

Criminal Justice System Capacity Building: Lessons from a Longitudinal Training Project in Guyana

Natalia Balyasnikova¹, Galina Sergeeva, Evelyn Neaman, Kaia Ambrose, Rolinda Kirton, Sonia Poulin

ABSTRACT

By drawing on two data sets— a performance monitoring plan and an outcome-based evaluation— generated over five years, this article describes training practices developed within a criminal justice system capacity building project in Guyana. The key stakeholders the project included members of the police force, including crime scene and police investigators, police prosecutors and public prosecutors, staff of the forensic labs, magistrates, and judges. The training sessions were led by international subject matter experts in a multidisciplinary and cross-sectional environment. Analysis of the data with reference to program's guiding educational principles, reveals the following positive factors of the trainings: recognition of co-constructed knowledge within a learning community, cross-sector training, and ongoing workplace support. The article showcases some of training practices and offers strategies for further development of high-impact educational programs for criminal justice system. The authors argue that such training programs need to be dynamic, collaborative, responsive, iterative, and embedded in the enabling environment of a community of practice.

Key Words: Program design, International development, Police education, Capacity building, Community of practice, Professional learning communities

INTRODUCTION

This article examines training practices developed for a criminal justice system capacity building project in Guyana developed by Justice Education Society (JES) and delivered from 2015 to 2020. JES is a Canadian-based organization that creates and delivers training programs to the justice sector across Central and South America. By offering the training events as stages towards creating a professional learning community (DuFour & DuFour, 2013) the programs introduce new skills and behaviours in established communities of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Given that training programs are embedded within a broader system of capacity building projects, they also enhance trainees' potential to influence other actors in the system through their actions and relationships.

The training practices described in this article were developed within a longitudinal training program in the justice sector, carried out through an international cooperation project. The data presented in this article were generated using 1) a performance monitoring plan and, 2) an outcome-based evaluation which gleaned the outcomes and probed to understand which activities and outputs contributed to the outcomes. Combining these two complimentary evaluation frameworks allowed us to generate multilayered data from a complex training environment and understand the impact of the training program on the Guyanese criminal justice sector.

This article will unfold as follows: First, we provide a background to the project and discuss previous research on the principles of criminal justice sector training, we follow by outlining the conceptual framework that guided the development of training programs offered by JES as well as evaluation and analytical frameworks. Finally, we outline the main findings and elaborate on some practical recommendations.

¹ Corresponding author: natbal@yorku.ca

BACKGROUND

Guyana is a South American country bordering Venezuela, Suriname, and Brazil. In recent years it has seen a significant increase in violent crime, murder, armed robbery, and sexual violence. The criminal justice system in Guyana is generally underfunded, under-resourced and therefore faces significant challenges. Despite the fact that nearly one in four Guyanese consider crime to be a pressing issue in their country (Sutton & Baxter, 2017), public trust in policing and justice agencies is low, as are conviction rates.

In 2015, JES began working in Guyana with key actors in the criminal justice system to build individual and organizational agency and support changes in capacity, behaviours, and relationships aimed at strengthening the integrity and responsiveness of Guyana's criminal justice system.² An initial needs diagnostic (Hicks, 2015) illuminated the need for improvements within the police investigative units and among police prosecutors. These included a generally low quality of police investigations, as well as a low level of trust and confidence between institutions within the system and in the public. Moreover, the working culture did not seem to encourage or reward creative thinking and the acquisition of new practices. While identifying these areas of improvement, the diagnostic also highlighted the potential of the existing knowledge system. The project had two main objectives:

1. Strengthen the Guyanese criminal justice system by improving the investigation of crime and crime scenes, case preparation, and trial advocacy, and ensuring media and public support for justice system reform.
2. Develop the capacity of the Guyanese criminal justice system to collect and effectively digital evidence recorded at a crime scene.

