
Organizational Culture:

Is it a Plus or a Minus
in Your Organization?

Charlie Connolly

ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE:

IS IT A PLUS OR A MINUS IN YOUR ORGANIZATION?

In previous handouts we have discussed the need for ethic's centered leadership in our law enforcement organizations. We acknowledged the current contributions of what might be the best and brightest of leaders in the profession. But it must be noted that the world and, indeed, the nation is in constant flux, given the demands on combating terrorism, domestic and international crime and our ability to contain it (2.2 million in prisons, countless millions on parole and probation). Such problems are accompanied by changing demographics amidst concerns for our economic wellbeing. If we can agree with the previous statements, perhaps we can encourage those current leaders with their attributes, abilities and capabilities towards the pathway to that of the "transformative leader." If further change and flexibility is a desired state then we need to move beyond that of the chief and his/her executive staff. The type of change we are suggesting is not just a top down initiative. It may begin there, but its roots must be as strong at the grassroots level if it is to make any real impact on the agency and society. Examining organizational culture within the agency, therefore, should be at the top of the list.

An examination of the agency's organizational culture allows us a view rarely seen by top command. Yes, their movements through the ranks gave them snapshots of what one believes was the culture, but rarely has anyone tried to get their arms around the process. If change is essential to how we view the workings of a contemporary law enforcement agency, and if we are successful in developing a better understanding of what, how and why such culture exists, we may better understand the dynamics of change that occurs at varying levels effecting the delivery service of our primary product, "protect and preserve our nation's values and justice institutions." It may be that the ethic centered leader's greatest challenge will not be fulfilled until such an internal audit is attempted. With that in mind let us examine the topic of organizational culture.

Organizational Culture

You say you have it. How well do you know what it is? Are you and your colleagues certain that you know what is to be known about this internal culture? A culture that critics often demand be changed along with its leadership or is it one we and others continually praise as something the community should be proud of? The age old question still persists, "How do we know the unknowable?" Are there those who are that confident that they are aware of what they don't know? If true, then we could take steps to remedy a defect or deficit in our system. Our real dilemma, however, is not knowing what we don't know. Yet, knowing such a difference exists could enable us to act upon our ignorance by taking a giant step towards an ethics/principle centered organization. Admittedly, any examination of an agency's culture is an extremely difficult task. This is merely an attempt to raise thoughts and ideas that can help an organization gauge its relevancy to its belief system. If it stimulates interest in examining the

consistency of its cultural beliefs, it will have achieved some measure of success. While it appears focused on examining one's organizational culture, we believe that organizational improvements will not surface unless we understand the dynamics of change involved in every aspect of its delivery of service system, whether it stems from the public or private sector. The police community does not operate in a vacuum or a cocoon. The emergence of change in society will transform not only who is in the workplace, but client relationships and its product/service delivery system. We claim that the status quo in policing has and will continue to be altered by our hand or those who demand the need for its services and protection.

Admittedly, we are asking the reader to consider the positive utility of those methods that have been successful in the most valued corporations. If doable, we recommend incorporating those innovations that have proven successful. This project recognizes that unlike many private corporations the control of one's agency is not in the hands of the "corporate few." The police administrator's power or its limitations can be located in the chief's governmental appointing authority, political legislatures, local media, unions, and even community activists. While not always visibly obvious, diverse groups can also play a hand in controlling police accountability. Our premise, with limited proof, suggests that none of the foregoing may influence an organization more than the influence of its internal informal communication networks. The power of such networks can't simply be ignored or selectively dismissed by organizations, existing culture systems or on the basis of geography.

This paper is not offering a definitive approach to dealing with informal social communication networks other than to recognize their influence within an agency's culture. Informal communication networks, intentional or not, are influencers and influenced by individual members, fraternal associations, ethnic, race, religious, gender and sexual orientation. All of these diverse groups function within or attempt to influence law enforcement organizations.

Nor are we sure what is an appropriate model for large law enforcement organizations as we don't know what managers can or should do with this information. Yet, you may be ignoring a very important communicative dimension that can be counter productive to the agency's goals and objectives. What you chose to do may depend on just how much the formal and informal system can work with one another. Probing its depth can be a risk and possibly dangerous to morale. Ignoring its existence may be the cause of further chaos, again poor morale and an inability to deliver the public service that leadership has determined is needed. Nevertheless, a principle/ethic centered leader is asked to make hard decisions and meet challenges not just win popularity contests. Timid or meek souls rarely, if ever, find themselves on statues.

