

**SMI Advisory Group  
Charlotte-Mecklenburg PD (Training Academy)  
December 13, 2018 at 1:00pm**

**Meeting Minutes**

**WELCOME**

**Chairman** Terry Miller called the meeting to order at 1:00 PM and welcomed all the members to the December 13, 2018 SMI Advisory Committee. **Terry introduced Richard Herman, who was selected to replace retiring member Walter “Dub” Bridges as the SMI Advisory Group’s electromagnetic energy technical expert advisor. Member Herman addressed the group and stated that he has been with the State Highway Patrol for twenty-five years, and is the Troop Engineer Supervisor in Newton. Terry thanked Member Herman for agreeing to serve in such an important role on behalf of the Commission, and welcomed him to the group. Terry also thanked Member Joe Carey for providing a location to meet and a recommended lunch location prior to the meeting.**

**ROLL CALL**

**Members Present:**

Terry Miller	Thad Condrey	Richard Herman
Fred McQueen	Ethan Brinn	
Chris Gaddis	Bob Stevens	
Joe Carey	Jason McIntyre	
Ryan Weeks	Anthony Locklear	

**Members Absent:**

**School Director Position - Vacant**

**Guests Present:**

Dan Worley

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**Terry reminded the group that he submitted to them an electronic version of the draft September 2018 meeting minutes, and asked if there were any revision recommendations to them. There was no revision recommendations. Terry opened the floor for motions to accept the draft version of September 6, 2018 minutes without revision. A motion was made by Member Ryan Weeks, and the motion was seconded by Member Ethan Brinn. The motion carried unanimously.**

**Terry then shared how important being in this position is, and expressed to the group that he takes this responsibility very seriously. Terry continued by assuring the Group**

that he will do his very best to continue leading the program at its highest proficiency, and expressed his appreciation to the group for their help, guidance, and experience along the way. Terry reminded the Group that former Chairman Dan Worley was promoted, and as such, was required to step away from these responsibilities. Terry commented that Dan has been a great asset to the program over the years and this group appreciates all that he has done along the way. Terry advised the group that Dan will remain at the North Carolina Justice Academy primarily, and he has also been appointed as the Qualified Assistant in SMI Instructor Training for an undetermined amount of time. Dan, who was present as a guest, thanked the Chairman for his kind words, and reminded the group to always make decisions based off of the need to maintain the integrity of our program.

## **NC JUSTICE ACADEMY ITEMS – CURRICULUM/TRAINING**

### **SMI Program Concerns**

Terry began with an overview on SMI related concerns and how the concerns had been raised thus far. He summarized that at the August 2018 School Directors Conference, a few Directors and current/former SMI Instructors expressed concerns about a number of issues, including that the current Criminal Justice Standards Division interpretation of rule was that a student who is attending the initial basic SMI Instructor school loses his/her operator certification if a motor-skills failure occurs during the school. Terry stated that the general consensus at the conference was that this interpretation was reducing the number of interested applicants who desired to attend SMI Instructor training, and that the reduction in interest is causing a shortage across North Carolina of SMI Instructors. This, in turn, was said to be a hardship on our School Directors. Terry advised the group this interpretation was initially made by Standards, but that several years ago, it was brought to the table by the SMI Advisory Group and the group supported the interpretation by CJSD by a majority vote of 1. Terry said there were also other concerns expressed at the conference, including whether signing off on all the devices is truly necessary, and some recommendations were provided as well. It was determined that any SMI stakeholder (School Director, QA, or Instructor) with concerns should be invited to attend the September 2018 SMI Advisory Group meeting so the group could hear concerns from them first hand. Terry referred the members back to the September 2018 meeting minutes for review of that session.

Terry reminded the group that based upon the recommendations received on these topics, the SMI Advisory Group has a lot of discussion and decision ahead. Terry instructed the group that, depending on the recommendations developed for submittal to the Commission, changes could include revision to the manuals, test forms, and Administrative Code. Therefore, he continued, our decisions should be made only with very careful forethought. He suggested that the group take a series of concerns at the time, instead of discussing all at once. This should act to focus the group on addressing issues, rather than briefly discussing many at once with misinformed decisions reached. The group agreed.

First, Terry requested that the group discuss and make a decision on the primary concern expressed by some School Directors at the conference, and then by five (5) of the six (6) presenters at the September meeting. That is – the concern that we have less interest in becoming a SMI Instructor across the state. Terry reported that based on his own personal knowledge pre-entrance testing is the overwhelming majority of failures in SMI Instructor training. He continued that the normal expectation is there will not be a failure once the student passes pre-entrance testing. Terry went on to state that there has been several suggestions and he is asking the group for direction.

Terry reported that there have been suggestions to run multiple pre-entrance exams. Terry stated that it could be done, but would it take away from the program to run multiple pre-entrance testing dates? Terry restated that multiple pre-entrance testing dates are ran with the Driver Instructor pre-qualifications. If they come the first day and fail the Driver Instructor pre-quals, they return the next day and try again. If they fail the second day, they come back the third day. But, Terry continued, Driver Instructor is different than Radar. Driver training facilities, and opportunities, are not apparent across the state. In many cases, students arrive at the Academy and have not been in a car driving within the courses since they attended BLET because of the lack of facilities. Whereas with Radar, every operator has equal access to obtaining an operator manual to study by. They are exposed to training and testing at least once every three years. So, while the pre-entrance written exam and motor skill pre-entrance testing is unique, its information that every operator is exposed to on a routine basis. Terry also asked the group to consider if the Academy should do a pre-entrance study session, where the students come a month or two prior to pre-entrance testing and go through a one or two day refresher prior to the pre-entrance testing session? Terry only remarked that the group needs to keep the integrity of the testing and training program at heart as we work through this decision.

Member Thad Condrey disagreed. Member Condrey stated that entertaining a change to pre-entrance testing in some form is something he can get on board with, but not from the stand point of giving them more than one chance to pass it. Member Condrey stated that when you look at this from an administrator's standpoint, to send people to these classes, the administrator has to fill out justification memos, expense accounts, etc. for each of these students to attend. If he send 6-8 guys down there, he has to complete a lot of paperwork to get them down there for a two week school. He continued that if it remains a one day pre-qualification exam for motor skills and for the written, at some point prior to the actual course, it could actually act to lessen the amount of paperwork an administrator is required to complete.

Member Joe Carey shared that he was trying to understand an example of what multiple pre-entrance testing sessions would look like. Member Chris Gaddis asked if Member Carey was asking logistically how the justice academy could set this up? Member Carey agreed. Member Gaddis recommended the group consider September 15<sup>th</sup> and October 15<sup>th</sup> as the pre-qual days for SMI where if they fail their first attempt at pre-entrance testing on September 15<sup>th</sup>, they would simply return on October 15<sup>th</sup> to try

again. Member Condrey stated that he didn't realize what the proposal was; as in doing it two or three times ahead of the actual school. Member Condrey continued by saying he would only support signing up for one of those pre-quals attempt. They shouldn't be allowed to do it each month. He continued, that if they want to try it again next year, they can attempt at one of those two or three pre-qualification dates. Member Condrey was concerned that it wouldn't be an accurate measurement of their knowledge. He opined that with just a month between attempts, the students will just memorize those questions so they can get a sneak peak the first time. Member Gaddis replied that any officer that attends under the current process likely does that anyway. He continued that if he attended pre-entrance testing and failed, he would honestly grab his materials and go back through the highlights as quickly as I could to prepare for the next attempt he had the following year. Member Ethan Brinn proposed that we think about dealing with the test questions is that we generally have an intelligent pool of people coming, so what is stopping them from remembering the test questions when the pre-qual day is the first day of class as it is? We are limiting them to one day, so we are limiting them to only one opportunity on a pre-qual date per year. Member Brinn suggested that either way, whether one attempt or multiple attempts, they going to highlight and go back anyways for the next time - any intelligent student is going to go that. Terry inquired about possibly developing two or more sets of questions. Member Brinn agreed, recommending that Academy staff could develop multiple pre-entrance tests. Member Condrey agreed with having multiple versions of the exam. Member Brinn recommended either the group or academy staff developing a bank of questions and have two to three different versions of the test with different questions on it. Member Condrey reported in attempting to prepare the group of Troopers desiring to attend the upcoming RADAR Instructor pre-entrance session, he set-up a SHP preliminary school. In this school, it also consisted of an informal pre-entrance test as well. Member Condrey and First Sergeant Smith at the training academy developed the test of one hundred (140) questions based on general RADAR operator knowledge. The highest grade on our own internal pre-entrance test was a 75 out of all 8 that attended the unannounced SHP pre-entrance testing. Member Condrey reiterated that the highest grade was a 75, and that it was general knowledge questions on an unannounced test. Terry added to Member Condrey's statement that when students come for pre-entrance testing on the first day, Academy staff don't know how much the students have studied prior to coming for the testing, or if they even studied at all. Terry reported that in the training calendar for every basic instructor school, it is clearly pre-warned that pre-entrance testing will occur and what scoring is considered acceptable. He went on to state that the common misconception today in the field is that the elevated fail rate in basic SMI Instructor training is because the "Academy staff" either seeks out to fail the students, or is incompetent and doesn't deliver the materials appropriately. Neither is the case. The fact is that the highest fail percentages occur because the students don't meet the minimum score of 90 on the pre-entrance written test, or they fail to perform a standard motor skills test within 90 minutes. These tests session results are based on training that was received from the field prior to attending pre-entrance testing – not from the Academy. Terry went on to suggest that the group could certainly work towards reviewing or developing the pre-entrance test questions to discern if they are unusually difficult. Member Jason McIntyre asked if that thought is any different than

