

**BUREAU OF JUSTICE ASSISTANCE
NATIONAL TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE INITIATIVE
Assignment No. 098**

**Assessment of the Training Needs of the
Atlanta Police Department
Criminal Investigations Division
Special Enforcement Section
Narcotics Unit: PHASE I**

**Implementation Stage
Of the Recently Implemented APD Training Program**

May 2008

Consultant

Transformational Strategies and Solutions, Inc.

This report was prepared under the auspices of the Bureau of Justice National Training and Technical Assistance Project at American University, Washington, D.C. This project is supported by Grant No. 2005-DD-BX-K053, awarded to the University by the Bureau of Justice Assistance, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice.. The Bureau of Justice Assistance is a component of the Office of Justice Programs, which also includes the Bureau of Justice Statistics, the National Institute of Justice, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, and the Office for Victims of Crime. Points of view or opinions in this document are those of the author and do not represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Executive Summary	
I. Introduction	1
A. Background of this Technical Assistance Study	4
B. Components of the Training Needs Assessment and Key Issues Addressed	6
C. Assessment Methodology of the Implementation Stage	7
II. Summary of Interviews and Documentation Reviewed	10
A. Staff Interviews	10
1. Interviews with Executive Staff	10
2. Interview with Narcotics Unit Commander	11
Table 1: Narcotics Unit Staff: Race, Gender and Age Range by Rank	13
Table 2: Narcotics Unit Staff: Length of Experience in Law Enforcement and Narcotics Unit by Rank	13
3. Interviews with Sergeants	13
4. Interviews with Investigators	15
B. Review of Documentation of the Training	17
III. Analysis of Training Plan and Courses	20
A. Overview of Training Provided	20
Table 3: P.O.S.T. Training Records for May 2007-March 20, 2008	21
B. Content of the Training Curricula Reviewed	22
1. Course # 1 – Legal Issues in Obtaining Valid Consent to Search	22
2. Course # 2 – Search and Seizure	23
3. Course # 3 – High Risk Warrants	24
4. Course # 4 – New Investigator’s Course	25
5. Course # 5 – Criminal Procedure Guide for Drug Agents	32
C. Courses for Which No Lesson Plans Were Provided	33
Table 4: Content of Training Curricula: Summary	34
IV. Comparison of the Training with the Standard Operating Procedures	36
V. Findings and Recommendations	40
A. Principal Findings	40
B. Recommendations	42
1. Adequacy of Training Provided	42
2. Strengthening the Training Records Management System	42

Executive Summary

This report documents the first phase of technical assistance provided by the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) National Training and Technical Assistance Project at American University (AU) to the Atlanta Police Department (APD) in response to a request from Major Siobhan O'Brien of the Atlanta Police Department (APD) for an assessment of the APD's training efforts for the newly formed Narcotics Unit following a critical incident which occurred within the Unit. Transformational Strategies and Solutions, Inc., (TSS) of Seminole, Florida, was designated by the AU project to serve as consultant to provide this technical assistance. TSS, under the leadership of Carol Rasor, Lead Investigator, has had extensive experience in developing plans and conducting needs assessments regarding training needs of law enforcement agencies.

The technical assistance is being provided in three stages over the course of a six month period: (1) assessment of the initial implementation stage of the training program; (2) a follow up assessment of additional training received by members of the Narcotics Unit as well as any changes in Standard Operating Procedures and related information relevant to training needs; and (3) an outcome stage addressing the effectiveness and impact of the training in promoting the Unit's successful performance. Each of these stages examines key issues in the training needs assessment process. This report reflects the findings of the first stage of technical assistance.

Site services for the first phase of assistance were conducted January 29 – February 1, 2008 by Dr. Rasor and Leo Cordero, Principal Consultant. In preparation for the visit, available documentation on the Department's training efforts for the Unit was provided by Lt. John W. Mathis to AU during November and December. Training curricula, standard operating procedures and other documentation were analyzed and interviews with staff from the Atlanta Police Department were conducted to provide initial key findings that resulted in recommendations to enhance the training and performance of the Narcotics Unit's investigators and supervisors.

The Atlanta Police Department had utilized both internal and external resources for training, including: Georgia Bureau of Investigation; Drug Enforcement

Administration; and staff from the Atlanta Police Department. The available training curricula provided by the Atlanta Police Department to the consultants provided a partial view of the content of the training. The content of the training was relevant, contemporary and job-related.

The key findings, more fully discussing in the following sections of this report, are briefly presented below:

- Substantial effort was made by the Atlanta Police Department to restructure and revitalize the Narcotics Unit in an effort to restore community confidence and trust.
- The Narcotics Unit was expanded and new personnel transferred into the unit. These changes presented challenges in terms of the need to provide a significant amount of training to new personnel, while balancing the community demands for narcotics investigations and suppression; introducing personnel whose experience was limited to narcotics investigations while assigned to the Field Operations Division (patrol) to their new role of narcotics investigator; and educating personnel in the mission of the Narcotics Unit.
- A formalized selection process for the position of investigator was utilized to select staff; some investigators, however, expressed the opinion that their assignment to the Narcotics Unit as investigators was not their desire, but they would serve their two-year commitment before requesting a transfer to another investigative position.
- A need existed for investigators to rebuild the confidential informant file.
- The nature of the job duties for the narcotics investigators requires substantial and continuous training in entries and tactical raid planning.
- Firearms training needs to be decisionary-based with moving targets to enable officers to enhance their firearms skills by making the decision of “Shoot or Don’t Shoot” depending on the nature of the threat.
- Standard operating procedures need to be appropriately formatted and pertinent to

the unit to serve as a powerful training tool.

- Training records management should capture all training activities conducted by and for the Narcotics Unit in a formalized and documented process. Training records should include all training curricula.
- Ancillary issues emerged pertaining to equipment and overtime.
- A comprehensive training plan needs to be developed for all investigators and supervisors assigned to the Narcotics Unit.
- The comprehensive training plan (recommended above) needs to take into account the impact of staff rotation.

Law enforcement agencies throughout the nation are introspectively assessing how to improve performance and public perception in terms of public confidence, cooperation and trust. More than ever, law enforcement agencies are challenged to deliver professional services that recognize the needs of each community in an efficient and effective manner. The selection, training and supervision of staff are the key components in creating a culture of police excellence. The following sections of this report further address these issues as they relate to the training activities of the APD's Narcotics Unit.

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Background of this Technical Assistance Study

In October 2007, Major Siobhan O'Brien of the Atlanta, Georgia Police Department, requested technical assistance from the Bureau of Justice and Administration (BJA) to provide an independent assessment of the APD's training efforts on behalf of the newly formed Narcotics Unit. The APD requested this training assessment following a critical incident that occurred within the Narcotics Unit and was designed to ensure the APD and the Atlanta community confidence that Narcotics Investigators and supervisors are properly trained in the best narcotic enforcement practices used nationally.

The requested technical assistance has been provided by BJA's National Training and Technical Assistance Project at American University (AU). Transformational Strategies and Solutions, Inc., (TSS) of Seminole, Florida, was designated by the AU project to serve as consultant to provide this technical assistance. TSS, under the leadership of Carol Rasor, Lead Investigator, has had extensive experience in developing plans and conducting needs assessments regarding training needs of law enforcement agencies.

The technical assistance is being provided in three stages over the course of a six month period: (1) assessment of the initial implementation of stage of the training program; (2) a follow up assessment of additional training received by members of the Narcotics Unit as well as any changes in Standard Operating Procedures and related information relevant to training needs; and (3) an outcome stage addressing the effectiveness and impact of the training in promoting the Unit's successful performance. Each of these stages examines key issues in the training needs assessment process. This

report reflects the findings of the first stage of phase of technical assistance.

