

LAW ENFORCEMENT MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE

A REPORT ON THE SELECTION AND RESPONSIBILITIES
OF THE ACCREDITATION MANAGER

A RESEARCH PAPER
SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE
LAW ENFORCEMENT MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE

BY
MONTY R. STANLEY

CARROLLTON POLICE DEPARTMENT
CARROLLTON, TEXAS
October, 1991



#193

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION

Accreditation	1
General Role of the Accreditation Manager	2
Agencies Surveyed	4

II. SELECTION

Rank or Position	6
Abilities/Characteristics	9
Chief Administrator's Responsibility	11

III. RESPONSIBILITIES

Preparation Phase	12
Collect Information	13
Plan of Action	16
Orientation Training	16
Compliance Phase	17
Involvement of Personnel	17
Tracking System	18
Training On New Directives	21
Evaluation Phase	22
Accreditation Manager Review	22
Mock Assessment	23
CALEA On-Site Assessment	26
CALEA Commission Meeting	28

APPENDIX

Survey Form	31
-------------------	----

REFERENCE LIST	34
----------------------	----

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	35
-----------------------------	----

THE SELECTION AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE ACCREDITATION MANAGER

I. INTRODUCTION

An accreditation manager is a person who will guide a law enforcement agency through a process which, if successfully completed, will bring the agency a considerable amount of prestige and honor. The process, which is called Law Enforcement Accreditation, is designed for law enforcement agency personnel to be able to take a critical look at their own operations and to measure themselves against national standards. Captain Dorse Cooper, the Accreditation Manager of the Fairfax County, Virginia, Police Department, said:

"The concept is not unlike the 'quality control' function of a major corporation or manufacturer. In order to insure consistent quality of service, police departments are starting their own 'quality control' divisions, and accreditation is a cornerstone in the United States." ¹

The accreditation program for law enforcement agencies is under the direction of the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies, Inc. The program requires various types and sizes of law enforcement agencies to come into compliance with over 900 national standards which are divided into 48 topical areas. These standards were developed with the following goals:

1. Increasing the effectiveness and efficiency of the delivery of agency services.
2. Increasing the capabilities of the agency to deter and control crime.

3. Increasing cooperation between law enforcement agencies and between law enforcement and other agencies within the criminal justice system.
4. Increasing citizen and employee awareness of and confidence in the goals, directives, and practices of the agency.

The Chief Administrator of an agency will make many decisions about accreditation. It is a voluntary program, but the task of bringing the agency into compliance with all of the standards is a long and serious investment in time, money, manpower, and other agency resources. The project will use resources that are normally deployed toward local issues and problems and use those resources to meet national standards.² Questions will arise over the use of resources and someone will need to be prepared to answer with applicable project information. One person will be the manager of this project.

The accreditation manager will literally be able to "make or break" an agency in its quest to gain accredited status. The accreditation program will require many changes within an agency and many of those changes will be resisted for various reasons. It will be the accreditation manager's job to help the agency and its employees through these changes. He or she will not be able to effectively force change alone, so the manager must be able to understand and manage all the forces that may oppose a change. Many of the actions taken, and decisions made by an accreditation manager will affect an agency for years to come. Most managers are selected by virtue of their rank and/or position and not always for their abilities and characteristics. An understanding of the

characteristics needed, and the impact the selection can have on an agency, will allow the Chief Administrator more information to use in making an informed selection.

There is not a significant amount of published information on the selection process for an accreditation manager. The best information could be obtained by asking those persons who have been accreditation managers. A survey form was developed, and it was sent to the Accreditation Manager of Record for forty one (41) accredited agencies. The survey was designed to find out how accreditation managers were selected and the characteristics or abilities which were valuable in being a successful manager. The survey also identified which of these characteristics were most important to the most respondents. The survey was also designed to identify the types of activities accreditation managers are most likely to be responsible for.

At the time the survey was prepared, 156 agencies in the United States and Canada had been accredited. In order to select a workable number, the agencies were grouped by size into three categories. Of the 156 agencies, 17% had 49 employees or less, 37% had 50-199 employees, and 46% had 200 or more employees. These categories were each given a number of surveys based on the percentage of agencies in that size category.

Agencies were randomly selected (by drawing) in each of three size categories by using the following guidelines:

1. Obtain the widest geographical coverage of agencies.
2. Obtain the greatest diversity of types of law enforcement agencies.
3. Obtain the greatest difference in total agency personnel between agencies.

