



Federal Law Enforcement Training Accreditation

STANDARDS REVISION FORM

Please provide standard number, and place an X in the appropriate box.

Standards Manual Edition September 2005 Standard Number 1.05.01

New Standard		Revision	X	Deletion	
--------------	--	----------	---	----------	--

Proposal (State the standard exactly as you believe it should appear in the manual.)

May want to consider combining with 1.05.02 if all agencies now have an automated record keeping / enrollment system.

Drop the "objective to test linkage" reference here as this is covered in other standards, such as 4.03.04.

Rationale for Revision.

Most automated record keeping systems cover the elements of both program content and student performance mentioned in these two standards.

"Objective to test linkage" is covered in Chapter 4.



Federal Law Enforcement Training Accreditation

STANDARDS REVISION FORM

Please provide standard number, and place an X in the appropriate box.

Standards Manual Edition Sept 05 Standard Number 1.05.02

New Standard		Revision	X	Deletion	
--------------	--	----------	---	----------	--

Proposal (State the standard exactly as you believe it should appear in the manual.)
Delete "Either Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory is recorded in a permanent record."

Rationale for Revision.
1. The current bullet is duplicative. The previous bullet already requires applicants to maintain a record of training evaluation scores and completion statuses and satisfactorily addresses this requirement. 2. Applicants may use other units of measure to record completions depending on the course such as, pass/fail or completed/incomplete, etc. 3. The bullet is also partially covered in standard 4.06.05 regarding the setting of pass/fail cut scores.



Federal Law Enforcement Training Accreditation

STANDARDS REVISION FORM

Please provide standard number, and place an X in the appropriate box.

Standards Manual Edition September 2005 Standard Number 1.06.01

New Standard		Revision	X	Deletion	
--------------	--	----------	---	----------	--

Proposal (State the standard exactly as you believe it should appear in the manual.)
Minor point: Consider moving to 1.01.05

Rationale for Revision.
It appears that moving this budget standard the Administrative and General Management section behind short term and long term training needs standards would be more logical.



Federal Law Enforcement Training Accreditation

STANDARDS REVISION FORM

Please provide standard number, and place an X in the appropriate box.

Standards Manual Edition September 2005 Standard Number 1.08.01

New Standard		Revision	X	Deletion	
--------------	--	----------	---	----------	--

Proposal (State the standard exactly as you believe it should appear in the manual.)

Minor point: Consider making this standard (Student Orientation) consistent with 2.01.02 (Staff Orientation).

Rationale for Revision.

It appears that both Orientation topics should be more similar.



Federal Law Enforcement Training Accreditation

STANDARDS REVISION FORM

Please provide standard number, and place an X in the appropriate box.

Standards Manual Edition Sept 05 Standard Number 1.08.02

New Standard		Revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Deletion	
--------------	--	----------	-------------------------------------	----------	--

Proposal (State the standard exactly as you believe it should appear in the manual.)

The Applicant has a DAC establishing a health screening process for students participating in **applicable** programs.

Rationale for Revision.

Add "applicable" to the standard as not all programs require health screening. For instance, a training program on the use of investigative computer software or photography does not necessitate student health screening. Or, training to law enforcement job positions that do not have health or physical aptitude requirements—such as certain laboratory personnel or industry operations investigators. Health screening requirements should be dependent on the training requirements documentation regarding physical performance requirements, safety, risk, and liability.



Federal Law Enforcement Training Accreditation

STANDARDS REVISION FORM

Please provide standard number, and place an X in the appropriate box.

Standards Manual Edition September 2005 Standard Number 2.02.02*

New Standard.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Revision	<input type="checkbox"/>	Deletion	<input type="checkbox"/>
---------------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------	--------------------------

Proposal (State the standard exactly as you believe it should appear in the manual.)

* In lieu of the INSTRUCTOR DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM requirement, consider adding additional standards to Chapter 2, Qualifications & Development of Training Staff. Perhaps increase the nine standards to twelve by expanding standard 2.02.02 placing more emphasis on demonstration of ISD principles, adult learning, and developing instructional materials.

Rationale for Revision.

Instructor Development should be a part of the Academy Accreditation, not a separate program. Adding a few appropriate standards to Chapter 2 appears to be a logical choice and by combining a few of the redundant standards (such as 1.08.01 and 3.01.06), the total number of Academy standards could still remain about 70.



Federal Law Enforcement Training Accreditation

STANDARDS REVISION FORM

Please provide standard number, and place an X in the appropriate box.

Standards Manual Edition Sept 05 Standard Number 2.03.01

New Standard		Revision	X	Deletion	
--------------	--	----------	---	----------	--

Proposal (State the standard exactly as you believe it should appear in the manual.)

The Applicant establishes processes and criteria to document quality checks of instructor preparations, class presentations and results. A process is in place for supervisory review of the documentation.

Rationale for Revision.

