

Association of Law Enforcement Intelligence Units (LEIU) and
International Association of Law Enforcement Intelligence Analysts
(IALEIA)



**Annual Training Conference
Course & Instructor Evaluation Report**

Nashville, Tennessee May 2-6, 2011

Executive Summary

The Association of Law Enforcement Intelligence Units (LEIU) and the International Association of Law Enforcement Intelligence Analysts (IALEIA) Annual Training Conference was held at the Gaylord Opryland Hotel, Nashville, Tennessee on May 2 - 6, 2011. LEIU was celebrating its 56th annual conference and IALEIA was celebrating its 31st annual conference.

The conference was designed to provide LEIU and IALEIA members with practical information on organized crime, gangs and criminal extremist groups as well as training in effective and legitimate applications of the criminal intelligence process. The conference also supported and fostered critical networking between local, state, federal, and international members.

Conference and Workshop Attendance: The conference was well received this year as it continues to be considered one of the best training conferences of its kind where many beneficial member contacts are established. Of course, the level of training and variety of training opportunities the conference provides is well-respected among its members and associates. There continues to be significant support to have both organizations combine their annual training conferences. We continued to offer certificated tracks in both the “Fundamentals of Criminal Intelligence” and “Advanced Analytical Skills Training”. These tracks were well received. However, one of the three required workshops in the “Advanced Analytical Skills” track received low evaluation marks and we must consider replacing this workshop.

This year there were a total of 558 attendees: LEIU Members = 164; IALEIA Members = 165; Non-members = 69; Sponsors/Exhibitors = 71; Instructors = 35; Staff = 36; and Spouses = 18. Although many agencies were affected by budget issues, several agencies still sent representatives because of the good reputation, quality, and timely workshop topics, dynamic speakers, and overall organization of the conference.

Bank Cards Accepted: We continue to accept bank cards for registration fees. We purchased an online bank card processing service which has reduced our bank fees somewhat. However, we continue to have to pay approximately 4% of all transactions for bank fees. This is necessary since many organizations will now only allow these transactions via credit cards.

Future Conferences: We need to continue to pre-plan the budget for future conferences. The budget environment, with so much still remaining unknown, is our biggest issue. We have now booked 2012 conference at the Loews Hotel on Coronado Island (San Diego), CA, and we are currently researching locations for the 2013 conference. Both conferences have generated local support through LEIU member agencies and IALEIA Chapters/members.

We continue to utilize an on-line registration process through a secure internet site. We also have instructors submit their workshop descriptions, instructor biographies, and registrations through this site. This has streamlined the processing of registrants considerably and assists us in receiving completed registrations in a timely manner. The site now also generates a confirmation letter negating the requirement to print and mail over 600 letters.

We also need to identify a third workshop in the “Advanced Analytical Skills Training” certificated track so we may continue to offer this incentive. The conference coordinators will be discussing this in the near future.

Comments or Suggestions about the Conference: We received numerous comments and suggestions about the conference. Those comments/suggestions are contained in the following detailed sections.

Evaluation Report Introduction

This is a course and instructor evaluation report for the LEIU/IALEIA Annual Training Conference held in Nashville, Tennessee on May 2 - 6, 2011. Attendees of the course were provided with a secure web location utilizing software from *Survey Monkey*. The first portion of the evaluation dealt with the overall conference (registration process, conference staff, hotel, geographic location, registration cost, Awards Banquet, suggestions for future conferences, etc). The second portion evaluated each presentation and instructor. The form primarily requested multiple choice responses to specific questions and allowed for written comments. The allowable responses in the overall conference section were (generally): Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor, and Not Applicable. The allowable responses in the presentation/instructor sessions were: Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor, Very Poor, Not Applicable. There were 148 respondents who started the survey and 137 completed their responses.

Evaluation Report Summary

Generally, the attendees were very complementary about the conference, the staff, the program content, and the location (Nashville). Many attendees (who stayed at the Gaylord) were very critical of the cost of the hotel as it was above the regular rate for government employees. The overall conference evaluation received an average of 4.4 out of a possible 5.0. There were some comments that will help us in the future.

The top five (three tied for 3rd) rated workshops were:

1. Lenny Leedy: *Automating Excel Using Macros, Custom Menus, and Modifying the Quick Access Bar* (4.7 out of 5.0)
2. Thomas Manson: *Powerpoint for Analytic Presentations* (4.6 out of 5.0)
3. Tied for third: Lenny Leedy: *Analytical Functions Using Excel* (4.5 out of 5.0), Foria Younis: *Muslim Culture vs. Radical Violent Extremism* (4.5 out of 5.0) and Jerry Ratcliffe: *Strategic Analysis* (4.5 out of 5.0)

This is very close to the verbal responses to the question: “Which Presentation/Workshop did you enjoy the most?” (see page 9). However, this section provides a breakdown of the top five courses based on average scores received.