The principal challenge faced by JES has been to ensure that a systemic change in the working culture – both on the individual and organizational levels – would be sustained after completion of the project. Mainly, the project aimed to address deficiencies within the criminal justice system in Guyana by building local capacity for the securing, managing, presenting and evaluating of evidence. Furthermore, our project aimed to foster organizational transformation as well as individual behavioural change. Specifically, the project focused on building the technical capacities of all parts of the criminal justice system (police, prosecution and the judiciary) to work with criminal evidence according to international standards. It also sought to establish the collective culture and innovative partnerships needed to provide a systemic response to violence and criminality, including public education and media sensitization, to ensure public confidence and support.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE SECTOR TRAINING AND INTERVENTIONS

Criminal justice sector interventions often include (re)training of police, prosecutors and judges. Globally, we are seeing a shift towards more systemic approaches to training, rooted in theories of adult learning (McCay, 2011; McCoy, 2006), student-centered instruction (Birzer, 2004), and cross-sector learning or learning in partnership (Hoyle & Emslie, 2010). It has been noted, however, that regardless of their geographical location, police training and education programs often face similar challenges, particularly related to their design and delivery (Cordner & Shain, 2011).

²Funded by the Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs, U.S. Department of State.

Some countries meet the challenge of developing impactful training programs by involving different agencies in curriculum creation. In Brazil, for example, police academies are increasingly partnering with universities and other post-secondary institutions to encourage cross-sectional dialogue and facilitate joint training sessions (Rogério Lino, 2004). Similar interventions can be found in the EU, the USA, India and other countries (Paterson, 2011), which point to possible benefits in the design of training programs.

In some countries, training recognizes and promotes lifelong learning culture. A study conducted in Poland with the police (Kordaczuk-Wąs & Sosnowski, 2011), suggests that in-service training is often welcomed by the officers. Notably, the authors highlight the role of nonpolice institutions in the delivery of trainings, “since specific fields of activity may require specialist knowledge acquired by professionals dealing with particular issues, e.g. domestic violence, preparation of prevention programmes or communication with the media” (p. 321). At the same time, the authors note that the many officers do not have opportunities to engage with nonpolice agencies in their self-development. Similarly, in Croatia, there is a growing recognition of the value brought on by the continuous professional development (Veic & Cajner Mraovic, 2004). Notably, much of the educational restricting work in Croatia is done with the international cooperation and assistance programs.

However, as noted by Kratcoski (2004) there is still a need of comparative international perspectives on delivery of such training programs, allowing for exchange of knowledge and experience. Moreover, more research is needed in the assessment of the effectiveness of such trainings and sharing of promising practices.

TRAINING AS A SITUATED PRACTICE

We conceptualize training as a situated practice through which learners and facilitators mutually enrich one another. Thus, the objective of our training program was not only to share knowledge and practical skills, but to facilitate creation of a community of practice (Lave, 2019; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998; Wenger, McDermott, Snyder, 2002). In addition, we pose that adults are especially receptive to learning within professional learning communities because their rich lived professional experiences are recognized throughout the training process. In professional learning communities peers engage with peers in deep reflection on an issue, question or dilemma and “learn deeply . . . to develop shared meaning, and identify shared purposes related to the topic” (Hord, 2009, p. 41).

Originating from the seminal work of Jean Lave and Etienne Wenger (1991), the notion of communities of practice has firmly established itself in the research and implementation of professional development³. Lave and Wenger pose that learning is not simply situated in knowledge and practice confined to the traditional classroom but is more so a “generative social practice in the lived in-world” (p. 35). In other words, when engaged in a dynamic and social process of learning, individuals move from the periphery of their community of practice to its centre “gaining access to sources of understanding through growing engagement (p. 37).” Thus, learning within a community of practice results in people “deepen[ing] their knowledge and expertise in [one] area by interacting on an ongoing basis” (Wenger, McDermott, Snyder, 2002, p.4).

A community of practice is characterized by the “mutual engagement of participants” (Wenger, 1998, p. 73) where the meaning and purpose of actions are negotiated between the members of the community. Wenger (1998) specifically differentiates mutual engagement and

³For some interdisciplinary examples see Akerson, Cullen, & Hanson, 2009; El-Hani & Greca, 2013; Wilding, Curtin, & Whiteford, 2012.

such common teaching techniques as teamwork or collaborative exercises. He specifies that mutual engagement is grounded both in challenges of misunderstanding and opportunities for understanding, as well as in the differences and similarities between diverse members of the community.

A community of practice is also characterized by “a negotiation of joint enterprise” (Wenger, 1998, p. 77), which reflects and enables the mutual engagement described earlier. Negotiation of joint enterprise does not always equate agreement, but it is crucial for sustaining communal cohesion. It is important to note here that the finalized enterprise should be understood as a “local collective creation of a community” (p. 80). In other words, diverse members of the community have an opportunity to voice their opinions and establish “a regime of mutual accountability” (p. 81) where each member understands that their role and purpose is to sustain the community itself.

