

State and Local Training Advisory Committee – Summary of Meeting
Federal Law Enforcement Training Center (FLETC)
Department of Homeland Security
October 16, 2008
St. Simons Island, Georgia

Executive Summary

Mr. Malcolm Adams, Acting Deputy Assistant Director, Office of State and Local Training (OSL), Federal Law Enforcement Training Center (FLETC), opened the meeting, welcomed all members, and facilitated introductions. Opening remarks were provided by Ms. Connie Patrick, Director, FLETC; Mr. Carl Peed (acting Co-Chair), Director, Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS), Department of Justice (DOJ); and Mr. James Hagy (acting Co-Chair), Law Enforcement Coordinator, Office of State and Local Law Enforcement, Department of Homeland Security (DHS).

Mr. Malcolm Adams briefed the Advisory Committee on the OSL's strategic plan, the Lessons Learned Committee presentation given by Colonel Steve Flaherty, Commander, Virginia State Police, and the FLETC Journal article written by OSL staff member Mr. Scott Santoro.

Mr. Barry Mulcahy, Administrator, Vermont Correctional Academy, briefed the members on the intelligence-led policing working group session held on October 15.

Mr. Ron Dionne, Chief, State and Local Training Management Division, OSL, briefed the members on the Rural Policing Institute (RPI), and sought their feedback on the OSL's activities with respect to this new initiative.

Mr. Michael Bostic, Program Specialist, State and Local Training Management Division, OSL, briefed the members on the OSL's plans for conducting a rural law enforcement training needs assessment and sought the members' feedback on this process.

There was a period of open discussion. Members discussed the FLETC's anticipated new FTEs, workshops of interest to the OSL at the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) Conference, and the Homeland Security Institute.

Closing remarks were provided by Mr. Hagy, Mr. Peed and Mr. Jones.

The next meeting is scheduled for April 9, 2009.

The agenda and list of attendees are attached.

Welcome and Introductions

Mr. Malcolm Adams called the meeting to order at 8:00 a.m. on October 16, 2008. He welcomed everyone present and thanked them for their attendance. Mr. Malcolm Adams introduced the principal representatives in attendance:

- Ms. Connie Patrick, Director, the FLETC;
- Mr. James Hagy, Law Enforcement Coordinator, representing Department of Homeland Security (DHS) Co-Chair Ted Sexton, Assistant Secretary for State and Local Law Enforcement;
- Mr. Carl Peed, Director of the Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) Office, representing Department of Justice (DOJ) Co-Chair Jeffrey Sedgwick, Attorney General for the Office of Justice Programs; and
- Mr. Seymour Jones, Acting Assistant Director of the Field Training Directorate for the FLETC.

Mr. Adams then asked the Committee members to introduce themselves, followed by all others in attendance. Next, he introduced Ms. Reba Fischer, the Designated Federal Officer, who made several housekeeping announcements. Mr. Malcolm Adams invited Director Patrick to deliver her opening comments.

Opening Remarks

Ms. Connie Patrick, Director, Federal Law Enforcement Training Center (FLETC)

Director Patrick opened by welcoming new members to the Advisory Committee.

Director Patrick explained that DHS was one of only two agencies to receive its budget on time this year. This year's budget includes funding for the Rural Policing Institute (RPI). She explained that Senator Salazar and several other senators supported the initiative, and she thanked the Advisory Committee members for their leadership and direction on it.

Director Patrick stated that this year's budget is the largest in the FLETC's history, which she attributes to the high demand for law enforcement training. She noted that the FLETC's budget has grown from approximately \$22 million 12 years ago to approximately \$500 million this year. She provided details of the funding increase.

Director Patrick stated that the kind of technical training the FLETC offers is paramount to successful law enforcement operations. Therefore, there is high demand for training from not only the federal sector, but also from state, local, international, tribal, and university entities. She explained that one of the FLETC's challenges will be using technology to provide distance learning for more students. Director Patrick stated that the FLETC has done some testing in this area this year, and we will continue to explore more options for state and local training in this manner.

Director Patrick emphasized the importance of the Advisory Committee in helping the FLETC provide the right training at the right time for the right people. She formally recognized Mr. Peed's friendship, leadership and integrity, noting that Mr. Peed will be leaving the federal government, but will remain active in law enforcement through private consulting.

Mr. Carl Peed, Director, Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS), Department of Justice (DOJ) (acting Co-Chair)

Mr. Peed explained that over the past few months, he has attended several conferences, including the Problem-Oriented Policing Conference and the National Native American Law Enforcement Association (NNALEA) Conference, where he observed FLETC participation. Specifically, he commended the FLETC instructors that delivered training at these conferences.

Mr. Peed proceeded to discuss the 2008 COPS grant, which totaled approximately \$587 million distributed throughout the United States. He explained that the COPS office discussed with the Major City Chiefs and the Major County Sheriffs how the money should be allocated. The grant included \$20 million for new hires, the first such money since 2005. This money funded 269 new positions in support of federal task forces. The 2008 COPS grant also included \$15 million in private funds, \$61 million in methamphetamine grant funds, and \$205 million in technology grants. The COPS office also received \$15 million to develop a Child Sexual Predator Program, through which it awarded approximately 35 grants of up to \$500,000 each to various regions in the United States.

Mr. Peed described the 2009 COPS grant. He explained that the DOJ is under a Continuing Resolution, which is expected to continue through March of 2009. Presently, the Senate is considering approximately \$600 million for the COPS office and the House is considering approximately \$657 million. The Senate version includes \$50 million in hiring money and \$55 million for the Child Sexual Predator Program. The House version includes \$40 million in hiring and \$10 million for the Child Sexual Predator Program.

Mr. Peed directed the Committee's attention to several new publications that were handed out. One was the document that resulted from the COPS office's second intelligence summit with the IACP, which will be presented at IACP's upcoming conference in San Diego. This summit was a follow-up to the first one that took place in March of 2002, shortly after the 9/11 terrorist attacks. The second document Mr. Peed referred to was titled Integrated Intelligence and Crime Analysis, produced by the Police Executive Research Forum (PERF). He explained that the purpose of this document is to encourage organizations to pay closer attention to their intelligence capabilities by merging responsibilities of crime analysts and intelligence analysts.

Mr. Peed noted that the COPS office will have two publications issued shortly on this topic. One is the second version of the Intelligence Guide by Dr. David Carter from Michigan State University, due out by the end of the year. The original was published in 2002 as a result of meetings with chiefs and sheriffs throughout the country about redistribution of intelligence responsibilities post-9/11. The second publication the COPS office will issue is titled Policing

Terrorism and the Executive's Guide, which contains 50 briefs addressing many issues relevant to rural police departments, such as the National Incident Management System (NIMS).

Mr. Peed explained that the COPS office is also involved with several conference calls addressing issues important to law enforcement, such as fuel costs and mortgage fraud.

Finally, Mr. Peed spoke about the transition and reiterated that he will be leaving the COPS office January 20, 2009. He explained that he has already met with the Major County Sheriffs and with the entities that handled the first transition. He will also meet with the Major City Chiefs at the IACP Conference in San Diego. Mr. Peed explained that he is urging people in state and local law enforcement to become involved in the federal sector.

Mr. James Hagy, Law Enforcement Coordinator, Office of State and Local Law Enforcement, Department of Homeland Security (DHS) (acting Co-Chair)

Mr. Hagy began by thanking the Committee members for their presence and for their work. He explained that having been the sheriff of a 420-person agency, he knows the importance of training. He acknowledged the balance that must be struck between having officers off the street for an extended period of time and the benefits gained from training. Mr. Hagy also acknowledged how important training is in keeping officers up-to-date in a dramatically changing environment.

Mr. Hagy next spoke about the Coast Guard's new Transportation Workers Identification Credentials (TWIC). He explained that in the New England states, beginning October 15, this card will be required for entry into the ports for work or for product delivery. He explained that transportation workers must undergo background checks in order to obtain one of these cards. Tens of thousands of these credentials will be issued, and Mr. Hagy stated that state and local law enforcement involvement will be necessary to help enforce this new program.