The law enforcement agencies that were asked to participate in the survey were:

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Edmondton Police Service
Edmonton, Canada
1371 Personnel | 2. Arvada Police Dept.
Arvada, Colorado
160 Personnel |
| 3. Glastonbury Police Dept.
Glastonbury, Connecticut
73 Personnel | 4. Delray Beach Police Dept.
Delray Beach, Florida
205 Personnel |
| 5. Hillsborough County
Sheriff's Office
Tampa, Florida
2168 Personnel | 6. Monroe County Sheriff's
Office
Key West, Florida
294 Personnel |
| 7. Ocala Police Dept.
Ocala, Florida
178 Personnel | 8. Tampa Police dept.
Tampa, Florida
1115 Personnel |
| 9. Clarke County Police Dept.
Athens, Georgia
132 Personnel | 10. Covington Police Dept.
Covington, Georgia
47 Personnel |
| 11. Evanston Police Dept.
Evanston, Illinois
211 Personnel | 12. Illinois State Police
Springfield, Illinois
3741 Personnel |
| 13. Elkhart County Sheriff's
Dept.
Goshen, Indiana
137 Personnel | 14. Cedar Falls Police Dept.
Cedar Falls, Iowa
52 Personnel |
| 15. Jeffersontown Police Dept.
Jeffersontown, Kentucky
46 Personnel | 16. Baltimore County Police
Dept.
Towson, Maryland
2093 Personnel |
| 17. Andover Police Dept.
Andover, Massachusetts
65 Personnel | 18. University of Mass. at
Boston
Dept. of Public Safety
Dorchester, Massachusetts
35 Personnel |
| 19. Ann Arbor Police Dept.
Ann Arbor, Michigan
203 Personnel | 20. New Brighton Police Dept.
New Brighton, Minnesota
22 Personnel |
| 21. Grandview Police Dept.
Grandview, Missouri
48 Personnel | 22. Montana Hwy. Patrol
Helena, Montana
258 Personnel |

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>23. Lincoln Police Dept.
Lincoln, Nebraska
306 Personnel</p> <p>25. Dover Police Dept.
Dover, New Hampshire
56 Personnel</p> <p>27. Scarsdale Police Dept.
Scarsdale, New York
48 Personnel</p> <p>29. Hamilton Police Dept.
Hamilton, Ohio
122 Personnel</p> <p>31. Rapid City Police Dept.
Rapid City, Iowa
108 Personnel</p> <p>33. Amarillo Police Dept.
Amarillo, Texas
327 Personnel</p> <p>35. Highland Park Dept. of
Public Safety
Highland Park, Texas
61 Personnel</p> <p>37. Falls Church Police Dept.
Falls Church, Virginia
46 Personnel</p> <p>39. Newport News Police Dept.
Newport News, Virginia
329 Personnel</p> <p>41. Virginia Beach Police
Dept.
Virginia Beach, Virginia
869 Personnel</p> | <p>24. Las Vegas Metropolitan
Police
Las Vegas, Nevada
1764 Personnel</p> <p>26. Albuquerque Police Dept.
Albuquerque, New Mexico
1178</p> <p>28. Fayetteville Police Dept.
Fayetteville, North Carolina
316 Personnel</p> <p>30. Milford Police Department
Milford, Ohio
17 Personnel</p> <p>32. Brentwood Police Dept.
Brentwood, Tennessee
46 Personnel</p> <p>34. Burleson Police Dept.
Burleson, Texas
38 Personnel</p> <p>36. Houston Police Department
Houston, Texas
5610 Personnel</p> <p>38. James City County Police
Dept.
Williamsburg, Virginia
52 Personnel</p> <p>40. Stanton Police Dept.
Stanton, Virginia
55 Personnel</p> |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

Of the forty one (41) surveys that were sent out, all but six were returned.

II. SELECTION

The selection of an accreditation manager for an agency is one of the most critical decisions a Chief Administrator must make concerning the process of accreditation. A Chief Administrator should not be an accreditation manager.³ He or she has too much responsibility to be that manager. The Administrator is responsible for the overall operations of the agency. The duties of an accreditation manager will include detail work and much time involvement. The Administrator cannot be expected to accomplish these types of duties, if he/she is to continue to effectively manage the agency.

Most accreditation managers are selected because of their rank or their assignment within the agency. It is easy to give this assignment to someone in Planning and Research or a division commander because of rank.

Table 1

Methods Used by Agencies
To Select An Accreditation Manager

Method	Percent
Rank/Assignment	69
Assessment of abilities	31

It is usually believed that a person in a specialized position or with high rank would be able to handle this assignment, but that is not always the most productive way. This assignment is unlike any task most personnel within a police department have ever done. Personnel who are assigned the task blindly will sometimes resent the assignment or the extra workload. Most agencies do not have the luxury of assigning personnel full-time to the accreditation process. Only 31% of the survey

respondents were able to have an accreditation manager assigned full time to the project. While 69% of the accreditation managers must assume this assignment without giving up his/her normal duties. This combination eventually leads to longer hours each day and many week-end work days.