the state written Radar exam, or Radar Recertification exam. Member McIntyre went on to state that CJSD doesn't advertise it, but the basic RADAR operator test and the RADAR operator recertification tests are both the same test. Member McIntyre went on to suggest that students could go out and say, ok I remember this was on the Radar test as well, so he said that he thinks the Academy and CJSD are in the same boat as far as that is concerned. Terry stated that he has not looked at the pre-entrance test yet, but from what he remembered taking the exam, it is not questions exactly like one would see on the state exam, and in some cases it is details from the operator manual not normally tested on the state exam. However, Terry continued, that doesn't mean the test is necessarily too hard. The information was all covered in the manual, and in many cases, we would hear that students utilized popular study guides for the state exam as their preparation to take the pre-entrance exam. We all know that those study guides may, or may not, be updated and accurate. Member Thad Condrey stated that he felt that when a student is attending instructor training, the test 'should' be more comprehensive than an operator recertification exam. I know that some years ago, CJSD started taking some of the case law out of the state written test with the argument that it was not necessary to know how to operator a radar – while the instructor pre-entrance written test still has a lot of case law in it. However, Member Condrey continued, to be a well-rounded instructor I believe you 'should know' all the facets of the operator manual and that includes our legal case law. He continued, case law is still a very important part of the manual, and with the bad testimony from the "sowards case," we see it is still an important part of the game. Terry Miller agreed with Member Condrey by saying his points are good points. Terry reminded the group that one may suggest the pre-entrance written test is too hard, or another may suggest that we need to recommend relaxing the minimum score lower than a 90. However, Terry continued, the advisory group initially recommended setting the score a little bit lower than 90, but the Commission recommended a higher minimum score of 90. Therefore, it was the Commission that revised the recommendation by the advisory group to be 90. He said that even now if we elect to present the Commission with a lower score for the pre-entrance exam, ultimately, the Commission may accept that recommendation or make it higher. Terry offered as an option that the advisory group could consider lowering the score, even if by a few points to 85, 88, or 89; but the Commission would have final say in what the acceptable score would be. Member Thad Condrey stated that in his opinion if the score is decided to be lowered, they shouldn't lower it by much. He stated that he don't think it should be, but for the sake of capturing some of those 88's or 89's, he would listen to arguments to lower it by a few points. Member Ethan Brinn stated that he felt confident the Commission desires instructor candidates that know the operators information well enough to be instructors of their topics. He continued by saying the best way to prove that theory is through an effective pre-entrance exam. Member Brinn suggested the pre-entrance testing is effective as it is, and that is evident by the very low failure rates after one successfully passes the pre-entrance testing and enters the actual school. He said that the Academy doesn't need to be teaching the students basic operator level knowledge in an instructor school - they should have a strong foundation of that knowledge coming in. He ended with the thought that in his professional opinion, the advisory group should not consider recommending lowering the pre-entrance minimum score. Member Thad Condrey asked how many questions

were currently on the exam, and Terry replied that there are 80 multiple choice questions for RADAR. Member Condrey then recommended that maybe you could capture a few more people if you increased the number of questions to 100 questions? Member Bob Stevens reminded the other advisory group members that the way the pre-entrance exam arrived to the score of 90 was by the wishes of the Commission to begin with. Member Stevens stated that if we go back and ask them to reconsider a directive they handed down to us to begin with, it might be difficult to explain that we want to lower our score for the sake of getting a few more people to pass that otherwise would not have. Member Stevens recommended that the advisory group should remain respectful of the Commission's directive they handed us before. Terry stated he understood Member Stevens concerns, and that he agreed we should respect the directive handed down from the Commissioners. Member Condrey reiterated that maybe his recommendation to increase the number of questions to 100 would be a way to get by that? Member Condrey asked to clarify that he was not proposing additional questions that are just an assortment of simple or easy questions for the sake of getting more passing grades, rather, increasing the number of questions to capture a better overall picture of the knowledge brought by the student. Terry clarified that if we recommended adding 20 more questions to make a 100 question test, they will become one (1) point each. Member Thad Condrey agreed, adding that then they become one (1) point each instead of one (1) point whatever. Terry agreed. Member Ethan Brinn you're still requiring the same scoring. They still have to get 90. Member Thad Condrey you may have to capture those 89's among those people who are missing it by one (1) question. Member Chris Gaddis asked to now add the previous discussion on the multiple pre-entrance testing sessions to this example. He stated that he is aware from other curriculums when there is a pre-qual they have up to a year to come back and enroll into instructor training, and from what Member Gaddis has seen, for those who have months between pre-qual and actually attending the instructor training course, they show up for class with skill levels that are not nearly as proficient as it was the day they took the pre-qual or pre-entrance test because they passed pre-entrance testing and never look at it again. Member Gaddis stated that he mentions this now because if the advisory group was to recommend multiple pre-entrance test sessions months prior to the actual SMI Instructor school, we have to assume that some will report on day one of instructor school not having that command knowledge of the operator materials putting us right back in the same predicament of having to teach them all over again. Member Chris Gaddis added that pre-entrance testing in SMI not only includes the written exam, but they also get in the car and ride with the students to make sure they are proficient in every mode of operation, front and back. Member Gaddis recommended that we keep it this way, because it is one thing to read the material and know the book, but it's another thing to actually be able to physically perform the steps appropriately and competently. He went on to state that he is professionally concerned about us going to a pre-qual standard of giving them a month or more between the pre-entrance test and the first day of instructor school. Member Fred McQueen asked the advisory members why they could not just recommend that the Academy does one pre-qual the week before the school starts? He also asked, does it have to be two or three attempts, if so, why? If we did it the 2<sup>nd</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup> week in January and then the class actually starts the last week of January, we eliminate the 90 day wait and you'll know

how many students you have since the attendance cap is set at twenty four. Terry Miller corrected Member McQueen by saying there actually is no cap because the Academy always strives to get anyone that wants a shot at SMI Instructor into the training for that session. Terry went on to say the only restriction would be making sure enough staff are available to meet the 1:6 ratio. Terry then asked the advisory group if they are leaning toward having multiple pre-entrance test days ahead of the basic instructor school, but only allow any given student to attempt one pre-entrance test session per year? Member Chris Gaddis asked what the historical enrollment is every year for this class – and if there a waiting list? Terry replied that the Academy makes an effort to provide all of the students with an opportunity to attend pre-entrance testing since we only run one basic instructor course per year, so there are rarely (if ever) a waiting list for SMI Instructor training. Terry went on to say that if there was a waiting list of students that we could not provide an opportunity to attend pre-entrance testing, we would run multiple instructor schools per year to make sure everyone has a chance to attend once. Member Gaddis stated the reason why he was asking was by the suggestion made in the September meeting where they believed the students only have one shot to get into the class per year. If that is the case, then we need to consider multiple attempts at the course. Member Thad Condrey stated he did not have any issues with the fact there is only one class per year, and as long as they get at least one shot in a year at it, he has no problem with it. Member Condrey stated he understood from one of the presenters that it could be an Academy budgetary issue, and that would be a consideration for any of us when planning out these in-depth training courses. Terry stated that running one SMI Instructor course per year is really no budgetary issue for the Academy, and opined that former Chairman Dan Worley was present in the audience to help ensure he was correct on this response. Terry stated that after the high failure percentage of pre-entrance testing last year, Dan had considered running a second basic instructor school later in the summer because he assumed there would be a significant number of the returning students who were interested. But because the actual numbers of interested attendees were slightly less than planned, Dan made the decision to not run the second course. Terry asked Dan in the audience if that was correct. Dan agreed, and went on to report to the group that currently the Academy applies for funding to the Governors Highway Safety Program to receive grant funding for our SMI and Driving adjuncts at the Academy. Dan stated that he then, now Terry, has to budget a year in advance for these grant funded expenses. Dan stated that when he was finally able to compile the expenses versus the reserve fund in the grant towards the summer, he knew it would require mostly state funding from within the budget of DOJ. Furthermore, when he compared the need of 7 to 10 students that already had one shot at the pre-entrance test back in January (except for one student), Dan determined the needs did not validate proceeding on with the request for additional funds from DOJ. He said it was solely a budgetary decision that he made not to run the second school in an attempt to be a good steward of the taxpayers' dollars. Dan stated that it had absolutely nothing to do with DOJ experiencing budgetary hardships, which is the assumption provided by one presenter in September. Dan went on to request from Chairman Miller the opportunity at some point to make two additional points to the group's previous discussion whenever it was appropriate. Terry approved for Dan to address the group at that time.