Mr. Hagy discussed the Law Enforcement Deployment Teams (LEDTs). He stated that Assistant Secretary Sexton and the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) have written and submitted a report on this topic to Congress. Mr. Hagy explained that state and local law enforcement were involved in putting together this report; in particular, sheriffs and chiefs were consulted about efficacy and feasibility. Although he could not present the entire report because it has not yet been released by Congress, he read its conclusion, which indicates that the writers believe the establishment of LEDTs is feasible and appropriate. Specifically, the report concludes that improving national capacity is in the best interest of all Americans, even though it is not inexpensive to effectively and efficiently provide large numbers of law enforcement officers trained and experienced in community-oriented policing, intelligence-led policing, and critical incident management.

Mr. Hagy described a booklet on crime that has been developed by mayors and police chiefs, for submission to the next President of the United States. He proceeded to outline the various recommendations found in the booklet.

- Reinvigoration of the COPS Office. Although this will be expensive, Mr. Hagy cited the success of the COPS program that he has witnessed during his career. Specifically, he noted that when he was a sheriff he hired 56 police officers through the COPS program. Furthermore, during his time as sheriff, the number of sworn deputies grew from 72 to 193 largely due to the COPS program.
- Full funding for the Byrne Justice Assistance Grant. Mr. Hagy explained that although this money has presently been eliminated, the booklet contends that local officials should receive homeland security funds directly and they should have the flexibility to use them to meet locally identified priorities.
- Transferring responsibility for the administration of homeland security grants benefitting local law enforcement agencies from DHS to DOJ. Mr. Hagy explained that those who wrote the booklet believe law enforcement should be involved in the grants.
- Reestablishing the block grant program, which would give police departments more flexibility in spending money and tailoring its use to meet local needs.
- Taking more DNA to establish a more robust database, which the writers believe is a good way to reduce crime.
- Ballistics testing. Mr. Hagy explained that Maryland passed a law requiring that before handguns are sold, they are to be fired and the print placed in a database. The booklet recommends implementing this on a nationwide basis.
- DHS allow local officials more flexibility in using DHS funds so that they can better focus on local needs and priorities. Specifically, it recommends DHS recognize the value of funds used for beat officers. Mr. Hagy explained that one current problem with grants is that they cannot be used for backfill. However, it is difficult for agencies to engage in exercises to practice what they have learned in training because it is impossible to pull all officers off the street at one time. Mr. Hagy explained that when FEMA spoke with local law enforcement representatives, the representatives expressed the need for funding for backfill in order to address this problem.

Mr. Hagy commented on personal protective equipment, noting that he spoke about this at the last meeting. He explained that a standard was developed and placed in the public register for comment. The public comment period has now ended, and standards will be adjusted accordingly and sent out soon. Mr. Hagy explained that the last version he saw consisted of four levels of personal protective equipment, including an eight-minute water barrier, which he explained limits the amount of a time an officer can stay in the suit. However, Mr. Hagy stated that he is not sure what the final product will be.

Mr. Hagy spoke of how his office brought together various law enforcement organizations, including the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives (NOBLE), the PERF, the Major City Chiefs, the Major County Sheriffs, and the NNALEA. He explained that when these groups were asked about their priorities, they all cited training as a key issue.

Mr. Hagy commended the FLETC staff and stated that he has heard compliments about the staff from former FLETC students.

Briefings and Discussions

Office of State and Local Training (OSL) Update/Committee Feedback – Mr. Malcolm Adams, Acting Deputy Assistant Director, OSL

Mr. Adams asked the Committee members if they had any questions about the minutes from the April 2008 meeting. No questions were asked, and the minutes were approved as written.

Strategic Plan: Mr. Adams directed the Committee members to Tab 3 in their binders. He stated that the OSL is proud that strategic plan has been completed and is being routed for approval. He explained that the managers' annual goals will be based on the strategic plan, and that those goals will cascade down through the staff. Mr. Adams described the strategic plan as a roadmap for the OSL through 2014. He explained that the OSL is now in the process of developing action plans in order to implement the plan. He acknowledged the assistance of the FLETC's Strategic Planning Office in finalizing the plan.

Lessons Learned Presentation: Mr. Malcolm Adams stated that in August of 2008, Colonel Steve Flaherty, who is a member of the Advisory Committee, came to the FLETC to present a briefing on the Virginia Tech shooting incident. He stated that the presentation was very successful, with a few hundred people in attendance.

Mr. Adams explained that the Lessons Learned Committee at the FLETC sponsors presentations on critical incidents and lessons learned, particularly those dealing with officer safety. He encouraged the Committee members to indicate on the back of their meeting critiques if they are interested in giving a presentation or if they know of an incident that would be appropriate for this program.

Rural Policing Institute: Mr. Adams explained that Mr. Ron Dionne will speak about the RPI later in the morning.

FLETC Journal: Mr. Adams referred the Committee members to the 2008 FLETC Journal. He noted that an OSL staff member, Mr. Santoro, wrote an article for the Journal about the FLETC's 25th anniversary of training state, local, campus and tribal officers.

Intelligence-Led Policing, Mr. Barry Mulcahy, Administrator, Vermont Correctional Academy

Mr. Malcolm Adams directed the Committee members to Tab 5 in their binders and introduced Mr. Mulcahy, Administrator of the Vermont Correctional Academy, to facilitate a discussion on intelligence-led policing and the RPI.

Mr. Mulcahy explained that he served as the process facilitator for a working group session on intelligence-led policing on October 15. The goal of that meeting was to identify the scope and direction of intelligence-led policing training needs for rural law enforcement agencies.

Mr. Mulcahy outlined the four objectives of the process. The first was to identify the most current philosophies, technologies, standards, best practices, resources, and capabilities of information-sharing and analysis within the law enforcement community. To that end, he noted that Sergeant Sean Sullivan, detailed to the FLETC from the New York City Police Department (NYPD), gave an introductory presentation which provided context for the proceeding discussion. The second objective was to develop a working definition of intelligence-led policing as it relates to rural law enforcement agencies. Mr. Mulcahy stated that the group came up with a wonderful definition that focuses on the officer on the street. The third objective was to identify the most pressing enforcement challenges facing rural police agencies. To accomplish this, the group discussed response calls, rural police officers' duties, and the unique obstacles and challenges rural officers face. The final objective was to analyze the results compiled during the day's discussion.

Mr. Mulcahy explained that the group used the definition of a rural police agency provided by Congress. He noted that the group also discussed other constituencies and stakeholders which may be affected by intelligence-led policing.

Mr. Mulcahy described the group's background discussion on intelligence-led policing, which focused specifically on existing operational needs and resources. These were written down and ranked. He pointed to the list displayed on the wall, which included fusion centers, computers, multi-jurisdictional task forces, crime analysis, community-oriented and problem-oriented policing, previous knowledge of the subject, interpretation, analytical software, local and regional meetings, several intelligence networks, and grants.

Mr. Mulcahy presented the workgroup's definition of intelligence-led policing. It was defined as a strategy that enhances the ability of law enforcement to accomplish its mission by utilizing data, intelligence, and information to identify problems and create actionable solutions. Mr. Mulcahy asked for feedback from the Committee members on this definition. He explained that a group of practitioners will meet next week in Atlanta, which will form its own definition. The two definitions will be reconciled.

To explain why the OSL is putting so much energy into the concept of intelligence-led policing, Mr. Jones stated that the authorization language of the RPI requires the FLETC to offer several specific expert training programs intended to meet the needs of rural policing agencies and other emergency response providers. One of those needs is intelligence-led policing. Because of this Congressional mandate, the FLETC has brought in a Fellow from the NYPD and is conducting focus groups, such as the October 15 working group and the one next week in Atlanta.

Mr. Needle pointed out that although several definitions of intelligence-led policing were discussed at the working group meeting, he does not believe it is necessary at this point to have a single definition. Mr. Needle asked Mr. Peed if he agreed that this was a fair statement. Mr. Peed agreed and cited the paragraph about intelligence-led policing on page 15 of one of the handouts. He noted that five years after 9/11, police agencies still cannot agree on a good definition of intelligence-led policing.

Mr. Peed explained that the same problem existed with finding a single definition of community policing. He noted that various definitions existed around the country, and finally the COPS office created a broad definition. Mr. Peed commented that he likes the definition of intelligence-led policing that the working group formed because it is broad, and can fit in with campus and tribal law enforcement. Mr. Needle agreed that defining community policing was initially an obstacle. He explained that in order to do this, the label was minimized, and instead the discussion focused on the elements and concepts, which minimized debate. He stated that this is a lesson to be learned as intelligence-led policing moves forward.

