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EDITORIAL

Prof. Paul Senior, Sheffield Hallam University and Charlotte Knight,
De Montfort University

This is the first occasion that the BJCR has exclusively focused on the subject of training in the Community Justice Sector; a focus of particular bearing at a time when the anticipated cuts within the public sector are likely to erode any progress made in the development of qualifications and training across the sector.

There have been undoubted developments; some more robust than others. The Community Justice Sector is a complex web of agencies managing many of the processes of community justice but with no real evidence of any systematic coherence. This is reflected in the variations and differences in expectation of training and qualifications in the different agencies, as the articles in this issue reflect. Crucial questions abound: what is the educational level appropriate to professional training; what should be the core curriculum for any designated professional group; what should be the balance between academic learning and training for competence through identified occupational standards; how far is training increasingly a shared enterprise given the inter-agency aspirations for joined-up justice; and finally, how sure-footed are the arguments for a set of core educational principles for basic training when, in absentia, this exposes the lack of frameworks for post-qualifying inadvertently leading to a more agency-dominated and technically-defined operational practice as a career develops.

Probation training has been a graduate profession for many years, delivered by a number of different universities. It now embarks on yet another change with the introduction of the Probation Qualifications Framework (PQF) that offers an employment-based route to a full professional qualification via a foundation degree to an honours degree, delivered by just three main HEI providers, though one provider has a three-way HEI partnership. Much smaller numbers are expected to be recruited onto this new framework, although the inclusion of a previously neglected group, probation service officers, is to be welcomed. The former qualification the Diploma in Probation Studies, seen by some commentators as a ‘Rolls Royce award’, is being superseded by a more building block approach to training, though drawing on many elements which have been seen as successful over the past 12 years. It remains to be seen whether the introduction of specific training for probation service officers leads to a greater predominance of lower level outcomes or whether the routes to full probation officer status remain possible in this tightening fiscal climate.

The police service has established the ‘Initial Police Learning and Development Programme’ (IPLDP) for all new recruits, which is delivered through a range of schemes; some in-house and some in partnership with Higher Education providers as foundation degrees. Dominey and Hill in their article reflect on the role of Higher Education within this process and make comparisons with the employment-based route developed by the probation service. The ongoing tensions between practice demands and academic ‘freedoms’ are highlighted, including
how universities may ‘bend’ to the needs of employers whilst protecting the right to ‘academic freedom’, and enhancing the ability for critical thinking and reflection in its students. The article points to potential benefits for multi-agency education and this resonates with the increasingly integrated responses to offender management between key criminal justice agencies such as probation, police and prisons. The ways in which training can impact upon occupational cultures is explored. The fact that the police have had little exposure to higher education training in the past is also considered. The arguments in this article raise key questions about continuity in educational experiences and further point to the need for higher education to penetrate beyond basic training to post-qualifying.

Other developments, such as the one described in the article by Farrow, Hughes, Paris and Prior in this issue, have begun to address the qualification gap that the expansion of new occupations concerned with community safety and anti-social behaviour following the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 has created. The exploration of the balance in the curriculum between vocational and educational domains of knowledge that this article expounds is redolent of similar discussions that pre-dated the changes in probation training and education which are used as a contrast in their discussion. The return to a mixed mode assessment of the award at post-graduate and undergraduate level reignites the debate about the relationship between practice learning and academic learning, which was resolved in favour of a single graduate level qualification in probation training in 1998 but remains a rumbling issue between competing viewpoints.

Duke, in her article, reflects on the training needs of the drugs workforce and explores the process of ‘criminalising’ drugs work and the conflicts and contradictions this has created for those working in the field. The article suggests that there is still much contestation of where drug workers and drug policy sits to definitively locate the skills, competencies and educational requirements of any programme of training. What the article argues is that unless workers engage in training which develops their skills of reflection and critical appraisal in dealing with the challenging and often unpredictable personal and social circumstances of many drug misusers then, in such a contested policy and practice environment, workers will fail to provide the independence of thinking and self-defining actions for good quality informed practice. Regrettting a criminal justice domination of drug treatment services in recent years may be as much about a failure to understand what should be the goals of intervention as any particular institutional location of service delivery. This article helpfully raises many dilemmas for multi-agency practice delivery.

The needs of the Youth Justice sector present perhaps the most complex challenge for a qualifications framework, employing as it does, within Youth Offending Teams (YOTs), a combination of multi-agency staff on secondment who hold professional qualifications from their own sector, working alongside direct entrants with no or few prior qualifications. Which skills and knowledge are common to all youth justice staff, and need a standardised qualification route and those specific to the particular professions contained within the YOTs, but where there may be potential for integration, is yet to be fully articulated and translated into a defensible framework. The article by Hester reflects on how the future construction of a qualification framework might be conceptualised engaging in a critique of recent YJB inspired attempts at training. Hester points to the difficulties of balance in professional education between elements which are more geared to exposition by higher education and the needs for training and development to be located in the underpinning skills and knowledge of daily practice.

The extent to which working with offenders in the community requires a graduate workforce; with staff operating at sophisticated levels of thinking, analysis and planning may depend on the philosophy and objectives of the agency. However, given the scope for the exercise of power, the use of discretion and the potential for discrimination which many of these agencies hold, the argument for a common base line for training and qualification would seem compelling. The article by Stout and Canton on a European approach to probation training offers the first clear indication of a movement aimed at laying down the basic standards, skills and values required for working with offenders across Europe. Though they recognise that other agendas may make a full European core curriculum for probation a distant objective, they describe a Benchmarking project which would be a useful first step in this process. In this article too is a further hint about the needs of continuing professional development beyond basic training.

Creaton, in her article, provides a comprehensive overview of the development of professional doctorates in criminal justice, which sets the scene for a much closer collaboration between academia and practice, in research activity and knowledge creation at the highest level, and moving beyond the constraints of more traditional PhDs. Given the straitened times it is heartening to reflect on the potential for such collaborations that are already well embedded within the Health Sector and which offer a dynamic synergy between practice wisdom and academic insight. Such awards offer a potential win-win-win for agency, individual and the academy alike. However, given the paucity of post-qualifying awards in the past 12 years, a feature alluded to throughout this collection of articles, it seems unlikely that funding from agency resources will help develop the potential of the professional doctorate, though we watch this space with interest.

If the crucial links between training and education implied in joint models of training throughout this edition are to be maintained, then this needs to be reflected at all levels of practice experience within agencies. If it is important for basic level training then it is no less needed as people take on more complex roles within their organisations. An increasing amount of in-service post-qualifying training with its prescriptive and tight delivery regimes, sometimes pejoratively referred to as ‘sheep-dip training’, does not augur well for a criminal justice profession which arguably needs the critical thinking and reflective practice celebrated at basic training to ensure innovative solutions are found to the problems facing our criminal justice institutions throughout the lifelong learning of practitioners. This collection of articles demonstrates that there remains some potential to ensure that basic training delivers not only a competent workforce but one which has the capacity for critical self-renewal in the face of changing social and political circumstances. We need to ensure that this is not lost as workers become embedded in their organisation.
THE HIGHER EDUCATION CONTRIBUTION TO POLICE AND PROBATION TRAINING: ESSENTIAL, DESIRABLE OR AN INDULGENCE?

Jane Dominey, Principal Lecturer in Community and Criminal Justice and Programme Leader for the Probation Qualification Framework & Andy Hill, Senior Lecturer in Policing and Criminal Justice and Programme Leader for the Foundation Degree in Policing, Division of Community and Criminal Justice, De Montfort University

Abstract
This article explores the higher education contribution to the qualifying training of police officers and probation officers and asks whether university study is an essential, desirable or indulgent ingredient in the education of people entering these careers. Claims for the benefits of higher education in vocational training for criminal justice work are examined, as is the extent to which possible benefits are delivered in practice. The importance of a graduate workforce, the potential for the experience of higher education to lead to organisational culture change, practice in the area of diversity and the exercise of professional discretion are all investigated. The article concludes that, in order to make an essential contribution to the training of these criminal justice workers, universities must deliver programmes that offer real academic challenge and opportunity. The article draws on research and policy as well as the authors' experience as teachers and trainers in practice settings and in higher education.

This article explores the higher education contribution to the qualifying training of police officers and probation officers and asks whether university study is an essential, desirable or indulgent ingredient in the education of people entering these careers. Claims for the benefits of higher education in vocational training for criminal justice work are examined as is the extent to which potential benefits are delivered in practice. The article draws on research and policy as well as the authors’ experience as teachers and trainers in practice settings and in higher education.
In the past, there were significant differences in the arrangements for and expectations of the training and education of those intending to become probation officers and police officers. Over the past decade, the training for both occupations has moved closer together, with the use of national vocational qualifications and the creation of a range of awards based in higher education. Probation officer training has been located in higher education for much of its history. By contrast, police officer training in the United Kingdom has been provided on-the-job and by police personnel. In recent years, the probation service has made much greater use of work-based training and some police services have worked with universities to develop foundation degrees for the training of new officer recruits.

The article begins with a brief recent history of the development of probation officer and police officer training. It then considers a number of arguments that have been advanced in favour of a higher education contribution to training: the importance of having a graduate workforce and the potential for experience of higher education to lead to culture change; improved practice in the areas of diversity and the exercise of professional discretion. The article examines the extent to which these benefits can be achieved by a particular model of training and identifies some obstacles to achieving best practice in the real world.

The training and qualification frameworks for both police officers and probation officers are currently the subject of debate and development. From 1998, the qualification for probation officers was the Diploma in Probation Studies (DipPS), an award that combined an honours degree with a National Vocational Qualification (NVQ) at Level 4 and was achieved in 24 months’ work and study as a probation service employee (a Trainee Probation Officer (TPO)). However, the National Offender Management Service (NOMS) has called time on the DipPS and no TPOs have been appointed since 2008. A new qualification framework for the probation service is in the process of development and will begin in 2010. For the first time, this framework includes the probation service officer (PSO) grade. PSOs are the staff who undertake much work with offenders assessed as posing a low or medium risk of harm.

Under the new arrangements, the qualification for this grade will be a vocational qualification (VQ) at Level 3, an award which sits one step below the first year of a degree in the national qualifications framework. Qualifying as a probation officer will still require the completion of an award combining academic study at degree level with the assessment of supervised practice.

Police officers are no longer trained on a residential basis at regional training centres. These centres closed in the summer of 2006. This brought an end to the Centres (Central Police Training and Development Agency) led Probationer Training Programme (PTP) and all 43 police forces across England and Wales were required to develop their own strategy for delivering recruit training. Since that time, student police officers have completed a national programme: the Initial Police Learning and Development Programme (IPLDP). The IPLDP is underpinned by seven core learning goals set down in the ‘Learning Requirement for Police Probationer Training in England and Wales’ (Elliot and Kushner, 2003). Like probation officers, police officers are also assessed against national occupational standards, being originally required to complete 22 units at levels 3 and 4. With effect from January 2010 this requirement is reduced to the 10 units which form part of the Skills for Justice ‘Diploma in Policing’ qualification (Skills for Justice, 2009).

This change to police training, bringing it from the regional training centre into the community, has already resulted in a number of drivers, including criticisms of the police service made following the Brixton riots (Scarman, 1981), in the report of the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry (Macpherson, 1999), by Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) in the reports ‘Training Matters’ (HMIC, 2002a), ‘Diversity Matters’ (HMIC, 2002b) and in response to the Panorama documentary ‘The Secret Policeman’ (BBC, 2003) amongst others. Police forces are not required to train officers at degree level and a number deliver the IPLDP in-house. Others, though, have chosen to work in a wide range of partnerships with further education and higher education institutions.

In higher education, this has led to the development of foundation degrees and honours degrees in policing and a debate about whether student police officers should undertake these programmes before or after their appointment as new police officers. In the pre-employment model, student police officers are not employed by the police and enrol on a degree course which is funded by the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE). Students on these programmes often gather practical experience by being attested special constables and, on graduation, can apply to become police officers but have no guarantee of employment. Student officers who have completed the foundation degree will be required to complete the Police Action Checklist and be assessed as operationally competent before being allowed to work independently. In the post-employment model, new recruits are appointed and complete a foundation degree which incorporates the IPLDP and the national occupational standards. Post-employment training is funded by the police force who contract with higher education to deliver and assess the foundation degree.

The new framework for probation training is a post-employment model. However, the framework does include an accelerated route to qualification as a probation officer for recruits who have already achieved an honours degree deemed relevant. It remains to be seen whether this option will encourage universities to develop and amend courses in criminal justice or community justice so that their students are well placed to take this new route.

Funding of qualifying training for probation and police services will be a key issue over the next few years as these organisations, as well as universities, face budget cuts. The Treasury is demanding a £500m saving from the police budgets over the next five years (Home Office, 2009) and the probation budget will fall by 4% in the year 2010/11 (Napo, 2010). HEFCE funded programmes are becoming more attractive to police forces across England and Wales who value the higher education contribution to the training and education of student police officers.
So why are universities seen as the right place for police officer and probation officer training? Locating vocational training in higher education is argued to bring a number of benefits to a practitioner’s ability to work in a complex and unpredictable world. It is suggested that graduates are better able to use professional discretion, that the skill of reflective thinking is important for good practice, and that well-educated graduates and police officers will respond better to the needs of diverse communities. Elliot and Kushner (2003) highlighted the absolute requirement that reflective and critical thinking be a core element in student police officer training. Similarly, making changes to training is seen as a key way of changing the culture of an organisation.

Nellis (2001: 384) writes 'a good degree – ‘graduateness’ – should broaden horizons, stimulate curiosity and imagination, foster intellectual confidence and a capacity for self-directed learning, facilitate spoken and verbal expression, and inspire a reasonable love of reading and a strong ethical sense.'

Approaching the question from a contrasting and more bureaucratic perspective, the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA) outlines the skills and ability expected of those who have attained various levels of qualification. It explains that, amongst other things, the holder of a bachelor's degree with honours ‘will be able to:

- apply the methods and techniques that they have learned to review, consolidate, extend and apply their knowledge and understanding, and to initiate and carry out projects;
- critically evaluate arguments, assumptions, abstract concepts and data (that may be incomplete), to make judgements, and to frame appropriate questions to achieve a solution - or identify a range of solutions - to a problem;
- communicate information, ideas, problems and solutions to both specialist and non-specialist audiences.’

The higher education experience should, therefore, be producing students who have the motivation, capacity and enthusiasm to develop their knowledge beyond the end of their training. Students should emerge from training with an ethical and informed approach to the making of judgments and the use of discretion. They should have above average communication skills, both spoken and in writing.

From the perspective of the probation service, there are two important points to be made. The first is to acknowledge the various commentators (Treadwell, 2006; McGowan, 2002) who have argued that, given its compressed nature and its incorporation of the NVQ, the DipPS was not capable of producing graduates with the attributes outlined above. Nellis (2000) outlined the positive aspects of the DipPS, but set out the risks that the qualification could cease to deliver the outcomes required of a degree. These points are countered, in part, by contributions to the debate by Jarvis (2002) and Knight and White (2001), who highlight the strengths of the DipPS as a vehicle for enabling students to integrate theory to practice and learn how to use the skills of reflective practice.

Separate from the debate about whether the DipPS (and its successor qualification, which is certainly no more generous in the time it allows students to read, reflect and be curious) is really able to produce ‘graduateness’ in its students, is the shift in importance in probation service staffing from the probation officer grade to the probation service officer grade. Oldfield and Grimshaw (2008) highlight the steep rise in PSO numbers from 1,919 in 1997 to 7,247 in 2006. Increasingly, PSOs undertake much front-line assessment and supervision work with offenders. PSOs hold caseloads, produce reports for courts and enforce orders. The job title ‘offender manager’ can refer to a PSO as much as to a probation officer. Historically, the training needs of this grade of staff were neglected. In some parts of England and Wales, PSOs have had access to NVQs at Level 3 and to Certificate of Higher Education programmes run jointly by higher education institutions and probation employers, but the position is far from consistent across the country. As a result of this change in staffing, much probation work ‘on the ground’ is not carried out by probation officers and, hence, not by staff who achieve a graduate level of professional vocational training. This will continue to be the case after the implementation of the new qualification framework, as PSOs will be qualified at NVQ Level 3.

The police do not have a tradition as a graduate profession and, therefore, the new foundation degrees represent the highest level of external accreditation attained by newly qualified police officers. Some commentators (e.g. Stone, 2009) do argue that all qualified police officers should have achieved an honours degree. The probation debate is yet to take place within policing. Through the National Policing Improvement Agency (NPIA) and Skills for Justice, the organisation that develops national occupational standards in the justice sector, there appears to be a growing desire for some form of common foundation degree curriculum for all police officers. The discussion as to the effectiveness or validity of such a programme of study is still in its infancy. At the time of writing, the Diploma in Policing (Skills for Justice, 2009) is being developed by Skills for Justice and this is expected to inform any future discussions regarding student police officer curriculum.

Crisp and Ward (2008: 65), writing from their experience of developing a foundation degree programme for police officers, offer ‘anecdotal evidence’ for the emergence of a ‘new more critical and culturally aware and sensitive police professionalism’. This is an encouraging start. Further evaluation of the impact of new training regimes on the attitudes and behaviour of constables as they move on into their careers will be needed to produce credible evidence that hoped-for changes are being delivered in practice.

Heslop (2010) questions the benefits and advantages of training student police officers in higher education. He suggests that student police officers who have no background of academic study prior to commencing a foundation degree at university are in some way disadvantaged and that this disadvantage extends beyond the ability to write academically.
He considers the style and approach to delivery by academic staff to be highly influential in the experience of student officers being trained at university. Even in 2010 there remains no minimum educational requirement to become a police officer in England and Wales (Home Office, 2010). Heslop (2010) also argues that the traditional delivery of police recruit training within the PTP was a ‘great leveller’ for those new officers with and without a degree level qualification. It can, though, also be argued that a foundation degree can act as a leveller, enabling all recruits to the police service the opportunity to gain knowledge, look critically at practice and benefit from the experience of higher education.

The police foundation degrees and the DipPS are examples of higher education seeking to adapt to the needs of employers and construct programmes with specific and prescriptive curriculums. Programmes such as these play a part in raising the proportion of adults who have access to higher education. The government target that 50% of young adults have access to higher education may be both unrealised and controversial, but would seem to require police and probation officers to be in the ‘higher education half’. Maintaining the concept of ‘graduateness’ whilst responding to the demands of employers and funders is a challenge.

To what extent does the qualification pathway for an occupation influence the organisational culture? There are many pressures that shape the culture of organisations like the police and probation service. The nature of training is one of these, but it would be unrealistic to expect a reform in training arrangements alone to lead to a significant change in culture. There is a wide recognition that previous attempts at culture changes within the police service have been short-lived. Calvert-Smith (2005), in his report for the Commission for Racial Equality, stated that ‘the police service is like a permafrost - thawing on the top, but still frozen solid at the core’. By taking the training of new police officers away from regional residential centres and placing them in the heart of their communities together with the exposure to higher education, it could be argued that the thaw suggested by Calvert-Smith (Ibid: 9) might begin from within and not just from the top. Moving student police officers onto a university campus is arguably not enough; engagement with suitably qualified and experienced academic staff and police trainers is required.

Making changes to police training and increasing the input from outside the organisation, and higher education in particular, is often recommended as a way of achieving cultural change. See, for example, the government reply to the Home Affairs Committee which stated ‘we acknowledge the benefits which a more academic approach could bring to the delivery of police learning and training...We agree that such an approach would expose officers to a wider cross-section of the community and weaken the negative elements of the occupational culture’ (Home Office, 1999: para.79).

The concept of police ‘canteen culture’ is a powerful one, conveying the notion of a strong supportive bond that affirms traditional ways of working, unites officers who conform and perpetuates undesirable attitudes, including sexism, racism and homophobia. More considered writing about police culture (Foster, 2003; Waddington, 1999) argues that the picture is more complicated than this. For example, it may be more accurate to think of a variety of police cultures. It is also appropriate to consider the positive and beneficial aspects of a strong organisational ethos.

Rowe (2007) recognises that however good and well-intentioned the educators of new police officers are, the impact of becoming operational and the associated socialisation that takes place in the early weeks and months after initial training has historically resulted in the police recruit becoming subsumed within the dominant culture and often unwilling or unable to challenge the status quo. This challenge was recognised and acknowledged by Elliot and Kushner (2003) and they very specifically made the recognition of dominant occupational culture a theme of their report (Ibid: 9).

Whilst police ‘canteen culture’ is a familiar concept, the informal culture of the probation service is a less considered and discussed notion. Traditionally, the probation service has not provided its staff with canteens, so it is in tea rooms that workers set the tone and display the attitudes which transmit values and understanding of practice to new colleagues.

