COUNCIL OF EUROPE'S STRATEGIES REGARDING HUMAN RIGHTS TRAINING EVALUATION

André Konze

European External Action Service –
Civilian Planning and Conduct Capability

Abstract

The Council of Europe is an international organisation that promotes and protects human rights. Leaders within the Council of Europe accentuated the importance of effective training and training evaluations since 1993, but human rights training evaluation for law enforcement officials is still not sufficient to fully promote and to protect human rights. Program managers organise and evaluate training for law enforcement officials, but many program managers do not apply the evaluation guidelines of the Council of Europe. The researcher in his exploratory multi-case study interviewed a sample of 11 out of a population of 30 focusing on their strategies to evaluate human right training for law enforcement officials. The theoretical framework that has been applied was Kirkpatrick's four-level evaluation model. While the first (reaction) and second (learning) level provide assessment for internal validity, the third level assesses the behaviour of participants, and the result level shows the external validity of the program. The leadership style used by the Council of Europe leaders determines their strategies. Transactional leadership might be appropriate to guide program managers to adhere to the evaluation guidelines. However, Council of Europe leaders who follow the transformational leadership approach are more likely to lead their program managers effectively. The findings of the study surprisingly showed that program managers independently developed strategies to evaluate law enforcement training. The qualitative multi-case study promoted an understanding of the strategies used by program managers to evaluate human rights training.

Keywords: *Training, Training Evaluation, Leadership, Qualitative method, Multi case study, Law Enforcement Training, Council of Europe*

CEPOL

Introduction

The Council of Europe is an international organisation that promotes and protects human rights through international conventions since 1949 (Council of Europe, 2015b). The Parliamentary Assembly in 1993 articulated its deep concern about the resurgence of racism, xenophobia, and intolerance throughout Europe, and recommended the introduction of human rights training, including training evaluation findings (Council of Europe, 1993). The Parliamentary Assembly in 1997 recognised continued failures in applying human rights standards by law enforcement officials due to a lack of effective evaluation of training (Council of Europe, 1997). Over the last 10 years, the annual budget spent by the Council of Europe and the European Commission for human rights protection increased to €90,403,000 in 2017, but the number of litigations issued by the European Court of Human Rights originating from a lack of effective training evaluations did not decrease (Council of Europe, 2015a; Council of Europe, 2015b).

In the opposite, the number of litigations instigated by the European Court of Human Rights concerning law enforcement between 2006 and 2016 increased from 347 to 643 (European Court of Human Rights, 2017). Council of Europe leaders needed research providing information on how to ensure program managers follow the evaluation guidelines. Law enforcement officials who have participated in training improved by evaluation findings might demonstrate a higher adherence to human rights standards. The Police and Human Rights Program of the Council of Europe has countered the human rights issues since 1997. The purpose of the program and its successors was to promote the development of police services that respect and protect the human rights of the public (Council of Europe, 1998).

The evaluation guidelines issued by the Directorate of Internal Oversight (DIO) in 2014 prescribed training evaluations in a structured way using a systematic and an impartial approach. Utilizing the evaluation guidelines aims to make evaluations credible and useful (Council of Europe, 2014). Program managers of the Council of Europe organise and evaluate human rights training for law enforcement officials; however, many program managers do not apply the evaluation guidelines in training programs. Summative training evaluations as described in the evaluation guidelines may enhance the accountability of training, feed into management and decision-making processes, maximise the impact of the training provided, and drive organisational learning and innovation. The regulatory and financial resources to conduct summative training evaluations are available, but many program managers of the Council of Europe do not strictly follow the evaluation guidelines (Council of Europe, 2015a).

CEPOL

Statement of the Problem

The general problem is Council of Europe program managers fail to adhere to training evaluation guidelines increasing litigation issues (Carnevale & Shulz, 1990). The specific problem is that some Council of Europe leaders lack effective strategies to ensure that program managers of human rights training adhere to the evaluation guidelines (Bassi & Shulz, 1990). The qualitative multi-case study design choice intended to generate an understanding of the effective strategies used by Council of Europe leaders to guide program managers on the utilisation of the evaluation guidelines (Punch, 2005).

Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework for the exploratory qualitative multi-case study was the Kirkpatrick four-level model of training evaluation (Kirkpatrick, 1960). Kirkpatrick originally formulated his model in 1959 and further developed the model over subsequent decades. The Kirkpatrick model focuses on four levels described as reaction, learning, behaviour, and results (Kirkpatrick, 1960). Reaction is a measure of what the delegates taught of an activity or program; learning is a measure of the learning of principles, facts, skills, and attitudes; behaviour is a measure of changes in aspects of job performance; and results is a measure of the changes in the criteria of organisational effectiveness. Kirkpatrick's model highlights the necessity of comprehensive training evaluation including participants' behaviour change evaluation as opposed to a description of training and participants' immediate reactions to training. Kirkpatrick's four level model is appropriate for the exploratory qualitative multi-case study as it could serve as a framework for the evaluation of Council of Europe human rights training (Kirkpatrick & Kirkpatrick, 2006).

Significance of the Study

The significance of the exploratory qualitative multi-case study was founded in the importance to explore what effective strategies Council of Leaders use to ensure that program managers of human rights training adhere to the evaluation guidelines. The exploratory qualitative multi-case study aimed to provide leaders with effective strategies to ensure that program managers of human rights training adhere to the evaluation guidelines (Aytes & Connolly, 2004). Leaders in intergovernmental organisations financed by member states are accountable for the thorough management of the organisation as the member states expect a return of investment.

Methodology

The researcher used a qualitative methodology to explore the strategies of program managers to evaluate human rights training for law enforcement officials. Researchers use the qualitative method to explore the unique views of a small sample as qualitative research increases the understanding behind situations and occurrences (Glesne & Pesh-

kins, 1992; Starman, 2013). The qualitative method has been an emerging and interpretive method for investigating individuals or situations in a natural environment to discover individual perspectives and strategies (Yilmaz, 2013).

Design

From different qualitative designs like ethnography, phenomenology, and grounded theory, the researcher used the exploratory multi-case study design as the case study approach allows investigating a contemporary phenomenon in depth and its real-world context (Yin, 2014). Researchers use case study design to analyse programs, events, or groups of individuals from a rigorous perspective. The case study design could be evaluative, explanatory, descriptive, or exploratory (Tellis, 1997). The evaluative case study is a psychology, assessment, or evidence-based approach. Researchers who employ the descriptive case study start with a descriptive theory, and the use of explanatory case studies allow determining the value of conducting a research study. The holistic approach of the exploratory case study supports exploring the effective strategies that Council of Europe leaders use to ensure that program managers adhere to the evaluation guidelines (Yin, 2014).

Setting, Population and Sample

A population is the entire group of individuals or items that share one or more characteristics, used to gather and analyse data (Simon & Goes, 2012). The population of this multi-case study contained leaders within the Human Rights Directorate and within the Directorate of Internal Oversight (DIO) of the Council of Europe. The number of Council of Europe leaders – and therefore the population of the study - within the Human Rights Directorate and within the DIO have been 30 (Council Europe, 2017a; Council of Europe, 2017b; Council of Europe, 2017c). The expertise of the population was the basis for the choice of individuals in the proposed study.

Participants of a study represent a sample of some larger population to which the researcher wishes to generalise her or his findings (Cone & Foster, 2006). For the exploratory qualitative multi-case study, the researcher used purposive sampling with a predetermined criterion of importance. Purposive sampling is a process, researchers use to obtain samples through qualitative research, and is determined through the research question (Mason, 2010). The researcher obtained the information about the participants from the organisation chart of the Council of Europe, as the participants were, or have to be, in charge for law enforcement human rights training. There are no set sample sizes in qualitative research, but in case study research, the researcher should follow the principle described as selection to the point of redundancy, which means that the sample size must be sufficient to reach data saturation (Guba & Lincoln, 1994). Data saturation is reached when there is enough information to replicate the study, when the ability to obtain additional new information has been attained, and when further coding is not feasible (Fusch

CEPOL

& Ness, 2015). After nine interviews, the researcher conducted two more interviews to meet confirmability of data saturation. The interviews were conducted in English, as English is an official language of the Council of Europe.

Number of Interviewees (4 male, 7 females|)	Unit/Task during the time of the interview
5	Interviewees were working in the Criminal Law Cooperation Unit within the AACD.
1	Interviewee was working in a unit that coordinates cooperation projects or projects of technical assistance in the fields of probation, police, and prisons.
1	Interviewee was working with projects in the criminal justice field.
1	Interviewee was working in the Justice and Political Cooperation Department of the Council of Europe.
1	Interviewee was working as a project manager of projects involving training in the field of human rights.
1	Interviewee oversaw a program including human rights education for judges, prosecutors, and lawyers.
1	Interviewee oversaw a program including human rights education for judges, prosecutors, and lawyers.