Mr. Mulcahy indicated that while an accurate definition is needed, it is important that the definition be one the officer on the street understands. Mr. Leyva commented that one of the local law enforcement officers at the working group had brought up the point that the definition had to be succinct and workable so that it makes sense to police officers on the street. Mr. Leyva stated that in his opinion the definition the group arrived at is broad, but concise enough to be workable.

Mr. Amerson commented that he liked the definition. He explained that his agency tried to break down intelligence-led policing into goals associated with everyday tasks, thus using it in an attempt to establish standards for performance. In this sense, intelligence-led policing became a practical application rather than only a theory, and could be used to compare officers' performances and to verify that steps were being taken to follow a strategy of intelligence-led policing. Mr. Mulcahy confirmed that the working group observed that one of the outcomes can be constancy of purpose.

Mr. Baragiola noted that it is sometimes useful to put the definition up at the end of a training session rather than at the beginning; therefore, the training supports the definition. He explained that this is especially relevant when teaching police officers because when they see a new definition, they will initially wonder if it is going to replace something or invalidate something they are doing. Ms. Herriott stated that this raises the point that police officers can be cynical about new programs. Therefore, she commented that training must show police officers how a new initiative will make their jobs easier. She stated that it will only be successful if cops buy into it. Mr. Baragiola agreed that there is no scary language in the definition.

Mr. Mulcahy congratulated the Committee members on their work. He then shifted the discussion to challenges. Mr. Mulcahy noted that the group worked with elements of the Weisheit report of 1999, the first significant needs assessment done on intelligence-led policing. He explained the process of storyboarding, which includes two major functions. The first is brainstorming or word-spinning and the second is analyzing the results. He explained that because the group only had six hours, more spinning was done than analysis. The analysis that was done was primarily ranking with a color key. He explained that the yellow dots signify background, the red dots signify what is most critical, the green dots signify what is most frequent, and the orange dots represent application to intelligence-led policing.

Mr. Mulcahy proceeded to discuss the types of response calls that were listed during the discussion, which included property calls, domestic violence calls, traffic stops, and quality of

life calls. He then noted the frequency associated with each of these calls. In order of frequency, they were domestic violence calls, quality of life calls, accident investigations, traffic stops, and property calls. Mr. Amerson commented that service of warrants and papers should be added to the list because sheriffs' offices spend a lot of time on this. Ms. Herriott pointed out that even though agencies may believe some areas are more critical than others, members of the public want their particular issues handled, which she said makes them mandates for agencies. For example, she pointed out that while the police department may be concerned about burglaries, members of the public may be concerned about a barking dog keeping them awake at night. Mr. Mulcahy affirmed that this is important in considering how the types and frequency of response calls relate to intelligence-led policing.

Mr. Jones pointed out that his previous agency made quality of life issues a priority, which he said served the purpose of addressing more serious crime problems. For example, if a person is arrested for peddling in the street, he may also be wanted on three warrants for more serious offenses. Therefore, Mr. Jones pointed out that concern for quality of life issues was not just a result of citizen demand; the police department also made it a priority.

Mr. Mulcahy said that as a process facilitator, he would recommend asking how intelligence-led policing might impact the areas in which rural police officers spend their time. Ms. Herriott stated that it is important when officers engage in quality of life calls that they involve other government agencies that should be involved in solving problems so that police officers do not have to repeatedly address the same problems. Mr. Amerson noted that with problem-oriented policing, analysis is necessary to reduce or eliminate problems so that police officers do not have to continually return to the same addresses.

Director Patrick commented that many calls she remembers responding to were domestic issues, but not necessarily violent ones. She questioned which was intended in the list that the group formed yesterday. Mr. Mulcahy replied that the intent was domestic-related calls, and that he would return to that point later when discussing criticality. Mr. Baragiola stated that he believes one reason domestic violence is high on the list is because these types of calls tend to take a long time to address, often tying up officers for two or three hours. Mr. David Adams spoke to Director Patrick's point by stating that some of these calls may be neighbor-related issues, such as problems with kids.

Mr. Mulcahy explained that the group next ranked how rural police officers spend their time in terms of criticality. The top seven were domestic violence, felony crimes, narcotics-related crimes, child abuse, traffic stops, first responders, and property calls. Dr. Webb commented that intelligence-led policing implies that officers should collect information in order to respond to potential threats. Therefore, she stated that training might give officers a different perspective through which to view the calls to which they are responding. In this sense, training would assist officers with what additional issues they can address in these calls in the vein of intelligence-led policing, rather than changing the nature of their jobs. For example, training would help officers know what else to look for when responding to child abuse calls or when making traffic stops. Therefore, intelligence-led policing would be integrated into rural police officers' existing tasks.

Mr. Mulcahy stated that the next item the group examined was duties. It used the process called DACUM, which is a process for developing a curriculum that involves storyboarding applied to job task analysis. Mr. Mulcahy explained that unlike a job task analysis, yesterday's process was not validated, but instead was a brainstorming activity. However, Mr. Mulcahy stated that he believes it was a worthwhile activity. Duties were ranked in terms of criticality. Mr. Mulcahy explained that the workgroup felt that the most critical duty of a rural police officer is to model professional and ethical behavior. He asked the Committee members for their comments.

Dr. Lord said that although she was not present at the working group meeting, based on Ms. Herriott's and Dr. Webb's comments, she believes a very important duty is taking information. She recalled research she has conducted through which she learned that if line officers are not collecting the necessary information and do not understand the importance of doing so, it is difficult to move forward. Mr. Mulcahy stated that Dr. Lord's point was very cogent. He explained that with the DACUM process, high-performing workers define their jobs; however, it is different with a new initiative because the tasks are not yet part of their jobs. Mr. Amerson noted that from a management standpoint, if officers are not writing reports and collecting information, it is impossible to make decisions.

Mr. Jones requested the working definition of criticality. Mr. Mulcahy responded that it is what is most important in terms of how an officer does his/her job.

Mr. Mulcahy stated that the question is whether the sample is big enough. He explained that yesterday's session took a snapshot of the collective wisdom in the room. Mr. Baragiola commented that while yesterday's session included people with a lot of experience as administrators, it would be interesting to engage in the same exercise with police officers with five to seven years experience.

Mr. Hagy had a question about the ranking process. Mr. Mulcahy explained the ranking process explaining that the highest number was supposed to be placed next to the most important issues.

Returning to Mr. Jones's question, Mr. Bostic pointed out that operational people define criticality as level of risk to the mission. He asked the Committee if it agreed with that as a definition of criticality. Mr. Needle stated that in doing this type of exercise that involves rankings, sometimes cuts are made that possibly should not be made because each element is essential. Therefore, he stated that sometimes groupings are better than rankings. Mr. Mulcahy pointed out that the group did a lot more spinning than analysis and thanked Mr. Needle for his comments. He stated that next week in Atlanta, he will facilitate a similar process with practitioners from rural, urban, university, and tribal police agencies.

Mr. Mulcahy explained that the next item the workgroup examined was challenges and obstacles unique to law enforcement. The list the group formed included lack of resources, multiple roles, lack of training, quality of applicants, technology, manpower, backup, politics, unfunded mandates, narcotics investigations, ethics, and community pressure.

On the topic of quality applicants, the group found that although officers are traditionally hired at the entry level and subsequently move up the ranks, it is possible that with intelligence-led policing, specialization may mean it is in the best interests of law enforcement to examine a variety of channels through which people can join the police community. On the topic of quality of applicants, Mr. Amerson noted that in his state, urban areas pay more than double what a rural sheriff's office pays. This means the rural areas have essentially become training entities. People join the force, are trained, and if they are rising to the top, it is easy for them to transfer elsewhere for better pay. Mr. Hagy pointed out that it takes the average police officer eight years to be exposed to 80 percent of the types of calls handled during a law enforcement career. As a result, he stated that experience produces a much better police officer over time. Mr. Hagy echoed Mr. Amerson's point that rural agencies become training grounds. Mr. Mulcahy asked if this means that capacity building never occurs, to which Mr. Hagy responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Jones returned to the subject of defining criticality. He stated that if Mr. Bostic's working definition, that is, level of risk to the mission, is used, he would not have a problem with the rankings. He explained that he believes it is very important to define criticality. Mr. Mulcahy stated that if the Committee agrees, he will put the definition up and it can be used in Atlanta next week. He said the same can be done with the definition of frequency. Mr. Needle confirmed that the definition of frequency needs to be clarified, because he interpreted it as number of calls but Mr. Baragiola interpreted it as length of calls.