Dan asked Terry to first pole the committee on whether a study session should be offered immediately prior to the pre-entrance test session(s). Second, Dan asked Terry to place on the record the opinion of the advisory group for them to be responsible for reviewing the pre-entrance written exam and revise the existing questions, or adding questions to it, or taking questions away. Member Thad Condrey remarked first that he didn't think offering a study session would be appropriate. It would just be too much opportunity to degrade the exam. Terry asked, with an informal show by hands, who on the advisory group would be ok with a one day eight hour study session prior to them coming to take the pre-entrance exam. There was no member to raise their hand. However, Member Jason McIntyre then compared the act to what happens in BLET, stating that school directors have study sessions for their cadets prior to taking the BLET exam – it might not be a stretch to offer the same to SMI Instructors as long as you are not teaching the test, but reviewing only the objectives. Member Fred McQueen opined about how many of them are not going to actually study the material but just attend the 8 hour class instead. He asked if we were to provide a study session, are we really soliciting learning from the student by doing that, or just incorporating memorization of the literature. Member McQueen stated that we should hold these people to a higher level by requiring them to learn the materials, not just memorize for the sake of taking a test. Member Ryan Weeks asked if there was not a web based prep course from an operator level, sometime years back on the operator level. Terry replied that there was an instrument familiarization course for instructors, and an operator refresher course for operators. Member Weeks asked if it was dealing with more motor skills. Terry replied for the instructor refresher course it was dealing more with instrument familiarization, but for operators it was a manual refresher. Member Weeks stated that what he was hearing in the room is that we are considering these folks trying to get into instructor training as instructor level people already. He stated, in his opinion, the advisory group should not look at it from that perspective. He went on to state that they are showing aptitude and interest, but not already at the instructor level. Member Weeks stated that the pre-entrance exam should remain at 90%, but he wants to be able to recruit people who are sharp with their instruments and they do very well with knowledge. I think at that point if they meet the 90% on the pre-entrance written, they have shown they can meet a certain level of aptitude and can then be developed. Terry replied that all students attending pre-entrance testing must be at the probationary instructor level before they can attend. Therefore Terry continued, they should arrive having some knowledge of instructing, preparing students for exercises and exams, etc. Terry stated that his impression of Member McQueen's point was that those attending are already general instructors and should have some concept by that point how to study for an exam and properly prepare themselves, and I agree with him on that point. Member Fred McQueen agreed with Terry, and went on to state that there have been some students who came more than once and failed the pre-entrance testing, suggesting that their ability to understand the proper preparation for testing is lacking to begin with – yet, the advisory group is considering ways to supplement that. Member Ethan Brinn stated it was his understanding that we are asking those desiring to become SMI Instructors to arrive being competent operators and knowledgeable within their specialty. We are not asking more than that, especially



not on the pre-entrance part of it now. Member Brinn continued that the whole point of the pre-entrance exam to weed out those folks that are not efficient and knowledgeable operators, no different than pre-employment screening for law enforcement officers does. Member Thad Condrey agreed with Member Brinn, and said the State Highway Patrol goes even above and beyond what the Academy does by trying to weed out Troopers before they are sent by the Patrol to pre-entrance testing. Member Ethan Brinn suggested that if we deliver a study session prior to the pre-entrance testing, we're giving them an idea of what they are reviewing when, by the time they step in the door, they should already have a good operating knowledge of that book. So really, do we need to do a study session for them? Member Fred McQueen I still say if you want to be an instructor you need to be able to show that your capable and interested in studying for yourself. We shouldn't be considering giving them a day of study, then I'm going to take the test now, that I've just memorized. If a student wants to be a RADAR instructor, you need to be able to study the materials, practice and prepare yourself, and arrive having that commanding knowledge. There are over a hundred RADAR Instructors across North Carolina today that didn't require holding their hand to come to RADAR Instructor school – the future people shouldn't either. Member Thad Condrey agreed, saying that a prospective student should certainly be proactive to a certain degree. Member Fred McQueen asked theoretically how many radar operator recerts are ongoing throughout the state? If I was interested in going to radar instructor school and scared to study, I can go sit through the first couple of days to get a good review of the materials. Member Ethan Brinn stated that was a good option. He also said the Academy could consider bringing back an online review class and encourage prospective students to attend a local recert or basic course prior to the pre-entrance session. Member Ryan Weeks stated that he really thinks there are people out here who want to be radar instructors, but they are few and far in-between. Member Weeks stated the people that are really interested in RADAR Instructor are those that like technical type things, they like that part of it. But are we going to see a huge difference to solve what some may seem as a low instructor numbers problem by offering a study session, or multiple pre-entrance test days? I don't think so. I do not believe this will make any significant changes to our numbers. Member Thad Condrey I have radar operators who are absolutely awesome and can do their clocks in 20 minutes and they know everything about that instrument and they'll make a high score on that test and have zero interest in being a radar instructor and I know they would be great at it. But they just don't want to do it and take on extra responsibility. Member Ryan Week suggested that some of these fail percentages could be skewed because people who are just not interested in SMI are being forced to attend the school. Member Weeks said that he has heard that loosely said before and through rumor that administrators will only send staff to general instructor if they also attend RADAR, or driving, or PT, or whatever. Member Thad Condrey asked Terry if he has ever personally experienced an individual that was, by their own admission, forced to attend. Terry Miller replied that yes, the Academy has definitely had that. Member Thad Condrey was openly surprised by this information. Terry Miller we have several good discussions going. I don't think we are ready to move on that so we cut that discussion off and table it until another meeting.

Dan Worley asked Chairman Miller if he could address the advisory group with an exiting thought on the pre-entrance testing discussion. Terry then allowed him to address the group. Dan stated that he wanted to make sure the advisory group understands that instructor schools are set up by the Commission to teach individuals who desire to be instructors in a specific field 'how to be an instructor' in that 'specific field.' Dan went on to clarify that what he meant by that is with radar instructor, when the students arrive on pre-entrance testing day, the Commission expects them to have a commanding knowledge as a basic operator. He said the Commission then expects us, the Academy staff, to provide those individuals with instructor level training that provides them with the knowledge and ability to teach the instruments, deliver road tests, correctly grade score sheets, teach the basic materials, submit the paperwork correctly, etc. It is not expected that Academy staff should go back and retrain the students on the basic theories and principles that they should have already learned in operator training to begin with. That is why the Commission, when the SMI advisory group suggested a lower pre-entrance test score, the Commission asked for a higher expectation of entry level knowledge. And, Dan continued, that is exactly why the pre-entrance testing is there to begin with, just like Member Brinn said earlier. It is to weed out those who do not have a commanding foundation of basic operator level knowledge. That is clearly evident by the very low fail rates for those who make it past the pre-entrance testing and into the basic school. Dan continued, that for what his interpretation of the pre-entrance expectations are currently held by the Commission, the current pre-entrance testing process is 'extremely effective' – although it means less people get into the school. "It demands that the students arrive with exactly what is expected – a commanding knowledge." This is not exclusive to the SMI program. All of the other instructor programs share the same expectations in their pre-entrance testing. Historically, SMI and Driver Instructor have experienced the highest two fail rates in pre-entrance testing, with failures occurring during the delivery of the basic school being very rare. Dan stated that he presumed that is because, with Driving, students have little or no opportunities for practice prior to attending. Dan stated that the Academy has taken steps to counter that by offering a driving practice day prior to the pre-entrance testing because there are just not that many tracks around the state for officers to borrow and practice. However, he continued, realistically that one day of practice has not proven to be a factor for significantly improving fail rates with driving. As for SMI, the high pre-entrance fail rates may be a combination of students studying the incorrect materials (such as old or invalid study guides, old operator manuals, etc.), or, it could be a lack of interest in applying themselves prior to attending pre-entrance testing because they were forced to attend, or simply do not possess a lot of motivation to excel in the topic. Regardless, failures do occur across the board, and Dan relayed to the advisory group that he is confident the pre-entrance fail rates are not an example of poor training the students received from our Community Colleges, nor is it a case of Academy staff desiring to achieve high fail percentages for the sake of just sending people home either.

Terry agreed, and went on to say he would like to share statistics from the Justice Academy registration and grading system that was started in 2015. Terry said he felt like these statistics would also further justify Dan's comments as well.

Terry stated that the following statistics were pulled from present day back to July 2015, and anything further back than that would have to be pulled from paper files in storage which can be done, if needed. So, Terry continued, these are statistics cover the last three and one-half (3½) years of our RADAR Instructor classes and the Academy runs one (1) RADAR Instructor class per year for 2016 – 2018. During that time frame, Terry reported that a total of fifty-four (54) students came for the pre-entrance testing. Of those fifty-four (54), thirty-two (32) people failed the written or motor skills pre-entrance test. That account's for a failure rate of fifty-nine percent (59%) from pre-entrance testing. The remaining twenty-two (22) students that passed pre-entrance testing entered the two (2) week basic instructor school and all twenty-two (22) students passed the basic school courses. Therefore, the pass percentage for those that successfully complete the pre-entrance testing is one hundred percent (100%). Additionally, of those twenty-two (22) that successfully completed the basic school, all twenty-two (22) successfully completed the state written examination resulting in a one hundred percent (100%) pass rate on the state exam.

Terry then reported the Instructor recertification statistics for the three and one-half (3½) year period of July 2015 to present. A total of one hundred and twenty-four (124) instructors attended the RADAR Instructor Recertification classes during this three (3) year period of statistics. Of the one hundred and twenty-four (124) instructors that attended, only one (1) instructor failed to recertify and lost his SMI operator and instructor certification. His failure occurred on instrument sign-offs, which is a motor-skills failure. Therefore, the pass percentage of those instructors who attended recertification during this time frame is ninety-nine point one percent (99.1%). Terry again reminded the advisory group that this was only a three year capture of the statistics, but continued on to say that he estimated that even a ten (10) year capture of the fail percentages would establish fairly similar results as these. Terry offered to the advisory committee that if they would like to see statistics from ten (10) years ago, or longer, he would certainly provide them with the numbers, but that would take time to research and compile from stored files. There was no such request by the advisory group.

