



REPORT

October 31, 2019

Governor's Task Force on Law Enforcement Training

Doug Carter, ISP Superintendent

James Markle, Director, Northwest Indiana Law Enforcement Academy

Steve Hunter, Colonel, Indiana DNR, Law Enforcement Division

David Wedding, Sheriff, Vanderburgh County

David Wantz, President, Independent Colleges of Indiana

Manny Mendez, Office of Management and Budget

Bryan Shearer, Chief, Ligonier Police Department

Tim Horthy, Director, Indiana Law Enforcement Academy

Report of the Governor's Task on Law Enforcement Training

The 2019 Session of the Indiana Legislature directed Governor Holcomb to appoint a Task Force to Study the Law Enforcement Academy. Study topics included:

- (1) The current and future role of the Indiana law enforcement academy in serving the training needs of law enforcement agencies in Indiana.
- (2) The current and future funding needs for the operation of the Indiana law enforcement academy, including recommendations on sources of funding for long-term operational viability.
- (3) Alternative means of certifying and delivering basic law enforcement training across Indiana, including entering into partnerships with institutions of higher education.
- (4) Whether it is appropriate for local law enforcement agencies to pay fees for Indiana law enforcement academy training services and, if so, what the appropriate fee amounts should be.
- (5) A short-term and long-term capital plan for the Indiana Law Enforcement Academy training campus if the Task Force finds that the academy is the appropriate model for accommodating training needs in the future.
- (6) Any other topics concerning the Indiana Law Enforcement Academy as determined by the Task Force.
 - (b) The governor may appoint any individual to serve on the Task Force.
 - (c) The Task Force shall submit a final report containing its findings and recommendations to the legislative council and the budget committee not later than November 1, 2019. The report to the legislative council must be in an electronic format under IC 5-14-6.

Executive Summary

To meet the charge, the Task Force examined:

- how we got here,
- whom we serve,
- the desired state of law enforcement training, and
- how we get there.

After reviewing the history of law enforcement training in Indiana, the Task Force framed the questions by first understanding the various groups who are affected by the charge to examine law enforcement training. In doing so, the report will cover all six areas identified in the statute.

Three groups have claim to the effectiveness of law enforcement training:

- the law enforcement officers we train and their families,
- the communities they serve, and
- the elected and appointed officials who oversee law enforcement.

Each group expects that basic training will be current, expert, effective, and efficient.

In the 50 years since law enforcement training was mandated by state law, much has changed about an officer's job; those changes must be reflected in the training delivered to our officers. The ILEA has for decades proudly produced highly trained officers to serve our communities, but can we do better? Can we become a world-class facility? The ILEA buildings, once modern and sufficient, have become more costly to maintain as they age. As a cost-saving measure ILEA has partnered with the Department of Corrections to make capital improvements and more efficiently maintain the building. Changes in law enforcement drive changes in curriculum, which drive changes in the classrooms and facilities needed to teach more effectively.

CSO Architects was retained to evaluate the current needs and to develop a master plan for ILEA. That report is separate.

Major findings

1. **Scenario-based training** is a superior method of delivering and retaining training material and ought to be the method used to train basic students. It allows for realistic training, exchanges paper and-pencil tests for real-life, enables practical application of skills, and provides opportunities for complex problem solving. A change from a largely lecture format to scenario-based training will require significant changes in the buildings, instructional format, and testing.
2. All training must be **consistent, high-quality, and standardized**, delivered via the most effective means possible. Curriculum standards must be the same at each academy site so that a student at one academy could pass a test in the same subject at another academy. The ILEA facility in Plainfield serves the majority of students, but the satellite

academies are just as important and necessary to discharging the responsibilities of the LETB basic law enforcement training.

3. In working with **institutions of higher learning**, the LETB standards, behavior objectives, and measures must prevail. A college degree in criminal justice is a worthwhile credential but may not automatically equate to the kinds of practical skills training law enforcement officers need. The ability to offer a certified basic curriculum will help Indiana's colleges understand the needs of law enforcement, offer expert advice, and reduce the load on ILEA and other academies. Engaging colleges to grant credit for LETB training will make it easier and more likely that officers will complete bachelor's and graduate degrees.
4. There are certain subjects that can best be taught by **experts in various fields** who may not be sworn officers, e.g., mental health, criminal law, first responder, National Incident Management System NIMS training, etc. Once the courses and instructors are evaluated and certified to ensure they meet the LETB curriculum standards, they could relieve some of the pressure on current ILEA staff. As with institutions of higher learning, the LETB standards, behavior objectives, and measures will prevail. A list of subjects that may be appropriate for colleges or other experts to teach is attached.
5. Regular **job-task analyses** indicate what subjects must be taught in order to meet the current needs of law enforcement.
6. A **thorough review of the current curriculum**, assisted by experts, will help LETB be certain of what is being taught and ensure that it is measuring the right metrics on its examinations.
7. **Technology** makes it possible to deliver education and training asynchronously; i.e., at different times and in different places. We must no longer rely as heavily on face-to-face teaching as the primary way of conveying knowledge. LETB needs to plan for replacement of outdated computers and to explore ways to deliver training over the internet. Class material delivered to this generation of law enforcement officers must be visual and vibrant instead of being grounded in reading texts. If we are going to set training standards that mirror actual law enforcement practice, students should be issued laptops and given class materials on removable drives. The committee recommends that a Director of Planning and Research position be created to ensure that LETB stays current in its training mission and to oversee evaluation and assessment.
8. As a result of its work, the Task Force believes that short-term solutions will not be sufficient to meet the needs identified in this report. The Task Force recommends a **long-term strategy that is phased, fair, reasonable, dependable, and sufficient**. The satellite academies are valuable to the training mission and can pilot improvements that can then be scaled up to ILEA. A model similar to the one used in Kentucky appears to meet the criteria; it adds a fee to vehicle or property and casualty insurance policies. Eventually, it will be possible to remove the ILEA from the General Fund, to make needed repairs, to make continuous improvements, and to incentivize professional development for law enforcement officers. Likewise, this strategy will help fund the satellite academies across Indiana.

How we arranged our work

One of the Task Force's first activities was to arrive at a common understanding of the needs of law enforcement training in Indiana. An expert in process design (and Task Force member) led an affinity exercise to group similar ideas and prioritize them. The results of the affinity exercise are attached. (Task Force Study Topic: TFST #3)

The results of this matrix exercise led to the creation of a subcommittee to look specifically at the curriculum, delivery, and relationships with colleges. The subcommittee presented its work to the entire Task Force for review, refinement, and acceptance.

As the Task Force continued its work, additional ideas and rationales were blended with the work of the subcommittee.

