

# Memorandum

## City of Lawrence

### Police Department

TO: David L. Corliss, City Manager  
FROM: Tarik Khatib, Chief of Police  
CC: Diane Stoddard, Assistant City Manager  
Casey Toomay, Assistant City Manager  
Brandon McGuire, Assistant to the City Manager  
Toni Wheeler, City Attorney  
DATE: May 14, 2015  
RE: Accreditation

#### **Background**

Accreditation is a process through which a police department receives formal recognition that it has met a specified standard in policies and procedures. Although some states have accreditation programs for law enforcement agencies, the national Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies, Inc., (CALEA) is one of the most commonly sought. CALEA was formed in 1979 through the combined efforts of the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP), the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives (NOBLE), the National Sheriff's Association (NSA) and the Police Executive Research Forum (PERF). According to CALEA, the purpose of the accreditation programs is "to improve the delivery of public safety services, primarily by: maintaining a body of standards, developed by public safety practitioners, covering a wide range of up-to-date public safety initiatives; establishing and administering an accreditation process; and recognizing professional excellence".

Stated goals are to:

- Strengthen crime prevention and control capabilities;
- Formalize essential management procedures;
- Establish fair and nondiscriminatory personnel practices;
- Improve service delivery;
- Solidify interagency cooperation and coordination; and
- Increase community and staff confidence in the agency.

The accreditation process involves a comprehensive self-assessment by the department of the standards addressing major law enforcement areas. After undergoing self-assessment, the agency is examined and inspected by a team of trained independent law enforcement assessors.

These CALEA assessors verify the department's compliance with standards by checking its proofs and interviewing operations and management personnel. Accreditation periods are three years in duration. During this time the department must maintain compliance with the standards and must submit annual reports attesting to this fact. Re-Accreditation occurs at the end of this period, pending another successful on-site assessment and hearing before the commission.

**Participating Agencies – Data**

According to a 2008 Bureau of Justice Statistics report, there are 17,985 state and local law enforcement agencies in the United States. In 2013 CALEA reported membership of 643 local and state Law Enforcement Agencies. This represents approximately 4% of the nation's total. Membership agencies range from small University Police Departments, such as the University of Kansas Medical Center Police Department, to large metropolitan agencies like the Miami Police Department. The following table lists the accreditation status of the 30 *Benchmark City Survey* participants:

Benchmark Agency	Accreditation
Alameda, CA	No
Bellevue, WA	Yes
Boca Raton, FL	Yes
Boise, ID	Yes, through Idaho Chiefs of Police Association
Boulder, CO	Yes, through Colorado Association of Chiefs of Police
Broken Arrow, OK	Yes, through Oklahoma Association of Chiefs of Police
Cedar Rapids, IA	No, started process for Communications Accreditation
Chesapeake, VA	Yes
Chula Vista, CA	No
Columbia, MO	No
Coral Springs, FL	Yes, through CALEA and Florida Commission for Law Enforcement
Edmond, OK	No
Fort Collins, CO	No
Fremont, CA	No
Garland, TX	No
Grand Prairie, TX	Yes, through Texas Chiefs of Police Association
Henderson, NV	Yes
Irving, TX	Yes, through Texas Chiefs of Police Association
Lakewood, CO	Yes
Lawrence, KS	No
Lincoln, NE	Yes
Naperville, IL	Yes
Norman, OK	Yes, through Oklahoma Association of Chiefs of Police
Olathe, KS	No
Overland Park, KS	No
Peoria, AZ	Yes
Plano, TX	Yes
Richardson, TX	Yes, through Texas Chiefs of Police Association
San Angelo, TX	No
Springfield, MO	Yes, currently going through mock on-site then re-accreditation

Eleven of the agencies are accredited through CALEA and eight are accredited through their state association only. Ten agencies are not accredited. One agency is in the self-assessment phase. A state accreditation program does not exist in Kansas.

