of working together. Of course teamwork needs to be trained, it is not a given gift. The non-sharing of information or trying to arrest a dangerous person without the help of colleagues are just two examples of various executive levels, which can easily lead to failure. Every member of a team should have the same information. Therefore teamwork should be a part of leadership training to enforce teamwork.

Above all police-leadership should be based on motivation. Motivation is one of the key factors for success. Colleagues want to be respected for what they do and who they are. This begins when communicating among hierarchy levels. Showing respect and expressing oneself clearly helps to avoid misunderstandings. A police leader can influence the way of communication.

Next to motivation is the formulation of orders. They have to be clear and precise. We all know the problem of unclear orders. Quickly, frustration can be the result. Without any doubt, all orders of police leaders have to be based on laws.

But there is a solution, to overcome these difficulties. A better coordination of resources, as well as more trusting the other can already be a big step in direction of common space for security and freedom in Europe. All circumstances which create our environment lead also to the need of a professional police force. Leadership within police organizations is one of the most important key-factors for success and the most important goal for police – freedom.

1.5. What can be the role of training?

Leadership has to be developed through training. Training itself is a very complex issue. Policemen are trained for years to be prepared for their challenges. Dangerous situations, quick decisions that have to be made and in the end keeping calm in stressful situations all lead to the need for a highly professional training.

As already announced before we face a common and interconnected future in Europe, confronted with similar and parallel problems. Therefore, it is obvious that training should be parallelized as well. Common training has many advantages. Some examples are:

- using common sense;
- understanding various expectations;
- broadening worldviews, enlarging the horizon;
- networking;
- establishing mutual trust

2. Police Leadership and common professional standards on an European level

2.1. Police Leadership

2.1.1. As stated before, we live in a fast changing world, requiring skills and competences in almost all areas of the society, state and public services. The pace of changes challenges our ability to properly and quickly adapt. There is a gap forming between the “traditional” way of policing and the society living already in “Web2.0”. Our children should already prepare for jobs and related knowledge challenges that are not yet existing. The police is no different from that. Still, can we say that the profound changes in society, technology and the environment were accompanied by similar ones in the core concept of policing? There is a gap, and this gap has been widening between police and the “external” world.

2.1.2. Are we, police leaders and managers brave and honest enough to face those changes and challenges? The general perception is that police leaders are focusing on dealing with the problems of the present, and seemingly not concerned about the future. How can we achieve that the primary concern of the police leaders is if and how they are prepared for the future?

2.1.3. There are inevitable links between the society and the police within. Its actions are influenced also by the quickly developing and complex technology, and it interacts with the environment. These systems have an impact on what we call the nature of the police or the nature of policing. The public look at the police and forms its opinion about police legitimacy based on how it responds to those changes. Trusting the police is also dependant on the capacity of the police organisation in “staying connected” with the society and the environment in general.

2.1.4. Police leaders have a key role in that process. But, what kind of police leadership is required, in order to be able to find the right answers? What are the differences?

2.1.5. First and foremost: as yesterday tools are not good enough to solve tomorrow’s problems, critical thinking is a prerequisite for recognising the need to adapt. Fix the roof when the sun shines - and show assertiveness. Start with your own police

staff, enable them to take their share in critical thinking and the promotion of innovation. Critical thinking helps police leaders understanding the real nature of their police organisation and the way how subordinates perceive their work and police values. What is your inner police story?

2.1.6. Police leadership is changing and expanding. Listening to both the public and our own staff is crucial, in order to stay on the game and not only see the world but also to understand how the world sees us. And even more, our police staff needs to be empowered, to guarantee that changes are implemented in-depth (and not only from top-down). In that way they become themselves leaders, in their everyday interaction with the organisation and the public both.

2.1.7. The European police structures are interlinked, but still diverse. However, there are several established channels existing to facilitate communication, sharing knowledge, following best practices and staying connected. Carefully though, but the Lisbon Treaty points towards the deepening of these relationships in the intra-European scene. Police leaders should understand their responsibility in understanding the challenges of that road and continuously look for ways to achieve them. Why? Because the European societies are already paving the way for further integration and interaction - supported (or even promoted) by technological developments and environmental changes. European police structures have no other choice but to understand the nature of those changes and look for ways to adapt and align themselves. They have a huge asset in reaching this goal: the key values of law enforcement that connect those organisations and establish a solid ground for mutual understanding of both, challenges and opportunities.