Instruments

The researcher, who functioned as the interviewer, developed the interview questions based on the research question. The interview questions were related to what effective strategies Council of Europe leaders use to ensure that program managers of human rights training adhere to the evaluation guidelines and serve as a guideline for the proposed multi-case study. The semi-structured format allowed intense communication with each participant and provided the flexibility to pursue a rich description based on participant responses (Yin, 2014).

The researcher used an interview protocol in the exploratory qualitative multi-case study for asking questions and recording answers during a qualitative interview. The interviewer recorded information from interviews by making handwritten notes and by audiotaping. Notes should be taken even if an interview is taped if recording equipment fails. The interview protocol of the proposed study included the following components: A heading comprising date, place, interviewer, and pseudonyms assigned for the participants; instructions for the interviewer to follow; the interview questions; a thank-you statement to acknowledge the time the participant spent during the interview was included in the interview protocol; and a log kept by the researcher that would work well for primary and secondary data (Castillo-Montoya, 2016).

Limitations

The researcher got permission to use the premises of Council of Europe to conduct the interviews within the framework of a study visit. In its letter from August 28, 2018, the Council of Europe granted the researcher permission to use a room within the Council of Europe within the period from October 8 through October 10, 2018. The researcher needed to schedule the interviews within the period October 8 through October 10, 2018. The number of interviews led to data saturation and none of the participants denied the invitation because of not being available within the given period. The limited time might have caused time pressure for participants to be less open, calm, or affected their moods (Simon, 2011; Merriam & Tisdell, 2015).

The Researcher, Informed Consent, Confidentiality, and Ethics

The researcher was responsible for organizing, performing, and evaluating human rights training activities that time. A lack of rigor caused by the bias and the emotional attachment of the researcher could be a consequence. To reduce bias and increase the likelihood of honest responses, no participant has been interviewed who worked together with the researcher on training evaluation. Moreover, the interviewer did not interject personal opinions during the interviews. Participants of the study obtained satisfactory information about the proposed study before such participants made an informed decision. Those participants received a copy of the informed consent to read, review, understand, and sign before participating. The letter advised participants about the potential for risks inherent in any research study. No participant withdrew from the study (Yin, 2014).

The researcher must protect participant identities in recordings and written information. All identifying participant information on the audio recordings and throughout the analysis and reporting process were replaced with pseudonyms. The pseudonyms include the word participants and an actual name, i.e. participant Alan. The master list of participants, the assigned pseudonyms, and the transcripts will remain in a locked safety deposit box at the researcher's house for three years. Each participant received a copy of the transcribed and revised interview. The participants made their remarks in handwriting on the document provided by the interviewer. Following transcription approval, destruction of all audio recordings by means of demagnetisation occurred. If desired, the participants may receive a summary of the study findings following defence of the research study (Yin, 2014).

The protection of human rights is essential in human subject research. Researchers must exercise caution to do no harm physically, emotionally, or psychologically to study participants. Harm could arise from deceptive practices, data misinterpretation or misrepresentation, breach of confidentiality, or an increased awareness of inadequacy. Study participants could be at risk for psychological regret, embarrassment, emotional anxiety, or fear. To help relieve the possibility of emotional harm, participants were assured that

CEPOL

no right or wrong answers existed. After multiple reviews of the recordings and transcripts, all recordings were destroyed.

Financing Training Activities of the Council of Europe

Financing training evaluation within the Council of Europe is dependent on the budget line of training activities. For human rights training financed by the European Union, the Council of Europe is regularly used as the facilitator of the respective training. The Council of Europe organises the training in the framework of projects with budgets lines assigned for training evaluation. The Council of Europe also organises and performs training outside of a project, such training activities are financed by the ordinary budget of the Council of Europe. Council of Europe training takes place in member states in which no training projects financed by the European Union are organised. Training financed by the ordinary budget of the Council of Europe might also be conducted where there is a specific need that is not part of a European Union project. The Council of Europe is also conducting and financing conferences or multi-lateral conferences that are organised in Strasbourg/France. Training and conferences financed by the Council of Europe have no budget lines assigned for training evaluation.