There are seven law enforcement agencies accredited in Kansas: Andover Police Department, Salina Police Department, Topeka Police Department, Shawnee County Sheriff's Office, Riley County Police Department, and the University of Kansas Medical Center Police Department. Local area agency participation is listed in the following table:

Surrounding Agencies	Accreditation
Douglas County Sheriff's Office	No
Shawnee Police Department	No
Johnson County Sheriff's Office	No
Lenexa Police Department	No
Gardner Police Department	No
Mission Police Department	No
Merriam Police Department	No
Topeka Police Department	Yes
Shawnee County Sheriff's Office	Yes
Riley County Police Department	Yes
KU PD – Lawrence Campus	No
KU Med Police Department	Yes
Andover Police Department	Yes
Olathe Police Department	No
Overland Park Police Department	No
Salina Police Department	Yes

**Agency Survey**

Department staff surveyed (not all were able to be contacted or responded) the *Benchmark City Survey* agencies, local agencies, and the Kansas agencies that are accredited for information on the value, costs, and advice regarding the program. The following information was provided by the agencies surveyed:

Agency 1 – medium size, accredited since 1991

- The agency has a full-time Accreditation Manager who reviews policy development and coordinates the on-site visits.
- Attendance at accreditation conferences is required.
- Every three years there are on-site reviews and agency pays assessor costs (hotel/food).
- During on-site visits there will be extra costs depending on what the auditor's recommendations are. For example, a refrigerator in an evidence room needed to be bolted down.
- In order to receive full accreditation, the agency must do what is recommended. There are different levels of accreditation, however, the agency recommends the full or none.
- Creates accountability, but also extra steps. For example, there are several types of reports the agency would not normally produce, but accreditation requires it.
- Saves money on liability insurance (\$20,000), however, this is offset by added accreditation expenses. Since 2012, the agency has expended \$42,000 on CALEA related expenses not including the Accreditation Manager's salary. Some expenses

include: \$6,000 for a Power DMS computer system maintenance agreement, annual accreditation fees of \$4,100, a \$3,400 mock on-site audit, and a \$3,200 conference expenditure.

#### Agency 2 – small size, accredited since 2013

- Does not have an Accreditation Manager, but highly recommends one as it is a very time consuming process.
- Initial process involved weekly meetings of the whole department.
- Could not give an estimate on the cost of initial set up, but stated the most costly aspect was the personnel time.
- Did not have many expenses from the on-site visit that occurred, but a cost was incurred in regards to evidence storage in that the agency had to move some external storage inside.
- Agency had to purchase Power DMS computer program which is the tracking program for accreditation and allows file reviews in an electronic format.
- Two types of accreditation: Full (Advance) and Tier 1 (Lite). The agency recommends Tier 1 because the cost is the same, but less work is involved.
- Accreditation is a lot of work, however, the agency highly recommends it.

#### Agency 3 – small size, accredited since 1996

- Started the process in 1992, and were accredited in 1996.
- Full-time clerk dedicated to the program and a lieutenant approximately 50% of the time.
- Do not have an Accreditation Manager, but would highly recommend it.
- Accreditation program has benefits, but it is expensive: \$4,000 a year for CALEA fees, \$15,000 for Power DMS licenses (three-years), and \$700 per person for annual CALEA conferences (three conferences a year in different cities).
- During the accreditation or re-accreditation year, the Chief of Police and Accreditation Manager are required to attend a CALEA conference where they are questioned by a panel about their accreditation program and then accreditation is awarded.
- The agency has been told they can save on liability insurance, however, they were not able to do this through their insurance provider.
- Accreditation helps for policy review to have outside eyes looking at policies, and citizens believe accreditation is a way of striving for a better police department.
- Recommend Tier 1 accreditation as it costs the same as Full accreditation, however, there are less proofs (480 instead of 1000) of compliance.