2.1.8. These values are key to facilitate partnerships, trust and cooperation, and form a solid ground for establishing common professional standards across the EU. Still, these values are not carved in stone, and the critical thinking over and over again is necessary to adapt and develop newer ones.

2.1.9. Europe offers a unique environment for police leaders as there are a number of ways to interact with and learn from each other. The European Union presents a cohesion force, stimulating discussions on how to better share information, techniques, tools, knowledge, expertise. European training is crucial in creating a

better understanding on the challenges that await the police leader of tomorrow. The channels of operational and strategic information sharing will have to be complemented with a more effective European police training that should attempt to establish a better vision on the nature of policing and the understanding of the challenges for policing in the new society. With that, European training should develop new police leaders, being able to deploy new techniques, methods and ways of problem solving. A new relationship with both the European citizens and your own police organisation is needed - training those who will be mandated to navigate through the challenges is crucial. The European training should assist in seeing clearly not only the problems that await for the police leader, but also understanding the systems and the drivers of those changes through different lenses.

2.2. Common professional standards

2.2.1. What are common professional standards?

At the first glance one could assume that a “definition” of common standards could be set very easy. That it would be somehow “standardised”. But it is not that easy. Already at the first pick in the internet a big world of different approaches and attempts for common standards in a big variety of areas of life can be found. Also a powerful tool such as Wikipedia does not provide neither a definition nor an explanation for common standards. This means that it will take a different approach to come to the answer of the question what are common standards.

Although the assignment is to find out the “rules” for common professional standards (CPS) for the law enforcement area, it can be said that CPS in general are a way where subjects with:

- a common approach
- under a common set of rules
- in the comparable environment
- using a similar set of tools
- are “struggling” for a common goal.

Of course the above mentioned is far away from the definition of CPS, but it helps us understand the area of the work done. The definition has to be translated to the law enforcement environment in the countries members of the EU and EU as a whole. The last one is the main focus of the Ceuol Topspoc IX 2011.

In the time of work overload and lack of resources in all areas of law enforcement it would be highly inappropriate to “reinvent the wheel”, searching for the definition of CPS. A group of highly experienced and motivated law enforcement officers, participating in the Ceuol Topspoc VIII-2010 spent a lot of time and energy searching for that definition. After various questions, discussions and research, they agreed for the definition of CPS:

“a manner to conduct police duties or tasks in a commonly approved and widely used manner in order to render interactions with each citizen across Europe predictable, building confidence and mutual trust.” VIR: POLDEON

2.2.2. What is the advantage (the need for) of common standards?

In the time where all (or at least the majority) of the police forces are facing significant cuts in their budgets resolving in cuts in the figure of personnel and other resources it is extremely important to optimize the means and ways of work. Having in mind the rights of the societies to demand the same (or higher) level of security, regardless the cuts, it is undisputable that common approaches are necessary.

It is a practice that has been developed and fruitfully used in the other areas of society decades if not centuries ago. Technicians and business man discovered that they can save a lot of money and time if they are using the same standards for products. This does not only allow them to cut costs, but also allows them to combine their work and products with other products, what was one of the important pillars of technical development and the synergy of different knowledge and experience. The main idea behind that can (or has to be) copied also to the law enforcement environment. And that not only in national areas but also in the EU environment. The necessity for CPS was therefore included also in the multiannual programme adopted in the European Council. The Stockholm programme – an open and secure Europe serving and protecting citizens encourages the upgrade for the tools for the job stating that:

“Security in the EU requires an integrated approach where security professionals share a common culture, pool information as effectively as possible and have the right technological infrastructure to support them.”

“The European Council stresses the need to enhance mutual trust between all the professionals concerned at national and EU level. A genuine European law enforcement should be developed through exchange of experiences and good practice as well as the organisation of joint training courses and exercises...”

Reading these general lines it can be seen that the awareness for the necessity of the CPS was recognised also on the highest level and not only among the professionals in the law enforcement environment.

