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Abstract  Australian governments, academia, and law enforcement agencies have recognized the need to improve intelligence capabilities in order to adapt to the increasingly complex criminal and security environments. In response, the Australian Criminal Intelligence Commission (ACIC), the Australian Federal Police (AFP) and other Australian policing agencies have adopted several reform measures to improve intelligence capability support. While some have focused on developing specific criminal intelligence doctrine, others have sought to improve more challenging aspects of intelligence capability such as analytical and field collection workforce planning. The complexity of the current and emerging criminal environment and a growing professionalization of policing practice more broadly has resulted in a uniquely new strategic approach to developing the analytical and field collection workforce. This article surveys the development of an Australian Criminal Intel Training and Development Continuum (CITDC). The continuum is an end-to-end continuing professional development framework for criminal intelligence analysts and field intelligence officers that monitor proficiency, competence, and knowledge achievement through pre-entry aptitude testing, rigorous class room, and workplace mentoring. The continuum is designed at the post-graduate level and articulates with Charles Sturt University’s MA (Intelligence Analysis). The article argues that both the philosophy of rigorous standards and the learning underpinning the continuum are having demonstrable and positive outcomes for intelligence practitioners and the investigative workforce they support.
Introduction

This article is organized into four sections: Background, Drivers for reform, Stages of reform, and Conclusion. The ‘Background’ section will introduce the two Australian federal law enforcement agencies—the Australian Criminal Intelligence Commission (ACIC) and the Australian Federal Police (AFP) involved in the development of different aspects of the Australian Criminal Intel Training and Development Continuum (CITDC). The second section (‘Reform drivers’) will outline what factors in the Australian federal law enforcement environment provided the impetus towards the development and implementation of the CITDC. The third section (‘Stages of reform’) will examine in detail the various components of the CITDC (e.g. doctrine, design, skills and qualification framework, and organization of cultural factors) before the final (fourth) section will summarize early tangible impacts of the CITDC.

Before surveying the development of the CITDC, it is necessary to first define how we intend to use the term ‘criminal intelligence’ in this article. Defining ‘intelligence’ regardless of its context (national security, criminal, or military) is contested among practitioners and in the literature (Ratcliffe, 2008; Walsh, 2011; Lowenthal, 2012). For the purposes of this article, we define it by what it does. In other words, criminal intelligence enables policing to establish a pro-active response to crime by identifying criminal groups and activities and understanding societal and international trends impacting on the criminal environment. Once criminal identities and their methodologies are known, criminal intelligence can assess trends and forecast future criminal opportunities to directly support operational decision making and investigations.

Background

The two key Australian agencies involved in the development of the design and implementation of the CITDC are the AFP and the ACIC. Their roles and functions are well known in Australia, but in the first section, and for the benefit of an international audience, we will explain briefly the role of each agency. The AFP provides Australia’s policing response to organized transnational crime and national security. Established in 1979, the AFP’s primary mandate is to enforce Commonwealth criminal law, contribute to combating organized crime, and to protect Commonwealth and national interests from criminal activity in Australia and overseas. The ACIC is Australia’s intelligence agency for criminal intelligence and was formed to strengthen the response to crime affecting Australia. The ACIC’s intelligence collection and analytical capabilities work with state policing and national and international law enforcement partners to create a national intelligence picture of crime, to target serious and organized crime, and to deliver information and services to frontline policing and law enforcement. These agencies partnered and engaged early and continuously throughout curriculum design and training delivery with the Australian Graduate School of Policing and Security at Charles Sturt University.