Summary of Responses

Overall Conference Section

Evaluation Methods: Where appropriate, attendees were instructed to complete the online survey instrument rating each listed component in the overall conference using a scale of: Excellent (5 points); Good (4 points); Neutral (3 points); Fair (2 points); and Poor (1 point). In order to determine an average for each component all points were added together and divided by the number of responses provided—giving an average rating. In some cases—where there are only yes or no answers or the response only required comments—there are no average ratings. Additionally, as another perspective, the evaluator provided the percentage of responses that were in the “excellent to good” categories.

1. **Rate the Online Conference Registration and Confirmation**

Average Rating = 4.4

Excellent/Good = 84%

Representative Comments: *I don't recall any problems with it. *A little confusion with the guest category. *The sessions were not that great this year and Opryland was a poor choice. *Paying using a credit card over the internet would be helpful. *The conference was well organized. *Good process, but the welcome letter was not initially linked to registration. *It would be useful to be able to pay by credit card online, instead of having to call the office. *No issues, straight forward.

2. **Rate the Helpfulness of the Conference Staff**

Average Rating = 4.6

Excellent/Good = 96%

Representative Comments: *They were really committed to their duties. *Awesome group of people. Very helpful, servant's attitudes, genuinely cared about their organization and the people that attended the conference. *Very Friendly. *Registration went quickly and the staff was friendly. *Outstanding! Michele Rocks! *The staff went well beyond what was necessary to assist me with an issue, that I, myself created with the hotel reservation.

3. **Rate the Hotel**

Average Rating = 4.4

Excellent/Good = 83%

Representative Comments: *It was a wonderful hotel, but too expensive. Two meals a day exceeded the per diem that we were authorized. There wasn't anything close in the area, which may have served as an alternative. Most attendees that I knew have lost money on this trip because of this issue. *Pricey, but pretty and huge. Food was far too expensive. *Too big, got lost the first two days, but then familiarized myself with the place. *The hotel itself was beautiful, but the restaurant was expensive and terrible. *The Gaylord Opryland was the most beautiful hotel I have ever seen and I have traveled inside and outside of the

United States. *Nice location, but the hotel was so large and hard to navigate for us “older folks.” *Beyond Excellent! By far, the best conference facilities, I’ve ever attended. *I felt the food was overpriced, especially for the quality and portions. The interior with the landscaping was magnificent and the rooms were clean.

4. **Rate the Conference Facilities**

Average Rating = 4.6

Excellent/Good = 93%

Representative Comments: *The conference rooms were nice, spacious, and comfortable. Sound was a problem, only a couple of times. The places provided for socializing were comfortable. *Training sessions, where the certificates could have been earned should have been in the larger rooms because they were always crowded and full. *Despite advance order, no internet was set up at the booth and it took several hours to get it installed. *Conference facilities were amazing, but they never could get the temperature right in the exhibit hall, it was often too warm. Also, please provide fruit on the menu for future conferences. *It was the largest hotel, I ever stayed in. It was difficult getting around. I prefer my conference to be the “only show in town.”

5. **Did you stay at the hotel?**

Yes = 85%

No = 15%

Representative Comments: *I was able to take advantage of the gym and pool twice. My room was very comfortable. *Beautiful. *Too large and expensive. *I was disappointed with the food selection, price and quality. As the facility is not near other places to purchase food items, I was struck ordering pre-made sandwiches with stale cheese and bread and paying way too much. *Great hotel! A huge improvement from the damp hotel the year prior. Loved, that it was like a mini city inside which had everything. *Top notch with an excellent staff. *Needs an indoor smoking lounge!

6. **Rate the location (Nashville)**

Average Rating = 4.4

Excellent/Good = 90%

Representative Comments: *I wish we were more accessible to Nashville proper, as the distance made visiting town a bit difficult at 9 p.m. *Place was a bit quiet. *Very welcoming city, lots of friendly people, great entertainment (and I am not a country music fan) and lots of green space. *It is an ideal location. *A little far from downtown. Due to unfortunate circumstances the mall was closed, reducing entertainment outside of immediate hotel area. Still Excellent! *This was my first conference, so don't have other IALEIA/LEIU venues to compare against. I will say that the location was isolated, so that the conference site was the most viable option for outside activities.

7. **Rate the overall quality of the conference**

Average Rating = 4.3

Excellent/Good = 91%

Representative Comments: *I was a presenter and a bit disappointed as to my location of the presentation. I was very far away from the main area, which resulted in a lack of participation. *Some of the courses were excellent. Some of them promised much and were delivered poorly. The "Law Enforcement Sensitive" courses should not have been labeled that way. *Classes were at a very low level. Should have a more advanced class or at least offer advance level classes. This was not as much value to experienced staff and seemed to be aimed at new staff. *This was my first IALEIA conference, and I enjoyed it.