Mr. Bostic suggested that issues that have not been resolved, such as the definitions of criticality and frequency, be put aside to be addressed when the OSL is finished processing the outcome of the working group. Mr. Mulcahy stated that Mr. Jones' point is well-taken, and that time needs to be taken to create common definitions before engaging in this kind of process. Mr. Needle pointed out, however, that the process should not become so complex that no progress is made.

In terms of criticality, Mr. Needle observed that he was unsure of whether it meant consequences for the police officer, the agency, the community, or the victim. Mr. Baragiola asked if it would be better to look at duties and competencies after looking at criticalities.

Mr. Mulcahy explained that before the Atlanta meeting there will be a meeting to discuss how the process might be improved. Mr. Needle stated that from his perspective duties were discussed from two perspectives - in terms of phrases agencies have in their mission statements and in terms of competencies and skills. He suggested to Mr. Bostic that he clarify this for the group next week. Mr. Bostic thanked Mr. Needle for the observation.

Mr. Mulcahy asked if the Committee had any further comments about the challenges or obstacles facing rural police officers ranked by criticality. Mr. Amerson stated that one of the issues all law enforcement officers face is collecting intelligence and sharing it. For example, if a suspicious person moves into a neighborhood and starts asking questions about the water supply, there is a general lack of ability for local law enforcement to collect that information and pass it along to be used with other intelligence sources.

Mr. Mulcahy stated that the last item the group discussed was the tie-in to intelligence-led policing. He presented a slide relating response calls, ranked by criticality, to intelligence-led policing. Mr. Mulcahy noted that quality of life calls drop in criticality in this ranking. Next, he showed a slide on duties tied to intelligence-led policing, ranked by criticality. He stated that interpreting and applying the law was ranked at the top. Mr. Mulcahy asked the group what it meant by this. Mr. Baragiola explained that his group looked at duties as the fundamental duties a police officer must do, which are nonnegotiable. Their discussion focused on the ability of an officer to apply and interpret the law accurately.

Dr. Lord pointed out that she believes it is important to include collection of information here, because it is a critical tie-in. She clarified that this means collection of relevant, appropriate information and some sort of strategy or knowledge about where information needs to go. In response to this, Mr. Mulcahy stated that it might be valuable to do a DACUM on the rural police officer, identifying the duties and tasks associated with the job and the knowledge, skills and traits required. The process would then be repeated five years later in order to measure the effects of implementation of intelligence-led policing. Mr. Mulcahy reiterated that the product currently before the Committee is not validated.

Mr. Hagy noted that interpreting and applying the law in relation to intelligence must be examined from two sides. On the one hand, 28 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) indicates what agencies can do with information once it is gathered. On the other hand, officers are applying the law that allows them to collect information to begin with. He explained that most police officers are not going to apply 28 CFR because they do not have an understanding of it. He explained that rural officers are exposed to different situations than officers in places like New York City or Los Angeles.

Mr. Mulcahy next presented the unique obstacles and challenges ranked by criticality as they tie into intelligence-led policing.

Recalling her time as a trainer and manager at the Justice Academy in Salemburg, North Carolina, Dr. Lord noted that a huge obstacle is lack of interagency communication. Mr. Mulcahy responded that this point may have been captured, just not ranked high in criticality.

Ms. Wilson pointed out that the working group's session was based on people's perceptions. She noted that she does not believe she effectively represents rural law enforcement and that she hopes the next group is truly representative of rural policing personnel. She also noted that because the session is based on perception, it might be helpful if the next group brings actual data. She explained that while people may think they spend their time on one issue, they may really be spending most of their time on something different. Mr. Bostic stated that there are a variety of ways of conducting needs analysis, which will be discussed later in the meeting. He noted that due to time constraints, it was decided to use a well-selected focus group rather than a survey. He stated that there are often disconnects. He explained that although a national survey on intelligence-led policing is not being conducted, the goal in conducting this focus group is to ask questions in such a way that those disconnects can be identified, specifically wants versus needs.

Mr. Peed asked the Committee members if they understand the meaning of rural. He stated that the appropriations language defines it as other than metropolitan statistical areas (MSAs). Mr. Baragiola stated that beyond size, rural could also mean lack of resources or lack of capability. Mr. Dionne stated that the OSL used the definition Dr. Ralph Weisheit used in his widely recognized nationwide study. Those criteria are fewer than 50,000 people in a community and fewer than 50 commissioned officers. Mr. Jones commented that the OSL is compelled to use the universally recognized definition because it is under Congressional mandate and Congress would understand this definition. Mr. Jones added that it is also a good starting point for identifying what is rural.

Mr. Amerson noted that very rural police agencies are often lucky if they have even a few computers. He would like to see the OSL's activities result in minimum recommendations for law enforcement agencies, such as having computer-based information gathering systems. Mr. Bostic stated that the binders from the working group and the binders for the Atlanta focus group contain materials on this topic. Specifically, the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) compiled a list of minimum requirements for a law enforcement agency, which is included in the binders. Also, a study was conducted on minimum standards for training and the roles and capacity for intelligence-led policing. Mr. Bostic stated that this study will be referred to during the curriculum development phase.

Mr. Mulcahy explained that the next few minutes would be used to discuss the issues that were put aside earlier in the discussion.

First, Mr. Mulcahy asked the group how "criticality" might be defined differently. Dr. Parsons suggested using a less sophisticated word, such as "essential" or "important," because people are more likely to agree on a simpler word. Dr. Lord recalled the terms "consequences" and "risk to mission," which were raised earlier in the discussion. She stated that these words provide a different tone. Specifically, officers would be accustomed to using the word "criticality" from this standpoint, that is, what the consequences or risk to the mission would be if a certain task is not performed. Mr. Malcolm Adams indicated that it is important to clarify to whom the risk would be - the officer, organization, community or victim.

Raising a similar point, Mr. Jones observed that the present definition presumes knowledge of how the term important is intended. Mr. Jones asked if the word "panelists" refers to the people being surveyed or the people in the focus group. Mr. Mulcahy asked those who participated in the working group to explain what was intended. Mr. Needle stated that he does not believe it has to be specifically defined and that it might be best to work with multiple dimensions. For example, he noted that the definition might be considered in terms of the citizen, the organization, and the officer. Ms. Wilson agreed that she liked keeping the definition broad. For example, if the definition is level of risk to mission, that can mean if an officer gets injured, the mission is impacted. Or, if a citizen gets injured, the mission has not been fulfilled.

Mr. Bostic explained how he came up with the original definition. He used law enforcement's basic mission to protect and serve, which means protecting fellow officers, oneself, and the

community and serving the community. In terms of risk to mission, then, he meant the risk of not protecting fellow officers, oneself, and the community or not serving the community.

Mr. Hagy added that the mission should include intelligence-led policing and how it relates to the RPI.

Mr. Mulcahy stated that the group's input will be considered in altering these definitions.

Mr. Mulcahy turned the discussion to the definition of frequency, asking the group if the definition can be improved. Ms. Herriott explained that she viewed the definition as twofold, meaning both the number of calls and the amount of time a call takes.

Mr. Hagy raised the point of how preventative patrolling fits into the RPI. For example, he stated that a rural police officer would know if a certain car does not belong in a certain driveway, which is very different from urban patrolling. He pondered whether this is the sort of thing that should be taught in the RPI with respect to intelligence. Mr. Hagy stated that preventative patrolling is very important in gathering intelligence. Mr. Mulcahy noted that this issue was ranked number two in frequency by the working group, and it will be interesting to see where the group next week ranks it.