Site services for the first phase of assistance were conducted January 29 – February 1, 2008 by Dr. Rasor and Leo Cordero, Principal Consultant. In preparation for the visit, available documentation on the Department’s training efforts for the Unit was provided by Lt. John W. Mathis to AU during November and December. Training curricula, standard operating procedures and other documentation were analyzed and interviews with staff from the Atlanta Police Department were conducted to provide initial key findings that resulted in recommendations to enhance the training and performance of the Narcotics Unit’s investigators and supervisors.

Police agencies are tasked on a daily basis to provide communities with effective and efficient law enforcement service to diverse communities. Problem-solving techniques are implemented to identify, analyze, respond, and assess situations in an effort to reduce or eliminate criminal activity. Police agencies also have the responsibility of assessing their performance by analyzing whether their actions promote the organization’s goals and objectives, provides the highest level of service, and promotes integrity, all of which ultimately determines the satisfaction and trust the community has in its police department. The selection, training and supervision of staff are the key components in creating a culture of police excellence.

After a critical incident occurred in the Atlanta Police Department’s Narcotics Unit, the Department made the decision to restructure and revitalize the unit. The first step was to rebuild the unit and new personnel was transferred into the unit. This action was designed to enable the unit to have a fresh perspective and promote a message to the community that the Atlanta Police Department is committed to revitalizing the performance and the image of the unit. Two stages of personnel transfers occurred in May and then August of 2007. Additionally, the size of the unit was expanded. The next

step was to provide the new staff with training to enable them to competently perform their new duties. Staff members began to receive training in narcotics-related topics provided by both internal staff and external resources.

To compliment these efforts, the Atlanta Police Department authorized a training needs assessment to ensure that the training was relevant to the duties and responsibilities of the position of narcotics investigator. It was for this purpose that BJA technical assistance was requested and (TSS) was asked to design the methodology and to conduct a comprehensive training needs assessment.

B. Components of the Training Needs Assessment and Key Issues Addressed

The training needs assessment has been designed to be conducted in three stages: (1) assessment of the initial training (**Implementation Stage**); (2) assessment of additional training needed, either to fill gaps or address changes in Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) or other developments (**Intermediate Stage**); and (3) impact of the training (**Outcome Stage**). Each of these stages has key issues that are examined. The key issues of the Implementation Stage will be addressed in this report. Two follow-up reports detailing the key issues addressed in the Intermediate Stage and the Outcome Stage will be produced subsequently.

The key issues addressed during the **Implementation Stage** of the training needs assessment focused on determining the appropriateness and comprehensiveness of the training delivered to staff members of the Narcotics Unit in terms of supporting successful performance and accomplishment of the unit's goals. The appropriateness of the training was assessed by conducting a comparative analysis of the learning outcomes/objectives of the training with the standard operating procedures to determine

if the initial training received by the unit's staff members parallels the agency's procedures. The analysis also examined the comprehensiveness of the delivered training in comparison to the duties and responsibilities of the investigator and supervisory positions.

The key issues to be addressed in the **Intermediate Stage** of the training needs assessment will focus on (a) any additional training provided to the members of the Narcotics Unit to supplement the training reviewed during the initial site visit, (b) the effectiveness of the implemented training in accomplishing the Narcotics Unit's goals with efficiency, effectiveness and professionalism, (c) identification of any gaps in training; and (d) recommendations for enhancement of the standard operating procedures.

The key issues to be addressed in the **Outcome Stage** of the training needs assessment will focus on finalizing the training assessment to determine the effectiveness and impact of the training in promoting the successful performance of the Atlanta Police Department's Narcotics Unit for the time period covered by the training needs assessment. This process will render a final review of all training delivered to the new staff members, conduct a survey of the impact of the training on their job performance during the training needs assessment period, recommend any additional training to benefit the Narcotics Unit, and provide a recommendation for an on-going training plan for current and new personnel.

C. Assessment Methodology of the Implementation Stage

The Atlanta Police Department had initiated sending staff members of the Narcotics Unit to several training courses prior to the commencement of the training needs assessment. The training needs assessment methodology was designed with the consideration that the Atlanta Police Department had created a training plan that

identified courses required by members of the narcotics unit for successful performance of their duties. Therefore, the training needs assessment was constructed to examine three stages of the training. As noted above, the first stage is designed to assess the initial implementation of the training; the second stage, referred to as the intermediate stage of training, examines the progress of the training plan; and the third stage examines the outcome of the training.

The methodology for conducting the Implementation Stage of the training needs assessment has consisted of the acquisition and analysis of critical documentation and information required for a comprehensive training assessment. The requested documentation included the following:

- Overview of the structure of the Narcotics Unit
 - Organizational components of the Narcotics Unit
 - Span of control
 - Roster of the Narcotics Unit's members (to include the member's tenure in law enforcement and any previous experience in a narcotics unit)
- Overview of the action taken by Atlanta Police Department in restructuring the Narcotics Unit to include:
 - Selection process
 - Training process
 - Evaluation process
- Documentation regarding the Narcotics Unit's training after the restructuring of the unit to include:
 - Name of instructor or institution with contact phone number
 - Syllabus with major learning outcomes, course objectives and curriculum
 - Duration of the training
 - Cost of the training
 - Roster of attendees from the Atlanta Police Department's Narcotics Unit
 - Georgia POST records for all members of the Narcotics Unit
- All Standard Operating Procedures of the Narcotics Unit or any related General

Orders or Directives

- Copy of the job task analysis for the position of narcotics investigator
- Copy of the Narcotics Unit's tactical plan

The Implementation Stage also included interviews with key staff members to acquire a brief summary of the critical incident that led to the Narcotics Unit's reorganization with the primary focus of discussing the current training delivered to members of the Narcotics Unit to determine relevancy to the job position of investigator and supervisor. The names of the Narcotics Unit's sergeants and investigators are not listed in this report due to their undercover status and the need to protect their identities.

The following Atlanta Police Department staff members were interviewed:

- Chief Richard Pennington
- Assistant Chief Alan Dreher
- Deputy Chief Carlos Banda – Commander of the Criminal Investigations Division
- Major Debra Williams – Commander of the Special Enforcement Section
- Major S.M. O'Brien – Academy Director
- Lt. T. Mathis – Training Division
- Lt. William Trivelpiece – Narcotics Unit Commander
- Sgt. #1 (undercover status) – Narcotics Unit
- Sgt. #2 (undercover status) – Narcotics Unit
- Sgt. #3 (undercover status) – Narcotics Unit
- Sgt. #4 (undercover status) – Narcotics Unit
- Sgt. #5 (undercover status) – Narcotics Unit
- Investigators – random sample of available investigators
- Ms. Jennifer Zeunik – Director of Programs, Atlanta Police Foundation

TSS conducted the first site visit on January 29 – February 1, 2008 to meet with staff from the Atlanta Police Department to discuss the methodology of the training needs assessment, collect additional needed documentation and interview staff members.

II. Summary of Interviews and Documentation Reviewed

The following is a summary of the interviews conducted by TSS with all staff members who are pertinent to the training needs assessment and the documentation that was analyzed for conducting the implementation stage of the training needs assessment.

A. Staff Interviews

TSS conducted individual interviews with the staff members referenced in Section I. The purpose of the interviews was to extract information that may not be captured in the documentation and to identify the benefits and challenges of restructuring the Narcotics Unit. All staff members were cooperative and receptive of the inquiries made pertaining to the training needs assessment.

1. Interviews with Executive Staff

The executive staff members (Majors and above) were informed in detail as to the methodology of the training needs assessment, the required documentation and the purpose of the interviews. This group of staff members recognized the need to restructure and revitalize the Narcotics Unit to enhance the effectiveness of the unit and to restore public confidence and trust. These staff members indicated that the best approach to accomplish this goal was to transfer new personnel into the unit, expand the size of the unit and ensure that all staff members were adequately trained to competently perform their job functions and responsibilities. Executive Staff members agreed that this has been a challenging and labor intensive endeavor.