Finally, a community of practice develops a “shared repertoire” (Wenger, 1998, p. 82) to make and negotiate meaning within the group. Grounded in the historical sustainability of the community as well as recognising the dynamic state whereby newcomers move to the centre due to the affordances of legitimate peripheral participation, shared repertoire serves as a resource for both mutual engagement and negotiation of shared enterprise. In describing the role of shared repertoire, Wenger specifically highlights that misunderstandings “are not merely problems to solve, but occasion for production of new meanings” (p.84). Thus, challenges are seen as productive moments of growth and not obstacles in the way of community’s evolution.

Seeing our training interventions as unfolding within a specific community of practice, we sought to understand how different actors in the justice system experience professional development training. In other words, community of practice framework allowed for a broad and holistic analysis of training projects.

EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The data were generated using a performance monitoring plan (PMP) with annual and end-of-project targets and results anticipated for key performance indicators and outcome harvesting (Wilson-Grau, 2018; Wilson-Grau, Britt, 2012) used to first ‘harvest’ the outcomes and then determine whether the project contributed to these changes. Combination of these two complimentary evaluation frameworks allowed us to generate multilayered data within a complex training environment as well as understand what impact it was making within Guyanese communities of practice.

Project evaluations were conducted in 2018, 2019 and 2020⁴. The monitoring and evaluation of the training project was based on principles of Developmental Evaluation. Patton (2006; 2010) describes Developmental Evaluation as an evaluative approach that facilitates ongoing reflection and that supports co-creation of learning and adaptation. Within this evaluation framework, continuous evaluative exercises provide real-time (or close to real-time) feedback for the programme staff, highlights emerging findings, supports programmatic learning and documents programme adaptations and rationale for changes.

In 2018 we adopted an outcome-focused approach, which combined elements of outcome mapping and outcome harvesting to capture both planned and unexpected results and identify links between the activities and outcomes of the project. Following this, the Mid-term Outcome

⁴The 2018, 2019 annual evaluations were external, independent exercises; the 2020 evaluation was an internal extension of this process, which has strengthened the evaluation capacity and thinking culture of the team, prioritizing learning and adaptive management in a participatory and systematic way.

Evaluation continued to build on the outcomes harvested by using the Outcome Harvesting steps to review documentation, distill and classify outcomes harvested, engage with key stakeholders to substantiate outcomes, and to analyze and interpret these outcomes.

Throughout 2019, project staff and subject matter experts identified and recorded outcomes in an outcome harvesting spreadsheet-based database. Outcomes were identified from public sources, personal interactions with partner institutions, subject matter expert reports and other sources. During the February 2020 evaluation trip to Guyana, the project team conducted 13 interviews and 2 focus group discussions. To facilitate discussions, interview participants were asked to reflect on what changed for them individually since January 2019 and what changes were most significant; what changed institutionally and what change was most significant; and what gaps they can still see. From these transcribed interactions, the project manager then identified and recorded additional outcomes that were added to the outcomes database. Approximately 240 outcomes were recorded for the period between January 1, 2019 and March 31, 2020.

All interactions with research participants of the evaluation were audio/video-recorded; JES team also took notes during evaluation sessions. Each participant received a consent form informing participants that their participation is voluntary and outlining the purposes of the evaluation and how its results will be used. Through the use of the consent form, JES obtained permission to record from each participant.

The data were analysed and categorized thematically (Braun & Clarke, 2006) according to three categories. The first category identified area of project intervention relating to a particular stage of the criminal justice process. The second category related to a particular progress marker, which had been developed by the project for each stakeholder group. The final category highlighted whether the progress was institutional, individual, or whether it was not accomplished. In order to maintain reciprocity with the stakeholders, the progress markers were validated by magistrates and interview participants. Based on the thematic analysis and categorizations, outcomes were summarized into broader, key results supporting project objectives and organized by areas of project interventions. Some outcomes represented success factors – intermediate outcomes that in turn supported achievement of objectives. Other outcomes were negative and were included as challenges still affecting the criminal justice system.