Drivers for reform

The impetus for the design and implementation of the CITDC arose from the interplay of several drivers. Some drivers are external, whereas others came internally from within the AFP and ACIC. The main external drivers were changes to the global criminal environment. Increasingly, the organized crime environment has become more complex and volatile as globalization has facilitated the growth of illicit markets of criminals and criminal groups. Although crime continues to have local manifestations, increasingly, more ‘local’ criminal activity has become globalized. Crime has also become increasingly technologically enabled and transnational, thereby demanding a multi-agency and multi-jurisdictional response.
Given the complexities of the operating environment, it also became clear to law enforcement agencies that prosecution as a primary outcome was less effective due to the transnational and interjurisdictional operating models of many organized crime groups. Accordingly, law enforcement agencies would need to deploy their intelligence capabilities in more proactive ways that would facilitate the discoverability and disruption of complex threats rather than solely working up intelligence for prosecutions (Innes and Sheptycki, 2004; Innes et al., 2017). Australian federal law enforcement agencies such as the AFP and ACIC, like other countries (Australia, Canada, UK, USA, and New Zealand), were increasingly encouraged to deploy proactive intelligence collection against terrorists and complex transnational organized crime threats by successive national governments (Williams, 2011; Walsh, 2016). Combined, these external drivers influenced the AFP, in particular of the need to evaluate its intelligence capability and training to meet the challenges of the changing operating environment.

Within Australia, all state and territory police academies provide training in intelligence trade-craft and align them to the Australia New Zealand Policing Agency standards. Furthermore, through the ACIC-led National Criminal Intelligence Capability Committee, the state, territory and federal police, and law enforcement agencies have come together to share and coordinate, among other things, practice in intelligence training and curriculum design. The AFP and ACIC, had long offered training to their intelligence staff, though training programmes were usually developed by agencies in relative isolation from each other. Although significant improvements had been made in police recruit training in embedding competencies in learning modules in Australian and European law enforcement agencies, it had not occurred to the same extent in specialized areas such as intelligence (Peeters, 2010, Walsh, 2011; 2017). Historically, in Australian law enforcement, it had been challenging at both agency and community-based levels to articulate common training standards and curriculum and following this up with work-based learning that also created a pathway for professionalization (McClellan and Gustafson, 2012). Importantly too, training offered to intelligence staff were not always synchronized with the needs of the agency’s intelligence functional area. In summary, these factors inhibited individual agencies and the broader Australian intelligence and law enforcement communities to move tradecraft training packages into a coherent training and education approach that offered common standards or a continuous professional development pathway for intelligence analysts.

Over the past decade, the AFP and ACIC in common with the broader community, have delivered an ‘opt in’ model for intelligence training. However, it did not reinforce classroom learnings with a formalized experiential phase of learning and workplace-based assessment. Intelligence community-wide reviews revealed common themes indicating that training and professional development were not optimally preparing analysts to work in the evolving global criminal environment described earlier. In particular reviews found:

- increasing reliance on intelligence policing models and analytical software tools;
- lack of consistency in intelligence staff roles;
- inconsistent training linkages from classroom to workplace learning;
- few tertiary aligned learning or awards;
- the need for improvements in written and oral briefing abilities;
- the need to further elevate the status of intelligence staff within their law enforcement peer group; and
- the need for increased integration and understanding between investigators and intelligence staff.

At the same time, that the AFP and ACIC were reflecting on the above training and analytical capability gaps, both agencies continued to develop
closer relations with Charles Sturt University—a globally recognized provider of research and education for professionals in law enforcement, investigations, and intelligence. For example, in 2009, the AFP and CSU entered into a professional agreement to promote a study pathway for all police officers pursuing a Bachelor of Policing (Investigations) and entry into postgraduate programmes. More specifically, to this article, the AFP and CSU had developed a long-term partnership for criminal intelligence courses, particularly in the provision of strategic intelligence training (Walsh and Ratcliffe, 2005). As discussed later, the AFP and ACIC's links to CSU became an important factor in the design and implementation of the CITDC.

In summary, the external and internal drivers discussed above became instrumental in identifying significant treatment options necessary to address the suboptimal pathway for continuous professional development of field intelligence officers (FIOs) and analysts. In particular, a major reform initiative was required that could improve common skills, competencies training, and professionalize the intelligence cadre. In the next section, we focus on explaining the design and implementation phases of this major reform process, which became the Australian CITDC.

The stages of reform

Doctrine comes first—What is criminal intelligence?