Significant change in the conduct and practice of probation work over the past decade has been attributed to a number of factors: the arrival of centrally imposed targets linked to funding; the creation of national standards for the management of orders reducing practitioner discretion in enforcement; and the creation of the National Offender Management Service bringing the possibility of contestability and privatisation. This is also the period during which a significant proportion of direct work with offenders has passed from PO grade staff to PSO grade staff. If probation officers do not comprise a significant majority within the organisation, then the training they receive can only have a minor influence on the way that the probation service as an organisation understands its job and its relationship with offenders and with wider society.

Can input from higher education improve professional practice in areas such as diversity, discrimination, and community and race relations? It is attitudes such as racism and sexism which are identified as being sustained by the undesirable aspects of police canteen culture. In a similar vein, commentators on probation training have argued that an understanding of anti-oppressive and anti-discriminatory practice must be central to the higher education curriculum for probation training (Knight, 2002; McGowan, 2002).

The process by which the higher education experience might make for more sensitive and culturally aware professional practice is, perhaps, not obvious. A university degree is clearly neither necessary nor sufficient to ensure that people bring fairness, justice and respect to their work. It is not a guarantee that the holder will be without inappropriate prejudice. Police and probation officers undertaking higher education can, however, be exposed to the ideas, experiences and values of people from a wider range of social and political backgrounds than would be the case if they trained exclusively within their own agencies.
Learning outcomes, reading lists and assessment tasks can be planned to ensure that students consider the complexities of working in criminal justice in a complex society.

Institutions delivering programmes for probation officers and police officers should be encouraged to play to this strength and ensure that students are benefiting from the best of higher education. The DipPS, and its successor qualification, already have a packed curriculum, with much of the input delivered using distance learning methods. As a result, opportunities to use visiting speakers who could provide students with a distinctive voice or perspective are hard to arrange.

Central to the IPLDP is an understanding of community and of human and social diversity. The police service, and others, has been the subject of much justifiable criticism about discriminatory practice over the past 30 years (Scarman, 1981; Macpherson, 1999). In these and many more recent reviews, investigations and reports, accusations of poor community relations and the absence of community awareness and engagement is cited as a contributory factor to police failings. The embedding of the Police Race and Diversity Learning Development Programme (PRDLDP) developed by the NPIA (2004) must be central to any police training. Engagement with diverse communities should equally be at the core of any such programme. University campuses are often richly diverse micro-communities and the training of police officers within a campus setting offers the opportunity for engagement with a wide range of members of the public in a way that was not possible at police regional training centres.

Key to good practice in the area of diversity is the ability to exercise appropriate professional discretion. Canton and Eadie (2008: 101) write about the ‘dilemma of discretion – the need for both the impartiality and predictability of the rules, and the flexibility to take account of the very many ways in which circumstances and individuals may differ.’ Despite moves to impose consistency and standardise practice, police and probation work is a constant exercise of discretion. Police officers must decide who to stop, whether to arrest and which questions to put. Probation officers make decisions about the enforcement of orders, the assessment of risk, and the allocation of resources and opportunities.

It is argued that training in higher education enables criminal justice practitioners to be more effective users of the discretion with which they are entrusted. Perhaps this is because academic study encourages the challenging of assumptions, the questioning of texts and the recognition that there may be a range of solutions to a problem. For example, on probation training programmes students write case study based assignments in which they are explicitly asked to write about other options that they may have taken in their work, noting both the constraints and the discretion at play. Similarly, student police officers engage in role-play exercises with members of the public who are all volunteers from local communities. Student officers are required to write reflectively and critically regarding their performance in the role-plays. They are additionally assessed in the way they apply discretion and exercise their powers.

Finally, in addition to considering the arguments advanced in favour of a higher education input into training, it is important to consider the extent to which potential benefits are delivered in practice. One potential benefit is the possibility of inter-professional education and learning (IPE and IPL). Higher education institutions that offer courses across a range of occupations can run joint sessions in areas such as mental health, child protection, domestic violence and youth work. In this way, student professionals have the opportunity to learn more about the roles and responsibilities of other agencies and find their stereotypes and assumptions of other workers challenged whilst training (Anderson and Thorpe, 2008). This has the potential to leave them better equipped for multi-agency work and the management of complex cases in the future. Such learning opportunities can, though, be easier to propose than to deliver against a background of cramped curriculums and incompatible timetables.

The location and accommodation within the university of students and staff working on these programmes can also be an important. Some universities have provided purpose-built or specially designed facilities for police programmes. However, Heslop (2007) studied the development of a post-entry foundation degree programme for police officers in the north of England. He wrote:

The recently formed university Police Studies Department is housed in what can not too inaccurately be described as a large Portakabin type building, located right on the very periphery of the campus. Whilst there may be perfectly sound administrative reasons for this, the location and structure became symbolically significant. (Heslop, 2007)

Work-based programmes such as post-employment police foundation degrees and the new probation degree have timescales and assessment requirements that are set by the needs of the employer. These often fall outside traditional academic routines and timetables, and require universities to be flexible with processes and procedures. Where failure of academic work risks the termination of employment, neither students nor their employing agencies can wait months for the next university exam board. This point is made by Banim and McGrath (2008) who also identify that university facilities may not be geared up to meet the needs of students who are on campus for the whole of a working day and attending programmes without traditional holidays.

From the perspective of the university, involvement in police and probation education could, perhaps even should, bring benefits to the quality and relevance of research and scholarship. Future practitioners, managers and chief officers studying at university are given the opportunity to learn from and challenge the ideas of academics whose research and writing can influence policy developments. Equally importantly, academics have regular opportunities to talk to those involved on the frontline and who are familiar with current practices, priorities and pressures. The number of universities directly involved in probation
Academics need to find ways to convince trainee professionals of the importance and value of perspectives which extend their thinking beyond current policy and orthodox practice. Programmes need to incorporate sufficient time, despite their busy timetables and need to education of police officers or probation officers requires universities to do more than agree immediate requirements of the job. However, making a genuine contribution to the providers. Universities provide qualifications which have credibility and status beyond the probation services. Some of these benefits are organisational and administrative. Employers Working in partnership with higher education does bring clear benefits to police and grades of staff, all play a key part in shaping organisational culture.

Locating training in higher education should ensure that curriculum development takes account of perspectives from both inside and outside the agency. However, a partnership with higher education offers the police and probation service benefits other than those of course content and learning environment. Universities have robust and credible structures for assessing students and regulating awards. Those who achieve a foundation degree in policing or a Certificate in Higher Education in community justice have attained an award that is understood and recognised beyond their immediate employment. The quality and status of the training linked with a particular occupation will be a factor that can help the recruitment and retention of staff.

Looking into the future, police and probation services will be assessing the financial cost of their training arrangements and making decisions that are about cost effectiveness just as much as about learning outcomes. In the police context it is clear that pre-entry foundation degrees are cheaper than post-entry ones. In the probation context, PSOs are both cheaper to train and cheaper to employ than probation officers.

In conclusion, this paper does suggest that the contribution that higher education, through training, makes to the shape and nature of police and probation work can be overstated. Training is only one of a number of factors that dictate how workers perceive their job, how they interact with and judge the public, and how values and work practices are transmitted from one generation of workers to the next. How organisations are funded and how performance is monitored, as well as the balance of power between different groups and grades of staff, all play a key part in shaping organisational culture.

Working in partnership with higher education does bring clear benefits to police and probation services. Some of these benefits are organisational and administrative. Employers are effectively ‘contracting out’ the tasks of training, assessment and certification to specialist providers. Universities provide qualifications which have credibility and status beyond the immediate requirements of the job. However, making a genuine contribution to the education of police officers or probation officers requires universities to do more than agree to administer and deliver a programme that the agencies could have run in-house.

Programmes need to incorporate sufficient time, despite their busy timetables and need to combine academic work with assessed practice, to allow students to explore ideas, concepts and perspectives which extend their thinking beyond current policy and orthodox practice. Academics need to find ways to convince trainee professionals of the importance and value of theoretical perspectives on their operational tasks. Teaching contributions should be made by lecturer and speakers from a pool that extends beyond current and recent practitioners. Student police officers and probation officers need to have the opportunity for both informal meetings and formal inter-professional education experiences with students embarking on other careers and courses of study. Trainee employees need time to be students.

In difficult financial times, sending trainee probation and police officers to university may be seen as an indulgence which cannot be afforded. However, this article has sought to outline the clear and desirable benefits that higher education can bring to training for these workers. To be able to argue that higher education is making an essential contribution to the development of these staff, universities need to ensure that their professional programmes offer real academic challenge and opportunity whilst being relevant to the reality of practice. To do less than this is to sell the higher education experience short.
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Abstract
The expansion of new occupations concerned with community safety and anti-social behaviour following the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 brought with it demands for relevant professional education and training. This article discusses the development of an academic programme designed to meet these needs, which emphasised the importance of theoretical and critical reasoning for practitioners, and contrasts it with divergent developments in professional training for probation officers and youth justice workers. The article concludes by reflecting on the likelihood that future qualifying programmes for the new community justice occupations will follow probation and youth justice in adopting a restricted ‘skills and competencies’ approach to professional training.

Introduction
This article explores our experience, over the past five years, in developing education and training for community safety and anti-social behaviour professionals in the Institute of Applied Social Studies (IASS) at the University of Birmingham. It begins with an outline of the legislative and policy context for the emergence of these new occupational groups before considering what they do in practice, and identifying the knowledge and skills required. The article describes the process through which our Community Justice programme was developed, a summary of the curriculum content and the response from students. This is contrasted with developments in the professional curriculum for probation and youth justice workers. We conclude by commenting on the future of all community justice occupational education and training in the current economic climate, highlighting the trend towards a focus on skills and competencies.
The development of the Birmingham programme occurred in a context in which no national qualifications existed for these occupations and, while one or two other universities had begun to offer courses aimed at community justice staff, there was no formal agreement regarding common standards or approaches. The Birmingham programme was therefore an attempt to break new ground in developing a curriculum appropriate to the educational needs of these staff. As with all university-accredited courses, the academic levels which the programme was designed to meet were defined by the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (QAA, 2008), in particular Levels 4 (Certificate) and 5 (Diploma); more detail on the nature of the curriculum is given below.

The emergence of the new community justice occupations

The Crime and Disorder Act 1998 was unquestionably of major significance in the growth of new occupations concerned with the reduction of crime and anti-social behaviour and the promotion of community safety. From that date, all local authorities in England and Wales were required, with the police, to jointly lead the establishment and operation of formal Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships (CDRPs), which meant that specialist staff were needed to support the Partnerships. At the same time, ‘coordinators’ were required to oversee local arrangements for implementing the new anti-social behaviour powers contained in the Act. The Act also established a new youth justice service, based on multi-agency Youth Offending Teams (YOTs), again with local authorities taking the lead coordinating role.

The Act therefore prompted the emergence of a substantial new group of public sector workers whose jobs were defined by policies, enshrined in statute, which for the first time placed legal responsibilities for addressing local issues of crime and disorder onto agencies other than the police and the probation service. Beyond the public sector, some other agencies also responded to the priorities signalled by the Act by appointing new staff, in particular Housing Associations seeking to take advantage of the new measures for tackling antisocial behaviour (ASB).

Some of the newer community justice occupations did not, however, originate in the 1998 Act. A number of local authorities, especially those in larger urban areas, had begun employing ‘community safety officers’ as early as the 1980s in response to Home Office crime prevention and reduction initiatives, such as the Safer Cities Programme (Crawford, 1998; Tilley, 2002). Other posts with a community safety focus were created through various urban regeneration funding schemes, as local problems of crime and disorder increasingly came to be recognised as serious obstacles to social and economic regeneration. Whilst a large number of these pre-1998 jobs were initially created on the basis of short-term funding or as secondments from other services, others – again, particularly in the larger local authorities – were funded through mainstream budgets as permanent posts.

The situation following the implementation of the 1998 Act was thus one characterised by an expanding group of staff, all of whom could be broadly defined as concerned with ‘the prevention and reduction of local crime and disorder’ but who were of rather different backgrounds and experience (Hughes and Gilling, 2004). Some had been in such jobs prior to the Act and brought with them considerable knowledge and experience of addressing local crime issues, especially in implementing specific projects such as CCTV schemes, but now had to learn to operate in the new environment of formal, complex and ‘strategy-focused’ multi-agency partnerships (Gilling, 2007). Others were newly appointed to support the CDRPs, many in authorities where there was little previous experience of crime-related work, and did not necessarily possess much knowledge or experience of community safety work. Staff were also recruited to fill new specialist roles, the most significant group numerically being the anti-social behaviour officers. In the largest authorities these might number 20 or 30 and tended to be recruited from a range of service backgrounds, including housing, environmental health, the police and the armed forces.

This new occupational group, comprising community safety (CS) officers, anti-social behaviour (ASB) officers and related roles, therefore reflected a range of different professional backgrounds and varied sets of knowledge and skills. Recruitment was largely on the basis of experience and aptitude rather than qualification and, indeed, it would have been difficult to identify any established relevant qualification as a requirement for appointment. In the following sections we discuss the kinds of work that CS and ASB officers do, and the knowledge and skills required for effective practice.

What do ASB officers do?

ASB officers are expected to provide a comprehensive service which prevents and addresses ASB. There is some variation in emphasis and practice between areas as there is no prescribed national job role, which Mayfield and Mills (2008: 82) call ‘the patchwork quilt of provision’. However, ASB officers do work within a clear legislative framework and adopt core actions in order to meet the prevention and enforcement agenda.

They are expected to investigate and resolve incidents of ASB, with the key aim of resolving ‘the problems causing the troublesome behaviour’ (Mayfield and Mills, 2008: 77). This requires a focus on both the people and the behaviour (Prior et al., 2006). Officers need to work with those experiencing or complaining about the ASB, but also with those perpetrating it. Whilst the primary beneficiary is the complainant, the hope is that by preventing further instances of ASB the perpetrator also benefits by not becoming more enmeshed in the criminal justice system. ASB officers typically deal with a wide range of problem behaviours including noise nuisance, graffiti, verbal abuse, racial harassment, intimidatory behaviour and alcohol-related disorder, but also, in certain areas, prostitution, guns and gang-related activity (Squires, 2008). ASB officers also raise public awareness about nuisance and ASB and provide support and guidance to housing providers, community safety partners and the public more generally.
ASB officers usually have individual responsibility for a number of specific cases such that
the investigation and coordination of responses rests with them. While local practice styles
vary, officers tend to adopt a problem-solving approach, interviewing relevant parties,
collecting information and liaising with other agencies to assess the seriousness of the
problem and its potential for resolution. Many ASB officers wherever possible seek to
resolve the problem informally through negotiation, mediation, verbal and written warnings
and Acceptable Behaviour Contracts (Prior et al., 2006; Mayfield and Mills, 2008). If this is
not effective they will prepare cases for legal action, collecting and collating the required
evidence (for example, witness statements) for formal interventions such as Anti Social
Behaviour Orders (ASBOs), injunctions and evictions.

Knowledge and skills of the ASB officer

ASB officers need a good understanding of the legal framework governing ASB and the court
procedures that they have to work within. They are helped by having an understanding of
ASB, its social context and how it connects with wider social issues such as inequality,
discrimination, social exclusion, youth unemployment and domestic violence (Pitt, 2005; Flint,
2006). ASB officers frequently express concern that the enforcement side of their role is over
emphasised at the expense of the preventative work they undertake (Morton, 2005; Prior et al.,
2006; Varnfield, 2005). Certainly knowledge and understanding of other public policy
agendas is invaluable in adopting a more ‘joined up’ approach and response to ASB and crime.

ASB officers need good communication and negotiation skills in order to work with both
complainants and perpetrators of ASB, and to liaise with and coordinate the responses of
other agencies. The requirement to respond quickly and appropriately to complaints
demands initiative and good organisational skills. Furthermore, the expectation that cases
may result in court action means that the officer needs to work accurately with careful
attention to detail to ensure that appropriate evidence is collected and that witnesses are
supported throughout this process.

What do community safety officers do?
The remit of community safety officers is wider than that of ASB officers, with
responsibilities for helping CDRPs to develop strategic responses to the range of crime
and disorder issues identified locally. Job descriptions vary, reflecting different approaches
between areas but also differences in the areas themselves, for example, population density,
urban/rural differences and ethnic diversity. The community safety function itself may be
undertaken by a team of people (allowing specialism) or by one person undertaking all tasks.
CS officers work on both prevention and enforcement agendas, targeting ‘hot spots’ where
there are instances of high levels of crime and/or ASB and working with the community
more generally to enhance security and well being. They are expected to develop, broker,
commission and implement projects aimed at reducing crime, the causes of crime and also
the fear of crime. This involves liaison with the public, particularly with a view to
understanding the concerns people have at neighbourhood level in order to put
mechanisms in place to ameliorate those concerns (York, 2006).

The expectation is that CS officers should not only gain information from the public about
what needs to be done and keep them informed on progress, but also ensure that individuals
and groups within the community understand how they too can contribute to their own
safety and that of others.

Knowledge and skills of the community safety officer

Community safety officers need to understand how community safety connects with wider
policy agendas, such as health, education and regeneration, and how it contributes to the
pursuit of community justice and social inclusion. They also require a working knowledge of
the objectives and operations of specific elements of the criminal justice system such as the
youth offending services and drug action teams. CS officers need good project management
and implementation skills (Erol and Millie, 2006) and the ability to develop relationships
with other agencies which ‘go beyond policy networks and become delivery boards’ (Schiller,
2006: 29). They need to be able to manage the processes of change and have leadership
skills which enable them to bring together diverse groups with competing agendas. They also
require skills in communicating with the public, both in identifying public concerns and
priorities and in engaging local people as participants in community safety initiatives.

The development of the community safety and
ASB certificates

In 2004 Government Office West Midlands (GOWM) approached IASS seeking to develop
training and education for community safety professionals. A regional training audit had
identified gaps in the skills and knowledge base of CS staff, and GOWM decided to put
resources into resolving them. This was a local drive rather than a national initiative though
it chimed with ‘the mood of the time’; thus Schiller (2006: 29) warned that ‘the lack of a
professional training programme for CS staff...and the limited resources for training... can
leave (them) with all the responsibility but limited capacity for response’.

An important factor shaping our response to this request was that IASS is a major centre for
social work education and, indeed, is the longest established academic provider of social
work qualifications in the UK. The IASS social work programme is built on the values of
social justice, anti-oppressive practice and critical reflection, and it was thus axiomatic that
these values would run through all elements of any programme for community justice
workers. For its part, GOWM was clear what knowledge and skills should be covered by the
programme and a three module (60 credits) certificate course was negotiated between
GOWM and IASS staff (equating to level 4 of the higher education qualifications
framework). The Certificate in Crime, Community Safety and Social Policy included two
compulsory modules on knowledge (crime, criminality and community safety) and skills
working with information, project and partnership management and working with
communities). A third module offered a choice between two options: ‘offender
management’, which examined community-based methods for dealing with offenders, and
‘crime control and public policy’, which explored the relationships between community safety
and wider social policy objectives. Each module involved five days face to face teaching and was usually assessed through a written assignment.

Within 6 months of the development of the community safety programme, IASS was approached by Birmingham Anti-Social Behaviour Unit (BASBU) and other West Midlands agencies to develop a ‘bespoke’ certificate for ASB professionals. A steering group of BASBU practitioners and managers, the Chair of the Social Landlords Nuisance Group, a local authority legal advisor and police and housing representatives, together with University staff, was formed to develop the curriculum. Actively drawing on research from a recent evaluation report on the impact of BASBU (Prior, Farrow and Paris, 2004), the group negotiated the direction and structure of a pilot programme. The Antisocial Behaviour Prevention and Intervention Certificate (60 credits, level 4) comprised three compulsory modules: the first covered the wider context of ASB as a social ‘problem’ and the aims and values underpinning different kinds of response to it; the second module considered the skills associated with specific forms of practice, both formal and informal, which reflected preventative and reactive interventions, including legal enforcement; and the third explored the role of ASB officers in partnership working with other agencies and between sectors.

The informational content of the programme was then matched with the relevant Skills for Justice National Occupational Standards (www.skillsforjustice.com). Values and skills associated with anti-discriminatory practice were a core theme of the ASB programme.

Students were admitted to the programmes provided they were formally supported by their employer, and met criteria of current job relevance, appropriate experience and educational standards. In line with University of Birmingham admissions criteria, students could be registered at either graduate level, if they did not possess an undergraduate degree, or postgraduate level if they did possess a degree. However the students were taught as one group and covered the same curriculum; the difference between the graduate and postgraduate levels was reflected in the marking criteria for assignments. This difference in academic levels did not appear to be reflected in differences of job roles and responsibilities or levels of remuneration, although the graduate/postgraduate distinction is an issue that would need to be addressed in any future national qualifying framework for these occupations.