An inherent limitation of the outcome harvesting methodology is that it captures only those outcomes that are clear and evident to a specific research participant (Wilson-Grau & Britt, 2012). The evaluation team attempted to mitigate this limitation by inviting a diverse group of stakeholders to participate in evaluation activities, as well as corroborating the data with that collected throughout the year and stored in the outcome harvesting database. While there was dialogue and sensemaking during the interview and focus group discussion, the main recording and final summarization and interpretation of outcomes was primarily done by a single person (project manager), who also wrote the report. This is a result of resource/staffing limitations. To confirm validity of the analysis, two project team members (Project Director and Country Representative) read and provided feedback on the initial research findings.

FINDINGS

The monitoring and evaluation process allowed the research team to identify intermediate outcomes, which supported achievement of the project's objectives. As a full discussion of these outcomes is beyond the scope of this paper, we focus, instead, on the skills and knowledge that sustained one of the communities of practice. The evaluation of this project not only highlighted the processes within a community of practice of Guyanese criminal justice system

practitioners, but also illuminated the impact of training on moving the community towards a new pattern of effectiveness over the course of the five years that the training took place.

The various actors in the criminal justice system formed a community of practice that contributed to the improvement of the overall quality of major crime investigations. These changes reflect the notion of mutual engagement posed by Wenger (1998) as one of the characteristics of a community of practice. As members of the community of practice, different stakeholders sustained mutual accountability in investigations. Prior to the project, criminal files were not consistently sent to the office of the Director of Public Prosecutions for legal advice, which contributed to a lack of accountability. To address this, JES experts stressed the importance of having legal advice prior to submitting criminal files. As a result, more crime files were sent to the office of Director of Public Prosecution for legal advice. In the words of one trainee: *“we have been pushing to have legal advice in all criminal files . . . all crime files before we institute charges.”*

In addition, lack of cooperation between police units undermined mutual accountability. As such, training facilitated some practices that otherwise would not have taken place. One of the trainees commented that prior to the training investigators were “doing their work in isolation from the crime scene ranks” and there was lack of cooperation *“between the investigator as in what type of evidence the crime scene person would have recovered at the scene and how valued that evidence could be.”* He noted that the collaborative training yielded more cooperation in the field and that as a result, they *“see much more success, since from those training.”*

Change of any kind has an inherent element of risk to it, which often makes following established practices a more attractive option than attempting new ways of doing things. With that in mind, it was illuminating to see how stakeholders engaged in the negotiation of their joint enterprise. Arguably, one of the best examples of this that also legitimized peripheral participation can be seen in a comment one of the supervisors made regarding what advice they would give to a struggling colleague:

He needs to interact with the subordinates, he needs to build a relationship with them, he also needs to listen, [...] understand what is their defaults, what is their strength, what is their weakness and try to build them up in those capacity. Also, he needs to implement a feedback system and delegate and he needs to be in the know of the investigation, not just be the boss, he needs to be the leader, he needs to be in the know. Only so that he can get the day to day briefing of each investigation, he can be a part of that, and only that way he can achieve to being of the standard of that other investigator.

Further examples came from seeing early adopters of new practices demonstrating them to their subordinates and convincing their superiors that these new methods would bring results. A trained participant commented that *“we had to satisfy [...] our superiors, to get their buy-in. [...] [the] boss has certain concerns: “Are the crime scene being properly processed or if this being handled properly? [...] So when we're done, from the way how we would do our work - those that were trained by JES, - that would have reassured our heads in the way how we're doing our work.”* Furthermore, because they had been jointly negotiated by the community of practice, the new methods were received positively, while old approaches were sometimes rejected. However, this was not always the case, as the professional community was only beginning to develop a joint set of practices. Consider this example from practice shared by one of the trainees:

I was quite impressed with the prosecutor [who had JES training]. However, she asked to prosecute in Courts in the outlying district, it therefore meant that another prosecutor

was asked to come to be the [...] prosecutor. This prosecutor has not been exposed to JES training so there is that gap; so, where as I found in the case of the first prosecutor, she was able to stand her ground when defense council meet certain objections and be able to deal readily with the evidence very eloquently. With this new prosecutor—no fault of hers—she has encountered tremendous difficulty in being able to engage meaningfully with the defense counsel.

Overall, due to legitimate peripheral participation of the trained members of the community of practice, more and more members of the Guyanese criminal justice system became convinced of the value of the new methods promoted by the project.