The current standard requires that supervisors directly document instructor performance. While this works with a permanent instructor staff in an academy environment, it is not as feasible in an environment where instructors come from the field and are not part of a permanent staff. In our organization, many instructors are pulled from the field to provide specific short blocks of instruction. As they are temporarily detailed to the training program, they technically report to the chief of the entire academy while detailed to teach. In this environment, program managers provide the first line of over site over instructors. In most cases, the program managers are also subject matter experts. Program managers are responsible for ensuring training quality, documenting activities, and evaluating instructors. Supervisors are then responsible for reviewing the paperwork, following up on potential issues, and spot checking with evaluations of their own when deemed necessary.

Standard: 3.01.02

Selected tasks are compared with existing training materials in sufficient depth to determine if existing training adequately supports task performance.

Compliance Indicator(s):

The documented administrative control specifies how the task selection steps will be documented and who is authorized to verify that the steps were completed.

The comparison of training tasks to existing materials is clearly an integral part of the Instructional Systems Design (ISD) Model and happens during the Analysis phase. The ISD manuals and SOPs that I have encountered during the two assessments I've been on, as well as other Models I have read, all basically state (in the Analysis Phase) the following:

Comparison to Existing Training Material

If the task analysis relates to training that is currently being conducted, the selected tasks should be compared with existing training materials in sufficient depth to determine if existing training adequately supports task performance. If such a comparison shows that the existing program substantially covers the selected tasks, then a determination should be made as to whether the existing program should be modified to include the additional identified tasks. The existing program should also be examined to determine whether any of the tasks trained should be eliminated.

This Standard should be renumbered to 4.02.02 and the remaining two standards in that sub-chapter (4.02) should be renumbered to 4.02.03 and 4.02.04, respectively. The remaining standards in Chapter 3 should be pulled up to reflect the elimination of this standard.



Federal Law Enforcement Training Accreditation

STANDARDS REVISION FORM

Please provide standard number, and place an X in the appropriate box.

Standards Manual Edition September 2005 Standard Number 3.01.06

New Standard		Revision		Deletion	X
--------------	--	----------	--	----------	---

Proposal (State the standard exactly as you believe it should appear in the manual.)
Very similar, if not identical, to standard 1.08.01 (Student Orientation).

Rationale for Revision.
OR drop 1.08.01 and keep this one in Chapter 3.



Federal Law Enforcement Training Accreditation

STANDARDS REVISION FORM

Please provide standard number, and place an X in the appropriate box.

Standards Manual Edition September 2005 Standard Number 4.03.02

New Standard		Revision	X	Deletion	
--------------	--	----------	---	----------	--

Proposal (State the standard exactly as you believe it should appear in the manual.)

Consider combining this standard with the next two that also deal with learning objectives and linkage (4.03.03 and 4.03.04), as well as the "objective to test linkage" reference that is covered in 1.05.01.

Rationale for Revision.

It appears that a technical report with an Objective-Job Task-Test Item Matrix would cover all 4 learning objectives requirements.



Federal Law Enforcement Training Accreditation

STANDARDS REVISION FORM

Please provide standard number, and place an X in the appropriate box.

Standards Manual Edition Sept 05 Standard Number n/a

New Standard	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Revision	<input type="checkbox"/>	Deletion	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------	--------------------------

Proposal (State the standard exactly as you believe it should appear in the manual.)

When the academy is managed and staffed primarily through a contract vendor, DACs governing academy operations indicate review and authorization by the contracting Federal agency to ensure adherence to existing agency directive, policy, and procedure.

Rationale for Revision.

This is due to confusion caused when conducting an assessment on the training program for the Department of Energy's Basic Security Officer training. The entire academy is managed and staffed by a contracting company. This includes complete management of the ISD process. While the contractor was able to provide DACs that conformed to standard 1.02.01, as well as other applicable standards, there was not a way to verify that the company was conforming with orders or directives required by DOE. All DACs provided were company policies, not DOE policy.

The assumption that was made when the task force originally made these designations was that an Agency would first achieve Academy accreditation and then go on to Program accreditation for one or more programs. With this as background, it has now come to light that Agencies have the option of seeking Program accreditation before (or without ever seeking) Academy accreditation. If this is the case, there are several standards currently marked as "Academy Only" that should be documented by Agencies seeking Program Accreditation without having first achieved Academy Accreditation.

As an example, Standard 2.02.01 requires that the applicant have a system for monitoring and mentoring new instructors. This is an "Academy Only" standard. However, this standard becomes a critical standard which should be met by Agencies seeking Program accreditation without having first achieved Academy accreditation.

My recommendation is that there should be three check boxes for each standard as follows:

- Academy (A)
- Program with Academy already Accredited (P)
- Program/No Academy accreditation (P/NA)

In analyzing the 73 standards, there are only five standards affected, and they are located in chapter 2. The check boxes should be as follows:

	A	P	P/NA
2.01.01	X		X
2.01.02	X	X	
2.02.01	X		X
2.02.02	X		X
2.02.03	X		X
2.02.04	X		X
2.03.01	X	X	
2.04.01	X	X	
2.04.02	X	X	