Member Joe Carey agreed that the statistics speak for themselves for the delivery of the actual school, and the recertification courses. Member Carey went on to state that Dan brought up a good point earlier that maybe the advisory group should look at the questions? Member Carey stated the only reason he was considering that is simply to say the more eyes that are on it, the more validated the questions may be. Member Carey stated that the advisory group may very well come to the conclusion that no questions should be added or changed, or, we may establish that some questions

should be clarified. Even if the group determines one or two questions that are worded a little confusing to the students could be a difference between an 89 and 90. Member Ethan Brinn stated that he remembered one question when he came through that sticks out in his head. He said if that question is still in the exam, it would not be a valid question anymore. Member Brinn said he felt like the questions should be reviewed. Member Thad Condrey agreed by stating the questions should be current and reflect what's in the manual, but went on to state that he personally did not want to see the questions to the pre-entrance test because the temptation to review with these guys would be too much to teach them the test. I want it to be that the understanding of these general instructors attending the pre-entrance session must first study the manual. And while there is nothing wrong with a SMI Instructor reviewing the manual with the prospective students, I wouldn't want the test questions to be known - the temptation would be too high to teach the test. Member Jason McIntyre agreed, and said that is exactly why CJSD doesn't allow the School Director's to see the BLET test. It prevents accusations that they would be tempted to teach the test – like concerns expressed by Member Condrey. Member McIntyre stated that CJSD staff even ask them to leave the room during administration of the state exam; to step out of the room. Terry asked the group to take an informal poll with a show of hands of those who are against everyone else seeing the test other than him. The majority of the members raised their hands. Member Thad Condrey stated that one thing Terry could consider is to select a few members of the group, or maybe the group themselves could vote a subcommittee of two or three people on the group that would review the pre-entrance exam for clarity and accuracy. There was no discussion on this proposal. Member Bob Stevens then stated that he does not like the idea of having too many eyes on the pre-entrance exam. Member Stevens recommended that the group take a proposal discussed earlier and add an additional twenty (20) more questions to the pre-entrance exam. He stated that as an advisory group they can each submit twenty (20) questions, and that would present Terry with a large bank of questions to select one hundred (100) questions from and no one individual group member would know everything that is on the pre-entrance test. Member Ryan Weeks agreed with Member Stevens recommendation, saying that method would not damage the integrity of the test. Member Joe Carey stated that he understood the concern about being tempted to teach the test, but reminded the group that all of them take the recertification test every three (3) years and will go “Ah yeah, I remember this question” and then when we are delivering the review for operator recertification training later down the road and come across something we saw on the state exam - we make sure to cover that as part of our review. It just happens. At that time, the group had no further comments or proposals. Chairman Miller recommended that this topic is something the advisory group might should take under advisement and be prepared to return in March to reach a consensus? Several of the members openly agreed. Member Thad Condrey reminded the group that each member could submit one question a piece, or maybe a selected subcommittee of the SMI advisory group was nominated. Dan Worley then approached the group and stated that the Chairman would need to research policy on this, as there

may be a policy that restricts the releasing of the pre-entrance exam. However, Dan continued, I do think that the proposal by someone earlier of each advisory member developing ten (10) or twenty (20) questions each was a great idea. That would provide the Chairman with a good bank of questions to select from and the integrity of the exam should not be called into question. Dan stated that he could not recollect which member proposed that, but it was a great idea. Member Thad Condrey stated that to avoid overlapping of questions, the group members could be assigned topic blocks where they develop questions from these specific pages. Dan agreed with Member Condrey and stated he felt like that was an excellent idea. Dan stated there is one section of the pre-entrance exam that normally causes a lot of failure, and that is case law review. Remember gentlemen, I graded these pre-entrance test for 11 years now, and I think based upon the input from people who are dismissed, a lot of them are using operator exam study guides that have been distributed around the state. These study guides are designed sometimes by students who go into the state exam, and memorize questions on the state exam. Since the state exam doesn't have much, if any, questions pertaining to case law, the study guides cover very little of that as well. Then, they arrive to take the pre-entrance test and we cover it pretty intensely on the current pre-entrance exam – about 6 questions. So, Dan continued, when you can only miss up to 8 questions – that becomes a pretty significant element to the fail percentage. The problem is, do we adjust the questions to match the state exam, or do we have a pre-entrance test that is conforming to the materials as a whole? The legal section is many pages of information in the manuals. Do we omit questions on the pre-entrance exam just because the state exam or some study guide doesn't cover it? I would submit that no, you test the instructor candidate's knowledge of important portions of the operator manual. So, Dan continued, that is the truth in the history of this issue. Member Thad Condrey stated to Dan that is exactly what his theory was because the state exam doesn't ask that level of detail on their questions, if the students just presumed it was not worth studying. Member Condrey also openly said that he wonders how many instructors simply breeze through that part without really covering it because case law is not covered extensively on the state exam. Dan replied to Member Condrey that when he was School Director for SMI Instructor training he stressed how important the legal section is and routinely encouraged instructors to cover the legal and operational considerations sections intensively, specifically using the travesty caused to our program by bad testimony in the 'Soward's case' as the purpose in that. Member Condrey agreed, and proposed that the advisory group just assign between now and March that each member write ten (10) questions and be prepared to submit them in March. Member Ethan Brinn asked if that would benefit the next instructor school in January, and Terry replied that no it would only be implemented at the next basic instructor school that occurred later in 2019 or early 2020. Dan also asked the Chairman for the record to be cleared on a misconception that the advisory group holds about the current pre-entrance exam. Dan advised the group that the pre-entrance exam was reviewed, and if necessary revised, to match any changes that occurred during the preceding year because of updates or revisions to the manual. Dan stated

that for the upcoming basic instructor schools, he had already asked School Director Miller to go through all the exams and ensure they are current to the manual, and assured the group that he himself had personally reviewed the exams about two weeks prior to each delivery of pre-entrance testing. So, Dan continued, rest assured that as things changed, the questions that were no longer applicable to that period were revised to accurately reflect the changes that occurred. Terry agreed that Dan had already instructed him to review the exam for accuracy and applicability, but that he simply had not had time to do so yet. Terry advised the group he would, however, review it prior to the delivery of the upcoming basic instructor school. Terry thanked Dan for his guidance and historical clarification on the pre-entrance topics. He then asked the group if everyone was ok with writing ten to fifteen (10-15) questions a piece and submitting them. Member Ryan Weeks agreed, and stated the group will develop and submit them to the bank of questions. Member Thad Condrey asked which section Member Brinn was to look at. Member Joe Carey proposed that each member develop two questions from each section of the manuals. Member Ryan Weeks suggested that the group take more time to think about this, and recommended that Terry send out an email between December and the March meeting assigning sections. Terry Miller agreed, and stated he would send out an e-mail to everyone and assign sections to develop ten to fifteen (10-15) questions, and then asked if the group was accepting of this recommendation. No member was in opposition to this. Member Thad Condrey asked if the pre-entrance exam is multiple choice, or is there some true and false? Terry asked Dan to clarify that for the group, and Dan reported it is currently eighty (80) questions and all are multiple choice. Member Condrey then asked if that is the type of questions the group should stick with, and Terry replied that multiple choice was the best option. Dan clarified that Terry will send an e-mail to the group that will format how the group should develop the questions. There was no further discussion on this topic, therefore, Terry placed the meeting into short recess at 2:00 pm.

Terry resumed the session at 2:06 pm, and asked the group to focus now on the primary concern expressed by the School Directors at the conference, and then again at the September meeting. Terry reminded the group that concern was the interpretation of rule by CJSD that a student attending the basic instructor school would lose their operator certification if a failure occurred during the school. Terry stated that this concern was being exemplified by School Directors who said this rule was a primary reason for why they could not recruit more interest of people to attend SMI Instructor school. Terry stated that at the School Directors conference, when this issue was first brought up, he miss spoke because he was not aware the interpretation was being handled like that, but he was aware that if they failed the pre-entrance testing they did not lose their operator certification. So, to clarify, Terry reminded the group that failure during the pre-entrance testing does not result in loss of operator certification, but once they pass pre-entrance testing and are in the basic instructor school, if a failure were to occur then they would lose their operator certification under the current interpretation. Terry stated that this was a decision made by a former Administrator at CJSD, which was later supported by the SMI Advisory Group through a very narrow one (1) majority

vote. Terry agreed with the concerns held by the School Director, and stated that he felt like this rule interpretation could potentially be a reason for someone to not chance attending the school. Other than that, he continued, I will turn this discussion over to Member McIntyre.

Member Jason McIntyre stated that he understands ultimately the decision is up to him on whether we keep this rule the same or we change it. Member McIntyre stated that while he has a personal opinion about it, he wouldn't dare make an absolute decision on his own without getting input from the advisory group. Member McIntyre stated that his personal opinion is that you should not lose your operators certification should a failure occur in the basic instructor school, however, if a failure occurs during instructor recertification, a suspension of the operator certification would be necessary. Member McIntyre continued with having said that, he wanted to go around the room and see how each of the group felt and if the consensus of the room. Member Joe Carey stated that he agreed completely with both Terry and Member McIntyre. Someone, if their sole responsibility is traffic and they are going to risk losing their certification, "oh I am off the traffic unit if I fail radar instructor school, I am not going" that in no way encourages folks to better themselves and become radar instructors. I think definitely there needs to be an interpretational change in my opinion where you do not lose your certification for failures that occur within the basic instructor school. Terry stated that, as the statistics have shown already today, most of failures that do occur happens during the pre-entrance testing – not the sign-offs later. Member Thad Condrey stated that is why he views the current interpretation as being backwards to logical thought. During pre-entrance testing, you arrive to do a motor-skills test on an instrument you're theoretically certified on and using every day. So, it is better that you demonstrate incompetence on that unit which you write tickets on every day, or that we take your operator certification if you fail on an instrument you have never seen before? He said the logical sense approach to this was just not there in his mind. Member Condrey clarified that he was not arguing that we should change the rule that if they fail the pre-entrance motor skills that they should lose their operator's certification, instead, he is arguing that the current concept is, at best, backward. Member Bob Stevens stated the issue he has about the sign-offs is the instructors get an advantage in a way the operators do not. In fact, he continued, they are allowed to leave the room once per sign-off to check their notes without a failure occurring by using 'the star' and could do that on each sign-off if they so wished. If there are 19 sign-offs, they could possibly use 'the star' 19 times (once per sign-off attempt). Additionally, they also get up to 10% of the total number of sign-offs to request a RETEST for a failure. Member Stevens stated that in his opinion, this is just too much leniency. His proposal would be that the limitations on RETESTs remain, but without the use of any 'stars.' Member Fred McQueen stated that he recollected discussions by the administrator at that time about when you are taking that state test your showing proficiency because the state test is basically the 100 questions, basic operators plus what instructors did. His argument was related to that, which is the reason he was so adamant about them losing the operator certification, but I cannot honestly remember the exact argument. Member Bob Stevens stated that it doesn't

