An Evaluation of The Florida Criminal Justice Executive Institute Senior Leadership Program

Michael D. Brick

Abstract

This is the report of a level three, macro-evaluation, of the first three sessions of a senior management level criminal justice training program which is conducted by the Florida Criminal Justice Executive Institute. It was done to determine if the program is attaining its stated goals and providing the intended service to the graduates and the agencies which send them to the program. The necessary data were collected using questionnaires of all enrollees and supervisors who had observed the workplace behaviors of each graduate before and after completion of the program. This study found that the program is generally meeting its goals, and does in the opinion of those who observe the post graduation improvement in work behavior of the program's graduates, provide a useful service. A number of weaknesses were discovered, and recommendations for improvement are made.

Introduction

The purpose of this research project was to evaluate the effectiveness of the eighteen month long management level training course known as The Senior Leadership Program (SLP) at the Criminal Justice Executive Institute. The study was conducted to determine if the program is attaining its stated goals, and providing a useful service to the law enforcement and corrections professionals who have completed the training, and the agencies which nominate them.

Background

"In November 1988, three sheriffs, three chiefs of police and the Commissioner of FDLE (Florida Department of Law Enforcement) met as a committee to study the lack of meaningful law enforcement executive leadership training in Florida"[1]. Since that first meeting, the group that became a Policy Board grew to include the Florida Secretary of Corrections, a representative of the state Law Enforcement Chiefs' Association, a local corrections official, and a representative of the Florida Department of Education. This group, which was chaired by Ocala Police Chief Lee McGehee, met on numerous occasions and developed and published a concept paper on law enforcement executive level training then available in Florida, and planned for such training in the future.

The Policy Board, found that Florida offered, "no continuing education effort for criminal justice executives, and there is little formal effort to prepare future executives for criminal justice service".[2] The Board learned that there were numerous, stand alone training programs for middle and senior managers through out the state, but no

---

[1] "Senior Leadership Course", a brochure published by the Florida Criminal Justice Executive Institute, undated, page 1.

[2] A. Lee McGehee, Chief of Police Ocala, and Dr. James Sewell, Chief of Police, Gulfport, Florida, (1989) "The Florida Criminal Justice Executive Institute: A Concept for the Future", published by FDLE

standardized or comprehensive course of study similar to the FBI's National Academy, the University of Kentucky's Southern Police Institute, or the California Peace Officer Standards and Training (P.O.S.T.) Command College. This board of senior criminal justice executives felt that there was a need to develop such training in the state of Florida, and on October 26, 1989 Chairman McGehee reported their concept to Florida's Criminal Justice Standards and Training Commission. The concept envisioned a Criminal Justice Executive Institute which would become responsible for the development of an integrated management training program, executive seminars, and short courses as well. According to the Policy Board, the Institute was to become a "center for learning, where the best of criminal justice instruction and management could join together to prepare and shape Florida's criminal justice system of the future,...would be an independent center for executive education and as a consequence, (be) separate and distinct from any existing criminal justice facility,...at a central location in the state near both major airports and highways."[3] "This concept was unanimously approved by the Commission as the blueprint for Executive training in the future."[4]

The 1990 Florida Legislature soon after recognized the need for such a multifaceted approach to the education and training of criminal justice executives, and it enacted HB 2611, which formally created the Florida Criminal Justice Executive Institute within the Florida Department of Law Enforcement and required its affiliation with the Florida university system. A component of the Criminal Justice Executive Institute which came to be known as the Senior Leadership Program, and was patterned closely after the California Command College, soon emerged and had as its primary goals:

> *The goal of the Florida Criminal Justice Executive Institute, Senior Leadership Course, is to advance criminal justice professionalism by providing the means for criminal justice leadership to further define is purpose, values, and goals. A major emphasis is on facilitating excellence in leadership and fostering the ability to influence and manage change. Through this process, the Florida Criminal Justice Executive Institute, Senior Leadership Course, fosters the development of a network of future-oriented criminal justice leaders in Florida.*
>
> *After completion of Florida Criminal Justice Executive Institute, Senior Leadership Course, the participants will:*
>
> *1. Recognize the relevance of futures studies to anticipate and manage the future;*
> *2. Possess an overview of past and current methods to anticipate and influence the futures in both general and criminal justice specific instances;*

---

[3] IBID.
[4] IBID.

3. *Be able to select tools and identify sources of information and conduct analysis and evaluation in anticipating and shaping the future;*
4. *Be aware of emerging issues that influence the shape of the future of criminal justice in Florida;*
5. *Develop greater organizational effectiveness;*
6. *Develop a network of futures-oriented leaders.*[5]

Like its closest predecessor, the California Command College, this training program was designed to have mid-level, Florida criminal justice executives, who were interested in attending the program, make application and successfully compete for enrollment in a screening and selection process. The process was designed to become very selective, and the attendees at the first session would be hand picked by the members of the Policy Board.

Each session of SLP consists of ten weeks of classes, held on the basis of one week, every other month, over an eighteen month period, and requires that among other assignments, each student has to complete a research project, then write and defend a paper. Academic credit has been sought, and has now been approved through the Florida State University.

The Charter Session of the Senior Leadership Program (SLP) began on July 19, 1991 with an initial enrollment of twenty-four, (24), students, and graduated twenty students on January 15, 1993. The second session began on June 29, 1993 with an enrollment of twenty-three and graduated twenty-one students on December 2, 1993. Session III, of which the author is a member, began on June 10, 1993 with twenty-five students and is expected to graduate nineteen students on January 27, 1995.