#### Agency 4 – large size, accredited since 1986

- CALEA fees are approximately \$5,600 per year.
- Could not estimate the time and work involved in initial accreditation, but it depends on the agency's components (detention, court, etc.) and state of current policies and procedures in place.
- Accreditation management assigned to a position that already existed for budget, grants, and policy review.
- Accreditation took 18 months, however, this was an aggressive timeline that was accomplished by providing staff time to work on the project.

- Outcomes included having comprehensive policies and procedures on best practices, potential limitation of liability and risk, and requirements for certain types of analysis to support fact-based management decisions.
- Strengthened internal and external accountability.
- Accreditation allows for continual review and inspection of practices and deficiencies can be immediately addressed.
- One criticism is the department can accomplish all the standards without paying a fee, however, there would not be a mechanism to ensure continual compliance to include assessments by CALEA.

#### Agency 5 – large size, accredited since 1988

- Fees are \$8,085 per year for law enforcement and communications accreditation.
- Agency has an Accreditation Assistant who works on accreditation, policy, and procedures.
- Began the process in 1986 and were accredited in 1988.
- Agency believes in accreditation due to having outside law enforcement practitioners visit the agency every three years to review agency processes.

#### Agency 6 – large size, accredited since 1989

- Agency has a full-time Accreditation Manager.
- Agency recommends having staff dedicated to accreditation due to time sensitive work.
- Process typically takes two years from the time a contract is signed.
- Typical accreditation cost is \$27,000.
- Positive outcomes have included: improved policy writing, ability to keep up to date with reports, and assistance defending lawsuits due to well documented policy and officer training.

#### Agency 7 – large size, accredited since 2000

- Full-time civilian Project Manager assigned. Additionally, a sergeant spends a majority of their time on accreditation and a lieutenant then oversees the process.
- There are annual costs for conferences and costs for CALEA inspectors (airline, hotel, meals) that the agency incurs.
- Power DMS software is needed for digitation of all materials. Documents are uploaded to the Cloud and CALEA then has access. This includes items such as officer disciplinary actions and officer involved shootings.
- All CALEA employees have access to the policy side of the agency information, however, only a select few would have access to the agency assessment information.
- During the on-site visits, the assessors would have access to everything so that the assessment could be completed.
- During one on-site visit, a policy was not in place, so the assessors had the agency create the policy and put it in place while the assessors were present.
- Initial accreditation took three years to complete.
- Believe accreditation is worthwhile from a standardization aspect.

#### Agency 8 – small size, accredited since 2012

- Professional Standards sergeant is assigned to track the accreditation program and spends the majority of their time on it. Agency recommends having a full-time Accreditation Manager position.

- Most of the costs are not the CALEA fees, they are the personnel time costs as well as overtime costs during the initial set-up and on-site visits.
- Agency believes accreditation is worthwhile due to policy review.

#### Agency 9 – large size, accredited since 2002

- Agency has a lieutenant, sergeant and two officers assigned to the accreditation program and they have other duties as well (assigned to the professional standards department).
- If the agency follows the standards, a department should not have too much to change when the on-site visits occur.
- The agency had to change their security alarm system, so some expense may occur during this process.
- The agency believes accreditation is worthwhile because it helps during lawsuits as it provides guidance and it is something to fall back on.

#### Agency 10 – large size, accredited since 2003

- Initial accreditation took 2.5 years to complete.
- A captain, sergeant, and two officers are assigned to the accreditation program and also have other duties assigned to them.
- Additional expenses incurred will depend on the state of the particular department. For example, the agency's evidence room was not complaint due to not having three separate rooms for firearms, currency, and narcotics. Other changes includes removing locks on interview rooms and having to provide locked gun boxes for officers.
- The agency receives discounts on insurance because of the way they handle accidents and injuries with the staff. They review the incident, and if possible, make changes to policies or procedures to prevent future incidents.
- The agency recommends accreditation because it assures the employees as well as the citizens that the agency is continuing to strive to be a better department through reviewing policies and procedures.
- CALEA provides guidelines and allows the agency to customize the policies for their department. It can be a lot of work. For example, the agency's union didn't want the agency to investigate any complaints after 45 days of occurrence. CALEA standards specify complaints will be investigated no matter the timeframe. The agency had to work with their union, but after a month the union changed their contract.