For the Australian context, the AFP and ACIC developed a joint criminal intelligence doctrine to describe and define criminal intelligence, its functions, and practitioner roles in greater detail to support the CITDC. It acknowledged intelligence as both an output and a process. The intelligence cycle being the process, while products, insights, and understanding being the output. As a process, intelligence involves the collection, processing, integration, evaluation, interpretation, and analysis of available information. As an output, intelligence compiles the developed insights and understanding into a product for dissemination to support strategic, operational, or tactical levels of decision making.¹

The new doctrine described three broad functions of criminal intelligence:

- strategic intelligence influences high-level policy decision making. Strategic intelligence also enriches our understanding of the operational environment by painting ‘the intelligence picture of crime’, thus providing a contextual framework for operational decision makers;
- operational intelligence supports operational leaders in making wise decisions on resource allocation and the triaging of operational priorities. It identifies targeting opportunities and convergences across criminal groups and crime types. Operational intelligence also informs strategic intelligence by identifying and understanding criminal trends;
- tactical intelligence focuses on the specific attributes of target entities and identifies new opportunities. It is generally produced in compressed time scales and supports decision making at a tactical team level for preventative, disruptive, or enforcement action.

More importantly, though for discussion in this article, the doctrine defined and described the two core roles within criminal intelligence: FIOs focused on collection including open and human source intelligence and Criminal Intelligence Analysts (CIAs) focused on analysis. These roles are interdependent though not interchangeable without cross training of skills and can be performed in most instances by police and professional staff. These core roles are defined as follows:

FIOs engage in the collection, collation, and analysis of information to produce and disseminate

¹ Australian Criminal Intelligence Model (ACIM) Strategy 2017–2020, p. 4.
tactical and operational intelligence in support of criminal investigations. They are adaptable, operating in both the office and field environments, sometimes for extended periods of time in support of law enforcement operations utilizing human source and technical collection methodologies. FIOs communicate with a wide range of stakeholders including police, state/territory and Commonwealth government agencies, foreign law enforcement partners, private industry, and members of the public in order to achieve intelligence and operational outcomes.

Like CIAs, the fundamental role of FIOs is to reduce uncertainty and to enable decision makers to make wise operational and tactical decisions.

CIAs contribute to the understanding of the rapidly evolving criminal environment, identify current and emerging criminal threats, and illuminate the jurisdictional and judicial implications for policy and operational decision makers. CIAs must provide accurate, timely, client focused, and insightful analysis to inform decision making at the strategic, operational, and tactical levels in Australia’s law enforcement, national security, and other partner agencies.

The significance of this influential role means that our CIAs must demonstrate high levels of curiosity, tradecraft, energy, integrity, and professionalism in producing intelligence that is reliable, influential, and actionable. It requires the ongoing commitment by analysts to collaborate with partners.

The design and implementation of the CITDC

The next phase in the criminal intelligence training and reform process was to articulate values, characteristics, and principles that would underpin the design and implementation of the CITDC. If the CITDC was to become a catalyst for moving criminal intelligence from a tradecraft where practitioners are increasingly professional in their practice; into a discipline that has the status of a profession within law enforcement, certain core elements were required (Green and Gates, 2014), namely:

- a specialist knowledge base;
- a distinct ethical dimension;
- continuous professional development requirements, and
- standards of education and accreditation;
- consistency of evidenced based practice;
- knowledge and talent management;
- continuous professional development; and
- workforce mobility and agility.

In addition, four other principles were to guide the design and implementation of the CITDC. First, intelligence training needed to be integrated and sequential rather than a series of different courses that did not articulate with each other as intelligence practitioners progressed from simple to more complex intelligence practice roles. Secondly, in-class assessment had to be both more rigorous and accountable. Assessment required a stronger link to clear learning outcomes and a formal in workplace workbook programme was identified at the design stage to ensure if the staff could demonstrate competency in the office and field through workplace assessment. Thirdly, to provide intelligence staff (both analysts and FIOs) a clear pathway for continuous professional development that articulates with tertiary qualifications in Australia. This principle is underlined by a growing realization in Australia, New Zealand, and the European Union (EU) that effective law enforcement education and training, including criminal intelligence, is increasingly likely to be a product of workplace learning and academic knowledge and skills through acknowledged degrees (Jaschke, 2010, p. 305; Walsh, 2011). Specifically, utilizing the 70/20/10 learning model where 70% is workplace learning, 20% coaching and mentoring in role, and 10% formal education; any new approach needed to support well ‘on the job learning’. Fourth, principle guiding the training pathway is
the drive to standardize intelligence tradecraft training modules and the development of curriculum from them would need evaluation periodically by intelligence training staff and its CSU partners to ensure a more evidence-driven approach to improving intelligence training and professionalization is achieved longer term (Walsh, 2017).