All sessions of the Senior Leadership Program have been held at the training facility within the headquarters building of the Florida Department of Law Enforcement in Tallahassee, Florida. Students who did not reside in Tallahassee were encouraged but not required to stay at the Cabot Lodge, a bed and breakfast style motel which has facilities and amenities which encourage the students to network in the evening at its free happy hour.

Need for Training Evaluation

Now that two sessions of the Senior Leadership Program are completed and the third is very close to graduation, an evaluation of the program is in order, to objectively determine how effective Senior Leadership has been in the past and how the program can be improved in the future.

According to Ronald R. Sims (1993), Associate Professor of Business Administration at the College of William and Mary, "The training process is not complete until and unless evaluation has taken place, for it is evaluation which informs training and gives it meaning."[6] Hamblin, (1970) defines evaluation of training as "any attempt to obtain information, (feedback), on the effects of a training program, and to assess the value of

---

[5] Florida Criminal Justice Executive Institute Course Announcement, page 12.
[6] Ronald R. Sims, (1993), "Evaluating Public Sector Training Programs", Public Personnel Management, Vol 22, No. 4, page 591.

the training in the light of that information...Evaluation tries to answer the question: did training work, and if not why not."[7]   Sims (1993) reported that the "lack of training program evaluation is even more evident in the public sector, and is possibly the least developed aspect of the training process in public agencies"..."Yet it is arguably the most important."[8]

Review of Literature

D. L. Kirkpatrick appears to be the leading expert in the field of training evaluation, and most sources refer back to his writings over the past twenty-five years. Kirkpatrick, according to his numerous adherents, teaches that there are four levels of training program evaluation, each measuring different outcomes. Most evaluations done during or immediately after the program, only measure the students' reaction to the program itself, and do not attempt to determine if the training later appears in the workplace as improved behaviors in terms of job performance.

According to Carolyn Ban and Sue Faerman (1991), "Training evaluation is generally seen as having four possible levels: evaluation of trainees' reactions, learning, individual behavior, and organizational results (Kirkpatrick, 1976)".[9]   In Chapter twenty-six of the book, How To Be An Effective Trainer, by Barry J. Smith and Brian L. Delahaye (1989), of the Queensland Institute of Technology, the authors report that in his book, A Practical Guide to Supervisory Training and Development, Kirkpatrick identifies four areas in which training outcomes can be measured: reaction, learning, behavior, and results. Smith and Delahaye reported that evaluating only students' reactions and learning are of comparatively little value and do not assure that improved job performance will result. For that reason they stated that "evaluation of the contribution of training to the achievement of organizational goals must concentrate on changes in the areas of job behavior and organizational results".[10]   In his 1993 paper, Professor Sims discussed Kirkpatrick's four components of training evaluation and described them as: "reaction to training; learning changes; transfer of changes and results", and said that "transfer of training is perhaps the most critical goal of training".[11]

In their book, Training for Impact (1989), Dana Gaines Robinson and James C. Robinson reported another version of Kirkpatrick's 1983 model of the four levels of training evaluation and described them as: "Level I: Reaction Evaluation; Level II: Learning Evaluation; Level III (Type A): Behavior or Skill Application Evaluation; Level III (Type B): Evaluation of Nonobservable Results; and Level IV: Impact or Results Evaluation."[12]   The Robinsons go a little further than Kirkpatrick and describe their methodology for examining the impact training has on individuals and groups with

---

[7] IBID., page 592.

[8] IBID., page 591.

[9] Carolyn Ban & Sue Faerman, (1990), "Issues in the Evaluation of Management Training", Public Productivity & Management Review, Vol. XIII, no. 3, page 271.

[10] Barry J. Smith & Brian L. Delahaye, (1987), How To Be An Effective Trainer, Second Edition, New York, John Wiley & Sons, page 381.

[11] Ronald R. Sims,"(1993), Evaluating Public Sector Training Programs", Public Personnel Management, Vol 22, No. 4, page 604-5.

[12] Dana Gaines Robinson & James C. Robinson, (1989),Training for Impact, Jossey-Bass Publishers,

microevaluation being the study of the impact on the individual and microevaluation being the study of its impact on groups of people.

The Criminal Justice Executive Institute Senior Leadership Program Staff have conducted Level I evaluations of each of the completed sessions, and each of the modules thus far completed of Session III. To their knowledge, no one has conducted an evaluation beyond Level I, however a survey of students who have completed the Chief Executive Seminar is being conducted simultaneous to this author's evaluation of the Senior Leadership Program, (which is not the same program as the Chief Executive Seminar).

Since the experts seem to agree that training is not completed until a suitable evaluation is done, and that only measuring students' reaction to the learning during or at the end of the program is not the best way to measure a program's effectiveness, this author chose to conduct a modified Level III, Type A evaluation of the Criminal Justice Executive Institute Senior Leadership Program to determine if the program is meeting its stated goals, and the graduates' work performance is improved as a result.

Methodology for Training Evaluation

According to Robinson and Robinson (1989),"When it comes to measurement of human behavior, you have three methodology choices: behavioral observations, interviews and questionnaires." "HRD (human resource development) professionals typically track behavioral change through surveys."[13] For this author's purposes there was not enough time available to directly observe the work of or interview the forty-one persons who completed the Senior Leadership Program. Since surveys seem to be an acceptable if not the typical method of collecting the needed data by the experts identified in the literature review, the author designed a survey or questionnaire for students' self-reporting.