Undoubtedly, the issue of applying will and creativity to power is not as easily accomplished as that of private entrepreneurial power. Yet, such is not a reason for inertia in the furtherance of examining one's organizational culture. It is merely one more obstacle in pursuit of a successful result. In fact, any success, however limited, might be an asset in reducing those external influences on police authority and its delegated responsibility. Before discussing the internal workings of a law enforcement agency, perhaps we should take a cursory look at the external operating environment as seen by the transformational leader. Any insight one gains from this exercise may assist in assessing and appreciating the dynamics of misunderstanding among the

various operating levels within one's culture. Would these questions be relevant in your organization?

- ✓ Who are the agency's constituencies?
- ✓ Do you consider members of your agency a constituency? Does bargaining with the union cover that responsibility?
- ✓ How do you identify community groups? Is it appropriate to do?
- ✓ How would you describe each group's relationship? What are the specific issues involved? How long have these issues existed. If negative aspects exist, what has been done to alleviate them? Are there any positive aspects or history in the relationship?
- ✓ Can a claim of disparate treatment or share of services be made? What prior steps have been taken?
- ✓ In servicing various communities, are there any special issues or obstacles towards cooperative relationships?
- ✓ Are there any special strengths or weaknesses in dealing with specialized or prominent groups?
- ✓ Within your area of responsibility are there communities without clear community leadership or is there the presence of divisive loyalties? Can you offer any explanation?
- ✓ Has the agency ever made any attempt to recruit and develop local leadership? Should you do so?
- ✓ Is there any future potential for improving client relationships with specific groups? Would it be cost-beneficial?
- ✓ Experience suggests there are communities that appear to prefer less police contact, while some demand more. Some communities are more trusting of the police, while others are less trusting. Is this a continuing fact of life or should efforts be made to integrate better understanding of both types of communities? Are such dual beliefs held by some of your members of the service?
- ✓ Are there new groups to be added?
- ✓ Is there anything else that can be done to reverse real or perceived community feeling about a "negative playing field?"

- ✓ Given the notion, if not the belief, that there exists “protected classes,” can law enforcement maintain there is a universal standard of law enforcement? If we claim one operating standard, are you comfortable that it is truthful? How widespread are those beliefs in the community at large?

In examining the presence and impact that an agency’s organizational culture has on its effectiveness, it might be worthwhile to assess whether your members have a “not invented here mentality.” Is it appropriate to acknowledge that unlike most corporate enterprises, police agencies rarely are able to launch a new “product” or “service?” It can, however, launch different ways to deliver current services. The difficulty in the latter transition is that it sometimes requires managers to act against some of their traditional and somewhat reasonable instincts. In assessing one’s organizational culture, remember if we have to deal with the negatives, we have an obligation to promote the positives. In assessing any culture one of its attributes is that it must practice rationality and common sense behavior. Therefore, positive change will not occur if we don’t make it a practice to:

- Communicate a sound rationale for every undertaking and change.
- Appoint the right people to the right position.
- However, painful, remove or neutralize the “resisters.”
- Seize upon every positive opportunity to improve the culture whether it’s from your adversaries, competitors, or simply some one else’s misfortune.

Whether you agree or not, leadership requires distinct behavior that makes it debut on the day one is promoted. Real success is all about growing others as well as yourself. Principle centered leaders relentlessly upgrade their teams’ skill sets. They use every opportunity to evaluate the right people for the right job. They push the need to advance and support those who exhibit the ability and teamwork to move forward while simultaneously preparing their replacements. It is the ethics centered leader and his staff’s responsibility to build self confidence, encourage people to stretch, take risks and achieve their dreams. These elements are the fuel of winning teams. With such concepts in mind it is time to examine the state of our agency’s “organizational culture.”

