
BACKGROUND AND METHODOLOGY

Together we will build on the legacy and the traditions and the skills We will take that most famous shield, the most famous badge in the world—and whatever little . . . tarnish exists, it will be wiped clean, and it will be the most brilliantly shining badge of any in the United States.

William J. Bratton,
upon his appointment to position of Chief of
Police of the Los Angeles Police Department,
October 28, 2002

Half a century ago, the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD, or “the Department”) and its version of professionalism were models for police agencies worldwide. Law enforcement and the concept of police professionalism have since changed. So, too, via several significant events, has the reputation of the LAPD.

The change in the standing of the Department was confirmed by the *United States of America v. City of Los Angeles, California, Board of Police Commissioners of the City of Los Angeles, and the Los Angeles Police Department Consent Decree of June 15, 2001* (the “consent decree”). This wide-ranging document mandates the implementation of many changes across the LAPD. Paragraph 133 of that document, that portion of concern to this study, requires that

Within 18 months of the effective date of this Agreement the Department shall audit police officer and supervisory officer training, using independent consultants who have substantial experience in

the area of police training. The audit shall assess: ways in which LAPD training could be improved (i) to reduce incidents of excessive use of force, false arrests, and illegal searches and seizures and (ii) by making greater use of community-oriented policing training models that take into account factors including paragraph 117(c).

The factors cited in paragraph 117(c) are

cultural diversity, which shall include training on interactions with persons of different races, ethnicities, religious groups, sexual orientations, persons of the opposite sex, and persons with disabilities, and also community policing.¹

Succinctly, the mandate is to scrutinize Department police training in five areas: use of force, search and seizure, arrest, community policing, and diversity.

Numerous commissions and work groups have examined LAPD training over the last decade.² Some of the better known include the work of the Christopher Commission and the Rampart Independent Review Board. These many sources have provided several hundred recommendations pertinent to LAPD training. Many are unique. Some are contradictory. Others are repetitive. Still others are no longer needed or valid.

Our book is therefore merely the latest of numerous evaluations of Department training, all of which have similarly sought to improve the education provided to Los Angeles police. Many of our observations are very similar to those raised previously by the Christopher, Rampart, and other undertakings.³ It is likely that any further efforts will yield similar results until identified shortcomings are remedied.

We took two deliberate steps in an effort to make our contribution as valuable and pertinent as possible. First, we deliberately chose not to review in-depth the conclusions of other studies until after developing our own findings and recommendations. Second, because

¹The consent decree, 2001, pp. 55, 61.

²Robin Greene, Director of Police Training, LAPD, interview by Barbara R. Panitch, February 10, 2003.

³These are mentioned in several cases identified in the pages that follow.

many LAPD problems are systemic in nature and require solutions at a fundamental level, we identify the most common shortfalls, explain their character, and provide a single unifying concept that the LAPD should incorporate in addressing them. That theme is professionalism. This concept provides a way of taking many seemingly separate issues and linking them in a logically comprehensible whole.

SETTING THE CONTEXT

The training problems facing the LAPD are not entirely unique. National case studies indicate that other law enforcement agencies regularly wrestle with the same or similar issues. It is also important to acknowledge the concerted and genuine efforts of many members of the LAPD, city government, and citizens of Los Angeles to improve their police agency. Many have the will to improve. It is necessary to identify and pursue the best way to do so.

Los Angeles benefits from a heterogeneous and dynamic character that adds vibrancy to its economic and cultural life. It also explains why the city confronts many issues previously seen only internationally and why Los Angeles experiences many law enforcement challenges before the rest of the country does. The unique character of the city gives the LAPD the opportunity, and responsibility, to be a leader in policing and to develop ethical, legal, and innovative responses to these emerging needs. It also puts it in a position to establish examples for other major domestic and international departments. As a world class city, Los Angeles can also benefit by learning lessons from others. Fifty years ago, many people thought that the LAPD could solve all of its problems from within. Today the Department must understand that it has as much to learn from outside as it has to offer. Our findings and recommendations draw on innovations and lessons learned elsewhere, both from inside and outside the law enforcement community.