Robinson and Robinson (1989) caution evaluators not to only rely on learners' self-reports of their behavior changes, but to seek third-party sources such as managers, supervisors, or co-workers who are in a position to directly observe the learners being evaluated. This author called these sources "supervisors", and designed a similar survey for supervisors or people who have observed the students' work before and after completion of the Senior Leadership Program, (hereafter called supervisor's survey). To avoid possible flaws which might result from only tracking behaviors after the training was completed, the author ensured that the surveyed supervisors should have observed the learner's behavior before the training as well as after it was completed. The only supervisors surveyed were those of the learners who completed the Senior Leadership Course. Supervisors of dropouts, or students still enrolled were not surveyed since they could not observe post graduation behaviors, which might take a few months after graduation to become apparent.

These questionnaires were primarily designed to determine if Senior Leadership Program learning is now appearing in new work place behaviors of the students. For example; respondents were asked if they were now employing new behaviors in their work life, such as whether they go to the library more often, or read about and discuss

---

[13] IBID., page 218-20

futures oriented issues, or network with other futures oriented criminal justice leaders more than they did before their attendance in the program. In addition, respondents were asked how they came to be interested in SLP, which session they attended, to what extent course goals and expectations were met, their reactions to faculty, as well as their continuing or long term reactions to certain aspects of the program such as housing, location of the program in the sate, comparability to other programs outside Florida, and in light of the cost of the program, whether they would recommend others to seek to attend SLP.

To encourage a good response rate which would make the returned data more reliable, surveys were designed to minimize the completion time requirement for the respondent, and therefore were no longer than two pages. Since this was a macroevaluation of the students as a group, all surveys were designed to be anonymous, and respondents were instructed not to put their name any place on the survey. To identify the best "supervisors" each graduate was contacted by telephone and asked for the name of a person who has observed their work before and after completion of the Senior Leadership Program, and was instructed to alert that person that the survey would be sent to them, that the supervisor was not to put any names on the form, and was encouraged to complete and return the survey to the author in the provided addressed and stamped envelope. At the same time graduates were told of their surveys and given similar instructions with encouragement to return the survey as quickly as possible. The contents of the survey were not discussed with the intended respondents.

Knowing that respondents can possibly be influenced by the questions in a survey, all questions were written in a positive way in the unlikely event that if any respondent was influenced, it would result in a more positive rather than a more negative answer. This author did not complete any survey, and his responses have neither been sought nor tabulated.

Student Survey

Questions one and two were designed to determine how the student became aware of and interested in the Senior Leadership Program. Question three was used to determine which session the student attended. The remaining questions were value statements, where the student was asked to read a statement and report the degree to which they agreed with the statement by using a value scale with 1 meaning they strongly disagree; 2 meaning they somewhat disagree; 3 meaning that they were neutral; 4 meaning that they somewhat agreed; and 5 meaning that they strongly agreed.

Questions four and five were to determine whether SLP goals were made known to students before their arrival, and if those goals were met after arrival. Question six was for those students staying at the Cabot Lodge, (where students were encouraged to stay), to report on how learning was affected by staying there, and the value of having students in the same housing facility, while question seven was for students who did not stay at the Cabot to report on learning outside the classroom, and the value of having students in the same housing facility. Question eight sought to determine if students felt that the Executive Institute Policy Board's desire to have the program offered in a central

location in the state was worthwhile. Question nine sought to learn students' reaction to the faculty used.

Questions ten through twelve were intended to elicit to what extent the important behaviors taught, are being used on the job and whether the program has helped the student to become a more effective criminal justice leader.

Question thirteen sought to learn if in the opinion of the student, the program was comparable to the FBI National Academy, the Southern Police Institute or the California Command College. The final question sought to learn whether, in light of the cost of attendance to the students' agency (which has been estimated by this author as between $10,000 and $15,000 depending upon the amount of per diem required, and included travel and an average prorated annualized salary of $45,000 for the attendees who were away from their normal jobs for ten weeks over the entire eighteen months required by SLP), the attending students would recommend the Senior Leadership Program to other criminal justice professionals.

Supervisor Survey

The supervisor survey was the author's primary instrument to measure the transfer of the program's training to learn if learned behaviors were now appearing in the graduates' work lives. The instrument was very similar in appearance to the student survey, but concentrated more on the "supervisor's" observation of the student's behaviors on the job. Questions one through three were to determine if the supervisor had been through the SLP, and how the person they observed came to know about and apply for acceptance to the program.

The remaining ten questions were value statements like those used on the student surveys, with the same rating scale. Question four sought to know if the supervisor has seen an improvement in the student's ability to think through difficult situations, and arrive at correct decisions. Question five was to determine if the graduate had caused someone on the supervisor's level to think about future issues, on more than one occasion (see goal 1). Question six tried to determine if the graduate was now better able to select tools, identify sources of information and conduct analysis and evaluation in anticipating and shaping the future for his/her agency (see goal 3). Question seven sought to determine if the graduate now spends more time in the library (taught from orientation through week five), and question eight was written to learn if the graduate is reading more and talking about futures issues facing criminal justice (see goal 4). Question nine was intended to learn if the student has developed a network of futures oriented criminal justice leaders with whom he/she consults on a regular basis (see goal 6). Question ten sought to learn if the graduate is a better leader, and uses his/her new found skills regularly (taught extensively in week one). Question eleven asked if the graduate is better able to plan for and implement change than before attending SLP (taught in weeks five through nine).

