

**ILLINOIS LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING AND STANDARDS BOARD  
4500 SOUTH SIXTH STREET ROAD, ROOM 173  
SPRINGFIELD, ILLINOIS 62703-6617**

**MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE  
President Abraham Lincoln Springfield Hotel, Springfield, IL  
September 21, 2016**

**I. ROLL CALL – ESTABLISHMENT OF QUORUM**

The September 21, 2016 meeting of the Executive Committee was held in Springfield, Illinois, and was called to order by Chairman Salmons at 4:23 p.m. Roll was called by Ellen Petty and a quorum of Committee members was established.

Executive Committee members present:

Valerie Salmons  
Pat Hartshorn  
Tim Gleason  
Jan Noble  
John Schlaf  
Richard Watson

Staff present:

Brent Fischer, Executive Director  
Eric Pingolt, Deputy Director  
John Keigher, Chief Legal Counsel  
Kelly Griffith, General Legal Counsel  
Ellen Petty, Personal Assistant to Executive Director  
Laura Baker, Administrative Assistant  
Jon Elder, Applications Development Coordinator  
Dan Sluga, Information Technology Manager  
Keith Wallace, Information Technology Intern  
Scott Schaefer, Field Representative  
Jennifer Wooldridge, Manager of Operations & Special Projects  
Path Hahn, Manager of In-Service Training  
Jill Weber, Program Manager

Others present:

Mark Edwards, Director of Mobile Team Unit 12  
Len Mendoza, Director of Mobile Team Unit 4  
Mike Norrington, Director of Mobile Team Unit 15  
Doug Fargher, Director of Mobile Team Unit 1  
Jill Marr, Mobile Team Unit 16  
Richard Fonck, Director of Mobile Team Unit 16

Tod Dowdy, Director of Mobile Team Unit 9  
Julie Smith, Mobile Team Unit 2  
Deborah Alms, Director of Mobile Team Unit 2  
Donald Gladden, Mobile Team Unit 2  
Beth Pinter, Director of Mobile Team Unit 5  
Terri Newbill, Director of Mobile Team Unit 13  
Tom Reasoner, Director of Mobile Team Unit 3  
Bob Brislan, Wicklander-Zulawski & Associates  
Jeffrey Fritz, ILETSB Executive Institute  
Susan Nichols, Director of ILETSB Executive Institute  
Jill Joline Myers, Director of WIU School of LEJA

## II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- A. June 29, 2016
- B. May 27, 2015
- C. December 11, 2013
- D. June 6, 2012
- E. November 18, 2011
- F. June 2, 2011
- G. Review of Closed Minutes from Previous Meetings
  - September 1, 2010
  - December 8, 2011
  - June 6, 2012
  - September 12, 2012
  - December 5, 2012
  - March 11, 2013
  - December 11, 2013
  - April 3, 2014
  - June 4, 2014
  - August 27, 2014
  - February 3, 2015

**Motion was made by Watson, seconded by Hartshorn, and carried by all members present to approve all open minutes.**

**Motion was made by Watson, seconded by Hartshorn, and carried by all members present to keep all previous closed minutes closed.**

## III. NOMINATING COMMITTEE

Chairman Salmons advised that she would be selecting members to serve on a nominating committee to make a recommendation for new Chairman at the December meeting.

## IV. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

## A. Litigation & Legislation Update

John Keigher reported on the IROCC case of Henrichs v. Board: We are waiting on a motion to dismiss, but plaintiffs keep filing extensions. He hopes to be able to report on it at the next meeting. Regarding Fields v. Dart: A motion to dismiss has been filed and we expect a ruling soon, as it is an EEOC case and the Board is not the employer. With regard to legislation, the Budget bill was passed and fully funded the Board for FY17, in spite of being a stopgap budget. There were a couple of training bills passed regarding sexual assault and domestic violence, which are being reviewed by staff and should be implemented in basic law enforcement and in-service training soon. A resolution is being watched regarding cultural competency and other training topics being incorporated into basic training. Fischer clarified that the IROCC litigation is holding up any review of discrepancies or arguments in favor of correctional officers becoming eligible for the program due to the recent DC decision. The Board cannot move forward in any way with a decision to maintain its current stance or adjust its policies regarding corrections and their eligibility until this case is concluded in one way or another. Keigher reported that he believes Judge in the case wants to decide on the case right away, but the plaintiffs keep asking for extensions.