We found that an increasing number of Guyanese criminal justice system members began developing a shared repertoire. Having a common repertoire has the potential to sustain what Wenger (1998) calls the continuity of the community of practice. In this project, the repertoire was established through shared practices such as note-taking, statement-writing, court testimony by police, identification and collection of evidence, as well as documentation of crime scenes. For example, one of the trainees explained in an interview: *“The most significant change I have seen in our investigative process for last year would have been a more proactive, thorough and a more structured way in which we approach our investigations.”* Moreover, the research team observed improvement of police teams’ ability to complete investigations and supervise subordinates. The evaluation also identified a significant increase in the shared practice of video-recording police interviews of suspects and the use of CCTV footage in investigations. These instances demonstrate the value of collaboration when working toward a common goal.

Although the training activities contributed to positive changes in the criminal justice system, it is important to note that these positive outcomes were enabled and reinforced institutionally within the Guyana Police Force. Had it not been for the establishment of a professional learning community across judicial sectors, these change may not have been possible.

DISCUSSION

Due to the fact that criminal justice systems operate with a diverse range of stakeholders, understanding of multiple stakeholders’ roles, responsibilities, and training needs was essential to the project’s goals. The key stakeholders the project included members of the police force, including crime scene and police investigators, police prosecutors and public prosecutors, staff of the forensic labs, magistrates, and judges. From within the police force, JES selected key opinion leaders⁵. These leaders participated in further professional development offer coaching to their peers and supervisors in the Guyana Police Force.

The diversity of stakeholders necessitated that training engaged professionals from each sector in the same learning environment. We used a variety of teaching methods and formats that not only imparted skills and knowledge, but also encouraged the application of creative problem solving and critical thinking skills beyond the classroom walls. We elaborate on the promising practices of the training design in this section.

⁵ We use the term Key Opinion Leaders to describe an interaction between the community (in this case coaching and mentoring the peers) and influencing/advising superiors.

Dynamic and iterative course development

The training formats included classroom presentations by experienced international subject matter experts and local trainers on a new approach used in their field the use of forensic evidence, video evidence, major case management, trial management . In addition, the trainers implemented dynamic and interactive exercises to help each participant understand the information and skills necessitated by the introduced approach. Most of the curricula used a scenario-based learning approach relying on Guyanese cases, a method that has been successful in engaging investigators, police prosecutors and magistrates in Guyana. All training incorporated iterative design (Francis, 2009) by drawing on feedback from participants and tailoring the presentations to recognise local needs. The research team observed that iterative course design enabled the subject matter experts and local trainers to gauge the learners' interest and recognize their identity as valuable members of the community of practice.

Collaboration and attention to learners' needs

The subject matter experts that delivered the training came to know the participants. In addition, they gained insight into the specific challenges and issues present in the justice sector in Guyana, which helped inform their teaching. As a result, each expert was able to design their syllabus to reflect relevant issues. Additionally, they incorporated ongoing coaching into their course, adapting their instruction as local circumstances changed. Each subject matter expert made themselves available online or by phone when not in Guyana. Relationships built in this manner proved to be important for the participants, as one explained, “[W]e would not be able to retain everything at one time. So that’s why I call [one of the project SMEs] and let him remind me again how to proceed at the scene. . . . he is always available.”

The project encouraged collaboration within the Guyanese justice sector which created shared commitment to a common vision for strengthening the criminal justice system. To facilitate this, much of the programming took place in a multidisciplinary environment where participants from other fields and agencies were present. We anticipated that the participants would better understand the new methods being discussed and could respond more knowledgeably when they encountered that new skill. To illustrate, training sessions on forensic video evidence were offered to forensic video analysts, major crime investigators, crime scene technicians, police prosecutors, magistrates and judges jointly. Having a cross section of disciplines and expertise in the room enabled interdepartmental conversations. During these sessions, stakeholders discussed the technology, the extraction process and processing stages as well as the procedure necessary to bring the evidence before the court. As a result, participants were able to fill in knowledge gaps and the role of each stakeholder was better understood. These findings echo research on workplace participatory practices which recognizes learning as negotiated between multiple actors (Billet, 2004; Billett, Barker, Hernon-Tinning, 2004) and argues that organizations need to promote co-participation to sustain active learning in the workplace (Billet, 2001). The participants of our project responded positively to a cooperative multi-disciplinary environment. For example, according to the interviews, investigators trained through this process now enter a crime scene more aware of the need to be cautious not to disturb the scene until it has been processed by a technician. In addition, this training approach has assisted police prosecutors and magistrates to better understand hearsay evidence and continuity of evidence, and to apply this knowledge more effectively in court proceedings. In the words of one of the participants (a police prosecutor):

[Cross-training made] it easier for the prosecutors in court because we are on the same wavelength, we see through the same lens. Sometimes you know, the lawyers who are not that fortunate to get this training, they would keep objecting to certain things and the magistrate would say, oh no this is it. And that’s the way it is.