Question twelve reports the author's estimated cost of the training program to the agency per student, and sought to know if the money was well spent, resulting in a better criminal justice leader. Question thirteen asked if based on the work performance improvements observed, would the supervisor recommend others for the SLP.

All of the questionnaires returned to the author were scored and sorted a number of different ways. The survey data were expected to reveal post graduation reaction and transfer of learning of the students as a whole, by session, and by the reported motivation for enrolling in the program. The author compared the responses of the learners and the "supervisors" to determine if the learner's self-report information is different from the supervisors.

Dropout Rates

Finally the author looked at the dropout rates of each session to determine if any patterns are developing and attempted to correlate those rates with the FBI's National Academy and the California Command College.

Data Analysis

Survey Return Rates

This author sent out sixty-eight, (68), student surveys and received fifty-three, (53), of them completed and returned essentially as requested, for an overall return rate of 77.9%, which is an extremely good rate of return. Five, (5), of the returned surveys indicated that the respondent dropped out of the program, but failed to list which session in which they had been enrolled. There were twenty-two, (22), surveys sent to students of the charter class, and sixteen, (16), of those were completed and returned for a return rate of 72.7% from Session I. Twenty-two, (22), surveys were sent to students of Session II, and seventeen, (17), of those were completed and returned for a return rate of 77.3% for Session II. There were twenty-four, (24), surveys, (which did not include the author), provided to the author's classmates in Session III, and fourteen, (14), of those were completed and returned for the lowest rate of return of the three sessions of 58.3%, which is still acceptable.

The author sent thirty-four, (34), "supervisor" surveys to the people identified by graduates as someone who has observed their pre and post SLP work behavior. The author was not able to locate the remaining seven, (7), graduates, or learned that they were no longer working in a place where there was an individual who observed their work before and after completion of the program. Twenty-eight, (28), of the thirty-four, (34), "supervisor" surveys were completed and returned for a return rate of 82.4% which was extremely good.

Findings

Student Surveys

Data obtained as a result of the student surveys were tabulated eight different ways, and reported on two different student survey tables. Table 1displays the responses of all students, students from SLP I, students from SLP II, students from SLP III, and all dropouts responding, without identifying the session they attended. Table 2 displays the responses of all students again, students who learned of SLP and sought to attend on their own initiative, students who were urged to attend by someone else, and students who were told to attend. As reported earlier, questions four through nine, and thirteen

and fourteen of the student surveys were reaction questions, while ten through twelve were student's self report of on the job behaviors.

Supervisor Surveys

Table 3 lists the responses of the twenty-eight, (28), supervisor surveys which were completed and returned. Responses to those questions common to the student and supervisor surveys are listed for comparison purposes.

Table 1: (All Students, and by Session Attended)

VALUES USED WERE:

STRONGLY DISAGREE--	SOMEWHAT DISAGREE--	NEUTRAL--	SOMEWHAT AGREE--	STRONGLY AGREE
1	2	3	4	5

SURVEY QUESTIONS	All Stud.	SLP1 Stud.	SLP2 Stud.	SLP3 Stud.	Dropouts
4. Goals were made known to me before arrival	3.9	3.5	3.5	3.8	4.6
5. Program was what I expected it to be.	3.1	3.9	3.1	2.7	3.6
6-A. I learned more at the Cabot Lodge than in class. 2.8	2.2	3	3	3.5	
6-B. SLP less effective at other motel/hotel.	3.3	2.8	3.6	3.3	4
6-C. SLP less effective if class scattered among motels.	4.4	4.2	4.4	4.4	5
7-A. Learned more outside of class than in class.	2.2	1.3	2.5	3	2.5
7-B. SLP more effective at same motel/hotel.	3.7	3.5	4	4.5	0
8. SLP would be more effective in central location in State.	3.1	2.9	2.8	3.2	4
9. Faculty/Instructors up to date, dynamic and top rate.	3.4	4	4	3	4
10. I use much of what I learned on my job on a regular basis.	3.6	3.9	4.6	2.9	3.8
11. I spend much more time in the library. 2	2.1	1.8	2.1	2	
12. SLP helped me to be more effective criminal justice leader.	4.2	3.9	4.5	3.9	3.6
13. SLP comparable to NA, SPI, Command College.	3.2	3.8	3.2	2.6	2.8
14. I recommend others attend SLP Training Program.	4.1	4.3	4.5	3.8	3.8

_____

* All Student scores are not an average of the other four columns, since differences can occur due to rounding.

Student Motivation for Enrolling in SLP

Five, (5), of the fifty-three, (53), student respondents, (9.4%), reported that they learned of the program on their own initiative, and asked to attend. Fourteen, (14), student respondents, (26.4%), reported that they were told about the program and asked to attend. Twenty, (20), respondents, (37.7%), reported that they were told about the program and were urged to apply by someone else. Ten, (10), of the respondents, (18.9%), indicated they were told about SLP and were told to apply. Four, (4), student respondents, (7.5%), replied in the "other" category, or failed to answer the question.

Responses to Student Reaction Questions

Question Four drew thirty-six, (36), responses in agreement, (14 of them strongly), eleven, (11), in disagreement and four, (4), respondents who were neutral. In Question Five, which stated that the SLP Training Program was what the student expected it to be, the average response from all students was only neutral, (3.0). Overall twenty-three, (23), Agreed, twenty-two, (22), Disagreed, and four, (4), were neutral on Question Five.