The advantages of CPS can be seen in many ways:

- The knowledge gathered through decades and centuries in different countries or parts of Europe can be transferred and used in other countries, having in mind the national, cultural, economical, religious... differences.
- Rising mobility of citizens of EU (and others), also means fast changing of modalities of crime and CPS also allows the mobility of police approaches and prevents the “reinventing of the wheel” by different police forces. The result is faster adjustment and better reactions to new crime phenomena.
- Common approaches also mean common respect to rights and freedoms and allow that justified police measures also get the approval of highest courts also on the EU or international level, regardless of the country where measures have been taken.
- CPS allows better mobility of police officers, who can conduct their tasks within joint investigation teams or other ways of cooperation in a easier and efficient way.
- Common standards in technical equipment would allow lower prices and better availability of the equipment needed for the work.

All of these reasons are helping also to raise the mutual trust among different law enforcement authorities, as one of the ground stones for good cooperation.

2.2.3. What do we expect from common standards?

The answer to the question: “What do we expect from common standards?” would probably be answered differently by each of the law enforcement officers asked. It can only be assumed that the common answer would be to make our day to day work easier and efficient and give us the tools we need.

Already in the discussion within the PLUS group we came to different views and ideas. They could be expressed as:

- to satisfy different expectations toward the European police leader
- to act as bridges between national training systems
- to help developing a definition of “EU Police Leadership”
- to assist in developing an EU dimension for future PL

CPS should act as a vehicle for the police leader to achieve the provision of the best police service to the citizen in the EU.

2.2.4. Which common standards do we need (in what matters....) ?

Also the question: “Which common standards do we need...?” is a hard nut to crack. In the fact it represents one of the core challenges for CPS in the first place. Each law enforcement authority has specific needs and weak points that could or should be improved with the use of CPS.

Looking at the Stockholm Programme we can see that politicians after a long period of drafting the programme could agree on the following integrated approach:

- common culture,
- effective information pool,
- appropriate technical infrastructure.

The programme foresees the development of genuine European law enforcement culture through exchange of experiences and good practices as well with the organisation of joint training courses and exercises. The programme (as expected)

does not give any guidance how to come near to the right technical infrastructure and effective information pool.

Due to the lack of an effective EU approach toward to standardisation there are different attempts (PEP, EACT...) to achieve that goal in limited areas in EU. These approaches do not give us the answer to the question which CPS we (all) need, because they are focused to solve concrete problems in concrete areas (criminal police, corruption...). The reason for the rise of such initiatives is a real need for some “standardisation” and obviously the absence of EU (in time and in the core of the problem) level solutions that would fit the needs of the “consumers”.

After a discussion the PLUS group agreed on the areas that would be suitable for CPS:

2.2.5. What are the challenges of developing common standards?

The law enforcement area is one of the sensitive areas, being protected by member states (and different law enforcement agencies) as one of the strong ground stones of sovereignty. Through the recent past EU member states were just slowly coming to legal solutions that allowed common approach in different areas. On the grounds of different historical reasons and the specifics of different member states this is a process that is developing very slowly.

Law enforcement area is considered as much closed (restricted) and very conservative. Therefore it had also some challenges adjusting to fast social changes in recent years. This has to be considered when thinking of the challenges of developing CPS.

The main challenges are both at the recipient of the CPS side and on the side of decision makers:

- The difficulties to identify areas that could be “standardised”
- The challenge to agree on the approach of “standardisation” (which best practices to take, how broad and deep the “standardisation” should go...)
- Very different social, economical, historical... background of different law enforcement authorities in different EU member states.
- Insufficient knowledge of the needs for CPS at the day to day work
- Traditional mistrust of some countries toward some countries or areas of EU (their law enforcement authorities), their expertise, knowledge, approaches.

- The feeling: “Only we know how things have to be done. Nobody can force us to change that!”
- The ignorance about professional achievements and possibilities already gained in the law enforcement community.

3. Training

3.1. How are police leaders trained?

Today most of the European countries are committed to implement the Bologna Process in the higher education area, which defines the training of the future’s police officers and police leaders. In the spirit of the requirements arising from the Bologna Process, the establishment of a linear and multi-cyclic higher educational institution is aimed in the field of law enforcement.

In the first main cycle of the EU-compatible law enforcement higher education one can get a BA degree, as well as professional qualification. The second training cycle is based on the first one and results in the MA degree and a MA degree in law enforcement.