It made sense that a small group of scribes would assemble a report and submit it to the rest of the Task Force to ratify. This report is the result and represents the consensus of the Task Force.

In June 2019, ILEA Director Tim Harty issued Requests for Proposals for assistance in facility review and master planning to investigate the current building and grounds of the Indiana Law Enforcement Academy and to propose improvements consistent with the charge to the Task Force. CSO Architects was selected as the consultant.

It is important to note that the master plan represents **one way** to achieve the goals explained in this report. It derives from CSO's attempt to understand the Task Force's concerns, its independent investigation, and its review of other police academies.

To investigate best practices in law enforcement training, members of the Task Force and CSO Architects visited training academies at the Kentucky Department of Criminal Justice Training and the Oregon Police Training Academy. A representative from the East Tennessee Regional Police Academy spoke to the Task Force at a meeting in Plainfield. Drafts of the report-in-progress were shared with several current chiefs and training commanders as a validity check.

The Task Force assigned itself an accelerated schedule and met approximately once every three weeks in order to complete the report by the deadline of November 1, 2019.

Introduction

This report is arranged around four fundamental ideas:

- *How did we get here?*
A review of the history of law enforcement training in Indiana
- *Whom do we serve and what do they expect?*
The officers being trained, the communities they serve, and the law enforcement administrators and civil governments they report to
- *What is the desired state for law enforcement training?*
The best, most reliable, valid, and efficient means of training law enforcement officers based on research and consultation
- *How do we get there?*
The curricular, physical, policy, and budgetary needs to meet the expectations Hoosiers have for law enforcement training

In answering these questions, we will address all of the charges given to the Task Force.

How did we get here?

In 1969 a statewide law enforcement academy was called for by legislative action, and the Law Enforcement Training Board (LETB) was therefore created to oversee all law enforcement training. Prior to that date, one needed only to raise a hand and take an oath in order to become a law enforcement officer. It was a troubling time in our nation, with riots, racial tensions, protests and demonstrations, and widespread unrest. Indiana saw the need to organize the training for those who had the power of arrest and seizure. For the first time the words *professional* and *police officer* were being used together.

The first academy was held on the campus of the University of Indianapolis (then Indiana Central College). Two types of certificates were awarded for the six-week class—one for attendance, the other for completion—and the students were referred to as members of a “test class.” Subsequent academy classes were held on the campus of Indiana University in Bloomington. The oral history abounds with stories of close-cropped, uniformed law enforcement officers marching in formation on campus while being taunted by long-haired, denim-clad students and faculty. It was likely good practice and a testament to the officers’ ability to withstand verbal taunts and remain professional.

In 1975 the Indiana Law Enforcement Academy welcomed its first class. The ILEA sat on 300 acres just outside of Plainfield and was state-of-the-art, with an indoor pool, indoor firing range, tiered classrooms, cafeteria, and dormitory rooms. In the 1980s an outdoor driving range and outdoor firing range were constructed. In the 1990s an additional classroom, physical tactics room, and offices were added.

Over the past 44 years, however, deferred maintenance depleted some of the structures and systems. Leaks in the pool required it to be drained and taken out of service. Moisture in classroom and office walls was rectified with HVAC repairs. (More information on current conditions at ILEA is included in a report authored by CSO Architects.)

Whereas in 1975 a central academy with dormitory rooms was sufficient to meet the demand for law enforcement training and served the entire state, today the LETB certifies five regional academies in addition to the Indiana Law Enforcement Academy:

- Indianapolis Metropolitan Police Department Academy
- Indiana University Police Department Academy
- Northwest Indiana Law Enforcement Academy
- Southwest Indiana Law Enforcement Academy
- Fort Wayne Police Department Academy

We have been training law enforcement officers the same way for the past 50 years, using lecture and paper-and-pencil tests, and assuming that a good test score equates to competent skills. Learning styles and cultures have changed a lot since 1975. The technology and teaching methods used nearly a half century ago are no longer effective or efficient in meeting the law enforcement training needs of officers today. (TFST #1)

The Legislature and Governor have given Hoosiers an opportunity to envision law enforcement training for the 21st century and address the needs and complexities we face today. The year 1969, when the LETB was created, was a tumultuous time in America, and training needs revolved around when and how to shoot, the basics of criminal law, and how to handcuff suspects. The demands on a law enforcement officer today are more complex, expectations are much higher, and the effects of a wrong decision have longer-lasting consequences.

The future of law enforcement training will include strong regional academies, partnerships with colleges and universities, and more realistic scenario-based instruction. The changes and improvements are explained later in this report. (TFST #1)

Whom do we serve and what do they expect of us?

The LETB has three sets of clients, each with its own set of expectations: the officers being trained, the communities they serve, and the law enforcement administrators and civil governments they report to.

Law Enforcement Officers

It is important to understand that the oath an officer takes entails much more than merely agreeing to a contractual duty or making a promise to do a specific task. Though the words may be the same for other civil offices—to protect and defend our Constitutions—the demands are much different for law enforcement officers, who alone pledge their lives to the execution of that oath, to keep us safe and preserve our way of life.

They have a right to expect that we will prepare them to come home every night.

Law enforcement officers want to do their jobs professionally and discharge their duties successfully, precisely, and consistently. They expect we will teach them everything they need in order to perform the tasks we have assigned them. They must continue to learn and grow throughout their careers. In their basic training—which is the focus of this report—they should expect to be competent in law, clear in their writing, skilled in verbal communication and de-escalation skills, accurate and wise in using force, skilled in emergency driving, accomplished in defensive tactics, compassionate with mental illness, excellent at problem-solving, and proficient in every other demand we place on them.

This Task Force underlines the duty the State has to prepare our law enforcement officers in exchange for the sacrifices we ask of them. A sworn oath is a social contract between us and the officer. We promise to prepare you. You promise to do your duty based on that training. We pledge to serve and protect one another.

On a personal level, the student officers' families are sacrificing as well. The residential model of training has benefits but significant costs. Student officers leave home on Sunday night and are away from family and friends all week. Adults at home become single parents for the duration of the academy and must juggle all their own duties plus the ones their spouses and partners handled. It is worse for single parents with the added burden of child care. Nor can the student officer leave to attend a parent-teacher meeting, award ceremony, ballgame, or concert. These are not insignificant losses and begin a process of strain that law enforcement families must deal with in service to a career in uniform. Basic students deserve our best efforts to make their training the most effective and the least intrusive.

The Community

The community has always had expectations of law enforcement. Communities across Indiana expect law enforcement officers to keep them safe and secure, uphold their values, and maintain the quality of life. They want to be treated politely, with dignity and respect. They expect officers to be knowledgeable and professional.