8. **The conference registration cost was appropriate**

Strongly agree/somewhat agree = 54%

Neither agree nor disagree = 29%

Disagree somewhat/strongly disagree = 17%

Representative Comments: *Extra meal tickets were way too pricey. *There are so many intelligence personnel that need to attend these conferences but their agencies can't afford to send them. Homeland Security money is drying up. The conference fees need to be reduced and more cost effective hotels need to be used. Even things like parking costs add up at fancy hotels like this. *Price was reasonable for the training and amenities provided. *Too costly to smaller agencies during tough budget times. *High!

9. **If You Could Change One Thing What Would It Be?**

Representative Comments: *Have more attractions closer to the conference location. The cost to travel anywhere from the site was anywhere from \$25 - \$60 depending on who provided the service. Way too expensive to be able to travel to and enjoy other attractions in the area. *I wish my presentation was advertised a bit more and the room was closer to the main area. *Price for hotel parking: Living near Nashville, I wasn't staying at the hotel. I didn't have a parking voucher and at almost \$20 a pop, I couldn't even attend every day of the conference. *Nothing, this was my first time and was excellent. *I was surprised and a bit disappointed with how many of the presenters came without a PowerPoint, handouts, or some type of visually engaging material. I found it very difficult to retain any information from the presenters who chose to not prepare a presentation. *Having more classes for investigators (attendees) that have already received the basic and advanced certification to attend.

10. **Did You Like the Inclusion of the Sponsor Training on Monday?**

Yes = 82%

No = 18%

Representative Comments: *I would have preferred it be spread out throughout the week; some of us did not arrive until Monday so we missed it. Perhaps at 0800-0845 each morning and starting the sessions at 0900 would work better. I would also prefer training sessions not overlap so that we can all attend all of

them or we choose. *I wasn't able to take full advantage of it. *But I wish they would have spoke longer. The video presentation was much too short. *I believe in giving the Sponsors their time, but recommend changing their presentation format. Following along with an application presentation was of no value to me. *It was helpful for our analyst.

11. **Was the Sponsor/Exhibitor Information Useful/Applicable to Your Work?**

Yes = 84%

No = 16%

Representative Comments: *But I found it a bit confusing, not being an IT person myself. Maybe group products together so it's easier to figure out which products are similar and what they all do? How they're unique, etc. That would have been more helpful. *I liked having the lunch in the exhibitor area to give us a chance to interact. I would have preferred a more open environment to easily find the exhibitors. *My agency uses a lot of the vendors that were present during the conference. It allowed me to ask certain questions to products that we use on a daily basis to have a better understanding of the product that was being administered. *Data collection and info processing are prerequisites of intel analysis, but are not intel analysis. I thought this was an intelligence analysis conference.

12. **What Other Exhibitors Would You Like to See Represented at the Conference?**

Representative Comments: *CrimeLink, Inc. * i2 Inc. Maybe products developed by police agencies, in-house. Like, for example, Memphis PD's Blue Crush system would have been interesting to see in operation. *Equipment I can use for surveillance work. My job entails following people to learn their habits, getting close enough to identify their associates, to overhear conversations, and to never be detected. My equipment interests include: binoculars, monoculars, cameras (still and video), mini-cameras, night vision, lock picking, personal tracking devices, mini-voice recorders for notes, voice recognition software for transcription, facial recognition software, lighted pens for note taking in the dark, etc. NOTHING TACTICAL; no body armor, no entry tools, guns, cuffs, etc. *The ones with training in how to use Excel and PowerPoint, etc were useful. *Equipment for intelligence ops such as trackers, cameras, etc.

13. **Did you attend the Thursday evening Awards Banquet?**

Yes = 66%

No = 34%

Representative Comments: *It was good but finished quickly. *Have the entertainment play before and after the banquet so that everyone can enjoy and support them. People were too tired to stick around after the dinner and awards. Many that did wanted to talk with fellow intelligence personnel and it is simply too noisy in the banquet hall. *Felt it should have been held earlier in the week when people are less burned out after several days of the conference and evening break out sessions. The band was excellent, but almost no one stuck around to

watch them since the next day was exit/travel day. *Fantastic job as usual. It is unfortunate that people did not take advantage as it seems there were some empty seats. *Great food and music. *We had difficulty hearing the speeches in the back. The band came on way too late and lighting was too bright after dinner. The facility was very nice and the food was excellent.

