Federal Law Enforcement Training Centers Instructional Capacity

December 30, 2022

Fiscal Year 2022 Report to Congress

Federal Law Enforcement Training Centers

Message from the Director

December 30, 2022

I am pleased to present the following report, "Federal Law Enforcement Training Centers Instructional Capacity," which has been prepared by the Federal Law Enforcement Training Centers (FLETC).

This document has been compiled pursuant to language in House Report 117-87, which accompanies the Fiscal Year (FY) 2022 Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act (P.L. 117-103).

Pursuant to congressional requirements, this report is being provided to the following Members of Congress:

> The Honorable Lucille Roybal-Allard
> Chairwoman, House Appropriations Subcommittee on Homeland Security
>
> The Honorable Chuck Fleischmann
> Ranking Member, House Appropriations Subcommittee on Homeland Security
>
> The Honorable Chris Murphy
> Chair, Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Homeland Security
>
> The Honorable Shelley Moore Capito
> Ranking Member, Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Homeland Security

Inquiries regarding this report may be directed to FLETC Senior Legislative Affairs Advisor Anthony Acocella at (912) 230-0668.

Sincerely,

Thomas J. Walters
Director
Federal Law Enforcement Training Centers

Executive Summary

House Report 117-87 articulates Congress's expectation that FLETC maintain training at or near facility capacity before entering into new leases or establishing new partnerships with training organizations. Accordingly, House Report 117-87 further directs FLETC to provide a cost analysis detailing FLETC's capacity at each site as measured against annual student occupancy.

As a technical school for law enforcement professionals for 119 federal law enforcement agencies, FLETC is unlike any other training institution. In addition to providing services to many agencies, FLETC also is able to accommodate constantly evolving training schedules that require combinations of hundreds of distinct training venues with varying arrival timeframes and program lengths, thus enabling these agencies to meet their operational mission. This unique character informs relationships between FLETC's maximum capacity, the courses delivered, and FLETC's annual student occupancy rate. Based on these factors, FLETC developed a model for calculating instructional capacity and for showing training throughput as a proportion of that capacity.

This report represents the model that FLETC has developed to calculate instructional capacity. FLETC defined a baseline mathematical construct that accounts for the supply of available facilities. From this construct, FLETC derived an operational baseline that accounts for the training demands of more than 100 federal participating organizations, requiring complex schedules that are revised continuously to meet the requirements of FLETC's clients/partners. FLETC then utilized the mathematical and operational baselines to identify instructional capacity at each of FLETC's four training delivery sites. Given the impacts of the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic in FY 2020 and FY 2021, FLETC's capacity has not changed from FY 2019. Therefore, FLETC is using the FY 2019 enterprisewide instructional capacity baseline of 236,590 student weeks across four training sites. In FY 2021, utilization of that capacity was 170,189 student weeks. This results in a utilization of 71.93 percent as a proportion of that capacity in FY 2021.

FLETC paused training from March 20, 2020, until June 17, 2020, because of the COVID-19 pandemic. For the remainder of FY 2020, FLETC established operational protocols to train students safely in the COVID-19 environment. These protocols significantly restricted FLETC's throughput capabilities. FLETC modified its operating status as pandemic conditions changed throughout FY 2021. The combination of widely different operating conditions compared to a typical year, coupled with the need to reevaluate and change operating status continuously, deemed FLETC's instructional capacity model not useful in measuring capacity for FY 2020 and FY 2021.

The model described in this report helps to identify training venue chokepoints to ascertain future requirements and provides a realistic indicator of how much training FLETC can accommodate without taking extraordinary measures. FLETC is committed to continued analysis of its instructional capacity to remain a good steward of the funding that Congress appropriates to it, and to ensure that it provides effective training for federal law enforcement officers and agents in their operating environments.

Federal Law Enforcement Training Centers
Instructional Capacity

Table of Contents

I. Legislative Language

House Report 117-87, which accompanies the Fiscal Year (FY) 2022 Department of Homeland Security (DHS) Appropriations Act (P.L. 117-103), includes the following requirement:

> *Use of Training Facilities.*—The Director shall schedule basic or advanced law enforcement training, or both, at all four training facilities to ensure they are operated at the highest capacity before entering new leases or establishing new partnerships with training organizations. FLETC is also directed to provide a cost analysis detailing, at a minimum, each training center's maximum instructional capacity by course and measured against its annual student occupancy. The Department is directed to report back to the Committee on these efforts within 60 days of the date of enactment of this act.