Returning to the definition of frequency, Mr. Hagy indicated that it may differ depending on the angle from which one is looking. He stated that when he was a patrol officer, he did not pay attention to how much time he spent on a certain type of call. However, a supervisor or administrator might pay closer attention to it. Ms. Herriott questioned whether this was preventative patrol or intelligence and direct knowledge of the community. Mr. Hagy stated that knowledge of community is what he was trying to convey at the working group during the discussion on duties. Mr. Mulcahy stated that he believes that high-performing incumbent workers are in the best position to explain what they do. Mr. Amerson stated that preventative patrolling can fall under quality of life, and that patrolling can be broken down into two different types. On the one hand, a community wants to see officers out in public because it makes them feel safe. On the other hand, agencies will create targeted patrols where a particular problem, such as burglary, has been occurring.

Director Patrick stated that as an analyst, she would look for two different pieces of data on frequency, the amount of time spent on a call and the number of times an officer responds to a particular location. She stated that she would not combine it into one piece of data.

Mr. Mulcahy indicated that the group's comments have been captured and that they will be considered in altering definitions.

Next, Mr. Bostic described how the product of the working group will be used. First, he stated that the work will be cross-validated with the Weisheit Report. The same will be done with the product that results from the Atlanta focus group. Out of this will come a summary that includes correlations and variances, providing a starting point for rural law enforcement training needs as

they relate to intelligence-led policing. Mr. Bostic indicated that the Committee's vision will be seen in the final product. He thanked the members for their contributions.

Rural Policing Institute (RPI), Mr. Ronald Dionne, Chief, State and Local Training Management Division, OSL

Mr. Dionne began by recapping the presentation he gave on the RPI at the April 16, 2008, Advisory Committee meeting. He directed the Committee members to Tab 6 in their binders, pointing out the law establishing the RPI. Mr. Dionne explained that the RPI is a \$4 million a year initiative for five years. Mr. Dionne acknowledged the contributions of the Advisory Committee, Director Patrick, and the FLETC Executive Team in helping this initiative come to fruition. He also acknowledged the staff's contributions over the last two years.

Mr. Dionne explained that the purpose of the initiative is to provide training programs for rural police agencies. He proceeded to describe the OSL's current activities related to this initiative.

Mr. Dionne stated that the State and Local Administrative Division is currently writing a business plan, which will be submitted to DHS and the FLETC Executive Team on November 17. He explained that the OSL is also developing an operational plan, which is an internal document outlining the deliverables associated with the RPI, such as training programs and needs assessment. Mr. Dionne explained that he would request advice from the Committee members about evaluating the needs of law enforcement. He stated that Ms. Margaret Sullivan has been directed by Ms. Denise Franklin, Chief of the State and Local Training Administrative Division, to form a project team to work on outreach and marketing. He stated that the OSL will be asking the Advisory Committee for advice on RPI actions.

Mr. Dionne stated that the OSL is using the operational plan to brief federal, state and local agencies, and this plan is serving as a roadmap for executing the project. He explained that even though the operational plan is almost finished, the OSL still would like the Committee members' input and guidance.

Mr. Dionne explained that the RPI concept began in 2001, when the OSL was working closely with Minot State University through funding from the Northern Plains Initiative. While the idea faded in 2001, it was resurrected in 2005 by Senator Salazar of Colorado. Mr. Dionne explained that the final bill included subject areas tied closely to DHS's mission, such as intelligence-led policing, civil liberties, and privacy issues.

Finally, Mr. Dionne explained that the RPI project team will collaborate with partners beyond the FLETC. He stated that the Advisory Committee plays a large role in helping the OSL determine the organizations with which it should be collaborating. Mr. Dionne stated that the RPI is structurally aligned closely with the OSL strategic plan.

Mr. Dionne explained that the OSL originally expected to receive \$35 million over six years for the RPI. However, the appropriation is such that the OSL will receive \$4 million each year from

2009 through 2013. Due to the change from \$35 million to \$20 million, the OSL needed to restructure its plan.

Mr. Dionne explained that the OSL currently has plans to hire staff. Eight positions will be filled during Fiscal Year 2009, and seven will be filled the following year. Mr. Dionne pointed out that the law requires the OSL to evaluate the needs of law enforcement agencies and other emergency response providers in rural areas. He stated that this is currently the number one challenge, which is why this issue will be discussed later in the meeting. Delivery of training will also be discussed during the afternoon session. The OSL will also look to the Advisory Committee for advice on how it should collaborate with other entities.

Mr. Dionne explained that the OSL has already started the process outlined above through the focus group that met yesterday on intelligence-led policing for rural law enforcement officers. He stated that the OSL has also met three times with the Director of the Civil Liberties – Civil Rights Office in DHS to discuss what the OSL will do with respect to civil liberties and privacy rights training.

Mr. Dionne asked the Committee for questions and comments and explained that the afternoon session on this topic will center on engagement from the Advisory Committee.

Rural Policing Institute (RPI) / Committee Feedback, Mr. Ronald Dionne, Chief, State and Local Training Management Division, OSL

Mr. Dionne stated that the purpose of this session is for the OSL to obtain feedback from the Advisory Committee. He referred the members to tab 6 in their binders, specifically pointing out the language of the RPI bill related to curriculum, found in section B. This section requires that the RPI not duplicate existing law enforcement training. Mr. Dionne explained that in order to meet this requirement, the OSL has reached out to or plans to reach out to three organizations to avoid duplication of training. Those entities are the Rural Domestic Preparedness Consortium, which is affiliated with Eastern Kentucky University and led by Interim Director Amy Hughes; the National Center for Rural Law Enforcement, which is tied to Arkansas University's Criminal Justice Institute and led by Dr. Jeffrey Clark; and the Rural Law Enforcement Technology Institute, which was previously part of the Rural Domestic Preparedness Consortium, but is now a separate entity led by Mr. Scott Barker and Mr. Rod Magner.

Mr. Dionne stated that the OSL would like advice from the Advisory Committee on which organizations it should look to for partnerships. As the OSL's Training Management Division develops training for rural law enforcement, it will engage subject matter experts from the FLETC, as well as city, county, state, campus, and local law enforcement instructors. Mr. Dionne stated that Dr. Parsons explained that the International Association of Directors of Law Enforcement Training and Standards (IADLEST) represents 776 law enforcement training academies throughout the United States from which subject matter experts can be drawn. Mr. Dionne explained that this is the kind of advice the OSL is seeking.

Mr. Peed stated that \$4 million is not a lot of money. After salaries, only around \$2.5 million will remain for training programs. Therefore, he stated that the OSL will have to rely on partners to leverage that remaining money. Mr. Peed stated that the IADLEST is a great partner, and that the OSL should also look to partner with the Regional Community Policing Institutes (RCPIs). Mr. Peed explained that the RCPIs will have instructors with subject matter expertise in many areas, including civil rights. He stated that the OSL may also wish to work with his office in identifying DOJ civil rights lawyers and instructors as it develops training in civil rights and intelligence-led policing.

Ms. Herriott asked if the OSL is working with specialized areas within larger organizations, such as the IACP. Mr. Dionne responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Dionne stated that before new staff is hired, the OSL will begin developing training required in the RPI bill, including intelligence-led policing, privacy issues and civil rights. He explained that the needs assessment is so important because the OSL will start putting programs together based on it. He explained that suggestions from the Committee regarding whom the OSL should reach out to would be helpful.

Mr. Michael Folmar stated that the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) is providing training to small police and sheriffs' departments in subject areas such as gangs, street survival and civil rights. He explained that this training is provided on an ad hoc basis as resources permit. Therefore, Mr. Folmar asked that the OSL coordinate with the FBI in order to avoid duplication. Mr. Dionne agreed that the OSL is seeking this kind of coordination. Mr. Dionne further clarified that it is important to avoid duplication of not only subject areas but also training locations.

Mr. DeVita stated that partnerships with universities are often overlooked. He explained that his organization just partnered with The Johns Hopkins University, as have the FBI; Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms (ATF); and the United States Secret Service. These agencies link their subject matter experts with experts in education and delivery. Mr. DeVita stated that universities embrace partnerships like these. Mr. Dionne agreed and asked Committee members to share the names of any universities or organizations that might make good potential partners for the OSL. Mr. DeVita explained that The Johns Hopkins University is developing a degree specific to immigration for Immigrations and Customs Enforcement (ICE). Dr. Lord stated that she represents the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences, which consists of all the universities that have criminal justice programs. She stated that it might be useful for the OSL to have someone at this group's annual meeting in March to talk directly to some universities. Mr. Dionne suggested that if any Committee members have suggestions of potential partner universities that they coordinate through Dr. Lord as the point of contact.