Questions Regarding Student Housing

In Question Six-A, the statement was that the student learned more at the Cabot Lodge than they learned in class. Twelve, (12), responding students agreed with the statement, while sixteen, (16), disagreed and six, (6), were neutral. In Question 6-B which stated that SLP would be less effective at any other motel/hotel, fourteen, (14), agreed, nine, (9), disagreed and eleven, (11), were neutral. In question 6-C, which stated that SLP would be less effective if students were scattered among different motels/hotels, twenty-eight, (28), agreed, (26 strongly), while four, (4), disagreed and three, (3), were neutral on the issue. Two, (2), of the ten students that indicated that they stayed at places other than the Cabot Lodge agreed that they learned more outside the classroom, seven (7), disagreed and one was neutral. Four, (4), of the ten agreed that the program would be more effective if the students stayed at the same facility, one, (1), disagreed and five, (5), were either neutral or did not answer that portion of the question.

Located in the State

As to the issue of where the SLP should be located within the state, Question Eight stated that a more central location would be better. Nineteen, (19), respondents agreed, (13 strongly), nineteen, (19) disagreed, (none strongly), and fifteen, (15), were neutral on the subject of location in the state.

Faculty/Instructors

Thirty-eight, (38), of the fifty-three, (53), student respondents reported that they agreed with the statement in Question Nine which stated that the faculty/instructors used were dynamic, up to date, and top rate, but only eight, (8), agreed strongly, while six, (6), disagreed, and four, (4) were neutral on that issue.

Student Responses to Transfer of Learning Questions

Thirty-four of the respondents agreed that they use much of what they learned at SLP on a regular basis in their jobs, but only six, (6) agreed strongly, while seven, (7), disagreed, and ten, (10), were neutral on Question 10.

Only six, (6), of the fifty-three, (53), respondents reported agreement with the statement that they go to the library more since SLP, while thirty-six, (36), disagree, (19 strongly), and nine, (9), were neutral. Nonetheless, forty-six, (46), of SLP's students agree that the program has helped them to become a better criminal justice leader, (17 strongly and 29 somewhat), while only two, (2), disagreed with Question 12, and three, (3), were neutral.

Program Comparability

Eighteen, (18) of the respondents agreed that SLP is comparable to named senior level criminal justice training programs outside Florida, (after which the Policy Board modeled this program), (only 5 strongly), nine, (9), disagreed, seventeen, (17), were neutral, and nine, (9), did not even answer the question.

Recommend SLP for Others

Thirty-seven, (37), respondents reported that they agreed with the final statement and would recommend other criminal justice professionals to the Senior Leadership Program, while four, (4), disagreed, seven, (7), were neutral, and five, (5), did not answer.

Analysis by Session Attended

Interestingly, there are a number of differences in the responses of the students depending on the session of the Senior Leadership Program they attended. For example: there is a straight line decline in expectations being met between SLP I and SLP III, in Question 5, and the average would have been lower for all students if the response of the dropouts, who failed to list their session, had not been so high. Of particular interest was those respondents who dropped out felt their expectations were met on average higher than any other students. Some of those respondents reported wanting to re-enroll in SLP when the situation which arose causing them to withdraw changes.

There appears to be continuing agreement with the statement in Question 6-A, which states that the student learned more at the Cabot Lodge, which closely corresponds with the continuing increase in agreement with Question 7-A, which states that the student who did not stay at the Cabot learned more out side the classroom.

There also appears to be a continuing increase in students each session who agree with the statement in Question 8 which states that the Senior Leadership Program would be more effective in a more central location in the state. There is however, a sudden drop off in favorable reactions to the faculty/instructors in Session III, which bears attention. Although there is a continuing decline in students' self-reporting of the use of the material learned on their jobs, it is probably too early to pay too much attention to this response from Session III students, since they are still enrolled, and this is intended to measure learning transfers, post graduation. (It must be noted however, the surveys were completed by Session III students near the end of the eighth session, which is near the end of the program.)

There is a clear, straight line decline of favorable reaction between the three sessions in students' comparison of the Senior Leadership Program to those out of state programs after which SLP was modeled. Finally of particular interest is that notwithstanding the continuing declines in key areas of the program, student reports that they would recommend SLP to other criminal justice professionals remains fairly high.

Table 2 All Students and by Motivation

VALUES USED WERE:
STRONGLY DISAGREE-- SOMEWHAT DISAGREE-- NEUTRAL-- SOMEWHAT AGREE--STRONGLY AGREE

	1	2	3	4	5

SURVEY QUESTIONS	*ALL STUD.	ON OWN INITIATIVE	URGED TO ATTEND	TOLD TO ATTEND
4. Goals were made known to me before arrival.	3.9	4.2	3.6	3
5. Program was what I expected it to be.	3.3	3.4	3.1	2.7
6.				
6-A. I learned more at the Cabot Lodge than in class.	3	2.4	2.8	3.3
6-B. SLP less effective at other motel/hotel.	3.4	3.4	3.2	3.5
6-C. SLP less effective if class scattered among motels.	4.5	3.8	4.9	4.4
7-A. Learned more outside of class than in class.	2.3	1.3	2.8	2.7
7-B. SLP more effective at same motel/hotel.	4	2.3	4.7	3.3
8. SLP would be more effective in central location in State.	3.2	2.6	3.3	3.3
9. Faculty/Instructors up to date, dynamic and top rate.	3.3	3.75	4.5	3.9
10. I use much of what I learned on my job on a regular basis.	3.8	4.3	3.8	3
11. I spend much more time in the library.	2	1.7	2.4	1.8
12. SLP helped me to be more effective criminal justice leader.	4	4.3	4.3	3.8
13. SLP comparable to NA, SPI, Command College.	3.1	3.5	3.1	1.9
14. I recommend others attend SLP Training Program.	4.1	4.4	4	3.4

_____
_____

*Column marked All Students is not an average of the remaining three columns, it is of all students responding.