The community safety programme had been initially wholly funded and subsequently partially funded by GOWM, such that participants on the course had been drawn from a wide range of agencies including local authorities, the police, the fire service, probation, GOWM, housing providers and voluntary organisations. All participants were required to have community safety as a central component of their job description and as places were limited they were shared between agencies and across the region. The ASB programme, although engendering considerable support from stakeholders, relied on employers paying fees for each participant and as a result had a smaller intake for each cohort. Participants on the ASB programme were for the most part ASB practitioners and managers, including social housing managers who had specific responsibility for ASB. Between 2006 and 2008 two cohorts successfully completed each of the certificates making 70 students in total.

Feedback about the programmes was generally very positive with a number of students expressing the wish to study further and build on the certificate in order to gain a more substantial qualification.

**Development of the Certificate/Diploma/Masters in Community Justice**

In 2008 the two programmes were reviewed with the aim of addressing a number of emerging issues:

- Issues of student recruitment, with GOWM no longer having funding available to support the CS certificate and some employing agencies reluctant to meet the full costs.
- The considerable overlap between certificates in terms of knowledge content within the first module. Having to deliver this twice rather than once per year was causing pressure on course tutors reducing their availability for other teaching.
- The need to develop a more flexible programme that enabled students to take their study to a higher level and to give them choice in the modules they could take.

Following consultation with past and potential students, employing agencies, staff tutors and the external examiner, it was agreed that the two courses would be replaced by a single programme offering a Certificate (60 credits) and Diploma (120 credits) in Community Justice. The programme requires all participants to undertake two mandatory modules: ‘Responding to crime and anti-social behaviour: core issues and key concepts’ and ‘Core skills and knowledge for community justice: management and practice, people and process’. Students then design a pathway for themselves which reflects their interests and knowledge requirements for their roles, by selecting from a range of additional modules covering such issues as: the challenges for community justice in a society of diversity and difference; ASB policy and practice; skills and knowledge for engaging with individuals, groups and communities; theory, policy and practice for youth justice; and the links between community justice and other areas of public policy such as education, health, housing and regeneration.

Since the introduction of the new Community Justice programme, 21 more students have undertaken the course: 13 have completed the Certificate whilst 8 have achieved the Diploma. Two of these 8 are continuing with the programme in order to obtain a Masters in Community Justice.

**Contrasting approaches: training for probation and youth justice**

In this section we consider the developments described above in the context of parallel developments in education and training for staff in the probation and youth justice services, highlighting key points of comparison with our approach.
Although the Probation Service was created in 1907, it was not until after World War Two that probation officer (PO) candidates started to receive professional university-based training, jointly with social workers. Following the Dew’s report in 1994, new training arrangements were made for POs which separated them from social work on the basis that social work methods had failed to deliver reductions in offending. From 1998-2010 the Diploma in Probation Studies (DipPS) became the requisite qualification for POs. This was a composite of an approved undergraduate degree and an NVQ level 4 in Community Justice completed in two years whilst being employed by probation areas.

The academic curriculum of the undergraduate programme was built around the knowledge and understanding of the occupational standards which Whitehead and Thompson (2004: 31) describe as ‘knowledge organised around the activity of a publicly funded, centrally controlled, criminal justice agency’. This reflected a changed understanding of the priorities of the Probation Service with a much clearer emphasis on the assessment and management of risk and protection of the public, and a reduced commitment to the rehabilitation of offenders. Although victims, potential victims, the general public, the Ministry of Justice and criminal courts might all be considered stakeholders in the work of the Probation Service, it is offenders who are the primary recipients of interventions: the DipPS has ‘offender management at the core of [its] curriculum’ (Burke, 2010: 4). This clear focus on offenders had a particular impact on the design of the knowledge curriculum in probation training, and marked a difference from the curriculum we developed for CS and ASB officers with its strong concerns with the impacts of their work for both victims and the wider community.

The DipPS provided a focused curriculum with a mixture of academic and practice modules which brought together knowledge from traditional disciplines such as psychology, criminal law, criminology, penal policy with theories around skills and methods, for example, motivational interviewing, crisis intervention, working with individuals to achieve change, risk assessment and management. A similar blend characterises the Certificate and Diploma programme for community justice staff that we have developed. Stout and Knight (2009: 271) suggest that retaining probation training within Higher Education (HE) allowed ‘the development of critical and reflective skills ... [and] skills to interrogate and analyse new information especially in relation to risk assessment and management’. Some have argued that the DipPS has struggled to manage the competing demands of academic assignments and practice requirements, but Burke (2010: 3) suggests it produces ‘confident and able workers possessing appropriate skills and knowledge at the point of qualification’ – which we regard as the primary goal for CS and ASB officers undertaking our programme. A number of commentators (for example, Maruna and Immarigeon, 2004; McNeill, 2009; Ward and Brown, 2004) argue that theory and practice underpinning probation has become too pre-occupied with individualising risk in terms of cognitive deficits, for example, poor problem solving, which ignores some of the more widespread socio-economic problems that many offenders have to face, for example, poverty and unemployment. Ward and Brown (2004) in their ‘Good Lives Model’ argue that offenders need to be seen as individuals within communities who have both strengths and other supports that can be brought into the equation when trying to promote longer term desistance from crime. This is certainly a perspective that is encouraged within our community justice programme, although we would argue that it reflects the approach adopted by many of the students in their practice anyway.

Stout and Knight (2009) suggest that one of the limitations of the DipPS was that it was targeted at one grade of staff only, namely, POs, and yet the demand for frontline staff and the resources available has meant they cannot all be trained to this level. Oldfield and Grimshaw (2008: 3) found the workforce working with offenders had increased by 37% during the period 2001-2008, but the number of qualified POs fell by 4% and probation service officers (PSOs) rose by 77% during the same period. This has meant many tasks once undertaken by POs have been transferred to PSOs on the grounds of cost and expediency, particularly as the term ‘offender manager’ (a core term within the current structural arrangements, known as the Offender Management Model) can either be a PO or PSO.

Since April 2010, a new qualifying framework for probation staff has been introduced which provides work-based pathways to qualify as either a PSO or as a PO. Staff in training will work as PSOs and be allowed some study leave each week. They will register with one of three Higher Education (HE) providers to undertake a foundation degree, though the teaching inputs will be delivered through distanced learning. It is too early to comment on the content and impact of the new arrangements but there are risks that the academic learning experience offered by HE will be weakened, with a shift in the training curriculum to a narrower focus on skills and competencies (Ministry of Justice, 2010).

In contrast to the probation service, until recently no single or specific professional qualification existed in relation to youth justice. As detailed by Hughes and Prior (2007), the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 brought significant changes to the strategies, organisational arrangements and practices of the youth justice system. Fundamental to these changes was the introduction of a Youth Offending Team (YOT) in every local authority area. Section 39 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 sets out a clear multi-agency framework for the creation of YOTs. Each YOT was to include, as a minimum, a local authority social worker, a police officer, a probation officer, a health service worker and a representative of the local education authority. In addition, YOTs also employ generic youth justice workers without a recognised professional qualification.

Delivery of youth justice provision therefore resembles CS and ASB work, in that it involves a range of practitioners with contrasting professional backgrounds, expertise and training. A key difference, however, is that while the CS and ASB fields lack both a common agreed framework for professional training and development and any national body that could generate such a framework, in youth justice such an infrastructure does exist. The Youth Justice Board (YJB), as the public body responsible for overseeing and maintaining standards within the youth justice system, has introduced the Youth Justice National Qualifications Framework (NQF). The NQF includes a range of courses designed to provide a common, accredited training programme able to meet the needs of the various professionals employed...
by the system. This includes a two-year Foundation Degree in Youth Justice and a BA (Hons) in Youth Justice Studies, delivered by the Open University: 'a vocationally-oriented academic qualification for students working in a professional or voluntary capacity with children in the youth justice system' (www3.open.ac.uk/study/undergraduate/qualification/b63.htm, last accessed 20.06.10). These programmes are designed primarily for YOT workers with no previous professional qualification, volunteers working in the youth justice system, and those planning a career in this field.

Central to the NQF is the Professional Certificate in Effective Practice (PCEP), which is recognised by the YJB to be the ‘core professional qualification in youth justice’ for ‘both new and experienced practitioners’ (www.yjb.gov.uk/eng/ yjs/Getinvolved/Careers/NQF, last accessed 20.06.10). As well as ensuring a fundamental understanding of the youth justice system in England and Wales, the course seeks to develop skills of critical thinking and reflective practice, in the context of the dissemination of the ‘Key Elements of Effective Practice’ (www.yjb.gov.uk/eng/practitioners/ImprovingPractice/EffectivePractice/KEEPS, last accessed 20.06.10); a series of ‘manuals’ describing the features of effective services, based on systematic reviews of the research literature, and identifying staff and organisational learning and development needs. These documents demonstrate the extensive and prolonged investment in research designed to address questions of ‘what works’ in relation to effective practice with young people at risk of offending, and underpin recent quality assurance processes. The consistent implementation of the Key Elements of Effective Practice is therefore intended to ensure youth justice policy and practice is grounded in reliable evidence, derived from systematic research (Prior, 2005). Currently, an equivalent evidence base is not available to inform ASB work (Prior, 2009) and is only available in relation to some aspects of CS (see, for example, Tilley, 2005). The Birmingham community justice programme has, therefore, given greater emphasis to enabling students to develop both a fuller understanding of the contexts in which they work and the capacity to draw on available knowledge to reflect on and evaluate the impact of what they do.

### Developing the Community Justice Curriculum: Discussion and Evaluation

Changes in the long established arrangements for professional qualification in probation work and the development of a common qualifications framework for youth justice reflect tensions that are likely to be apparent in any professional context. These tensions require judgements as to the appropriate balance between ‘theory’ and ‘practice’, between ‘knowledge’ and ‘skill’, between ‘education’ and ‘training’, in producing the kind of judgements as to the appropriate balance between ‘theory’ and ‘practice’, between ‘education’ and ‘training’, in producing the kind of knowledge and skills, between ‘education’ and ‘training’, in producing the kind of knowledge and skills within a range of different contexts and for varying purposes.

It was, however, also clear that the new qualification being offered had to acknowledge that students would be pursuing it from very different starting points in terms of existing levels of educational achievement. The programme sought to recognise this through flexibility in enabling modules to be undertaken at either graduate or postgraduate level. This distinction was reflected not in what was taught but in the standards by which assignments were assessed. The teaching content and style of delivery encouraged consideration by students of the notion of a new kind of work and what this should mean in terms of its values and objectives. This was supported by the dialogic nature of the teaching, which considered the students to be at the fore of a new professionalism developing around and through them as practitioners in their day-to-day work, rather than being defined in established textbooks and course curricula. The pedagogic approach was therefore one that emphasised interaction and participation, punctuated where appropriate by more formal teaching inputs. At the same time, the programme sought to play an important role in questioning students’ tacit knowledge and exploring assumptions underpinning their practice; challenging what practitioners (think they) know and encouraging critical thinking in the development of practices, methods and techniques.

Although the programme has not been independently assessed or evaluated (apart from the university’s own processes of accreditation and external examination), we did encourage evaluation by students of individual modules and the programme as a whole using standardised feedback forms. Overall, students commented on the usefulness of understanding about theories of crime, criminality and the links with other social policy agendas. They valued inputs about diversity, anti-discriminatory practice and youth justice, not only for the theoretical and conceptual knowledge gained but in helping them see how society demonises certain groupings and that their role needs to avoid confirming those prejudices. Although they need to understand risk and its consequences they do not want detailed teaching on risk assessment processes and offender management as they see this to be outside their remit. In terms of specific skills, they appreciated and made good use of theories and models that help develop effective partnership working, and also approaches which facilitate effective engagement with individuals, groups and communities. Perhaps most importantly, they valued the experience of learning within a university, evaluating current policy and practice and critically reflecting on their current way of doing things. This is evidenced by these anecdotal extracts from feedback from some of our more recent students on completion of the programme. In response to the question ‘How have you changed how you work as a result of attendance on the programme?’ the following comments were made:

- ‘I now practice a broader approach to problem solving when dealing with ASB and youth crime especially’ (student a).
- ‘I do look at things from a different perspective now than before I attended the course. I didn’t question why legislation had been put into place or look at theories behind policy changes, but with the regular changes in legislation it is something I am now interested in’ (student b).
Although feedback from managers in the students’ employing agencies was not systematically sought, a number did provide informal comment on the value that they felt the programme had delivered. This particularly related to the extent to which students had been exposed to a wider range of thinking about issues of crime and justice, enabling them to make more considered judgements in their own practice. Several managers commented that they wished they had the time to undertake the programme themselves!

Conclusion

There are two stories told in this article. The first story is of the emergence, in response to changes in legislation and policy, of a new group of occupations addressing local issues of crime and antisocial behaviour and of the development of a university-based programme, agreed with and supported by local agencies, to meet the professional knowledge and skills requirements of these occupations. Importantly, such requirements were seen to include the traditional academic discipline of theoretical and critical reflection. That story could be read as an account of early steps being taken towards the eventual establishment of recognised professional standards and qualifications for people working in those roles. The second story, told in less detail, is of the parallel downgrading of professional qualifications in the most long established institution of community justice, the probation service. Here, a series of changes imposed by government over the past ten years have weakened the professional status of probation officers, with many tasks transferred to a new grade of less qualified officers. At the time of writing, the new Probation Qualifications Framework for all probation staff is still under development. Whilst this does propose an academic pathway to qualified Probation Officer status, involving study for an Honours Degree, there is a concern that the overall emphasis is shifting from the development of theoretical and critical understanding of the probation role, and the expertise required to perform it well, to a more pragmatic focus on skills and competencies. For youth justice practitioners, meanwhile, currently occupy something of a middle ground between these two approaches.

With the Coalition Government committed to a programme of very substantial reductions in spending on public services, it seems likely that it is the restructuring of the probation service that will provide the future story-line about what happens to the new occupations of community justice. The University of Birmingham Community Justice Programme was already, by autumn 2009, experiencing difficulties in recruiting sufficient student numbers to make the programme viable, as local agencies faced reductions in their training and staff development budgets. It is highly doubtful whether this kind of programme, with its objective of providing a broadly-based, theoretically informed and reflective curriculum to underpin the development of occupational skills and knowledge, can survive in an era when the number of jobs is certain to be fewer, those who are in relevant jobs have less time for personal and professional development and the jobs themselves are increasingly defined in terms of fixed sets of specific competencies.

The core questions addressed by this article concern what kinds of people are needed to carry out the varied functions of community justice, and, therefore, what kinds of knowledge and expertise should characterise the professional capacity of those people. If the kind of programme created at the University of Birmingham aspires to give practitioners the capacity to enhance their practice by drawing on a set of developmental learning resources, future training and development for community justice professionals is more likely to be concerned with equipping them with a ‘toolkit’ from which they can apply specific techniques to specific problems. We certainly think that vocational qualifications could have a key role to play in the provision of education and training for these workers; our worry is that in the emerging approach to vocational training workers come to be viewed as ‘technicians’ rather than ‘professionals’. The question to be resolved is which approach is likely to provide the more effective response to the challenge of delivering the goals of community justice.
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Abstract

In the last decade, the number of people in drugs treatment in England has more than doubled to a total of 207,580 in 2008/9. The increasing access to drugs treatment has been accompanied by an expansion and development of the drugs workforce. This development has taken the form of a ‘professionalising strategy’ and includes the introduction of national occupational standards to establish levels of competence required of those working in the drug treatment field and enhancement of career pathways. This paper charts the growth of the drugs workforce over time, examines the changes in terms of their training and education, and considers the impact of contemporary policy development on their practice. In particular, it will explore the process of ‘criminalising’ drugs work and the conflicts and contradictions this has created for those working in the field. The paper will also consider the recent debates relating to the organising ideologies for drug treatment and how the current emphases on recovery, reintegration and personalisation might impact on the training and the practice of the drugs workforce.

Introduction

During the past decade, there has been unprecedented investment and expansion of drug treatment services in Britain. Given the emphasis on drug-related crime within contemporary drug policy, the criminal justice system has become a major route into treatment services and much of the investment has occurred there. This is a new development. Historically, the treatment services and the criminal justice system have existed independently of each other with very little overlap and interaction. These changes have been based on the growing evidence base indicating that ‘treatment works’ and reductions in crime could be linked to treatment (Godfrey et al., 2004; Donmall et al., 2009). From a political perspective, the links between drug treatment and crime reduction have helped to secure the funding and long-term investment to expand services and win public support for this spending. However, this expansion of treatment and the situating of service provision within the criminal justice system have had profound effects on the practice and training needs of drugs workers.
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In order to increase capacity and access to treatment, there has been a massive expansion of the drugs workforce. In 2001, the National Treatment Agency (NTA) was established as a special health authority in the National Health Service. A key target of the NTA was to double the number of people in treatment from 100,000 in 1998 to 200,000 by 2008. This target has now been exceeded, with 207,580 adults in structured treatment in 2008/9 (NTA, 2009). To achieve this target, the Drug Strategy Directorate and the NTA produced a workforce development plan which focused on three key themes: increasing capacity; improving competence and career pathways; and mainstreaming drug and alcohol skill (Skills for Justice, 2007). In terms of increasing capacity, the number of individuals working within drug treatment in the community in England increased from 6,794 in March 2002 to 10,628 in March 2007. This includes both permanent and temporary staff whose main function is to provide drug treatment in the community. It does not include shared-care GPs or drug workers in prison (NTA, 2009).

The drugs workforce is extremely diverse and complex in its composition. It is made up of a broad range of workers with varied sets of professional backgrounds, competences and qualifications. They are found in a variety of statutory services, statutory and voluntary agencies, and the private sector. Rassool (2009: 260) suggests ‘the workforce is best imagined as a continuum from specialist to generic, falling across all sectors’. Three key groups of workers are involved in addressing substance use and providing a range of services such as prevention, early intervention, specialist treatment, enforcement and reintegration. This includes generic workers with occasional substance misuse functions, such as police officers, prison officers, teachers and youth workers; generic workers with a substance misuse function within their portfolio, such as GPs, medical officers in prisons, social workers, and health promotion staff; and specialist drug and alcohol workers who provide expertise in substance misuse as their main activity, including CARAT (Counselling, Assessment, Referral, Advice and Throughcare) workers in prison, healthcare staff working in a specialist treatment unit, DIP (Drug Intervention Programme) workers, community drugs and alcohol workers, DAT (Drug Action Team) coordinators, and probation officers supervising community sentences with Drug Rehabilitation Requirements (DRR). Furthermore, the drugs workforce is characterised by a highly professionalised and qualified sector which includes medical doctors, psychiatrists, clinical psychologists, and social workers at one end of the continuum, while there are other people working with drug and alcohol users who have no qualifications at all at the other end. Wardle (2009) has also characterised the workforce as ‘migratory’, in that workers tend to move between organisations frequently due to the competition for funding.

Along with the recruitment of new staff, the workforce strategy also examined their training needs and aimed to improve the competence and career pathways of those working in the drugs field. Existing staff had to be retained and given opportunities to enhance their skills, knowledge and career development. A key aim of the strategy is to ‘promote adequate investment in professional development, offering workers the opportunity to develop a specialist career in drug treatment’ (Hayes, 2004: 213). This aim has been underpinned by the creation of national occupational standards which establish the levels of competency required of drug treatment staff. These standards form the basis for many of the new qualifications which have been developed within the drugs and alcohol field. It is clear that the drugs workforce has begun to employ a ‘professionalising strategy’ by developing a unique knowledge base to underpin their professional practice, extending the education and training to become qualified, and conforming to certain standards of performance and behaviour (Abbott and Meerabeau, 1998).

This paper will chart the growth in the drugs workforce over time, the changes in terms of their training and education, and the impact of contemporary policy development on their practice. It will examine two key trends: professionalisation and criminalisation. The paper will also explore the recent debates relating to the organising ideologies for drug treatment and the current emphases on recovery, reintegration and personalisation, and how this will impact on the training and practice of the drugs workforce. Very little academic analysis has been undertaken on this topic, so the paper will conclude by pointing the way forward for future research.

The ‘professionalising strategy’ of the drugs workforce

As the drug ‘problem’ has grown and changed over time, drugs services and the corresponding workforce have expanded and adapted to deal with the new issues and numbers. For example, the growing drug ‘problem’ during the 1960s led to the emergence of a number of voluntary organisations to deal with the problem. Turner (1994) has charted the history of the development of voluntary drug services and organisations and argues that by 1970, a clear pattern of voluntary and non-statutory services was established, which provided accommodation, day centres, outreach and detached work, advice and counselling services. This included the pioneering and innovative work of a number of community drugs services. By the 1980s, the new problems of increasing heroin use, HIV and fears of contamination into the general population led to the rapid expansion and diversification of drug services. The Central Funding Initiative was developed during the 1980s to improve services for drug users. This led to an expansion of the drugs workforce and the range of statutory and voluntary organisations providing drug services. Most of the funded services were multidisciplinary, community-based and accessible. The new workers in the drugs field had a wide range of experience and backgrounds, completed different forms of training and held different qualifications. The HIV epidemic and the emphasis on harm reduction brought increased funding and new players into the field, including infectious disease specialists, public health professionals, GPs and a reshaped voluntary sector, but the involvement of generalists such as community workers, outreach workers and ex-users in drugs treatment continued (MacGregor, 1998).