The four principles guiding the implementation of the continuous professional development of intelligence personnel were a focal point in the establishment of the CITDC, see Fig. 1. The CITDC provides a structured career pathway for intelligence staff, which is aligned with professional qualifications. The CITDC is further aligned to both intelligence streams, FIO and CIA. The CITDC outlines the mandatory training requirements for the staff and sets firm timeframes for the completion of various training and aligns tertiary qualifications with internal training courses.

The development of a skills and qualification framework
As noted earlier, the four principles of the approach to criminal intelligence training and development became the foundation upon which a Skills and Qualification Framework (SQF) could be built. The SQF is a competency-based framework, which outlines the core knowledge, skills, and qualifications required for each intelligence member dependent on their role (e.g. FIO or CIA). The SQF provides the foundations for the CITDC and ensures consistency among the workforce—consistency in regard to training, standards, and qualifications. In doing so, it standardizes the practice of criminal intelligence and professionalizes the role of members and the role of intelligence.

The SQF acknowledges that both the FIOs and CIAs have unique roles. The SQF maps each skill to the CITDC, which is where practitioner knowledge acquisition occurs. Using the SQF, it was possible to determine the skills required of intelligence practitioners, and from there produce role scopes. Building on this, the SQF aligns internal LEA training to the Australian Qualifications Framework. By doing so, it ensures that all training delivered under the SQF—and as part of the CITDC—is not only relevant to the workplace but also aligned to tertiary qualifications. In moving from a tradecraft to a profession requires intelligence staff to not only be better trained, but also to attain qualifications relevant to their role. This not only provides for a higher qualified workforce, but a one which is always highly mobile and interoperable.

Finally, the SQF provides a professional development pathway for all intelligence staff. It allows staff to maintain and progress their professional development, identify and enhance their skills, study towards further qualifications, and avail themselves of the training opportunities. By building the CITDC on the foundations of the SQF, it allowed for the alignment of internally awarded qualifications with externally awarded tertiary qualifications. The benefit to this is two-fold, with the alignment of tertiary qualifications attesting to the quality of intelligence programmes with the professional development opportunities available to the staff.

The CITDC and SQF are not unique to intelligence and directly reflect growing investment in law enforcement and intelligence professionalization worldwide. The development of new policing models such as intelligence-led policing in the UK concluded that crime reduction was now directly linked not just to investigative outcomes, but to the extent the intelligence could proactively provide police decision makers with a wide range of policing, intelligence, and enforcement strategies to drive down the crime (Cope, 2004; Maguire and John, 2004; Ratcliffe, 2008). The growing uptake of intelligence-led policing outside of the UK in Australia, New Zealand, the USA, and parts of the EU meant that intelligence was now been given a more front seat in policing, encouraging further investment in the analyst workforce (Walsh, 2011; Den Hengst and Staffeleu, 2012; Carter and Phillips, 2015; Darroch and Mazzerole, 2013; James, 2016). In UK, this was addressed with the establishment of the National Intelligence Model (NIM) in 2000, which set a doctrinal blueprint on
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Figure 1: The sequential Criminal Intelligence Training and Development Continuum.

Table 1: Illustration of the proficiency regime cycle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 35 points | Intelligence course/programme delivery  
Mentor on core intelligence programmes |
| 25 points | Intelligence workshop delivery  
Mentor others in the workplace  
Mentor on workshops |
| 10 points | Internal/external intelligence presentations  
Further intelligence-related study  
(i.e. Masters of Intelligence) |
| 5 points | Seminars/Conferences  
Active contributor on the community of practice forums |


By the mid-2000s in Australia, the NIM and the various intelligence doctrine guides published by the former UK National Policing Improvement Agency became influential in promoting both intelligence-led policing and providing a map for many law enforcement agencies to also develop their own intelligence doctrine, including providing a strategic framework for developing new approaches to intelligence training (Walsh, 2011). Victoria Police in particular used many NIM principles to underpin its doctrine and training in the mid-2000s, but like most other Australian policing agencies has since moved away from the NIM approach to build more endogenous doctrines.