In Table 2, it becomes evident that there is a significant difference in the responses by students who wanted to go to the program and those urged or even ordered to attend. It appears that the student's motive for attending the program has a lot to do with that person's reaction to the program, and the student's transferring SLP's learning into work behaviors.

There is a clear decline in the reaction to questions 4, and 5, where students reported to what extent they knew what they were getting into, and whether their expectations were met. Respondents who also reported that they were told to attend, appear to agree more with the statement in Question 6-A which said that the student learned more at the Cabot Lodge than in the classroom.

Reactions to faculty and/or instructors in Question 9 declined sharply depending upon the respondent's motivation for being in the program, and students who were told to attend the program appear to use the SLP learning less on the job. Additionally students told to attend compare SLP to the out of state programs less favorably than those respondents who reported that they attended the program because they wanted to, or were only urged to attend. As seen in the responses to Question 14, students told to attend the program were much less likely to recommend this program to other criminal justice professionals.

Table 3: Supervisor Responses

VALUES USED WERE:				
STRONGLY DISAGREE-- SOMEWHAT DISAGREE-- NEUTRAL-- SOMEWHAT AGREE--STRONGLY AGREE				
1	2	3	4	5

SUPERVISOR SURVEY QUESTIONS: **And student responses on comparable questions.**	**Supervisors**	**Students**
4. I have seen a definite improvement in graduate's ability to think through difficult situations and arrive at correct decisions.	3.9	
5. On more than one occasion, I have seen graduate cause us to think about the future for our agency.	4.2	
6. The graduate is better able to select tools, identify sources of information and conduct analysis and evaluation in anticipating and shaping the future for our agency.	4	
7. Since the graduate completed SLP, I have noticed that he/she spends more time in the library.	2.5	2
8. The graduate seems to read more and talks more about new things he/she has learned at SLP.	3.9	
9. The graduate has developed a network of futures oriented criminal justice leaders, with whom he/she consults on emerging issues that will shape the future of criminal justice in Florida.	4.4	
10. After completing SLP, the graduate is a better leader, and uses his/her new found skills on a regular basis.	4	4.0/3.8
11. The graduate is now better able to plan for, and implement change in our agency, and mitigate organizational resistance to change, than before attending SLP.	4	
12. The money that my agency spent on the graduate to attend SLP was well spent and has made the graduate better able to perform as a criminal justice leader in our agency.	4.1	
13. Based on the work performance I have observed in the graduate, I would recommend that my agency and others should continue to send students to SLP.	4.4	4.1

Only one responding supervisor reported attending the Senior Leadership program. Five of them said that their graduate learned about the program on their own and asked to attend; six said that the graduate was told of the program and then asked to attend; sixteen, (16), of the supervisors reported that their graduate was told of the program and urged to attend; only one reported that the graduate was told to attend; and one respondent stated other, or do not know. That response is in disagreement with student responses which reported that almost 20% of the students of SLP were told to attend.

Twenty, (20), of the twenty-eight "supervisors" surveyed agreed with the statement that "I have seen an improvement in the graduate's ability to think through difficult situations and arrive at correct decisions, which was found in Question 4, while two, (2) supervisors disagreed and six, (6) were neutral. Twenty-three of the supervisors, in question 5 agreed that the graduate is causing others to think about the future, while only one disagreed, and four were neutral. (The supervisor who disagreed added commentary to the form saying that the problem was with the particular graduate, and was not the fault of the training program). Twenty-two, (22), supervisors reported that they agreed with Question 6's statement that the graduate is better able to select tools, identify sources of information and conduct analysis and evaluation in anticipating and shaping the future for their agency, while one, (1), disagreed and five, (5) were neutral.

Only three, (3) responding supervisors stated that their graduate spent more time in the library since SLP, while eleven, (11), disagreed, (7 strongly), and fourteen, (14), were neutral. This corresponds fairly closely with the students' self reporting in Question 11 on Table 1.

Twenty-two, (22), supervisors surveyed agreed that their graduate seems to read more and talk more about new things he/she learned at SLP, while only four, (4), disagreed, and two, (2), were neutral. All but one of the supervisors reported in Question 9, that their graduate has developed a network of futures-oriented criminal justice leaders, with whom they consult on emerging issues, and the only one in disagreement was only somewhat.

Twenty-one, (21), of the twenty-eight responding supervisors agreed in Question 10 that the graduate is now a better leader, and uses new found skills regularly, while only three, (3) disagree and four, (4), were neutral. These answers correspond closely with the students' response in Questions 10 and 12, in Table 1. In Question 11, twenty-two, (22), supervisors agreed that their graduate is now better able to deal with change, and resistance thereto, while three, (3), disagreed and three, (3), were neutral.