We observed that pathways of change evolve from a positive initial reaction and enthusiasm for embracing new skills and learning, to the consistent application of skills while also championing the methods in the workplace, with the external partners and members of the public. In order to sustain progress, all the actors in the interlinked judicial system need to understand the importance of the new skills they have learned and consistently apply them. The quote above highlights the importance of the cross-sectional training and reminds us of the fundamental goal of the project – the systemic change of the working practices. Having participated in the trainings, different stakeholders were able to work together more effectively due to applying the “same lens” to an issue at hand.

Development of an enabling environment

An important component of the sustainable training model was our emphasis on collaboration among the various units and disciplines involved in the investigation and prosecution process. To ensure application of the new learning across the policing community, instructors identified individuals in each discipline who demonstrated an ability and talent to assume a training role within their group. These local trainers were expected to champion that new skill area and be available to provide information and serve as a local subject matter expert within their units. In this way, they provided motivation for colleagues to adopt these new approaches as best practices and contribute to overcoming an observed culture of mediocrity that prevailed at the time. Further, specific leadership training was offered to those local trainers who had potential to act as key opinion leaders⁶ (KOL).

Beginning in 2017, the KOL program emphasised the importance of continuous self-development and provided opportunities for participants to demonstrate leadership within the scope of their authority, including how to build strong relationships with peers, superiors and subordinates, with a focus on working to develop trust and confidence. The KOL training had a great impact on ensuring the sustainability for the program. For example, during two two-day seminars in April 2018, the trained local trainers presented on a range of subject areas to over 50 subordinate detective officers, divisional detective officers, and head prosecutors from each policing division. The police prosecutors generally agreed that training the trainers had made a difference. In the words of one participant: “[The training] . . . really helped me. So, I was able to understand what was expected of me at the other side of the room being the trainer. So, it built a certain amount of confidence as trainer.” The research interviews demonstrate that as the trained participants moved into supervisory roles, there was a greater chance that the learning would be sustained and become entrenched. To support this transition the JES team and subject matter experts held regular round table sessions with the senior management of the Guyana police force to review recommendations resulting from the project. These sessions presented an opportunity to acknowledge areas of success and progress and to raise concerns that required attention within the community of practice. We elaborate on the importance of creating a community of practice through training below.

CONCLUSION

Training activities of the project sought to create a professional learning community (as conceptualized by DuFour & Eaker, 1998; Hord, 2009; Harris & Jones 2010) in which the experience was comprised of both a social practice and an educational program. To achieve this, a collaborative approach to project implementation and training delivery was

⁶ Note that key opinion leaders do not simply provide mentoring to their peers but are seen as leaders and influencers in their own sphere of influence.

implemented. It helped to more fully understand the context and systems within which the project was working, and to champion an adaptive management approach.

Similar to the community of practice, professional learning communities value diverse levels of participation through peer support and mentoring. The project identified improved accountability as a key factor contributing to improvements in the quality of major crime investigations. From its early stages, the project focused on building the capacity of local leaders, which contributed to the early adoption of new practices among a group of trained individuals. This was also possible due to inclusion of participants from across the criminal justice sector in the same training activities, leading to better understanding of each other's roles and fosters better working relationships. Participants noted that this contributed to stakeholders holding each other accountable for implementing new practices.

Despite the objectives of the project being to develop skills, encourage cross fertilization within the police and between the stakeholders, there were some unexpected results such as development of a cadre of leaders, beyond mentors who became change makers. This, we argue, stems from the promising practices discussed earlier in this article. The evaluation interviews at the end of each training term confirmed that participants believed they had benefitted from the teaching methods we used. We also observed that the participants embraced the skills training with enthusiasm. Moreover, several recommended broadening the training to include new recruits, other units, and other supervisory levels.