Some agencies have selected non-sworn personnel or personnel from outside the agency for the accreditation manager assignment. In most of these cases, the agency director used some type of selection criteria. These people were usually selected because of such things as the ability to write, the ability to communicate, the ability to organize, etc. Why do we not afford at least the same type of selection process when we select sworn personnel? Being a high ranking officer does not automatically mean a successful accreditation program, if the person's abilities do not match the job.

In the survey, only a small percentage of the managers were civilians. Civilians, although capable, usually find an attitude that the sworn personnel feel the civilian cannot identify with them because he/she has never been a police officer/deputy "on the street." Of the sworn managers, only 30% were captains and above. Almost 60% were either sergeants or lieutenants. Most agencies do not use a high ranking officer.

Table 2
Rank of Accreditation Manager

Rank	Percent
Civilian	6
Police Officer	6
Sergeant	29
Lieutenant	29
Captain	14
Ranks above Captain	16

Rank should be considered, but not as a primary criteria. Rank can be very helpful in the process or it can be very detrimental depending on the personality and the abilities of the person. When it becomes detrimental, then a change is needed.

Most agencies, 63% of them, were able to continue through the process with the same manager. When you must change managers during an accreditation program, the two most common reasons, according to the survey, were when the manager's personality or his/her abilities did not match the job. Two of the more common outcomes are loss of continuity and/or a stalling of the process.

Table 3
Effect of Changing Accreditation
Managers During The Process

Effect	Percent
Loss of continuity/ stalled process	62
Continuity when change due to promotion/retirement	38

These two outcomes occur because the new manager must learn about the job and what has been done and what remains to be done. The stalling of the overall process cost the agency time and money. Time to get the process going again and money to change some things which will need to be changed in order to meet new timetables or the new managers expectations. What criteria can be used to select a good manager on the first try?

There is no perfect process to choose a manager who can do it all. But, there are some characteristics and abilities which are more useful than others. By looking for these characteristics and abilities in those personnel considered for this assignment, and by choosing the best combination of these characteristics and abilities for the particular

agency, the Chief Administrator should have reasonable success in selecting a person who can handle the assignment.

In the survey, a list of nineteen (19) characteristics or abilities were listed. The respondents were asked to rate each one on a scale. The most important characteristics to look for in an accreditation manager would be those characteristics at the top of the list with, for example, ratings of 98% or better. An accreditation manager then should have the initiative to get things done. He/she should be a good organizer and a good planner in order to complete a successful program. He/she must have integrity in the way the program and the people are handled. He/she must be a self-motivator and not depend on someone else to tell the manager everything that needs to be done.

Table 4
Characteristics of an
Accreditation Manager

Characteristics	Percent
Initiative	100
Organizer	100
Integrity	100
Planner	100
Self-Motivator	98
Confident	95
Trustworthy	91
Intelligent	91
Leadership	90
Delegator	90
Decisiveness	90
Task Oriented	86
Mediator	86
Evaluator	81
Fair	76
High Rank	43
Seniority	29
Socializer	24
Procrastinator (not to be)	100

Good communication skills and a positive attitude toward the process are essential. The one characteristic an accreditation manager must not have is that of being a procrastinator. A procrastinator will most likely never complete an accreditation project. These ratings were made by accreditation managers who have been through this process and know what it takes. Although officers in certain ranks or particular assignments should have these characteristics; many times they do not.

The overall job of an accreditation manager is to help the agency become accredited. He/she will have to accomplish that task by using most, or at least some, of these characteristics and abilities. He/she will have to plan and organize the entire project, complete with time tables, assignments, researching, writing, filing, delegating, and controlling the massive flow of paperwork and ideas. He/she will have to solve problems, manage "bottlenecks", communicate with all levels within the departments and many outside influences. Others will have to have trust that the manager knows what to do and how to do it. The manager will have to have the confidence to deal with superior officers and the initiative to make some decisions which will not be popular with everyone. He/she will have to manage the changes which will be forced on the agency and will have to be able to push some changes through. In this case, rank can help if used properly. He/she must be able to involve others in the process to the extent that they have a "desire" to see the agency become accredited.

