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Why We Did This Audit

Since the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) was formed, it has faced challenges integrating and consolidating legacy agencies’ support structures, including multiple training facilities and programs. DHS continues to be on the Government Accountability Office’s high-risk list for management of its human capital and integration.

What We Found

DHS does not have adequate oversight of its workforce training. DHS lacks reliable training cost information and data needed to make effective and efficient management decisions. In addition, it does not have an effective governance structure for its training oversight, including clearly defined roles, responsibilities, and delegated authorities. Finally, DHS has not adequately addressed 29 different recommendations to improve training efficiencies made since 2004 by various working groups. As a result, DHS cannot ensure the most efficient use of resources.

What We Recommend

We made three recommendations to DHS to improve tracking and reporting of training information, and oversight and management of its workforce training.

DHS Response

In its response to our draft report, DHS reported that it is committed to consistent oversight and transparency in order to ensure unity of effort, and encourage efficiency, effectiveness, and accountability. Accordingly, DHS agreed with our report recommendations.

For Further Information:
Contact our Office of Public Affairs at (202) 254-4100, or email us at DHS-OIG.OfficePublicAffairs@oig.dhs.gov
MEMORANDUM FOR: The Honorable Russell C. Deyo  
Under Secretary for Management  
FROM: John Roth  
Inspector General  
SUBJECT: DHS' Oversight of its Workforce Training Needs Improvement  

Attached for your action is our final report, DHS' Oversight of its Workforce Training Needs Improvement. We incorporated the formal comments from the Department in the final report.  

The report contains three recommendations aimed at improving the Department's tracking and reporting of training information, and oversight and management of its workforce training. Your office concurred with all recommendations. Based on information provided in your response to the draft report, we consider recommendations 1 through 3 open and resolved. Once your office has fully implemented the recommendations, please submit a formal closeout letter to us within 30 days so that we may close the recommendations. The memorandum should be accompanied by evidence of completion of agreed-upon corrective actions and of the disposition of any monetary amounts.  

Please send your response or closure request to OIGAuditsFollowup@oig.dhs.gov.  

Consistent with our responsibility under the Inspector General Act, we will provide copies of our report to congressional committees with oversight and appropriation responsibility over the Department of Homeland Security. We will post the report on our website for public dissemination.  

Please call me with any questions, or your staff may contact Mark Bell, Assistant Inspector General for Audits, at (202) 254-4100.  
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Abbreviations

CBP U.S. Customs and Border Protection
DHS Department of Homeland Security
FEMA Federal Emergency Management Agency
FLETC Federal Law Enforcement Training Centers
FY fiscal year
GAO Government Accountability Office
ICE U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement
NPPD National Protection and Programs Directorate
OCFO Office of the Chief Financial Officer
OCHCO Office of the Chief Human Capitol Officer
OIG Office of Inspector General
OPM Office of Personnel Management
PALMS Performance and Learning Management System
TSA Transportation Security Administration
USCIS U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
USSS U.S. Secret Service
Background

The *Homeland Security Act of 2002* created the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), merging 22 Federal agencies. Since its formation, DHS has faced challenges in integrating and consolidating legacy agencies’ support structures, including multiple training facilities and programs. Some of DHS’ training includes preparedness, law enforcement, and leadership development. In fiscal year (FY) 2014, DHS requested more than $1.4 billion and in FY 2015, it requested $1.1 billion to provide training to both employees and external stakeholders, such as state and local first responders. As of June 2015, the following 9 DHS components operated 31 training centers across the United States.\(^1\)

- Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)
- Federal Law Enforcement Training Centers (FLETC)
- National Protection and Programs Directorate (NPPD)
- Transportation Security Administration (TSA)
- U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS)
- U.S. Coast Guard
- U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP)
- U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE)
- U.S. Secret Service (USSS)

In 2003, the U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO) identified the integration of DHS and Human Capital Management as a high-risk area. In a 2015 update to the High-Risk Series, GAO continued to emphasize the need for improved management integration, human capital management, and financial reporting. DHS has undertaken several initiatives since 2004 to identify training efficiencies, including integrating and consolidating some of its training infrastructure. However, additional actions are necessary to improve the oversight of DHS’ workforce training.

Results of Audit

DHS does not have adequate oversight of its workforce training. DHS lacks reliable training cost information and data needed to make effective and efficient management decisions. In addition, it does not have an effective governance structure for its training oversight, including clearly defined roles, responsibilities, and delegated authorities. Finally, DHS has not adequately addressed 29 different recommendations to improve training efficiencies made since 2004 by various working groups. As a result, DHS cannot ensure the most efficient use of resources.