Executive staff members further described the selection process for the transfer of new personnel to the Narcotics Unit. The selection process to fill the vacancies in the

Narcotics Unit followed the agency's Standard Operating Procedure 2100 – Appointment to Investigator or Senior Police Officer. The required selection process had three qualifying standards required in order for an applicant to submit an application for the position of Investigator:

- First, the applicant must have a minimum of 3 years of continuous service;
- Second, the applicant must not have an active record of pending discipline for an adverse action equal to or greater than a 5 day suspension; and
- Third, the applicant's last three annual evaluations were required to be at the level of effective, satisfactory or higher.

The competitive selection process was based on six criteria:

- a scored practical exercise;
- a scored oral interview process;
- a review of the applicant's education;
- an assessment of the applicant's specialized training;
- a review of the applicant's complaint history; and
- the section commander's review.

Each criterion has a weighted score and the applicants are ranked by their overall score and an eligibility list is created. The applicants selected for transfer to an investigative unit must attend the agency created and delivered training course – New Investigators (80 hours). All personnel transferred to the Narcotics Unit participated in this selection process.

Executive staff members were satisfied with the selection process and supported the need for these new investigators to participate in training that would ensure their success in their new position. Additionally, the staff members transferred to the Narcotics Unit were required to serve two years in the position. Executive staff members

did articulate their concern that when the current investigators conclude the 2 year period, these staff members would be eligible for transfer to other job assignments. Thus, new staff would be transferred into the Narcotics Unit to fill the vacancies and the issue of thoroughly training the new staff would re-emerge. Executive staff members requested TSS to make recommendations as to how to deal with the future issue of training new staff in an efficient and effective process.

2. Interview with Narcotics Unit Commander

The interview with Lt. Trivelpiece, Narcotics Unit Commander, indicated that he had previously been assigned to Internal Affairs Unit and recognized the need to follow policies and procedures, and provide training to staff members. Therefore, training the new staff is the top priority in rebuilding the Narcotics Unit. Lt. Trivelpiece further advised that all staff members assigned to the Narcotics Unit reviewed the standard operating procedures pertaining to the unit.

Lt. Trivelpiece explained how the Narcotics Unit was restructured. Staff members transferred to the Narcotics Unit were selected from the eligibility list and a group of new investigators were transferred during two periods, May 2007 and August 2007. The Narcotics Unit is comprised of four teams, each team having a sergeant and six to eight investigators. Additionally, a fifth sergeant was assigned to the Narcotics Unit for administrative duties and an officer was on loan from the Field Operations Division (uniform patrol). Due to an injury, the uniform officer served only in an administrative capacity assisting the Narcotics Unit.

Teams 1 and 2 were transferred into the Narcotics Unit in May 2007, while teams 3 and 4 were transferred in August 2007. Therefore, teams 1 and 2 were more advanced in their training and had attended more training courses as compared to teams 3 and 4.

Lt. Trivelpiece advised that all teams would eventually receive the same training, but due to staffing levels and availability of training, only a limited number of investigators could be sent to a particular school.

In terms of operational issues, Lt. Trivelpiece acknowledged the challenge of balancing the community demands for narcotics investigations and suppression, with the demands of adequately training new investigators to effectively perform their duties. At the time of the site visit, teams 3 and 4 were still receiving training and limited in their involvement in narcotics investigations.

Lt. Trivelpiece provided a printout of all personnel assigned to the Narcotics Unit with their names, age, gender, race and length of experience in law enforcement. This printout will not be included in this report to protect the identities of the undercover investigators. However, Table 1 provides a presentation of the demographics of the thirty-seven members of the Narcotics Unit.

Table 1: Narcotics Unit Staff: Race, Gender and Age Range by Rank

Rank	B/M	B/F	W/M	W/F	Age Range
Investigator	11	4	12	4	25 - 45
Sergeant	3	0	2	0	34 - 44
Lieutenant	0	0	1	0	N/A

Table 2 provides a presentation of the staff members' length of experience in law enforcement and tenure in the Narcotics Unit by rank.

Table 2: Narcotics Unit Staff: Length of experience in law enforcement and Narcotics Unit by Rank

Rank	Law Enforcement Experience Range	Law Enforcement Experience Average	Narcotics Unit Experience Range
Investigator	4 – 20 years	8.19 years	8 – 10 months
Sergeant	10 – 23 years	14.2 years	8 – 10 months

Note: The lieutenant has 20 years of experience in law enforcement and 10 months in Narcotics Unit assignment.

3. Interviews with Sergeants

Structured interviews were conducted with each of the five sergeants assigned to the Narcotics Unit. The structured interviews explored the comprehensiveness of the training, strengths and weaknesses of the training, parallelism with the standard operating procedures to the training, and any other issues that may be pertinent to the training needs assessment as viewed from the sergeants' perspectives. The sergeant staff members indicated that the department was making a dedicated effort to restructure the unit and provide training. Staff felt that they had received appropriate training for their job position; however, training efforts need to be continuous especially in the area of tactical training. Tactical training had occurred within teams but the Narcotics Unit needed tactical training in which teams were cross-trained so that teams had experience working with other team members. The firearms qualification course is currently designed as a static course of fire. The course could be enhanced by being designed as an interactive, decisionary-based course of live fire. Staff also recommended the issuance of assault rifles in lieu of shotguns, which are currently issued.

Sergeant staff members were asked if they identified any contradictions between received training and the agency's standard operating procedures. Staff could not readily identify any contradictions, but indicated that the standard operating procedures could be clearer and more unit specific. Standard operating procedures could be enhanced for training and operational application by formatting the standard operating procedures to reflect the guidelines pertinent to a particular unit, instead of guidelines formatted for an entire division with different units and job functions.

Sergeant staff members also emphasized the need for investigators to be well-trained in establishing, maintaining and controlling confidential informants. Staff indicated that developing confidential informants was a priority because the F.B.I. had taken custody of documentation related to the confidential informant file. Therefore, confidential informants needed to be cultivated and the files reestablished.

Sergeant staff members also addressed parallel issues to training that would enhance the performance of the Narcotics Unit. For example, staff recommended a strong inter-agency communication network would be beneficial for coordinating information and action. Specifically, staff recommended the issuance of Nextel cell phones to enable immediate communication with the Georgia Bureau of Investigations, Federal Bureau of Investigations, Drug Enforcement Administration and other local agencies. Staff also articulated the need for having surveillance equipment assigned and maintained by the Narcotics Unit. Currently, staff members must make arrangements with the Electronic Surveillance Unit for equipment needs. At times, surveillance equipment is unavailable or readily inaccessible to narcotics investigators, as the Electronic Surveillance Unit serves numerous units and the needs of the entire department. Staff also articulated the need for better vehicles and a greater variety of vehicles to ensure covert operations.

4. Interviews with Investigators

Structured interviews were conducted with a random sample of available investigators from the four teams, examining the same issues as those discussed in the sergeants' interviews. Similar to the sergeants' perspectives, the investigators felt that the department was making a dedicated effort to train the staff. However, staff recommended continuous tactical training. The tactical training should incorporate the

cross-training of teams with a focus on dynamic entries and the preservation of evidence. Current training techniques consisted of slow, methodical entries similar to how S.W.A.T. trains. Staff believed that the emphasis should still be on officer safety, but should also encompass the preservation of drug evidence which is a street challenge faced by narcotics investigators because of the frequency with which perpetrators destroy evidence during entries. Staff also recommended additional training on operational planning and briefings, and tactical scenario training, and felt that an off-site location for the Narcotics Unit, instead of being located at headquarters, would be beneficial to ensure covert operations and the ability to have a facility for narcotics training.

The investigators also indicated that they had experience only with the Atlanta Police Department and had only narcotics experience limited to their previous uniform assignment in the Field Operations Division. Some of the investigators were F.I.T. certified which enabled them to be involved in specialized street level investigations of narcotics, robberies, special assignments, etc. while being assigned to the Field Operations Division. Additionally, some investigators felt it was a challenge to be assigned to the Narcotics Unit because of the restructuring which resulted in the experienced personnel being removed from the unit and new personnel with limited narcotics experience being transferred into the unit. Additionally, while the investigators voluntarily participated in the selection process for investigator, the decision as to the unit an investigator would be assigned, is ultimately the decision of command staff. Some investigators did not want to be transferred to the Narcotics Unit, but were interested in other investigatory positions. These investigators indicated they would request a transfer from the Narcotics Unit at the end of their two year commitment. The detectives felt that the selection process for investigator was a fair, competitive process.