We argue that international training programs for professional learners need to be dynamic, collaborative, responsive, iterative, and embedded in the enabling environment of a community of practice. Working within a community of practice model ensures that the training program understands the larger context, including how the system works, the role of various actors within the system, motivating factors, the capacity of individuals, and so on in order to best approach and foster change. Moving forward, senior management in a similar multidisciplinary institutional situation needs to prioritize continuing education and training programs for all ranks so the cultural shift toward improved supervisory and investigative processes can be sustained.

REFERENCES

- Akerson, V. L., Cullen, T. A., & Hanson, D. L. (2009). Fostering a community of practice through a professional development program to improve elementary teachers' views of nature of science and teaching practice. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching: The Official Journal of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching*, 46(10), 1090-1113.
- Billett, S. (2001). Learning through work: workplace affordances and individual engagement. *The Journal of Workplace Learning*, 13(5), 209–214
- Billett, S. (2004). Workplace participatory practices: Conceptualising workplaces as learning environments. *The Journal of Workplace Learning*, 16(6), 312–324
- Billett, S., Barker, M., & Hernon-Tinning, B. (2004). Participatory practices at work. *Pedagogy, culture and society*, 12(2), 233-258.
- Birzer, M. L. (2004). Andragogy: Student centered classrooms in criminal justice programs. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 15(2), 393-411.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative research in psychology*, 3(2), 77-101.
- Cordner, G., & Shain, C. (2011). The changing landscape of police education and training. *Police Practice and Research*, 12(4), 281-285.

- DuFour, R., & DuFour, R. (2013). *Learning by doing: A handbook for Professional Learning Communities at Work TM*. Solution Tree Press.
- El-Hani, C. N., & Greca, I. M. (2013). ComPratica: A virtual community of practice for promoting biology teachers' professional development in Brazil. *Research in Science Education*, 43(4), 1327-1359.
- Francis, L. M. (2009). *Learner interest: An affective variable in iterative course design evaluation* (pp. 1-176). Capella University.
- Harris, A., & Jones, M. (2010). Professional learning communities and system improvement. *Improving schools*, 13(2), 172-181.
- Hicks, M. (2015). *Guyana Criminal Justice System. Report on the January 2015 Mission*. Justice Education Society, Unpublished.
- Hord, S. M. (2009). Professional learning communities. *Journal of staff development*, 30(1), 40-43.
- Hord, S. M. & Hirsh, S.A. (2008). Making the promise a reality. In A.M. Blankstein, P.D. Houston, & R.W. Cole (Eds.), *Sustaining professional learning communities*. Corwin Press.
- Hoyle, C., & Emslie, L. (2010). Delivering awareness training to staff in the criminal justice system. *Mental Health Practice*, 13(10), 21–23.
- Kordaczuk-Wąs, M., & Sosnowski, S. (2011). Police in-service training and self-education in Poland. *Police Practice & Research*, 12(4), 317–324.
- Kratcoski, P. C. (2004). Police education and training in a global society: Guest editor's introduction. *Police Practice and Research*, 5(2), 103-105.
- Lave, J. (2019). *Learning and everyday life*. Cambridge University Press.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge University Press.
- McCay, D. A. (2011). *They are old enough to carry guns, should we teach them like children? The application of adult learning strategies in police training*. Purdue University.
- McCoy, M. (2006). Teaching style and the application of adult learning principles by police instructors. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 29(1), 77–91. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13639510610648494>
- Paterson, C. (2011). Adding value? A review of the international literature on the role of higher education in police training and education. *Police Practice & Research*, 12(4), 286–297.
- Rogério Lino, P. (2004). Police education and training in a global society: A Brazilian overview. *Police Practice & Research*, 5(2), 125–136.
- Stoll, L., & Louis, K. S. (2007). *Professional learning communities: Divergence, depth and dilemmas*. McGraw-Hill Education.
- Sutton, H., & Baxter, S. (2017). Understanding and Combatting Crime in Guyana. *IDB Policy Brief No IDB-PB-271, December*.
- Veic, P., & Cajner Mraovic, I. (2004). Police training and education: The Croatian perspective. *Police Practice & Research*, 5(2), 137–148. <https://doi.org/10.1080/156142604200190289>
- Wenger, E. (1999). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge University Press.
- Wenger, E., McDermott, R. A., & Snyder, W. (2002). *Cultivating communities of practice: A guide to managing knowledge*. Harvard Business Press.
- Wilding, C., Curtin, M., & Whiteford, G. (2012). Enhancing occupational therapists' confidence and professional development through a community of practice scholars. *Australian Occupational Therapy Journal*, 59(4), 312-318.
- Wilson-Grau, R. (2018). *Outcome harvesting: Principles, steps, and evaluation applications*. IAP.