#### Agency 11 – large size, accredited since 1997

- The agency has a full-time Accreditation Manager who works on policies and procedures as well.
- Agency uses the asset/forfeiture funds to pay for CALEA related costs.
- Agency recommends accreditation because they believe it saves them money through lawsuits and fines, but the agency does not receive any savings from their insurance company.
- Agency has accountability from a third party through audits, inspections, and reviews of their practices, policies and procedures.

#### Agency 12 – large size, accredited since 1992

- Agency has a full-time Accreditation/Compliance Manager whose job is to work on the accreditation program that includes accreditation for law enforcement and

communications. Agency has a communications Accreditation Manager who is also the dispatch supervisor and they assist with the communication portion.

- Their current Accreditation Manager was an Accreditation Manager from another law enforcement agency and it took that agency 4.5 years to complete the accreditation process.
- Agency had to pay for an extension through CALEA and give them a reason why for the extension. Plan on 3 years to complete the process.
- Costs besides the annual CALEA fee are the manager's salary and benefits, Power DMS program (scanner and PDF software to be able to scan and create documents), annual fee for membership to the local CALEA association, and annual conferences.
- The agency recommends accreditation because of accountability. Everyone in the agency has to be on the same page in regards to support of the program.

#### Agency 13 – large size, accredited through state Chief's Association

- Agency is accredited through their state's Police Chiefs Association; it is the Best Practices Recognition Program.
- The agency used to be accredited through CALEA but it was expensive and was very broad. They found the state recognition program was more geared towards their state laws and was cheaper.
- The recognition program is focused on the officers' training and their equipment. They evaluate their equipment quarterly so they know when their equipment is failing and immediately address it.
- Agency went from over 750 standards with CALEA to 165 standards with the state program. The agency believes the 165 standards covers the 750 CALEA standards but are more condensed.
- The Recognition Manager is a civilian Division Manager who oversees records, the property room, and is responsible for maintaining the facility.
- When the agency began their Recognition Program through the state, the Division Manager spent approximately half the day on the program. Once it was up and running, the Division Manager does not have to spend as much time on it except for the quarterly evaluations.

#### Agency 14 – large size, accredited through state Chief's Association

- Agency is accredited through their state's Police Chiefs Association; it is the Best Practices Recognition Program.
- Agency decided to use the local program because it is not as time consuming and not as expensive as CALEA.
- The Police Planner works on their Recognition Program as well as other duties
- Agency recommends local recognition or some type of accreditation because it has improved their operations, they are held to higher standards, they have a check and balance system in place, and it insures consistency with procedures when new command staff are appointed.

#### Agency 15 – large size, accredited through state Chief's Association

- Agency is accredited through their state's Police Chiefs Association; it is the Best Practices Recognition Program.

- The agency was not interested in CALEA because it is a nationwide program and they wanted a program that was more localized and based on their state statutes. They believe it is a better fit for their department to be recognized locally.
- Agency has a lieutenant who runs the program and they have other duties besides the Recognition Program.

Agency 16 – large size, accredited through state Chief’s Association

- Agency is accredited through their state’s Police Chiefs Association.
- Agency decided against CALEA because of cost and it is geared towards a larger department. The local accreditation program is focused on state statute requirements and training which is what the agency prefers.

Agency 17 – large size, accredited through state Chief’s Association

- Agency is accredited through their state’s Police Chiefs Association.
- The agency is working on being CALEA compliant but currently is not able to be CALEA accredited due to manpower issues.
- Currently the agency has a sergeant who runs their state accreditation program, but they have other duties to include maintaining the policies and procedure manuals, internal affairs, training, grants, and the property room.