The investigators interviewed also agreed that enhancements could be made to the

standard operating procedures by making them specific, streamlined and pertinent to the Narcotics Unit. During the interviews, discrepancies were noted as to what was covered by the standard operating procedures and how many standard operating procedures were pertinent to the Narcotics Unit. This issue could be addressed by having the supervisors review, in detail, all standard operating procedures with the investigators to ensure they have a comprehensive understanding of the standard operating procedures. Additionally, to strengthen the standard operating procedures, supervisors and investigators should be encouraged to provide input into the drafts and revisions of existing and new standard operating procedures.

The investigators articulated similar concerns as the sergeants, recommending better equipment and access to equipment such as body bugs, video equipment and props such as ladders, tool belts, signs, etc. The investigators also noted the need for Nextel cell phones, in lieu of transmissions through dispatch, to ensure the integrity of the undercover operation. The investigators appreciated the agency's transition to a higher capacity firearm; and the determination that, for undercover investigators, this weapon would not be issued having Atlanta Police stamped on the weapon, as with previous department issued handguns.

The investigators were cognizant about the challenges of rebuilding an entire unit and were complimentary about the agency's dedication to training. They recognized that the Narcotics Unit was in its infancy stage. Some investigators were still going through the training and were not authorized to do street buys; therefore, their experience was limited. The investigators also articulated a concern that they were unsure of the Narcotics Unit's mission --whether it was a street level narcotics unit, a midlevel drug interdiction unit, or both. They hoped that this would be clarified by having more experience in the unit or by their supervisors. The investigators also indicated that

planning operations, at times, were difficult because of only flex time, rather than overtime or comp time, was authorized.

B. Review of Documentation of the Training

In response to the study team's initial request for documentation relevant to the training assessment, the APD provided the following documentation prior to the initial site visit:

- Atlanta Police Department's Standard Operating Procedures (S.O.P.)
 - Appointment to Investigator or Senior Police Officer – S.O.P. 2100 (revision date 10/1/06)
 - Search and Seizure – S.O.P. 3020 (revision date 4/1/07)
 - Criminal Investigations Division – S.O.P. 5010 (revision date 1/2/06)
 - Special Enforcement Section – S.O.P. 5030 (revision date 7/1/04)
 - Undercover Operations – S.O.P. 5110 (revision date 4/1/07)
 - Confidential Fund – S.O.P. 5150 (revision date 7/1/07)
 - Confidential Sources – S.O.P. 5160 (revision date 7/1/07)
- Lesson Plans
 - Legal Issues in Obtaining Valid Consent to Search – Georgia Bureau of Investigations
 - Search and Seizure – Georgia Bureau of Investigations
 - High Risk Warrants – Atlanta Police Department
 - New Investigator Course – Atlanta Police Department
 - Criminal Procedure Guide for Drug Agents – Drug Enforcement Administration

The following additional documentation was provided either during or after (no later than March 20, 2008) the initial site visit:

- Georgia Peace Officer Standards and Training Council (P.O.S.T.) records for each current member of the Narcotics Unit.
- Document titled – Completed Narcotics Training: this document listed names of schools, hours and who attended the training in terms of rank. [No support documentation verifying names of attendee, date of training, location, etc. was provided. Atlanta Police Department was unable to provide lesson plans for some of the courses listed.]
- Two memorandums for training
 - One dated 11/1/07 informing that Narcotic Unit's teams 1 & 2 participated in a 4 hour refresher course – High Risk Warrant Entry. [The Memorandum listed 2 sergeants and 13 investigators attending this training. No lesson plan, attendance sign-in sheet, or instructor information was provided.]
 - One dated 12/13/07 informing that Narcotic Unit's teams 1 & 2 participated in a refresher course – Entry Training. [The Memorandum listed 2 sergeants and 13 investigators attending this training. No lesson plan, attendance sign-in sheet or instructor information was provided.]
- Roll Call Training Sign-in Sheet – for A.P.D. 07.13 – Use of Deadly Force Policy Change – listing the names of all members of the Narcotics Unit – dated 12/17, 12/18, and 12/19. [No other information provided.]
- Four Printed Matter Control Sheets
 - A.P.D. S.O.P. 6011 – Electronic Communication Devices – listing the names of all members of the Narcotics Unit – dated 12/14, 12/15, 12/16, 12/17, and 12/18. [No other information provided.]
 - A.P.D. S.O.P. 4011 – Use of Tire Deflation Device – listing the names of all members of the Narcotics Unit – with various dates ranging from 12/10 to 1/10. [No other information provided.]
 - A.P.D. S.O.P. 6030 – Property and Evidence Control – listing the names of all

members of the Narcotics Unit – with various dates ranging from 12/27 to 1/10. [No other information provided.]

- A.P.D. S.O.P. 3042 – Use of Taser – listing the names of all members of the Narcotics Unit – with various dates ranging from 12/26 to 1/7. [No other information provided.]
- Atlanta Police Department’s Field Training Program for Narcotics Investigations – shell documents only
- Property and Evidence Control – S.O.P 6030 (revision date 12/1/07)
- Atlanta Police Department Tactical Plan
- Atlanta Police Department Performance Development Plan (Blank - Evaluation)
- Job Description – Police Investigator

III. Analysis of Training Plan and Courses

A. Overview of Training Provided

The Atlanta Police Department did not provide a written training plan describing the training courses, sequencing of the training courses or time frame for implementation and completion of the training received by the Narcotics Unit. However, the training staff provided some of the courses' curricula to be reviewed by the consultants. From the Georgia's Peace Officer Standards and Training Council (P.O.S.T.) training records which were provided, Table 3 was constructed to present an overview of the courses attended by the members of the Atlanta Police Department's Narcotics Unit. The P.O.S.T records were utilized for Table 3 because the records are derived from documentation submitted by the Atlanta Police Department to Georgia's Peace Officer Standards and Training Council and are a reliable source of information.

The consultants requested that all training documentation be submitted no later than March 20, 2008. This report reflects the P.O.S.T. documentation of training for the time frame of May 2007 to March 20, 2008. Documentation that can identify the name of an undercover member of the Atlanta Police Department's Narcotics Unit will not be identified or attached as an addendum in this report or the final report to support the integrity of undercover operations.

Table 3: P.O.S.T Training Records for May 2007 – March 20, 2008

Course Name	Course Hours	Investigators	Sergeants	Lieutenant
Street Survival	36	27	5	1
Risk Management	16	27	5	1
High Risk Warrant Entry	8	16	2	1
High Risk Warrant Entry	16	2	0	0
High Risk Warrant Entry	24	13	3	0
Drug Law Enforcement School	80	29	5	1
Supervising Counter-drug Operations	24	0	5	0
Drug Investigations	16	11	3	1
Drug Interdiction	8	14	3	1
Drug Interdiction	24	1	0	0
Basic Investigator's Course	80	27	5	1
Undercover Operations	4	4	0	0
Undercover Operations	60	14	3	0
Undercover Operations	80	1	0	0
Criminal Procedures	16	11	2	0
Standard of Procedures and Guidelines	2	21	1	0
Active Shooter Response	8	8	1	0
Analytical Investigation Techniques	40	2	0	0
Drug Testing Procedures	2	4	0	0
Officer Safety for High Risk Entries	40	3	0	0
Search Warrants & Affidavits	16	1	0	0
Tactical Training	8	1	0	0
Tactical Squad Training	8	1	0	0
Annual In-service Training	16	23	4	1
Firearms Requalification & Use of Force	8	22	2	1
Firearms Requalification & Use of Force	16	17	3	0
Instructor Certification	80	3	1	1
Supervisory Training In-house	20	2	0	0
Supervisory Training In-house	24	1	0	0

Supervisory Training Level I	56	3	0	0
------------------------------	----	---	---	---

The Narcotics Unit has thirty-seven staff members and Table 3 is a compilation of the thirty-seven P.O.S.T. training records. With the exception of one incomplete training record that only provided training data to November 2007, the above Table illustrates all formalized training from the time frame of May 2007 – March 20, 2008 by rank. As of that date, not all investigators had received all of the training; the situation will be again reviewed when TSS conducts a second site visit in June as part of Phase 2 of this technical assistance review. However, Roll Call training is not documented in the P.O.S.T. records. When analyzing the number of training hours received as of March 20, 2008 by the entire Narcotics Unit, the total training hours computes to 11,532.