Table 5
Most Often Cited Characteristics
Needed by An Accreditation Manager

Planner
Organizer
Communication Skills
Positive Attitude
Integrity
Innovative
"People Person"
Ability to get things done
Self-Motivator
<u>Familiar with overall operation of agency</u>

There is one more essential thing that an accreditation manager must have. Without it, the other characteristics and abilities will probably not be enough to accomplish the task. This last item is also the one characteristic that an accreditation manager does not possess on his/her own. The Chief Administrator of the agency must give his full support to the accreditation process and the accreditation manager. Without that willingness to support the process, and the manager, the agency will suffer through a long, hard process that will most likely not be successful. It will take an involved and supportive Chief Administrator to select and support an accreditation manager who is right for the job.

III. RESPONSIBILITIES

Now that an accreditation manager has been selected, we will examine why the job is so important that it requires the time and effort to select the right person. The responsibilities are varied and require many long hours and a commitment to the agency and the accreditation process.

Table 6
Major areas of Responsibility
Of An Accreditation Manager

Initial review of standards
Fill out agency profile questionnaire
Determine filing system
Coordinate with CALEA staff
Public information
Make chapter/standard assignments
Maintenance of files
Mock assessment preparation
On-site assessment preparation
Commission hearing preparation
Attend/participate in commission meetings
<u>Annual Reports</u>

The job responsibilities can be divided into three major phases which are:

1. Preparation Phase
2. Compliance Phase
3. Evaluation Phase

The preparation phase is where the tone for the entire project will be set. The Chief Administrator and the Accreditation Manager begin here with their commitment to the process. The decisions made at this time about how the agency will conduct its self-assessment will affect the agency for years to come. The manager must fully understand the accreditation process as it impacts the agency.

One of the first things that must be done is for the manager to collect information. First of all, he/she should read through the Standards Manual. It is not a quick task. There are 908 standards with 760 "bullets" or sub-sections, which must be addressed. By reading through the manual, the manager will begin to understand the complexity and completeness of the self-assessment he/she must manage. Another area of information gathering is to make some field trips.

Before the actual self-assessment begins, at least two field trips should be considered.⁴ One is to attend a national commission meeting of the Commission on Law Enforcement Accreditation (CALEA) and the other is to visit an accredited agency which is similar in size and type. The trip to the CALEA meeting has several benefits including obtaining a better understanding of the accreditation process and the Commission's role. The manager will be able to meet and talk with other accreditation managers who have been through the process. He/She will be able to network with these other managers, which is a vital step. Agencies going through this process face similar problems, both large and small. By building this network of contacts, the manager has a number of "consultants" to draw information from and these "consultants" are free. Another way to network with more of these managers is for the agency to join and participate in a state or regional accreditation coalition of agencies involved, or interested, in the process. In Texas, for example, membership in the Texas Accreditation Coalition is also open to agencies in other states who do not have a coalition of their own.

Another benefit is that the manager is able to meet and talk with the commission staff. They will no longer be only a voice on the telephone. Each agency in the accreditation process is assigned one main field representative contact person from the commission. This person will work with the agency throughout the process. By going to a CALEA meeting, the manager can meet and talk with the contact representative and, more importantly, the staff member can get to know the accreditation manager. The rapport that the manager can begin to build here will be valuable later on in the process. The commission staff member will be able to have a degree of trust in the manager when dealing with procedural questions or specific problem areas later in the process.

The second field trip is to visit at least one accredited agency similar in size and type to the manager's agency. In the law enforcement field, we sometimes seem to think our problems are unique to our agency or location. By going to other agencies, the manager will expand his/her way of thinking by seeing how that agency solved problems, possibly in a way the manager had never thought of. He/she can obtain ideas on manuals, procedures, filing systems, and any number of items by "looking" at an agency which has been accredited.

The Accreditation Manager and Chief Administrator should obtain an application for assessor to become an assessor for the Commission. By becoming an assessor, the manager would be sent to an agency to conduct an actual on-site assessment for accreditation. He/she will receive training and then conduct the on-site with other experienced team members. As an accreditation manager and assessor, my experience of conducting an on-site while my agency was still in self-assessment was extremely helpful in

giving me a better understanding of the process and in helping me perform my assignment when I returned. The manager should also obtain several different directives manuals from accredited agencies. These will be valuable reference manuals during the process.

One key principal that an accreditation manager must understand and be able to effectively communicate is what constitutes "proof of compliance" for a standard. A proof can be in a written format, by interview, or by observation. The specific CALEA definitions are:

1. Written Directive - any written document used to guide or affect the performance or conduct of agency employees. The term includes policies, procedures, rules and regulations, general orders, special orders, and instructional materials, and laws or ordinances.
2. Other Written Documentation - these may include reports, logs, records, files, goals and objectives, budget documents, plans, and evaluations.
3. Interview - this is simply the assessor asking questions of a person or position holder who is specified on a document.
4. Observation - this category involves viewing a facility, condition, activity, or object required by a standard.
5. Other - This category is used to record proofs which do not fall into the other four categories.⁵

After gathering information and making contacts, the manager is now ready to make some operational decisions. A determination must be made as to whether or not the manager will operate alone or with a team. Some type of selection criteria, based on ability, should be used if team

members are selected. The manager will need to determine work space, supplies, and the type of filing system. At this point, one decision which must be made is what type of written directive system the agency will use. Some agencies continue with the directive system already in place and expand it. Other agencies construct a new directive system and many of these use the CALEA standard numbers as the indexing system. The collection of manuals from other accredited agencies will be very helpful in expanding a directive system or in creating a new directive system.