Citizens are aware that their taxes pay for law enforcement and sheriff's departments, and their salaries, equipment, and supplies. They are quick to point out when they perceive they are not getting the money's worth. Sometimes, they know only what they expect in enforcement's absence or in ironic ways: "I want cops to crack down on speeding, to be tough on crime, and to keep the peace, but not when I am over the speed limit, need the benefit of the doubt, or have a party that is a little loud." They expect officers to understand the spirit of the law as well as the letter of the law and to use discretion in discerning when and how the law is enforced.

In 1969 the law enforcement academy could be a short six-week program because the expectation of law enforcement officers was pretty simple: arrest bad guys. Today we expect law enforcement officers to do more. We want them to be experts in crime prevention, to help with homelessness and drug addiction. We expect them to be sociologists and deal effectively

with every race, gender, national origin, or level of ability they encounter. “In the past, a conflict paradigm had been the norm, whereby law enforcement saw themselves and functioned as isolated paladins,” academic research has suggested. “Under such a conflict model, the officers observed the community in which they worked, identified its problems, and responded with their perceptions of the appropriate resolutions. Yet many believe that law enforcement officers’ faulty interpretations or a ‘just the facts, ma’am” attitude toward the situation have resulted in merely treating the symptoms of the problems and not the problems themselves. . . . This conflict model is typically associated with the ‘war on crime’ and depicts law enforcement officers as providing a reactive approach to criminality.”¹

Fifty years ago, at the height of the war on crime, the community would not react the same way it does today to a police-action shooting, nor would its members be so inclined to fight or harm a law enforcement officer. There was a level of respect for law enforcement simply because there was respect for a person wearing a uniform. Respect for law enforcement today requires a higher standard. Every poor decision, every angry confrontation, every misstep, every police-action shooting can become a flash point for the community, touching off riots and unrest for many days.

Chiefs, Sheriffs, and Municipalities

The cities, towns, and agencies that send their officers to an academy also have expectations. It is quite costly to send an officer to 15 weeks of training. The department pays salary and benefits for the basic officer while receiving no work in return, expecting that an employee with a Law Enforcement Officer certificate is worth the investment. Chiefs and sheriffs have an expectation that their deputies/officers can be enrolled in an academy class within three to six months after their hire date. Under the current capacity situation, that is not always possible.

The top officials in the department are extremely sensitive to the community and to their elected officials. They hope that their officers will be able to fit in immediately upon return. Elected and appointed officials need help—expect help—in solving not just the effects of crime, homelessness, and drug addiction but the root causes as well. And that kind of problem-solving falls on the law enforcement officers. So, officials expect a level of law enforcement training sufficient to solve very complex problems. “Locking up the bad guys” is no longer a sufficient answer for addressing complex problems.

Elected and appointed officials need law enforcement officers to help maintain and improve the reputation and integrity of the community. To attract new residents and new businesses, a community cannot have law enforcement officers who are heavy-handed, rude, or incompetent. A case of injustice, poor decision-making, or deadly force can leave a lasting stain on a community, even if the adjudication of the event vindicates the officer. Preventing

¹ Abstract of Vander Kooi , G. P and Bierlein Palmer, L. (2014). Problem-based Learning for Law Enforcement Academy Students: Comparison of Those Receiving Such Instruction with Those in Traditional Programs. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 25:2, 175-195, DOI:10.1080/10511253.2014.882368

problems is always better than remediating them. Just the legal costs of defending lawsuits are enough to prevent investments in civic improvements—another reason to provide law enforcement officers with highly effective and realistic training.

Neither law enforcement agencies nor municipalities have enough funds to do all that they are asked to do by their constituents. Law enforcement training, therefore, must be a good investment for the municipalities. It was reasonable for the ILEA to charge a \$500 fee for each recruit two years ago as well as the cost of training ammunition to department budgets, but it pushed the budget problem down to the agency and municipality level. The Task Force feels it is important for agencies to contribute some portion of their training costs back to ILEA. (TFST #4)

What is the desired state for law enforcement training in Indiana?

(TFST #1)

1. *Scenario-based training*

Today's law enforcement officers face many new and uncharted threats that conventional training (lecture format) may not cover. To counter this, scenario-based training was created to give officers a tactical advantage and prepare them for "speed of life" events. Scenario-based training is a combination of knowledge and skills-based training, incorporating psychomotor coordination and reinforcing a survival mindset in the student officer. A new EVO track with a Hogan's Alley feature helps accomplish this goal using mock streets, alleys, roundabouts, and interstate exchanges providing more time behind the wheel of a police vehicle for recruits. Incidents involving motor vehicles are the second highest cause of death (behind firearms) for police officers. These realistic situations, along with instructor feedback, can be used to assist student officers in the development and reinforcement of their skillsets.

Currently, ILEA relies too heavily on lectures to deliver information and places the emphasis on the teacher—the so-called "sage on the stage." It is an ineffective way to guarantee student learning and retention, because the students are passive, and their interaction with the subject is limited. Moreover, lectures can cover only one topic at a time; therefore, the education is siloed into discrete class topics. We then measure success with a paper-and-pencil test, hoping a good paper score means the officer will be able to produce the skill instantly when needed.

Scenario-based training, on the other hand, integrates many topics at once and allows the student to solve problems and immediately respond to ever-changing events. The "realness" of the scenario and its practicality improve retention and performance. Immediate feedback, coaching, and the ability for a "do-over" help the student to perform more confidently and appropriately in a realistic setting. This method is consistent with the science behind all adult education: learning

takes place when the learner combines personal experience with new information that has been obtained, assimilated, and accepted.²

Imagine training a surgeon using the same methods we use to teach law enforcement officers. Getting an answer correct on a paper-and-pencil test does not guarantee that the surgeon would be able to perform well in an actual operation. So we give doctors plenty of hands-on experience, whether with 3-D models, patients played by trained actors, or even actual cases under the supervision of a senior physician. Scenario-based training is a better way to enable students (whether doctors or law enforcement officers) to perform tasks consistently and perfectly.^{3,4}

The recommendation, therefore, is to move to scenario-based training. Doing so will be the most significant change in law enforcement training since the ILEA was founded 50 years ago. Professional experience and research evidence indicate that the lecture method is the least effective means of conveying or retaining complex information.

Scenarios should be developed to include the most frequently occurring events an officer will encounter and build toward more complex or exigent conditions. Though there are dangers in every citizen encounter, scenarios must not present only the most extreme situations. Instead, the student officer should be able to conduct routine skills successfully before being exposed to extreme situations.