Interviews

The researcher evaluated the transcribed interviews identifying common themes. The interview questions at the beginning of each interview served as a guideline and a door opener. The researcher developed the interview questions assuming the evaluation guidelines of the Council of Europe are the core document for program managers when it comes to training evaluation. When conducting the interviews, the researcher detected that the interviewees do not include the evaluation guidelines when preparing and performing training evaluation. The semi-structured format allowed the researcher intense communication with each interviewee and provided the flexibility to pursue a rich description based on participant responses (Christensen et al., 2014). The researcher triggered the interviewees to present the current training evaluation, which in most cases disregards the evaluation guidelines. At the end of each interview, the researcher offered participants the opportunity to add comments about training evaluation not directly related to a specific interview question. The researcher extracted the essential statements from the transcripts of the interviews. The researcher rephrased the statements without changing the meaning when necessary to understand the dialogue.

Interview of Alan: *"When I started my current position, I was surprised that the Council of Europe has no training evaluation system in place. The only current training evaluation is the training report. The training report is subjective because it is the personal view of the program manager. Through a lack of internal communication, important information regarding training and training evaluation is not transferred to and between program managers."*

Interview of Betty: "*I do not know about the evaluation guidelines of the Council of Europe. Program managers or trainers write a report about the training. These reports are not a summative training evaluation. The reports do not include an objective description of the training elements, the training implementation, or the training outcome. Council of Europe human rights training does not include training evaluation except evaluation on a trainer based personal initiative. After law enforcement training in Georgia, questionnaires are handed out to the trainees. The questionnaires contain questions about the satisfaction of the trainees, which include even the quality of the coffee. It is critical to know if the trainees have received the necessary information, useful for their current day-to-day work.*"

Interview of Carol: "*Training evaluation could be conducted ex-ante or ex-post to the training. […] Feedback should be integrated in programming of future training. Evaluation is nothing new. Evaluation was already part of the Marshall Plan and the project cycle management. For training, delivered in the framework of Project Management, evaluation has always been included.*"

Interview of Dorothy: "*I was involved in the development of guidelines for the development of training for legal professionals. These guidelines were called "The HELP Course from Design to Evaluation". It is critical that program managers see the need of training evaluation. At the beginning and at the end of each training, a questionnaire will be handed out. The questionnaire allows assessing the evolution during the training. Another questionnaire should be handed out after three months and another one after six months…When a project or training is being developed, the learning objectives should be defined.*"

Interview of Emma: "*Evaluation guidelines do not exist within the Council of Europe. There is no structured training evaluation at the Council of Europe. Qualitative evaluation should measure knowledge at the beginning and at the end of the training course. Current training evaluation does not include such measuring. Project managers organise training evaluation on their own initiative. Program managers are constantly working on improving evaluation. Program managers must submit training reports. The European Court of Human Rights case law is extremely important when teaching prison guards and law enforcement officials.*"

Interview of Florence: "*There are no general training evaluation guidelines within the Council of Europe. There are evaluation guidelines developed by the Department for Internal Oversight. I have partly read them. I do not apply these guidelines for training activities. I forgot to mention interim reports, progress reports, and final reports. Such reports are a good tool to collect information of a project. I used self-developed questionnaires as an evaluation tool for training activities. I was satisfied with the results as these questionnaires allowed to assess the level of knowledge after the training course.*"

CEPOL

Interview of Gloria: *"There are no evaluation guidelines of the Council of Europe. Self-developed multiple-choice questions and oral exams should be considered as internal training evaluation. Training evaluation is one of the most important elements of training. The donors do not impose us to evaluate the training."*

Interview of Harold: *"Evaluation guidelines did not exist when I started working on projects and training 15 years ago. That was a time of big enthusiasm after the fall of the Berlin Wall. It was not so much time of evaluation. That was the time of action. For the program manager it was interesting to see if the participants did benefit from the training. At the beginning, the questions were simple like how the training material was, 'was the trainer good, what would you like to see improved, what are the topics you would like to see'. External evaluation differs from internal evaluation. Initially, the Council of Europe conducted internal evaluation with questionnaires connected to the organisation of each training. In contrary, external evaluation is evaluation performed by a company, a firm, an institution, or a consultant that is external to the Council of Europe, external to the donor and that conducts the evaluation. The way the Council of Europe works, including evaluation, became very bureaucratic and too hierarchical. It should be more flexibility and not too much evaluation. The evaluation guidelines are rather impractical, written by people with limited experience with project management. Evaluation guidelines should include more freedom, more autonomy, and more flexibility. A project manager should have the choice, where to spend the money. I would prefer to spend it on training rather than on evaluation when there is no sufficient budget to hire the necessary team."*