Experience should tell us that there is an informal structure within any organization (the grapevine) that contributes to the success or failure of agency policies and programs. You won’t find it on any organizational chart. Yet, in some instances it may be more crucial to the overall effort than those individuals occupying command offices on the same floor. Undoubtedly, many ranking officers would be uncomfortable with the notion that some clerk, administrative aide, street supervisor or an entry level line officer can influence attitudes and behaviors as much or more than they can. Why? Because such social networks of alliances and disclosure are not maintained by chiefs or generals but individuals who serve as “hubs,” “gatekeepers” and “pulse takers.” For purposes of definition these transmitters are described as:

- “Hubs” are easy to spot as they share and similarly receive information from everyone.
- “Gatekeepers” form the crucial links between different parts of the organization and are critical to the flow of information. The person may be some one in administration who has contact with a variety of areas including operations. Due to their “listening posts” these individuals can expedite or interfere with the flow of official information. Rumors, gossip, even facts can be part of the process.
- The “Pulse Taker” may be the least obvious participant role. They are well connected, but more circumspect in handling information. They know the angles and the players and often act in a “Machiavellian” style. They even have some power in altering the context if not the content of the information before passing it along. Obviously, they can be part of management.

Why are the roles these people play important? – Because in many instances, they are the “culture carriers.” They help form the informal response to department policy in positive or negative ways. It is imperative that principle centered leaders recognize its importance and use their influence to move values, ideas, and policy rationales onto their playing field. If our overall goal is to win the hearts and minds of the public and to the extent possible the media, the ethic centered leader’s first step should be directed at those who deliver the actual police product. Again, it is neither an obvious or easy chore.

The links they create combine to form an unusual world of human trust in the agency. Whether we like it or not their communication exchanges can revise and distort the intent of official messages. We can ignore this phenomenon at our own peril as official mentors lose their effectiveness, ambitious members jump ship and the institutional memory becomes diminished if not confused as to its historical accuracy. The question of whose information is to be trusted should concern any agency. It is reasonable to say that no one fully understands the influence or synergistic impact it has on the official communication networks. To some extent it is similar to the President’s State of the Union address or his weekly radio address. After he speaks, the opposition party proceeds to tear down or attack the contents of the talk. I am not referring to official union statements. It is those conversations that are carried on in the patrol car, standing around on details or any place where two or more interested parties are involved. Those who see themselves as “worker bees” very often are not praising the efforts of leadership. Given one’s position in the agency it’s likely there are two different work perceptions at play. As difficult as it may be, properly addressed and communicated to some of these “resisters” can be an untapped resource for effective performance. Ignored they can be a tremendous source of organizational discontent, counter attacking the best instincts of the institution. Addressing them is a difficult challenge, most difficult for a number of reasons.

The informal communication network is not only invisible but noiseless to those who ignore the untold number of shared confidences on the street, in the radio car, off duty, at recreation and

leisure gatherings even the proverbial water cooler and the ever increasing Internet. Probably some in leadership have an intuitive understanding of the informal social network, but only that portion in a specific performance area. At some point during their careers they may have been part of it. However, no one intuitively understands the scope or value it has throughout the organization. Organizational leadership is somewhat detached from the informal intercourse. Agency action taken against members of the service, in highly charged circumstances, can be viewed somewhat differently depending on the position or perceived vulnerability in the organization. It seems sensible that somehow, somewhere, leadership find a better way to understand and feed this network. Who and how it is fed is another challenge.

While we are offering more encouragement than example initially, it may be important to assess the quality of official information, directives, policies, press releases, and even training bulletins being distributed. Such examination tells you what you been saying to the troops. If there is a disconnect between the agency's stated word and the feelings and beliefs of a large portion of the membership, maybe it's time to evaluate the need for a better alignment between the agency viewpoint and its members' perspective. We shouldn't forget that for large institutions we are "always preaching to a parade." That applies also to the political, media and general community constituencies. Never forget that the "deliverers" of the agency's product have to be considered a key constituency of the agency. As such, in producing an effective statement of purpose and mission, one is attempting to align a better balance between the possible and impossible. Even the most courageous leaders are often reluctant to acknowledge that there are problems for which there is no ready solution. This effort requires a real measure of ethics and character upon the part of the chief and his immediate staff. The lack of a ready solution requires not only forethought but sound marketing skills, as well. Any success should provide a clearer sense of direction and inspire others to feel a sense of self esteem and being part of something important. Those engaged in improving their organization must be convinced and capable of convincing others that beneath one's hard exterior is an individual who wants to be appreciated. If that is not the case, then a review of some better selection and retention processes must be explored. Opportunities may be lost but hopefully someone will act on the ones missed. The smart leader should make every effort to ensure that person is working for the organization! Understandably, any assessment of the informal network could surface a positive or negative purpose, or a combination of both. Within the organizational culture it would be foolhardy were we to simply identify "persons of influence" and move them somewhere else in the organization. For the most part, they are interchangeable parts of that parade that was just mentioned. Principle centered leaders need to explore and evaluate ways in which to engage even debate different and often negative perceptions among the entire workforce. The real issue is whether this dialogue is constant, consistent and honest. The best end result is to turn such individuals into organizational assets.