For example, it is possible but not likely that a motor vehicle stop will involve extraction, flight, or assault. Teaching basic officers how to conduct frequently occurring interactions and operations will give them a platform for handling more extreme or exigent events. Those unlikely but very dangerous situations must also be taught. They ought not be the foundation of the training, however; law enforcement officers need a wide range of skills because they will face a wide range of encounters.

If the only situations officers encounter in their training involve altercations or deadly force—as important as those events are—it may inadvertently produce officers who are so anxious about engaging with the public that they present themselves as combatants rather than as public servants. Such events do not accurately represent the majority of activity the officer will experience while on duty.

Moving to scenario-based training will require reconfiguration of ILEA classrooms, increased staff, more skill venues, additional finances, a new training schedule, new methods of instruction, and consultation with experts in curriculum design. With so many academies across the country delivering scenario-based training, it is likely that the LETB could get valuable assistance from its colleagues in the International Association of Directors of Law Enforcement Training.

^{2,3} Vander Kooi, G.P. and Bierlein Palmer, L. (2014). Problem-based Learning for Police Academy Students: Comparison of Those Receiving Such Instruction with Those in Traditional Programs. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 25:2, 175-195, DOI:10.1080/10511253.2014.882368

⁴ Prosser, C. A. & Quigley, T. H. "Vocational Education in a Democracy." American Technical Society, Chicago, Illinois, 1949.

Scenario-based training could be phased in at ILEA, but neither quickly nor easily. It will require a total revamp of the culture and longstanding practice. That is a very big lift. A way to reduce the complications and to learn from mistakes would be to run pilot programs, which would allow for smaller classes in a controlled setting as well as experimentation with curriculum, scheduling, testing, and so on.

2. ***Consistency across academies***

The LETB approves curriculum and standards for instruction for all basic law enforcement training. Further, it certifies satellite academies across the state. However, there is currently no mechanism to assess whether that training is delivered with the same effectiveness at the various academies and no way to identify patterns of effectiveness or deficiency. At a minimum the LETB has an obligation to make sure its curriculum is being executed consistently across the state, and that will require staff travel and inspection.

In addition to the standard-setting and certifying, the LETB has a duty to assess whether those standards are consistently achieved at the various sites across the state. If some of the recommendations for using colleges and other experts are implemented, it could free up ILEA staff to do the assessment work across the state.

The Task Force also recommends a funding review so the satellite academies may share in the revenue afforded to ILEA for training. The satellites take a load off the Plainfield academy and ought to be funded at some level to continue their mission.

3. ***Cooperation with institutions of higher learning*** (TFST #3)

Many people entering law enforcement come with experiences and training unrelated to a college degree but have skills that are transferrable. Military training is an example of alternative skills training. So are skills gained from work and life experience.

At the same time, the job of law enforcement continues to grow in complexity, with criminals getting smarter, more sophisticated, and international. Historically, law enforcement departments were asked to investigate crimes and enforce the law. Today, law enforcement is asked to develop comprehensive crime reduction programs, to act as social workers in addressing homelessness and mental health, and to assist with improving the quality of life and economic development. These demands are seldom covered in basic training and are rarely the subject of in-service classes.

A way to address those increasingly complex demands is through higher education. Some departments across Indiana see a college degree as an indicator of professional development and require such of its recruits. Our neighbors in Kentucky, for example, are making it possible for officers to earn associate's, bachelor's, and master's degrees. Why would Hoosiers not want their own officers to have as much training and education as possible?

As valuable as a college degree could be to the future of policing, however, the Indiana law enforcement community is not quite ready to accept a degree or even training on a college campus as equivalent to the experience of training at an academy. A college classroom does not look like an academy class. The military bearing and discipline so common in law enforcement is not present on a college campus. At the same time, the Task Force recognizes that some states rely entirely on community colleges to deliver basic training.

Therefore, the Task Force recommends an approach that will strike a balance, respecting the sentiment of the current law enforcement culture while enlisting the benefits colleges have to offer. The LETB should develop the behavioral objectives and measures of success for certain academic or classroom subjects and invite institutions of higher learning to teach them. The LETB has the legal duty to set the standards for performance but could ask colleges to design classes that would meet them.

Though criminal justice classes do contain practical components, we do not believe there is currently a one-to-one checklist of academic classes in a criminal justice major that would satisfy the LETB basic training curriculum. We do believe it is possible that colleges could create classes designed to meet the LETB standards. Such classes could help to fulfill new entrance requirements and lessen the amount of time a student would spend at an academy.

Furthermore, the Task Force recommends inviting colleges to evaluate the LETB curriculum in order to grant college credit for the academy classes. Coming out of the academy with college credits could encourage officers to complete their degrees. It takes only one college to grant the credit. All colleges must accept the credits that have been granted by another (assuming it is regionally accredited).

Because the LETB is responsible for teaching adults, it makes sense that the best practices in adult education inform its work. A partnership with institutions of higher education could provide valuable insight into curriculum design and evaluation by experts in adult learning. In fact, many of the faculty in criminal justice programs have experience in law enforcement and could be very helpful in meeting our needs.

Why would colleges be interested in helping the LETB? As colleges try to respond to workforce needs and to differentiate themselves, a partnership with the LETB could help them attract students eager to go into law enforcement. College campuses could also be a pipeline for recruitment, especially in terms of diversity of applicants. Such a partnership will also help the state's workforce development needs and its desire to have 60% of its citizens attain a certificate or degree beyond a high school diploma.

The Task Force has listed a set of subjects that do not require a sworn officer as the instructor (attached). In Section 3, above, we recommended that non-sworn teacher/experts could tackle many of those subjects. That same list could be the start of a partnership with Indiana's many colleges. The Task Force suggests that the LETB identify a set of classes, draw up behavioral objectives and test measures, then invite

conversations with college representatives to implement a pilot program. LETB will also need to prepare additional staff dedicated to quality assurance and accreditation.

In short: the LETB already accepts classes, training, and credentials from many sources in certifying officers' training. Rather than have all classes taught by a law enforcement officer at a physical academy, this Task Force recommends that the LETB do more overseeing of training than actually performing the training itself.

The Task Force also recommends that the satellite academies be given the freedom to enter into partnerships and to decide for themselves what topics might be taught and where. At the NILEA, for example, the sentiment may be that all classes taught by outside experts must be done at the academy site. Other academies may believe otherwise. Each academy should have the flexibility to teach its students how it chooses so long as the LETB standards can be met.

4. ***Reliance on experts***

A review of the LETB practice for certifying out-of-state officers as well as those who have been out of law enforcement demonstrates that the Board is flexible in how it accepts training certification. Likewise, there are many topics now taught at ILEA and its satellite academies that are delivered by non-sworn personnel conducting the classes.