II. Background

The Federal Law Enforcement Training Centers (FLETC) are unlike any other training institution. FLETC is a technical school for federal law enforcement professionals from more than 100 federal law enforcement agencies. This unique training mission, and its associated distinctive administrative and logistics infrastructure, reflect its one-of-a-kind character. This unique character informs the relationship between FLETC's maximum instructional capacity, the courses that it delivers, and FLETC's annual student occupancy rate.

Each training day, FLETC's four training delivery points (TDP) deliver, assist in delivering, or host a combination of training sessions unique to that day; that is, training sessions that may never have occurred in the past, and may never be repeated in the future. FLETC and its participating organizations currently deliver 801 distinct training programs, which could use hundreds of thousands of combinations of 1,315 different training facilities across four TDPs. Training program lengths range from 2 hours to 117 days. FLETC's training workload varies each year, depending on the programs that participating organizations require.

FLETC's ability to organize training sessions to respond to the constantly changing needs of its 119 federal participating organizations is an essential element of its value to its clients. Surges in hiring, changes in agency priorities, changes in agency budgets, and the dynamics of recruiting and hiring all affect agency training plans. Estimating FLETC's annual capacity, therefore, is not as simple as outlining training to be delivered based on available venues because the programmatic mix and associated schedules change as FLETC accommodates the dynamic training requirements of clients. FLETC has developed strategies to address these contingencies as they arise. Unlike a traditional university, college, or technical school, which publishes a fixed schedule up to a year in advance, FLETC publishes a "living" schedule that is changing constantly because of evolving and/or unforeseeable participating organization needs and funding levels.

With the backdrop of these unique factors, FLETC has developed a model for calculating instructional capacity and for showing training throughput as a proportion of that capacity.

III. Impacts of the Coronavirus Disease 2019 Pandemic on Instructional Capacity Analysis

FLETC paused training from March 20, 2020, until June 17, 2020, when the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic emerged in the United States. For the remainder of FY 2020, FLETC established operational protocols to train students safely in the COVID-19 environment. These protocols restricted FLETC's throughput capabilities significantly. Additionally, FLETC modified its operating status as pandemic conditions changed through the completion of FY 2021. The combination of widely different operating conditions than are normal in a typical year, coupled with the need to reevaluate and change operating status continuously across four TDPs, deemed FLETC's instructional capacity model not useful in measuring capacity for the full fiscal year. For that reason, the parameters for last year's report's analysis were restricted to October 1, 2019, through March 20, 2020. During FY 2021, FLETC continued to execute its COVID-19 protocols for the full year. Therefore, this year's report considers FLETC's training throughput compared to the operational baseline established in FY 2019.

When FLETC initially resumed training following a 3-month pause because of COVID-19, it implemented numerous safety protocols resulting in reduced throughput compared to previous fiscal years. These included leveraging only single occupancy on-center lodging, setting aside dormitory space for isolation of COVID-19-positive and -exposed students, instituting designated dormitory space for a 10-day restriction of movement (ROM) period before students began training, and scheduling separate cafeteria hours for students in the initial 10-day ROM period. FLETC continued with different combinations of these protocols at different points in time at its four TDPs during FY 2021.

To execute its mission within these parameters, FLETC prioritized conducting only Level 1 training, defined as training that prepares federal law enforcement personnel to perform the essential tasks for the position into which they were hired, or for the essential tasks associated with new duties to which they have been assigned. Thus, FLETC was not able to offer a significant portion of its program offerings during FY 2020 and for parts of FY 2021, significantly reducing throughput and rendering the program mix dramatically different than in other fiscal years.

Furthermore, FLETC's operating status continuously changed across the four TDPs from the period of March 21, 2020, through September 30, 2021, in line with pandemic conditions and their impacts on the FLETC community. For example, at different points in time at different training delivery points, FLETC was required to pause training temporarily while students sheltered in place because of community spread of COVID-19. This caused FLETC to have to readjust training schedules, including rescheduling the use of training venues to accommodate the continuously evolving programmatic mix.

FLETC's reduced throughput capabilities and continuously changing operating status for portions of FY 2021 created conditions under which FLETC's mathematical construct for

measuring instructional capacity was not useful in analyzing capacity for the full fiscal year.