upset him if the operator keeps the certification even after a failure during pre-entrance testing because technically the student is not “in” a SMI class at that point. They are attempting to test and score into the class – so how can a motor skills failure be applicable when they are technically not in the class at that time? However, Member Stevens continued, I agree with the previous administrators thoughts that once a student passes the pre-entrance test and the student is then officially admitted into and begins the class, it should result in a loss of their existing certification. Member Chris Gaddis stated that he brought this up about four (4) years ago to the group and it generated a pretty decent discussion then. He stated that his personal and professional opinion stay the same – meaning that whether we change it or not, I honestly don’t feel like this is going to be that big of a factor to recruit new people into our program. I really don’t think that’s it. However, he stated that in his professional opinion we should just look at the fairness of what we are assessing during the training. Member Gaddis argued that the person is enrolled for an instructor level class and not an operator class. He stated that it is true a student must have an exceptional foundation of operator knowledge to teach it, but as for the procedural side to it, at some point within that preceding three years the student has demonstrated his or her ability to perform at the operator level already. Therefore, if they attend the basic instructor school midpoint of that three years and have a bad day, he cannot justify voting that they should lose their existing operator certification - it just isn’t fair. He continued that of course they would not pass the instructor part of it, but they should go home without losing their existing operator certification because we’re really not assessing them as an operator after they pass the pre-entrance testing. Member Thad Condrey stated that he partially agreed, but that one could certainly convince him easier that the student should lose their operator certification for failures during pre-entrance testing. Member Chris Gaddis stated the only thing about that is, remember that we are assessing them on the pre-entrance exam at a score of ninety percent (90%) correct that’s well above the basic operator level. As for the road test itself, we are assessing them at the time limit of an instructor because there is an hour and a half (1½ hours) instead of two (2) hours in operator, so the stress may be added to it. Member Thad Condrey rebutted that if they don’t make a ninety (90) on the pre-entrance exam, he wouldn’t recommend they should lose their operator certification. However, Member Condrey continued, if the student scores a sixty-five (65) on the pre-entrance test, maybe they should lose their operators certification for that as well – I could be persuaded in that argument too.

Member Ethan Brinn stated that he agreed with Member Gaddis. After the student passes pre-entrance testing, they are being evaluated solely as potential instructor candidates at that point. There should be no repercussions to their operator privilege for that. Member Ryan Weeks stated that he agreed with Members Gaddis, Brinn, McIntyre, and Miller that the current interpretation should change. He went on to say that he is aware we are trying to look at the aspects and where necessary, make positive changes where they are needed. In this case, however, Member Weeks said that while he hopes this makes a tremendous difference and we see an flux of new people coming out, he does not believe that will be the case. Member Anthony Locklear



stated that he agreed with Member Gaddis and the others – there should be no repercussions for the operator certification. Member Richard Herman offered the opinion of someone who is not an operator, and stated he agrees with Member Condrey. He stated that if a student comes in and takes the pre-entrance test and fails, he goes home with his operator certification still being good on a unit that he uses every day, while another student passes the pre-entrance test but then fails a unit he has never seen before and never used to write a ticket and yet he is punished for that. Member Herman stated that it doesn't make sense to him. Terry asked Member McIntyre if he would like to make a decision based off the input thus far, or did he wish for a formal vote. Member Jason McIntyre asked for a formal vote by the group. Terry Miller asked if there was any further discussion? Member Chris Gaddis asked to clarify that the current interpretation is applicable to both basic and recertification that if you fail, you lose your operator. We have discussed thus far restoring that a failure in basic instructor training shall not cause the operator certification to suspend, but what is the difference in a recertification course? Member Gaddis stated that he is thinking the same thing should apply to recertification as well. For example, if a failure occurs during instructor recertification, why can't the operator certification be temporarily suspended and they just have to go back to an operator level and recertify within a certain amount of time to show their proficiency as an operator. My thought process, we've always done it and I hear what everyone has said, I have been a radar instructor for a long time and I feel whole heartedly that yes you should go to recertification and that counts as recertification for everything. It piggy backs on all of the certifications, but if we're really looking at it closely – we come back for recertification when we do our road test at the instructor level. When we do our sign offs, we're doing everything at an instructor level. We haven't shown any proficiency at an operator level. Even though it's much greater, we're still not showing proficiency as an operator. The written test is 100 questions of operator, 50 questions of instructor combined together to make up the instructor exam. My opinion is that we should lift this and say you never lose your operator, per se, even in the instructor recertification we should suspend the operator and that person has a certain amount of time to return to recertify on an operator level to stay competent as an operator. Does that make sense? Member Ryan Weeks I think that's kind of in place already. Member Chris Gaddis I'm saying if you fail the recert, you have to go back to a basic operator and take the complete 1 week class. What I am saying is you should be able to go to your local community college and do a operator recertification class. Member Joe Carey disagreed. Member Carey stated that while it is true there are aspects of instructor standards that apply during the recertification, there is also operator level testing that is occurring. For example, he proposed, if someone comes back to an instructor recertification and they get in the car and they fail their road test because they throw an estimate over 12 (twelve), that is essentially the same exact standard that operators must follow. The same can be said about the sign-offs as well. There are higher standards, such with limitations on retest, but the act of the sign-off is the same standard and that is nothing more than an operator level recertification as well. I cannot see the argument where there is a

difference. Member Thad Condrey stated the agreed, and the certification itself answers that concern because it is factually an “instructor/operator” certification. Member Chris Gaddis suggested that the group technically think about this. He said that if I get into a car and throw an estimate off by fifty two miles per hour (52 mph), or forget two fork tests – it is obvious I don’t know what I am doing operating the device, but I am being assessed at a time limit of one and one-half (1½) hours – not two hours. it is an instructor level test – not operator. Member Gaddis stated that he has a personal opinion that they should lose it all, but argued that if you look at it professionally, it may not be so clear. Member Fred McQueen disagreed, saying it is clear that you have two certifications combined together from the one course. It is titled Instructor/Operator certification, which means the one course counts as satisfying both certifications. Terry asked Member McIntyre that if the group voted to follow Member Gaddis’ thought process, wouldn’t CJSD have to create a separate certification to divide the two? Member Jason McIntyre agreed with Terry, stating that basically Mrs. Witherspoon would have to generate a new certification template to separate the two certifications. Member Thad Condrey stated that while he finds that Member Gaddis presents some valid points in his argument, he more clearly sees the issue at hand resting with the interpretation presented by the School Directors. He continued that we should be addressing what the concerns are from the field, if it is valid concerns. Member Jason McIntyre agreed, and further stated that we should consider revising the current interpretation that if a failure occurs in the basic instructor school, no loss of operator certification occurs. However, if you fail to successfully complete instructor recertification, you lose both the instructor and operator certification just as the interpretation has been. There was no further discussion. Terry Miller opened the floor for motions. A motion was made by Member Thad Condrey to **change the current interpretation that if a failure occurs during any basic SMI instructor course, you lose the ability to be certified as an instructor, but your operator certification remains untouched. Meanwhile, this procedure does not extend to any SMI Instructor recertification courses. If you go to a recertification and you failed you lose everything and have to go back just as it is now.** The motion was seconded by Member Joe Carey, and the **motion carried unanimously.** Member Jason McIntyre what I will do, when I get back and get a chance, I’ll email all of you what I intent to propose. The Commission meets again in February. I’ll do the presentation, Terry and I will both be there then. We’ll do the presentation on Wednesday to E&T and then the Commission on Friday and will give feedback in an email.

### THIRD ISSUE

Terry Miller let's talk about the supervise field practice hours. There was concern that 16 hours were too many. Some suggestions were made to cut it back some as much as 4 hours or 12 hours that way when you have your different stationary moving and same direction that would put you 4 hours for each one, a good round figure and 12 hours would be enough to show they knew how to operate the instrument properly with a person who was already certified. A lot of your departments are working 12 hours shifts and they are possibly saying this could be done in one shift or two shifts. We know because of calls that's not possible. Member Thad Condrey if they came to Standards and you saw 12 hours done in one shift, without any breaks. Member Jason McIntyre I would want to see a CAD printout of what they were actually checked out. Terry Miller any thoughts, should we leave it at 16 hours? Member Joe Carrier if someone goes through basic operator and they sign off on a unit that's stationary moving only, they do 16 hours of field practice and they come back in six months and want to add the same direction unit. They have to do 4 hours of supervised field practice. Same direction is more difficult as far as procedurally than stationary and moving opposite. We're saying 4 hours is sufficient for same direction for someone to test on same direction and do their field practice, 4 hours is sufficient for same direction which is the most complicated configuration. If that is the case I don't see why the other two, stationary and moving opposite should be more than 4 hours, which will put it at 12. We've already said 4 hours is enough for same direction. Most people that come through on same direction radars, we don't have that many left that aren't same direction. If that were the case where someone would come through, I propose they still do 12 on a moving opposite and stationary and if they want they'd have those 12 hours and if they want add same direction they would have to do another 4 hours which is already what's required of them. Which that total will be 16, so that's why I believe the 12 is sufficient on the supervised field practice. Member Thad Condrey that makes a good argument as far as if you're only doing stationary moving opposite. If you're going to reduce anything, if someone is just getting moving opposite direction and stationary then maybe it shouldn't be 16 hours for that, especially with his argument as far as if your doing 4 hours for same directional. I don't know if we can reduce that 16 hours for all the configurations. Terry Miller any other comments. Member Jason McIntyre does anyone whose been here long enough know why it was originally set at 16. What's so special about that? Member Ryan Weeks I think it was 8 stationary, 8 moving opposite. Member Chris Gaddis I always thought it was 2 days of training, an 8 hour day and an 8 hour day. That's how I looked at it. When same direction came along we arbitrary came together and discovered 4 hours. Terry Miller asked member Bob Stevens if recalled the reason for the 16 hours. Member Bob Stevens My understanding where 16 came from when NHTSA came out with their recommendation, that's what they recommended back in 80's, 81 or 82. That was the recommendation they had come out with and that's what I was going to ask if anyone looked to see if according to NHTSA (National Highway Traffic Safety Administration) standard if that's still what they are recommending. Dan Worley that would make sense a lot of our stuff has always been