Today's theme is asking what type of leader can find ways and means to nourish both the formal and informal networks. The major challenge is to identify whether such a dual system can better serve the needs of both. Can we agree that police organizations are a constant source of shared confidences and communication? It seems rational to suspect that one can't effectively function without the cooperation or with non-cooperation of the other. Most of us, I believe, recognize that some form of counter communication exists. The central issue is whether to engage or

ignore it. Here are some questions that might aid in this search for better balance.

- ✓ Is it possible to inquire of an employee, “Whom do you go to for an answer to some current police issue?”
- ✓ Whose opinion do you respect?
- ✓ Who is the “go to guy” in your unit?
- ✓ Can you ask somewhere lower in the chain, “How do you get a sense of what’s happening within the organization?”
- ✓ We often hear the refrain, “What do you hear?” It’s common among front line officers. Do you marginalize it by simply responding that “cops are nose by nature?” Its entirely possible its the process by which they chose to receive their informational fixes. Police officers are not by nature “wallflowers,” they will add or reinforce some negative aspect of departmental activity, policy or public controversy.
- ✓ Currently, can you suggest areas of perceptual disagreement between the hierarchy and its operational workforce?
- ✓ Are you and your staff willing to debate or acknowledge difference of opinion among officers as to how the agency functions in regard to responding to political, community, minority and media criticism?
- ✓ How would you react or even respect their opinions regarding a serious gap in their understanding, the role of policing in a democratic society?

It might prove fruitful if we knew who they go to for decisions, whether it was personal or job related. In our judgment, it is just as important to know who officers trust and listen to as well as who reports to whom.

Recognizing, if not fully understanding, this somewhat silent network is equally important given the existence of the “unspoken conversation.” This is a form of silent communication whereby the individual may disagree with the contents of official communications, even conversations or perhaps the content of a training lesson. Further, regardless of that individual’s position in the organization, he/she chooses not to challenge or engage out of fear of retaliation or loss of position or prestige as it would be contrary to official dogma or political correctness. The inherent loss, due to this lack of communication, reduces debate and the opportunity to openly change opinions through honest discussion and training. Moreover, it leaves an air of dishonesty as their silence over fear of being called a boss hater, racist, warmonger, anti poor, etc. gives the impression of approval. These “unspoken conversations” are surely part of the informal network and hence detrimental to the overall organization. If the assumption is that there is a disconnect between top agency management and many of its subordinates “working the street,” is there an

opportunity to challenge the latter and better inform the former? In order to challenge the assumptions and values that officers either grew up with or adopted within the “brotherhood,” you must first initiate a dialogue and debate. In order to have purposeful discussion and deliberation the participants must feel comfortable in expressing their beliefs and feelings without fear of retaliation. It is the responsibility of management to provide such comfort. Are you comfortable as an ethic centered leader that you can initiate and foster that responsibility through the chain of command? Ranking members must be encouraged to walk among and talk with line supervisors and officers. They should not be expected to solve many of the issues, but just may be able to alter their perceptions about what is right and wrong about their organization. Having such “verbal visibility,” the line officers might discover that “bosses” are not as bad as they thought they were.

In formulating an initiative accessing the organizational culture, it should be noted that the value and veracity of “information” can be misused. The organization’s attempt could be seen as curtailing free speech or simply propaganda. Snapshots of simple gossip channels can under appreciate both the process and those skill sets of the participants. Faulty assumptions, flawed analysis, accompanied by misjudgment, can render any organizational attempts useless. An acknowledgment of such “pitfalls” should be part of any introduction of such an assessment project. Honesty is valued by one’s workforce similar to the community. It’s the presentation that screws up the process. It may surprise us to find out that those we believe are the most communicatively connected are really out of touch. Rather, people you never heard of may have the trust and are an essential part of keeping the social network in tact. We have to be careful to avoid the inclination to attack the messenger rather than focusing on the importance of how the network functions. What is occurring is a natural phenomenon that people simply want to know what is happening in their world and share confidences while appearing to be in the know. The need to connect is a fundamental reality of the human condition. Should we learn to accept its potential for good rather than that of a destructive force or is it simply a nuisance? From our perspective there is much to consider, much to learn. You can choose to ignore it, attempt to dismantle it or find ways to bring it into the values added column. Understanding the informal network can help in assessing and shaping the current culture in alignment with the ethic centered mission. Remember nothing is totally clear in any informal communication network as it is always in motion. Whether it is a force for good or bad may depend on how and what it is fed by the parent organization.