Agency 18 – large size, accredited since 2014

- The agency has a Professional Standards Manager whose primary duties are the accreditation program. A police officer is assigned to work on policy. The officer reviews, updates, and creates policy then presents it to the command staff and forwards it on to the City Attorney.
- The agency pays \$5,000 a year in CALEA fees.
- Agency recommends accreditation for liability, review, and re-evaluation of policies.
- If a department has good policies and procedures currently in place then the accreditation process will go smoothly.
- The initial process can take up to three years but if a department has several of the standards currently in place then the process may go more quickly.
- Agency has Tier 1 accreditation because the full accreditation is geared for larger departments and they are small so they do not meet all of the standards for the full accreditation.

Agency 19 – large size, accredited through state Chief’s Association

- The agency is accredited through their state’s Police Chiefs Association.
- Agency has an employee who works on the accreditation as well as other duties.
- Agency is discussing becoming CALEA accredited. The agency is currently looking at the cost and manpower needs; they will need a full-time Accreditation Manager and support staff.

Agency 20 – large size agency, accredited since 2005

- The agency could not provide an exact figure of how much accreditation cost, but the fees paid to CALEA are minor. The real cost is the amount of staff time required. During the initial year, at least one full-time person supported by several others working on the project part-time will be needed for accreditation.

- Agency currently has one captain who spends approximately 60 – 70% of their time on the program and is supported by an administrative assistant. The administrative assistant spends 20 hours a week on the program. These two are then supported periodically by personnel throughout the year for specific requests.
- CALEA allows up to three years to prepare for the initial accreditation with extensions possible but departments have to pay for the extensions.
- Re-accreditation is every three years which requires an on-site visit, however, this is changing to a four-year cycle.
- The accreditation process is an ongoing project that needs to be continually worked on throughout the year.
- The agency believes accreditation is worth it. If policies are weak or have never been thoroughly reviewed, the accreditation process has significant benefits in that it is a great way to make sure a department is utilizing the industry's best practices.
- The agency believes accreditation adds a significant amount of credibility when the department has to defend something their officers did that did not have a great outcome. In a few high profile cases for example, the agency had some misconduct cases that went public. When the press began reporting that the department had a broken culture and had an ineffective internal discipline process, the department was able to show that they followed best practices because of their accreditation, and that they were in-line with other agencies their size across the nation as far as misconduct complaints go.
- The accreditation process helped discover a serious problem in the agency's property room that likely would have otherwise gone unnoticed for several years if they had not been forced to take action.

### **Recent *Benchmark City Survey* Conference**

Recently, some Lawrence Police Department Staff attended the annual *Benchmark City Survey* conference. Staff were able to receive additional feedback and information regarding CALEA accreditation:

- From a police chief's perspective, CALEA was seen as a good way to leverage increased funding of their department.
- The civilian analysts reported accreditation was a "nightmare" in terms of the additional personnel work time required.
- There was a sentiment that departments give up control of some policies to a national standard that may not always be what works best locally.
- With accreditation, an agency can't deviate from policies that may be overly specific. This may reduce the ability to flexibly function depending on the circumstances with creating a technical policy violation.
- The Accreditation Manager would have to attend CALEA accreditation training at an additional cost.
- It was recommended that accreditation would require two full-time personnel for the first three years, and then one after that.

Some takeaways that may impact accreditation for the Lawrence Police Department include:

- The reality of current Lawrence Police Department evidence facility/situation may keep the department from obtaining CALEA.
- Some policies may lead to additional personnel positions being required or additional funding needed. Examples include: a quartermaster to keep track of all equipment and

perform audits; and the requirement that all personnel who teach within the department attend a teaching and lesson plan development course. This would require additional training unit personnel.

- Some CALEA policies may not integrate with more global City policies. Examples include: hiring, promotion, evaluations, and discipline.