The manager must decide on a plan of action for obtaining compliance and how to track that plan. One way is for the manager (and team) to do most of the writing and "legwork." This approach usually shortens the time span, allows for easier tracking, and involves fewer people in having a stake in the results. A second way is to have as many other people as possible in the agency involved in the writing of directives and collection of data. This approach usually takes longer and makes tracking more difficult, but it involves many more people in the outcome of the accreditation process. Which approach is best would be determined by the type of agency, the agency personnel, and the internal and external forces influencing the agency.

Once the initial decisions have been made about how the agency should proceed, the manager must develop a training orientation for department employees. A separate orientation should be developed for other personnel outside the agency, such as other government officials that the agency personnel interact with. The orientation will need to discuss why the agency is involved, what the process will entail, who will be involved, when the process will begin, and hopefully be completed, and

how the agency personnel will accomplish the task. All department personnel should attend an orientation. The more involvement within the agency that the manager can develop, the more benefits for the agency will be created during the accreditation process and beyond. It can point out the agency's "up and coming" personnel, such as those who can write well, those who have an ability to develop policies, those who can train others, and those who can lead others by example and/or ability.

The next phase that the manager must move into is the compliance phase. In this phase, the actual work towards accreditation will be done. The policies and procedures will be written, the proofs will be compiled, the files will be completed, and the training on new directives will be accomplished. This phase is the longest phase, usually taking 60% to 70% of an agency's total time during the accreditation process.

There are any number of ways to involve agency personnel in the process. One example of how to get the most people involved will now be discussed. The manager must read through each of the 48 chapters and determine which division is responsible for that chapter. The entire chapter is then assigned to an appropriate commander with a due date for the entire chapter to be returned. The commander then reviews the assigned chapters and then divides those out by chapters or standards to his/her commanders and they do the same thing, until the patrol officer, for example, ends up with two or three standards. His/her assignment is to read the copy of the standard and commentary and decide whether or not the agency meets the standard. If it does not, they are to write down what it would take or write a policy statement to cover it. If it does meet the standard, they are required to prove it by attaching a copy of a

directive or detailing some other proof. This process works best if everyone has attended a training orientation session. If they have attended a training session, they will understand that agencies are bound by only what the standard states. They are not bound by the commentary.⁶ Sometimes, personnel will think the commentary is binding, but it is to clarify the intent of the standard. The completed assignments go back up the chain of command with each level adding comments or attachments. The completed chapter is then returned to the accreditation manager who reviews the documentation. He/She reviews the documentation for content to determine if the accreditation standard was properly addressed. If it was not, the paperwork is sent back to the commander to be corrected. Once proper documentation is received, the accreditation manager is responsible for writing the directives in the proper format for the directive system, filing all the proofs in the file folder, and placing of all the new directives in the proper chapter or section of the manual.

In order to accomplish this task, the manager must develop a tracking system. He/she must be able to know where each standard is and who is responsible for that standard. But even in the most sophisticated system, items are sometimes lost or overlooked. One rule an accreditation manager should make is that once a document, file, or directive is created, the original never leaves the accreditation manager's control. Additional working copies can always be made, as long as the original is available. The tracking function is best maintained by a computer, but a paper and pencil system can accomplish the task. The tracking system has three parts which are:

1. Assignment
2. Control
3. Follow-up

The assignment part is simply a file card, computer program, or tracking sheet that indicates who has been assigned the particular standard or chapter, the date it was assigned, and the date it is due back to the accreditation manager. There should also be a master list for due dates. A list of dates, with the chapters due, would be a quick reference. The control part is using a method to control the amount of paperwork coming in. Usually, several standards or chapters would be due on the same day for ease of tracking. The manager needs to be able to make sure that each chapter that was due has been turned in. He/she needs to then make sure each standard in the chapter, and each bullet within appropriate standards, were properly and completely addressed. Then, the proper notations must be made on the control logs and/or tracking cards or sheets. The manager can then go back and easily find those chapters and standards that are late.