Even if the same Bologna Process is used in Europe, the implementation and the outcome is different country by country. This is not criticism, but a fact: at the end the police leaders’ training shows big differences.

It is accepted in all EU MS that police leaders shall follow dedicated courses on high level. When comparing the trainings provided for police leaders across the EU countries, in some cases this is conducted only within the national police education system, in other countries it is also partly done within the general state or even private training institutions.

3.2. What is training?

The training is a method which is different from the traditional teaching-learning activities. The difference is primarily due to the fact that it is built on the idea of participant learning. Learning occurs in small groups, where the members are in permanent and reciprocal relationship with one another. Adult education is typically not only learning from the trainer, but also learning from each other. The aim of the training is to develop existing or already learnt professional knowledge, skills and abilities throughout the social and psychological laws and feedback of the members of group. Its

effectiveness is largely determined by the trainer's personality and professional skills. They are not teaching, but working in the process as a catalyst. Their tasks are make an appropriate level of interest, trust, openness. Their features include:

- the creation and maintenance the group,
- make the group's rules, frameworks,
- the development and maintenance of group cohesion,
- development of competency,
- and indirectly support the learning process.

The reason of training is to make the best of potential self-awareness, development of personality and team building possibilities, which basically affects the motivation of the participants as well. Feedbacks are essential in the development of human relationships. The method involves several advantages. Classes do not directly transfer knowledge, skills and attitudes, but development in abilities and behaviour takes place. In small group solution, much more personalized attention and manifestation is possible, the personality can be developed than in a traditional lecture. This proven method work well for identifying and developing leadership skills, as well as the increasing of the person's success in workplace, and strengthening the person's motivation and commitment.

3.3 What is the benefit of training?

Primary benefits:

- Acquiring leadership knowledge
- Acquiring specialised knowledge (e.g. cyber crime, IT skills, "white collar" crime, financial knowledge, drug crime, chemistry knowledge etc.)
- Upgrading of knowledge

Secondary benefits:

- Building up new relationships, networking
- Recreational aspects

3.3. What do we expect from training?

The training can be based on knowledge, ability and competence, because everyone -thus the police leaders- can be trained in the following way: give them existing knowledge and solutions for known problems, improve their abilities to face future challenges and increase their level of competence.

For the good and efficient (police) leader all of the previously mentioned things are important and essential, but because in literature the knowledge and ability belongs to the category of competence, the police leadership training is competency based in all EU countries.

The definition of competence is not clear, several publications exist with a number of definitions, having similar contents:

- scope of authority,
- expertise,
- suitability,
- knowledge,
- attitudes,
- skills and abilities in general,
- ability to use the acquired knowledge,
- personal experiences and skills in different situations of life.

Regarding the level of the competencies, besides basic, generic and key competencies, leaders must acquire the following leadership skills, too:

- leading and motivating other people by example
- learning from mistakes
- developing and maintaining contacts
- impacting on other people
- making decisions

- staying focused on the objectives and processes
- elaborating strategies
- promoting ethical attitude.

The regular, professional academical and practical training of the leaders is essential, through which modern techniques and means of leadership knowledge can be acquired, and the strategic and systematic thinking can be developed.

Blended learning or mixed learning means the joint application of traditional (face to face) educational forms and e-learning. In this way the advantages of both methods can be combined.

3.4. When and where do we need training?

Training has to be regular and continuous, adjusted to the developing carrier path of the leader (e.g. change of scope or change of leadership assignment, but also in order to maintain knowledge). On the job trainings should be considered next to more regular forms of training activities. Training delivered in EU level should be considered as an asset, including the participation in EU-wide exchange programmes. Also, police leadership training should be enriched by trainings provided by private companies, in order to enlarge worldviews and promote critical thinking.

3.5. What does already exist in the field of common training in the EU?

3.5.1. CEPOL

CEPOL is a European Union Agency, established in 2005. Its mission is to bring together senior police officers from police forces in Europe - essentially to support the development of a network - and encourage cross-border cooperation in the fight against crime, public security and law and order by organising training activities and research findings.

Next to the EU MS, Iceland, Norway and Switzerland also take part in the work of CEPOL as associated countries.

CEPOL provides common trainings, sharing of expertise and is also a perfect platform for networking.