THE FOUNDATION'S CORNERSTONE: A COHERENT APPROACH TO IMPROVEMENT

The Los Angeles Police Department Training Group labors under a myriad of proposals and recommendations, now including those that will follow here. It is critical that an organizing principle and

leadership vision guide implementation in order to introduce coherency and consistency in training messages. We found this organizing principle heretofore lacking. Initial classroom observations indicated an absence of a unifying theme for officer development. Focus group sessions with probationers, field training officers, and other personnel corroborated this finding. Finally, individual interviews pointed to a struggle in developing a consistent leadership vision for Department officers (partly, and understandably, due to administration changes). That the LAPD does not successfully communicate a unified message creates a dangerous vacuum that individual officers fill with their own interpretations of proper behavior. While the consent decree itself acknowledges that the great majority of officers conduct themselves in a manner that community and Department norms would deem appropriate, some officers do not. The consent decree recognizes the need for the LAPD to better instill integrity throughout the department. A clearly, consistently articulated unifying professional ethic will help considerably in meeting these aims. Chapter Two provides an overview of modern police professionalism. This concept has three fundamental tenets. Chapters Three, Four, and Five provide analyses of the tenets' application to LAPD training in the areas of use of force, search and seizure, arrest procedures, community policing, and diversity awareness.

Chapter Two: Law Enforcement Professionalism and the LAPD

The concept of police professionalism evolved throughout the twentieth century. In its earlier years, policing was based on a "political model" in which officers were assigned to neighborhoods and grew intimately familiar with their "beats." Decisions about police services for a community were made by political bosses.⁴ Policing during this period was characterized by overwhelming political influence and, too often, corruption.

The subsequent so-called "professional" era of policing was a direct response to this political control and manipulation of city law enforcement agencies. Reforms included outfitting police officers in

⁴Seattle Police Department, 1996.

readily identifiable uniforms. Departments took advantage of the increased availability of cars and assigned more officers to vehicle patrol, in part because they were thereby easier to supervise. Standards of conduct were instituted, including the International Association of Chiefs of Police Law Enforcement Code of Ethics that was considered one of the greatest accomplishments of that era.⁵ The code specified a standard for ethical and legal police conduct. Paramilitary command and control structures became prevalent. Officers were educated to do as they were told and not question authority.

Police analyst George Kelling believes it is more appropriate to characterize this period as one of “reform” rather than professional policing.⁶ It created many new problems even as it addressed many of those from the political era. Critics claim that the reform model created professionally remote, internally oriented, legalistic, formalized, and rigid police departments in the efforts to prove integrity and efficiency. The Los Angeles Police Department became the epitome of this “professional” model, its officers emblematic of the police experts who demanded “just the facts.”

The civil unrest of the late 1960s accented these shortcomings in the reform model. Police in the political era had often been too involved with community politics. Now they were frequently too removed from the society they were to serve. Departments did not reflect the racial mix of the communities they served. Police might have been technically proficient but they too often lacked requisite communications skills. Officers often had problems communicating effectively with the diverse elements of American society.⁷

Efforts at reform gradually shifted to community policing approaches. The basic strategy was one of partnership with those served and included goals of identifying and solving problems mutually recognized as important.

It is the spirit of August Vollmer’s professionalism (see Kelling and Coles, 1996, p. 75) that underlies this shift and the concept of profes-

⁵Ibid.

⁶Kelling and Coles, 1996, p. 75.

⁷Fyfe et al., 1997, p. 16. This dichotomy of competence continues to affect policing today.

sionalism as it is presented in the pages that follow. His tenets of serving a higher purpose, rigorous education for officers, broad police discretion, and collegial control are similar to the universal concept of professionalism described by Samuel Huntington and recognized in many vocations.

Chapter Three: Corporateness

Corporateness is the first considered of the three components that define professionalism. Corporateness involves instilling an understanding of professional duty and building a minimum level of expertise in an individual before he is admitted to the profession. It thereafter demands collectively maintaining established standards of performance. Implementation of the concepts underlying corporateness takes many forms. In Chapter Three, we focus on three critical aspects of training necessary to instilling and maintaining a sense of corporateness: (1) using lessons learned for sustaining expertise, (2) creating and maintaining quality instruction, and (3) developing structures and procedures to obtain the maximum potential from police training.

Chapter Four: The Police Responsibility to Community-Oriented Policing in a Diverse Society

Responsibility is the next tenet of professionalism receiving attention. It requires that the officer have an understanding of duty that is greater than service to oneself. The client of every profession is society. The police officer performs a service for the greater good much as doctors sustain public health, lawyers defend individual rights, and military personnel protect their citizenry. Such service to society implies that the professional police officer understands the social context in which he works.