modeled after. Terry Miller I don't think anyone has look and I haven't even thought about that Bob, but that was a good suggestion. Member Jason McIntyre out of 10 SMI 15 logs I get, at least 4 of them are incorrect. These people don't know how many minutes per mode, it's not explained to them. I'll have them send in 15 hours of stationary and 1 of moving opposite and they got their 16 hours. Every SMI 15 log that comes into me I have to physically recount them to make sure they have them. Terry Miller would it change anything as far as your concerned. Would it change anything that you have to do differently except it would be less hours? Member Jason McIntyre It would be just changing the number of minutes per mode you're checking. Member Thad Condrey would it make it simpler if it was a more round, like 5 hours per configuration than instead of being 16 it being 15 hours. You can't reduce a whole lot to 12 hours. You can reduce it to 15 hours and that would make it 2 ½ hours. Member Ethan Brinn would be 2 ½ hours per antenna, per mode. Dan Worley that was the argument so you all remember. The argument from the audience that day, the reason he brought that up is because it was so difficult for them to sit there and figure up how many minutes per antenna. Their argument is if you do a nice round number like 12 it can divide up. Member Thad Condrey how convenient instead of coming to 15 they came to 12. Member Ryan Weeks at some point to, you've got to think about. They've already shown a level of proficiency to pass the motor skills exam. This is here for them to practice with a certified operator sitting next to them in the car. How many hours are we going to require for them to complete a practice of just sitting there. Member Thad Condrey I think it builds in. When they have to go to court and I know we don't have a lot of speeding tickets contested in court. It builds in the extra experience that they can testify to, instead of, oh I just got out of school and I wrote my first speeding ticket the next day. I sat with an experienced operator who demonstrated to me the proper this or that. It gives them a little extra, something for their resume if they ever have to sit on a stand about their training experience. How much time is that is sufficient. Member Jason McIntyre It would be nice, let's say for example if the person checking off all 6 modes, just have a minimum number of minutes per mode and you're still sitting with a certified operator don't change anything about that. Let's just say if they're doing all 6 modes or just doing 4 in the same lane, we have a set number of minutes that way the student knows ok, when I'm riding with my evaluator I have to do x amount front opposite, rear opposite, front stationary, rear station whatever they are checking off on. If all 6 or 4 we have a minimum number of minutes and they don't have to figure up 160 minutes of each mode in order to get 16 hours or 240 minutes if I'm only doing 4. Member Thad Condrey if I am correct to, this is a very rare occasion, if you're adding an antenna you don't have to do any practice time. Dan Worley that is correct. Member Thad Condrey so should we go so far to even say practice time without any specification to which antenna. Dan Worley that is an interpretational issue that Standards has specifically applied. Some administrators did not require an equal amount of time. I am talking here to Jason. Because none of us have talked about this prior to meeting about this, but in the past some administrators said yes I want the rear antenna included in this equally and some have said we just wanted to show some love

to the rear antenna. Well when it got to be equal so that interpretation is up to you. Where the interpretation stops is the 3 numbers, which is 4 hours for same direction, 8 hours for moving mode if it's new, 16 hours if it's a basic recruit graduate. Those 3 numbers are written as the policy on the SMI, and that form is controlled by you guys. Member Joe Carey well if it was 4 hours per configuration, to break it down by antenna would be simple. 2 hours per mode, per antenna, 120 minutes. Member Ethan Brinn 5 hours per mode would be just as easy, 2 ½. It's what number do we want to assign. Member Thad Condrey I was with a certified operator for 12 hours before I actually ever wrote my first speeding ticket. After 30 hours of instruction and passing a written and motor skills test. Member Fred McQueen 15 is closer to 16 and 16 has been the history. Member Richard Herman there are two things we don't like, the way things are and change. Member Ethan Brinn I think assigning a number of hours per mode that you're signing off on probably makes it a little easier for the student and supervising operator. It may even make it a little easier for him because say you do have a small agency that just bought a front end antenna stationary moving opposite unit. Member Ethan Brinn they're going to have to do 10 hours if you say 5 hours per mode, they still have to do 10 hours. So add a rear antenna in that order, now that's dual antenna stationary moving opposite 10 hours, 5 per mode. I am just saying you buy a new unit and it's moving opposite stationary only, now its dual antenna. 10 hours, 5 hours stationary, 5 hours moving opposite split front and rear. 2 ½ apiece. I think it makes it simpler and then a year down the road this officer adds the same direction unit and goes out and does 5 more hours to add same direction to his certification. Member Joe Carey why are we adding more hours when 4 has been sufficient. Member Ethan what I am saying, if your adding we split it up, field practice. You do a certain number of hours per mode. That's kind of the idea that was kick around. You're still doing fewer hours total. I like the idea of assigning a certain number of hours per mode that you're signing off on even if you're a basic student. If you're doing a stationary only unit, go do 4 of stationary radar. If you're doing a stationary moving opposite unit as a basic student go do 8 hours, 4 stationary, 4 moving opposite. The number of practice hours you do depends upon how many modes you're signing off on. Later on, add a mode to your certification you got to go back and do 4 more hours for that mode. It makes it a little simpler for everybody to understand I think. Member Jason McIntyre if they were saying 16 is too much we're making it more than 16 now. If we did just 2 hours per mode that's 12 hours of operation. Member Ethan Brinn I am just throwing it out there per mode. Say you have an agency that doesn't buy a rear antenna, they still have to do 4 hours, whatever the minimum is for that mode of operation. Member Chris Gaddis I think I'm tracking Jason. Your saying 4 hours for each mode equally divided upon antennas. Member Jason McIntyre we can do it that way, yes. That will be real simple for a student, evaluator, instructor and me to understand this person needs this amount of hours. Whatever we decide those hours are. Dan Worley reminded them not to forget about the Supplemental. Also try to come up with something applicable across the board. Member Ethan Brinn that's what I'm thinking, you tell them you have to do 4 hours per mode across the board. Ok, you're signing off a stationary moving opposite

unit only you have to only do 8 hours. If you want to add same direction later you have to come back and do 4 hours. Because we do 4 hours per mode. There is not any math you have to do really. 4 hours per mode divide it between 2 antennas. Terry Miller that would just be a simple form change. Member Jason McIntyre changing a form is not that simple. Charminique is in charge of revisions to student forms and you know..... it would be a manual change. Member Ethan Brinn yes, we'd have to change the language in the manual talking about the number of field practice. Member Ryan Week and the test. Member Thad Condrey just make sure the test doesn't have an answer of 12 and 16, so eliminate 16 off of it. Terry Miller so Jason you're saying it would have to go through the Charminique to be changed technically no matter we decide on, if they are against it? Member Jason McIntyre for example, if I went back to Michelle and said the SMI Committee wants to change the number of hours from 16 to 12, she's going to have to agree and Director Combs will have to agree before Charminique could change anything. It's not a rule but just an interpretation. Dan Worley lesson plans will have to be revised. These guys brought up the exams and I know it will be affected by it. This is not something that can take place tomorrow. Member Thad Condrey you would have to say, after the actual written test was updated is when you would have to put it into effect. Here is there other question I have we forgotten to mention, somebody comes to N.C. after having been certified in another state. We always require of them to show proof of certification and we always require them to do some practice hours regardless of what their state requires. It's my understanding they are always required to do at least 4 hours of practice. Member Jason McIntyre I think 4 hours is what we've been requiring them to do. It's not set in stone but we're trying to make it the same as if they were adding a unit. Member Thad Condrey let's just say they're coming from Georgia and they were certified in Georgia on everything we're certified on, moving, opposite, stationary and same direction. They show proof of that, are we going to require them to do some practice hours when they come to their state or are we going to honor their certificate? Member Fred McQueen that's Standards decision. Dan Worley the current rule is, if they're coming from another state and they were previously certified there, then the program administrator determines that state's training program meets or exceeds the N.C. standard, then they can omit all the supervised field practice if he finds that. Ultimately it's him in that position that makes the decision if they meet or exceeds N.C. or not. Member Thad Condrey do they still have to do through our operator course first. They just don't have to do the practice. Dan Worley that's correct. Member Ryan Weeks with that could we also, as long as it's still compliant with NHTSA's recommendation. I don't want to do something that is going to bring our program down or lower than what NHTSA's recommending since so much is based on it. Bob brought up a good point, that's something that should be looked into. Terry Miller that's a very good idea. **We'll table this on the changing of the field practice hours until the March meeting so we can look at NHTSA and see what that is.** Terry Miller turned the meeting over to Jason McIntyre for CJ Standards updates.