IV. Results

Given the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic in FY 2020 and FY 2021, FLETC's capacity has not changed from FY 2019. Since FY 2019, FLETC has not experienced any significant changes in its facilities infrastructure resulting in a capacity change. Therefore, for purposes of this year's analysis, FLETC is presenting its FY 2021 capacity utilization[1] as a proportion of FY 2019 capacity for each of its four TDPs as shown in Table 1:

Table 1. Site Capacity

Site	FY 2019 Instructional Capacity in Student Weeks	FY 2021 Capacity Utilization	Utilization as Proportion of Instructional Capacity
Artesia, New Mexico	50,145	43,631	87.01%
Charleston, South Carolina	27,290	13,772	50.47%
Cheltenham, Maryland	17,032	8,084	47.46%
Glynco, Georgia	142,123	104,702	73.67%
Total	**236,590**	**170,189**	**71.93%**

FLETC developed Table 1 using the following methodology:

Development of Baseline Mathematical Construct

As its first step in calculating capacity, FLETC developed simulations for each training delivery point based on an analysis of historic usage of facility type[2] at each site allowing for the maximum use of available venues. This capacity calculation resulted in two distinct models: one that applies to Glynco, and one that applies to Artesia, Charleston, and Cheltenham. The models differ because the types of programs that FLETC and its participating organizations conduct at these sites differ. For Glynco, the model is based on basic training programs that utilize multiple venues. For Artesia and Charleston, the model is based on the availability of dormitory space. For Cheltenham, which hosts minimal basic training, the statistical model is based on firearms ranges and 48-person classroom utilizations. In other words, the models for each site consist of a programmatic mix that best represents the workload at each site and that maximizes the use of the remaining time that a facility is available to be scheduled (white space).[3]

---

[1] Capacity utilization in this analysis accounts for students who were in training between October 1, 2020, and September 30, 2021 (FY 2021), and unrealized demand (unfilled seats). In contrast, FLETC's published training statistics only account for students who graduated in FY 2021.

[2] Because FLETC has 1,143 distinct training facilities, for purposes of developing these models, FLETC grouped facilities into 10 categories as follows: 24-Person Classrooms, 48-Person Classrooms, Classrooms of "Other" Size, Breakout Rooms, Driving Ranges, Firearms Ranges, Firearms Classrooms, Mat Rooms, Mission-Specific Venues, and Tactical Venues.

[3] For purposes of this analysis, FLETC assumed a training schedule of 7:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. Monday through Friday, minus federal holidays and any other designated nontraining days.

Using Glynco as an example, FLETC identified the basic training programs that constitute the majority of training at that site. FLETC then calculated how many of those programs it could run before reaching a chokepoint, which for Glynco, in FY 2021, was 48-person classrooms. FLETC populated the remainder of the model with advanced training programs to fill all remaining space. FLETC then ran a Monte Carlo simulation to develop a figure representing total student weeks and total students associated with that model as a baseline. This baseline represents a mathematical construct in which participating organization needs align precisely with FLETC's ability to meet those needs.

Note, this baseline represents a student-weeks figure (1 student week equals 5 training days for one student) requiring a constant number of students at the mathematical maximum. However, this circumstance is not a practical representation of reality because FLETC's training schedule is dependent completely upon demand from participating organizations. It would be highly improbable, if not impossible, to create a scenario in which demand matched the mathematical maximum every single day in a fiscal year.

Development of Operational Baselines

Using mathematical baselines for each training delivery point as a starting point, FLETC developed operational baselines for each training delivery point that take into account demand for training and associated execution. The operational baseline represents a student-weeks figure that shows how much training is possible at each site as described in the process above. By utilizing this approach, FLETC creates an operational baseline that considers real-world operational issues and uncertainties.

The models account for the reality and complexity of scheduling, making it virtually impossible to fill all "white space." Because the mixture of programs that FLETC delivers each year is based entirely on demand, and because those combinations change each year based on needs and funding levels, scheduling personnel work constantly to fit in as much training as possible to maximize venue usage. However, there inevitably will be "white space," but FLETC cannot fill that "white space" unless a required program fits perfectly into it.

The nature of the training that FLETC conducts dictates that there always will be venues not in use at particular times. For example, Program A may require firearms ranges on Monday, but not on Tuesday of a given week. However, that does not mean that FLETC could utilize those firearms ranges on Tuesday unless it could determine that another program requires using them on that specific day. "White space" among training venues is inevitable, because demand for facilities is a function of which training programs participating organizations require and when they are needed. Other reasons for "white space" include training workload that is distributed unevenly throughout the year because of budget processes, inherent inefficiencies emerging based on program sequencing necessary to maintain training quality, and creation of ad hoc adjustments based on various conditions ranging from clients' ability to hire to adverse weather conditions. FLETC leverages automated scheduling tools to maximize utilization of available facilities and alters course sequencing when possible, without degrading the quality of training. However, there inevitably will be days when particular venues are not in use because the particular programmatic mix that day does not require them.