Interview of Ian: *"The Council of Europe does not have evaluation guidelines. There is an evaluation unit, which has developed some guidelines. These guidelines should not be considered as an evaluation strategy. Although program managers do not have training evaluation guidelines, program manager try to assess and evaluate the training that has been conducted. Program managers developed questionnaires that are completed by the participants. Program managers monitor training sessions and coach the trainers. Program managers ask the trainers to provide the pre- and post-questionnaires to the participant. My unit launched evaluation techniques to conduct a long-term evaluation. We use focus groups of ten or twenty participants for hundred or two hundred participants to evaluate the training after six months, after one year, and after two years."*

Interview of Kathleen: *"Evaluation has been conducted on the initiative of program managers. I designed a tool for trainers where different types of scenarios like role-playing have been included. The participants should identify themselves with victims and investigators on the crime scene. It is important to observe the multiplying effect of training and to work with academies incorporating exercises into their curriculum. Flexibility of evaluation guidelines is important."*

Interview of Leroy: "*The evaluation guidelines of the Council of Europe are very general and leave a lot of room for flexibility. An example of training evaluation are Training of Trainers activities with the pre- and post- knowledge and skills tests, which measure the immediate success rate of training. Training evaluation is different depending on the respective unit of the Council of Europe. Program mangers adjust their evaluation to the needs, the beneficiaries, and the target group, which could include judges, prosecutors, academies, or judicial training centres. The Department for Internal Oversight does not systematically conduct evaluation of each project or program.*"

Analysis of Interviews

Interviewees clarified that through weaknesses within the internal communication, important information regarding training and training evaluation is not completely transferred to and between program managers.

Self-Developed Summative Training Evaluation

Program manager are assigned to organise human rights training financed by the European Union within the framework of budgets and by the ordinary budget of the Council of Europe. The European Union introduced intensive evaluation as a part of the project contracts. Some evaluation must be an external evaluation, implying financial issues. Interviewees explained that organizing and conducting training, including evaluation, became too bureaucratic and too hierarchical. To make evaluation happen, program managers make use of trainers to conduct human rights training for law enforcement officials. Program managers and trainers write training reports such as interim reports, progress reports, and final reports for projects and human rights training. The reports include the number of trainees, as well as major difficulties and major items highlighted by the trainees. Such training reports are subjective because the reports include the personal point of view of the program manager. The training reports additionally often disregard the point of view of the trainees. Moreover, the reports do not include an objective description of the major training elements, do not include how the training was implemented, and do not include what the outcome of the training was. The reports should also contain the lacunae, the loopholes, and further needs. For training facilitated in the framework of a project financed by the European Union, the reports do not comply with the requirement of the evaluation requested by the European Union as the reports are a quantitative.

The results of the training evaluation are submitted to the financing authority. Program managers developed a wide range of training evaluation tools and activities, including self-developed strategies for training evaluation to fulfil the requirements of the European Union. Interviewees invented self-developed evaluation-like questionnaires because

from their perspective it is important to know the point of view of the trainees. Simple questionnaires contain questions about whether the trainees were happy with the content, whether the training was useful, whether the premises were good, and whether the coffee was served hot. Several items about the training, which should be addressed through a proper, evaluation-training questionnaire, are not included in such simple questionnaires.

Training evaluation developed by program managers for human rights training including Training of Trainers activities often contain pre- and post-knowledge and skills tests. Such tests measure the immediate result of the training. Pre- and post-tests are distributed and collected by trainers and sent back to program managers after the training. Pre- and post-tests may be complemented by self-developed multiple-choice questions and oral exams. Another self-developed evaluation tool for trainers includes exercises, handouts, and ideas about different types of scenarios, most role-playing. The aim is that the participants should identify themselves with victims and investigators on the crime scene. Program managers together with experts and trainers are developing entry and exit questionnaires based on the substance of the respective training to measure the level of knowledge at the entrance and level of knowledge at the exit.

Triangulation

The purpose of the triangulation was to confirm the findings of the analysis of the results of the exploratory qualitative multi-case study. Triangulation was achieved using several sources when retrieving data (Yin, 2014; Seidman, 2013; Chowdhury, 2015). The first triangulation source included one-on-one interviews with Council of Europe leaders. The second and third triangulation source include the document review. The researcher reviewed documents including litigations of the European Court of Human Rights, reports from the European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, and evaluated reports issued by the Directorate of Internal Oversight.