Today this notion of service requires a community policing approach that recognizes social diversity. Every modern metropolitan area is a palette of rich demographic differences. The concepts underlying community policing and diversity awareness must therefore pervade the entire organization, including its training functions. This chapter details the need to integrate elements of community-oriented policing and diversity awareness models throughout training.

While corporateness addresses organizational *systems* and *procedures* that must support officer training, responsibility speaks more to the policing *philosophy* that a department chooses to advance. The systems of corporateness act to establish and maintain the philosophy of responsibility. Both systems and philosophy rely on the unique expertise that police officers provide to their clients.

Chapter Five: Developing Police Expertise

Expertise constitutes the third pillar of professionalism considered. Training develops and constantly hones the unique skills of a profession. While the LAPD Training Group is primarily responsible for formally developing the skills and expertise of Los Angeles officers, every leader and officer must unceasingly work to better himself and his colleagues as public servants. Department training in turn should not only help recruits become officers, but also constantly educate police at every echelon beyond their graduation from the academy.

As noted, we reviewed LAPD training in five subject areas: use of force, search and seizure, arrest procedures, community policing, and diversity awareness. We quickly realized that to fulfill the intent of the consent decree we could not treat these as separate entities. Nor can training treat them as independent, as they are inextricably interconnected parts of service on the streets. The five subject areas constitute a core set of skills that an ethical and effective police officer will regularly employ in combination. Our overriding recommendation in this area is that the LAPD training curriculum be integrated in a way that allows officers to realistically practice using all relevant skills and knowledge needed for effective police work, thus meeting current standards of excellence. Training in these areas cannot be effective if it simply entails a given number of stand-alone hours covering each of the five areas.

Expertise in these five areas demands more than physical adeptness. The professional officer is proficient in both technical skills (e.g., weapons proficiency, physical arrest procedures, and other topics frequently labeled as “tactical”) and communication skills. The LAPD has a long history of excellence in technical proficiency, but our analysis indicates that most officers need more training in interpersonal and verbal communication skills than they currently re-

ceive. During interviews with Mayor James K. Hahn, Los Angeles City Council Public Safety Chair Cindy Miscikowski, members of the police commission, and community representatives, we repeatedly heard expressions of strong interest in greater interpersonal skills training for officers, especially those skills essential for deescalating conflicts. Effective communication is no less a vital “tactical” skill than are those related to weapons employment, expert driving, or other “hard” technical abilities. Good police officers are as skilled in communications as they are in “physical tactics.” Police are frequently in the business of convincing people to do what they otherwise would not be inclined to do.⁸ Officers must be adept at addressing all those in the “communication continuum,” individuals ranging from those with whom they must work to resolve immediate issues to representatives of the mass media who will report or interpret their actions.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND DATA ANALYSIS

In this section we detail the study methodology, describing the data collection processes as well as the analysis undertaken. The project team included RAND researchers, a community outreach consultant, and an expert panel of five police practitioners (see Appendix A). The RAND team contributed expertise in research design and the fields of law enforcement, education and training, operations research, sociology, psychology, and organizational behavior. The community outreach consultant added significant local knowledge regarding the history of police-community relations in Los Angeles and provided contacts with important community leaders and elected officials. The expert panel shared from their extensive experience in policing throughout the process. The panelists participated in problem analysis, debated alternative solutions to training problems, and reviewed project materials.

The research team used a variety of methods to collect data for this effort. Most of the analysis was based on qualitative data, which was gathered from the following sources:

⁸Ibid.

- literature reviews in the areas of adult and police education, policing, use of force, search and seizure, arrest procedures, community policing, and diversity awareness
- a case study survey of best practices in the field of policing, both domestic and international
- a review of written course documents, Department policies, and protocols
- observations of training instruction sessions
- focus group sessions with police department personnel
- interviews with police managers, elected officials, and community members.

The authors engaged in a process called “theory building through case analysis.”⁹ Such a process is used when there is no existing theory that sufficiently covers all aspects of the field under consideration. Our examination included police training, law enforcement operations, legal and community standards, and the specific mandates of the consent decree. There was no single applicable overarching theory. Thus, we engaged in theory building through our data collection and analytical efforts. Theory building is an iterative process: Gather data, examine data, develop a theory that appears to fit the data, and then validate and refine the theory through further data gathering and analysis. In this process, data collection and analysis are interwoven procedures.¹⁰ Field testing of the recommendations made herein was not possible given study time constraints.