Using Glynco as an example, the first chokepoint is again 48-person classrooms. However, the operational baseline accounts for the fact that even though a firearms range may be empty at the point that Glynco reaches maximum usage of its primary constraint, FLETC could not fill that space with more basic training. FLETC must account for the venue requirements associated with the programmatic mix that is developed entirely on demand.

Development of Instructional Capacity

Having developed mathematical and operational baselines, the final step is for FLETC to translate these figures to instructional capacity. The last piece to consider is how to account for programs not filled to maximum student capacity. For example, although a particular program is scheduled to hold 48 students, fewer students may arrive for the start of class. Additionally, some students will not graduate at the end. FLETC makes the business decision to run a program with, for example, 42 out of the maximum 48 students, because it is critical to ensure that all federal participating organizations can deliver new law enforcement personnel to the field. The qualitative benefit or public good of training new law enforcement personnel so that they can perform their agencies' missions outweighs capacity inefficiencies. However, those six empty seats leave capacity that is impossible to fill. These unfilled seats must be accounted for when calculating instructional capacity and capacity utilization as a proportion of it. In other words, the venues in use for the unfilled program(s) are 100 percent in use even though fewer students are in the venue than expected. For example, FLETC cannot use empty spaces left on the firing range or empty seats in the classroom for other students who are enrolled in an entirely different program. Therefore, FLETC added in the unrealized demand (unfilled seats) to represent FY 2021 capacity utilization as compared to the instructional capacity at each site.

By weighting the original Monte Carlo-derived mathematical construct, FLETC developed instructional capacities for each site as represented in Table 1.

V. Analysis/Discussion

FLETC's instructional capacity outlined in Section IV emerges from analysis of mathematical constructs that account for the total supply of venue space available at FLETC and operational baselines that account for participating organization demand. Both mathematical constructs and operational baselines account for programmatic mixes typical of each site.

Operational baselines describe capacity utilization at each TDP within routine budget, staffing, administrative, and logistics parameters. Under these conditions, 10 percent of dormitory rooms are scheduled offline, allowing for occasional high-volume days of overlap and routine repair and maintenance of dormitory rooms. Additionally, typical conditions allow staff to schedule routine leave, travel, and training. In FLETC's history, there were times when these conditions were overshadowed by exigent needs, creating peak conditions during which FLETC took extraordinary measures to meet participating organization training requirements. Under these conditions, FLETC invokes reasonably attainable strategies, such as temporarily hiring additional staff, utilizing secondary and tertiary training venues, amending service contracts to enhance throughput, and creating evening and weekend training shifts. An example of peak conditions occurred when DHS launched the Secure Borders Initiative in 2005, with training reaching a peak in 2009. FLETC would invoke similar measures if peak conditions arose again before entering into new lease agreements or before establishing new partnerships with training organizations.

As FLETC considers future training venue requirements and associated budget requests, it continues to identify requirements for two distinct purposes: increasing capacity and improving capabilities. FLETC evaluates participating organizations' future training requirements compared to venue chokepoints in order to identify venues needed to increase capacity. Likewise, FLETC continuously assesses training in collaboration with participating organizations in order to identify modifications or new training venues that provide the highest quality training experience.

FLETC received funding in recent years primarily intended to alleviate identified constraints in order to increase capacity to meet increasing training demand. FLETC also requested funding for venues primarily intended to improve the quality of training, not solely to increase overall capacity. FLETC anticipates that training programs will continue to require realistic venues that mimic conditions in the field, and therefore, improving capability will continue to be a parallel need to increase capacity. For example, in recent budget years, FLETC received funding for tactical training venues.

VI. Conclusion

FLETC continues to refine its datasets and to apply statistical models to analyze facility utilization in order to maximize the utilization of available resources and to make sound data-driven decisions. FLETC created a model for measuring instructional capacity at each training delivery point that utilizes both mathematically constructed and operational baselines that account for the supply and demand sides of capacity. This model assists FLETC in identifying training venue chokepoints in order to ascertain future requirements and provides a realistic indicator of how much training FLETC can accommodate without taking extraordinary measures. FLETC is committed to continued analysis of its instructional capacity in order to remain a good steward of the funding that Congress appropriates to it, and to ensure that it provides training that federal, state, local, and tribal law enforcement officers and agents need to be effective in their operating environments.

Appendix: Abbreviations

Abbreviation	Definition
COVID-19	Coronavirus Disease 2019
DHS	Department of Homeland Security
FLETC	Federal Law Enforcement Training Centers
FY	Fiscal Year
ROM	Restriction of Movement
TDP	Training Delivery Point