Litigations of the European Court of Human Rights

The researcher used the HUDOC database to identify litigation of the European Court of Human Rights against member states of the Council of Europe, where misconduct of law enforcement officials led to a violation of human rights. The researcher limited the research to the years 2010 until 2018. The researcher selected litigations against member states of the Council of Europe, which are not member states of the European Union. Member states of the European Union are not covered by human rights training of the Council of Europe. The researcher identified 32 cases in which misconduct of law enforcement officials was considered a serious violation of human rights of citizens. The research

was limited to the years 2010 until 2018 and to member states of the Council of Europe, which are not member states of the European Union. The high number indicates that law enforcement official still lacks effective human rights training. Human rights training for law enforcement official would be more effective, if the training would include findings from a summative training evaluation.

Reports from the European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment

The researcher used the HUDOC database to identify reports of visits of the European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment to member states of the Council of Europe, where severe physical ill-treatment of persons detained by the police as criminal suspects led to a violation of human rights. The researcher limited the research to the years 2017 and 2018. The researcher selected reports about member states of the Council of Europe, which are not member states of the European Union. Member states of the European Union are not covered by human rights training of the Council of Europe. The researcher has evaluated four reports issued in 2017 and 2018 for Azerbaijan, Ukraine (2 visits/reports), and Serbia. All reports include that the CPT received numerous and widespread allegations of severe physical ill-treatment of persons detained by the police as criminal suspects including juveniles as young as 15. The alleged police ill-treatment appeared to follow a very consistent pattern throughout the different regions visited. Police ill-treatment was said to have occurred mostly in police establishments during initial interviews by operational police officers, with the aim to force the persons to sign a confession, provide other information or accept additional charges. Law enforcement officials have not been trained effectively to refrain from misconduct. Summative training evaluation would have led to a more effective human rights training for law enforcement officials.

Annual Reports from the Directorate of Internal Oversight

The Directorate of Internal Oversight (DIO) of the Council of Europe provides independent oversight, objective assurance, and consulting services designed to add value to and improve the Organisation's operations. The researcher evaluated the annual reports 2016 and 2017 issued by the Directorate of Internal Oversight. The reports were assessed concerning the statements of the DIO about training evaluation. The reports contained recommendations to provide the Council of Europe with more transparent and efficient processes, greater controls, and better compliance with the existing regulations including training offered by the Council of Europe.

Summary

The purpose of the qualitative multi-case study was to explore Council of Europe's strategies regarding human rights training evaluation. The analysis of results focused on the analysis of the interviews of eleven Council of Europe leaders and their strategies regarding training evaluation. Two leadership styles show promise in providing effective strategies to assure that program managers are following the evaluation guidelines. The leadership styles are transactional leadership and transformational leadership. Bass (1985) suggested that transactional and transformational leadership are separate concepts, and that good leaders demonstrate characteristics of both.

Improving Training Evaluation

The interviewees underlined the need to know if the trainees have received the necessary information for their current day-to-day work. Program managers try to obtain such information by qualitative evaluation. Qualitative evaluation should measure knowledge at the beginning and at the end of the training. Evaluation should take place six months after the training. This is rarely done with Council of Europe human rights training. There is a contractual obligation to evaluate European Union financed projects including standardised questionnaires. Interviewees proposed to improve the evaluation guidelines through more freedom, more autonomy, and more flexibility. The guidelines should also fit if the project is relatively small and has limited resources. In the case, a program manager or supervisor is left with the choice about where to spend the money it should be possible to spend the respective budget solely on training.

Leadership and Leadership Styles

The transactional leadership theory views the leader-follower relation as a sequence of transactions and exchanges between the leader and the followers. Transactional leaders focus on an exchange of resources. A transactional leader-follower relationship includes rewards or punishments, respectively, to compensate followers' compliance and efforts to achieve organisational goals, or followers' failure to meet the leader's goals. Transactional leadership is often referred to as command-and-control type leadership. Transactional leadership has been the typical type of leadership used in organisations, the military, and government service. Transforming leadership is a process whereby leaders and followers support each other to achieve a higher level of moral and motivation. Transforming leaders should be able to generate considerable change in the life of people, organisations, and communities. Transforming leaders possess the traits, personality, and characteristics to articulate energised vision and challenging goals (Burns, 1978; Bass 1990; Judge & Bono, 2000; Yukl, 2002; Zaccaro, 2007; Burns, 2010).