Similarly, drawing on broad analytical standards from the national security intelligence community in Australia or other countries has not provided sufficiently useful pathways to developing training standards or continuous professional development. For example, in the USA, the Office of the Director
National Intelligence (ODNI) has had some success in articulating common analytical standards and promoting cross-community training (e.g. intelligence community directive 203-Analytical Standards), yet it is unclear as to how such broad and mechanistic standards have really improved analytical training in the USA much less using them to inform analytical training in other Australian law enforcement agencies (Gentry, 2015; Hare and Coghill, 2016; Walsh, 2017). Similarly, the ODNI’s establishment in 2011 of a National Intelligence University from the former National Defense Intelligence College offers a suite of undergraduate and postgraduate programmes for the US intelligence community, which may have some applications to law enforcement intelligence staff working in specialized areas such as counterterrorism and transnational crime, though the National Intelligence University focus is mostly on national security rather than criminal intelligence (Spracher, 2017).

By the mid-2000s, more solid improvements to Australian law enforcement intelligence training emerged. Some agencies including the AFP had become registered training providers and there were consolidated efforts in many (e.g. AFP, Queensland Police, NSW Police, and Victoria Police) to provide associate diplomas in policing intelligence via the Australia New Zealand Policing Advisory Agency. Although these diplomas were an improvement on earlier training, in many cases they still lacked sufficiently rigorous or realistic scenario-based assessment in the class room or back in the workplace. Post-course (workplace) also lacked adequate mentoring and coaching or planning for regular proficiency testing. Furthermore, academics in Australia, except for a few exceptions (e.g. Wing, 2000; Evans and Kebbell, 2012) have also been slow to identify empirically characteristics and competencies required by analysts that can inform competency-based intelligence training within law enforcement agencies. Finally, for Australian law enforcement agencies, there had been almost no evidence-based focus on how to improve training and ‘institutionalize evidence-based norms for determining future training curricula’ (Chang and Tetlock, 2016, p. 904; Walsh, 2017).

Over the past 5 years, three significant academic papers have been published discussing the practice elements of respective policing tradecrafts. Exploring the professional characteristics of detectives, intelligence analysts and crime scene examiners (Kelty et al., 2011; Martin, 2011; Evans and Kebbell, 2012; Westera et al., 2016) have reformed the understanding of these critical roles. Each paper uses similar techniques to distinguish effective characteristics required of each role specifically; however, when landmarked together, these papers have valuable insight into the recruitment, training, and management of police. In ‘The Effective Analyst’, Evans and Kebbell address the skills and abilities required of intelligence analysts discovered through the interviewing of 30 subject matter experts. The highest frequency variables identified by the Evans and Kebbell’s study: communication and thinking skills, written skills, and the ability to derive meaning from information, among others underscored the many principles used in the development of the Australian intelligence training continuum.

For you, by you, with you

For the CITDC to be successful, the change effort had to communicate the message effectively and ensure personnel participation and involvement (Smith, 2005). This was given a considerable thought taking into account the monolithic elements of core police culture and limited desire for change within policing (Loftus, 2008; LePard and Davey, 2014; White and Robinson, 2014; Charman and Corcoran, 2015). Police culture is widely recognized as inherently difficult to penetrate or change, and it is often acknowledged in the literature that police officers will attempt to, over time, refute, and disassociate themselves with directives that they feel do not complement with their core activities (Chan, 1996; Chan and Dixon, 2007;
Charman and Corcoran, 2015). The philosophy of 'by you, with you, and for you' was a guiding principle in developing the CITDC. First, members of the training team were drawn from within intelligence—they were current practitioners, nominated by their peers, and supported by qualified trainers and curriculum designers. Secondly, all programme mentors and the advisory working groups that were formed came from the workplace—both from within intelligence and specialist areas. Thirdly, the development of the CITDC and the training programmes contained within was for the members with the alignment of tertiary qualifications and further professional development opportunities encouraging personal development and growth.