The activities inherent in the analysis that underlies this study were as follows.

Literature Reviews

The research team reviewed academic and practitioner literature in the areas of adult and police education, policing, use of force, search

⁹Eisenhardt, 1989, p. 532.

¹⁰Strauss and Corbin, 1990, p. 280.

and seizure, arrest procedures, community policing, and diversity awareness. Results from the literature reviews informed the development of the curriculum assessment instrument (Appendix B), and laid an important foundation for understanding the data collected at the LAPD. Together with the case studies, the literature reviews established that valuable material in specific subject areas exists, but that there are two fundamental gaps in the knowledge base of the field. One is the failure to meaningfully measure outcomes from police training. It is behavioral outcomes—actions of officers in the field—that are ultimately of interest to police educators. Yet work in this area is in its early stages. It cannot be said with certainty what kind of training works best for police. We are instead required to extrapolate from more general educational sources as well as to gather knowledge from related disciplines, such as the military.

Case Studies

The second fundamental gap in knowledge in the field was highlighted by both literature reviews and case studies. These two tools were used to survey the state of the art in policing. Sources indicated that breaking the study's topic areas into isolated parts is unsatisfactory. There is excellent writing on specific subject areas, for example in the area of use of force. Generally speaking, however, each topic is handled discretely and is not tied to other topics and, further, not tied to training. There are some exceptions, but the comprehensive attempt that this study represents is among the first of its kind.

Yet respondents in the case study interviews made clear the integrated nature of the research areas and demonstrated how the relevant issues are interwoven throughout police operations. For instance, when discussing use-of-force training, sources inevitably moved to discussion of review boards, risk management, and public perception, indicating that it is artificial to speak strictly of training. We were left in the gap between segmented literature and the reality of police operations, which is that all these issues are at play all the time. To continue in a segmented fashion, making audit-type recommendations, seemed to us to add only marginal value and perhaps even detract from the reform efforts of the Department, tying it to soon-to-be-obsolete and ill-fitting mandates.

Instead, this paradox of overly discrete versus overly holistic approaches seemed to demand an organizing principle. An organizing principle speaks not to a goal (for instance of crime control), it speaks to how that goal will be achieved. It provides operating rules. Small, seemingly insignificant decisions can be as readily guided by the principle as macro-level, comprehensive-change initiatives are. It distills the essence of not what a police officer is, but who he is, both as part of the organization and on an individual level, thereby allowing for coherent decisionmaking in any range of situations.

To identify the initial list of case study agencies, we used literature reviews, personal knowledge of researchers, and recommendations by the expert panel members. Police agencies in 20 jurisdictions were evaluated for the applicability of their experiences to the challenges confronting the LAPD. The thirteen sites ultimately selected for in-depth review were metropolitan areas with particularly relevant lessons for use of force, search and seizure, arrest procedures, community policing, and diversity awareness (see Appendix J).

Written Curriculum Review and Classroom Observation

Simultaneous to the early work of the literature reviews and case study interviews, we began our foray into the classrooms and written materials of the LAPD. What we saw quickly corroborated our preliminary sense of a missing piece. Individual instructors and individual courses carefully described specific, technical matters. Yet, confusion in classroom discussions was evident. Students were having difficulty understanding how each segment related to another, much less how to apply them to a real-life situation. Fortunately, this was not true across the board. Some curricula and instructors deliberately interwove material and demanded synthesis and judgments from students. Yet, in general, there were important gaps between classroom learning and application in the field and transfer of skills across subject areas.

Adding to this issue, many instructors discussed their own philosophy or experiences rather than offering guides by which an LAPD officer should make a decision (e.g., “LAPD officers are public servants” or “the LAPD leadership does not feel that the ends justify the means”—how would these values guide daily work?). Some form of ethos was certainly being transmitted, but it often varied among

instructors and courses. These inconsistencies seemed to support a culture of individual decisionmaking, a culture that could, at its crudest level, pose a liability problem for the Department.

The corroborated findings from these various sources gave rise to the overarching recommendation: The LAPD should adopt a new concept of professionalism in order to

- provide a construct that lends coherency to its training
- establish a basis for police officer standards of performance and conduct.