Recommendations to Council of Europe Leaders

Program manager act as transactional leaders when they follow the project plans, perform evaluation, and provide such evaluation to the donors of the activities. Program managers do not apply the evaluation guidelines for training evaluation. Program manager are filling the gap of policies when they develop their own evaluation tools. Program managers safeguarded the compliance with the requirements of projects and prevented the Council of Europe from breaking the rules. Some program managers are trying to interconnect projects, but program managers are organisationally and financially bound to their projects and therefore unable to find a higher level of ethical guidelines and motivation. The tools developed and applied by program manager might fulfil the project requirements but lack the achievement of an interconnected strategy.

Council of Europe leaders should create considerable change in the adherence of program managers to the evaluation guidelines when using transformational leadership. Transformational leadership facilitates a redefinition of a people's mission and vision, a renewal of leaders' commitment, and restructuring their systems for goal accomplishments. Council of Europe leaders should make use of the motivation and enthusiasm of program managers. Council of Europe leaders, together with the Department for Internal Oversight, should use effective communication and transparency to introduce effective evaluation tools to program managers. Program managers are hesitant to use means provided by the Council of Europe. Council of Europe leaders need to convince program managers that the use of such means is serving their own goals and the goals of the organisation. Program managers should be asked to contribute to the development of an evaluation strategy of the organisation.

Conclusions

Training evaluation generates the information for decision-making about future training methods, training contents, and training participants. Although the Council of Europe Secretariat in 2014 has introduced the evaluation guidelines as a binding document, program managers of the Council of Europe do not fully apply the evaluation guidelines for training evaluation of human rights training for law enforcement officials. The only current systematic training evaluation is the training report. Training reports are formative. Each individual program manager decides how the evaluation of activities will be organised. Program mangers develop and conduct training evaluations on their own initiative. The self-developed training evaluation contains elements of summative training evaluation. Program managers made constructive proposals about conducting training evaluations for human rights training.

CEPOL

Council of Europe leaders and program managers achieved remarkable results when evaluating human rights training for law enforcement officials adding elements of summative evaluation. Program managers provided a cornerstone of evaluation when using self-developed evaluation tools to provide the required results to the European Union. Council of Europe leaders using transformational leadership should support each other to achieve a higher level of morale and motivation. Council of Europe leaders should generate considerable change concerning training evaluation, as they possess the traits, personality, and characteristics to articulate energised vision and challenging goals. Council of Europe leaders, through transformational leadership, should develop further training evaluation to achieve the goals of the organisation.

References

- Aytes, K. & Connolly, T. (2004). Computer security and risky computing practices: A rational choice perspective. *Journal of Organizational and End User Computing, 16*(3), 22-40. doi:10.4018/joeuc.2004070102

- Bass, B. M. (1990) From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics, 18*(3), 19-31. doi:10.1016/0090-2616(90)90061-S

- Bass, B. M. (1985) *Leadership and performance beyond expectations.* New York, NY: The Free Press.

- Burns, J. M. (1978) *Leadership.* New York, NY. Harper & Row.

- Burns, J. M. (2010) *Leadership.* New York, NY. Harper & Row.

- Carnevale, A. P. & Shulz, E. R. (1990) Return on investment: Accounting for training. *Training and Development Journal, 44,* 1-32.
  Retrieved from http://www.worldcat.org/title/return-on-investment-accounting-for-training/oclc/743493513?referer=di&ht=edition

- Castillo-Montoya, M. (2016) Preparing for interview research: The interview protocol refinement framework. *The Qualitative Report, 21*.
  Retrieved from http://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol21/iss5/2

- Chowdhury, I. A. (2015) Issue of quality in a qualitative research: An overview. *Innovative issues and approaches in social science*, 8(3), 142-162. doi:10.1590/0104-070720150001150015

- Christensen, L. B., Johnson, R. B. & Turner, L. A. (2014) *Research methods, design, and analysis* (12th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

- Cone, J. D., & Foster, S. L. (2006) *Dissertations and theses from start to finish*. American Psychological Association. Washington, D.C.: APA

- Council of Europe (1993) *Recommendation 1222–Fight against racism, xenophobia and intolerance.*
  Retrieved from http://www.assembly.coe.int/nw/xml/XRef/Xref-XML2HTML-en.asp?fileid=15256&lang=en

- Council of Europe (1997) *Recommendation 1346–Human rights education*.
  Retrieved from http://assembly.coe.int/nw/xml/XRef/Xref-XML2HTML-EN.asp?fileid=15380&lang=en

- Council of Europe (1998) *Yearbook of the European convention on human rights 1997*. Leiden, NL: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.