In developing the CITDC, several formal and informal advisory working groups were established to bring together and leverage the expertise of intelligence practitioners, subject matter experts, and learning and development staff from the AFP's own college. The aim of the working groups was to develop clear standards for training, alignment of programme content to the requirements of the workplace, and to ensure the continued adherence to best practices. Additionally, in both the AFP and ACIC, workplace face-to-face group consultation sessions were held by management and training staff to explain and discuss the new training model with staff and gain their inclusion and support.

Sequential learning programmes: apprentice to expert

The intelligence training programmes offered under the CITDC seek to maximize the various styles of learning. At the foundation-level is the Criminal Intelligence Development Programme—a 2-week face-to-face component that delivers the basic theory and concepts—which underpin criminal intelligence. Participants then return to their workplace for 12 weeks where they enter into an informal mentoring programme and commence a workbook. The workplace-based workbook is an integral element to the CITDC. It allows ongoing assessment of participants once they return to the workplace, as they demonstrate the application of their knowledge and skills across several practical tasks completed in real-time and using real-world events.

Following the experiential component of the foundational programme, participants return to review and consolidate their learnings, and participate in practical scenarios using the Hydra Immersive Simulation System (Hydra). Hydra allows participants to practically apply the knowledge and skills they have learnt. Using a variety of scenarios collaboratively developed with the AFP and ACIC, specifically for intelligence practitioners, it challenges participant’s ability to analyse and provide sound recommendations in time critical and often stressful situations.

Under the CITDC, the staff progress through the foundation-level training programme of the role-specific courses within a predetermined time. This ensures that participants are not only inducted into the portfolio but also are exposed to the values and required standards early in their career. Given the alignment of the SQF with the CITDC and all training programmes, completion of the role-specific courses allows members to achieve the required minimum competencies or proficiencies for their role.

The SQF determines the competencies required of intelligence members, with all programmes within the CITDC competency-based. Although there will always be an inherent theoretical component in every course, competency-based learning ensures that members are assessed in real-world situations reflective of the workplace. Given competency-based learning focuses on attaining the requisite skills, the next aspect of the CITDC was developing entry assessments for staff wishing to join the intelligence departments and ongoing testing and maintenance of skills of those already performing those roles.

Recruitment

For recruitment, gateway of entry prerequisites has not previously been a core requirement for anyone
wishing to enter a criminal intelligence role within law enforcement and as such has been vulnerable to staff joining who do not have the required aptitude and where investment in their training is not realized in competent workplace practice. The benefit of developing intelligence doctrine supported by intelligence-specific SQFs is that entry requirements can be clearly articulated as roles are defined in detail. It was with this information that an assessment centre gateway on entry model was developed that although not unique to many other roles in law enforcement had for the first time specific relevant elements that tested the suitability and aptitude of people to undertake roles within criminal intelligence. This process of recruitment which is conducted on a single day through an individual participating in a group discussion, written exercise, verbal briefing, and then formal interview in a sequential order enables a consistency of required standards and reduces wasted investment in training for those who do not demonstrate an aptitude for intelligence work. Additionally, those applicants who claim to hold relevant experience and qualification may be required to complete a recognition of prior learning pack, where again the SQFs can be the independent measure to which their stated claims can be assessed aiding the selection and interview process.

If assessment centres are essential to ensure that the right people are recruited into the criminal intelligence profession, then an annual ongoing proficiency regime is also a key component of the CITDC, recognizing that intelligence tradecraft skills are perishable, require ongoing maintenance, and should be regularly formally assessed to ensure currency, competency, and best practice. Although knowledge and skills are learnt and refined during formalized training, it is once practitioners return to the workplace that learning really starts—and ideally should never cease. The competencies tested are the knowledge, application, and continued professional development that influence a particular job role and are based on the SQF. Proficiency testing should be considered to be part of the learning process identifying skills gaps as learning opportunities to develop.