## CJ STANDARDS DIVISION ITEMS – STANDARDS

### CJ Standards Update

Member Jason McIntyre kind of going hand in hand and we're talking about the log. The one thing I am not getting a lot of is, when we have someone who was previously an operator and for whatever reason they let their certificate go and they come back through another operator course. I need a copy of the SMI Copy of the 14 to come into me when you're submitting your post deliveries and their clocks, and I need a copy of their old radar certificate. A lot of times I have to reach back out because most people forget. I need a copy to be included with their papers. Member Thad Condrey what I have done in the past because this has happened too, is when they can't find a copy of their old certificate, I have reached out to Charminique or Sharon. Member McIntyre yes, we can find it but however, it involves them going to archive and hand thumbing through the old files to pull out a copy of the old certificate. We can do that, but if I can get them not to do that, they would appreciate not having to go in those dusty archives and try to pull out the hard copies. Yes, we can do that because not everything is in TNS. Member Fred McQueen does it have to be their original, they first took it to begin with or will a recert suffice? Member McIntyre I think any previous radar certificate will work just to show to go along with the 14 they did have their certification in N.C. TNS will show me where they went to their first school, what community college and stuff like that. Technically I guess I can use that but it's always good to have the hard copy certificate to go with the 14 attached with the paperwork just to show, because the hours they may have to be required. Member Thad Condrey the other thing I told you about on the SMI 14 wit asks for where they originally attended and dates and we don't know either. Member McIntyre sometimes I can get that from TNS our records system we've got. That's a records keeping thing with the forms I have to go through.

### SMI Raleigh Program Update

Member McIntyre at the last Commission Meeting as far as SMI related, Raleigh PD with their SMI Program came off their 6 month probation. They were put on probation because they had a new operator riding with an evaluator who was not only expired on their certification for that unit but they've been expired for several years. I don't know if you guys know, as far as Goss with Raleigh's training division in Raleigh, he is excellent. He and Sherry Hunter have been working great over the 6 months between myself and Bob Beck working with them. We've worked out some new checks and balances in the system to where they've done nothing but been outstanding since the violation occurred. Actually on Raleigh's behalf they found the violation and reported it to Training and Standards. They were honest in that aspect of it. They've been outstanding on that part of the program, so the Commission did vote to take Raleigh off of probation with their SMI program at the last the last Commission meeting.

## SMI Testing Sight Oath Accessibility

Member McIntyre We've been working more, I don't know if any of you guys have experienced it, the testing dates for the regional testing are becoming so full with GI, BLET and SMI instructor. All the testing, Michelle Schilling has allowed the staff in our office to pull SMI out and we can go and visit your location of choice and administer your oaths at the testing sight. We have done that for Raleigh, HP, Cary and some of the other community colleges. That's something that kind of helps with the testing because we are limited as the testing sight on the number of people we can have. BLET always gets the first choice and so if you guys needs us to come to your agency give us enough heads up about it, we can actually come out and test at your agency if you want us to. Member Ryan Weeks do you have a minimum? Member McIntyre I would like for it to be worthwhile. If you have 5 or more, just enough to make it worthwhile. Member Ryan Weeks are you guys open to hey we'll come to you? Member McIntyre we've got a conference room that holds 20, if you want to come to Standards and test we can do that too. I like going to you guys because it gets me out of Raleigh. Member Ryan Weeks it's just the same. Member McIntyre Wake Tech their rooms holds 100. Last Friday we had Charminique went to Raleigh PD, I went to Cary PD, Michelle went to Elizabeth city and Don came over to SHP campus so that was 4 in addition to Mr. Beck having a 100 testing at Wake Tech which was a combo of GI, BLET and stuff like that. If you guys want us to come to you I am open to and if I am tied up, Sharon, Dawn or Schilling can come over.

## Email Request for Post Deliveries

Member McIntyre I will ask, if you're sending in post deliveries, some people are sending them to Sharon or to me. If we can all use the [SMI@ncdoj.gov](mailto:SMI@ncdoj.gov) website that puts a lot of checks and balance because I am the worlds worse at reading an email and deleting it. If you have your post-delivery attached to it I can't account for it or I lose it. If someone calls in and says hey I went in October to radar recert and haven't gotten my certificate yet, by sending them to the website, what happens is that Ms. Gail who's our receptionist at the front, she will open it up. She will log it in on an excel sheet to keep track of when it came in, the day it came in, so we can say yep, we received your information on such and such date. She also date stamps it and then she prints it off and it comes to us for processing. So if everyone uses the same website it all goes to the same place and it just helps as far as housekeeping keeping up with documentation. That way we're not calling out to you at the community colleges and saying I know you sent me your post-delivery once, but I've lost it can you send it to me again. The same thing if you're doing instructor stuff too. [SMI@ncdoj.gov](mailto:SMI@ncdoj.gov) is the website for sending your post deliveries to help with accountability. Member Joe Carey if someone can't find their certification and they can't find it in their email, send an email to that same SMI address to search for it. Member McIntyre like when we email a certification back to you and they can't find it, is that what you're asking. In that type of situation if you'll contact



me or Sharon directly we can help you with that. Usually we can pull it up and if it's been issued we can email it right to you.

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

### Committee Meeting Information Update

Terry Miller for information about commission meeting update. The good thing was, there was nothing about SMI mentioned at the last meeting. That was great. Any additional items we need to address before we talk about the appointment to replace Steve.

Member Joe Carey Looking back through the minutes from the last meeting at some of the issues that came up or the concerns that were voiced in the last meeting. One of them were about the tuning forks again after reaching force of action, so I did a little informal research. Use to be, we had to use tuning forks after we switched modes going from stationary to moving, moving to stationary we had to use our tuning forks. Not necessary anymore, got rid of that. My proposal, my thought process is were what they brought up in the meeting is, are they necessary after reaching enforcement action. There are 3 reasons why I think they are not. 1) Radar is the only one we do tests after we reaching enforcement action. Time-distance we do not, lidar we do not, but only radar. 2) It's in our manual under legal and operational considerations, page 10, although few operators tests speed measurement devices using speedometers today the underline theory remains valid that frequent calibrations improves the strength of cases. Case law and experience has proven it's sufficient to test the radar unit at the beginning and end of duty shift. So, that's in our manual we are teaching. I wanted some facts and hard numbers, so I reached out to everybody in our traffic unit, everybody in our crash unit, those heavy in our traffic, DWI task force that use a lot of radar. I polled them and asked them, I understand this is just CMPD but that's all I had the resources for to do this. I'm looking for any type of tuning fork issue that resulted in a citation being voided or a radar instrument being taken out of service. I wanted to know how long an officer has been running radar and whether or not they had tuning fork issues. I got 22 responses, I didn't include myself but I would be 23. Of all the people I polled, 275 years of radar operator experience and this is just Charlotte, not a single person had a tuning fork issue that required them to void a citation or take a unit out of service. I am not saying that tuning forks should go away, but I think we need to consider is it necessary. If you do one at the beginning tour of duty and you do a tuning fork at the end tour of duty, if there is a problem then yes the ticket however many were written in-between that time would need to be voided or dismissed. How realistic is that. 275 years of radar operator experience and zero tuning fork issues. Has anyone in here ever experienced a tuning for issue you had to void a ticket? Member Bob Stevens yes he has. Of course he'd be the odd ball. I had one that I wrote and went to do the tuning fork after the clock and the tuning fork didn't work. The numbers weren't

popping up right, turns out there was a short in a capacitor and antenna that messed up. I had to have it dismissed. I'm not saying I disagree with what Joe's getting ready to say. Member Ethan Brinn I had one to pop up on a motor cycle but it was discovered in the pre-shift check. A cable got pinched and the tuning fork read off because of a pinched cable. That was something I discovered even before I left. Member Joe Carey that's more of a reason we need tuning forks. We need the beginning tour of duty, end tour of duty but is it necessary after each enforcement? Member Ethan Brinn that's why I wanted to specify that was when I was getting ready to go out when I found the problem. Member Fred McQueen we had one in testing at the academy where the guy did his front clocks, he did his first rear clock and it would not take a tuning fork from that point on. That wouldn't issue a citation but we had to go find him another unit where he could finish up his clocks. My comment that was commented on last meeting I do lidar clocks, I get up there and do these clocks and officers are writing them just as hard as they can. When it comes lunch time I go to test the lidar again because my fear is it's not going to come and we wrote 60 some tickets or more and we're going to have to dismiss them. That tuning fork is just as simple two striking or one striking and you're done. Member Thad Condrey some of those good habits. Right now, having the guy to come recert and taking the tuning forks to his forehead so he can remember to do them, if we relax it at all is that even going to make it worse? Will they forget to do them at all? I'm not saying that they don't now. Member Fred McQueen it's obvious when they get in the car if they're start doing it or not. Member Ethan Brinn I think part of it in my mind is its much hard to do that frequently with a lidar or time-distance unit. Lidar you have to have your 150 ft. course set up near where you run the project or right where you're standing. That's not real convenient all the time. Convenience for the tuning fork, I mean its right there. So it's easy to do. If it was easy to do with lidar maybe we would consider having them do it more frequently with lidar, even on time-distance because they have to check. Member Thad Condrey not necessarily, all you have to do with time-distance is do a tenth mile clock. I've often wonder why you didn't do one after every enforcement action with a time-distance unit, because it's almost as easy doing a tuning fork test if not easier. Member Joe Carey do we need to change the manual and take out the part that says "case law and experience is shown that it only needs to be done at the beginning and end of tour of duty. Terry Miller I think according to case law that would be a minimum and it would show we're actually doing more than the case law says we is specified or the minimum should done, so we're above that. Dan Worley he is exactly right. The language that is in there is based upon the national standard. North Carolina exceeds the national standard in standards. That language is NHTSA language. Member Joe Carey why don't we do it every 15 minutes just to be really sure the radar is working properly. Dan Worley after every enforcement action your say? Member Joe Carey I'm saying, instead of doing it after every enforcement action why don't we do it every 15 minutes? Just to double check to make sure we are good? Dan Worley after every enforcement action is what this committee determined. The national model is at the beginning and end of shift. Member Thad Condrey I think if you do it after every enforcement action, instead of having 10-20 tickets to dismiss you only have