Turner (1994) highlights the growing professionalisation of specialist drug services which occurred in the late 1980s and 1990s with the demand for formal qualifications and post-qualification training for drug workers. There was concern about threats to funding, and services increasingly had to conform to the techniques of the New Public Management, such
as professional standards of management, detailed case recording, assessment procedures, quality assurance, performance measurement, and service audit. Although these mechanisms can help to ensure high quality services and increase accountability, they can reduce the potential for the development of therapeutic relationships between professionals and their clients (Dominelli, 1997). These bureaucratic procedures can also put pressure on services and constrain their development in terms of variety and innovation. Turner argues:

The difference between the 1960s/70s and the 1980s/90s was that in the former the pioneers were innocent who tried new approaches with little experience to go on, with no clear outcome identified as the goal and with no evaluation of the approaches they tried. In the latter, the majority were less often pioneers and more often drug worker professionals who were cautious of taking too many risks but were willing to push the boundaries of accepted practice to the limits without overstretching the mark. (1994: 228)

Moreover, the traditional autonomy of the treatment services was increasingly eroded, as they were asked to collaborate with other agencies, become part of wider planning processes and accountable for large sums of earmarked finance (Crnfield et al., 1994).

The trends towards increasing professionalisation, accountability and managerialism were accompanied by calls for more coordinated training for both generic health and social care professionals and for specialist drug and alcohol workers. For example, in 1990, the Advisory Council on the Misuse of Drugs (ACMD) criticised the lack of a national drug training strategy and the inadequate levels of training amongst drug workers. They recommended that training in drugs issues be a part of different professional courses and there should be an increase in training opportunities for the whole workforce. In 1995, Boys et al. (1997) conducted a national survey to gather data on the qualifications and training experience of workers within drug agencies in England. They found a wide range of backgrounds and qualifications within their sample. The majority of the staff were either drug workers/counsellors (35%) or nurses/community psychiatric nurses (25%). Other job titles included manager/co-ordinator (10%), outreach worker (9%), other professionals (9%), including social workers, psychiatrists, psychologists and clinical assistants, and volunteers (6%). The majority of caseworkers (80%) had at least one relevant professional qualification at the time of the census. Over half (54%) of those working as drug workers/counsellors entered the field with no prior training, a further 28% had obtained qualifications since, but a quarter of this group (25%) remained unqualified. However, most of these unqualified workers (88%) had received some additional training, mainly in counselling and therapeutic interventions. The researchers pointed to the lack of standardisation across the various training courses and concluded that there was a clear need to establish a set of key competencies for drug workers and other staff in the field (Boys et al., 1997).

In 2002, the Audit Commission report found that in many areas drug users experienced difficulties in accessing drug treatment services due to long waiting lists, poor management and co-ordination, and the unplanned and piecemeal development of the drug treatment sector. This was echoed by Paul Hayes, the Chief Executive of the National Treatment Agency, who argued that the sector had 'developed in an ad hoc manner over the last 30 years. Although this fostered innovation, it also led to wide variations in coverage, methodologies and quality' (Hayes, 2004: 211). Some of these problems were seen to be related to low levels of training and expertise within the drug field. The Audit Commission concluded that:

Many staff in the drug treatment sector are well-qualified, but their training is not always relevant to the job they are doing. Many receive little or no training relevant to their needs. Recruiting and retaining suitable staff is also a problem, exacerbated by the rapid growth of the treatment sector. (2002: 6)

Since the development of the NTA in 2001 with its targets to double the number of people in treatment and expand the capacity of the drugs workforce, much attention has been paid to the competencies, qualifications, professional training and continuing professional development of staff in the drug treatment sector. The key aim of the Federation of Drug and Alcohol Professionals, the professional body for the substance use field, is to improve standards of practice. It sets professional standards and has a Code of Practice and disciplinary procedures for its membership. A specific set of national occupation standards have been created called DANOS (Drug and Alcohol National Occupational Standards), which establish the levels of competence expected of drug treatment staff in three main areas: service delivery, management of services and commissioning services. These include both specific substance misuse national occupational standards, such as support individuals who are substance users (DANOS AB2) and supply and exchange injecting equipment (DANOS AH3), and generic occupational standards from health and social care and general health, such as promote effective communication for and about individuals (HSC 31) and promote choice, wellbeing and the protection of all individuals (HSC 34) (FDAP, 2009).

Although commentators agree that there was a need for minimum standards and competencies for drugs work, practice also needed to be underpinned by an understanding of the value and nature of the therapeutic relationship (Barlow, 2009). There is still a need for training in the theoretical bases for drugs and alcohol work. As Barlow (2009) argues, drugs workers need to understand why they are doing what they are doing and have the space to reflect upon their practice.

DANOS are underpinned by five key goals, which include: the development of role profiles that identify the range of competencies needed and knowledge, understanding and skills required to perform these competencies to the required standard; continuing professional development which regularly assesses role profiles and ensures that any shortfalls in competencies and knowledge are addressed; evidence of ‘basic competence’ to work with adults and/or children/young people and in some of the DANOS standards for all practitioners; codes of practice and related complaints and disciplinary procedures for all practitioners; and supervision to ensure that practitioners are putting their abilities into practice and acting ethically (FDAP, 2009). DANOS also underpin a range of qualifications and certiﬁcations such as NVQ/SVQ in Health and Social Care, NCFE Certificate in Drugs Awareness, FDAP Drug and Alcohol Professional Certification and qualiﬁcations in the
justice sector (e.g. NVQ/SVQ Working with Offending Behaviour). In addition, QuADS (Quality in Alcohol and Drug Services) were developed to establish quality standards for organisations in the field. While DANOS provides standards to measure the performance of individual workers, QuADS are standards to measure organisational performance (Skills for Justice, 2007).

These developments indicate a professionalising strategy for the drugs workforce where they are laying claim to a particular area of expertise and knowledge base, setting standards of performance and behaviour, extending education and training to become qualified, and adhering to the agreed mores and codes of practice established by a professional body. However, as Abbott and Meerabeau argue (1998: 9), key factors in claiming professional status are autonomy over work and a monopoly over provision. In the drugs field, as in other areas of service provision, managerialism is increasingly controlling the professional autonomy and judgement of drug workers. Furthermore, they do not have a monopoly over the provision of services. Many professional groups are involved in the treatment and care of drug users.

Most drug and alcohol users will have first contact with generic primary care services, medical and psychiatric services, social services, voluntary agencies and the criminal justice system, rather than specialist drug and alcohol agencies. Rassool (2009: 264) argues that ‘an active involvement of the different cadres of health and social care workers is indispensable in the early prevention, recognition, screening and brief interventions of alcohol and drug misusers’. However, the education and training in relation to substance use and misuse within undergraduate medical, nursing, social work, pharmacy and psychology curriculums is often inadequate (Crome, 1999; Day et al., 1999; Rassool, 2000). Health and social care professionals may not be able to engage effectively with substance users due to a lack of adequate preparation and training, negative attitudes and stereotypical views. This is reinforced by the view of much education and training, that dealing with substance use should be reserved for the specialists (Rassool, 2009). The workforce strategy recognised the importance of mainstreaming drug and alcohol skill, but it is clear that fundamental barriers and challenges need to be overcome for health and social care professionals to develop their knowledge and expertise to help them in their work with drug users.

‘Criminalising’ the drugs workforce

Since the 1995 drugs strategy Tackling Drugs Together, the preoccupation of many of the developments in drugs policy has been breaking the so-called drug-crime link and greater involvement of the criminal justice system in controlling the drugs problem. This emphasis on crime continued under the 1998 drug strategy, Tackling Drugs to Build a Better Britain, which focused on the development of new treatment initiatives accessed through the criminal justice system. Examples of these initiatives included Drug Treatment and Testing Orders (DTTOs) which are community sentences involving both testing and treatment components supervised by the probation service and the introduction of an integrated counselling, assessment, referral, advice and throughcare service (CARATS) in the prison system. In 2003, the Drug Interventions Programme was set up with the aim of getting offenders ‘out of crime and into treatment’. It provides opportunities for treatment at every stage of the criminal justice process, including arrest, bail, sentencing, imprisonment and aftercare in the community. By January 2008, over 3,750 offenders a month were entering treatment through the Drug Interventions Programme (UKDPC, 2008).

Initially, drug workers were reluctant to engage with the criminal justice system. Up until this point, drug treatment providers and the criminal justice system had existed independently with very few points of intersection. Their reluctance reflected an underlying resistance to becoming involved in treatment and therapy within a coercive setting and the low status historically accorded to health and social care within the criminal justice system (Duke, 2003). For example, the implementation of Drug Treatment and Testing Orders (now Drug Rehabilitation Requirements) encountered many difficulties relating to the cultural, ideological and philosophical differences between the treatment and criminal justice staff. Evaluations revealed fundamental problems around interagency working between the two groups (Turnbull et al., 2000; Hough et al., 2003; National Audit Office, 2004). The entrenched institutional interests of the health-oriented agencies around care, health and harm reduction clashed with the more coercive, punitive, and abstinence-based ethos of the criminal justice system. There were points of conflict between the requirements of the criminal justice system and drug treatment around issues of confidentiality and information sharing (Barton and Quinn, 2002). The criminal justice system is inflexible in terms of its ability to deal with the complexities of drug use and drug-related offending. Treatment services had an established tradition of tolerance and support in dealing with poor compliance. Practitioners are realistic in terms of defining and redefining ‘success’. For example, for some groups, the goals of abstinence from drugs and complete cessation of offending behaviour may be too ambitious. Reduction and changes in drugs use and offending behaviour may be more pragmatic goals. Moreover, the criminal justice system tends to be focused on the short term (i.e. duration of the sentence) while treatment services recognise the relapsing nature of problematic drug use and the long term recovery periods needed. Language variations in how individuals were referred to by the different systems and services (‘client’, ‘service user’, ‘patient’, ‘offender’, ‘prisoner’, etc.) also created problems for practitioners working at the interface of these two conflicting frameworks. Finch and Ashton (2005) argued, in relation to DTTOs, that the treatment agencies and criminal justice services needed to clarify the nature of their relationship and the expected outcomes.

It is evident that the conflicting demands of the criminal justice system and treatment have also impacted on individual drug workers’ practice with their clients. The Models of Care document (NTA, 2006) outlines a number of therapeutic activities which key workers are responsible for in the delivery of treatment. However, key workers supervising offenders on Drug Rehabilitation Requirements engage in additional monitoring activities, including collecting drug testing samples, monitoring attendance and writing reports for the court regarding the engagement and progress of the client. A study conducted by Best et al. (2009) explored what occurred in treatment sessions in mandated drug treatment and examined the proportion of contact time given to each activity (i.e. monitoring function and therapeutic activities). They found that most of the sessions were taken up with testing and
compliance issues (34%) and prescription for substitute medication (15%). This left very little time for care planning, harm reduction and psychosocial or therapeutic interventions which are effective in improving outcomes for treatment. Best et al. (2009) argued that although key workers are trained in psychosocial interventions through the NTA Models of Care, work on therapeutic goals was hindered by short sessions and the conflicting activities undertaken in DRR sessions. For clients who are breached for non-compliance and caught within the punitive system of sanctions, techniques such as ‘empathy’ may seem contradictory and difficult to utilise within the same session. Best et al concluded that management issues predominate over the more therapeutic activities and that there was a need for training and clarification around the duality of the key worker’s role:

Although keyworkers are trained in delivering specific interventions their implementation may be hampered by the keyworking playing dual roles as clinician and client advocate on one hand and as case manager and ‘custodian’ on the other. These are not roles which easily fit together and little guidance and training has been given as to how duality of role can be effectively achieved. (2009: 13)

It is clear that the existing training and education of drug workers have not prepared them to deal with the conflicts and contradictions between the demands of the health and social aspects of their work and those of the criminal justice system. The increasing merger with the criminal justice system has helped to isolate professionally those within the drugs field from other health and social care professionals. As Wardle (2009: 3) argues ‘...the growing alignment with criminal justice has actually only served to further isolate the drug treatment field from other related health and social care sectors delivering care and support to socially excluded people in the United Kingdom’. The drugs workforce employed within criminal justice initiatives are in danger of being cut off from their colleagues working in the community and from other professionals working in adjacent areas.

Recently, there have been important debates regarding the occupational ideologies of the drugs workforce and the overall goals for drug treatment. The practices of the drugs workforce in relation to long term harm reduction strategies have been challenged. Research conducted by McKeganey et al. (2004) demonstrated that drug users themselves prioritised abstinence rather than harm reduction as their aim for treatment. This led to debates amongst those planning and delivering drug treatment services (see Nelles, 2005; Martin, 2005; Roberts, 2005; Trace, 2005). Fuel was added to the fire in October 2007 when the BBC’s Home Affairs correspondent Mark Easton highlighted the finding that only 3% of drug users left treatment free of all drugs (including methadone) in 2006/7. This called into question the effectiveness of drug treatment and the reliance on harm reduction and stabilisation techniques. In many ways, this left some sections of the drugs workforce, who had been working within a harm reduction framework, unsettled and unsure of what their practice should entail. With the increasing interaction between drug treatment and the criminal justice system, there was also the danger that a punitive, hard line approach would become dominant.

However, the controversy also opened up the issue for informed discussion and led to organised debates about drug treatment and what should be guiding practice. These included the Great Debate seminars organised by Drugscope (Drugscope, 2009) and the Consensus Panel organised by the UK Drug Policy Commission. Clear themes emerged from these debates with new emphasis being placed on the concepts of ‘recovery’ and ‘social (re)integration’ and the development of a social model of treatment which focuses on wider social and environmental factors in the treatment and recovery process. This points to the importance of the drugs workforce regaining their therapeutic roles and more generic social and health care skills to help their clients in terms of their longer-term recovery and reintegration. The emphasis would shift away from individually-focused models of change to more social work oriented practice which focuses on drug users as part of wider networks, environments and communities. It also underlines the importance of interagency partnerships, which bring together the different agencies to help with the various aspects of a person’s recovery. Within a recovery framework, drug workers will have to be trained to work past stabilisation goals for some clients and to focus on longer-term goals such as housing, education, training, childcare, parenting, primary health care, care planning and relapse prevention.

The focus on ‘recovery’ and ‘reintegration’ coincides with the new public policy debates emphasising ‘personalisation’, ‘co-production’, ‘user involvement’, and ‘participative public services’ (HM Government, 2009). These involve the engagement and participation of service users in the design, development and delivery of their support and care packages. Under these initiatives, service users move from being ‘passive’ recipients of care and assistance to ‘active’ participants and designers of the services they use. The policy emphasis thus far has been in the area of social care, but there is now a drive to expand these ideas to other policy areas. It is clear that drug users could benefit from these new personalised approaches and should be included in initiatives to give service users more involvement, choice and control in their treatment and recovery (Duke, 2009). However, fundamental challenges need to be addressed particularly in relation to recognising and tackling the social, political, cultural and economic contexts of drug use which often mitigate against self-regulation and responsibility (Fraser and Moore, 2006). For personalisation to work effectively, changes also need to occur around the roles, responsibilities, organisational culture and training of staff. The relationships between professionals and users will be adjusted with a shift in power towards service users as professionals lose some of their power to direct and control services (Leadbeater et al., 2008). The role of drug workers will be transformed as they begin to work less formally as advisors, navigators and brokers. For this to occur, professionals and practitioners within the drugs field need training to develop and enhance these new skills.

**Conclusion**

Over the last ten years, there has been much progress in the development of drug treatment services and the training of the drugs workforce. Training and workforce development continue to be emphasised within the current drugs strategy (HM Government, 2008).
However, the rapid expansion of treatment services and the workforce, the introduction of occupational standards, the increasing interface with the criminal justice system, and the challenges to harm reduction have had an immense impact on those working in the drugs field. As the trends of professionalisation and criminalisation have become more defined, drug workers have lost much of their autonomy in terms of their practice. They are governed by the new occupational standards and the demands of managerialist processes such as monitoring, assessment and measurement. They also find themselves in a policy-practice paradox in terms of their growing involvement with the criminal justice system. The criminal justice framework can be rigid and punitive in terms of dealing with non-compliance and harm reduction. Their practice may be constrained by this framework as they no longer have the scope to use their discretion in dealing with their clients. However, at the same time, the use of long-term harm reduction is being increasingly questioned and more emphasis is being placed on longer-term goals such as recovery and reintegration through the development of personalised approaches.

These new philosophies have much potential in creating a comprehensive, holistic and inclusive approach to drug treatment. The emphasis on the ‘social’ aspects of recovery and reintegration hold promise in terms of unifying the practice culture in drugs work and reducing the divisions and conflicts caused by the abstinence/harm reduction dichotomy. However, different skills and training would need to be emphasised. This would entail shifting the focus away from the criminal justice system and the activities of monitoring, risk assessment and testing, towards developing effective partnerships with service providers in the community including health, housing, education and training. As Wardle (2009) has argued, this would help to end the professional, strategic and institutional isolation of the drugs field. In order to achieve such a coherent and holistic response, a multi-disciplinary, multi-professional approach to training is needed which involves professionals and practitioners from a range of backgrounds, including criminal justice, medicine, social work, clinical psychology, and nursing. Joy Barlow from STRADA (Scottish Training in Drugs and Alcohol) at the University of Glasgow stresses that there needs to be a strategy for developing this integrated response and the various professional groups need to learn together, communicate with each other and provide services together (Barlow, 2009). In particular, encouraging the various groups of professionals and practitioners to train together might help to ease the tensions around interagency working within this area.

There has been very little research on the drugs workforce, their increasing professionalisation, and the ways in which policy and the wider social, economic and political context is impacting on their practice. The values, philosophies and policies of treatment providers have not been studied extensively. Future research needs to concentrate on the perspectives of drugs workers themselves regarding the introduction of occupational standards, the goals of drug treatment in terms of recovery, reintegration, and personalisation, the conflicts and tensions within the criminal justice system and their future training needs. Research with practitioners and professionals working within the drugs field would be valuable in contributing to the evidence base which is vital to develop more effective drugs policy and practice.

End Notes
1. These tensions between the demands of the criminal justice system and the practice of drug treatment are not unique to Britain. For example, conflicts between therapy and punishment have been observed within the drug court system within the United States (Nolan, 1998). Similarly, Beyer et al. (2002) explored the perspectives of practitioners in Australia and found that their private views were at a variance with the overall policy context in relation to dealing with drug-related offences. The majority believed that the response to drug users and user-dealers should be a social and health-based strategy and that liberal approaches designed to minimise the harms associated with drugs were the best way forward, such as heroin on prescription and safe injecting places.
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PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION IN YOUTH JUSTICE: MIRROR OR MOTOR?
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Abstract
This paper explores the current training of youth justice practitioners and suggests that there is now a polarisation between the teaching of youth justice in England and Wales into an unhelpful vocational-academic dichotomy. The paper traces the development of the youth justice foundation degree and identifies a need to balance criticality with ‘underpinning knowledge’ by taking seriously the process of developing learning within the work setting. The paper concludes by recommending a ‘synthesised curriculum’ which would facilitate both employer engagement and ‘academic integrity’. This curriculum, in turn, may contribute to the development of ‘informed practitioners’ capable of addressing the very pressing needs of youth crime and antisocial behaviour.

Introduction
Dealing with youth crime and antisocial behaviour remains the subject of considerable concern in the UK and beyond. Furthermore, the degree of social construction, moral panic, stigmatisation and ‘knee-jerk’ retribution that surrounds the political and media representations of these issues has been fostered in the context of a globalised society. This, in turn, has accelerated the need for ‘modernised’ and productive practice delivered by informed, skilled and educated youth justice practitioners. There is thus a pressing need to provide an effective framework for the teaching of these ‘informed practitioners’, yet the urgency implied by such a rapidly changing environment may itself be counterproductive. This is because the development of higher order skills and the engagement in deep or even profound learning (Hay, 2007) takes time, both from the point of view of teaching and just as importantly from the perspective of learning. The cluster of thinking skills such as evaluation, analysis, and understanding go well beyond the acquisition of simple knowledge.