- Council of Europe (2014a) *The European Convention on Human Rights: The need to reinforce the training of legal professionals*.
  Retrieved from http://www.assembly.coe.int/nw/xml/XRef/Xref-XML2HTML-en.asp?fileid=20550&lang=en

- Council of Europe (2014b) *Parliamentary assembly*.
  Retrieved from https://www.coe.int/t/democracy/migration/bodies/pace_en.asp

- Council of Europe (2015a) *Council of Europe program and budget 2016-2017*.
  Retrieved from https://wcd.coe.int/com.instranet.InstraServlet?command=com.instranet. CmdBlobGet&InstranetImage=2864512&SecMode=1&DocId=2342508&Usage=2

- Council of Europe (2015b) *Human rights, democracy, rule of law*.
  Retrieved from http://www.coe.int/en/web/about-us/values

- Council of Europe (2017a) *Evaluation activities*.
  Retrieved from http://www.coe.int/en/web/internal-oversight/evaluation-activities

- Council of Europe (2017b) *Mandate and organizational chart*.
  Retrieved from http://www.coe.int/en/web/human-rights-rule-of-law/mandate-organigramme

- Council of Europe (2017c) *Directorate of Internal Oversight*.
  Retrieved from http://www.coe.int/en/web/internal-oversight/dio

- European Court of Human Rights (2017a) *Annual Report 2016*.
  Retrieved from http://www.echr.coe.int/Documents/Annual_report_2016_ENG.pdf

- European Court of Human Rights (2017b) *HUDOC*.
  Retrieved from http://hudoc.echr.coe.int/

- Ford, J. K. & Sinha, R. (2008) Advances in training evaluation research. In C. Cooper & S. Cartwright (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Personnel Psychology*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

- Fusch, P. I. & Ness, L. R. (2015) Are we there yet? Data saturation in qualitative research. *The Qualitative Report, 20*. 1408.
  Retrieved from http://nsuworks.nova.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2281&context=tqr

- Glesne, C. & Peshkin, A. (1992) *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction*. White Plains, NY: Longman.

- Judge, T. A. & Bono, J. E. (2000) Five factor model of personality and transformational leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*, 751-765. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.85.5.751

- Kirkpatrick, D. L. (1960) Techniques for evaluating training programs. *Journal of ASTD, 14*(1), 13-18.

- Kirkpatrick, D. L. & Kirkpatrick, J.D. (2006) *Evaluating training programs–The four levels* (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

- Guba, E. G. & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994) Competing paradigms in qualitative research. *Handbook of Qualitative Research*.

- Mason, M. (2010) Sample size and saturation in PhD studies using qualitative interviews. *Qualitative Social Research. 11*(3).
  Retrieved from http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1428/3027

CEPOL

- Merriam, S. B. & Tisdell, E. J. (2015) *Qualitative Research: A guide to design and implementation*. (4th ed). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Punch, K. F. (2005) *Introduction to social research: Quantitative and qualitative approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Seidman, I. (2013) *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

- Simon, M. K. (2011) *Dissertation and scholarly research: Recipes for success.* Seattle, WA: Dissertation Success, LLC.

- Simon, M. K. & Goes, J. (2012) *Dissertation and scholarly research: Recipes for success*. Retrieved from http://dissertationrecipes.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/04/samplesizematters.pdf

- Tellis, W. M. (1997) Introduction to case study. *The Qualitative Report, 3*(2), 1-14. Retrieved from http://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol3/iss2/4

- Yilmaz, K. (2013) Comparison of quantitative and qualitative research traditions: epistemological, theoretical, and methodological differences. *European Journal of Education, 48*, 193-325. doi:10.1111/ejed.12014

- Yin, R. K. (2014) *Case study research–design and methods* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Yukl, G. (2002) *Leadership in organizations*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

- Zaccaro, S.J. (2007) Trait-based perspectives of leadership. *American Psychologist, 62,* 6–16.