## B. Office Relocation

Director Fischer reported that since he started in February, he has found that the current office is less than a productive place to work and the Board is already outgrowing it, and it just not a good scenario with the space being shared with other state agencies. He has been pursuing other locations including another site just down the road, not far from the current office, which provides a turn-key move in situation for the Board. It would allow additional space to grow and meet our legislated mandate needs as they come along. Our current facility does not allow for good meeting space with our small conference room, or for appropriate testing space. It is a standalone building with no build-out required. There are 70-80 dedicated parking spaces, so parking would not be an issue. It is easily accessible from the Toronto Road Exit off of I-55 for those who come to the office to do testing or attend meetings.

## V. NEW BUSINESS

### A. Staff and Personnel Issues

Director Fischer reported that Board staff is doing a tremendous job. He introduced Kelly Griffith, new General Counsel, hired since the June meeting. John Keigher is still going to be Chief Legal Counsel on contract with the Board.

### B. Mandated In-Service Training Update

Director Fischer reported that there are a number of new training mandates, in addition to the basic training requirements. He asked Pat Hahn to go over the proposed policy regarding mandated in-service training, in depth. Hahn reported that the Police and Community Relations Act included a number of training mandates. These apply only to in-service training, not training provided by the basic law enforcement academies. The good news is that the

MTUs were already providing training in many of the topics outlined in the Act. Every year, officers must train in use of force and legal updates; and every three years, in human rights, civil rights, constitutional use of law enforcement authority, procedural justice, and cultural competency. The Board was waiting on recommendations from the Commission on Police Professionalism, also created by the Act. However, it does not appear that they are going to make any recommendations on in-service training, and they are focusing mainly on disciplinary measures. Therefore, he would like to propose that the Board use the system already in place, by allowing MTUs and Executive Institute to vet and certify courses that meet the guidelines set forth by the Board for each of the training mandates. This would allow for both current courses and new courses which meet the training mandates to be approved by the Board, through the MTUs and Executive Institute. Members were provided with the guidelines which have been developed by Board staff. This process would work much like the current process used for the Lead Homicide Investigator certification ongoing training. It is possible that some courses may overlap and meet multiple mandates, according to the guidelines. This would be marked on the application for certification to the Board. This supports the MTU system, and the Executive Institute. The Board is asked to implement a policy where only Board certified courses are accepted as meeting the training mandates, based upon the Board's guidelines. Director Fischer clarified that the training could be received from the MTUs, Executive Institute, in house, or from other sources. However, the agencies or training sources providing the training must submit the courses to and work in conjunction with their local MTU to obtain Board certification for the courses to ensure the training meets the mandate guidelines. The Executive Institute is currently in the process of developing a use of force training which can be completed online. That would be one avenue to obtain the training. Another avenue would be to attend an MTU course which meets the use of force mandate guidelines.

### C. Body Camera Guidelines

John Keigher reported that although the Body Camera bill went into effect at the beginning of this year, the Board was not provided with any of the appropriated funding until July. Even then, the fund was almost completely swept to cover other areas of the stop gap budget. Nevertheless, as of the previous day, the Camera Fund was back up to \$1 million thereby putting the Board in a position to seriously move forward with policy recommendations and the reestablishment of a grant system that meets the intentions of the reform act.

In the meantime, Board staff has drafted general guidelines that comport to the requirements of the law but have already received feedback from various agencies regarding areas that need clarification and further consideration. For instance, all agencies that utilize body cameras must report several details of their operation to the Board on an annual basis. This data must then be compiled by the Board for submission to the General Assembly. A small number of agencies reached out to the Board asking about this requirement, particularly the timing element. In staff's internal discussions we realized that agencies providing less than a full year's worth of data could potentially skew any resulting analysis. Therefore, it seemed logical to require these reports only after the cameras had been in use for a year or more.

Additionally, the Board has received several calls from agencies that have implemented a camera program with warnings and suggestions of things we should consider before any

guidelines or rules become permanent. It is our intention to gather as much feedback as possible before publishing any mandated guidelines and the Board welcomes comments from throughout the law enforcement community and the public as we craft the framework for a grant program that meets the needs of agencies throughout the state. The creation of a special commission composed of Board members and stakeholders will assist us in creating the best possible framework to increase the number of cameras in use and ensure that they are utilized in a way that protects officers, agencies, and the public they serve. Director Fischer and Chairman Salmons noted their support of the idea of the formation of a special commission to aid in gathering feedback in order to develop a program that truly meets the needs of the agencies in the state. They encouraged Committee members to let them know if they had an interest in serving on the commission.

## **VI. ADJOURNMENT**

**Motion was made by Watson, seconded by Hartshorn, and carried by all members present to adjourn the meeting at 4:59 p.m.**