Mr. Leyva stated that Mr. Peed's organization recently partnered with Michigan State University to conduct an intelligence-based needs assessment. He suggested the OSL utilize the RCPIs and their connections with universities and different agencies. Mr. Dionne stated that the OSL is aware that needs assessments have already been done and that the OSL will avoid replicating what has already been done if the data is available.

Mr. Peed stated that the Bureau of Justice Statistics is the research component for the DOJ. He stated that it conducted a survey on campus law enforcement a few years ago. He asked if DHS has a research arm or if it has partnerships with universities where a contract may already exist. Mr. Hagy stated that DHS partners with Louisiana State University. Mr. Peed explained that using an existing contract might be quicker and less expensive. Mr. Dionne asked if any of the members had contact names for universities like The Johns Hopkins University or Louisiana State University. Mr. Peed also mentioned Eastern Kentucky University. Dr. Webb suggested Michigan State University.

Mr. Peed asked if the OSL has a timeline for the needs assessment. Mr. Dionne stated that he could not provide a concrete timeline.

Mr. Edwards stated that a survey has just been completed dealing with six different aspects of emergency services in law enforcement for 45 Native American tribes. He explained that the survey was scientifically developed and that it might help with the tribal aspect of the OSL's work. Mr. Dionne responded that there is specific language in the law that requires the OSL to reach out to tribal institutions.

Ms. Herriott raised the issue of agencies not having sufficient technological resources. Mr. Jones agreed that this is an important area, as it relates to the capability of rural law enforcement agencies to work with up-to-date training methods, such as e-learning. There is concern about what plan the OSL has to provide training in areas that do not have the capability of utilizing technology as other agencies do. Mr. Dionne replied that the RPI Project Team has addressed this issue. He explained that some OSL staff members have been working with the FLETC's Training Innovation Division (TID) to make training available via the Internet. In addition, although the OSL probably cannot touch every single agency, collaborating with an organization like IADLEST can help it reach more. Mr. Jones pointed out that the OSL has a partner in DHS's science and technology component, which has just created a section specifically for state and local law enforcement.

Mr. Jones stated that the OSL's best resource for reaching out to universities is the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences. Dr. Lord reiterated that this group's annual meeting this year is in Boston in March.

Mr. Dionne returned to Director Patrick's point about collaborating in conducting needs assessments. Mr. Baragiola asked if he was referring only to needs assessments. Mr. Dionne clarified that he meant ongoing needs assessment, as it is not something that is done only once. Mr. Baragiola asked if, in addition to a survey instrument, the OSL is interested in anecdotal information. For example, he referred to the Western States Sheriffs' Association, which meets twice a year and discusses training needs. Rather than using a formal survey instrument, this group receives feedback from members. He asked if this was information the OSL would find useful or helpful, even though it is not validated through a survey instrument. Mr. Bostic stated that this type of information would be used to point to a need for topical assessment, which is what the OSL is doing with intelligence-led policing. Mr. Bostic stated that anecdotal information does not carry the weight needed, but has value as an arrow pointing in a certain

direction rather than as validation. Mr. Edwards stated that this was how his organization did its survey and this is why it was scientifically developed and vetted through two universities. Mr. Edwards explained that this study delineates the subject matter needed in specific demographic areas. He explained that DHS is not able to take this information because it is copyrighted. Mr. Edwards explained that the data is there, but that an organization pays a certain amount of money in order to use it.

Ms. Herriott asked how the OSL will disseminate the RPI training and if it would be done in stages. Mr. Dionne stated that there are performance measures that must be met by the end of the year. He explained that there are certain OSL programs that will be offered via the RPI. In addition, the OSL will partner with Naval Criminal Investigative Services (NCIS) in presenting cold case seminars as they relate to rural areas.

Mr. Jones clarified that the OSL is not required to fulfill any specific deliverables by the end of Fiscal Year 2009. He explained that the OSL determines the timeline for this, and it can hold off delivery if it needs time to develop the most appropriate assessment tools and to hire the most appropriate human capital. However, he maintained that the OSL must be responsible in spending. Also, it will need to show progress in fulfilling its mandates within a reasonable amount of time.

RPI Needs Assessment, Mr. Michael Bostic, Program Specialist, State and Local Training Management Division, OSL

Mr. Bostic explained that he would describe the OSL's plan for needs assessment and then seek the members' feedback.

Mr. Bostic stated that the OSL sees more than a mandate in the RPI; it sees an amazing opportunity to reach out to the field to determine needs and to serve those needs. He explained that the needs assessment will be the platform from which the OSL will work.

Mr. Bostic proceeded to brief the Committee on the Weisheit study. Mr. Bostic stated that there are only a few methodologies for conducting needs assessments; he proceeded to discuss four of them.

First, Mr. Bostic described the interview as the least useful methodology. However, he indicated that if it is to be used, it should be structured so that all interviewees are asked the same questions in the same way.

A second methodology is the focus group, which Mr. Bostic described as an agile response to a topical need. Mr. Bostic explained that interviews lead to a focus group, which consists of a nominal representation of the target audience. A focus group can be used to determine if there is a need, and whether that need can be met through training. Mr. Bostic stated that a focus group can also be used for identifying the deliverables for a survey. In this case, people are brought together to help determine the right questions to ask in a survey.

Third, needs assessment can be conducted through the use of a survey. Mr. Bostic explained that surveys previously were an expensive methodology because they had to be conducted through the mail or through interviews. However, online platforms can now be used, which are much less expensive. Mr. Bostic stated that manpower is still needed at the beginning of the process to design the survey and at the end of the process to assess and report on the data.

Finally, Mr. Bostic stated that a needs assessment can be conducted as Dr. Weisheit did – through a compilation of existing reports. Mr. Bostic explained that although small updated reports can be found, there is no comprehensive published work at this time.

Mr. Bostic indicated that the OSL has come up with a basic model for conducting its needs assessment and that it would like the Committee members' feedback on it. The basic framework consists of focus group, survey, focus group, and validation.

Mr. Bostic explained that the goal of the initial focus group is to identify the deliverables that must be identified in the survey. The group would determine what the questions are that need to be answered and what information must be acquired. Mr. Bostic stated that it is important to have the appropriate people in the focus group.

Mr. Bostic explained that after an effective survey has been developed, the next step is to determine to whom it should be sent. He stated that the OSL has a list of thousands of law enforcement officers, but the OSL must obtain a legal opinion on whether it can use those names. Another option is to utilize partners, such as IACP, IADLEST and the POST directors to identify appropriate survey recipients.

Mr. Bostic stated that after the survey data has been collected and compiled and a report has been written, he believes revalidation is necessary. This means bringing the report back to the focus group that initially identified the deliverables to see if it effectively captured the group's intent.

Mr. Bostic explained that this model is just one way of conducting the needs assessment. He asked the Committee members for constructive feedback, criticism, and suggestions for different options.

Ms. Herriott stated that the goal of this project is to implement training, which would hopefully result in the alleviation of crime problems. She clarified that the focus group should consist of a mixture of officers rather than command staff. Mr. Bostic stated that there would not be officers in the focus group. He explained that the role of the focus group is not to give information but to help design the questions. Therefore, it will consist mostly of academy directors, POST directors, and others who know about training needs. The questions will be scientifically structured to extract information from officers and operational command personnel. Ms. Herriott confirmed that the focus group would be using people from training organizations and academies who would draw on the learning objectives they use to train officers.

Mr. Bostic summed up the process by explaining that the deliverables will be given to someone who specializes in designing survey tools, and the survey will then be disseminated. Once the

information is returned in the form of a formal report, it will then be validated with the initial focus group. Mr. Bostic stated that this is just one model and he asked the Committee members if they see any faults or flaws in it or if they have suggestions for a better way of doing this.