One review found that 57% of the instruction is held in classrooms, whereas 43% is considered physical, tactical, or otherwise hands-on. Some of that classroom training, because of its specialized nature, is best taught by experts: dealing with mental health issues, dementia and other disabilities, criminal law, first-responder training, NIMS, water safety, etc. Relying on outside experts will free up sworn personnel to teach the subjects that only law enforcement officers can teach.

As a matter of efficiency, it is possible that the LETB could require that basic students come to the academy already possessing certain certified skills. The LETB has set entrance standards for physical fitness; why not have additional training standards as entrance requirements? Currently, the Department of Natural Resources requires its recruits to have CPR training in hand before they enter the academy. Perhaps we can require more pre-basic training.

The Task Force recommends that the LETB endorse alternative delivery methods and certification standards for instructors, draft goals and behavioral objectives for such classes, and create evaluation measures to ensure consistency across teachers and academies. The LETB Curriculum Committee should be vested with overseeing this responsibility.

5. ***Job-task analysis***

The LETB sets curriculum standards for all officers across Indiana. It has the problem of creating a one-size-fits-all curriculum for policing in Gary, Carmel, Princeton, and

Vevay. They clearly are not identical communities. Some of the law enforcement activity will be the same in each; some will not. But how do we know?

A systematic, reliable, and valid job-task analysis conducted across Indiana is the best way to know what is common to all basic law enforcement training. Absent that baseline data, the LETB and its staff are left to decide based on examples from other academies, anecdotes, unproven trends, or personal history. We must give our dedicated, professional staff a better way to determine what the basic students need.

Law enforcement training needs to be dynamic and current with new technologies, changes in the law, demands of the public, and best practices. We need to be sure that the subjects we teach are the right ones, in the right proportion, and done in the most effective way possible. Further, the standards the LETB adheres to must be based on fact, solid research, community standards, and the needs of law enforcement leaders, and address the current environment.

In this area, the LETB has a poor track record. From the Otis Gamma IQ Test, to the Metropolitan Life Height Weight chart, to the Hill-Tedford Reading Comprehension Test, we have relied on standards and measures without an underlying set of facts and research to support their use.

It is readily accepted that law enforcement officers need to be physically fit. It is a dangerous job, and being fit can help stave off heart problems and back problems, speed recovery from injury, protect from the effects of stress, and more.

We therefore recommend requiring certain standards for fitness. But we have anecdotes, not data, and that is where the problem lies. We cannot say for certain whether our standards mirror the kinds of activities law enforcement officers actually perform on a daily basis. For example, a certain number of sit-ups are required of basic students. Is there reliable evidence to demonstrate that all officers in Indiana, in order to do the basic functions of policing, need to be able to do sit-ups? We ought to know.

Law enforcement officers climb fences and push cars. Are they then not reasonable tests of an officer's fitness? The fire service, which has as many psychomotor demands, requires its basic students to haul hose, to climb stairs, to drag bodies, and to drive a weight with a sledgehammer—all activities a firefighter is likely to perform on a daily basis. Why does the LETB not use similar activities to measure fitness? We ought to have solid, empirical evidence for everything we require.

The prevailing sentiment in Indiana is that the Cooper Institute can be relied on to guide our physical fitness standards. The Cooper Institute, however, “does not perform law enforcement fitness testing validation studies.”³ The Institute does recommend

³ *Frequently asked questions regarding fitness standards in law enforcement.* www.cooperinstitute.org

that agencies rely on valid and defensible standards that will withstand both EEOC and ADA scrutiny. In short, the standards must be both job-related and scientifically valid. It is time for the LETB to thoroughly review the evidence upon which our standards and cut-off scores are based.

Clearly, nothing in this section should be read as a suggestion to lower fitness standards for officers. In fact, we affirm that being physically fit is one way to counter the ill effects of the job. What we are saying is that we need to give our PT instructors a solid basis for determining what skills an officer must actually perform and then the tools needed to teach them. With such a scientific foundation, we can also address court challenges to our standards.

The concern is not just psychomotor skills. Clear and concise report writing is also a very important daily skill. How do we know that the amount of report writing training required is the right amount, or that it is producing consistent results? Are we doing enough training in conflict resolution and situational awareness training? Would sheriffs across the state agree that our training in arrest and booking procedures are adequate? Are our officers prepared for the first time they present a case in court? Again, we owe it to our officers and their communities to know for certain.

A job-task analysis can determine the kinds of abilities, strengths, aptitudes, and skills any officer in any municipality must have to do basic law enforcement. A yearly questionnaire sent to departments across Indiana will help us to stay abreast of the changing needs our departments face. Kentucky's Annual Comprehensive Survey is an excellent model for this kind of regular data gathering.

6. *Thorough review of curriculum and teaching materials*

The Task Force recommends a thorough review of current curriculum on a regular basis to be certain of what is actually being taught and that we are measuring the right things on our tests. At ILEA, the staff instructors have so many duties to perform and so many students to teach that they may have only enough time to prepare for the next class. The staff would be hard-pressed to find the time to do any systematic reflection or improvement.

This observation does not blame the staff at any academy but recognizes that they are likely overburdened and do not have the time for such a review. To assist the staffs and to ensure the basic students are getting the material they need in a manner that is most effective, the Task Force recommends that the LETB conduct a thorough review of the goals, objectives, lesson material, and tests used in basic academies.

This review would make sure that the materials being taught are consistent across the satellite and stand-alone academies. Of course, there will be varieties of teaching methods and exercises, but a student at one academy ought to be able to pass a test or demonstrate a skill at any academy.

This kind of review might also be a good first step in partnering with colleges and universities who have experts in instructional design. Combined with a job-task analysis, the LETB can be assured the curriculum it approves will be the most current and most effective in preparing basic students to begin policing.

7. *Use of modern technology*

The Indiana Law Enforcement Academy recently celebrated its 50th anniversary. Among the honorees were five members of that first class of basic students. Since that first recruiting class, there have not been any significant changes in the delivery of law enforcement basic training. Trainers still rely heavily on lectures and paper-and-pencil tests.

At the same time, quite a bit of public safety training is now done outside of traditional lectures. National Incident Management System (NIMS) training, as well as various continuing education courses through Police One, are offered online. The LETB needs to improve its use of technology to take advantage of the benefits of online education, podcasts, and video training. Online education is a viable option as an alternative delivery method. Material can be delivered consistently, updated seamlessly and frequently, and received when it is convenient for officers to study. Not only training but also conferences and meetings can be conducted online via Zoom or Google products, enabling every participant to be seen and heard by the other participants. Here again, colleges and university partners can assist in implementing such distance learning modalities.