In the follow-up part, the manager must continue to track late standards, and also begin new tracks on individual standards that were turned in on time, but had to be returned for additional work. Both of these types of standards are given new due dates. The manager must work with the appropriate commander to correct the problems that caused the standards to be late. At this point, the manager may be dealing directly with a superior officer who doesn't agree with him/her and the manager needs to have the personality and communication skills to handle this type of confrontation. Likewise, in dealing with a junior officer in rank, the

skills are necessary so the junior officer feels a part of the process and not as though he/she were merely following orders. Occasionally, in the follow-up part, the manager will become involved with someone of the same rank, or superior rank, who is resentful of change and has little interest in the project. Sometimes the resentment can show up as definite procrastination or simply as the person who is not interested in the process, so he/she always has something which is more important to do than work on the standards which have been assigned. At this point, if the person cannot be convinced to accomplish his/her task, the accreditation manager will not be able to continue unless he/she completes the job for the other person, or unless the Chief Administrator steps in.

If the Chief Administrator has been actively supportive of the process from the start, a situation like this will be less likely to occur. If the Administrator has been perceived as only giving "lip service" support to the process because he/she doesn't fully support it, then this type of situation is more likely to occur. Then the Administrator will be required to make a decision to stand by the accreditation manager or not. If he does not, then the process is probably over for that agency, with that manager. This is another reason for the Chief Administrator to select the right person for the job. He/she has to have confidence in the manager to know he/she will not be confrontational with peers or senior commanders just to show his/her authority. The Administrator has to have enough trust in the manager to know he/she will only bring this type of situation to him/her if there is no other way to work it out and it is threatening the process. The Chief Administrator can actively support the process and the manager without

becoming actively involved in the details of the process. If he/she does support the process and the manager, these situations can most likely be avoided.

After the directives and proofs have been compiled, the new directives and previous ones which have been amended must be issued to department personnel and each person must receive training on those directives. Basically, there are two major ways this task can be done. One way is to save all the directives in a new manual and issue it at one time. The training, then, can be conducted in a shorter period of time, utilizing longer formalized in-service training sessions. The major problem is information overload.⁷ There is a tremendous amount of information in the new manual which must be understood. Another way to issue these directives is to issue them as each new chapter or section of the manual is updated or completed. The training then could be done utilizing roll call training sessions which would be shorter increments over a longer period of time than the in-service training. The major problem here is that many of the standards impact each other. A directive may be issued and, later, another standard impacts the directive already issued. The problem then is whether to update new directives already in place or issue another directive for the later standard and have some duplication. The duplication does not impact the accreditation process, but it does make manuals more difficult. At some point, it will be necessary to eliminate the duplication.

Either of these ways will work, even with the problems which were identified. The selection of which one to use will be based on the type of personnel within the agency and which way would be better accepted.

One advantage that can show up during training, if line officers have been involved in creating the directives, is defense of directives or procedures. Some of the directives issued are not met with open arms by all department members. Many times, when one employee makes a comment or questions a directive in a training situation, a person who had some part in creating that directive may explain why it was necessary. It becomes a source of pride for line personnel to see their ideas or statements in a departmental document.

The final phase of the accreditation process is the evaluation phase. In this phase the agency personnel find out if the many hours of work and the money expended has resulted in a successful process. One of the first things an accreditation manager must do is a review of the files. He/she must go through each and every file folder for all of the 908 standards. The review will be to determine if all necessary documents are in each folder, and if all necessary paperwork is properly filled out and marked. Each folder will have the following three major parts:

1. Copy of the appropriate standard
2. Individual Standard Status Report (ISSR)
3. Proof(s) of compliance

He/she must make sure that each part of every standard has been proven by a written directive, other written documentation, observations, or interviews or any combination of those depending on the requirements of a given standards.

The standards review is probably the single most time consuming task a manager will perform. It should not be delegated in part or whole. The accreditation manager is responsible for the project. The standards

review is his/her final check on the project. The manager must be able to answer questions concerning the files and the agency's readiness for inspection. He/she cannot adequately execute that responsibility without first hand knowledge of these files.

After completing the review, the manager will believe he/she and the agency are ready for the evaluation from the Commission. But, in many cases, they will not be completely ready. Many times an accreditation manager has missed small, but sometimes obvious points, because he/she is too close to the project and the agency.⁸ Sometimes standards are misinterpreted or even a part of a standard is overlooked, and that part has no proof of compliance in the file. That is why another standards review is extremely beneficial. But this review is conducted by personnel who have not been directly involved in the process of a particular agency. This standards review has come to be known as a "Mock" assessment.