The classroom observations and written curriculum review provided a rich source of data for more specific recommendations as well. Our review of LAPD written materials included recruit academy courses in the five areas of interest as well as those covering the topics of ethics, professionalism, and LAPD history (see Appendixes E and F). Reviews of material pertaining to continuing education training (also called in-service training) again included the five areas noted in the consent decree, as did our reviews of the Continuing Education Delivery Plan (CEDP), values, ethics, supervision, instructor development, and field training. Examination of roll-call training also focused on the five consent decree areas. Finally, the research team reviewed the LAPD manual, Department policies, management papers, training bulletins, and various review board reports and findings for relevant insights. Written material and classroom observation data were entered into an Access database for purposes of analysis of summary statistics.

Classroom observations were a critical source of data. We observed 50 percent of the courses for which we conducted written material reviews. The classes observed were selected based on relevance to the topics of consent decree interest and “snowball sampling” (i.e., questions and insights from initial observations precipitated reviews of additional courses). Together this entailed observations of 25 courses at an average observation length of more than two hours per class. Here again the assessment instrument was used to examine courses, and data were entered into the Access database. Table 1.1 summarizes classroom observations as a percentage of the written materials reviewed in each primary category.

Table 1.1
Classroom Observations As a Percentage of the
Written Materials Reviewed

Classroom Observation Categories	Observations ^a
Recruit	44%
Continuing education	73%
Command staff	100%
Roll call	12%

^aObservations are a percentage of written materials reviewed (i.e., the number of courses observed divided by the number of courses for which written materials were reviewed).

NOTES: Twenty-five courses were observed. The average observation length was over two hours, adding up to more than 50 hours of classroom observation.

The computer database allowed us to tally summary statistics about such items as types of teaching techniques used in a course. However, most of our data was qualitative, that is, things that cannot be counted. We therefore supplemented the brief statistical analysis with the in-depth process of theory building described above. We laid the groundwork for the theory building through an intermediary analysis of our course reviews, both written and observed. Appendix L summarizes major findings from this portion of our work. It is derived from the categories of inquiry in the assessment instrument. The categories common across topic areas included

- stated class objectives
- instructional style
- learning setting
- written curriculum quality
- adequacy of resources.

The reviews and observations further investigated the following specific elements of course content

- performance expectations
- individual accountability/responsibility
- integration of Department values/context/policies/mandates

- incorporation of a police professional ethic
- use of the professional ethic to establish context during training
- incorporation of community policing and diversity
- use of community policing/diversity to establish context
- tactical skills
- legal standards and definitions
- coverage of current topic-specific issues (e.g., changing demographics in Los Angeles)
- use of decisionmaking models appropriate to the topic (e.g., the use-of-force continuum)
- supervisor accountability/responsibility.

Police Focus Groups

Focus groups help to explore why people feel a certain way and provide insights into seemingly conflicting opinions, adding richness to other data collection efforts.¹¹ In the late fall of 2002, we held focus groups sessions with a total of 35 participants. We stratified these groups by function and rank. The facilitators worked from customized scripts that were adapted from the individual interview instrument. (See Appendix D.) We paired a note taker with a facilitator in each session and attempted to safeguard participants by assuring them that comments made in the session would not be attributed to individuals, but only to groups.

It is important to introduce a caveat for our focus group findings. First, the focus group sample was small in comparison to the size of the Department. Second, it was not selected randomly, as a result of causes beyond the researchers' control. We therefore cannot legitimately generalize findings from this group to the broader population of officers. We instead limited ourselves to drawing reasonable inferences and insights.

¹¹Unpublished RAND research by Margaret C. Harrell, on selective qualitative research methods.

Focus group discussions were used to gather data. Each group focused on a different aspect of the training process (see Table 1.2):

- Training coordinators discussed in-service instruction and the tension between demands for centralized and decentralized training.
- Senior lead officers described community policing training and its implementation within the Department.
- Training group sergeants and lieutenants provided insights on the adequacy and effectiveness of current training methods, curriculum development, and instructor delivery.
- Probationers (officers with less than one year since academy graduation) described their perceptions of classroom and field training, effectiveness of instructors, and their level of preparation upon leaving the academy.
- Field training officers (FTOs) also discussed the distinctions between classroom and field training, levels of effectiveness among FTOs, and FTO training needs.