Besides online delivery's convenience and ubiquity, today's law enforcement recruits are digital natives; for them, computers have always been around. From elementary school through high school and college, the Net Generation has been accustomed to using a computer for nearly everything.

As digital natives, this generation is accustomed to information that is delivered to them in a highly visual manner. Its members are not readers and writers in the traditional sense. They download podcasts and stream music and videos. They expect that "There's an app for that." They want their information at the touch of a button or a screen, not the flip of a page. Today's law enforcement officers will never know a time in their lives when they did not have mobile devices with instant access to information.

Technology is moving forward at an increasingly rapid pace. Therefore, we must be prepared to adjust to the current trends that will enhance learning for this generation of learners.

To these learners, the old model of pedagogy that is instructor-focused and one-way makes no sense. For young people, digital immersion has affected the way they absorb and process information. The students' fundamental ways of learning, communicating, and interacting are very different from those of their educators.

Recruit officers would benefit by having immediate access to materials in a compact, portable, and organized format. Most, if not all, law enforcement officers use laptop computers in their patrol vehicles and squad rooms to access information, write reports, and communicate with one another. We believe, therefore, the ILEA should issue laptop computers to each of its incoming recruit officers. The class material can be installed on the issued laptop as well as on a removable drive, thus giving student officers the immediate access to information they expect. Laptops can be collected at the conclusion of the basic training course and reissued to the next class.

All classroom material can be downloaded onto a removable drive. The information on that drive becomes a reference manual for the new officer. As we try to bring training into alignment with actual daily law enforcement practice, it makes sense that the LETB embrace current technology and teaching practices, and issuing laptops and downloading material to a removable drive are good first steps.

In conclusion, trainers cannot use and 20th-century instructional methods in a 21st-century learning environment. By not implementing modern technology, trainers and students will find themselves at odds in the basic academy environment. Instructors who cannot convey that they are up to speed with the times cannot establish credibility with their younger students. Just as knowledge of street policing can become stale and outmoded, so can the instructors' lack of familiarity with technology make them seem obsolete.

We strongly recommend that the LETB invest both staff time and budget money to improving the digital resources and delivery. The Task Force recommends that a Director of Planning and Research position be created in order for the LETB to stay current in its training mission and to oversee the called-for evaluation and assessment needed to ensure training consistency across Indiana.

How do we get there?

Phased increases in funding (TFST# 2)

In the short term, the Task Force recommends incremental increases to the ILEA budget. The current budget was increased slightly in the last session of the legislature as the staff adjusted by making improvements where necessary and continuing its search for efficiencies. But a short-term remedy will not cure the long-term needs the task force has identified.

CSO Architects addresses in its master plan how to phase the physical changes that are needed to enact the recommendations. We believe that some of the improvements in terms of training and collaboration, technology, and job-task analysis can also be done in stages; we leave that decision to the Executive Director. (TFST #5)

This committee has suggested many options, most of which will cost a significant amount of money to implement. As important as the changes to curriculum and delivery are, changes to how law enforcement training is funded must also be considered.

A review of the LETB funding in FY 2018 shows:

Legislative Appropriation (Budget)	
General Fund 10870	\$1,927,671
Dedicated Fund 38920	\$2,125,467
<u>Total</u>	<u>\$4,053,138</u>
Expenses	<u>\$4,332,085</u>
Surplus/(Deficit)	(\$278,947)
Legal Fund (LETB's reserve)	\$1,288,411

Projected revenue sources in 2018 were divided about equally between General Fund (46%) and Court Fees (45%). The remainder was derived from fees and charges (9%). Expenses were, as expected, largely due to personnel costs (82%). It is not unusual that a school board (for such is the LETB) would have most of its expenses in the personnel lines. That left only 18% of the budget, to cover all the other expenses needed to run the academy. The decision to require departments to pay a \$500 tuition and supply their student officers with ammunition was implemented as a cost-saving measure to augment the budget.

Previous directors have found creative ways to live within their means. Director Goodpaster, himself a former ILEA business director, reduced costs by eliminating evening meals during the week for students housed in the dormitory. The meal expense was, like the ammunition cost, passed on to agency/municipal budgets to reimburse officers for eating off-site.

Maintenance of ILEA facilities over the years has seen some deferral. When the HVAC failed in fall 2016 and remained unstable until late summer 2017, it was uncomfortable for both students and staff, but worse was the inability to contain the moisture in the building.

The 45-year-old swimming pool developed leaks that were not repaired. It now sits empty, and the surrounding deck is used as a place for odds and ends to be stored. A recent survey of the past three classes indicated 35% of the basic students cannot swim at all. When one considers that there are 5,000 retention ponds in Marion County alone, it means that a law enforcement officer might be called to the scene of a vehicle accident in a retention pond and be unable to render aid at the risk of his or her own life. Their oath may compel them to wade into the water, but they might well become victims in the tragedy themselves.

When the ILEA was built, the Law Enforcement Training Board saw a clear need to include a training tank (swimming pool) for exercise, rehabilitation of injuries, swimming lessons, and water rescue techniques. Yet, for several years, this training opportunity has not been available at ILEA, thus requiring the outsourcing of training locations. It's not because the need evaporated; it's because there has not been enough money to do preventive maintenance or to pay for repairs.

CSO Architects documents that the current facilities need prompt attention. There are immediate needs to renovate the current facilities, even before making improvements in order to carry out the recommendations. (TFSP #5)

Beginning in 2005–06, the ILEA received funding from the General Fund. For the first two years, that funding was sufficient to cover the approved budget. For ten years, 2007–08 to 2017–18, the allotment amount has continuously been below the budget, dropping each year.

A new funding model for law enforcement training is requested to help meet the future challenges we have reported. Without it, we will fall short of meeting the expectations of either the law enforcement officers we train, the communities they serve, or the departments and municipalities they work for.

We need a creative solution.

To be successful, a funding method must be:

- Fair
- Reasonable
- Dependable
- Sufficient

Hoosiers are famously frugal, yet we have a high standard of living. We are a good place to do business. Years of balanced budgets and reserves have allowed us to retain excellent bond ratings and to offer incentives that attract even more business and investment.

Every Hoosier agency, from libraries to public works, must limit its draw on the budget. It is difficult to continue passing along the cost of law enforcement training to the municipalities we serve. The Task Force recognizes that the LETB decision to eliminate meals and to require that ammunition be provided by the agencies caused municipalities to take money from some other agency or project to meet those expenses.

The Task Force contemplated adding fees to court costs and fines. The attraction is that it would be criminals who would pay for better law enforcement training. The problem is that we cannot rely on criminals to be a source of income.