B. Content of the Training Curricula Reviewed

Atlanta Police Department provided curricula for five courses attended by the Narcotics Unit staff. As summarized in Table 4 on page 34, while the course materials sent provided the content for the courses, the course materials did not always include a course syllabus, learning objectives, course duration, instructor name, attendance record or an evaluation method for measuring learning outcomes. Therefore, a brief overview of the content of each course will be presented to illustrate the knowledge and skills offered to participants from the training course.

1. Course #1 – Legal Issues in Obtaining Valid Consent to Search

This course was presented by the Georgia Bureau of Investigation. The provided training materials did not contain a syllabus, learning outcomes, duration of the training or verification of the name of the instructor(s). The cover page did provide the names of

instructors Special Agent in Charge John Edwards (Region 5) and Deputy Director Dawn M. Diedrich, Legal Services. The materials did contain a table of contents. This course introduced participants to the following topic areas:

- Determining the voluntariness of the consent
- Consent in a public place
- Consent at Home
- Exigent Circumstances
- Using a ruse, trickery or coercion to obtain consent
- Authority to consent
- Juvenile consent
- Scope of consent
- Scope of consent – bodily fluids
- Withdrawal of consent
- Refusal of consent
- Officer safety – protective sweep

Each topic area provided the application of litigated case studies. Participants analyzed 39 court cases and the curriculum contained 7 practical scenarios addressing the following circumstances:

- Child abuse
- Murder
- Juvenile/drugs
- Narcotics
- Homicide (2)
- Sexual abuse

The curriculum examines a broad scope of consent issues and, with the inclusion of court case studies, offers the participant a strong knowledge base pertaining to consent to search. This curriculum should be one of the foundation courses for a narcotics investigator and applicable for all sworn law enforcement positions.

2. Course #2 – Search and Seizure

This course was presented by the Georgia Bureau of Investigation. The training materials provided did not contain a table of contents, syllabus, learning outcomes, duration of the training or verification of the name of the instructor(s). The cover page did provide the name of the instructor, Special Agent in Charge John Edwards. This course introduced participants to the following topic areas:

- Rapport with prosecutors and judges
- Criminal defense lawyer strategy
- Objectivity vs. subjectivity
- Law-case specific and fact specific
- 7 maxims in search and seizure
- Rationale for the Exclusionary Rule
- 3 tiers of police and citizen encounters
- 4th Amendment and case law
- Katz Test
- The Two Prong Test
- Searches and seizures by category:
 - Plain view
 - Incidental to arrest
 - Consent searches
 - Vehicle searches
 - Abandonment
 - Inventories
 - Exigent circumstances
 - Curtilage issues
 - Roadblocks
 - Search warrants
 - Affidavit checklist

The curriculum was formatted as a PowerPoint and the content appeared to be delivered in a lecture. There were no activities presented for application of the knowledge by the students. However, the curriculum covered a multitude of topics that would be highly valuable for any type of investigator.

3. Course #3 – High Risk Warrants

This course was presented by the Atlanta Police Department. The training materials provided did contain a lesson plan, terminal performance objective, four enabling objectives, duration of the training (16 hours), verification of the name of the instructor – Sergeant Warren K. Pickard, and a course evaluation. This course was designed with eight hours of classroom and eight hours of a practical application. This course provided participants with knowledge and skills in the following topic areas:

- Building entries
- Ten deadly tactical errors
- Importance of training for instinctive shooting
- Equipment considerations
- Positions and responsibilities of the entry team (7 team members)
- Breaching techniques
- Principles of movement
- Clearing techniques
- Armed encounters
- Secondary search
- Debriefing

The practical application required participants to participate in reality base scenario training in high-risk entries in a low light facility. The lesson plan did not contain a written description of the scenarios. The sequencing of the training with 8 hours of classroom to provide knowledge and 8 hours of practicum to apply the skills is highly beneficial in learning the methodology and tactics for conducting high-risk building entries.

4. Course #4 - New Investigator's Course

This course was presented by the Atlanta Police Department. This is an 80 hour training course consisting of 22 sections designed to offer new investigators training in an array of topics. A comprehensive lesson plan covering all 80 hours was not provided; however, each section of the training had a lesson plan corresponding to the topic. Each section of the training will be briefly discussed below:

a. Drug Identification – 4 hour block of training

This block of training provided - lesson plan, terminal performance objective, enabling objectives, in-house instructor listed, course evaluation, student handouts, test questions and a practical exercise. Primary topics include: History of Narcotics; Georgia Controlled Substances Act; Common Narcotic Violations; Types of Narcotics; and Handling and Packaging of Drug Evidence.

b. Courtroom Testimony – No hours listed for this block of training

This block of training did not provide a lesson plan, enabling objectives, student handouts, test questions or a practical exercise. A course evaluation was included and the instructor was from the Office of the District Attorney, Atlanta Judicial Circuit.

The curriculum addressed the following topics: criminal court procedure; receiving a subpoena; the police report; preparing to testify; testifying in court; and general principles.

c. Concealed Carrying Handgun – 2 hour block of training

This block of training provided a lesson plan, terminal performance objective, enabling objectives, in-house instructor, course evaluation and a practical exercise.

The curriculum addresses: carrying positions and equipment for concealed handguns, drawing a weapon from the concealed carrying position and accessing a

concealed weapon in a strong side carry position. The practical exercise consisted of live fire at the range.

d. Raid Planning, Search and Arrest Warrants – 14 hour block of training

This block of training provided a lesson plan, terminal performance objective, enabling objectives, in-house instructor, course evaluation, two practical exercises and student handouts. A written test was included; however, it appeared to be from a course on bicycle safety. The lesson plan was created by staff from the Clayton Regional Law Enforcement Academy and updated by staff from Atlanta Police Department.

The curriculum addresses the following topics: Fourth Amendment; probable cause for issuance of a search warrant; scope of the search; execution of the search warrant; anticipatory warrants; and components of a search warrant. The two practical exercises require the participant to: complete an offense report; complete a valid search warrant application; and complete a search warrant affidavit and return. This block of training only contained one PowerPoint slide indicating the next portion of the instruction would be raid planning and the raid plans would be based upon the completed search warrants. However, there was no curriculum covering information pertaining to raid planning.

e. Media Relations and Supervisor Notification – 1 hour block of training

This block of training provided a lesson plan, terminal performance objective, enabling objectives, in-house instructor, course evaluation, student handout and a five question test.

The curriculum addresses the following areas: image and the media; media perception and motives; governing laws and APD standard operating procedure 1060 – Public Affairs (Media policy); and interview techniques.

f. Interactive Cover and Concealment – 4 hour block of training

This block of training provided a lesson plan, terminal performance objective, enabling objectives, in-house instructor, course evaluation, practical exercise and one test question.

The curriculum addresses the following areas: identifying proper tactical behavior for undercover officers and the importance of training; defensive tactics techniques; and APD standard operating procedure 3010 – Use of Force.

g. Uniform Crime Reporting and Case Clear-up – 2 hour block of training

This block of training provided a lesson plan, terminal performance objective, enabling objectives, in-house instructor, course evaluation, student handouts; and ten test questions.

