

# **LESB ADMINISTRATIVE PLAN OVERVIEW**

Informational Outline for Board Discussion  
December 11, 2025

## **I. Purpose of the Administrative Plan**

- Describes how the LESB will build statewide certification, training, professional standards, and data systems required under HRS Chapter 139.
- Establishes the structure for implementation across multiple years, tied to available resources and Board decisions.
- Ensures that the Administrator's work aligns with the Board's statutory responsibilities and long-term vision.
- Provides the basis for operational planning, staffing design, rule development, and system sequencing.

## **II. Why an Implementation Framework Is Necessary**

- Hawaii is establishing a certification and standards system without any prior statewide POST infrastructure, requiring a structured and disciplined approach to development.
- Multiple evaluative models were selected after assessing the scope of LESB's mandate. Each model provides a different viewpoint on organizational effectiveness, quality, risk, and system maturity. Using them together creates a multifaceted framework for building a high-quality statewide program.
- Applying these models at the beginning of implementation ensures objectivity, accountability, and consistency, and provides a clear method for measuring progress, identifying risks, preventing mission-creep, and maintaining alignment with the requirements of HRS Chapter 139.

### III. Overview of the Four Evaluation Models

These models guide the development of all systems described in the Administrative Plan. Together they provide multiple evaluative lenses for organizational development, certification design, training quality, legitimacy, and implementation readiness.

Some models focus on certification and training standards, while others focus on organizational performance and implementation capacity. Used together, they help ensure that LESB's structures, rules, and processes are built in a coherent, evidence-based manner that supports the Board's responsibilities under HRS Chapter 139.

#### A. HALE Performance-Based Certification Model

Hale refers to the certification methodology developed by Dr. Judith Hale, a nationally recognized authority on performance-based credentialing. Her work provides standards for defining competence, creating valid assessments, and developing certification programs that are measurable, defensible, and tied to organizational purpose.

- Establishes certification systems grounded in demonstrated competence rather than employment status or training completion alone.
- Defines required skills, knowledge, and performance outcomes with clarity and measurability.
- Emphasizes validity, reliability, and defensibility in certification decisions.
- Identifies common failure points in new certification programs, including unclear statutory and operational drivers.
- Supports the development of consistent, transparent certification processes aligned with LESB's mandate.

**Source:** Judith Hale, mentorship consultation with Administrator McCraw (2025); Hale, J. A. *Performance-Based Certification: How to Design a Valid, Defensible, Cost-Effective Program*. 2nd ed. Pfeiffer/Wiley, 2011.

## **B. IADLEST Accreditation Standards**

IADLEST is the national association of POST directors and statewide training authorities. Its accreditation standards provide a national framework for how a certification authority structures governance, training quality, assessment, administration, documentation, and continuous improvement. These standards represent the most widely recognized benchmark for evaluating the effectiveness of statewide law enforcement training and certification systems.

- Defines accreditation domains for governance and authority, training and curriculum standards, assessment and validation, administration and records management, instructor and staff qualifications, recertification, and program evaluation.
- Provides an external benchmark for LESB to assess the maturity, quality, and readiness of its developing systems and divisions, separate from internal tools such as Hale's performance-based model.
- Informs LESB's approach to training standards, instructor qualification, documentation, recordkeeping, and audit processes, supporting defensibility and long-term system quality across Chapters XX-3, XX-4, XX-5, and XX-8.
- Includes the National Certification Program (NCP) standards as a training-specific stand-alone subprogram that can be used to evaluate and strengthen Hawaii's course-level training quality.

**Source:** International Association of Directors of Law Enforcement Standards and Training (IADLEST), Accreditation Standards; National Certification Program (NCP) Standards.

## **C. 21st Century Policing Framework**

The 21st Century Policing framework was established by the President's Task Force to define nationally recognized pillars for modern law enforcement practice. It emphasizes legitimacy, accountability, transparency, community engagement, officer wellness, data-driven oversight, and the organizational conditions necessary to build and sustain public trust. These principles provide a national reference point for statewide certification, training, and accountability systems.

- Provides a national model focused on legitimacy, accountability, transparency, officer wellness, community trust, and data reporting.
- Aligns with and strengthens LESB requirements for statewide professional standards (Chapter XX-6), certification action procedures and accountability systems (Chapter XX-7), and public data transparency and reporting obligations (Chapter XX-8).

**Source:** President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing, Final Report (2015); 21CP Solutions, Task Force on 21st Century Policing: A Renewed Call to Action (2023).

