

Instructor Training Advisory Group
Meeting Minutes
January 27, 2020
OSDT – Apex, NC

Jessica Bullock called the meeting to order. She welcomed everyone who was able to attend.

Members Present:

Patricia Brown, Central Piedmont Community College

Amy Snider-Wells, Central Carolina Community College

Jeff Robinson, Wake Technical Community College

Greg Minton, Wilkes Community College

Michael Lamonds, N.C. Department of Public Safety OSDT

Stacy Buff, McDowell Technical Community College

Members Absent:

Elizabeth D. Parton, Waynesville Police Department

Wayne Coats, Pitt Community College

Ricky Watson, North Carolina Central University Campus Police

Kathleen Johnson, Bridgeton Police Department

Guests:

Autumn Hanna, Sheriff's Standards Division

Staff Present:

Jessica Bullock, N.C. Justice Academy

Tony Losada, N.C. Justice Academy

Jarrett McGowan, N.C. Justice Academy

Jennifer Fisher, N.C. Justice Academy

Becky Peterson, N.C. Justice Academy

Old Business/ Approval of Minutes:

Members were provided a copy of the minutes from the November 2019 meeting for review. The minutes were not approved at the time because a quorum was not present.

New Business:

Jennifer Fisher, Chairperson for BLET Revision Committee, attended the meeting to discuss concerns about what to do when multiple people revise the curriculum material. Jennifer provided a handout as a suggestion as to how to inform the public of curriculum revisions. She reported that this handout is a suggestion on how we could document the revision information. The area “Prepared By” would be the subject matter expert’s revisions by the person who developed the lesson plan. The “Legal Review By” would be revisions that were reviewed by the legal staff of the NC Department of Justice. The “Structural Revision By” area would be formatting, grammatical changes, spelling, etc., and “Content Revision by” would be revisions that have been made to the actual content.

All lesson plan revisions are currently archived in the NC Justice Academy Library. Concerns were raised in the past that some defense attorneys were unaware of who to contact as the subject matter expert for a particular section of the lesson plans. Furthermore, they did not know where to find the revisions. This proposed layout would make it easier to track the revisions that were made and make them more identifiable as to who made what revisions.

There was a discussion about how to handle situations where multiple people revised one block of instruction in the lesson plans. It may be too cumbersome to breakdown each sub-section that was revised by each individual developer by using page numbers, section titles, Roman numerals, or paragraphs numbers. We have archival folders that list who made each revision and could list by sub-sections A, B, C, etc. We could provide the minimum and then also a breakdown of information and which developers made the revisions, then those needing the more detailed information can be directed to the archival folders housed in the NC Justice Academy’s Library. For example, the block, “Criminal Investigations” has several people who contributed to writing this block. For each person who contributes to the revisions, it was suggested to list the various sections for such as Interview and Interrogations “Content Revision By.” Still, the developer would have had to help revise the entire section. So, the group decided that this would also not fix the issue.

The original lesson plan revisions would be approved by the E&T committee and would be an internal record that would be archived if needed by the public should it be subpoenaed, but then there would be a reduced copy for the students and instructors to reference. The IT Advisory Group wants the people who have contributed over the years to a lesson plan to still have their name attached to it.

The Developer Checklist would be readily available in the event the information is subpoenaed; this list would include the names and areas of the developers who have made revisions. Keep the Student & Instructor Lesson Plans to have the basic information. An additional suggestion was to add “developer notes” as a separate sheet at the end of the lesson plan to notate the developers and the areas each revised.

The suggestion was made to have an Academic Checklist along with a historical lesson plan that would list everyone that made changes to the lesson plan. Use the developer academic checklist as a listing of what each contributor added to the instructor lesson plan version, not in the student version. If we have multiple contributors, we can add a separate list of who contributed. This will be housed in the NC Justice Academy Library.

It was suggested to use the Academic checklist (Attachment #1) that Jennifer passed out like the finished project and by the developers’ name label with Roman numerals/letters for the section, rather than page

numbers. Training requests can date back to the 1970s, 80s, even the present and is usually in question if an issue arises. The BLET Advisory Group decided to have the most recent revised person on the document and just archive all the other names & dates. However, that gives people the general idea that the name listed revised the entire lesson plan, which is not always the case. We need to make sure we choose something attainable – we currently are revising material that is five years old. Jennifer suggested that the IT Advisory Group proposes starting with the BLET new job task analysis and going forward. We could add very small verbiage on the sheet stating that these outlines have been archived for reference in the NC Justice Academy library.

Pat motioned to accept the revision sample suggestion prepared by Jennifer to include Prepared By, Legal Review By, Structural Revision By, and Content Revision By. Amy seconded the motion. No one opposed. All were in favor of the motion.

Based on the group discussion, Jessica summarized that there seemed to be two options for multiple authors, using:

1. Parenthesis – this would be located beside the developer’s name on the Academic Checklist, to include the section or Roman numeral to direct them to the revisions.
2. Audit checklist (similar to the handout Jennifer presented with the Prepare By, Legal Review By, Structural Revision By, and Content Revision By)

Pat motioned to propose both options offering the parenthesis with the sub-section titles or using roman numerals and let the E&T Committee decide which option they prefer. Jeff seconded this motion. No one opposed. All were in favor of the motion.

A final suggestion was to include the entire history of revisions made by all of the authors/developers on the lesson plan or the most recent Content Revision By and Legal Review By. The IT Advisory Group chose to table this decision until the 1:00pm meeting reconvenes. The group does not like adding additional pages to the lesson plan, but the people who have contributed to the lesson plan should receive credit for their work. Currently, the BLET Advisory Group only lists the most recent person who revised the lesson plan and when the most recent legal review was completed. All other contributors/developers would be in the archived previous lesson plans.