The curriculum addresses the following areas: UCR process, guidelines and classifications; and APD case clearance process and forms.

h. Complaint Room – No hours listed for this block of training

This block of training did not provide a lesson plan, terminal performance objective, enabling objectives, or any method of testing. A course evaluation with the instructor's name was provided. The curriculum was formatted as a PowerPoint presentation.

The curriculum addresses the following areas: the process for filing charges post arrest; and the process post filing charges.

i. ICIS Case Management – 2 hour block of training

This block of training provided a lesson plan, terminal performance objectives, enabling objectives, in-house instructor, and course evaluation.

The curriculum addresses the following areas: overview of the Incident Crime Information System Menu; process for initiating a report, supplement report, field interview form generated from the CAD – Computer Aided Dispatch system; navigating through the ICIS functions; and features of the case management module.

j. Witness Identification and Line-ups – 1 hour block of training

This block of training provided a lesson plan, terminal performance objectives, enabling objectives, in-house instructor, student handouts, and course evaluation. The lesson plan indicated that student handouts and test questions were included in the Appendices; however, these were not provided.

The curriculum addresses the following areas: the 14 steps of photo lineups identified in APD standard operating procedure 3080; pertinent legislation; photo line-up admonition; photo line-up administration and identification; and factors that influence witnesses.

k. Officer Liability – 4 hour block of training

This block of training provided a lesson plan, terminal performance objectives, enabling objectives, in-house instructor, student notes guide, and course evaluation. The lesson plan indicated that it was originally prepared by the Georgia Peace Officer Standards and Training Division and updated by Atlanta Police Department.

The curriculum addresses the following areas: types of liability; civil liabilities imposed under state tort law and state civil rights law; court cases involving civil liability and rights; substantive and procedural defenses; liability and use of force; false arrest and

imprisonment; searches and seizures; negligence; Public Duty Doctrine; pursuit policy; and supervisor liability.

l. Criminal Procedure and Law – No hours listed for this block of training

This block of training did not provide a lesson plan cover sheet; however, terminal performance objectives, enabling objectives, in-house instructor, and course evaluation were provided.

The curriculum addresses the following areas: concepts of custody and interrogation; Miranda applications; searches without a warrant; searches of persons; exigent circumstances; hot pursuit; consent; airports, courthouses, public buildings, vehicles, open fields, and prisons searches; conspiracy; solicitation; and hate crimes.

m. Operations Security – No hours listed for this block of training

This block of training did not provide a lesson plan cover sheet; however, desired course outcomes, course objectives, in-house instructor and course evaluation were provided. This training was produced by the U.S. Department of Homeland Security and addresses Operations Security (OPSEC) Awareness Training for Public Safety Agencies. The instructor lesson plan was designed as a slide program with a companion video.

The curriculum addresses the following areas: key points about operations security; OPSEC risk management process; the need for OPSEC; types of adversaries; basic intelligence collection methods used by adversaries; and countermeasures public safety agencies can utilize to impact the collection of critical information by adversaries.

n. Fraudulent Documents – No hours listed for this block of training

This block of training provided a lesson plan, terminal performance objectives,

enabling objectives, in-house instructor, student handouts, and course evaluation. The lesson plan indicated that test questions were included in the Appendix; however, test questions were not provided.

The curriculum addresses the following areas: laws applying to fraudulent documents; reasons and methods for counterfeiting documents; methods to identify fraudulent documents; and security features of specific documents.

o. Confidential Sources and Confidential Funds – 4 hour block of training [2 segments]

This block of training provided a lesson plan, terminal performance objectives, enabling objectives, in-house instructor, student handouts, course evaluation, and consisted of two hours of training.

The curriculum addresses the following information: APD Standard Operating Procedure 5150 – Confidential Funds. Three test questions were provided.

The second portion of this training block addressed Confidential Sources. This block of training also provided a lesson plan, terminal performance objectives, enabling objectives, in-house instructor, student handouts, course evaluation and consisted of two hours of training.

The curriculum addresses the following topics: APD Standard Operating Procedure 5160 – Confidential Sources. The student handouts were the department forms related to confidential funds and five test questions were provided.

p. Investigative Tools – No hours listed for this block of training

This block of training did not provided a lesson plan cover sheet, terminal performance objectives, enabling objectives, and test questions. A course evaluation

identifying the in-house instructor and a detailed student handout depicting informational websites for investigators were provided.

The curriculum addresses the following areas: informational search tools to include – Criminal Justice Information System (CJIS), Horizon, Unisearch, Police Central and other web based tools; and case management and unit databases.

q. Transition from Uniform to Plain Clothes – 50 minute block of training

This block of training provided a lesson plan, terminal performance objectives, enabling objectives, in-house instructor, student handouts, course evaluation, and five test questions.

The curriculum addresses the following topics: APD Standard Operating Procedure 2130 – Dress Code; and Georgia Code 16-3-21 and 16-3-23 affecting plain clothes officers.

r. Interview and Interrogation – 8 hour block of training

This block of training provided a lesson plan, terminal performance objectives, enabling objectives, in-house instructor, and course evaluation. Test questions and practical exercises were referenced in the lesson plan cover sheet, but these were not provided.

The curriculum addresses the following topics: purpose of an interview; procedure in death notification, Miranda warnings; obtaining confessions; non-verbal deceptive clues; challenges in interviewing juveniles; and utilizing structured questions.

s. Surveillance – No hours listed for this block of training

This block of training did not provide a lesson plan cover sheet, terminal performance objectives, enabling objectives, test questions or a practical application. The course evaluation identified the in-house instructor and two student handouts consisting of department forms were provided.

The curriculum provided was limited in scope and depth, but included the following topics: legal topics; how the unit can help assist investigators; future plans of the unit; and body bugs.

t. Electronic Warrant – No hours listed for this block of training

This block of training did not provide a lesson plan cover sheet; however, terminal performance objectives, enabling objectives, the identity of the in-house instructor, student handout, and course evaluation were provided. It was indicated that Appendix C contained test questions; however, none were provided.

The curriculum addresses the following topics: the electronic warrant interchange for arrest warrants and search warrants.

u. Crime Scene – No hours listed for this block of training

This block of training did not provide a lesson plan cover sheet, terminal performance objectives, student handouts, or test questions. A course evaluation identifying the in-house instructor and the enabling objectives was provided.

The curriculum addresses the following topics: crime scene management; on-scene initial response; identifying boundaries and securing the scene; consent to search and search warrants; types of evidence; and processing of the crime scene.

v. Ethics and Professionalism – No hours listed for this block of training

This block of training did not provide a lesson plan cover sheet, terminal performance objectives, enabling objectives, practical applications (such as scenarios) or test questions. A course evaluation identifying the instructor as “Agent from FBI” and numerous Department of Justice articles pertaining to law enforcement corruption (assumed to be student handouts) were provided.

The curriculum addresses the following topics: practice and standards of ethical conduct; theories of corruption; and law enforcement dilemmas.

5. Course #5 – Criminal Procedure Guide for Drug Agents

This course was presented by the Drug Enforcement Administration. The training materials provided did not contain a syllabus, learning outcomes, duration of the training or verification of the name of the instructor(s). The cover page did provided the name of the instructor, Special Agent Edward M. Hendrie, and a revision date of February 2005. The course presented an extensive table of contents and table of authorities. The course was based on extensive case law.

This course introduced participants to the following topic areas: Fourth Amendment; constitutional interpretation; definition of Fourth Amendment search; cartilage; search warrants; relationship between the warrant clause and the reasonableness clause; emergency exceptions to the search warrant requirement; impermissible creation of emergencies; motor vehicle exception; inventory search; search incident to arrest; consent searches; special needs searches and seizures; confessions; Fourth Amendment basis for suppressing statement; voluntariness; Miranda; Sixth Amendment right to counsel; impeachment; The Vienna Convention; Sixth Amendment right to counsel at corporeal lineups; due process challenge to lineup; Title III; and video surveillance. This curriculum was very extensive in terms of content and provided the participant with a very comprehensive presentation of criminal procedures related to drug investigations.