Wilson-Grau, R., & Britt, H. (2012). *Outcome harvesting*. Ford Foundation, Cairo.

Appendix

The key stakeholders for whom the project sought to support and influence change in were:

- Police Commissioner and Deputy Commissioners: manage the police force.
- Crime scene investigators: collect and process evidence at a crime scene, specialize in forensic evidence. (Not including forensic video evidence)
- Police investigators: direct crime investigations, manage the files and provide their files for the prosecutors.
- Police interviewers: a subset of investigators, trained specifically for interview skills (with and without video recordings).
- Police prosecutors: Prosecute cases at Magistrates court. They are not legally trained; they have other regular police duties. ECAP Police Prosecutors are senior prosecutors dealing with the most serious offences and are housed at the DPP chamber.
- Key Opinion Leaders: JES selected trainers who have participated in further professional development and provide training and coaching to peers and supervisors in the GPF
- Prosecutors at the Office of the Director of Public Prosecution: Prosecute cases at High Court and Court of Appeal; legally trained lawyers.
- Guyana Forensic Science Lab: Managed under Ministry of Public Security and staffed by civilians. Broader client base.
- GPF Forensic Lab: Managed under the GPF and staffed by police. This is referred to as the ‘crime lab’.
- Forensic video analysts: Trained police experts who extract video and process it to use as evidence in court.
- Magistrates: lower court judges, make decisions in civil matters, criminal summary matters and adjudicate at preliminary hearings as to whether a case goes to trial at High Court.
- High Court Judges: Supreme Court; make decisions in civil and criminal indictable matters.
- Chancellor: head of entire Judiciary for Guyana and Appeal Court Justice.
- Guyana Police Force Public Relations Office: Office of GPF that is responsible for police public relations.
- Media: Media reporters who report on court cases.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to acknowledge that the “Strengthening the Criminal Justice System Guyana” project (July 2016 - March 2021) was funded by the U.S. Department of State, Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs (INL); the “Strengthening the Guyanese Criminal Justice System” project (August 2015 - May 2017) was funded by the Government of Canada’s Anti-Crime Capacity Building Program (ACCBP). We would also like to thank Stacia Rose and Kendecia Sears, as well as the INL team at both the U.S. Embassy and in Washington D.C.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Natalia Balyasnikova is Assistant Professor of Adult Education at York University, Canada. Her research examines promising educational practices in diverse contexts of adult learning. Prior, she was working as Education Specialist at Justice Education Society.

Galina Sergeeva was involved in the Strengthening the Criminal Justice System project first as a project coordinator and then as the project manager. She played a key role in designing systems and processes to collect, analyze and report on monitoring and evaluation data for the project.

Evelyn Neaman, MA, served as the Project Director for the JES Strengthening the Criminal Justice System in Guyana projects. For the past 30 years, she has managed access to justice and criminal justice reform projects across Canada, Ethiopia, Central America and Guyana. She is an independent consultant.

Kaia Ambrose is an independent evaluation consultant, previously holding positions at the Caribbean Development Bank's Office of Independent Evaluation, as well as the role of M&E Advisor at CARE Canada. Since 2001, she has worked with a wide range of organizations in Latin America, Africa and Asia to develop actor-oriented, learning-oriented planning, monitoring and evaluation systems.

Rolinda Kirton, LLB, is Justice Education Society Guyana Country Representative, for the Strengthening the Criminal Justice in Guyana project. Prior, the Project Manager for the Canadian Association of General Surgeons and later for the University of Toronto, in the Guyana Diabetes Care Project; and a Peace-building and Psychosocial-Support consultant with UNDP and UNICEF.

Sonia Poulin is CEO of the Justice Education Society with 25+ years of leadership experience within the legal and justice sectors in the areas of law reform, legal information & research, legal education & technology, and international development. Committed to access to justice and human rights, she has contributed to numerous boards and committees at the regional, national and international levels.