### **Prior Department Experience with Accreditation**

Lawrence Police Department accreditation was attempted in the early 1990's. All accreditation standards were identified and the supporting accreditation standards process documentation was obtained by the department. A lengthy review of the accreditation standards and the changes required to meet those standards began. It took significant time to review the internal operations of the department and then identify the relevant accreditation standards. The process of identifying the relevant and applicable standards was so lengthy a process that it was never actually completed prior to the decision to abandon accreditation.

As the process of identifying relevant and applicable standards was ongoing, some of the accreditation standards that were clearly applicable were reviewed for implementation. Many of these reviews lead to a conclusion that there would be a budgetary impact. Some of the focus turned to researching the potential fiscal commitment to actually meeting the accreditation standards. As the research progressed, the identified budget increases necessary to fund the operational and administrative changes began to raise a significant concern.

As the fiscal increase required to meet accreditation standards was being identified, some concurrent effort was made at immediate implementation of standards which could be instituted with policy and procedural changes that did not require additional funding. Many of these changes were within the hiring and training components of the department. Experimentation with implementing many accreditation compliant processes were successfully able to be performed. In every case, where an accreditation standard was met, the administrative outcome was an increase in the amount of personnel time required to complete the task under the new standards.

The Police Department Training Unit accreditation standards implementation resulted in the organization recognizing that there would be a reduction in workforce task availability. This was due to accreditation standards causing increases in the complexity of current tasks within the organization. Many of the tasks being performed would require additional steps and an increase in documentation under the accreditation standards.

One of the conclusions of the implementation was that additional employees may be necessary as a result of meeting accreditation standards. The increased task complexity would require additional work effort to be completed by the workforce with or without additional employee resources. This became an efficiency consideration lending itself to discussion about whether additional employees would be better utilized to accommodate an expansion of current work efforts instead of simply maintaining status quo under stricter standards. It was recognized as being possible to administratively absorb the increased time spent with current tasks. However, doing so would require evaluating the shifting of resources. Additionally, services may have to be reduced through diverting personnel hours toward the new tasks required to perform the same work already being accomplished; just doing it differently.

Doing additional work with greater process complexity in order to yield the same outcomes coupled with no increase in the workforce became a discussion of concern. This discussion joined with the identified direct funding increases required to meet those accreditation standards identified as requiring funding increases. Ultimately, the sheer budgetary cost of the changes required to become accredited became the focus. A final decision to discontinue accreditation came about after approximately two years of research and experimental implementation.

### **The Process**

To become accredited, the Lawrence Police Department would sign a contract with CALEA. The department would then have up to 36 months to conduct an internal review to meet the standards set forth by the level of accreditation desired. An on-site inspection visit would then occur along with a review of all policies and supporting documents. Additionally, the inspection team from CALEA would interview the Chief of Police and Accreditation Manager regarding the proofs of compliance as part of the review. Not including additional costs, the initial accreditation fees for the Lawrence Police Department are estimated at approximately \$11,450.

### **Discussion**

Based upon some of the research conducted, it is clear that accreditation can strengthen internal policies and control, as well as provide for better risk management and liability control. Whether accreditation creates a police department that is more efficient or effective is not as easily discerned. Similarly, it is unclear if CALEA certification reduces complaints, use of force incidents, or creates a better relationship with the community. The CALEA website offers many case study testimonials in regards to individual departments experiencing positive outcomes, however, I was not able to locate a statistical analysis of those departments as compared to others. CALEA does reference a 2002 study conducted by the *Tennessee Municipal League (TML), Risk Management Pool*. The study examined 23 non-accredited and five accredited agencies who were insured members of TML. The annotated results were:

- “In **Workers' Compensation** coverage, the 23 non-accredited agencies experienced a rate of 27.21 claims per 100 insured officers, while the 5 accredited agencies experienced a rate of 22.56 claims per 100 officers, or 17.1% less than the non-accredited agencies. The annual loss rate incurred by the non-accredited agencies was \$89,389 per 100 officers, while the accredited agencies experienced losses of \$72,565 per 100 officers, or 18.8% less than the non-accredited agencies”.
- “In **Law Enforcement Liability** coverage, the non-accredited agencies experienced a rate of 2.231 claims per 100 insured officers, while the accredited agencies experienced a rate of 1.093 claims per 100 officers, or 51.0% less than the non-accredited agencies. The annual law enforcement liability loss rate incurred by the non-accredited agencies was \$34,205 per 100 insured officers, while the accredited agencies experienced losses of \$30,434 per 100 officers, or 11.0% less than the non-accredited agencies”.
- “In **Police Auto Liability** coverage, the non-accredited agencies experienced a rate of 4.486 claims per 100 insured officers, while the accredited agencies experienced a rate of 3.081 claims per 100 officers, or 31.3% less than the non-accredited agencies. The

annual police auto liability loss rate incurred by the non-accredited agencies was \$13,799 per 100 officers, while the accredited agencies experienced losses of \$9,462 per 100 officers, or 31.4% less than the non-accredited agencies”.

- “In **Police Auto Physical Damage** coverage, the non-accredited agencies experienced a rate of 3.189 claims per 100 insured officers, while the accredited agencies experienced a rate of 1.267 claims per 100 officers, or 60.3% less than the non-accredited agencies. The annual police auto physical damage loss rate incurred by the non-accredited agencies was \$5,193 per 100 officers, while the accredited agencies experienced losses of \$2,164 per 100 officers, or 58.3% less than the non-accredited agencies”.

According to CALEA, the *Colorado Interlocal Risk Sharing Agency (CIRSA)* conducted another study. This study examined 22 non-accredited against 22 accredited agencies. The findings were:

- “The accredited police departments had 8.3% fewer Property/Casualty claims per fulltime police officer than the non-accredited police departments during the time period chosen”.
- “The accredited police departments had 7.5% fewer Workers’ Compensation claims per fulltime, police officer than the non-accredited police departments during the time period chosen”.
- “The accredited police departments per officer incurred costs for Property/Casualty claims were 52.2% lower than the non-accredited police departments”.

Even though I believe the department does a good job already (but, there is always room for improvement), and from a risk management perspective, I believe accreditation can be beneficial. The caveat, however, is there has to be a willingness to fund the necessary components needed to meet the goal. The department’s prior experience was an example of a failure in that regards. The department currently has a need for additional resources to better manage policies, procedures, and internal processes. From a staffing (sergeants, captains, civilian support) to officer perspective, the department has one of the highest ratios within the *Benchmark City Survey*. This makes it very difficult to take on additional administrative functions.

Although representing a small sampling of all law enforcement agencies in the United States, accredited *Benchmark City Survey* agencies do not appear to fare any better or worse in terms of response times, crime rates, crime clearance rates, officer involved crashes, use of force incidents, or citizen complaints. Across the nation, several examples of CALEA accredited agencies experiencing problems in relation to policies, procedures, and training can be found:

- In 2008, the U.S. Justice Department issued a 50-page letter to the Austin, Texas Police Department in regards to recommendations on use of force, policy and procedures, and officer training. A four-year investigation did not find a pattern or practice of violating individuals’ rights, however, there were many recommendations for improving internal controls. Prior to this, the Austin Police Department had been accredited for 15 years

through CALEA. After the Justice Department investigation, they chose not to continue with CALEA accreditation.

- In April of 2015, at the Tulsa County Sheriff's Office in Oklahoma, a reserve Deputy who thought he was reaching for his Taser shot a citizen in the back.
- In April of 2015, at the North Charleston Police Department in South Carolina, an officer shot an unarmed citizen running away from him after a scuffle.

### **Recommendation**

Accreditation for the Lawrence Police Department is worthy of consideration if proper funding support is given to insure success. The project's merits should be weighed against the several other projects requiring additional funding and administrative time. These include a police facility, continued replacement and update of the department Information Technology infrastructure, examination of new technology such as body cameras, additional detectives, additional School Resource Officers, full implementation of the Crisis Intervention Team initiative, and Fair and Impartial Policing initiatives.