Mock assessments are used to find the weak areas in an agency's proofs prior to the actual CALEA on-site assessment. In order to make the mock assessment as close as possible to the actual assessment, several guidelines should be considered. Those include who should conduct it, how long it should take, and what they should do.

"These pre-assessments also have a tendency to identify (1) additional source documents that may enhance the proofs already present in the folders, (2) superfluous proofs in folders, or (3) proofs that are not appropriately highlighted."⁹

The mock on-site should be conducted by three or four law enforcement managers with CALEA experience from outside the state. It may take more than four if it is a large agency in numbers or if it is spread out, such as a state agency, with many different buildings.

The reason for using out-of-state law enforcement managers is to eliminate any familiarity with the agency and the CALEA experience is needed to make sure the advice given is reasonable and in-line with what the CALEA assessment team will expect. Although, out-of-state assessors are the most ideal, many agencies will not have the funds to pay the per diem and expenses of all these assessors. A successful mock assessment can still be obtained using personnel from within the state or even from within the agency. The manager and the agency should make every effort to use at least one assessor who has been an assessor on a CALEA on-site assessment. The CALEA staff, the state coalition, other agencies in the process, and accredited agencies can assist in locating experienced and available people. If agency personnel need to be used, they should be competent personnel who have not been involved in the day to day accreditation process.

The mock assessment should take two to three days. All of the 908 file folders should be evaluated by the assessors for completeness and adequate proofs of compliance. If there is enough time, visual observations, ride-alongs, and interviews should be conducted. The daily workings of a team are usually in either an open forum or a closed forum. Which type of forum is determined by the agency, since it is their mock assessment.

In a closed forum, the team goes through the files privately, occasionally calling the accreditation manager in for consultation, discussing key issues at the end of the assessment, and then preparing a report for the agency within a specified time period.

In an open forum, the assessment team and the accreditation team work together, interacting all during the on-site whenever a question arises. A discussion of major points is also held at the end of the assessment. The report can also be a written report, but two other options are available which eliminate the time that the agency must wait on the report before changes can be made.

One option is to have the assessor fill out a form on each standard with comments or corrections. The forms are collected on the last day and repair work can begin immediately. Another option is to have the assessor write nothing down, but have a member of the agency accreditation team with the assessor. The agency member can make notes and clear up any questions immediately with the assessor on what he/she means about a correction or addition to a proof.

Once the mock assessment is complete and the appropriate changes have been carried out, the accreditation manager is ready to contact the CALEA staff to inform them that the agency is ready for the on-site inspection team. The CALEA staff will begin by requesting some random standards. They will ask for 40 to 50 standards to be sent to them. The accreditation manager will be required to send in complete copies of everything in the file folders of the random standards. The staff will use the random standards to have their own standards review and they will be used to familiarize the assessors with how the files are set up before

the assessors arrive. The random standards will always include standards related to deadly force and those related to the agency's written directive system.

The CALEA staff will also prepare a list of 35 to 40 potential assessors. Their names, agency name, and additional information will be sent to the agency. The Accreditation Manager and the Chief Administrator review the list and mark through those who may be familiar with the agency for some reason and return the list to the CALEA staff. The staff selects the assessors and notifies the agency.

The next few weeks will be devoted to preparations by the accreditation manager. He/she will be working closely with the CALEA staff on accommodations for the assessors, notifications for public information requirements, and information to the agency about the upcoming on-site assessment. Travel arrangements for the assessors will be made by the commission staff.

An on-site assessment is the final test of the accreditation manager's project management. The agency representative for the assessment team will be the accreditation manager. An on-site team will usually be in town for six days.

On day one, the accreditation manager is only responsible for meeting assessors when they arrive and getting them to their hotel. Training will be conducted the rest of the first day.

On day two, the manager will conduct the team on a tour of the agency's service area and the agency's building(s) and equipment. The agency tour will end in the room where the team will do the majority of their work. Last minute training and initial inspection of the agency's

accreditation file folders will be conducted.

Days three, four, and five will be the actual standard by standard assessment. Responsibility for answering questions from the team, obtaining additional proofs, making revisions, arranging training, arranging interviews, and arranging for anything the team needs to observe falls to the accreditation manager. A team of people should be available to assist the manager to make directive revisions and handling the continual "brushfires" that will occur.

Agency personnel and the manager will be available whenever the team is on-site and it may be longer than 8:00 AM - 5:00 PM. One night, the public hearing will occur and the manager will be responsible for arranging the hearing as well as video taping the hearing. Team members may start work earlier than 8:00 AM and will usually work late one or two nights.