Interviews

Our final method of data collection was a series of individual interviews with police managers, elected officials, and community members (interviewees are listed in Appendix C). We conducted 25 of these interviews throughout the fall of 2002. The interviews were semi-structured. That is, we had an interview guide that was adapted to suit each situation. Conversations were not limited to the questions listed in Appendix D. The guide was pilot tested for inter-rater reliability (to determine whether interviewers asked questions in a consistent manner). Individuals who desired confidentiality were assured it.

Interviewees were selected for their expert knowledge and opinion. Individuals were identified by the research team, and none of the interviews was mandatory. Respondents were identified as key to this study by virtue of their positions in the community, city government,

Table 1.2
LAPD Focus Groups

Focus Group	Area of Interest	Major Themes
Training coordinators	Training delivery for in-service curriculum; centralized and decentralized needs	<p>Not routinely asked for input on what is used for training or how it's delivered.</p> <p>Not asked about divisional needs for training.</p> <p>Asked to do many different tasks beyond “real” responsibilities.</p> <p>Were not handling such issues as 4th Amendment (search), false arrest, and use of force well when decentralized—could see need for centralizing training in these areas.</p> <p>In roll calls, think the training scenario should be acted out instead of just read.</p>
Senior lead officers	Training for community-oriented policing (CP) and quality of life concerns; adequacy and effectiveness of field and in-service training	<p>Only officers serve in community policing capacity.</p> <p>Think that the Department should emphasize CP to patrol officers.</p> <p>Believe that every captain runs division differently.</p> <p>May be pulled off CP to handle other duties.</p> <p>Taught CP and problem solving by their peers, not taught formally.</p> <p>Felt common in LAPD to be put on job without experience or training.</p>
Training group sergeants and lieutenants	Adequacy and effectiveness of current training methods; curriculum development and delivery	<p>Have added “drop-in” scenarios on all five recommended areas to recruit training.</p> <p>Think that each police officer 3 (senior) should spend one year as a field training officer (FTO) before being eligible to “go inside.”</p> <p>Think that people should be moved through the training group—too many make a career of it.</p> <p>Like the British model—police do no classroom work, all scenario.</p> <p>Think the ride-along period should be extended to a month.</p>

Table 1.2—Continued

Focus Group	Area of Interest	Major Themes
Probationers	Classroom versus field training; levels of effectiveness among instructors; level of preparation upon leaving academy	<p>Disappointed with the lack of rigor in the training program at the academy, expected it to be harder than it was.</p> <p>Believe there is a “war out there” and wanted to be trained for it.</p> <p>Wanted more realistic and tougher training to “weed out” the weak or unsafe.</p> <p>Recommended ride-alongs earlier in process to give a better idea of what police work is like.</p> <p>Did not feel they left the academy with an LAPD “culture.”</p> <p>Told by FTOs to forget the academy training—real training starts in the field.</p>
Field training officers	Classroom versus field training; levels of effectiveness among FTOs; training needs of FTOs	<p>Think that recruits do not receive enough training in real-life situations.</p> <p>Believe training should be more reflective of what is faced in the field.</p> <p>Believe that tactics training is still good but is affected by liability concerns; officer safety can be compromised (officers more likely to get hit first).</p> <p>See a disconnect between the FTO program and academy training—do not know what is being taught; have to ask recruits what they learned.</p> <p>Since FTO training only occurred once, no clear message heard yet from the Department on the role of the FTO.</p>

and the LAPD. Additionally, throughout our work, in interviews, focus groups, and classroom observation, the research team made an effort to include individuals of diverse backgrounds.

Interview and focus group data were both analyzed. Interviews, used predominantly for background information, were summarized. Focus groups, used for data gathering, were informally coded to identify major themes and areas of convergence or discord.

Recommendations

As described above, theory building is an iterative process. In this study, RAND was able to complete all the steps of theory building except for the testing of the model. This is an important step, and its omission is not insignificant. As researchers, we hope for the opportunity to complete the process. However, we necessarily limited our inquiry because of external constraints. We are also assured that the models we used are based on theories grounded in the training and education fields.

This process of analysis led to identification of findings and recommendations. Above, we addressed the genesis of the overarching theme of a redefined professionalism. We similarly derived the primary recommendations (as well as the supporting recommendations) from shortfalls identified during our data collection and analysis. At least three data sources pointed to each of the primary recommendations. Generally, the expertise that team members brought to the project together with all data sources established each piece of evidence.