CEPOL organises between 80-100 courses, seminars and conferences -including police leader's trainings- a year on key topics relevant to all police forces in Europe. Among its flagship activities the TOPSPOC seminars and the Erasmus-type annual exchange programme for law enforcement officers shall be mentioned.

3.5.2. Twinning projects

Within special programs mandated by the European Commission candidate member states to the EU benefit from the opportunity to learn from an experienced EU member state. When elaborating a project with a twinning partner, the EU member state supports the development of a policy area, or a specific topic with different possibilities. One of the main activities is training.

3.5.3. TAIEX

TAIEX is another program managed by the European Commission, and provides the possibility to organize conferences, seminars and other short-term projects for know-how-transfer and sharing of experiences on specific topics.

3.5.4. Forum Salzburg Group

Some years ago, when new member states joined the EU, Austria created this Forum to start a more intense cooperation in security matters with Slovenia, Slovakia, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Romania and Bulgaria. Its goal is to strengthen cooperation between those countries, and one of the key-issues is know how-transfer, based on common training.

3.5.5. Middle European Police College (MEPA):

Recognising the impacts of political, economic, social and technological developments in Central Europe, and the dramatic increase of international, transnational crime, several countries in the region have endeavoured for a new type of training cooperation. This resulted in the establishment of MEPA in 2001, which focuses on the training of police / CID officers. MEPA countries are Germany, Austria, Poland, Switzerland, Slovakia, Slovenia, Czech Republic and Hungary.

MEPA as a training institution organizes courses on various aspects of practical work and current police requirements, targeting middle police managers in Central Europe. Its aim is also to reduce problems of communication and establish better

understanding between officers. The language of training is German. The activities of MEPA contribute to the development of common professional standards in Europe, leading to efficient action against cross-border or international crime, but it can not be regarded as an institution which coordinate and harmonize police leadership trainings on EU level.

3.5.6. International Law Enforcement Academy (ILEA):

In 1995 the governments of the United States and Hungary jointly established the International Law Enforcement Academy (ILEA) in Budapest, Hungary to support law enforcement training in Central Europe and beyond. The academy training programs are comprised of eight-week courses and shorter (one- to two-week) seminars, and the primary target audience is mid-level law enforcement managers of former socialist countries. Beneficiary countries of the ILEA are:

Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Estonia, Georgia, Hungary, Kazakhstan, Kosovo, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Macedonia, Moldova, Montenegro, Poland, Romania, Russia, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, Uzbekistan.

It is clear that the main aim of this organisation is not to train police leaders on European level. Rather, ILEA plays a similar role similar function in police officer's training than the Marshall Centre in military officer's training, so it helps to build relationships, the common thinking, and helps for police officers and police leaders from non-EU Member States to incorporate European standards and thinking, preparing for change in mindset.

3.5.7. The Association of European Police Colleges (AEPC):

Since its creation in 1996, the Association of European Police Colleges has been acting as a network of police colleges from all over the European continent, connecting 50 member colleges from 42 European and European neighbouring countries.

AEPC organizes each year a choice of courses, conferences and various activities aimed at supporting and developing police training for senior police officers. It is a partner for EU institutions such as CEPOL or the European Commission.

AEPC maximises cooperation and coordination on police training between member colleges, though facilitating the sharing of best practice and research. It focuses upon the provision of training assistance to candidate EU countries and European countries by means of joint programmes, and it enables greater exchange of students and staff between national establishments including operational police officers.

CEPOL and AEPC concluded a Memorandum of Understanding, in order to optimise their cooperation, and avoid duplication. This also means that whenever CEPOL is in a position to undertake activities previously covered by AEPC, those activities will be implemented by CEPOL and the AEPC will cease to undertake them. With that the police leadership training - co-ordinated at European level – are being implemented within the framework of CEPOL.

3.5.8. Other international training co-operation forms:

There are bi-, or trilateral agreements between countries or police schools, exchange programs, etc., but only in a limited scale in terms of participants and duration.

Worth mentioning are also some forms of institutional cooperation based on common applications/programmes supported by the European Union (for example: Socrates-Erasmus, Tempus, Leonardo, DAAD, etc..)