On day six, there will be an exit interview with the Chief Administrator, the Accreditation Manager, and other appropriate agency personnel. The team leader will explain what the team found during the on-site and what standards, if any, are in non-compliance. He/she will explain what must be done to bring these standards into compliance, and then give a time limit. A written final report to the Commission will be submitted by the team leader, and all repair work should be completed prior to the submission of this report. Responsibility for getting the assessors to their transportation home also falls to the Accreditation Manager.

Agency personnel are not responsible for providing entertainment or meals for the team. An on-site team is basically self-sufficient in that regard. Many agencies do take the team out for a meal, usually on the night before the team leaves. Any meals or other activities must be cleared with the team leader because those types of activities cannot and will not be allowed to interfere with the on-site assessment activities.

After the team has departed, the accreditation manager is responsible for making any changes required by the assessors and to begin making preparations to attend a commission meeting. After the staff receives, and approves, the team leader's report, the agency will be scheduled to attend the next CALEA Commission meeting. A copy of the report will be sent to the agency. The commission meeting will require the agency representatives to attend two hearings. The Accreditation Manager and the Chief Administrator should also be there and anyone else designated by the Chief Administrator. Sometimes appropriate city, county, or state officials will also attend. According to procedures, the first hearing will be a committee hearing.

A committee is usually made up of six or seven commission members. One commissioner will be the lead commissioner for each agency. Committee members will have the team leader's report and information on the agency supplied by the commission staff. Committee members may ask the Accreditation Manager or the Chief Administrator any number of questions on any area covered by accreditation standards. They will usually ask questions on areas where problems occurred during the self-assessment or during the on-site assessment. The Chief Administrator is not expected to be completely familiar with the files and specific proofs of all

standards. An accreditation manager has that responsibility. Also, the team leader of the assessment team will be available in person or by telephone to answer questions about the report. After the questions are completed, the committee then votes on whether or not to recommend the agency to the full commission to be accredited.

The full 21 member commission then meets and may further question the agency representatives on any issue(s). Then the Commission votes on whether or not to grant the agency accredited status. An accreditation manager's responsibility does not end here. He/she must now begin to manage and track compliance of each standard over the five year period for which accreditation is granted. Sixty plus reports due during each year must be accounted for.

The job of the Accreditation Manager is a permanent job as long as the agency is involved with the accreditation process. Changes in accreditation managers usually will, and probably should, occur after initial accredited status has been gained. But, the Chief Administrator still must select a capable person to continue with the on-going accreditation process.

SURVEY

1. How were you selected for this assignment?
2. Were you assigned full time to the project?
3. Did accreditation managers change at your agency during the process?
If so, what caused the change and what effect did it have?
4. What was your rank and position in the agency?
5. How long did it take your agency to go through the process?
6. Briefly describe what you would look for if you were selecting an accreditation manager.

How would you rate the following characteristics/abilities for an accreditation manager?

	Very Important		Somewhat Important		Not Important
Self Motivator	5	4	3	2	1
Leadership	5	4	3	2	1
Evaluator	5	4	3	2	1
Planner	5	4	3	2	1
Organizer	5	4	3	2	1
Task Oriented	5	4	3	2	1
High Rank	5	4	3	2	1
Seniority	5	4	3	2	1
Trustworthy	5	4	3	2	1
Confident	5	4	3	2	1
Procrastinator	5	4	3	2	1
Decisiveness	5	4	3	2	1
Integrity	5	4	3	2	1
Initiative	5	4	3	2	1
Intelligence	5	4	3	2	1
Socializer	5	4	3	2	1
Fair	5	4	3	2	1
Mediator	5	4	3	2	1
Delegator	5	4	3	2	1

List any other characteristics/traits you believe are necessary.

Which major areas of responsibility were you accountable for? (Check all that apply)

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Initial Review of Standards | <input type="checkbox"/> Select Accreditation Team |
| <input type="checkbox"/> A.P.Q. | <input type="checkbox"/> Determine Type of Filing System |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Information to Command Staff | <input type="checkbox"/> Determine Type of Written Directive System |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Information to Dept. Personnel | <input type="checkbox"/> Determine How to Assign Chapters/Standards |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Coordinate with C.A.L.E.A. Staff | <input type="checkbox"/> Make Chapter/Standard Assignments |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Final Approval of New Directives | <input type="checkbox"/> Enforce Follow-Up on Late Assignments |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Issuance of New Directives | <input type="checkbox"/> Coordination of Team Personnel |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Training on New Directives | <input type="checkbox"/> Fees paid to Commission |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Answering Questions From Public | <input type="checkbox"/> Mock Assessment |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Handle all the Directive Writing Yourself | <input type="checkbox"/> Preparation for On-Site Assessment |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Preparation for Commission Hearing |

Please list any other areas of responsibility that were not listed or any other comments for this survey.