We have reviewed funding models from other states and believe it makes sense to remove law enforcement training from the General Fund. Such a decision could actually help the State fund other projects or increase the size of its reserves. (TFST #2)

A small fee on property and casualty insurance or vehicle insurance has worked in other states and could work in Indiana. Since the 1970s, such fees have allowed the Kentucky Department of Criminal Justice Training to make significant improvements and to stay current with the changing needs of law enforcement. The funds allow for assessment and validation studies and incentivize continuing education.

This kind of funding model makes sense and meets the criteria stated above. It is *fair* because the fee would be paid by property and vehicle owners. When a crime against property occurs

or an accident report is made, it is law enforcement that does the investigation. We expect law enforcement to prevent crime, to investigate complaints, and to keep the roads safe, so it is fair to use a small fee to pay to train them to do that to the best of their ability.

An insurance fee could be a *reasonable* option. It is logical to understand that the current model is insufficient. It was reasonable to increase gasoline taxes to pay for better roads. It is just as logical to increase insurance fees to pay for better law enforcement training. Only the owners of vehicles pay a gasoline tax, yet everyone benefits from having good roads and bridges. Likewise, everyone will benefit from better law enforcement training, from a fee paid on property and casualty insurance.

We rely on our satellite academies to provide 40% of the basic training. It would be prudent to provide them with the resources to do that training. It is fair and reasonable to provide them with the funds needed to discharge those duties as well. There are still some training functions that can and should be done in Plainfield. An expanded track and modern dorms will help with those. We need to be thinking about other regional academies and other facilities in the future. The General Fund and pass-along strategies will not help us anticipate those needs.

A fee on property and casualty insurance could provide a *dependable* source of funding that might allow ILEA to wean off the General Fund. Instead of passing along the costs associated with training to municipalities, a small insurance fee could actually help them meet their own budgets by not requiring that they pay fees to the ILEA to feed and train their officers.

Last, we believe that an insurance fee could provide *sufficient* funds to take care of the deferred maintenance and improvements called for in this report. A feature of the Kentucky fee model is the incentive given to officers for completing their required in-service training. Kentucky funds its Department of Criminal Justice Training completely. In addition, every law enforcement officer who completes in-service training is given \$4,000 annually. Further, the incentive may not be used to offset the officers' salaries, so the money goes right to the officers' wallets. It is crucial that we keep officers in the profession. It is likely, therefore, that this added incentive would help them meet their own fiscal needs as they serve their communities.

An additional feature of the Kentucky system is the way it assists officers in pursuing associate's, bachelor's, and master's degrees. As we noted earlier, we expect increasingly sophisticated results from our officers in order to meet our increasingly complex social problems. Encouraging them to seek more education is in our best interests as a society.

An infusion of funds will unquestionably improve the quality of training for Hoosier police officers. With additional funding, Indiana can finance planning and research so the changes suggested here can be sustained and improved. As discussed, an option could be a funding model similar to the one our closest neighbors use: a fee on property and casualty or vehicle insurance.

Summary

The Governor and Indiana Legislature have given law enforcement an incredible opportunity to review the way we prepare young men and women to become safe, professional, and competent guardians of their community. After 50 years of successful training at ILEA and the various satellite academies, we can hit the pause button and assess what we teach and how we teach it.

A job-task analysis will provide the foundation for what basic law enforcement training would look like across Indiana. Partnering with colleges and proven experts could help us reduce the number of hours our staffs must spend in preparing for classes and give them time to assess their work and make improvements. We do not believe such partnerships will erode our duty to give the very best training possible. Indeed, one of the LETB's core responsibilities is to set standards of training and ensure that they are met uniformly.

We must reduce the use of 20th-century pedagogy. For 50 years we have relied on lectures and paper-and-pencil tests. We are producing top quality police officers but we can do more. We must now pursue improved scenario-based training as a way to give student officers training "at the speed of life." Because the satellite academies carry some of the burden of training officers, we need to ensure that the curriculum, assessments, and standards are consistent across Indiana. And because they carry some of that burden, they ought to have the resources to carry it out.

It is insufficient to rely on training modalities that were current half a century ago. Paper, pencil, lectures, and text-heavy materials must give way to technology, visual presentations, and distance education. Young law enforcement officers are digital natives and are expected to use laptops in their patrol vehicles. They need to use laptops at the academy as a way to prepare for the daily work they will do upon graduation.

A new funding model that helps ILEA wean itself from the General Fund is just one suggestion. There have been many possibilities suggested; all will take courage and creativity in order to make the necessary improvements. The funding must take care of the ILEA in Plainfield and assist the satellite academies that also carry the duty of training law enforcement officers.

Making changes of this magnitude is the right thing to do for our young officers. We owe it to them. Such changes in the curriculum will necessarily shape how we look at and fund our physical plant. As the architects say: form follows function.

Governor's Task Force on Law Enforcement Training

Alternative Delivery of Instruction

Attachment A

After review of 600 hr. Basic Curriculum, Director James Markle determined:

57% is classroom instruction

43% is physical skills training

Classes for which Northwest ILEA currently uses non-law enforcement specialists for 42 hours of instruction (equivalent to one week of basic instruction)

2.09 Victim/witness assistance

3.04 Cultural awareness

3.05 Elder abuse

3.06 Stress management

3.07 Suicide management

3.22 Procedures for death notification

3.30 Persons with mental illness

3.31 Persons with disabilities

3.38 Alcoholism/Alzheimer's

8.01 EMS awareness

10.03 Water safety

Class taught by LETB-Certified instructor specialist equals 53 hours

4.20, 4.21, 4.22 Criminal law

Classes where non-law enforcement trainers could teach 36.15 hours (approximately one week)

1.06 Study techniques

2.02 Ethics

3.01 Human behavior

3.08 Domestic abuse

3.14 Juvenile procedures

3.15 Child abuse

3.16 Child molestation

3.36 Interpersonal communications

4.01 Traffic law

10.01 Report writing

Notes: All curriculums must be approved by LETB for presentation to basic students. Classes are conducted at NILEA training facility to allow for oversight by Academy staff. Changes in delivery could require a complete overhaul of the way training is delivered. Need continuity of curriculum across all basic academies, classes, objectives, and measures.