The implementation of ‘effective’ practice by a knowledgeable and capable youth justice system has significant implications at a number of levels: micro (e.g. for the young person, victims); mezzo (e.g. for families, schools, communities); and macro (e.g. socio-economic and political benefits). We might therefore ask how individuals working in the youth justice...
system of England and Wales (YJS) come to be considered ‘knowledgeable’, ‘educated’ or possessors of ‘expertise’ in youth justice practice. Knight and Stout (2009) for example, in the context of Probation staff involved in risk assessment, have noted that ‘The role of higher education within any framework remains essential if staff at all levels are to develop the skills to interrogate and analyse new information, and develop the skills of reflective and critical practice’ (2009: 269).

We might also consider whether there are substantive differences between the respective ‘youth justice educations’ experienced by, on the one hand, professionals/practitioners and, on the other, by traditional undergraduate youth justice students and indeed, if these differences do occur, whether they are legitimate. It is important to acknowledge at this stage that youth justice professionals are by no means a homogenous group. Their experience, expertise and qualifications can vary considerably from those ‘seconded in’ from Probation and Social Work, who have both professional qualifications and higher academic degrees, to those who have neither. The expertise of youth justice practitioners may lie in counselling, resettlement, substance misuse, outreach youth work, or be of a more general nature. Most importantly, we could ask what the central components of a professional education in youth justice might be—what ‘knowledge’, skills and abilities should be learnt, whose ‘knowledge’ should it be, who should deliver it, how and why?

The context of youth justice education in England and Wales

It could be argued that there has been a considerable polarisation in the teaching of youth justice in England and Wales since the inception of the Youth Justice Board (YJB) in 2000. From that time, youth justice teaching has divided into two pathways, one characterised by short-term, vocational, professional education and training modules (largely) sponsored by the YJB, the other, a more theoretical and critical grounding offered by university departments as part of traditional three-year degrees in the broader field of criminology.

This vocational-academic dichotomy exemplifies the epistemological and political schism within contemporary youth justice as a discipline in England and Wales, which can be described as a paradoxical ‘war’ between two sides who never engage with one another. On the one side we have the YJB, promulgating what might be characterised by some as an atheoretical, ‘evidence-based’, managerialist, quality-assured and practical/vocational position; on the other, a cadre of critical youth criminologists, highly sceptical of the academic merit, theoretical breadth and depth, evidential basis and ethical robustness of the YJB approach. The divide is further entrenched by the relative hegemony of each side within their particular corner of youth justice. The YJB (and its selective research projects and publications) creates and drives the agenda for students training to become youth justice practitioners, whilst prolific and passionate critical youth criminologists have largely commandeered the academic publications that underpin the undergraduate youth justice curricula and shape critical debate within universities.

Such a disjuncture within a crucial area of study inevitably misshapes the theory, research, policy and practice that constitute the ‘knowledge’ of youth justice obtained and utilised by students. This can engender unhelpful and divisive distinctions and dichotomies such as vocational-academic, instructional-educational, professionals-traditional students, trainees-thinkers etc. However, to what extent are these distinctions valid? If they are valid, what could be the impact upon the quality of professional youth justice education provided and the quality of student practitioner produced? Put starkly, to what extent is professional youth justice education intended to be a motor to propel improvements and changes to practice through honest, open-minded and critical reflection, as opposed to a mirror for a prescriptive, rather myopic approach to policy and practice, free of academic rigour, favoured by the governing and funding body, the YJB? What is the nature of the desired ‘reflection’: critical, incisive and augmentative (motor) or imitative and modelled (mirror)?

The birth of the PCEP and the nascent Foundation Degree in Youth Justice

By 2003, practitioners of youth justice could be excused from feeling a degree of fatigue from the extremely rapid changes within the system; New Labour, new legislation, and new ways of doing things were the order of the day. The relatively new YJB set itself the target that by 2006, 80% of the workforce would have received appropriate training. The response to this target was the creation of a National Qualifications Framework in which the centrepiece the Professional Certificate in Effective Practice (Youth Justice) (PCEP) was located.

The PCEP was initially delivered in England by the universities of Nottingham Trent, Sheffield Hallam and Portsmouth, and in Wales by NEWI. To study this 40 CAT point credit bearing ‘certificate,’ students were drawn from practice - Youth Offending Teams (YOTs) or the secure estate. Each student received a ‘learning portfolio’ and a ‘participant pack’ containing a study guide and a set of ‘topic readers’ on The 15 Key Elements of Effective Practice, which reflected the YJB’s conceptual framework for effective practice in Youth Justice.

The course was delivered in three taught modules (of only two teaching days each) between which were apportioned appropriate periods of ‘study time’. Broadly, the first module covered a brief overview of the youth justice system as a whole, its possible aims, a cursory glance at the ‘values underpinning the system’ and some principles of effective partnership. The second module focused almost exclusively on the ‘McGuire principles’ later referred to as ‘the principles of effective practice’ - a framework of principles distilled from research into the prevention of youth offending that supposedly identified ‘what worked’ in reducing offending and reoffending. The third module dealt with the preparation necessary for participants to undertake a mini audit using the now redundant Effective Practice Quality Assurance Framework (EPQAF) as a model.
Perhaps more worrying than the superficial attention paid to ‘student engagement’ in the original PCEP was the content of course materials (for a detailed account of this see also Kubiak and Hester, 2008):

The leitmotiv of the course was rather a relentless presentation of clear resolutions to the questions concerning ‘what works’ in preventing juvenile reoffending. Using the materials alone... it would have been quite possible for students to get the impression the Holy Grail had indeed been found (Kubiak and Hester, 2008: 4).

As mentioned in the above, contemporary cautionary lessons regarding the application of the ‘what works’ approach to the prediction of ‘risk’, i.e. Harper and Chitty (2005), Bateman and Pitts (2005), Webster et al. (2005) or Case (2007, 2006), generally, were ignored. Subsequently, Case and Haines (2009) have demonstrated that there are a number of pressing problems with the application of the risk factor prevention paradigm. However, the level of critique within the materials was minimal in terms of exposure to ‘dissenting’ voices.

Many students appeared to resent the course’s ‘one-sided view’, not least the session entitled ‘The history and structure of the system’ which started with the phrase ‘YOTs were established in 2000...’ (Ecotec, 2003). Worse still, the historical section concluded one sentence later (see also Bateman and Pitts, 2005: 253):

This apparent ‘airbrushing’ of any activity prior to the turn of the century received much criticism from many of those who had been practicing in the latter part of the last century and had witnessed both the successes and failures of youth justice over the last 20 years. (Kubiak and Hester, 2008: 4)

The Open University

In 2006, the YJB approached The Open University to be the single provider of the PCEP and to develop a foundation degree in youth justice. This direct approach did not go unnoticed by other Higher Education Institutions, who may have considered an open tendering process to be more in keeping with a transparent ‘purchaser-provider’ relationship. Indeed this may be seen by some as further evidence of the YJB continuing to want to ‘human resource development in drag’ (Boshier, 1998: 4) were reflected in the content of the PCEP and the early foundation degree modules. For example, the original PCEP placed an emphasis on how to contribute to the quality assurance framework and lacked any contextualisation of the importance of values and indeed relied on ‘heavily digested’ texts.

Significantly, the revised course asked students to consider what the aims of the youth justice system might be and provided a more critical view of ‘pre-emptive’ interventions. A year later, the first Level 1 course was produced, K115 Foundations for Effective Practice in Youth Justice, the content of which represented a radical departure from the previous youth justice training by introducing contested conceptualisations of childhood, an introduction to children’s rights, as well as an extended context for the ‘what works agenda’ and an introduction to law.

The third course produced (K116 Working with Children and Young People in Trouble), also at Level 1, whilst using the same framework as K115, was more focused on work-based learning. The final part of the foundation degree to be produced, K209 Theory, Research and Practice, aimed at plugging the overarching knowledge gap (Nellis, 2001) by examining more critically notions of crime and youth as well as a comparative contextualisation of youth justice in England and Wales.

The vocationalist mirror, not the academic motor

Disparities in the educational experience of youth justice professionals compared to that of undergraduate students may be attributable, at least in part, to the differential objectives of the provider (i.e. YJB or autonomous university) and indeed the aspirations of the student (i.e. to become equipped with skills and knowledge for practice or simply to gain knowledge and skills for a broader set of possibilities). Working within the globalised risk society, political pressures on the YJB for quality assured practice adhering to transparent institutional standards and benchmarks have arguably precipitated the standardisation of educational opportunities and practices related to youth justice (Zukas and Malcolm in Harrison et al., 2002). The commodification of youth justice education for professionals and the concomitant narrowing of the youth justice knowledge base to include only ‘year zero’, post Crime and Disorder Act 1998, New Labour developments can be viewed as an impediment to reflective practice.

Livingstone (in Edwards et al., 2002) suggests that in the modern-day ‘knowledge economy’, the narrow focus upon meeting the skills-based needs of industry and commerce under the conditions of globalisation, has produced a culture of ‘underemployment’ and ‘credential inflation’ (as opposed to a skills shortage), thereby creating a wealth of over-qualified workers. Hyland (1999) agrees, citing the demand for better qualifications and the ‘upskilling’ of workers amongst employers in the UK, which he castigates as the ‘McDonaldization’ of education and training. Such ‘narrow vocationalism’ (Field, 2002) and ‘human resource development in drag’ (Boshier, 1998: 4) were reflected in the content of the PCEP and the early foundation degree modules. For example, the original PCEP placed an emphasis on how to contribute to the quality assurance framework and lacked any contextualisation of the importance of values and indeed relied on ‘heavily digested’ texts which supported the government’s view on ‘evidenced-based’ practice.
The YJB’s perception of youth justice education clearly remains dominated by a modernising agenda to promote economic growth, a cost effective service and sustainable decreases in youth offending through the more efficient training and deployment of the YJS workforce. The modernising discourse of the YJB has prioritised practical, context-specific, procedural and declarative knowledge, vocationalism and the acquisition of skills and competencies over the more academic, theoretical, conceptual, critical, contextualised and transferable knowledge garnered by undergraduates within the traditional university context (McCormick, 2005). However, a deleterious consequence of the modernising agenda has been that the YJB, as a public sector organisation, has standardised and artificially minimised the student learning experience for trainee and existing practitioners (McCormick, 2005). In total, students of the original PCEP received approximately 36 hours of face-to-face tuition, much of which was spent discussing topics to elicit simple responses to sometimes quite complex issues, for example, the nature of evidence itself.

There is an obvious resonance between the PCEP/early foundation degree modules and several criticisms targeted at the Diploma in Probation Studies (DipPS) and social work training, particularly those related to anti-intellectualism within practice-based, competence-led learning (Jones, 1996; Webb, 1996). Some critics have chastised the DipPS for its superficial, non-intellectual and overly skills-oriented curriculum in which ‘there is little time within the course for academic skills to be developed’ (McGowan, 2002: 38). That is not to say however that the Probation Diploma was universally criticised. The small-scale study of the experiences of 15 students by Gregory (2007) illustrated that many students found the experience ‘had helped them to become reflective about their practice’ (Gregory, 2007: 53). Annison et al. (2008: 263) also found, in their analysis of three cohorts of Probation trainees, that ‘the prevailing probation ethos from those entering the occupation continues to be one of enabling and helping offenders to change, as opposed to the more controlling orientation of police or prison officer work.’ For further discussion on the Probation Diploma see also Davies and Durrance (2009) and Collins et al. (2009).

Cogently, Senior (2000) has asserted that this lack of academic rigour is attributable to the precision of the learning outcomes and the preconceived and parochial nature of knowledge specified by the funding agency, equivalent to the instructionalism privileged by the YJB conception of appropriate youth justice education. The vocationalist ‘performativity’ supported by the YJB’s conception of appropriate youth justice education evidences a managerialist and prescriptive view of learning, leading to the potential danger of perceiving students as merely ‘a bundle of functional competencies attained and exercised according to the demands of the market’ (Usher et al., 1997: 101).

In other words, youth justice students can become the commodities in the commodification of learning (Nellis, 2001; Kubiak and Hester, 2008). The mooted danger is that youth justice education constitutes, in effect, training and instruction, such that the pursuit of competencies through standardised knowledge delivery eschews any necessity for actual learning on the part of the student (McBride et al., 2004). This has led to numerous allegations that the professionalisation of youth justice has, in reality depprofessionalised practitioners in the field to the point that they operate as ‘tick-box’ technicians (Eadie and Canton, 2002) conducting ‘korrectional karaoke’ (Pitts, 2001).

**Critical reflection in the YJB mirror**

It is perhaps unfair to suggest that professional youth justice education in England and Wales has been an entirely instructional and competence-based affair with no room for the development of expertise through critical reflection. Indeed, rather than emphasising a teaching curriculum, whereby lecturers (‘schoolled adults’) deliver non-situated knowledge to novice undergraduates (many of whom have no intention of becoming practitioners), professional youth justice education is more likely to involve a learning curriculum that is co-constructed (to some extent) by practice-focused novices/apprentices and experts/masters from the field in a ‘community of practice’ (Lave, 1998). In this way, the learning curriculum consists of situated opportunities to learn the practice of the youth justice community, and to conduct the improvisational development of youth justice practice (Lave, 1998) through critical reflection. The emphasis on critical reflection (Taylor, 2010) moves students forwards from basic technical rationality (instrumental problem solving through the application of a skills-base) to the more critical and flexible ‘reflection-in-action’, whereby professionals can adapt and augment their practice in the field as a (pro)active response to challenges (what Fenton-O’Creevy et al. (2006) term ‘experienced dissonance’) to their preconceptions and established ways of working (Schon, 1991). However, there are at least two concurrent potential limitations to the use of critical reflection within professional youth justice education:

1. That students are reflecting on their practice in a ‘glib and reactive’ manner, in the absence of a knowledge base of any substantive depth or breadth (Nellis, 2001).
2. That the degree of critical reflection possible is restricted by the partial (in the dual sense of limited and biased) nature of the evidence, knowledge and methods perpetuated by the YJB.

Fenton-O’Creevy and Knight (2006) perceive effective reflection by practitioners as the integration of formal, tacit and self-regulative forms of expert knowledge, with the professional/learner challenged to reconceptualise their practice world when experiencing dissonance between their preconceptions and practice evidence. In this way, critical reflection inherent to professional youth justice education could be viewed as a motor for enhanced practice through the enablement of a continual ‘dialectic’ between theory and practice. However, lest we get ahead of ourselves here, it is imperative to caution that practitioners’ critical reflection takes place within the restricted frames of reference (e.g. theories, evidence, methods, systems, and guidelines) privileged and prescribed by the YJB, for example:
• Prevention – critical reflection that welfare should be prioritised when working with offenders is a worthy and potentially useful goal, but one that is inherently restricted by the ‘third way’ preventative and early intervention aims of the YJS since the Crime and Disorder Act 1998;

• Risk assessment – a practitioner’s response to the reflective conclusion that dynamic structural processes influence the nature and extent of risk experienced by a young person is limited due to working within risk assessment processes (i.e. Asset, Onset, APIS, the Scaled Approach) that prioritise the identification and amelioration of quantitative, individualised and psycho-social risk ‘factors’ (Case, 2007);

• Understanding offending – reflecting that young people are able to construct and negotiate their response to risk and resist pathways into offending in the present day may be of limited practical utility within risk assessment models that privilege deterministic and developmental understandings of the risk factor-offending relationship (Case and Haines, 2009) and that marginalise the efficacy of consultation with young people (Phoenix, 2010; Case, 2006);

• What works – reflective scepticism or optimism regarding the efficacy or appropriateness of different interventions may be tempered, or over-ridden, if these interventions either populate or are absent from the evidence-base of ‘what works’ responses and a prescriptive menu of ‘promising approaches’ promulgated by the YJB.

What should professional youth justice education look like?

Nellis (2001, 2003) makes a persuasive argument for the fusion of what he calls ‘underpinning’ and ‘overarching’ knowledge within probation training; an argument that can be readily extended to the education of youth justice to trainees/professionals. Underpinning knowledge is conceived of as the skills and competencies-based ‘know how’ that enables students to become capable practitioners, typically obtained through critical reflection and legitimate peripheral participation within communities of practice. Overarching knowledge refers to the theories, ideas, policies, values, perspectives, and socio-political and historical contexts that framework the youth justice field. Put simply, it could be argued that underpinning knowledge has been traditionally undervalued, neglected and peripheral to youth justice education in the formal academic university setting, whereas overarching knowledge has been marginalised within vocational, professional education and training. Therefore, Nellis (2003) speaks of the need to bridge the academic-vocational divide through the balanced integration of underpinning and overarching sources of knowledge, which would avoid the pitfalls of excessive instructionalism (McGowan, 2002) and the production of ‘pale imitations of academics’ (Jarvis, 2002) amongst the youth justice student body.

It may also be important at this point to consider briefly the notion of academic integrity. Recent fallout between the UK government and their Drugs Advisory Board in the context of the reclassification of cannabis brings into sharp relief the epistemological tensions between popular punitivism and ‘scientific’ evidence. The funding of the foundation degree by the YJB mirrors a similar tension. Tempting as it might be, undue interference by the government as to the level of criticality or curriculum content, for example, around the efficacy of the risk factor prevention paradigm (and its manifestation in the Asset assessment process) must be avoided at all costs. Likewise, in a potentially myopic attempt to ‘please the customer’, universities must be prepared to remain independent of politically expedient ‘truths’.

The balance between overarching knowledge and underpinning knowledge is a difficult one to strike. As Nellis suggests, to be a fully competent practitioner both overarching and underpinning knowledge are required. This is not a simple distinction of practice and theory but an acknowledgement that there is interdependency between the two. Much underpinning knowledge should be, and quite rightly is, acquired in the context of a living practice experience. Thus many aspects of underpinning knowledge such as the detailed execution of the assessment process, including completion of Asset forms, is not dealt with in the foundation degree. The current foundation degree in youth justice offered by The Open University attempts to address the balance by providing some insight into the political (policy) and theoretical contexts of the assessment of risk factors looking back in time as well as across to different jurisdictions. This has required the courses to look at the youth justice system more critically, as well as taking seriously the process of developing continuing learning within the work setting. There are of course dangers in developing criticality without thinking through what students will do this with overarching knowledge. There is the danger of producing student ‘hyper critics’ who become both frustrated and disillusioned with the contemporary managerialist constraints of the system. The curriculum of the foundation degree as a whole must therefore, above all else, concern itself with the application of skills and knowledge.

Conclusions

We believe there is a significant potential for a foundation degree in Youth Justice which addresses the current tensions of theory and practice. Furthermore, we would support the idea of extending opportunities for students to study towards a full honours degree and, indeed, for that to be the benchmark of the profession, as is the case within Social Work and Probation training. As Bromme and Tillema (1995) note, becoming a professional is not a process of substituting experience for theory, but rather a process of integrating the two. Professional expertise therefore requires the integration of formal and non-formal learning with the development of self-regulative knowledge (Fenton-O’Creevy and Knight, 2000). Such complex learning outcomes are unlikely to be achieved through a ‘knowledge transmission’ approach to curriculum design which ignores the pedagogy of higher skills such as interpretation and analysis or ignores the wider overarching theoretical basis of youth justice practice.
Professional practice requires deep, contextual understanding which is built up through time in the work place but draws from theory and research. To counter the disempowering ‘what works’ agenda (Raynor and Robinson, 2001) or knowledge production of the punishment ethic (Farrant, 2005), a curriculum is needed which is located in the idea of reflection on the wider context of youth justice practice, as well as reminding us of the need to achieve the ‘epistemological fit’ between theory and the world of work (Nellis, 2001).

Nellis (2001), in the context of Probation training, suggests a more criminally sophisticated and ethically nuanced vision of what an undergraduate degree entails. Consequently, there needs to be a relationship, or matching between what is taught and learned in the university and in the work place, bridging the vocational academic divide. Employer engagement is necessary but this must be a two way process leading to a ‘synthesised curriculum’.

As Freire (1970: 20) himself has put it, conscientização ‘does not lead to destructive fanaticism or to a sensation of total collapse’ but rather leads to a search for self affirmation. The teaching of youth justice cannot afford simply to provide the ‘rear view mirror’ of how policy theory and practice may occasionally collide (but often do not). It needs to drive forward practice by asking critical questions and suggesting solutions and, above all this, it needs to inspire, to create practitioners who themselves can inspire the agencies and young people with whom they work. Together with the work place experience, formal inspirational teaching should influence at least part of the learning process and thus change practice. Only then can the considerable concern expressed in relation to youth crime and antisocial behaviour be addressed in a meaningful way.
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Abstract

The possibility of a consistent approach to the training of probation officers throughout Europe has been discussed for some time. A combination of factors has led to this idea being given increased attention recently; these include the adoption of the European Probation Rules, recent EU framework decisions and the agreement of the Stockholm programme promoting alternatives to prisons and the European Training Scheme. The promotion of a European approach was given new impetus by a conference in Agen, France in December 2009, organised by the European Organisation for Probation (CEP) with the aim of harmonising probation training in Europe, sharing good practice and highlighting new initiatives.