\(^1\) This audit focused on those DHS components that operate training centers.
DHS Lacks Reliable Cost Information to Conduct Effective Oversight of Training

DHS does not have reliable training cost data and information to make informed management decisions. Multiple prior audits of DHS have reported weaknesses with the reliability of data at DHS. Additionally, DHS made multiple attempts to determine DHS-wide training costs for FYs 2012–14, but the results were unreliable. This caused GAO to note in a 2014 report\(^2\) that DHS needed to develop a methodology to capture training costs.

During our audit, we attempted to determine total DHS training costs for FYs 2014 and 2015. We obtained budget data from the DHS Congressional Budget Justification and monthly training data reported to the Office of Personnel Management (OPM). When we requested DHS training costs from the DHS Office of the Chief Financial Officer (OCFO), it could not readily provide the data. The OCFO did not have access to components’ financial systems; rather, it relied on data calls to provide us the training costs although it could not validate the data.

We found significant discrepancies between the total amounts reported, as shown in table 1. For instance, in FY 2014, Congress provided more than $1.4 billion for DHS training, but DHS only reported $1.9 million in training costs to OPM; and as of August 2015 the OCFO could only account for $267.6 million in training expenditures for FY 2014. Appendix C provides additional training costs for DHS components for FYs 2014 and 2015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Request</th>
<th>OCFO Data Call</th>
<th>OPM Reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1,412.7</td>
<td>$1,138.3</td>
<td>$267.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DHS Office of Inspector General (OIG) compiled from DHS and OPM data.

*October 1, 2014, through June 30, 2015.

Federal regulations require agencies to maintain training records and costs, including payments made for travel, tuition, and fees. OPM also requires Federal agencies to report accurate and complete training data every month. In an effort to comply with the OPM regulation, DHS has tasked at least three contractors to compile training data from nine different systems maintained by various components. However, the data being submitted to OPM has been

inaccurate. According to DHS Office of the Chief Human Capitol Officer (OCHCO) personnel, DHS does not have access to components’ financial data and relies solely on contractors to meet its reporting requirements.

In addition to submitting incomplete and inaccurate training data to OPM, DHS also is not providing oversight and quality assurance of that data. We reviewed DHS’ submission to OPM and determined that DHS reported less than one percent of the funds appropriated for training in FY 2014. We also found that DHS has not been reporting any training data for CBP, FEMA, and USSS. For example, according to the USSS, its contractor has been submitting training data to DHS’ contractor monthly. However, OPM did not have record of any training data reported for USSS since February 2014. According to DHS’ contractor, there have been problems with USSS’ data files; however, neither DHS nor USSS were aware of this issue prior to our audit.

To further assess the accuracy of training costs reported to OPM, we judgmentally reviewed training data for August 2014 and January 2015 from the USCIS, TSA, and NPPD, and determined that the data they reported to OPM was inaccurate. For example, in August 2014 the USCIS reported to OPM that it spent $23,893 for training. However, when we received data from USCIS for the same month, it reported that it spent $435,286. We also found discrepancies for TSA and NPPD as shown in table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>OPM</th>
<th>OIG Audit</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USCIS</td>
<td>$23,893</td>
<td>$435,286</td>
<td>$411,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSA</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$20,856,811</td>
<td>$20,856,811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPPD</td>
<td>$126,411</td>
<td>$8,699</td>
<td>($117,712)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: OIG created from DHS and OPM data.

Based on our review of the same three components’ January 2015 data reported to OPM, DHS was still reporting inaccurately. For example, TSA did not report any training costs to OPM for January 2015; however, in response to our data request, TSA reported more than $23 million in training costs. There were also discrepancies for NPPD and USCIS as shown in table 3.
Although DHS has taken steps to improve the reliability of its training data, further action is needed. In May 2013, DHS awarded a blanket purchase agreement to create an enterprise-wide learning management system. The initial launch date for the Performance and Learning Management System (PALMS) was December 2013. However, there have been multiple delays and PALMS was still not fully deployed during our audit. DHS now estimates that PALMS will be fully operational by 2017. Having reliable data is essential to DHS to fully meet its reporting requirements and effectively oversee its training funding.

### DHS Lacks an Effective Governance Structure for Training Oversight

In June 2012, DHS delegated the authority for training oversight to both OCHCO and DHS components without establishing a clear governance structure to provide systematic oversight. According to OCHCO personnel, the draft directive to improve this structure was last updated in August 2015 but has been in the approval process since 2010. In the meantime, DHS and its components must continue to rely on inadequate and conflicting management directive and delegation of authority documents.