Given today’s topic, a serious issue is whether we can produce or encourage a model of ethical/character/principle centered behavior. The corruption potential may not be equal given the different histories and variety of organizations. Notwithstanding those difference, should each agency focus on a series of compelling questions that force an agency to continually examine not only its written objectives but whether such actually reflect police operations in terms of recruitment, selection, training and internal communications. Every aspect of organizational culture should reflect an accepted belief system regarding one’s job performance and behavior. Often, in our opinion, the missing ingredient is reconciling the officer’s belief system with that of official policy. If reconciliation is doable, it should include recognition and understanding of the agency’s informal channels of communication. If an officer doesn’t fully subscribe or understand what is proper and right, the real danger is that the informal network will

most likely encourage and sustain some of that individual's job negativity.

The network thrives for a number of reasons but here are some of the most noteworthy:

- It has a variety of forms in terms of the delivery system, hubs, gatekeepers and pulse takers.
- Individuals have seemingly easy access to whatever topics are being discussed.
- Individuals throughout the organization and at different levels of responsibility buy into the process.
- There exists a sense of trust among the participants. Regardless of whether the relationship is professional or social there appears to be belief that they rely on the information or the efforts of others in the network. If such was not the case, why would they pass it on?
- There exists a certain amount of access to authority within the organization itself. A concern should focus on how the information is interpreted.
- There are some forms of leadership or authority sources throughout the communication chain. For any number of reasons there are individuals willing to serve as principal conduits and sources of information. While the human condition fosters the need to communicate, there are apparently those who enjoy shaping and invoking the process.
- The informal network can function with little constant care. Its probably too difficult to identify key players within the process. That is not the goal in an ethically principled centered organization. It is to reduce its negative aspects and foster a better process of informal communication. Besides, some of the contributors don't realize they are part of such a social network.
- Its volume and easy access to conversational items creates an unusual community. Basically, it is a community that physically or structurally does not exist.

A problem to its existence is that it can be detrimental to the police mission in usurping governmental responsibility by providing premature disclosures, exaggerating or downplaying the significance of policy, circumstances or situations. In this age of increasing transparency, we can't dismiss the notion that it often operates without any obvious point of origin. It's reasonable to assume the tenor of its conversation generally doesn't follow the "party line." For better or worse it assumes an air of an oppositional party.

In recent years it has become more common to speak of a shift from “government” to “governance.” The latter involves both formal and informal processes and institutions that guide and restrain the collective activity of one’s group. If the above trend is accurate, the informal communication network is increasingly a part of this process. It minimally should be a concern for any organization as its opposition can fuel media criticism and sow discomfort and confusion among the general population.

If the argument is relevant, what actions are necessary on the part of the transformational chief and his key staff? The hierarchical bureaucracy has to be reinvented to leverage what many might call “old wine“ into a new resource – a resource which provides the rank and file a better awareness of the complexity in policing a diverse democratic society. If decision making is not merely a case of black or white but shades of grey then how do we impart such complexity to the troops? Such engagement or enlightenment probably will challenge opinions held by many members throughout the hierarchy. If developed carefully and delivered correctly it can be a valuable asset in serving the needs of the community as well as the agency. Its likely that management and its training may require a greater focus on the art of collaboration, better use of technology, inter-exchange with other agencies, a need for strategic thinking across vertical and horizontal boundaries, results orientation and, lastly, change management.

While this paper is not intended to be the end all, there is a need to know in assessing the role of one’s cultural organization. For this purpose we conclude with some questions that can assist in the process:

- ✓ Does the agency mean what it says?
- ✓ How do they know it?
- ✓ How often do they say it?
- ✓ How sure are you that the message can be repeated effectively?
- ✓ How do you evaluate or judge that the message is received by its members?
- ✓ How often do you evaluate or judge the results?
- ✓ How do you judge the value it has for the members?
- ✓ Is the content and context the same message for every level of agency membership?
- ✓ In assessing a cultural evaluation of your agency are you ready to ask hard questions that speak to the language and reasoning experience of the supervisory and entry level ranks?