3.6. What are the best practices?

Beside national training programmes - that might offer best practices to be shared - there are a few EU or international training programmes/seminars or initiatives that provide efficient platforms of exchanging best practices, e.g. the TOPSPOC course by CEPOL, or the Pearls in Policing initiative by various countries.

4. Summary of statements

According to information provided by various lecturers during the TOPSPOC IX. Seminars, and following the action learning method that were explored by the participants, the members of the PLUS group agree with the statement that ***“actual training on Police Leadership (PL) and Common Professional Standards (CPS) across the EU is too elusive”***.

In that regard the PLUS group conducted some exercises, with using the so called futures methodology, in order to identify the drivers, worldviews and myths that exist behind the lack of cohesive EU system of training. One of the methods applied was the Causal Layer

Analysis (CLA), trying to map the relevant social, economical and political drivers, and then to describe the worldview, including cultural perceptions.

This resulted in the finding that although there are political expressions of a real will to establish an EU-framework (see Stockholm Programme), but there is a *lack of political drive to implement this, in the absence of proper legal instruments. Training in principle still follows complex, national agenda with various training schemes* : one consequence is that *multiple, uncoordinated initiatives* are existing; another consequence of the key finding is the *spreading of best practices between different training systems is insufficient*.

In the big picture – the worldview level – it was discovered that the various police training systems are *non-transferable*, and the *bridges between them* should be improved significantly. It is acknowledged that police leadership should stick to their national systems, but need to incorporate a much larger *EU dimension* and common professional standards, to be applicable across the EU MS. In short: we need **police leaders with common standards, but not standardised police leaders**.

Based on the findings the PLUS group considers that the overall question remains valid: “Do we have an EU context or dimension for Police Leadership and Common Professional Standards in the future?”

Finally, exploring the deepest, unconscious layer of CLA about police training in the EU, the PLUS group finds it relevant to ask whether there is a need for a *common police leader’s culture* that would also result in a better acceptance of the police leaders themselves with each other, including the professional standards they believe in.

The European Commission is busy in developing a European training scheme for law enforcement agencies. The Plus group thinks that the European Commission and CEPOL should continue investing resources and doing a lot of persuading to fill in the European framework, to make sure that it complements the national agenda and at last to implement the EU-wide approach. We think also that CEPOL should be empowered to take the driving seat to improve the bottom-up flow of the training needs and best practices between CEPOL and the national colleges.

As part of the “future methodology”, the members of the PLUS group also conducted a scenario exercise, as part of our efforts in elaborating alternative futures. These scenarios build the basis of the recommendations made under point 5.

5. Recommendations

To make it clearer for the reader, recommendations were written for each statement of point 4. The consequences of not following the recommendations are also described if relevant.

Statement 1: “there is a lack of political drive to implement this, in the absence of proper legal instruments”

More investments need to be done in the implementation mechanism. EU and JAI Council should take up their responsibility to agree on a concrete implementation framework, the legal and institutional tools; empower the COM and CEPOL to coordinate across the EU and enhance the platform for sharing best practices and develop CPS.

A failure would result in the continuation of the complex, imbalanced initiatives, mainly driven by MS considerations, but not an overall EU-perspective. That would mean a risk for the EU internal security, as the professional standards and ways on how law enforcement forces are managed would remain insufficient, non-cohesive and inefficient.

Statement 2: “training follows complex, national agenda”

- MS have to open up their national law enforcement training programs on leadership in order to incorporate complementary EU- or other MS modules. Doing this, bridges are created between the national agenda, best practices can be shared and common ways of training will be developed.
- Make the MS be interested in partnerships and sharing experiences. This will lead to a more effective and efficient cooperation to tackle the common future challenges due to our globalized society.
- The creation of a “European Centre of Police Excellence and a Knowledge base” (ECPEK) could also help the police leaders to share, to prepare common approaches and to fight against upcoming challenges and new forms of criminality. National experiences on such excellence centres show that it facilitates a more pro-active working of the police services.

Statement 3: “multiple, uncoordinated initiatives”

- In order to avoid duplication, to increase efficiency and cohesion, and to improve the labour sharing between these multiple initiatives, it is recommended to include these initiatives in existing European networks (CEPOL Network, for instance)
- The European Centre of Police Excellence and Knowledge could be the reference point in this matter as well.