This article will outline the factors that influence the debate on European probation training and set out the arguments for adopting such an approach. It will also identify possible difficulties and obstacles that might hinder a curriculum development process. The article will conclude by arguing that an appropriate first step toward developing a European approach could be the development and adoption of subject benchmarks for European probation training.

Introduction

The project to develop a consistent approach to probation training in Europe was given recent impetus by the Conférence Permanente Européenne de la Probation (CEP) conference in December 2009, in Agen, France on the subject of ‘Recruitment and Training of Probation Officers in Europe’ (the Agen conference). This article will start by outlining the drivers for adopting a consistent approach to the training of probation officers across Europe including the European Probation Rules, European Union framework decisions and the Stockholm programme. It will go on to identify potential difficulties and obstacles with some suggestions as to how these might be overcome. The article will conclude by arguing that an appropriate first step toward developing a European approach could be the development and adoption of subject benchmarks for European probation training.


Drivers toward a European Approach

The main drivers toward the development of a European approach come from Europe-wide legislation, rules and framework decisions. Although there is little that specifically argues for a common curriculum, the emphasis is always in the direction of consistency throughout Europe. Three of these drivers will be discussed in this section: the European Probation Rules; European Union Framework decisions and the Stockholm programme.

European Probation Rules

On 20th January 2010, the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe adopted Recommendation CM/Rec (2010) to the member states on the Council of Europe Probation Rules. These Rules set out basic principles and draw out their implications for the organisation, policies and practices of probation. Since the Rules and Commentary have a great deal to say about the skills and knowledge that probation staff need to undertake their work, as well as the values that should guide it, they have many implications for European training curricula. Some Rules (#23 – 29) refer explicitly to training and stipulate that:

- All staff shall have access to education and training at the appropriate level (#23)
- All staff shall undertake initial training to impart the relevant skills, knowledge and values, their level of competence shall be properly assessed and validated with an appropriate qualification. (#24)
- In-service training shall be available to all staff throughout their career to maintain and improve their knowledge and professional abilities. (#25)
- Training shall enable staff to use judgement and discretion within the framework of ‘law, ethics, organisational policy, up-to-date methodological standards and code of conduct’. (#26)
- Specialised training shall be available for staff who work / are to work with offenders who have committed some specific offences (#27) The Commentary explains that this refers to staff who work with people ‘who tend to commit particular kinds of offences (for example, sexual offences, violent offences) and / or whose offending behaviour is associated with persistent difficulties (for example, drug or alcohol misuse, offenders with mental health problems)’. (#28)

These Rules set out some important principles to guide the development of training. They insist, for example, that the training needs of all staff must be met; while in some countries the training of probation officers has dominated this debate, probation agencies employ staff in an increasingly diverse range of roles and all of them should be appropriately trained for the work expected of them. Again, debate – certainly in England and Wales and perhaps in other countries – has often concentrated on the nature of an appropriate initial training, but the Rules also encourage attention to continuing professional development. As the training debate continues, the European Probation Rules provide a common basis for discussion.

European Union Framework decisions

By December 2011, all member states of the European Union must have implemented Framework decision 2008/947/JHA 947 on the application of the principle of mutual recognition to judgments and probation decisions with a view to the supervision of probation measures and alternative sanctions. This Framework will allow for the transfer, in certain circumstances, of probation supervision from one jurisdiction to another – typically where an offender convicted in another country is returned to their own country for supervision or in order to carry out a community sanction like community service.

The significance for probation of this agreement goes even beyond the very important specific problems that it seeks to address. There is a long history of sharing ideas about probation practice internationally (Vanstone, 2008): in Europe, this has taken place mainly through the Council of Europe, the CEP, and through academic exchange. But the Framework calls for more than an exchange of ideas. If it is to achieve its potential, the member states of the EU will gradually need to learn much more about each other’s probation practices. Whether or not this will, in time, lead to greater assimilation in practice and, indeed, whether this is necessarily a desirable thing are interesting questions. For now, it must be recognised that this measure can only succeed if it is accompanied by greater understanding of and confidence in the probation practices of other countries. An established educational standard seems one component of this.

Stockholm Programme

The Stockholm Programme (EU, 2009) was agreed and publicised in December 2009 and sets out the EU’s priorities in criminal justice from 2010 – 2014. The CEP had been advocating for this programme to give attention to probation and welcomed the, albeit limited, attention that the programme gave to the development of alternative, non-custodial sanctions (CEP, 2009). With regard to training, the Stockholm programme stated that EU should support the establishment of training and exchange programmes for professionals who work in the cross-border criminal justice. Although probation training is not mentioned specifically (although arguably, probation officers could be included within ‘judicial staff’), the encouragement to ensure that a number of professionals will have participated in a European Training Scheme by 2015 does give impetus to greater European cooperation in probation training. In addition, the programme states that training curricula should include coverage of EU and international cooperation.
Opportunities

A comparison of the first and second editions of Probation in Europe (van Kalmthout and Durnescu, 2008) suggests that there is an increasing harmonisation of probation practice across the continent: the tasks and responsibilities of probation agencies are becoming more alike. One stimulus to these developments has been policy transfer. For example, assessment instruments – especially the LSI-R and OASys – have been widely taken up in many countries and sometimes adapted to meet the requirements of local practice. Twinning projects and other alliances, for example through EU PHARE projects, have also been the occasion for policy and practice transfer (Canton, 2009a). The Strengthening Transnational Approaches to Reducing Re-offending (STARR) project (London Probation Area, 2009) is another recent initiative to enable effective practice to be taken from one country to another.

A table in Probation in Europe (van Kalmthout and Durnescu, 2008: 19-20) identifies 33 specific tasks undertaken by probation staff across Europe. Some of these are common to almost all of the 33 countries covered (e.g. preparing a pre-sentence report is a probation task in all but four countries; community service in all but one). Some others are undertaken in just a few countries, while others again (mediation / victim support) are undertaken in several countries but not in several others.

A large number of these tasks are various forms of supervision. It is certainly possible to identify a set of skills and values that are necessary for some of these tasks. For example:

- to write a pre-sentence report calls for skills like the gathering and interpretation of information (including interviewing and eliciting information from people who may not be very forthcoming), analysis, judgement and written communication. It also requires much specific local knowledge – about sentencing practices that will vary from country to country with different institutions and legal frameworks. But the skills are by and large general ones.

- to supervise people in the community calls for skills of engagement, interviewing, securing cooperation and compliance. Again, knowledge may be different and jurisdiction-specific – at least to some extent – but the skills and the values that should guide practice are generic to all countries.

The concept of transferable skills is also valuable here. Even if tasks are not quite the same, there may be some general skills that can be applied from one activity to another. This has relevance not only for the feasibility of a common curriculum, but also for the level at which it may be taught. Students must acquire the habit of regarding their own experience as a first resource and to identify possibilities of transferring their skills, taking due account of the ways in which the new challenge is alike – but also different from -their past experiences.

Starting with the skills, knowledge and values that staff need to undertake their work offers a different perspective on some potential obstacles. For example, while it has been said that there is a trend in probation in many European countries away from social work and towards public protection and management of risk (Walters, 2003) what this amounts to at the level of curriculum is less clear. While the changes may be more than discursive or political, it remains the case that social workers and probation staff have many skills in common – personal engagement, interviewing, recording, working with involuntary clients, case management. In England and Wales, while social work was rejected with some vehemence as a characterisation of probation work, Smith has persuasively argued that:

...for all the rhetoric of punishment and public protection, risk management and enforcement, when practitioners decide what they are actually going to do to engage and motivate clients, help them access resources and convey a sense of hope in the possibility of constructive change, they will find themselves using ideas and skills that have emerged from social work theory and research. (2005: 634)

The idea of relationship skills should perhaps be emphasised especially here. The very first Basic Principle in the EPR states 'Probation agencies shall aim to reduce reoffending by establishing positive relationships with offenders ...'. The RNR model (Andrews and Bonta, 2010) has come to emphasise the importance of the relationship in effecting change. Some of its more recent emphasis came from the meta-analysis which identified ‘relationship factors’ as arguably the most important of core correctional principles (Dowden and Andrews, 2004). Meanwhile, the Good Lives Model (Ward and Maruna, 2007) has also set relationship skills at the centre of the work of rehabilitation. McNeill et al summarise this well:

The supervision process begins with the establishment of relationships and the effectiveness of every subsequent part of the process will depend in part on the quality of the relationship, though good relationships alone will not be enough to bring about change. (2005: 39)

So while there are differences of philosophy and emphasise among competing conceptions of best practice, there does seem to be a consensus that relationship skills are a crucial part of the professional probation worker’s skills set.

Difficulties and Obstacles

Despite these strong drivers toward a European approach to probation training, the process of achieving this has barely begun, and it appears to be low on the list of priorities for European probation services. In this section, some of the main obstacles and difficulties that are faced by this project are outlined.
Variation in structure and discipline of training

Contemporary probation training arrangements have developed separately in all European countries, and there is substantial variation both in the location and organisation of probation tasks, and the related training regimes. These can best be highlighted in the form of four key questions that will need to be addressed:

Is probation part of social work?

While we have tried to reframe this question, the extent to which probation officers and social workers should share a curriculum of professional training is salient in many countries. The disparities in training approach that flow from the question are apparent even within the United Kingdom. Probation officers in England and Wales have their own training regime, while those in Scotland and Northern Ireland undertake social work training. This means that probation officers who have trained in England and Wales are not qualified to practice in Northern Ireland or Scotland (Stout and Thompson, 2008). Looking Europe wide, some nations (including Austria, Ireland and the Netherlands) require probation officers to be qualified social workers so training encompasses skills and knowledge beyond criminal justice (Koss, 2008; O’Donovan, 2008; van Kalmthout and Tigges, 2008).

The question of whether probation is part of social work relates to the breadth of the curriculum, and how much training beyond core probation tasks is required. It also relates to the question of probation values, where probation is part of social work, social work values provide a basis for training, but in other jurisdictions those values are derived elsewhere. The recent adoption by the CEP of core probation values provides a strong foundation for values training in a probation training curriculum (CEP, 2010), while the European Rules also emphasise values in the work of probation.

What is the relationship between the probation and prison?

Those familiar with the progression of probation work in England and Wales over the last two decades might be tempted to consider the debate over the identity of probation as a continuum with social work at one end, associated with a liberal approach, and prison at the other, associated with a punitive approach. This is a crude, and arguably inaccurate, way to characterise probation training arrangements in England and Wales, and the more complex European probation training arrangements highlight this. In some countries, such as Slovenia, there is a blurring of roles with some probation tasks undertaken by prison officers, and others by social workers (Novak, 2008). In some other countries, probation work is strongly associated with prison. As well as the National Offender Management Service (NOMS) in England and Wales, this is particularly true in France and in Lithuania, where probation training takes place at the Prison Training Centre in each country (Pelissier and Perrier, 2008; Deviikyte, 2008).

The issues regarding the relationship with prisons are similar to those regarding the relationship with social work. It needs to be determined what training, beyond core probation tasks, is required. The issue of values remains important, in most instances the process of training prison officers in values has been very different to that experienced in social work. However, it could be argued that the differences relate more to language used than to substantive differences in professional values.

Legitimacy and decency are discussed more commonly in a prison context but clearly have relevance to probation, and a human rights discourse can link the two professions (Bennett, 2008; Liebling and Price, 2001; Canton, 2009b).

Should probation training be centralised or decentralised?

The most common training arrangements for probation officers in Europe is a decentralised regime, with some general standards being set and a variety of institutions being permitted to deliver probation training. Countries that deliver probation training as part of social work follow these arrangements, for example in Ireland and the Netherlands (O’Donovan, 2008; van Kalmthout and Tigges, 2008).

Other jurisdictions with less of a direct link to social work also follow decentralised regimes, such as in Belgium and Catalonia (Laurens, 2008; Barberan, 2008). However, this is not universally the case and some countries do rely solely or mainly on one prominent training institution. In France, all initial probation officer training is delivered on a residential basis in the National Prison Service School, in Agen (Pelissier and Perrier, 2008). In Norway, the Correctional Service Staff Academy (KRS) provides professional training residentially (Ploeg, 2008).

Whether a training regime is centralised or decentralised presents very different challenges regarding the adoption of a core curriculum. Where training arrangements are centralised, it is just necessary for one provider to accept or reject the curriculum. A decentralised regime provides a more complex challenge, and greater difficulties in maintaining a consistent approach. Decentralised training arrangements do, however, have many other strengths and the prevalence of these arrangements point toward the need to develop looser benchmarks rather than a more prescriptive core curriculum. This would allow each country to manage its own debates regarding what training should be delivered within the organisation and what should come from universities, and what should be qualifying training and what should be continuing professional development.

What is the appropriate level for probation training?

The fourth question relating to the varied approach throughout Europe relates to the educational level where probation training is located. At the highest level, probation officers acquire Masters degrees in Bulgaria and Ireland, with a Masters qualification a basic requirement in the Czech Republic (Rusinov et al., 2008; O’Donovan, 2008; Ourednickova, 2008). Honours degrees are required in England and Wales, Catalonia and the Netherlands (Knight and Stout, 2009; Barberan, 2008; van Kalmthout and Tigges, 2008). In other countries, including Belgium, Croatia, Denmark and Germany probation officers are simply required to undertake suitable in-service professional training, although in some of these countries applicants are expected to have already acquired a suitable university qualification.
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European developing democracies find all aspects of criminal justice reform to be a challenge (see, for example Goldsmith (2009), Beck and Robertson (2009) and Stojanovic and Downes (2009) for a discussion of policing developments in Turkey, Russia and Serbia) and probation tends to be lower down the list of priorities than police or prison. These developing democracies do look to the established democracies of Western Europe for ideas and support. This should provide an opportunity for shared learning, and a consistency of approach, but the process of policy transfer is not an easy or straightforward one (Canton, 2009a). In some European countries, not necessarily just developing democracies, the issue of devising a probation training curriculum that is in line with that of other European countries is simply not a priority at all.

In addition to the need to address the questions outlined above, any process of change also has to take account of the intrinsic challenges in making changes to established systems. Where probation training regimes are in place – whether in one institution or in many, and regardless of the level and the connection to social work or prisons – they will have been created through internal and external processes and will be difficult to revisit. Even if it was possible to impose a new curriculum, the practical difficulties in changing from one system to another could create great resistance to that process. Jurisdictions with newer probation services that are at an early stage of developing training regimes might be more open to a new European curriculum, but that is less likely to be the case in the more established probation services.

The questions and challenges noted above will need to be addressed but it would be wrong to consider them to be insurmountable, or to primarily focus on difficulties rather than possibilities. The following section outlines a possible way forward.

**Benchmarks**

The Agen Conference was a key stage in the process of developing a consistent European approach to probation training. It enabled the sharing of learning and experiences from jurisdictions throughout Europe as well as discussions regarding the general principles of training and recruitment. The conference gave rise to a project group (the European Probation Curriculum Group (EPCG)), tasked with making progress toward the development of a European curriculum.

In light of the variety of provision throughout Europe and some of the challenges outlined above, the EPCG has taken a view that a productive approach would be to develop European probation training benchmarks, rather than a full curriculum. The use of benchmarks is familiar to academics in the UK, through the work of the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) in developing subject benchmarks. The QAA defines benchmarks:

*Subject benchmark statements set out expectations about standards of degrees in a range of subject areas. They describe what gives a discipline its coherence and identity, and define what can be expected of a graduate in terms of the abilities and skills needed to develop understanding or competence in the subject. (QAA, 2010)*

In contrast, a curriculum is generally considered to be more detailed, and more prescriptive. An example definition (albeit with regard to schools, rather than universities) is provided by the Qualifications and Curriculum Development Agency (QCDA):
A curriculum will include how a subject will be taught and will set out details such as the order in which subjects will be covered, timetables and assessment strategies. It would be undesirable, and unrealistic, to attempt to impose a full programme on individual European jurisdictions in this way. Benchmarks, in contrast, focus on what will be taught. The development of benchmarks would shift the focus away from differences in individual jurisdictions onto the question of what knowledge, skills and values are required for probation officers to do their jobs. There is significant variation in the organisation of probation in European countries and a diversity of task but, crucially, there is no incompatibility in the roles that probation officers are asked to perform. Core tasks, such as the assessment and supervision of offenders, are carried out in all jurisdictions and require similar knowledge and skills. Tasks that are present in very few jurisdictions (for example probation officers provide supervision to pre-trial detainees in the Czech Republic, the Netherlands and Scotland) will nonetheless call on skills and knowledge that will be familiar to probation officers in other jurisdictions.

Developing benchmarks builds on the work already carried out to achieve consistency in probation practice and training throughout Europe. The CEP has already started the work of identifying and summarising the core probation values required throughout Europe (CEP, 2010). The Probation Rules require initial training to impart the relevant skills, knowledge and values, leading to a properly assessed and validated qualification. References to benchmarks will allow individual jurisdictions to develop their own curriculum and to include country specific modules to cover their own particular legislation and role requirements, but yet retain European consistency.

The EPCG has been tasked to investigate further the core tasks and training needs of probation officers in the jurisdictions associated with the CEP. At the time of writing, this project is underway, and once the information has been gathered, the next step will be to develop and then promulgate Europe wide benchmarks. The initial response to the EPCG’s request for information has been promising, and the completion of this group’s task will be a significant step toward the development of a consistent approach to probation training throughout Europe – a goal that is both desirable and achievable.

References
Trust Me, I’m a Doctor: Academic Knowledge and Professional Practice in the Criminal Justice Sector

Jane Creaton, Associate Dean in the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Portsmouth & Dr. Phil Clements, Principal Lecturer in Criminial Justice and Associate Head at the Institute of Criminal Justice Studies, University of Portsmouth

Abstract

Professional doctorates are becoming increasingly well established in UK higher education, with a growth in the number and diversity of programmes being offered. Several institutions have now developed professional doctorates which are targeted at criminal justice professionals. Although there is an increasing body of research which has examined the impact of professional doctorates, this has tended to focus on the more established programmes, such as education, engineering and business administration. This article explores the role of professional doctorates in the specific context of the Criminal Justice Sector. It provides an overview of the relationship between higher education and criminal justice institutions and explores some of the tensions between academic and administrative criminology. It compares recruitment, programme structures, curriculum content and assessment across selected programmes and considers how these reflect complex sets of relationships between different higher education institutions and different professions within the sector. It concludes with a discussion of the future role of professional doctorates in the sector and analyses the implications for higher education institutions and criminal justice professionals, and for criminal justice education and training as a whole.

Introduction

Since the first professional doctorates were introduced in the UK in 1992 (Bourner, Bowden and Laing, 2001) there has been a considerable growth in the number and range of programmes being offered. The most recent national survey undertaken in 2005 by the UK Council for Graduate Education (UKCGE) identified 192 programmes offered across a broad field of disciplinary areas (Powell and Long, 2005). Whilst programmes in areas such as education, engineering and business administration have become well established, it is
only in the last few years that programmes targeted specifically at the Criminal Justice Sector have begun to emerge. In this article, we outline the history, structure and characteristics of the professional doctorate and position the qualification in the wider context of education and training within the Criminal Justice Sector. We offer a comparison of the professional doctorate programmes that are currently available and consider how different structures, curricula and modes of assessment may reflect different conceptions of what constitutes valid knowledge. We conclude that the professional doctorate provides an exciting opportunity for criminal justice professionals to receive a higher level award that provides recognition of their contribution both to academic knowledge and to professional practice. However, the nature of the award also has some implications for the relationship between higher education and the Criminal Justice Sector, which may require further consideration.

**Professional Doctorates – The Background**

The UKCGE survey defined professional doctorates as ‘An award at a doctoral level where the field of study is a professional discipline and which is distinguished from the PhD by a title that refers to that profession’ (Powell and Long, 2005: 7). Although professional doctorates as currently constituted are a relatively new phenomenon in higher education, they have their roots in the subject-based doctorates such as Doctor of Law and Doctor of Theology that were offered by European universities from the 13th century onwards (UK Council for Graduate Education, 2002). The first modern professional doctorates were launched in 1992: a Doctorate of Education (EdD) at the University of Bristol and a Doctorate in Engineering (EngD) at the University of Warwick, the University of Manchester Institute of Science and Technology (UMIST)/University of Manchester, and the University of Wales (Bourner et al., 2001).

The Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) Framework for Higher Education Qualification does not differentiate between the PhD and the professional doctorate. Doctoral degrees are awarded for ‘the creation and interpretation of new knowledge, through original research or other advanced scholarship, of a quality to satisfy peer review, extend the forefront of the discipline, and merit publication’ (Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education, 2008: 23). Nevertheless, perceptions of the status of the award vary both in the academic community and in the professions. Some of the concerns about parity of quality and standards have been traced to differences in the time requirements for completion, entry qualifications and the length of the final thesis (Ellis and Lee, 2005; Neumann, 2005; Pearson, 1999).