14. **Please rate the Awards Ceremony**

Average Rating = 3.9

Excellent/Good = 49%

N/A = 33%

Representative Comments: *Band was too loud. *It seemed brushed over. It would have been nice to hear a few words about what each person had done to win the award. *The ceremony was well done. It was streamlined by simply presenting the awards and letting the audience read the full narratives, while still allowing for short speeches by the recipients. *Backgrounds on the IALEIA award recipients' work should have been articulated. That was a big void. *Food was good. Entertainment was late getting started and by the time they did, most people had left. Not too impressed. *IALEIA didn't read out why the awards were being given. There was plenty of time, while the individuals were walking up to the stage.

15. **Please rate the Awards Banquet (Food & Entertainment)**

Average Rating = 3.9

Excellent/Good = 49%

N/A = 33%

Representative Comments: *The band seemed to chase most of the people out of the room. *Have the entertainment play before and after the banquet so that everyone can enjoy and support them. People were too tired to stick around after the dinner and awards. Many that did wanted to talk with fellow intelligence personnel and it is simply too noisy in the banquet hall. *Food was outstanding. *Food was great. Band was decent but they started too late! *The food was excellent. There was too much delay between the dinner and the entertainment. Lost a lot of people. *The food was great! I wasn't expecting much from a buffet and was pleasantly surprised. The band was fun and I enjoyed hearing them play. *The food was Amazing! However, the band took forever to start playing and a lot of people started to leave. *Food was just okay for the price. Music was awesome, but too many people were getting ready to go, and they didn't set up till pretty late.

16. **How did you hear about the conference?**

IALEIA Website/Mailing = 54%

LEIU Website/Mailing = 29%

From Orlando Conference = 11%

Conference Flyer = 6%

17. **What did you most like about the overall conference?**

Representative Comments: *Friendly people passionate about their work. Love the mission of IALEIA/LEIU and their passion to support those in their field of expertise. *Great users of information and intelligence products. *Speakers were excellent. *Networking opportunities, ability to attend seminars on different days to avoid scheduling conflicts. *Reconnecting with people from previous conferences and meeting new ones from all over. *There were some excellent workshops and presentations. Networking is always good. *I thought it was very well organized and the diversity of topics was good. Good opportunity to receive both certifications. *The location and networking opportunities! *The interesting presentations and workshops. *The training, the networking and the vendors. *First day was outstanding and the networking was great.

18. **What did you like least about the overall conference?**

Representative Comments: *Need to supply decent food during the conference. Snacks are taken away too quickly; breakfasts are also sparse. If you want people to come, draw them in. *Repeat sessions from prior years! *Cost and lack of analytical driven content. *This year, just getting there was an adventure. Also, I was unable to attend some of the workshops due to conflicts or limited offerings. *The Hotel meals etc. were extremely expensive. (*Evaluator Comment -- The high costs at the hotel and the location were the biggest complaints by attendees.*)

19. **Which Presentation/Workshop did you enjoy the most?**

The presentations/workshops mentioned most (top 5 in order of numbers of times cited) were:

1. **Analytical Thinking & Presentation**
2. **Automating Excel Using Macros, Custom Menus, and Modifying the Quick Access Bar**
3. **Strategic Analysis**
4. **Investigating Gangs Using Social Networks**
5. **Muslim Culture vs. Radical Violent Extremism**

Evaluator Comment --This question reflects a tally of the most number of courses cited, not a quantitative breakdown of courses based on average scores received.

20. **What suggestions do you have for future conferences?**

Representative Comments: *Possibly more criminal network intelligence briefings. *Allow more time for the Excel and PowerPoint classes. *More cost effective and at least every third year have the conference in the Midwest. Most Midwest agencies don't have the funds to send personnel to expensive West Coast and East Coast destinations. *Pre-screen those who are speaking at the conference and make sure they know how to interact with the class before presenting. *Make sure the presenters are prepared and can offer a full presentation that is informative and relates to US Intelligence Unit operations. *Presentations that

develop real skills are most beneficial. *New presentations; new certificate program; perhaps offer the basic one every other year or every 2 years. ***Evaluator Comment -- The majority of attendees liked the current format and suggested there be no change. Most suggestions were to increase PowerPoint and Excel courses, while adding new issues/topics to the schedule. Also, less repetition of courses from previous years is desired.***

21. **What topics/speakers would you like to see at future conferences?**

Representative Comments: *More focus on analytical skills and techniques as well as practical applications using modern technology. *Tools to enhance product and save time. *The topics should be steered towards the latest terrorist/criminal activities and the applicability for the analyst. *Operational problems with current drug/gang investigations. *The full 2-day course in the PowerPoint class would be awesome. *Topics: environmental crime and smuggling. *Presentations on anarchists and environmental extremists.