This course was very impressive and an excellent foundation course for the Narcotics Unit's training plan. It should be sequenced after the in-house New Investigator's Course. The curriculum was parallel to the standard operating procedures.

C. Courses for Which No Lesson Plans Were Provided

The Atlanta Police Department's training staff was unable to provide lesson plans or other materials for the following courses:

- Undercover School – Georgia Bureau of Investigations
- Drug Unit Commander Academy – Drug Enforcement Administration
- DEA Basic Investigator's Course – Drug Enforcement Administration
- Bus and Storage Unit Interdiction – High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area
- Drug Tools Course #2 – High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area
- Analytical Investigative Techniques – High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area

Additionally, the Atlanta Police Department's training staff advised that the Narcotics Unit staff attended the course Law Enforcement Training for Safety and Survival, February 10 – 15, 2008. However, only a brochure of the course was provided. A lesson plan, syllabus or attendance roster was not provided for this course.

Table 4: Content of the Training Curricula - Summary

Description of Components	COURSE				
	Legal Issues in Obtaining Valid Consent to Search	Search and Seizure	New Investigator's Course	High Risk Warrants	Criminal Procedure Guide for Drug Agents
Lesson Plan Cover Sheet	Not Included	Not Included	Included (in majority of subtopics)	Included	Not Included
Lesson Plan	Content only	Content only	Varied with subtopics (content provided for all subtopics)	Included	Content only
Syllabus	Not Included	Not Included	Not Included	Not Included	Not Included
Duration	Not Included	Not Included	80 hours	16 hours	Not Included
Terminal Performance Objectives	Not Included	Not Included	Included (in majority of subtopics)	Included	Not Included
Enabling Objectives	Not Included	Not Included	Included (in majority of subtopics)	Included	Not Included
Name of Instructor	Included (on cover page but not verified)	Included (on cover page but not verified)	Included (in majority of subtopics)	Included	Included (on cover page but not verified)
Instructor/ Course Evaluation	Not Included	Not Included	Included (in majority of subtopics)	Included	Not Included
Student Evaluation	Not Included	Not Included	Included (in majority of subtopics)	Not Included	Not Included
Student Handouts	Not Included	Not Included	Included (varied with subtopics)	Not Included	Not Included
Appendix – Description of Scenarios, Case Studies, etc.	Included Scenarios & Discussion Questions	Not Included	Included (varied with subtopics)	Not Included	Not Included
Topics Overview	Scope and Circumstances of Obtaining Valid Consent to Search	Broad presentation of issues of searches and seizures, case law and rules/tests	Twenty-two subtopics that acquaints new investigators to their role and responsibilities.	Techniques for conducting building entries, responsibilities of team members.	Extensive presentation of criminal procedures related specifically to drug investigations

Comments	Course offers an in-depth presentation of consent issues with court cases and practical scenarios. Excellent foundation course.	Course has a broad scope of topics focusing on searches and seizures. Highly valuable for all types of investigators.	Course is valuable for the transfer of personnel into investigative positions. Broad exposure to pertinent department topics.	Course offers 8 hours of classroom and 8 hours of practical application. Highly valuable and critical for all narcotics investigators.	Course is very impressive and an excellent foundation course for the Narcotics Unit's Training Plan.
-----------------	---	---	---	--	--

Table 4: Content of the Training Curricula - Summary (cont'd)

Description of Components	COURSE					
	Undercover School	Drug Unit Commander Academy	DEA Basic Investigator's Course	Bus and Storage Unit Interdiction	Drug Tools Course #2	Analytical Investigative Techniques
Lesson Plan Cover Sheet	Not Provided	Not Provided	Not Provided	Not Provided	Not Provided	Not Provided
Lesson Plan	Not Provided	Not Provided	Not Provided	Not Provided	Not Provided	Not Provided
Syllabus	Not Provided	Not Provided	Not Provided	Not Provided	Not Provided	Not Provided
Duration	Not Provided	Not Provided	Not Provided	Not Provided	Not Provided	Not Provided
Terminal Performance Objectives	Not Provided	Not Provided	Not Provided	Not Provided	Not Provided	Not Provided
Enabling Objectives	Not Provided	Not Provided	Not Provided	Not Provided	Not Provided	Not Provided
Name of Instructor	Not Provided	Not Provided	Not Provided	Not Provided	Not Provided	Not Provided
Instructor/ Course Evaluation	Not Provided	Not Provided	Not Provided	Not Provided	Not Provided	Not Provided
Student Evaluation	Not Provided	Not Provided	Not Provided	Not Provided	Not Provided	Not Provided

Student Handouts	Not Provided					
Appendix- Description of Scenarios, Case Studies, etc.	Not Provided					
Topics Overview	Not Provided					
Comments	No materials provided					

IV. Comparison of the Training with the Standard Operating Procedures

The Atlanta Police Department's Standard Operating Procedures (S.O.P.) were reviewed to identify any possible discrepancies between the delivered training and department policy. The following eight SOPs were submitted to the consultants for review.

- Confidential Sources – S.O.P. 5160 (revision date 7/1/07)

The SOP provides detailed guidelines for the selection, processing, controlling, documentation and payment of confidential informants. The SOP also describes in detail the role of command staff, supervisors and investigators, confidentiality issues, debriefing requirements and records retention for the use of confidential informants.

This SOP parallels the delivered training and also presents more detailed information.

This SOP is an excellent tool for training new staff, and in the future, refreshing veteran staff in the Narcotics Unit. This SOP has been updated in a timely manner.

- Confidential Fund – S.O.P. 5150 (revision date 7/1/07)

This SOP provides detailed guidelines for the authorization, control and expenditure of confidential funds monies used by agency personnel. The role of commanders, supervisors, investigators and auditors, and the process to insure the integrity of the use of confidential funds are clearly illustrated. This SOP also makes reference to the Confidential Sources SOP, thereby, linking the process. Furthermore, the SOP identifies that "Sworn employees that wish to utilize the Confidential Fund must first compete a training seminar as prescribed by the custodians of the fund" (p.3).

This SOP parallels the delivered training in the New Investigators course and also presents more detailed and agency specific information.

Additionally, this SOP is an excellent tool for training both new and veteran staff

members in the Narcotics Unit. This SOP has also been updated in a timely manner.

- Search and Seizure – A.O.P. 3020 (revision date 4/1/07)

This SOP provides detailed guidelines for authorization, obtaining and executing a search warrant and the elements required for a warrantless search. The SOP illustrates when consent is and is not required for a search. The SOP also includes the HIDTA *Deconfliction* notification (notifying other jurisdictions of a narcotics operation), pre-operations briefing, tactical plan and requirements of staff for high-risk entries.

To enhance this SOP, the SOP should detail when an entry team within the Narcotics Unit is used, and what circumstances would exist for the S.W.A.T. team to be utilized for a high-risk entry. Substantial and continuous tactical training should be a priority because of the requirements of this SOP for members of the Narcotics Unit. Additionally, adding the requirement for videotaping the target location of the search warrant, when feasible, would insure that the search warrant is executed at the right location.

A substantial amount of the delivered training focused on searches and seizures.

This SOP represents a condensed version of the training and the SOP is parallel to the training. The SOP has been updated in a timely manner.

- Undercover Operations – S.O.P. 5110 (revision date 4/1/07)

This SOP is very broad and addresses the execution of undercover operations, undercover buys, tactical plan execution, and use of confidential sources, police decoys, and custody of evidence. Due to the broadness of this SOP, the delivered training was not in contradiction.

This SOP was updated on 4/1/07, and subsequently on 7/1/07, with additional information pertaining to the SOP delivered as Roll Call training. These two documents are not parallel in format and do not indicate what parts of the SOP have been revised, added or deleted. It is recommended that the original SOP contain the revisions, and the revisions should be indicated in bold for additions or changes and include a line through any deletions. This would reduce any

potential confusion of the policy or reference to the wrong version of the SOP.