- ✓ If you were asked, “Do you have a coherent ethical behavior policy?” how would respond? Would you and your staff be comfortable with your response? Are you comfortable with saying that every member feels a responsibility to treat each citizen fairly and equally?
- ✓ Would you accept the entry level notion that the further one is from actual operations the closer he/she is involved in creating policy? It’s simple reality. Do we take that into consideration when adopting a new policy?
- ✓ Do we recognize that every time a piece of information verbally travels through layers and levels of an agency it changes somewhat?
- ✓ Do we recognize that policies shouldn’t be papers that simply read well? They should inform, explain and encourage the application of practical experience, common knowledge and common sense. Well crafted it should result in positive behavior practices.
- ✓ Would you accept the notion that policy decisions often are actions taken with incomplete information?
- ✓ Do you agree that leaders need to be inflexible on principle but flexible on details?
- ✓ Are you aware that the best time to initiate change is when you want to, not when you have to?

In an era of increasing demands for transparency, policies should avoid the assurances that values will never be compromised nor will serious misconduct resurface. The human condition suggests these are continual realities of life. Our efforts should be in the reduction portion not in its elimination. Unfortunately, in our profession, crisis will continue as long as human beings are involved. Regardless of the circumstances, mistakes will be made, controversies blown up and mischaracterized, questionable accidents and injuries will occur, needless death, as well as corruption and charges of police misconduct can surface.

Despite what was just written, the principle centered law enforcement leader must maintain a sort of balancing act in managing the expectations of members of the agency and the public. On one hand, you have to utilize time and energy in responding to and resolving critical issues. Accept the notion that answering tough questions should be an exciting challenge, one which continually expands one’s breath of knowledge and experience. Simultaneously, you have to steel yourself to compartmentalize the scope of that activity and function in order to function “as businesses as usual.” Over focusing on a crisis can subsume the organization in blame, fear, confusion and paralysis. Leave that to the critics, they are better in that role! Initially you never have all the information you want. You may never have it. Often you don’t know what information you need as solutions surface slowly behind the criticism of the “hindsight brigade.” Each incident or crisis is different, some internal and amenable to quick resolution while others

become media events. Ironically, while the circumstances often appear to be the same, it is the participants who create the difference. Finally, it is important to recognize at the outset which crisis is more time urgent and which will roll out over time. Remember if life is tough, “I am tougher.” Also, changing negative attitudes and behavior in and out of the agency is a real example of a leader’s influence. Many of us honed our skills from those mentors who went before us. Developing the art of “giving back” is a great way to define your legacy and success. You have an opportunity to move the profession further along for future leaders exemplifying that ethical and principled policing is smart policing even though it will also be a work in progress. The leader who puts principles and ethics ahead of self promotion or self interest will exponentially influence his/her workforce for the greater good. That leader, in the final analysis, will succeed in changing the opposition to be part of the solution rather than the problem. Very few leaders get an opportunity to influence actions and behaviors on a grand world scale. Still, the leader who recognizes what needs to be accomplished within his/her sphere of influence and acts on that need is not only important but essential to the future well being of that organization. And that is all we can ask for!

About the Author

Charlie Connolly’s public and private protection career spans some 51 years, including 22 years with the NYPD, successfully achieving every competitive civil service rank. For 12 ½ years, he was chief executive of two other law enforcement agencies, Yonkers Police Commissioner and Director of Police, NYC Hospital Police. Connolly holds a Master’s degree in Public Administrator and an adjunct professorship at John Jay College of Criminal Justice and four (4) other institutions of higher learning, including West Point. He has held numerous chairmanships with the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) and American Society for Industrial Security International (ASIS), written a number of articles, and lectured at LEEDS, NEI, (Quantico Va.), Scotland Yard, NYPD Command Course, Australian Police College and the National War College. Since 1996 Connolly has been a member of the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) consulting on Global Crime, Transnational Terrorist threats and the role of Private Security in combating Terrorism. He was a consultant to the Anser Institute for Homeland Defense involving leaders from Public Health, Agriculture, Law Enforcement and Intelligence. He is a graduate of the National Academy and a Board member of NEI. Connolly’s Private Sector career consists of ten (10) years at Wells Fargo and Merrill Lynch. In 2006 Connolly was awarded the Penrith Award.