Attachment B

Affinity Exercise

Priority	Create Scenario-based training that prepares the officer for “speed of life” encounters. Training to support the reduction of #1 cause of on-duty fatalities.
Benefits	More realistic training, officers better equipped for service, improved de-escalation techniques, realistic situations, and holistic practice and allows officers to apply the knowledge they have learned. It provides the ability to direct and evaluate the officer in the high-risk encounters. Helps create an immediate feedback loop
Current State	Lecture-based training and some practice exercises. Practice building limited in changing room configuration to advance scenarios. The vehicle courtyard does not provide real-life cover and concealment officers face in the field. It only has room for a single vehicle. No video equipment is being used at this time. Officers and instructors cannot review actions taken.
Option 1	Design a training environment that includes video, equipment to provide realism to the training and an advanced training area (undercover delete) out of the elements. The training area would need to accommodate 3 to 5 vehicles and bleacher-type seating for observation of scenario training.
Option 2	Advanced simulators tools (weapons, classrooms with movable walls)
Option 3	Additional instructors to accommodate one instructor to five student ratio, (During training scenario days.)
Option 4	Additional classroom space
Qualifying Questions	
Basic Training	Yes, this is considered basic training for officers.
Aligned with Section 187	Yes, these advancements will support the future state of ILEA.
Risk Mitigation	Reduces the risk by improving speed training for officers. Reduce risk on #1 cause of fatalities of officers.
Cost Estimate	TBD
Notes: Scenario-based training can include the development of a “Hogan’s Alley” simulator course. The second EVO track also serves as a scenario-based training location for traffic stops, foot pursuits, vehicle searches, use of cover, etc.	

Priority	Use of colleges to support the Academy
Benefits	Utilizing colleges to reduce the burden off of the Academy staffers. Build a network of higher education opportunities across the state. Improve the chance of officer interaction with the younger generation. A more academic environment for classroom learning. Reduces academy time to increase class offerings. Option to have classes a prerequisite to the academy.
Current State	Currently not part of the ILEA model.
Option 1	Utilize the colleges to train some of the more complicated aspects of the curriculum (traffic law and criminal law). The curriculum would need to be approved by ILEA, and periodic audits would be conducted. Officers would be required to take a qualifying test at the Academy. Options to train on-site or at the colleges should be evaluated.
Option 2	Development of college courses that would be a prerequisite to Academy application.
Option 3	
Option 4	
Qualifying Questions	
Basic Training	Yes
Aligned with Section 187	Yes, it advances the current state of ILEA and capitalizes on additional resources outside of the Academy.
Risk	Ensuring training is conducted to ILEA standards.
Cost Estimate	TBD
Notes: Option to use higher learning institutions could provide an online solution to some of the courses. Need to determine the funding. Local departments could take on cost or reimbursement to the officer.	

Equipment/Building

Priority	Vehicle training facility to train officers to handle “safe engagements.”
Benefits	Support the reduction of the #2 cause of line of duty fatalities. Vehicle training providing real-life road conditions (gravel, rain, highway ramp, intersections, buildings, and other vehicle scenarios).
Current State	1.2 mi pursuit perimeter track, large interior pad for braking, evasive maneuvers and parking. Two indoor classrooms <u>35 capacity</u> in one, 20 in the other. Small office space and garage area for repairs. The EVO range is at capacity with current class needs. The majority of training vehicles are outdated crown Victoria’s. The majority of the departments are using sedans, SUVs and trucks as conventional pursuit vehicles.
Option 1	Build additional EVO facility. The location of EVO track can be located off-site from the Academy or at the Plainfield Academy. Advance the EVO with gravel, elevation challenges, water, interstate ramps and other vehicle challenges.
Option 2	Add additional training vehicles that mirror the current inventory of Indiana departments.
Option 3	Add additional instructors to accommodate one instructor to five student ratio for breakout and scenario-based training days.
Option 4	
Qualifying Questions	
Basic Training	EVO Drivers training is considered basic and critical training.
Aligned with Section 187	Yes, advancing the future state of ILEA.
Risk	The additional course and advanced obstacles will support the mitigation of road fatalities for officers and the public.
Cost Estimate	
Notes:	

Priority	State of the Art Facility
Benefits	Increase the number of classes available to departments, reducing the time to enter into the academy. Improve the learning environment. Provide training rooms that enhance realistic scenario-based training.
Current State	1970's construction. Dorms capacity 109 rooms 250 person, primary classroom 194 seats, 165 practical seating, no room for laptops, seven classrooms with a max of 50 occupants, one classroom 20 occupants, cafeteria 175 capacity, with three turnovers per meal (525 max per meal), assembly Hall/gymnasium 200 single file line, attached locker rooms, leisure space, parking for 350 vehicles. Academy is passed its capacity, causing a 3-6 month wait time to be slated for training.
Option 1	Renovate/replace the aging building(s).
Option 2	Increase the number of classrooms
Option 3	Renovate and add additional EVO driving range with added classroom space
Option 4	Increase dorm rooms and renovate current rooms to alleviate water leaks that cause mold.
Option 5	Research options for consolidated public safety academy
Qualifying Questions	
Basic Training	Yes
Aligned with Section 187	Yes, the growth of candidates and demand to train.
Risk	Reduce the 3-6 month waiting list to enter the academy. Vehicle range becoming unserviceable.
Cost Estimate	
Notes:	

Priority	Improve Training Technology
Benefits	Improve training through advanced media solutions. Lesson plans can be accessed through ILEA website and remotely. On-Line testing for basics and in-service training.
Current State	Computer access very limited, current display technology difficult to see in classroom.
Option 1	Update academy computer systems and software
Option 2	Increase computer laboratory from 20 stations to 45 for larger upcoming classes.
Option 3	Wire desks for laptop power
Option 4	Need upgraded Galaxy tablets for lesson plan access and note taking Upgrade software, currently using windows 7.
Option 5	Cameras needed in classroom to document instruction for later use. (basic recruits become ill, family death, birth of a child and other excused absences) Remote monitoring of class presentation.
Qualifying Questions	
Basic Training	Yes
Aligned with Section 187	Yes
Risk	Limits training technics available
Cost Estimate	
Notes:	

Priority	Advanced curriculum to support 21 st -century policing techniques.
Benefits	Insure ILEA curriculum is at the cutting edge of police training. Advanced officer's interaction with Generation Z and alpha citizens. Better equip officers to anticipate the dangers and opportunities.
Current State	The current curriculum was evaluated in 2015.
Option 1	Conduct curriculum review.
Option 2	Advanced cyber policing techniques.
Option 3	Create a new position that conducts research and planning to advance curriculum.
Option 4	Advanced computer lab to be more effective.
Qualifying Questions	
Basic Training	Yes
Aligned with Section 187	Yes, the advancement of the curriculum directly impacts the future state of ILEA.
Risk	Reduces the risk of training becoming outdated to the current environment.
Cost Estimate	
Notes: Computer lab upgrades needed to accommodate larger class sizes.	