In light of the estimated costs in Question 12, twenty-two, (22), of the responding supervisors agreed that their money was well spent, and their graduate is now a better criminal justice leader. Only three, (3), supervisors disagreed with the statement in Question 12, and three, (3) were neutral. Finally, twenty-four, (24), supervisors agreed that they would recommend that their agency send others to SLP, (18 of them strongly), while only two, (2) disagree, (both strongly), and two, (2), were neutral.

Dropout Rates

The Charter Session of SLP began on July 19, 1991, with twenty-four, (24), students enrolled, and graduated twenty students, on January 20, 1993. Three Charter Session students withdrew and unfortunately one died. The dropout rate for SLP1 was 12.5%. Session Two began on June 29, 1992 with twenty-three, (23), students, and graduated twenty-one, (21), students, on December 2, 1993, for a drop out rate of 8.7%, for SLP 2. The third session of the program began on June 10, 1993 with twenty-six, (26), students, and as of this writing will graduate nineteen, (19) students, in January, 1995, with a drop out rate of 26.9%, so far for SLP 3.

Discussion

It now appears clear to this author, and hopefully to the reader as well, that the Criminal Justice Executive Institute, Senior Leadership Program is generally accomplishing its stated goals, especially when viewed by the reactions of those who observe the job performance of its graduates. There remains strong support for this program by those supervisors, and they believe that their agencies are being well served by this training.

Chief among the successes for this program are that it appears that SLP graduates are thinking and reading more about the future, and networking with futures oriented criminal justice leaders, with a newly improved ability to think through difficult situations and arrive at correct decisions, and in the opinion of their supervisors or coworkers are becoming better leaders.

Luckily for the SLP, liking to go to the library was not a stated goal, but a great deal of program time was spent teaching SLP students to perform tasks, which many in discussions with this author stated they had no time for or interest in, and would have staff personnel to handle. Student and supervisor responses agree that these professionals have not spent much time at the library since graduation, and probably will not in the future. One responding supervisor, who was the only one to complete the SLP, commented to the author that it might be just as important to teach criminal justice chief executives of the future what a well researched document looks like so that they can recognize one which was poorly prepared for them by staff. There is merit to that, and being able to recognize poorly prepared work, can probably be taught much faster than were the skills necessary to complete this project.

A responding student stated to this author that rather than doing a mega-study on one topic, which might not have any implication for his/her agency, it would probably be more useful to have the nominating agency send a topic, or topics of interest to that agency which should be studied. Another respondent reported that he would have been better served by researching a number of topics, but to a lesser extent, and doing a number of shorter reports for SLP. Perhaps SLP staff could consider which type of academic credit the student is seeking, and make the research project contingent on the requirement for the credit sought.

The decline seen in the responses of students to the question asking if SLP was what they expected concerns this author even more than the amount of time spent teaching researching skills to people who do not seem interested in doing research. The average score for all students was only neutral on the issue, and the score for SLP III is now dissatisfied. Scores comparing SLP to the out of state programs after which SLP was patterned, continue to decline, as are students' willingness to recommend SLP to others. Unless attention is paid, scores for SLP IV will be below 2.5 which is getting dangerously close to the students being strongly dissatisfied. Potential students will not be inclined to apply for enrollment in this otherwise good program, which both students and supervisors agree has helped graduates to become better criminal justice leaders.

This author is most concerned about the differences in reaction to and the transference of learning to work behaviors on the part of those students told or required to participate in this program. The data speaks for itself; those who feel compelled to

attend do not react as favorably to the program, nor is their learning as likely to appear as improvements on their jobs. Those ordered to attend reported more often that they learned more outside of class, that the program would be more effective in a more central location in the State, that the faculty/instructors are less effective, that they use the material less often, and that they are not as likely to recommend the program to others, as those who asked to attend.

Dropout Rates

The dropout rates for the Florida Senior Leadership Program thus far are: SLP 1-12.5%; SLP 2-8.7%; and SLP 3-26.9%, for an average of 16.03% per session. For comparison purposes, the author contacted Dr. Susan Falb, Historian for the FBI to attempt to determine what the dropout rate was for the first three sessions of the FBI National Academy, and Mr. Russ Kinderman, of the California Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training, to learn the same data for the California Command College.

Ms. Leslie Clemmons contacted this author on Dr. Falb's behalf and reported that the first three sessions of the FBINA took place in 1932 and 1933, that there were no records of dropouts available, but that the FBINA has never had a drop out rate much over two to three percent per session.

Mr. Kinderman of the Command College wrote to the author to report that in their first session twenty-two, (22), students were accepted, and twenty, (20), graduated. Mr. Kinderman reported that in the first session one student became ineligible to continue and one was dropped from the program for incomplete work. He reported that in session two, twenty-six, (26), students were accepted and nineteen, (19), graduated, with three, (3) who failed to show up. From the second session of the Command College, one student dropped after becoming ineligible, one was dropped due to failure, one was dropped due to incomplete work and one student withdrew. According to Mr. Kinderman, class three started with twenty-one, (21), students and graduated eighteen, (18), after two dropped out for valid reasons after the first two sessions.

Unlike the Command College, (SLP's model program), it appears that no student has been forced out of Florida's SLP due to failure or incomplete work, while at least three students had to drop out due to work or family pressure, and intend to re-enroll or otherwise complete the course. Nonetheless, SLP 3 has had an inordinately high drop out rate which must be reviewed and minimized in future sessions.

Conclusion

It appears clear to this author that the Senior Leadership Program, and its concept of teaching futures oriented criminal justice leadership is generally widely accepted by students and supervisors of graduates alike. This program can continue to draw strong support, however a number of improvements must be made.