one. That's makes it unnecessary to do it every 15 minutes or so, if you do it after the last speeding ticket and you don't write another one or do it again after the next speeding ticket that's the only one that you'll have to dismiss. Member Fred McQueen Its not doing your sight alignment test and your distances and your time distance. Its two tuning strikes. Terry Miller do you have something on that Bob. Member Bob Stevens I know back in 1999 when we revised the whole program we actually recommended to the Commission that the tuning fork test be done at the beginning of shift and at the end of shift. It was the Commission who said they liked the rule that we had in place and they made us go back and put in after each enforcement action. Member Joe Carey that was 18 years ago, maybe we need to revisit it. Member Bob Stevens I am just saying the committee that did that the first time that was our recommendation. I don't have any heartburn with it. It's just the Commissioner that told us to put that back in. Member Joe Carey someone brought up an interesting point about NHTSA said we should do it. I love your point earlier that I didn't think of, you started looking up what does NHTSA say about the 16 hours. I like that because it didn't occur to me to look up what NHTSA said. If we're going by NHTSA and NHTSA says beginning tour of duty and end of tour of duty why aren't we following the same thought process and doing NHTSA on this? Dan Worley just keep in mind, you historically looked at what NHTSA does as a basic model. That doesn't mean you have to go along with that NHTSA says. Member Ryan Weeks I think that's why so many states and organization has modeled their program after North Carolina. They look at it as "WOW". Member Joe Carey my thought is, what is the harm at doing beginning tour of duty and ending tour of duty? Terry Miller I think, just like Thad said, the biggest thing it would affect that I see would be the amount of citation written. Let's say you have some officers who write 1 ticket a day and you have some who write a whole book of tickets day. Well, that person if his instrument messed up he'd have to dismiss 1 citation. If this person went out and wrote 25 he'd have to dismiss 25. Now, can you get 25 dismissed just as easy as 1? Maybe so? Member Thad Condrey I have never seen a tuning fork in my career not test accurately. Member Chris Gaddis I look at it a little differently. I look at as dismissing a citations but we're honing in only on citations for misdemeanors and infractions. I look at the event where you have a cop on the side who has written a couple of tickets and is not conducting a tuning fork test and then come along and suspects the instruments is still working properly as it was at 8:00 am that morning or 6:00 pm when they checked out and this is the 3<sup>rd</sup> stop of the day and they use this stop, a legal stop and found a kilo of cocaine. Now we've got a whole bigger predicament. I know this is the what ifs and maybe's and that type of thing, but I look at it, if we should be confirming this instrument as accurately each time we do an enforcement action. Member Thad Condrey it doesn't have to be a kilo of cocaine, because we use it all of the time for probable cause for DWI and its hard enough to get a conviction on a DWI as it is. Member Chris Gaddis I know we're talking about the what if's and maybe's and the severities and high probabilities. In my mind I understand exactly what you're saying and I see and have read it myself. I just think from the good training aspect of it too, I worry about if we say beginning and end tour of duty. Those

guys aren't going to remember to do it at the end tour of duty. They are going to cut their car off and won't check it again until the next morning. Member Joe Carey that's what it used to be. It used to be at the beginning tour of duty and end tour of duty and after each enforcement action, so if they got out of their car at the end of the day and walked in and didn't use a tuning fork. In theory, every ticket they wrote the entire day. Member Chris Gaddis I just think, like we have it right now is, in my professional opinion is better. It covers us liability wise a lot better, it does in so many different ways. That is just my, I guess more personal than professional opinion. I can be swayed. Member Thad Condrey if it went to before and after the department policy couldn't require after every enforcement action. Just because it says, you don't have to do it, doesn't mean you can't do it. If you felt about one case or another, like you used it to stop and you have a kilo of cocaine, DWI or some other you know this is going to be you, the probable cause is the reason for the stop and is going to be challenged that "hey I am going to get my tuning fork after this particular one since it's not just a speeding ticket." Terry Miller I see what you're saying too, but again if they're not going to remember to do it at the beginning of the day they're not going to remember to do it at the end of the day. Member Joe Carey if you look at just the research and just the numbers from a research perspective, it's a reliable instrument. Member Ryan Weeks technology has advanced so much its way more reliable than it used to be. Terry Miller now a lot of instruments do self-checks and it's not going to work properly if it's not working right. Member Bob Stevens I was thinking that myself but we've also got a bunch of units that are still cave man antennas and that's still using older technology and they're not going to cut themselves off and as long as they're on the list, I think that's an argument to do it as frequently as you can. Now, if we just had all these new ones with all the new technology, they're going to cut themselves off. As long as we've got those older units on the list I don't see where we can change the rule. Member Thad Condrey save this for March. Terry Miller so we're going to think on it till March as far as tuning forks or are we saying today we're not going to mess with it again? Member Thad Condrey I don't mind sitting on it until March. Terry Miller so **we are going to table that, that's something to think about until the March meeting. We've got to make some decisions in March. One thing to bring to your attention as we move on, we have to look at in March is the evaluations. We've got to vote on the units in March. Remember the evaluations, we'll vote on the additions in March.** Make sure you get a hold of everything to evaluate it, if we have to, let me know or Jason know, if we have to switch out units and meet you somewhere we can do that. Make sure you do the evaluations and send to Jason.

## Term Renewals

Nominations for Steve Warren's position

Terry Miller next is term renewals. Member Brinn and Steven coming up for renewals so we'll need to get some nominations for those to either re-nominate them or get extra names. We also need to think about Steve Warren's open position that we have to get

names for. So I guess well do Steve Warren to begin with since its open. Do we have any nominations for a replacement? We don't have any special requirements but we would like it be a school director somewhere and because this is a community college representation, would we want to look at it being possibly someone from the community college setting simply because they're not represented here today. We need someone from that aspect if possible. Also you have to look at where we're from throughout the state, I know Richard is from Newton, out that ways a little way, but we do not have anyone from the field from out west, Charlotte is the further west we've have. Let's think about maybe someone out that way if possible, if we have someone meet the requirements. One thing brought up at the last meeting was there is not diversity and unfortunately we can't dictate that women come to the radar field and program so we can put one in and racially we can't dictate what's that way either. I know it was brought up about him being from Robeson County and we have a member from Robeson County. We've got two members from Robeson County and he is Native American that takes care of that audience members weren't aware of that. I guess with that being said, hopefully I have explained the criteria enough. The Director chooses, so whatever names we get will be taken to the Director and he chooses from that point on who fills that position from the nominations we give him. Dan Worley confirmed he advised correctly. Terry Miller I'll take any nominations for a replacement for Steve Warrens. Member Thad Condrey nominate Curtis Dowdle from South Western Community College in Franklin NC, Macon County. He has been a radar instructor for a long time. He was the BLET Director for the South Western Community College for a long time and he currently is, if I'm not mistaken, the Dean of the Franklin Campus of South Western Community College. He has a Master's Degree, he is obviously very well educated and been in law enforcement. He is very qualified. Do these people need to be made aware they are nominated? I think they have to be receptive to be a member of the committee. Dan Worley Essentially what Terry has to do is you give him a list of names and those name will be presented to the Director and once the Director makes the final decision we'll reach out to that individual receptive to serving them everything is good, if not then we will be back in March. Member Thad Condrey To your other qualification, specification I don't think there is anyone other for the list than Curtis Dowdle.

Terry Miller shared we could always look at changing meeting locations for his consideration for travel. Anyone else. Ryan Weeks I was asked and have two names. I think both could be possible candidates, Lemuel Martin from Catawba Valley Community College in Hickory, NC. He runs some BLET classes and a lot of representations from different areas of the state. Lot of SHP. He is the Director of all Criminal Justice Training. He is still a radar instructor and will be renewing in October this year. Amy Snider-Wells from Guilford Technical Community College, representation from a huge quantity of students that come through another. I don't believe she is a radar instructor but she is the School Director of SMI. Member Jason McIntyre she is a police officer and operator and not an instructor.

Terry Miller these 3 names will be given to the Director, Curtis Dowdle, Lemuel Martin and Amy Snider-Wells. That's the 3 names given for Steve Warren's placement on the committee. If that doesn't work out we will readdress this in March.

Nominations for Ethan Brinn's position

Terry Miller for the renewals of Ethan Brinn. Member Ryan Weeks I would like to nominate Ethan Brinn. Member Fred McQueen Ray Evans from Pinehurst PD.

Nominations for Bob Steven's position

Terry Miller for the renewals for Bob Stevens. Dan Worley technically we have Bob in as Governor Highway Safety because he is over the SMI Selections. You present Bob as an option or chose a qualified individual from Murphy and Manteo. Member Fred McQueen Mike Brooks.

Terry Miller we have 3 names for Steve Warren's position, we have of course Ethan Brinn and a second name and we have Bob Stevens and a second name. Those will be presented to the Director of the Justice Academy for him to choose and I will let everyone know how that goes through email whichever one he approves and they accept I will let the committee know. If we don't get anyone out of that group we'll redo this at the March meeting. Any other comments or discussions.

He thanked everyone for coming and their input. He apologize for not knowing everything and asks for patience. He appreciates Dan being here.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

Member Joe Carey motioned for the meeting to adjourn, second by Member Anthony Locklear, meeting adjourned at 3:39 pm.