The SOP is very broad and addresses the potential activities of numerous job assignments. The broadness of the SOP mirrors that of a General Order document. The authorized activities of undercover operations performed by the FIT certified officers in the Field Operations Division (patrol) are different from the Narcotics Unit.

This SOP would be clearer if each unit's scope of undercover duties were better defined in the SOP, and the responsibilities of a supervisor, immediate supervisor and investigator were also articulated clearer in the SOP. The SOP noted that whenever possible, a body bug should be worn by the confidential source or investigator. It is therefore imperative that this equipment is available and easily accessible.

- Property and Evidence Control – S.O.P. 6030 (revision date 12/1/07)

This SOP was also very broad and encompasses several diverse areas to include: guidelines for receiving, storing, releasing and disposing of property seized as evidence; property held for safekeeping; procedures for maintaining department-owned property; and guideline for issuing supplies to APD employees.

This SOP needs to be broken into several other SOPs for clarity of responsibilities, procedures and streamlining topics.

This SOP would be very difficult to use as a training tool.

- Appointment to Investigator or Senior Police Officer – S.O.P. 2100 (revision date 10/1/06)

This SOP is very detailed in the selection process for appointment of investigators and senior officers. The selection criteria are well articulated and the post selection training clearly defined. This SOP was last updated on 10/1/06.

It would be beneficial to review and update all SOPs on a yearly basis. If no changes are made, still indicate that the SOP was reviewed and a review date listed.

- Criminal Investigations Division – S.O.P. 5010 (revision date 1/2/06)

This SOP is also very broad and would benefit from being formatted into several SOPs. The topics vary from the structure and components of the Criminal Investigations Division; developing pertinent case information; conducting interviews and interrogations; collection of evidence; preliminary and follow-up investigations; investigative aids – wiretaps, surveillance; background investigations; search and arrest warrants; case screening; and court subpoenas.

The SOP and delivered training were parallel.

- Special Enforcement Section – S.O.P. 5030 (revision date 7/1/04)

This SOP addressed the components of the Special Enforcement Section; and the responsibilities of the supervisory staff and investigators. Sections of the SOP were redundant and addressed in other SOPs. The SOP also covered conducting raid operations. Again, it is imperative that all units involved in raids and entries have substantial and frequent tactical training.

This SOP would benefit from a revision to streamline the information and eliminate redundancy. The SOP was last revised on 7/1/04. The SOP and delivered training were parallel.

The training materials reviewed also referenced APD S.O.P. 3080 – Lineups and APD S.O.P. 2130 – Dress Code. However, these SOPs were not provided to the consultants.

V. Findings and Recommendations

A summary of the principal findings and resulting recommendations developed on the basis of the staff interviews and review of the training materials and related documents provided by the APD is provided below.

A. Principal Findings

It is important to note that the findings listed below are limited to the analysis of only a portion of the training provided to the Narcotics Unit members since the Atlanta Police Department did not provide all of the lesson plans for the attended courses. When additional lesson plans are provided, the consultants will conduct a supplemental analysis.

- Substantial effort has been made by the Atlanta Police Department to revitalize and restore community confidence by restructuring the Narcotic's Unit. This restructuring included increasing the staff size of the Narcotics Unit and transferring new personnel into the Unit. An appropriate span of control was noted.
- The Narcotics Unit had to address the challenges of balancing the community demands for narcotics investigations and suppression, with the need to train an entire unit of new staff members.
- The training of the new investigators proved challenging and labor intensive, since the entire staff had to attend numerous training courses.
- The officers selected for transfer into the Narcotics Unit as investigators had narcotics experience limited to the Field Operations Division (patrol).
- While the intentions and efforts made by the Atlanta Police Department are commendable, the department did not create a written training plan detailing the projected courses required, sequencing the delivery of the courses or the timeline for implementation and completion of the training. A written training plan

enables the department to identify in advance potential training courses. The curricula can be reviewed prior to sending staff to ensure it is quality training and supports the department's standard operating procedures.

- Several lesson plans did not contain a syllabus or lesson plan cover sheet indicating the learning outcomes, course designer, date the course was created and updated, course instructor, duration of the training, evaluation process for the training, key topics or attendees roster with date(s) of the training. Some courses that referenced the existence of appendices did not include the material. Furthermore, some courses had practical's that included scenario-based training; however, there was no documentation providing a description of the scenario(s). This information needs to be collected by the Atlanta Police Department regardless of whether the training was provided externally or internally. Training files for each course should be created with the inclusion of this information, both for projecting training needs for the department and in preparation of any possible litigation.
- The staff members were satisfied with the selection process for investigators. However, some investigators indicated that they did not desire a transfer to the Narcotics Unit, but would serve their two year commitment, and then request a transfer out of the unit. This situation illustrates the need for a training plan for future officers transferred into the Narcotics Unit.
- A common theme articulated by the investigators was their lack of understanding of the mission of the Narcotics Unit. Investigators were unsure if their primary focus should be street level narcotics investigation, narcotics interdiction or long-term strategic narcotics investigation. This lack of understanding may be due to the staff being new; however, clarification and direction by the supervisors is needed to resolve this issue.
- Supervisors expressed the importance of confidential informant training because the confidential informant files needed to be rebuilt.
- The transfer of personnel into the Narcotics Unit occurred in two stages: May 2007 and August 2007. Teams 1 and 2 were transferred in May of 2007, while Teams 3 and 4 were transferred in August of 2007. This resulted in Teams 1 and 2 being more advanced in their training as compared to Teams 3 and 4. Teams 3

and 4 were limited in their investigative duties because of the need for additional required training.

- The job duties and standard operating procedures pertaining to the Narcotics Unit indicated the need for a heavy emphasis on tactical training. The tactical training for entries and raids needs to be substantial and continuous. The Narcotics Unit's four teams need to be cross-trained and have the experience of training with one another. The tactical training needs to be skill-based by designing the training to be hands-on. If the supervisors are provided the appropriate training, having them serve as the instructors would ensure consistency of method and the opportunity to evaluate and enhance the skills of their subordinates.
- The firearms training needs to be interactive and decisionary-based, as opposed to the current static course. Moving targets and "Shoot-Don't Shoot" scenarios would be beneficial.
- Other ancillary issues emerged such as the request for readily accessible surveillance equipment, use of assault rifles for the unit, Nextel cell phones for enhanced communication within the unit and with other agencies, acquisition of an off-site facility for the unit that could be also used for training, greater diversity of undercover vehicles, and the availability of overtime for operations.
- Some standard operating procedures were too broad and encompassed an array of topics. These standard operating procedures were not formatted for use as a strong tool for training.
- The topics presented in the courses that were reviewed by the consultants were relevant, contemporary and job-related. The content in the courses prepared by the Drug Enforcement Agency and the Georgia Bureau of Investigations was impressive. While the New Investigator's course designed by the Atlanta Police Department was broad-based, it provided necessary skills for new investigators.

B. Recommendations

1. Adequacy of Training Provided

Recommendations as to adequacy of the training provided will be made after the consultants are provided all curricula. Curriculum for the following courses still needs to be provided by the Atlanta Police Department:

- Undercover School – Georgia Bureau of Investigations
- Drug Unit Commander Academy – Drug Enforcement Administration
- DEA Basic Investigator’s Course – Drug Enforcement Administration
- Bus and Storage Unit Interdiction – High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area
- Drug Tools Course #2 – High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area
- Analytical Investigative Techniques – High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area

2. Strengthening the Training Records Management System

Based upon this first stage of the training needs assessment (i.e., the Implementation Stage), the consultant’s primary recommendation is for the Atlanta Police Department to strengthen its training records management system. A thorough effort should be made to obtain all curricula from any training attended by staff from the Narcotics Unit, including the above-listed curricula.

Additional recommendations for a training plan and steps for enhancing the training and performance of the Narcotics Unit will be presented in the final report developed at the completion of all three phases of this training needs assessment.