Dr. Webb stated that the OSL does not want to experience unfulfilled expectations on the part of rural officers. She explained that the Rural Policing Consortium conducted a survey like this through Eastern Kentucky University under her division when she was a part of DHS. She explained that it experienced a very low response rate because there was an unfulfilled expectation among officers of what would be received if they responded to the survey. Dr. Webb suggested that when the focus group meets, the OSL should have a reason why the RPI was formed, even if the FLETC decides what it is. She stated that the OSL cannot go wrong with skill-building.

Mr. Bostic stated that Mr. Dionne agrees that it is skill-building and that this is how the RPI will be couched. Mr. Bostic stated that he had difficulty understanding Dr. Webb's question because he believes the needs assessment is required to identify the gap. Dr. Webb replied that it is important to identify the threshold. For example, if the threshold is skill-building, the question becomes whether it is skill-building for preparedness or skill-building for regular law enforcement functions.

Mr. Edwards commented that in his opinion, officers should be included in the development of the survey. He stated that it must be a collaborative process, bringing together subject matter experts and academics to develop something that is meaningful to officers on the street and to their supervisors.

Mr. Bostic asked the Committee members if they had ever been part of a survey where the survey group helped design the survey and, if so, whether it had worked well. Mr. Needle stated that it worked fine. Dr. Parsons questioned whether there is any reason not to have both groups in the focus group. Mr. Bostic stated that this is one reason for this presentation, because his experience has been different.

Mr. DeVita explained that his group utilized subject matter experts and academics who taught his people how to teach better. He stated that the joining of these two forces is critical and that both should have representation.

Mr. Needle asked what the result will look like when the survey is completed. For example, he asked if the survey would show a ranking of courses or a ranking of skills. Mr. Bostic stated that a needs assessment should identify and validate knowledge, skills, abilities, and duties, more in the form of a job task analysis. Those are then tied back to training needs. Mr. Bostic indicated that the items Mr. Needle mentioned are identified during the curriculum development phase. Mr. Bostic explained that a good needs assessment should indicate what officers spend a lot of their time doing or which critical issues they are unequipped to deal with due to lack of training. These emerge from the needs assessment, and then a curriculum is developed to meet that need.

Mr. Needle requested clarification of the term “needs assessment” and recommended a continuum be presented as to where this fits into the development process.

Mr. Jones commented that the dissent is not with the model but with the subjects of the focus group. He indicated that the only place in which Mr. Bostic departs from the consensus is over whether the end users understand their needs. Mr. Jones stated that the consensus is that the end users do understand their needs and that the challenge becomes how to extrapolate that information. Specifically, the challenge involves getting rural police officers to indicate their needs rather than their wants, or how to get them to understand their shortcomings in terms of knowledge, skills and abilities. Mr. Jones stated that if the consensus from the Advisory Committee is that it is possible to ascertain competency gaps from end users, the OSL should follow that advice. Mr. Bostic replied that the vision was that the end users would tell the OSL everything needed in the survey. He stated that in planning the focus group, he focused on pulling people together who know how to design a survey. Mr. Needle stated that he would not separate the two groups.

Mr. Needle indicated that if he were part of the focus group, he would want to see the model from the beginning. Ms. Herriott stated she would have found it helpful to have received a written summary of the areas Mr. Bostic had explored because then she would have understood why he went in this direction.

Dr. Webb commented that in addition to law enforcement, the language in the bill addresses other emergency response providers. She stated that an EMT’s focus would be on saving lives. Therefore, Dr. Webb suggested that there should be a narrowed focus regarding what the RPI is pursuing. Mr. Bostic stated that the needs assessment is intended to allow the people in the field to tell the OSL what that direction should be.

Responding to Dr. Webb’s comments, Mr. Jones stated that as far as the OSL can determine from its mandate, it should be upgrading competency capabilities as they relate to homeland security law enforcement objectives. Therefore, the OSL is looking for gaps in the knowledge, skills and abilities of law enforcement officers and first responders as they relate to these objectives.

Mr. Edwards commented that before the OSL begins, it must define what the institution will be. For example, it should determine whether the RPI will be all things to all people or whether it will deal strictly with homeland security. Mr. Edwards stated that this helps with goal-setting. He explained that the next step is identifying existing training via a survey, which forms the baseline from which the gap is determined. Then another survey is conducted which should show the gap being closed, which demonstrates performance.

Mr. Dionne stated that the comments and suggestions from the previous session will be considered.

Open Discussion

Mr. Peed asked if the eight positions that will be filled during Fiscal Year 2009 will be full time or part time and if they will be permanent or temporary. Mr. Dionne explained that at the beginning of the process, the OSL asked for these positions to be added to its base funding at the end of the initial six years. Mr. Jones explained that the present funds supporting the 15 FTEs are finite, ending in 2013. However, he explained that the OSL has the opportunity to submit initiatives to add this funding to its base, which it will do by Fiscal Year 2011.

Mr. Peed explained that one of his challenges as Director of the COPS office has been that funding changes from year to year, which makes it difficult to maintain morale among employees. He encouraged the OSL to proceed along the premises that these will be permanent positions. Otherwise, it will be difficult to attract and maintain morale. Mr. Dionne replied that this is a key concern among the OSL staff. Mr. Jones added that the OSL presently has term employees who continuously rotate in and out for these reasons.

Mr. Peed next asked how the positions would be allocated throughout the OSL. Mr. Dionne stated that the new FTEs will be allocated throughout all three divisions of the OSL. He explained that of the three divisions that make up the OSL, training delivery falls under Mr. Malcolm Adams, training administration falls under Ms. Franklin, and training management falls under himself. Mr. Dionne stated that there will be a branch within the training delivery division called the RPI training branch.

Mr. Needle stated that many in the room will be attending the IACP conference in San Diego. He explained that there are at least 20 to 25 workshops scheduled on terrorism, information-sharing, and intelligence-led policing. Two examples are workshops that will be led by the San Diego Police Department and Superintendent Fuentes of the New Jersey State Police. He commented that this might be an interesting opportunity to see what these agencies are doing in terms of training. He suggested the OSL monitor these workshops to glean pertinent information. Mr. Needle stated that he will make sure all three workshops are covered. Mr. Needle also indicated that there is a very big and active homeland security committee. He suggested that this may be a good resource for feedback on training and training needs. Mr. Needle stated that it might be possible for the OSL to make an appearance at this committee.

Mr. Peed inquired about the status of the Homeland Security Institute. Mr. Dionne explained that the Homeland Security Institute concept began four or five years ago. He stated that Director Patrick committed to funding two curriculum development conferences and two pilot programs, which would most likely be two weeks long. The curriculum for these pilots is still being developed.

Mr. Jones stated that the FLETC would like to create a Homeland Security Institute, but Director Patrick is delaying any action until after the change in administration. Mr. Jones explained that under the chairmanship of Judge Webster, DHS's Advisory Committee has provided 10 recommendations to the DHS Secretary to be submitted to the new Secretary as advice on the direction to take the department. Recommendation number four involves training, specifically

that state and local law enforcement officers should be part of any plan to enhance the effectiveness of law enforcement in the United States through training. Mr. Jones explained that because of this, the OSL will broaden the scope of its homeland security concept to include professional development for homeland security professionals rather than narrowly focusing on state and local law enforcement, because it will need to relate the Homeland Security Institute to these recommendations. Mr. Jones stated that the only problem is that if the scope is broadened to include homeland security professionals, the OSL would have to obtain authorization from DHS.

Mr. DeVita commented that this was a presidential directive, not a suggestion. Mr. Jones agreed, but indicated that it was under the Chief Learning Officer. Mr. DeVita stated that the Chief Learning Officer is responsible for coordinating it. Mr. DeVita explained that he was at a meeting on this topic the other day where he learned that it is going to be massive, requiring 300 hours of training in order to become certified. Mr. Jones explained that the OSL is viewing it differently, and its challenge will be to avoid duplication of the presidential directive but to still broaden the scope of its homeland security concept to include development of homeland security professionals. Mr. Jones specified that the OSL is not referring to the colleges the Chief Learning Officer has created. Instead, it is referring to an easily identifiable institute for state and local law enforcement officers and pertinent homeland security law enforcement practitioners, such as ICE, CBP and others related to emergency response, in areas such as information-sharing and intelligence analysis.

Mr. Dionne thanked the members for their opinions and advice.