When our meeting reconvenes, we will be meeting to discuss concerns that the E&T Committee raised about the suggested changes to Instructor Training. Pat motioned to adjourn the meeting for a break. Jeff seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned for a short break.

Stephanie Freeman welcomed everyone to this portion of the meeting. The purpose of this meeting is not an E&T meeting; this is for the Instructor Advisory Group to explain their proposed changes in more detail in advance of the E&T committee meeting. Jessica Bullock thanked everyone for his or her time and attendance at the meeting.

Guests:

Trevor Allen, Director, NCJA

Steve Johnson, Vice Chairman of E&T Committee

Traci McPherson, E & T Committee Member

Stephanie Freeman, Chairperson of E&T

Jane Gilchrest, E&T Committee Member

Lee Farnsworth, E&T Committee Member

Steve Combs, Director, Criminal Justice Standards

Destiny Spinner, intern w/ Criminal Justice Standards, NCCU

Lacey McVey, intern w/ Criminal Justice Standards, ASU

Students and School Directors have requested that the students have more time presenting lesson plans and more practice in the classroom setting. They feel like they have mastered developing lesson plans, but want to strengthen their speaking abilities with more practice presenting in front of others. Another facet we were considering is that sometimes students cannot attend Instructor Training due to the requirement of being away from their agencies for an extended amount of time to complete this training. The original proposal was to provide them with the Instructor Training class with more presentation time and a separate online Microsoft Word and PowerPoint class. However, after receiving feedback from the E&T Committee, the Instructor Training Advisory Group went back to the drawing board and came up with a new proposal of having 10-hours of online classes for the legal, criminal justice leadership & professional resources blocks. These three blocks do not require as much student interaction with the instructor, and these could be completed prior to Instructor Training – these are more lecture-based blocks. These three blocks would be considered Phase I of the IT course. Then the students would complete Phase II, which is the 80 hours of in-person IT with more focus on presentations and the writing of presentations. The enrollee would need to complete the 10-hour online training portion no more than 12 months (1 year) before the student completes Instructor Training.

It has been suggested in the past to consider IT in two separate thoughts – a Delivery Track and a Development Track. We want to improve IT now to hopefully move us forward. Its time for us to adapt and move forward with alternative thinking. The student population is changing. We want to generate great instructors, especially if BLET is going to be more hands-on and more practical skills.

The academic part does not seem to be the issue; most students have never written a lesson plan. We need to restructure IT so the student is gaining knowledge so the student can learn it, use it and get back on the job. Greg prefers not to separate the current course into two separate courses. The proposed Phase I & Phase II gives the students more time to focus on the 80-hours of the course.

Some students have reported that they feel it makes them into a better person because of going through IT. Some feedback received from students stated they did not get enough time to present in front of others, especially those who have stage fright. Many students have requested more practical exercises to be included in IT. Some will never develop lesson plans. If we propose such a change, that would be a rule change for the E&T to decide. This proposal, the ways of teaching in a more practical application to include the “how to dos,” so the students receive the same message consistently, not watered-down information.

Logistical concerns were raised over putting that portion online and housing it at the NCJA. Instructor training that will be offered in phases; logistically, we want to consider how it affects the community colleges as well as the agencies. These phases will build upon each other. Most agencies will not want to send officers for longer than two weeks.

It was suggested to have a backup plan – not just 10-hours online offered exclusively through the NCJA and then the 80-hours in-person training offered elsewhere. Some were not onboard with a sole source situation with the online training. The community colleges could choose to offer this 10-hour course in-person or online. In

this situation, Acadis can be compared to a textbook distributor; the community colleges can choose to offer students the training via Acadis or in-person.

Students need to know how to develop lesson plans, where it comes from. These are platform skills; we need a balance. Training is where law enforcement is the most challenged in court. We need to have well-rounded information – those three blocks will be covered on the state exam. It is important that the instruction is consistently delivered. Tony has taught for four different entities - each one required the student to develop a lesson plan in addition to presenting. The person who creates and develops the lesson plan is considered to be the subject matter expert. They created the lesson plan; they know it better than anyone in the classroom.

An admissions requirement or pre-requisite would need to be determined so that students or agencies do not try to make last-minute changes – for example, swapping one student out for another. Many of the courses being offered in law enforcement training require pre-requisites that must be completed before being enrolled in courses.

We will need to define why each block's timing needs to be increased or decreased. Jessica explained that some blocks needed additional hands-on practical exercises and that other blocks needed less time than what was assigned. The committee divided the topics among the group members.

We might could solve the administrative code issue by removing the 15 days; we would need to change the time frame. The community college would need to show that they used the commission-approved lesson plan. The School Director would need to document that the student had met all requirements.

After much discussion, it was agreed to offer a 90-hours Instructor Training course to include 10-hours that can be completed online through the NCJA or in-person or online through a community college using the NCJA lesson plan, and a minimum of 80-hours in-person training. All 80-hours must be completed not to exceed 30-days prior to taking the state exam.

The recommendation from the Instructor Training Advisory Group is to add to the lesson plans an Academic Checklist. Jessica presented the sample BLET Revision example (attachment #1) which would list each revision specifically such as “Prepared By – the subject matter expert who originally prepared the document, “Legal Review By” – the revisions reviewed by the legal staff of the NC Department of Justice, “Structural Revision By” – the revisions based on formatting, grammar, spelling, etc. and the “Content Revision By” – the revisions based on changes to the content of the lesson plan. All in attendance agreed upon submitting this suggested example to the E&T Committee for approval.

There was no further business to be discussed. Jeff motioned to adjourn the meeting. Pat seconded; the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted on March 31, 2020

Becky Peterson

North Carolina Justice Academy