It is certainly the case that there are structural differences between professional doctorate and PhD programmes, although as some commentators have noted, these differences are perhaps becoming less distinct with changing practices in the structure and delivery of PhDs (Thomson and Walker, 2010). The defining features of the professional doctorate can, however, be discerned in part through comparison with the PhD. A key difference lies in the taught element of the programme. Although many UK PhDs now include an element of research methods training, and the ‘new route’ PhD contains a more significant taught element, the traditional doctorate in humanities and social sciences requires a three year period of research supported by a supervisor. A more usual model for a professional doctorate programme is a two year taught programme delivered on a cohort basis, followed by a research stage taking a minimum of two years. The content of the taught element varies across the programmes but will typically include research methodology, publication and dissemination, professional reflection or practice, and some subject-specific content. This is delivered and assessed through a series of modules credited at D level. Although students write an amount over the course of the programme that is broadly equivalent to the total words required for a PhD thesis, the final professional doctorate thesis is often shorter.

A second key difference is that the professional doctorate is embedded in professional practice. For entry to named professional doctorate awards there is typically a requirement that the student is employed in or otherwise engaged with the profession. The QAA Framework for Higher Education (2008: 25) notes that ‘Professional doctorates aim to develop an individual’s professional practice and to support them in producing a contribution to (professional) knowledge’. Assessments undertaken for the taught element of the programme therefore often involve an element of work-based learning, professional reflection or action research. The final research project undertaken for the thesis is also undertaken in the context of the student’s professional practice. This focus on the individual’s professional practice means that professional doctorates are also characterised by a greater degree of reflection and reflexivity than may be the case in a PhD.

However, debates over the equivalence between the PhD and the professional doctorate can also be seen to have an epistemological dimension, in that they are concerned with what constitutes a legitimate source of knowledge. Although professional doctorate students are undoubtedly engaged in the creation of new knowledge, this is often informal, situated and contingent knowledge generated through professional practice (Eraut, 1994, 2000) rather than with the more formal disciplinary-based knowledge of the academy (Becher and Trowler, 2001). Although Gibbons et al. (1994) have argued that disciplinary knowledge is being challenged by new ‘Mode 2 knowledge’, which is produced outside the academy in the context of application, and characterised by transdisciplinarity and heterogeneity, disciplinary boundaries in the organisational framework of the university have remained relatively intact. Furthermore, this Mode 1/Mode 2 model may be insufficiently sophisticated to capture the complexity of the relationships between academic and professional knowledge in the context of the professional doctorate.

Scott, Brown, Lunt and Thorne (2004) propose an alternative explanatory framework, which includes four different modes of knowledge: disciplinary; technical rationality; dispositional; and critical knowledge. Whilst they suggest that disciplinarity is indifferent to the practice setting, technical rationality ‘...prioritises outsider knowledge over practice-based knowledge’ (Scott et al., 2004: 53). Dispositional knowledge generated through reflection and reflective practice is well established in educational and health disciplines, but may also be viewed with suspicion in some academic contexts. Critical knowledge, where the purpose is ‘explicitly or implicitly political and change oriented’ may also be regarded as insufficiently objective.
They suggest that professional doctorate programmes draw on different configurations of these modes of knowledge, and that specific patterns are shaped by the relationship between the student, the profession in which he or she is located, and the higher education institution. It is to these specific relationships to which we will now turn.

**The Criminal Justice Context**

Tensions between academic and professional knowledge can be clearly observed in the Criminal Justice Sector. The production of knowledge about crime and criminality has had a long and established presence outside the academy, in government institutions and in professional practice. Crime and the reduction of crime has also become central to modern political agendas and the government drives evaluation and research priorities and shapes the production of knowledge. Rock (2007: 35) notes the consequent growing influence of government funding in 'shaping the form, mode and content of the discipline'. The production of criminological knowledge in government departments or research units is referred to by many academic criminologists as 'administrative criminology' and has been the subject of significant critique for its failure to adequately theorise or critique managerialist approaches. Presdee (2004: 276), for example, criticises it for a pseudo-scientific approach which has 'produced an overdetermined descriptive criminology'. The contested discourses and practices of academic and administrative criminology are also evident in education and training programmes for criminal justice professionals, which reflect the different ways that professional experience is constructed within different programmes.

The relationship between policing and higher education is perhaps the one which is most well documented and researched (Lee and Punch, 2004; Punch, 2007). The police service was traditionally a non-graduate profession with a reputation for scepticism about, or even hostility towards, university education (Lee and Punch, 2004). Even where the official rhetoric embraced higher education, Young (1991: 38) noted that the police service still held to 'a central ethic of distrust of the academic'. However, there have been a number of changes in both policing and in higher education over the past 20 years, which have impacted on the relationship between the police service and universities. With participation rates in higher education reaching 45% of 17-30 year olds in 2008/9 (National Statistics, 2010), more graduates are being recruited into the police service. Other institutions have entered into partnerships with local forces to deliver a foundation degree as part of the Initial Police Learning and Development Programme (IPLDP). As a consequence of these developments there are an increasing number of police officers with graduate qualifications. There were, for example, over 5,000 graduates (16% of the total number of full-time employees) serving in the Metropolitan Police by 2008 (Metropolitan Police, 2008).

Despite the trend towards contractual partnerships between individual police services and higher education institutions in delivering foundation degrees, most police graduates have acquired their qualification outside of the police education and training framework. This is in sharp contrast to the position in the Probation Service where, until 2010, trainee probation officers were recruited to a two year full-time programme leading to a BA Honours Degree in Community Justice (incorporating a Level 4 NVQ in Work with Offending Behaviour), successful completion of which led automatically to the award of the Professional Diploma in Probation Studies (Annison, Eadie and Knight, 2008; Nellis, 2003; Treadwell, 2006). The arrangements for establishing and delivering the new award were set out in a series of eleven Probation Circulars issued during 1997 and 1998 (Probation 2000, n.d.) and the programme was offered in partnership with a number of higher education institutions who provided external accreditation and delivered the academic elements of the programme to the specification provided initially by the Home Office. The new National Probation Qualifications Framework (Ministry of Justice, 2010) introduced a more flexible curriculum and structure with three different learner pathways through which individuals can become qualified probation practitioners.

The picture across other parts of the Criminal Justice Sector is complex and differentiated. Before the decision to transfer its functions to the Ministry of Justice, the Youth Justice Board developed a range of qualifications in youth justice with the Open University, including a Professional Certificate in Effective Practice and a Foundation Degree in Youth Justice (Youth Justice Board, n.d.). Custodial care is the third largest of the strands making up the sector after police and community justice (Skills for Justice, 2008), and includes prisons, immigration detention, secure escorting and electronic monitoring of offenders in the community. Many of these agencies are in the private sector and qualifications and training, where available, tend to be at the NVQ level. Courts and tribunals, prosecution services and forensic science agencies include a huge range of occupations, with a diverse range of entry requirements and relationships to higher education. As the overall level of qualifications attained by people working in these sectors increases, however, the potential for offering a generic or specialist professional doctorate route is likely to increase.

**Professional Doctorate Programmes**

The UKCGE survey in 2005 identified professional doctorates in a large number of disciplinary fields including education, clinical psychology, medicine, business administration, engineering, health and theology. Whilst some of these programmes, in education, social work and psychology, for example, recruited students working in relevant aspects of the Criminal Justice Sector, the development of programmes targeted specifically at criminal justice professionals has been relatively recent. Current programmes include professional doctorates in Criminal Justice (University of Portsmouth), International Criminal Justice (Sheffield Hallam University), Policing Security and Community Safety (London Metropolitan University), and Leadership in Children's and Young People's Services (including Youth Justice pathway) (University of Bedfordshire).

The drivers for the development of these programmes from the institutional perspective include: an increase in the number of graduates in the sector eligible to undertake doctoral level research; increasing demands for a higher level postgraduate award for students already
in possession of masters level qualifications; and a desire to increase the numbers of students successfully completing research degrees. Taylor (2008) suggests that universities are also motivated by the potential to build up relationships with the sector which can lead to opportunities in other areas relating to research, consultancy or teaching.

The evidence from the student perspective suggests that students are motivated by a range of extrinsic factors, such as differentiating themselves from other candidates in the job market or seeking career advancement, and intrinsic factors, such as achieving personal satisfaction in acquiring a doctoral level qualification, or contributing to academic knowledge or professional practice (Scott et al., 2004). Wellington and Sikes’ small scale study of the motivational factors for a group of Doctor of Education students found that there was a tendency to privilege the personal and social factors. They note:

...even if someone states that they are doing the course for promotion or in order to keep their job, other intrinsic motivations are also likely to be implicated, such as wanting to be seen as a good provider for one’s family, pride in attaining seniority, fear of being unemployed, making others proud, and so on (2006: 732).

The marketing, structure, content and delivery of these programmes do, however, have some interesting differences. Whilst the Portsmouth and Sheffield Hallam awards have generic titles and seek to recruit from across the Criminal Justice Sector, the other two awards are targeted at more specialist groups of criminal justice professionals in policing, community safety (London Metropolitan) and youth justice (Bedfordshire). The Youth Justice award is the only one of the four programmes which has been developed explicitly with employer engagement, in this case the Nacro Youth Crime Unit. However, all four programmes articulate the benefits of the programme in terms of both professional and personal development. The suggested benefits for the student include: improved practice in the workplace; the opportunity to lead on policy developments; and being equipped for leadership. Programmes also, perhaps in anticipation of employers contributing to student funding, identify some of the wider benefits for the workplace and the profession more generally.

In terms of structure of the programmes, there are some differences in the amount of time that can be taken to complete the programme. Depending on which institution the student attends, the qualification can be achieved in a minimum of three years part-time, or up to seven years part-time. The difference in study periods may be linked to entrance requirements; whilst some programmes require a master’s degree, others suggest that substantial professional experience may be adequate. Just one institution offers a full-time option, with the assumption being in relation to other courses that students will combine professional practice with study. There are also differences in the balance between the taught and thesis elements of the course, with the taught elements taking between one and two years to complete. These elements of the programme are credit-rated (the professional doctorate comprises 540 credits) but there is diversity in the number and weighting of the different modules.

However, the most significant differences lie in the conceptual underpinnings of the programmes and the different pattern of relationships between the sector, the individual student and the profession, which are critical to the delivery of professional doctorates. Scott et al. (2004) identify three different models of integration between professional and academic knowledge: adaptation; colonisation; and reverse colonisation. In the colonisation model, academic knowledge takes precedence and professional knowledge is subsumed by the ‘colonising’ tendencies of the university. There are few links between the university and the student’s employer and students tend to be motivated by the achievement of personal educational goals rather than by the strategic priorities of the employer. In the professional doctorate context, Scott et al., 2004 find this model to be characteristic of the EdD and the education sector. However, this model seems to capture the relationship between the police and higher education, where a decision to undertake higher education is (with the exception of recent foundation degree programmes) largely an individual one and is carried out largely autonomously from employer constraints.

The reverse colonisation model, in contrast, privileges the practice setting as the primary site of knowledge production and application. The role of the higher education institution is to provide the theoretical underpinnings for and accreditation of professional knowledge. However, the employer retains control over the identification of appropriate learning outcomes and how they might be demonstrated. According to Scott et al., universities become ‘...players in the game required to move much more into the territory of the practice setting and adjust their way of working so that knowledge is produced which has practical applications...’ (2004: 54). This model perhaps captures the relationship between the Probation Service and higher education described above, in which the practice setting takes priority.

The final model, the adaptation model, integrates academic and professional knowledge and has much weaker boundaries between academic and practice settings. Partnership working between the academic institution and the practice setting have developed to an extent that tensions between academic and professional modes of knowledge have been largely resolved. Scott et al. (2004) suggest engineering as a discipline where this has been largely achieved. The foundation degrees developed by some police forces and higher education institutions may represent the best examples of this model in the Criminal Justice Sector, in attempting to integrate academic learning and professional practice. Although some of the providers have reported successful evaluations of these programmes (Blakemore and Simpson, 2010; Wood and Tong, 2009), Heslop (2010) provides a more critical perspective. He suggests that university tutors undermined the development of the professional identity of recruits through the dismissal of the value of practical policing knowledge. Drawing on Bourdieu’s work on symbolic violence, he suggests the university remains a site of struggle where tutors ‘...devalue or minimise professional experience and subordinate it to academic perspectives’ (Heslop, 2010: 11).

Of the four professional programmes currently being offered, the Youth Justice Professional Doctorate appears to have the most explicit engagement with employers, advertising itself as being developed in collaboration with the Nacro Youth Crime Unit. However, all four
programmes appear to take a fairly conventional approach to the assessment of the degree, adopting models which have been developed largely in the context of the production of academic knowledge. All four assess the degree through a combination of coursework assignments and final written thesis plus viva, rather than some other form of assessment which might be more appropriate to a work-based or practice-related award. One institution does also require students to give a presentation prior to the viva to an audience of practitioners and in recognition of the need to demonstrate the ability to contribute to professional practice, but this is as a supplement to the traditional modes of assessment.

Maxwell (2003) suggests that programmes which continue to privilege academic knowledge and outputs are characteristic of ‘first generation’ professional doctorates, which are understandably hesitant to challenge the institutional status quo. However, as professional doctorates become more established, he suggests that ‘second generation’ doctorates offer a more radical potential to reshape the academic and professional partnerships. In second generation professional doctorates the ‘realities of the workplace, the knowledge and the improvement of the profession and the rigour of the university are being brought together in new relationships’ (Maxwell, 2003: 290). This is reflected in alternative assessment strategies more suited to the assessment of different types of knowledge generation, including, for example, a portfolio of different outputs.

**Conclusion**

Professional doctorates clearly have considerable potential in contributing to the personal and professional development of criminal justice professionals. The award provides an attractive alternative to a PhD for potential candidates who are seeking to become a ‘researching professional’ rather than a ‘professional researcher’. The nature and structure of the programme may also provide a more supportive and collaborative environment for students juggling employment with part-time study. For the Criminal Justice Sector, professional doctorates provide the opportunity for research to be undertaken which will have a direct impact on professional practice and which will equip the workplace with an experienced researcher.

However, if professional doctorates are to have a future beyond a qualifications undertaken by individual enthusiasts, some additional consideration needs to be given to the nature of the enterprise in which the student is engaged and the type of knowledge that they are generating. As we have seen, in many of the educational ventures in which the higher education and Criminal Justice Sectors have been jointly engaged, the value of professional knowledge and experience has often been subsumed to academic ways of knowing, understanding and writing. The professional doctorate offers the opportunity for universities and criminal justice professionals to becomes involved in a genuinely productive dialogue about the nature of criminological knowledge and how it can best be strategically deployed in the interests of all those working in the criminal justice arena.
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The Coalition: Programme for Government

The new government has published a programme of work for the coming five years which it argues is ‘inspired by the values of freedom, fairness and responsibility, and a shared desire to work in the national interest.’

In the area of justice, the programme includes

• A ‘rehabilitation revolution’ that will include paying private providers, by results, to reduce reoffending
• A full review of sentencing policy, to include ensuring that the sentencing of drug users helps them come off drugs
• Secure treatment-based accommodation as an alternative to prison for those with drugs and mental health problems
• Improving the funding for rape crisis centres by using money from the Victims Surcharge
• A fundamental review of legal aid
• New measures, including forms of restorative justice, to tackle anti-social behaviour and low-level crime.

A controversial plan to extend anonymity to defendants in rape cases was also included in the programme but subsequently appears to have been scaled back, perhaps with non-statutory guidance providing some anonymity in the period between arrest and charge.

In July 2010, the Ministry of Justice published a response to the public comments on this programme. The response acknowledges that very different perspectives were evident in the contributions. For example, some responses strongly supported tougher custodial sentences and others argued the merits of community options. A rehabilitation Green Paper is promised for November 2010.

The justice section of the Programme for Government can be found at https://programmeforgovernment.hmg.gov.uk/justice/ and the Ministry of Justice response is at https://www.justice.gov.uk/publications/justice-response.htm
In the area of crime and policing, the programme includes

- A plan to reduce ‘time-wasting bureaucracy’ and ‘health and safety laws that stand in the way of ‘common sense policing’
- A full review for the terms and conditions for police officer employment
- Increasing police accountability by introducing oversight by a directly elected individual
- The monthly publication of local detailed crime data and regular ‘beat meetings’ at which local residents can hold the police to account
- Ensuring protection for people who defend themselves against intruders in their property
- Changes to the arrangements for selling alcohol; banning its sale below cost price; reviewing taxation and pricing arrangements; increasing penalties for the sale of alcohol to children; allowing local councils to charge more for late night licences; and tightening some of the provision of the Licensing Act
- Better recording of hate crimes against disabled, homosexual and transgender people
- A system for temporary bans of ‘legal highs’ whilst awaiting full advice from the Advisory Council on the Misuse of Drugs
- A review of extradition arrangements between the UK and the US.

The Home Office has published a response to the public comments about these proposals. Many of the proposals are to be carried forward in the Home Office Structural Reform Plan, which includes plans to change systems for police procedures and recording, increase police accountability, review existing anti-social behaviour powers and make changes to alcohol licensing provisions.

The Home Office has published a response to the public comments about these proposals. Many of the proposals are to be carried forward in the Home Office Structural Reform Plan, which includes plans to change systems for police procedures and recording, increase police accountability, review existing anti-social behaviour powers and make changes to alcohol licensing provisions.

The crime and policing section of the Programme for Government can be found at

The Home Office Structural Reform Plan is at

Proportion Qualifications Framework

The new qualifications framework for the Probation Service has been in operation since April 2010, with students now recruited to each of its pathways. The framework covers both Probation Officer (PO) and Probation Service Officer (PSO) staff and is governed by the regulations set out in the National Offender Management Service (NOMS) regulatory framework.

Since April 2010, all newly appointed PSOs are expected to complete a Level 3 Vocational Qualification (the Level 3 Diploma in Probation Practice) during their first year in post. This qualification, which sits at the same rung of the National Qualifications Framework as A levels, is undertaken and assessed in the workplace. PSOs with this qualification will be viewed as qualified and existing PSO staff must be given the opportunity to achieve this award if they wish.

There are two routes to qualification as a Probation Officer. The first route, open to those who have already qualified as a PSO, is to achieve the new Honours Degree in Community Justice. This award combines degree level study with the achievement of a Level 5 Vocational Qualification (the Level 5 Diploma in Probation Practice). The second route, for people who already have an honours degree deemed ‘relevant’ by the NOMS regulatory framework, comprises the achievement of the Level 5 Diploma in Probation Practice and a new Graduate Diploma in Community Justice. This second route is open to qualified PSOs as well as newly recruited staff. Degrees currently deemed relevant are single honours degrees in criminology, community justice, criminal justice and police studies. Combined honours degrees that combine one of these subjects with a social science or law are also relevant.

The Honours Degree and Graduate Diploma are work-based qualifications. Students are employed by the Probation Service as PSO grade staff. Their workload is adjusted to allow for study time (typically one day per week) and the majority of the academic teaching is delivered using online and distance learning methods. Three universities were awarded contracts by NOMS to deliver this aspect of the programme. The University of Portsmouth delivers the programme in Wales, the North East, South East and South West of England and London. Sheffield Hallam University delivers the programme in North West England and Yorkshire and Humberside. De Montfort University delivers the programme in the East and West Midlands and the East of England.

The NOMS regulatory framework is at

A New Model for the Recruitment and Training of Police Officers in London

At the end of September 2010, the Metropolitan Police Authority approved plans to make changes in the arrangements for the recruitment and training of its police officers. The new proposals would see the majority of recruits coming from the ranks of Special Constables, volunteer part-time officers working alongside regular police staff. There will also be a route to appointment for people unable or ineligible to volunteer as Special Constables, including those employed as Police Community Support Officers, which will include a pre-entry requirement to gain a qualification in policing and law.

This proposal is argued to provide significant cost savings in salaries, training provision and recruitment. It is also seen to offer improvements in policing as it will require better training and support for Special Constables and ensure that the diversity and breadth of previous work experience found amongst Special Constables feeds through to the regular police. It is hoped that it will lead to reduced attrition from the ranks of the regular police as a consequence of ‘personal investment, cultural immersion and proven commitment’.
The proposals were criticised by a minority of members of the Police Authority who voiced the concern that many members of the public were not in a position to take on a demanding volunteer role and would, therefore, be excluded from recruitment to the police. For example, authority member Dee Doocey stated, ‘Many Londoners who would make excellent police officers currently have caring responsibilities or are juggling to keep down two low paid jobs. These proposals run the real risk of excluding such people from ever joining the Met. A key test of these proposals is whether they help to ensure that the Met looks more like London, with new recruits coming from the widest range of communities and backgrounds. Sadly these proposals fail this test.’