Statement 4: “the spreading of best practices is insufficient”

- A better interaction between law enforcement agencies is also required to define the needed common standards and to exchange best practices.

Statement 5: “non-transferable, no EU dimension”

- Include the European dimension in the national training programs of police leaders through a specific training module. The European Centre of Excellence and Knowledge would have to validate the national police leaders training programs and issue a European Police Leaders certificate (EPL).
- The EPL-certificate could be required for functions on European level.

Statement 6: “common police leaders culture”

- Exchange programs for Police Leaders, the continuation of specific trainings like the TOPSPOC and the development of continuous training programs by methods like “blended learning”, validated by the European Centre of Police Excellence and Knowledge, should contribute to the birth of a real common police leaders culture.

Statement 7: “continue investing resources and doing a lot of persuading to fill in the European framework”

- A stronger investment on EU level would mean savings on the MS side – but would also enable the EU to provide high value service – on equal basis - in police leadership training and common professional standards for law enforcement that could lead to their strengthened cooperation and sharing across the Union. Failure would result in lessening security, the prevailing of uncoordinated MS-driven initiatives, but still a high financial resource needs, both by various MS and by the EU funds.

Statement 8: “the bottom-up flow of the training needs”

- In order to develop training modules answering to the needs of the MS or of the existing networks, the possibility should be given to them to sensitize the ECPEK via a structured bottom-up flow.
- ECPEK should also map existing training programs in order to detect the needs of common modules or curricula. This idea is already reflected by the European Training Scheme – mapping project that has been launched by the European Commission and Cepol (Stockholm Programme, 1.2.6). Hopefully not only member states and agencies will be involved, but also the border regions – the so-called Euregions – where inspiring initiatives are taken.

If the need of an ECPEK is not shared by political and law enforcement leaders across the EU, the risk is that police trainings and the development of professional standards remain compartmentalised. The risks are great that in this case the choice will be to use the existing networks and initiatives, although they reached their limits and showed not to be able to improve sufficiently PL and CPS. And if the wish was to only improve the working of the existing networks and agencies, the resources needed would be similar or even exceed in our opinion the amount of what is needed for the ECPEK, without guarantee of success. This presents an obstacle towards servicing the European citizen in a globalized future.

CONCLUSION

The challenges law enforcement agencies are facing have often a supra-national dimension. This is not only the case in criminal matters, but also in matters of public order or disaster management.

In Europe, we have the possibility to work together, to get support from other member states if needed and to learn from good practices. Numerous activities exist, but mostly in an uncoordinated way. So, these processes need to be optimized to increase the security level of the European citizens.

Training on a European level can be one of the ways of optimization: it will increase mutual confidence and contribute to the development of common work methods. The Stockholm Programme and the Internal Security Strategy confirm the need of common EU police training. A lot of work has already been done or is still in progress, like the development of a

European Training Scheme by the European Commission. But it is fact that *a greater political drive* for the implementation of the recommended measures is needed now.

During the research work, the PLUS group found out that training still follows mainly national agenda, with no possibility enough of knowledge exchange and spreading of good practices. Many good initiatives are taken, but mostly uncoordinated. This affects especially the training of police leaders.

Nevertheless, in the opinion of the PLUS-group, training can help improving leadership and common professional standards in the future by:

- giving a real EU-dimension to the training of police leaders
- opening up the national training programs and including EU modules that must be controlled and validated
- facilitating partnership and sharing experiences between MS
- organising a bottom-up flow between MS and the EU to make sure the training is in phase with the needs of the MS
- promoting a better interaction between law enforcement agencies to improve the sharing of good practices
- introducing a “European Police Leader’s certificate”

For achieving this, the PLUS group recommends the creation of a “European Centre of Police Excellence”, including a knowledge base. According to our opinion, CEPOL should have a key role in this initiative, because the overall aim is to support training and development of common professional standards for police leaders. Police leadership must remain linked to the national contexts, but with an EU dimension and an EU leadership culture.

When Steve Jobs was asked about the future of computing, he talked about “cloud computing”. We think the same evolution can be foreseen for training : a sort of “i-training” allowing national training institutions and the new “European Centre of Police Excellence” to “synchronize” easily, whenever they want to or need to.

To summarize, do never forget: ***We do not need standardized police leaders, but we need police leaders with common standards.***