Proficiency testing for currency and competency

Proficiency testing further provides intelligence managers with advice that staffs have attained sufficient skill and knowledge to perform their duties to an agreed minimum standard. Under a proficiency model, there are three levels of competence:

- **Level 1:** It is the base level of proficiency. At this level, practitioners are assessed to have a broad and coherent body of knowledge while applying skills under guidance and supervision (apprentice level);
- **Level 2:** At this level, practitioners are assessed to have in-depth knowledge of the underlying principles and the ability to apply knowledge and skills independently (skilled level);
- **Level 3:** At this level, practitioners are assessed to be able to transfer their knowledge and skills to others in a professional context (Expert level).

The proficiency regime comprises of three separate components: online exam (knowledge assessment), portfolio submission (applied assessment), and continuous professional development (CPD) submission (professional development).

- The online exam (Knowledge Assessment) is used to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of intelligence consisting of 40 randomly generated questions and only one attempt is provided. Those who achieve a result of 85%+ will attain Level 1 proficiency.
- The Portfolio Submission (applied assessment) where the staff submit a portfolio of their work to demonstrate their application of intelligence. The submission consists of an Intelligence Plan, Intelligence Collection Plan, Intelligence Bulletin, and third-party report from their direct supervisor. Those
who are assessed as competent will attain Level 2 proficiency. Level 2 proficiency is deemed as the minimum standard required for intelligence practitioners to operate effectively and efficiently in their roles.

- The CPD Submission (Professional Development) where the staff submit a portfolio of evidence to demonstrate their CPD and the development of others. To reach Level 3, practitioners must be able to provide evidence to the sum of 75 points. Each activity can only be used once as part of the CPD submission.

The CPD points system provides intelligence managers with the opportunity and flexibility to identify, and give weighting to, activities they deem beneficial to the development of the staff and the intelligence profession, an example of how points may be weighted is detailed in Table 2.

**Conclusion**

In examining the pathway towards achieving professional status within a law enforcement context (Green and Gates, 2014), it was revealed that a doctrine was needed to provide a definition of criminal intelligence, which described the functions of strategic, operational, and tactical products and the practitioners’ roles as field intelligence officer and criminal intelligence analyst. The doctrine provides the foundation for the design and production of an SQF by mapping the artisan tradecraft nature of intelligence collection and analysis roles with tertiary learning. On completion, this aided the design of the CITDC, which includes recruitment assessments, sequential classroom and workplace learning, and annual proficiency testing of intelligence staff. Additionally, the early engagement of a higher education provider (CSU) at the design phase enabled the mapping and alignment of work-based learning with tertiary qualifications.

Although the CITDC is still new and evolving in the Australian law enforcement landscape, there are already emerging operational benefits from its implementation to date. One significant advantage is the increased national consistency of practice across all the regional bases of the AFP and ACIC and greater interoperability and surge capacity between agencies, facilitating improved practices in joint task forces and intelligence fusion centres. There have also been reports of emerging personnel benefits such as improved staff morale, retention, and reduced sickness. Additionally, some intelligence staff have reported back to their supervisors of their perceived elevation in value and status among other law enforcement disciplines and the opportunity to obtain externally recognized qualifications. Other managers have reported improvements in operational responsiveness, oral briefing abilities, staff mobility, and performance management due to the transparency of the competency-based learning and development model. In the Australian context, the learning framework is now being more broadly socialized and promoted among Australia’s state and territory police services and internationally among its ‘Five Eyes’ law enforcement partners (Australia, UK, USA, Canada, and New Zealand), where there is currently in development of an international programme at the master’s degree level to better develop intelligence practitioners for transnational inter–agency deployments working in partnership with investigators.

Further development of the CITDC is currently being undertaken to include specialist programmes for qualified analysts and field officers, which include financial and cyber intelligence programmes for analysts and human source and undercover programmes for FIOs. All these programmes are being developed with tertiary alignment and proficiency competences where staff eligibility is determined by their attainment of Level 2 competency as an analyst or field officer. In this manner, core competency skills are attained prior to more specialists and advanced programmes being undertaken ensuring sequential learning, and an apprentice to
expert pathway is maintained within the CITDC framework up to master’s degree level.

Finally, although there are signs of workplace improvement of intelligence staff, who have moved through the CITDC, the next phase in its development will be an empirical evaluation of delivered programmes drawing data from students, mentors, and leaders of how skills, qualifications, and competencies impact the workplace which in turn will be fed back into further curricula design of the framework.
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