## D. LESB 10-Step Evaluation Framework

The LESB 10-Step Evaluation Framework is adapted from the evaluation methodology developed by Dr. Seung Youn (Yonnie) Chyung (Associate Chair of the Organizational Performance and Workplace Learning program at Boise State University). The model provides a structured process for defining program requirements, assessing feasibility and risk, analyzing data, evaluating progress, and strengthening implementation efforts. It adds a disciplined, repeatable evaluation cycle that supports organizational development and helps prevent mission creep as LESB systems mature.

- Ensures that LESB development is sequenced correctly, scalable, and aligned with legislative timing.
- Provides structure for staffing models, division functions, workflow design, rule implementation, and future expansion.
- Supports continuous improvement and serves as an early-warning tool for identifying risks, drift from statutory purpose, or readiness issues.
- Reduces operational risk as LESB transitions from planning to phased execution.

**Source:** Seung Youn (Yonnie) Chyung, mentorship consultation with Administrator McCraw (2024); Chyung, S.Y. *10-Step Evaluation for Training and Performance Improvement*. SAGE Publishing, 2019.

## E. How the Models Integrate Into the Administrative Plan

MODEL	PRIMARY FOCUS	WHAT IT INFORMS IN LESB DEVELOPMENT
<b>Hale Performance-Based Certification</b>	Competence definition, assessment validity, defensibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Certification structure and requirements</li><li>• Competency and performance outcomes</li><li>• Defensible certification pathways</li><li>• Consistency across agencies</li></ul>
<b>IADLEST Accreditation Standards</b>	Governance, training quality, documentation, national best practices	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Training standards (XX-3, XX-4, XX-5)</li><li>• Instructor qualification processes</li><li>• Course approval and documentation systems</li><li>• Records management and audit trails</li></ul>
<b>21st Century Policing Framework</b>	Legitimacy, accountability, transparency, wellness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Professional standards (XX-6)</li><li>• Certification action processes (XX-7)</li><li>• Data transparency and reporting (XX-8)</li><li>• Community-oriented principles across system design</li></ul>
<b>10-Step Evaluation Framework (Chyung)</b>	Organizational development, sequencing, risk identification, continuous improvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Implementation readiness and phase progression</li><li>• Identification of risks and mission-creep</li><li>• Evaluation of system maturity</li><li>• Structured improvement cycles</li></ul>

#### **IV. Connection to HRS Chapter 139**

The Administrative Plan provides the structure for developing the systems required to fulfill the Board's statutory duties under HRS Chapter 139. The Plan organizes these responsibilities into operational components that will be developed through rules, staffing, and phased implementation.

- **Certification authority (HRS §139-3):** Eligibility requirements, background standards, training completion pathways, equivalency processes, and provisional certification.
- **Training standards (HRS §139-5 and §139-6):** Basic academy requirements, in-service and ongoing training expectations, instructor standards, course approval, and training credit.
- **Professional standards and ethics (HRS §139-3 and §139-6):** Establishment of statewide conduct expectations and accountability structures to support certification decisions.
- **Certification action procedures (HRS §139-6):** Investigation, due process, Administrator and Hearing Board procedures, Board findings, sanctions, and reporting obligations.
- **Data transparency (HRS §139-3 and §139-6):** Required statewide data collection, public reporting, National Decertification Index submissions, and annual reporting obligations.

## **V. What the Plan Provides**

### **A. For the Board**

- Gives the Board clarity on how its statutory responsibilities under HRS Chapter 139 will translate into statewide systems.
- Identifies which decisions must come before the Board, when those decisions are needed, and what information must accompany them.
- Provides a structured basis for reviewing rule proposals, staffing requests, system development milestones, and readiness assessments.
- Supports transparency by showing how the Administrator will operationalize Board decisions and track progress across implementation phases.

### **B. For the Administrator and Staff**

- Guides the sequencing of system development, rulemaking, staffing, and operational workflows.
- Establishes an evaluative process for determining readiness, identifying risks, and ensuring systems mature in the correct order.
- Provides a clear structure for operationalizing Board decisions, including documentation, internal processes, and cross-division coordination.
- Ensures development efforts remain aligned with statutory responsibilities, national benchmarks, and the Board's long-term vision.

### **C. For Stakeholders and the Public**

- Explains how statewide certification, training standards, accountability processes, and transparency requirements will be built and implemented.
- Demonstrates the Board's commitment to legitimacy, fairness, professionalism, and data-driven oversight.
- Provides clarity on how LESB systems will affect agencies, officers, training providers, and the public over time.
- Supports trust and understanding by outlining the pathway from planning to operational maturity.