A brief note on each of the five primary recommendations follows. (See Appendix M for a complete list of our primary and supporting recommendations.)

Establish an LAPD Lessons-Learned Program

This recommendation derives from heterogeneous sources within and outside of the LAPD. Many businesses today have learned the value of becoming learning organizations and of developing strong

knowledge management capabilities.¹² LAPD officials note that structural and cultural divisions among various units of the Department sometimes prevent the timely flow of information from the field to training and the reverse. Further, risk management and liability concerns support the need for a concrete effort to learn from previous actions.

Introduce and Maintain Consistently High Quality Throughout Every Aspect of LAPD Training

This finding addresses curriculum development, instructor quality, and assessment of learning. While the LAPD has undertaken training reform and has instituted some quality control initiatives, inconsistency of quality across curricula and instructors remains. The data that lead to this conclusion include classroom observation, document review, interviews with police personnel, and focus group responses.

Each reviewer of curriculum and observer of class sessions noted the inconsistency of training in his field notes. While there are individual examples of excellence, the inconsistencies were discovered across recruit, in-service, and management training, as well as across subject areas, indicating a need for improved overall quality control. Finally, this finding was also identified more than ten years ago in the Christopher Commission report. The LAPD continues to attempt to sufficiently revise its training protocols.

Restructure the LAPD Training Group to Allow the Centralization of Planning; Instructor Qualification, Evaluation, and Learning Retention; and More Efficient Use of Resources

This finding arose predominantly through identification by mid- and senior-level leadership in the LAPD. RAND was asked to suggest ways in which the training group might reorganize its functions so as to work more effectively. The request was bolstered by results from the focus groups as well as field observations about the nature and

¹²See work by Peter Senge and Jeffrey Pfeffer.

structure of the various training functions. Specifically, the division between recruit and in-service training functions, the unclear role and chain of command of training coordinators, and the manner in which roll-call curriculum was developed and delivered were all major points noted by interview respondents as well as researcher observation.

Integrate Elements of Community-Oriented Policing and Diversity Awareness Training Models Throughout LAPD Training

The isolated, segregated nature of community policing training was apparent from every data source. Elected officials and community members expressed desires to see more meaningful community engagement and partnership. Meanwhile, many Department personnel struggled to define what community policing is, much less to provide examples of how it is implemented. Case studies and literature reviews underlined that community policing is a department-wide endeavor. It is not a discrete task during the activity of policing and, therefore, cannot be handled as a discrete part of training.

Develop Training on Use of Force, Search and Seizure, and Arrest Procedures That Meets Current Standards of Excellence

This recommendation was heavily informed by curriculum review, classroom observation, and focus group responses. Some courses in these areas follow best practices in learning principles and some do not. Current training in these areas ranges from high quality to that needing substantial improvement, as understood by training experts, students of the courses, and community members and elected officials who see the translation to behavior in the field. While we did not measure student outcomes (how much officers learned and how they applied that learning in the field), classroom observations and focus group/interview responses indicated that students were not grasping the underlying principles of use of force, search and seizure, and arrest policies, or the interrelatedness of these three topic areas together and with community policing and diversity awareness.

NOTES

The authors ask readers to note the following four issues:

- *Gender pronouns.* We have chosen to use the male pronoun to avoid complicated and grammatically incorrect alternatives to gender specificity. We encourage the reader to see these notations as inclusive of individuals of both sexes, whether among LAPD officers or Los Angeles community members. The use of the male pronoun is not intended to imply that policing is a male profession.
- *Policing/law enforcement.* We understand that “policing” and “law enforcement” are not synonyms. We are keenly aware that the work of police officers is greater than simply enforcing the law. We have nonetheless chosen to use the terms interchangeably to avoid bludgeoning readers with overuse of either term.
- *Training/education.* We also acknowledge that “training” and “education” are not synonymous. Some in the field of professional development feel that the term “training” is limiting and is perhaps not appropriate when applied to human development. Others counter that training is more encompassing and involves greater internalization than does the concept of “education.” The term “training” is substantially used in police work and is a well understood and accepted term. Good training includes education; education of police officers includes training. We use these terms interchangeably.
- *Access.* Finally, we make an administrative note: Throughout all of our data collection efforts, LAPD personnel provided complete access to individuals, groups, classrooms, and precincts. We experienced no resistance to our requests.