The Metropolitan Police Authority paper can be found at http://www.mpa.gov.uk/committees/mpa/2010/100930/07/

Punishing Disadvantage – A Profile of Children in Custody

This report, from the Prison Reform Trust, seeks to answer the question, who are the children in custody in England and Wakes and how and why do they come to be there? The report reviewed information about children in custody held by the Youth Justice Board.

The review found that the majority of children were convicted of offences that often result in non-custodial penalties and about half were convicted of non-violent offences. No more than one-fifth of the children were assessed as posing a ‘high’ or ‘very high’ risk of causing serious harm to others. Breaching requirements of community sentences, licences and anti-social behaviour orders had led to custody in about a fifth of cases. The report noted that the majority of the children in custody had previous convictions and a number could properly be described as persistent offenders.

The report found evidence, from a detailed analysis of a sample of 200 children in custody, to support the findings of previous studies which suggest that imprisoned children face complex disadvantage. Common features in the background of these young people included absent parents, significant experience of bereavement and family problems with substance use and mental health. More than half of the children in the sample had been on the child protection register and/or experienced abuse or neglect.

In conclusion, the report argues that custody is being used as a response not to the most serious of offences but to patterns of repeat, less serious offending. It argues that imprisonment is unlikely to be the most effective way of reducing the offending of children who, whilst their behaviour is clearly problematic and troublesome, are themselves deeply troubled.

The report makes a number of recommendations for policy development. These include

• More support to vulnerable families from a variety of agencies
• An increasingly welfare-based approach to children who offend, this would include raising the age of criminal responsibility and improving the health and social care provision for children who get into trouble
• Sentencing guidance that clearly reserves the use of custody for the most serious offences
• Constraining the use of custody for breach of community orders where there is no further offending
• Developments to the assessment tool used in the Youth Justice system to improve the assessment of mental health problems and learning difficulties
• A ‘lengthening of the road’ to custody for young offenders with an increase in the use of police warnings and pre-court diversion


Investigating Disclosures Made by Sexual Offenders

Ministry of Justice Research Summary 6/10 reports on the preliminary study for the evaluation of mandatory polygraph testing. The report is authored by Jason Wood, Hazel Kemshall, Sue Westwood, Abby Fenton and Caroline Logue. The National Offender Management Service (NOMS) is piloting mandatory polygraph testing of offenders released from prison on licence having served a custodial sentence of 12 months or more. This preliminary study sought to investigate the nature and process of disclosure made by offenders to workers before the pilot in order to establish a baseline against which to judge the impact of the polygraph.

The report identifies four broad types of disclosures (risky behaviour and situations, historical information, information about thoughts, feeling and fantasies, and sexual behaviour). It discusses factors likely to encourage disclosure and the impact of disclosure on risk assessment and management plans.

The report concludes with some implications for the polygraph pilot, including

• Measuring the impact of disclosures triggered by polygraph testing on plans for risk management
• Exploring the questions asked during polygraph sessions, including establishing whether they have been asked previously
• Investigating whether polygraph testing is effective with offenders who show denial or lower levels of compliance
• Strengthening practitioner engagement with the research
• Giving consideration to additional training for practitioners in eliciting and working with sex offender disclosure.

The report can be found at http://www.justice.gov.uk/publications/docs/investigating-disclosures-sexual-offenders.pdf
Book Reviews

Equality and Diversity in Policing


This text book has been written specifically for students undertaking degrees in policing and related subjects. It is part of a series on ‘Policing Matters’, in which all books provide key information and learning activities related to core modules, and follow a common format of chapter objectives, case studies, practical and reflective tasks, with links to relevant National Occupational Standards and current legislation. This particular volume benefits from an author with criminal justice experience in both South Africa and Northern Ireland, the latter being of particular relevance in discussing the policing of sectarianism, associated hate crime and restorative justice issues. It provides a context for the difficult history of the police in relation to equality and diversity, lucidly sets out legislative and policy frameworks, and examines diversity issues both between police and community and within policing organisations and cultures. Its main concern is to encourage existing and potential police professionals to be reflective about the diversity dilemmas they may face, and to come to understand the importance of promoting fairness and equality in the policing arena. The book rightly emphasises that this is a process which amounts to much more than the ‘common sense’ rationale with which it is sometimes dismissed.

Six of the book’s eight chapters are built around what are described as ‘the six strands of diversity’, these being categorised as age, disability, gender, race, religion and sexual orientation. Although a function of the book’s deliberate structure, the reader might have benefited from hearing before, rather than after these categories were introduced, that diversity is a nuanced term which embraces any state of potential oppression, such as poverty, unemployment, homelessness and so on. Similarly, an earlier explanation of social construction (or labelling) theory would have provided a comprehensive underpinning of the entire subject matter, rather than appearing first in Chapter 3 on disability. The other difficulty, which pervades most contemporary writing on criminal justice is that, having exhorted its readers to refer to, for example, the disabled, as ‘disabled people’, the book goes on to use the label ‘offender’ rather than ‘a person who offends’. Just as in practising diversity, in writing about it there are no easy answers!
These are minor criticisms, however. In each of its chapters, this book provides reliable information and cogent argument surrounding each of its identified strands of diversity. Particularly useful is the inclusion of very recent examples of discrimination, such as the bullying of Fiona Pilkington and her 18-year-old daughter Francecca, because of Francecca and her brother’s disabilities, leading to Ms Pilkington killing herself and Francecca. This had gone unrecognised as ‘disability hate crime’ by Leicestershire Constabulary, which has since developed a definitive policy on this type of crime. Readers are encouraged to access relevant websites and to think hard about how they might behave and apply the law in similar circumstances. Conscious that police activity in relation to discrimination is often portrayed in a negative light, however, the author is at pains to balance this with accounts of more positive developments in recent times, such as the progress which has been made in countering racism since the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry in 1999.

As impressively up-to-date as the material in this book is, publications involving legislation are always at the mercy of enthusiastic politicians. Who would have believed prior to the advent of the Coalition Government in May 2010 that one of the first acts of a (formerly Conservative) Home Secretary would be to restrict the Section 44 ‘Stop and Search’ measures and to abolish ASBOs? At a stroke, this has removed huge swathes of police discretion in relation to race and age, both of which are addressed in this book. However, as noted in the very last paragraph, it is ‘easy to predict that the police will deal with new and unpredictable diversity issues in the months and years ahead’ (p.147). Indeed it is, and this publication has provided a most welcome body of knowledge and understanding from which to perceive, reflect and act upon equality and diversity in policing.

Gwyneth Boswell, Director Boswell Research Fellows and Visiting Professor, University of East Anglia

TACKLING ADDICTION: PATHWAYS TO RECOVERY


The chapters of Tackling Addiction: Pathways to Recovery embody the interdisciplinary nature of the subject area. Drawing together knowledge from a range of experts in the field, the narratives of academics, researchers, practitioners and drug users are blended to construct a comprehensive and interesting insight into the ambiguous concept of recovery.

The introductory chapter outlines some of the definitional problems associated with addiction and its subsequent recovery. This includes how the ambiguity surrounding the concept has contributed to the failings evident in recovery-orientated interventions, unclear treatment objectives and a widespread misunderstanding of what it means to be in recovery. Although, the book acknowledges the incongruence between the individualised nature of recovery and the creation of recovery models, it does little to address or reconcile this quandary. However, the book deals with the complex issue of recovery in an accessible and thought provoking way, which begins with a historical overview of recovery, perceptively written by the two editors, which acts as a milieu to the subsequent chapters.

The successive chapters by Best, Kuladharti and Thom examine the realities of recovery in various projects. David Best’s chapter is an insightful and realistic overview of drug treatment provision in the UK. It not only outlines the realities faced by those accessing treatment, but also the superficial and inadequate provision of the psychosocial support implemented alongside substitute prescribing, which has become ‘a script and a chat’ (p.35). The rhetoric of drug treatment does not match the reality; its purpose remains one of crime reduction and wider societal benefit, which is prioritised over the needs and recovery of the drug user. The therapeutic aspect of treatment is continually sacrificed in favour of criminal justice priorities and risk management, which ignore the importance of ‘social capital’ and the reintegration of drug users into society. If this is the stark reality for those accessing treatment, it is easy to see why those in recovery are so keen to participate in research that may initiate change.

Betsy Thom’s chapter is a judicious discussion of the issues faced by women in recovery. Although, the chapter focuses primarily on the needs of women, she draws comparisons with men where necessary without losing focus or getting caught up in the plethora of male-orientated research. The chapter provides a brief but comprehensive overview, not only of the issues facing women in recovery (mental health, sex work, homelessness, imprisonment and motherhood), but also the potential barriers. Although Thom acknowledges that research examining drug use amongst women has grown, research specifically addressing their pathway to recovery is still lacking. Best and Thom’s chapters also raise concerns for the differentiated recovery pathways of other drugusing groups. If there are gendered issues pertinent to the recovery process, then ethnicity, age and, as illustrated by Best, drug of choice are also likely to have an effect, complicating the issue further.

The chapters focusing on recovery in the setting of a therapeutic community provide a comprehensive overview of this particular intervention, including the Recovery-Orientated Integrated System (ROIS). The chapter on the Ley Community is a particularly welcome addition and has the potential to provide an insightful perspective into such ‘closed institutions’ (Goffman, 1961). Therefore, it would have been interesting if the authors had detailed some of the practises and therapeutic tools used in their programme, including the centrality of the log, the daily morning chant and the use of boiler suits when residents are put on various ‘contracts’. Although approaches vary and are not the defining element of a TC, it would have outlined how the practises implemented in a successful therapeutic community like the Ley help to achieve the aims and objectives set out and discussed in these three chapters.

Alex Steven’s chapter is a well-written, analytical and nuanced overview of UK drug policy; a theme found in much of his work. The chapter elucidates on the facades of drug policy, including its lack of evidence base and contradictory provisions, which have all contributed
to the criminal justice system becoming the main road or superhighway to recovery, through the implementation of coerced treatment. The subject of coerced treatment is discussed in the subsequent chapter by Tim McSweeney who, like Stevens, has a writing style that is critical but eloquent. The chapter outlines the effect coerced treatment has on the recovery process. McSweeney uses the Drug Treatment and Testing Order (DTTO) as a case study and draws on evidence from the QCT Europe Project to provide an objective discussion of the issues. Although, Alex Steven’s chapter leads nicely onto Tim McSweeney’s chapter, it was difficult for the reader not to speculate whether they (and the chapter by Brian Kidd) would not have been better placed at the beginning of the book.

Therefore, if pushed to find one constructive criticism, it would have to be the overall coherence of the book and its various chapters. Although the editors contextualised the subject area in the introduction and briefly outlined the issues raised in the subsequent chapters, they missed the opportunity to convey the collectivity of the chapters into an articulate whole. A more detailed discussion mentioning how the chapters interconnected and an accompanying synopsis outlining their contribution would have helped to coalesce these distinct seminar papers. This was also true for the conclusion, which was only two pages long and could have been used more effectively to draw these diverse narratives together.

Although some chapters stood apart from the rest, all of the chapters contributed to the overall importance of the book and its contribution to this field of knowledge. The book deals with this interesting but complex debate in an accessible and edifying manner. Since the chapters were originally papers taken from the ‘Pathways to Recovery’ seminar series, they are self-explanatory, making them suitable for both undergraduate and postgraduate students across a range of disciplines, including criminology, criminal justice, counselling and medicine. The contents would also be useful for practitioners working in the field and an essential read for people wanting to work in the field. Parents of drug users may also find the book informative as it outlines the realities of drug treatment and the different pathways to recovery.

The book draws the information on recovery together into one easily accessible and comprehensive source, which for many is an invaluable resource in an area where the literature is extremely fragmented and widely dispersed across a range of disciplines.

Tammy Ayres, Department of Criminology, University of Leicester

WORKING WITH YOUNG WOMEN. ACTIVITIES FOR EXPLORING PERSONAL, SOCIAL AND EMOTIONAL ISSUES. 2ND EDITION


This book is promoted as a essential tool for anyone working with young women aged 13-19 years, including youth workers, PSHE (Personal, Social, Health and Economic) teachers, pupil referral unit workers, Youth Offending Teams and voluntary sector youth leaders. Vanessa Rogers is a qualified teacher and youth worker with ‘over 10 years experience within Hertfordshire Youth Service both at practitioner and management levels’ (p.9), who devises and delivers a range of professional development training and offers consultancy to those working in both the statutory and voluntary youth sector. This is one of a number of resource texts completed by Rogers, which details activities for practitioners engaging in youth group work.

The activities are all clearly explained with straightforward guidance on the aim of each task, the materials required and instructions on ‘How to do it’. Grouped into seven sections, they include initial ice-breaker exercises under ‘Getting started’, followed by themes that may be pertinent to the intended target group, such as Self Esteem and Body Image, Healthy Lifestyles, Positive Relationships, Gender and Stereotypes, and Endings. There are some imaginative and thought-provoking ideas, many of which are likely to trigger considerable levels of discussion from participants, covering a range of topical and poignant issues which may impact, to varying degrees, on the lives of young women. There is a clear focus throughout on empowerment, which is commendable.

The book also includes guidelines for facilitating a young women’s group. This introductory section covers some helpful basics, such as participant selection, aims and purpose of the group, evaluation processes and boundaries. However, this aspect of the book’s discussion is very brief and in danger of oversimplifying the range of complex skills required to set up and facilitate group work effectively. Whilst it is acknowledged that this is not a book about group work theory, there is a danger that the emphasis on ‘fun sessions and practical activities’ overlooks the essential preparatory work that anyone undertaking group work, particularly with vulnerable young people, should address. Issues such as referral partnership agreements, parental consent, ground rules pertaining to anti-discriminatory behaviour, sanctions and exclusions for inappropriate behaviour are all touched upon fleetingly, however, without accessing appropriate support, guidance, supervision and consultation, an inexperienced worker may quickly experience difficulties with these type of negotiations and it may be helpful to say so.
Rogers does not discuss these important foundations to group work in any detail. It may have been more effective to say even less and simply highlight the importance of accessing appropriate training, guidance, supervision and support as a group facilitator prior to simply grabbing one of the suggested exercises and running with it. The inclusion of very brief bullet point observations on this subject may serve to minimise perceptions of the level of expertise required to run a group well. The most tried and tested of tools can still prove dangerous if placed in a pair of unsafe hands.

This second edition includes a new section on gender and stereotyping, with some activities which seek to examine male and female roles, how they are determined and how they might be challenged. What is perhaps missing here and, indeed, from some of the activities in other sections is the recognition that there are likely to be many other diverse identity factors which impact upon participants’ experiences as young women and their responses to the tasks. Gender-defined roles will also be inextricably linked to other factors such as culture, age, disability, mental health and class. Again, whilst a skilled worker might be able to recognise and manage such developments and observations within a group, the description of some of the activities often implies a one dimensional approach and response. The one or two introductory lines of guidance at the start of each activity do not appear to acknowledge the potential lines of complexity that may be raised.

Activity 5.12, for example, examines issues around anger and violent behaviour. The triggers for inappropriate expressions of aggression in young women may be multifaceted and deep-rooted and, whilst this exercise primarily examines the behavioural aspect of anger and methods of control, a facilitator may again quickly find themselves in ‘deep waters’, having opened up Pandora’s box in relation to the prior experiences of the young people concerned. Rogers may have experienced this. How can such scenarios be managed safely?

Vanessa Rogers is a well-established trainer, teacher and youth worker. The skills and knowledge that she will have undoubtedly acquired during her professional career as a group work facilitator however are not fully imparted here. Therefore, whilst for an experienced youth work practitioner this is likely to prove to be a very useful reference tool, the misinformed, albeit well intentioned, may not be so successful. The selection of activities, I would suggest, need to be undertaken with sensitivity and an understanding of group dynamics and strategies to manage them, as well as insight into the more specific issues and challenges, as specific to the young female participants in the particular context that the group worker is operating within. Rogers does not make this explicit in her guidance and those in the earlier stages of their careers are likely to benefit from her doing so.

Sarah Hilder, Senior Lecturer in Community and Criminal Justice, De Montfort University

MEN, LAW AND GENDER: ESSAYS ON THE ‘MAN’ OF LAW


Postmodern society has ushered in a number of social changes that seem to have left very little untouched. Contemporary institutions, the world of work, notions of gender, and how we conceive and experience the family suggests that things are not as they were. It is to these issues that Collier turns his attention. Chapter 1 of the book examines the evolution of the feminist critique of legal scholarship and the various ways that gender assumptions have informed what was perceived as the neutral area of legal discourse and practice.

These interventions reveal what Collier terms the ‘man of law’. White and middle class, whose world-view and priorities structure the legal discipline, how it is theorised, taught and practised. Collier also provides a comprehensive review of research carried out in these various areas that highlight with great precision how gender bias operates. Of particular importance is the discussion of the formation of the nation state and the role of law in that process, which is assisted by the writer’s use of Connell’s theory of hegemonic masculinity in providing a framework for his analysis. Many of the issues outlined in this chapter are explored in greater detail in Chapter 3, about legal academics, the law school, and social class and the experiences of those entering the legal profession from working-class backgrounds.

The corporatisation of the University and the impact of neo-liberal principles in higher education and the law school, what and how it teaches and its import for research is the focus of Chapter 2. This is a very compelling chapter which explore these matters in detail. Collier examines the impact of the ‘new’ economic imperative on the ethos and content of legal education that has contributed to a shift from the traditional orientation of liberal intellectual inquiry, to greater instrumentalism and vocationalism. Of particular interest is the finding that, rather than diminish the non-market content of legal education as feared, the growth of social-legal studies has led to greater interest in matters related to diversity. There is growing concern that the cultural shift to the type of performativity associated with this business ethos in the law school has contributed to its re-masculinisation at the expense of women who, it is suggested, benefit the least from this trend.

This is a very important chapter with ramifications beyond legal education, especially those in the area of policing education in terms of debates about professionalisation and the role of higher education in that process (Stanislas, 2010). The chapter illustrates the maturity of the legal sector, its evolution and in highlighting the relationship between the legal profession, major law firms, universities and the curriculum and provides a sound model in understanding professionalisation. That said, the chapter could have benefited from an exploration of the impact of corporatisation on the law schools of other countries, such as the US, given its greater familiarity with this ethos.
Chapters 5 and 7 examine the impact of social change on the notions of fatherhood and masculinity and important developments in law and attitudes which reflect this. These chapters are the most contentious and thought-provoking. Collier charts the historical views on fatherhood and how this has been inscribed in law and the role of marriage in cementing the rights and responsibilities of fathers. He goes on to outline how changes in family structures, the decline in marriage, greater levels of divorce, the improving economic opportunities of women, and new forms of family have legal ramifications. Marriage no longer provides the legal and cultural nexus which ties fathers to their children with import for notions of masculinity. Collier views the introduction of legislation that gives rights to fathers on being named on birth certificates as one example of the growing awareness of the new types of fatherhood. His examination of the father’s rights movement and the different ways this can be understood is very enlightening, albeit problematic in parts.

A major set of criticisms that can be levelled at these chapters is the way matters regarding ethnicity and class are handled, or not, as the case maybe. While outlining the various popular discourses around fatherhood where these matters may have relevance, such as concerns around absent fathers, children at risk, crime and social disadvantage inter alia; other than mentioning them in passing Collier fails to critically examine and integrate the key issues involved into his central narrative when they are of fundamental importance. It has long been noted that black families are ahead of the curve in terms of most of the changes which the author cites as being fundamental to understanding postmodernity (Gouldbourne & Chamberlain, 2001). The African Caribbean family has the highest divorce rate in the country, and one of most diverse family patterns types including the largest number of lone-parent families, higher number of women in employment than their white counterparts all of which has important ramifications for notions of gender (Stanislas, 2010). The shift from ‘cash to caring’, which Collier cites as being a feature of the new fatherhood, is far more pronounced amongst ethnic minority men and those in the developing world than amongst white Western Europeans but, given the limited material resources available to the former (Hylton, 1997), Collier locates these groups to the margins of the debate when in fact they are the vanguard and, in many instances, their experiences challenge his core arguments. For example, the notion that unmarried men have significant influence over the lives of their children given legal changes is questionable if the experiences of black men and men of modest financial means are considered. The very factors which make marriage such an unattractive option for these men are the same factors which weaken their ability as fathers to resort to law (Stanislas, 2010: 201). Ethnocentrism notwithstanding, Collier’s book is a very good postgraduate text for those interested in a range of issues around law, gender, social policy and related matters.

End Notes

Perry Stanislas, Senior Lecturer in Community and Criminal Justice, De Montfort University
ERRATUM


Errata: British Journal of Community Justice, 8(1), contents page. Please note that a typing error resulted in ‘Medical’ being printed as ‘American’ in the article title ‘Not another Medical Model: Using Metaphor and Analogy to Explore Crime and Criminal Justice’.
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