Closing Remarks

Mr. Malcolm Adams reminded the Committee members that if they have a potential topic for the FLETC Lessons Learned Committee to please indicate as such on their critique forms. He then turned the floor over to Mr. Hagy to deliver his closing comments.

Mr. Hagy thanked the Committee for its valuable participation, advice and counsel. He indicated that it is interesting to hear the different perspectives from which people approach the same problem and that this will benefit the OSL as it develops the criteria and curricula for the RPI.

Secondly, Mr. Hagy reminded the Committee that the World Trade Center towers were attacked for the first time in 1993, during President Clinton's first year in office. They were attacked the second time in 2001, during President Bush's first year in office. He noted that the first year of the next President's term is approaching. Mr. Hagy stated that it is possible that enemies see this as a time of weakness and want to see how much can be accomplished before things are organized. He stated that the FLETC played a large part in training people in preparation for the transition to the next administration. Mr. Hagy suggested that those present take this thought back to their agencies, as complacency leads to vulnerability to attack. He observed that state and local law enforcement officers are the first preventers, as they are out in the street every day. He noted that these officers must be made aware of these issues so that they do not let something go by that could cost lives.

Mr. Hagy closed by thanking the members again for their participation and stated that he looks forward to the next meeting.

Mr. Malcolm Adams asked Mr. Peed to deliver his closing remarks.

Mr. Peed commented that it has been a pleasure working with the Advisory Committee over the past several years, and he indicated that he hopes to remain involved with criminal justice in the future. Mr. Peed informed the Committee that Dr. Webb will be representing him for the COPS Office from this point forward pending a decision by a new director in the future.

Mr. Peed stated that the FBI has released its statistics, which indicate that both violent crime and property crime were down in 2007.

Mr. Malcolm Adams asked Mr. Jones to deliver his closing remarks.

Mr. Jones stated that he is representing Director Patrick with closing remarks. He thanked the co-chairs for their meaningful and sincere contributions. In particular, he thanked Mr. Peed and stated that he has been an outstanding asset to the Committee. Mr. Jones also thanked the Committee members. He noted that the members' contributions help the OSL perform its mission. Mr. Jones stated that the FLETC is often praised with respect to how well the OSL trains state and local officers. He attributed this to the staff, which he said is the best staff he has seen working on a governmental initiative.

Mr. Jones noted his appreciation for the knowledge and talent the Committee has brought over the years. He indicated that he does not anticipate a slowdown in the dynamic contributions the Committee is making, and he stated that the OSL has recently agreed to extend the ways in which the Committee can make contributions. Mr. Jones explained that when the OSL reaches out to form subcommittees to work on specific projects with clearly defined outcomes, it is because it is trying to more closely involve the Committee in its activities.

Mr. Jones concluded by stating that regardless of who wins the Presidential election, there will be change, and the OSL will continue to look to the Committee for advice and guidance.

Mr. Malcolm Adams announced that the next meeting will be April 9, 2009. [This meeting has been rescheduled to September 2, 2009]. Mr. Adams reminded the Committee members to complete their critiques before leaving. The meeting adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

I certify that this is an accurate accounting of the meeting held by the State and Local Training Advisory Committee, St. Simons Island, GA, on October 16, 2008.

// original signed //

Reba L. Fischer, Designated Federal Officer

State and Local Training Advisory Committee – Summary of Meeting
Federal Law Enforcement Training Center (FLETC)
Department of Homeland Security
October 16, 2008
St. Simons Island, Georgia

Attendees

Committee Members and Representatives

Mr. James Hagy, Law Enforcement Coordinator, representing Department of Homeland Security (DHS) Co-Chair Ted Sexton, Assistant Secretary for State and Local Law Enforcement

Mr. Carl Peed, Director of the Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS), representing Department of Justice (DOJ) Co-Chair Jeffrey Sedgwick, Acting Attorney General for the Office of Justice Programs

David Adams, Senior Policy Advisor, Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA), representing the Director, BJA, DOJ

Sal Baragiola, Undersheriff, Bernalillo County (New Mexico), consultant for local law enforcement

Charles DeVita, Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), DHS; Director, Office of Training and Development

Gary Edwards, National Native American Law Enforcement Association (NNALEA); Executive Director, NNALEA

Mike Folmar, Deputy Assistant Director, representing the Assistant Director, Training Division, Federal Bureau of Investigations (FBI), DOJ

Cynthia Herriott, National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives (NOBLE); Lieutenant, Rochester, NY, Police Department

Ray Leyva, Hispanic American Police Command Officers' Association (HAPCOA); Captain, Los Angeles, CA, Sheriff's Department

Vivian Lord, Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences (ACJS); Chair, Dept of Criminal Justice, University of North Carolina, Charlotte

Jerry Needle, International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP); Director of Programs and Research, IACP

Michael Parsons, International Association of Directors of Law Enforcement Standards and Training (IADLEST); Executive Director, Washington State Criminal Justice Training Commission

Laura Wilson, International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators (IACLEA); Director, Stanford University Department of Public Safety

Federal Law Enforcement Training Center

Connie L. Patrick, Director, FLETC

Seymour A. Jones, Acting Assistant Director, Field Training Directorate (FTD)

Malcolm Adams, Acting Deputy Assistant Director (DAD), OSL

Ron Dionne, Division Chief, State and Local Training Management Division (SMD), OSL

Denise Franklin, Division Chief, State and Local Administrative Division (SLA), OSL

Reba Fischer, Program Analyst (Designated Federal Officer), SLA, OSL

Nancy Beavers, Support Services Specialist, SLA
Mike Bostic, Program Specialist, SPD
Adam Harper, Training Specialist, SMD
Lisa Harris, Training Technician, SMD
Chad Ireland, Operations Specialist, SLA
Phil Krauss, Program Specialist, SPD
Rosana Mora, Program Specialist, SPD
Melissia Nyers, Training Consultant, IACLEA
Pat Perry, Training Technician, SMD
Sylvia Rose, Program Analyst, OSL
Scott Santoro, Program Specialist, SPD, OSL
Margaret Sullivan, Operations Specialist, SLA
Jennifer Tocco, Support Services Specialist, SLA
Carol Wood, Support Services Specialist, SPD
Ed Zigmund, Program Specialist, SPD

Guests

Barry Mulcahy
Germaine Perambo, FLETC Agency Representative, FinCEN
Sandra Webb, Deputy Director, COPS

Not represented

Steve Flaherty, State and Provincial Division, IACP; Superintendent, Virginia State Police
Terry Milam, Smaller Agency, State Division (IACP); Chief, St. John, MO, Police
Department
Steve Schuetz, Director, Training Operations, National Preparedness Directorate, Federal
Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), DHS
Frank Straub, Police Executive Research Forum (PERF); Commissioner, Department of Public
Safety, White Plains, NY

State and Local Training Advisory Committee (SALTAC)
Federal Law Enforcement Training Center
St. Simons Island, Georgia
October 16, 2008

Agenda

Thursday, October 16, 2008

Epworth by the Sea – Ellie Harvey Building

Announcements

8:00 a.m.

Reba Fischer, Designated Federal Officer

Welcome / Introductions

Malcolm Adams, Acting Deputy Assistant Director, OSL

Opening Comments

Connie Patrick, Director, Federal Law Enforcement Training Center (FLETC)

Carl Peed, Acting Co-chair, representing Office of Justice Programs, Department of Justice (DOJ)

Jim Hagy, Acting Co-chair, representing State and Local Law Enforcement, Department of Homeland Security (DHS)

OSL Update / Committee Feedback

Malcolm Adams, Acting Deputy Assistant Director, OSL

Intelligence-Led Policing

Facilitated Discussion

Advisory Committee Photo

LUNCH (on your own)

Rural Policing Institute Brief and Discussion

Ron Dionne, Chief, State and Local Training Management Division, OSL

Facilitated Discussion

Open Discussion

Closing Remarks

Jim Hagy, Acting Co-chair, representing State and Local Law Enforcement, Department of Homeland Security (DHS)

Carl Peed, Acting Co-chair, representing Office of Justice Programs, Department of Justice (DOJ)

Connie Patrick, Director, Federal Law Enforcement Training Center (FLETC)

Depart

4:00 p.m.

Notes:

Meeting may close early if the committee has completed its business.

Next Meeting is scheduled for April 9, 2009.

This page is intentionally blank.