When designing this training program, the Policy Board envisioned that students would have to actively compete for enrollment and would all be most desirous of attending. That has not happened, since too many students report that they were told to attend. One student reported to this author that he learned about his enrollment on

Friday afternoon before the class began on the following Tuesday morning. This author, who was also ordered to attend, tried to withdraw to pursue a masters degree at a university, and was not permitted to do so by his employing agency. It is clear in the data collected during this project, that students required to attend do not benefit as much as those who sought to attend, and are less likely to recommend the program to their peers. Valuable time and money is therefore wasted, while at the same time a student who wanted to be there was denied the opportunity to attend and thus become a better leader. A review of the student selection criteria is warranted.

Another concern raised by an increasing number of students has been where this program is located. The Policy Board envisioned the Executive Institute, when permanently located, being in a central area of the state, accessible to the greatest number of people, near major highways and airports, and not to become a part of any existing agency facility. To date all sessions of the Senior Leadership Program have been held in the FDLE headquarters building in Tallahassee, in the extreme northern part of the state. Thirteen of the fifty-two students responding to the SLP student survey felt strongly that the program would be more effective in a more central location within the State, while none of the SLP students surveyed strongly disagreed. Having to come to Tallahassee for a week every other month is a tough task both in terms of cost as well as time for many past, present and more importantly potential students. Hopefully the SLP has not yet been "permanently located" yet.

Additional concern has been raised about the quality of the faculty used, especially in SLP 3. In reviewing the minutes of the Policy Board, it appears that they designed the Senior Leadership Program to be similar to the Chief Executive Seminar, except that the SLP faculty would instruct at a slightly lower level. It would seem reasonable that using common faculty where ever possible would be desirable, however there exists a perception that there has been a marked difference in the quality of faculty used at the two programs, with SLP being the program short changed. Students of the Senior Leadership Program, including this author, thought they would get to hear the most up to date experts in fields whose instruction would have a direct bearing on what chief law enforcement executives would face in the future. The data is clear that there appears to be a sudden drop in the quality of the faculty used in SLP 3. The quality of the faculty used can have more effect on whether people recommend this course to others than any of the previous concerns.

Finally, it appears clear from the survey data and discussions with students and graduates that further study of the required research project and paper is needed. Many of the SLP students have not completed college, and have had great difficulty conducting master's level research and documentation, while others more academically inclined found the current requirement less troubling. The SLP alone cannot normally take someone without an undergraduate degree and see them become successful at the graduate level without extreme effort. Each student is willing to learn, and can be excited by new ideas, so much so that the student wants to learn more about the idea with outside reading, but cannot raise his or her performance level to the extent that might be required. For those students who do not wish to receive academic credit for their work, four or five smaller reports might suffice. A great deal of time has been spent teaching skills, including providing each student with a copy of the American Psychology

Association's Publications Manual, that are not and will not be used in the future. Consideration of the idea of having the type of academic credit sought determine the extent of the research project requirement must be given.

Recommendations

1. The screening and selection process for the Senior Leadership Program must ensure that students applying therefore are not being compelled to attend.

2. The Policy Board, in conjunction with available staff should review the faculty used in each session, especially SLP 3 to ensure that the best faculty possible will be used in future sessions..

3. Continued effort should be applied to attempt to locate the Program in a more central location, or to at least hold some of the sessions in a more central place.

5. What appears to be the inordinate emphasis on teaching research skills, and spending time in the library to do one major research project should be redirected to allow SLP students more   choice in the extent of the project they choose.

Mike Brick started his law enforcement career in 1968 as a Patrol Officer with the Florida State University Police Department. Appointed as a Special Agent with the Florida Department of Law Enforcement in 1971, he had various assignments including Technical Services Supervisor and Special Agent Supervisor, both in the Division of Criminal Investigations. Other assignments while with FDLE included Bureau Chief of the FDLE Academy and Senior Executive Assistant to the Commissioner. He served the last three years as the Special Agent in Charge of the Orlando Regional Operations Bureau. Mike retired in order to work in the private security business in 1995.

References

1.   "Senior Leadership Course", a brochure published by the Florida Criminal Justice Executive Institute, undated, page 1.

2.   A. Lee McGehee, Chief of Police Ocala, and Dr. James Sewell, Chief of Police, Gulfport, Florida, (1989), "The Florida Criminal Justice Executive Institute: A Concept for the Future", published by FDLE.

3.   IBID.

4.   IBID.

5.   Florida Criminal Justice Executive Institute Course Announcement, page 12.

6.   Ronald R. Sims, (1993), "Evaluating Public Sector Training Programs", Public Personnel Management, Vol 22, No. 4, page 591.

7.   IBID, page 592.

8.   IBID, page 591.

9.   Carolyn Ban & Sue Faerman, (1990), "Issues in the Evaluation of Management Training", Public Productivity & Management Review, Vol.III, No 3, page 271.

10. Barry J. Smith & Brian L. Delahaye, (1987), How to be an Effective Trainer, Second Edition, New York, John Wiley & Sons, page 381.

11. Ronald R Sims, "Evaluating Public Sector Training Programs", Public Personnel Management, Vol. 22, No. 4, page 604-5.

12. Dana Gaines Robinson & James C. Robinson, (1989), Training for Impact, Jossey-Bass Publishers.

13. IBID, page 218-20.