According to DHS’ *Management Directive 3210, Training*, the Under Secretary for Management, through OCHCO, has the responsibility for the oversight of training. This includes, but is not limited to, the establishment, operation, maintenance, and evaluation of training for DHS employees. The Under Secretary for Management is also responsible for training policies and establishing priorities. However, DHS Delegation number 03000, *Delegation for Human Capital and Human Resources* splits these same training responsibilities between OCHCO and component leadership. Specifically, OCHCO, through its chief learning officer, has authority over departmental learning and development, but not over component mission-specific training.

Although still in draft form, the chief learning officer updated DHS’ management directive on training, and the update is intended to clarify these responsibilities across DHS. This draft directive establishes authority,
responsibilities, and policies to manage workforce and organizational development.

DHS components also lack a unified process to govern workforce training, which hinders component leadership from having comprehensive oversight of that training. Although we determined that USSS and the Federal Protective Service had adequate oversight of their training, the remaining six of the eight components’ training areas we reviewed lacked sufficient oversight of all training:

- CBP’s Office of Training and Development does not oversee all of the Office of Air and Marine’s training. Furthermore, the Office of Air and Marine’s training office does not have oversight of the Unmanned Aviation System training.
- U. S. Coast Guard’s Force Readiness Command, Training Division does not oversee training at the Coast Guard Academy.
- FEMA’s National Training Directorate does not oversee training in the U.S. Fire Academy.
- TSA’s Office of Training and Workforce Engagement does not oversee training at the airports.
- USCIS’ Training and Career Development Division does not oversee component field-level training.
- ICE’s Office of Training and Development does not have oversight over the training at the Fort Benning, GA, training center.

The lack of effective governance structure further hinders DHS’ ability to adequately oversee its workforce training, which decreases opportunities for efficiencies.

**DHS Has Not Addressed Recommendations from Previous Reviews**

Over the last decade, DHS has conducted multiple reviews and working groups have made numerous recommendations to improve the integration of its training and development programs, as shown in figure 1.
As illustrated in figure 1 and detailed in appendix D, collectively from these reviews, 29 recommendations have been made. The investment of significant resources into these working groups should have resulted in the implementation of improved processes, oversight, and management of DHS workforce training. However, there is little evidence DHS has tracked or implemented any of these recommendations.

In some instances, the 2010 Training Facility Study working group (2010 working group) made recommendations similar to those in the 2004 Enterprise Learning and Development Capabilities Study working group (2004 working group). For example, the 2004 working group recommended DHS assess potential uses of the FLETC Charleston and study training capacity across DHS. The 2010 working group made a similar recommendation for DHS to optimize the use of existing DHS training facilities. Other similarities in the recommendations the two working groups made included issues such as improving efficiencies, clarifying policies and procedures, standardizing training, and improving training tracking.

DHS continues to initiate working groups to improve training management without taking action on prior recommendations. In response to the Secretary’s Integrated Planning Guidance, DHS convened a Training Facilities Infrastructure Team in April 2014 to identify options to consolidate and reduce training campus infrastructure. This team collected data related to DHS
training facilities but did not make any recommendations. Then, in August 2014, DHS created a FLETC-led Training Facilities Consolidation working group in response to a request from Representative Jeff Duncan.

Representative Duncan wrote a letter urging DHS to consider consolidation of training facilities and programs. The Training Facilities Consolidation working group made one recommendation in October 2014 to terminate the lease of an ICE Training Academy in Dallas, TX, and consolidate it into a DHS-owned facility by the end of FY 2015. Although personnel from the Office of the Chief Readiness Support Officer and OCFO concurred with the working group’s recommendation, the Under Secretary for Management still had not made a decision by the end of our fieldwork. In April 2015, DHS and FLETC decided to disband the Training Facilities Consolidation working group, and in June 2015, DHS assembled yet another working group — the Government-owned Training Facility Review working group under the co-leadership of the Office of the Chief Financial Officer and the Office of the Chief Readiness Support Officer to evaluate DHS-owned training facilities.

DHS has overlooked opportunities for known efficiencies and continues to create working groups. This lack of action hinders DHS’ ability to improve oversight of its workforce training and ensure the most cost-efficient use of resources.

**Recommendations**

We recommend that the Under Secretary for Management:

**Recommendation 1:** Develop and implement a process to accurately capture and report training information across DHS.

**Recommendation 2:** Establish an effective governance structure at DHS and component levels with clear guidance and authority for training and development.

**Recommendation 3:** Evaluate past working group recommendations and create an implementation plan for recommendations that will improve the management of DHS training.

**DHS Comments and OIG Analysis**

In its response to our draft report, DHS concurred with all three of our report recommendations. A summary of DHS’s response and our analysis follows. We have included a copy of the management comments in their entirety in appendix B. DHS also provided technical comments to our draft report, which we incorporated as appropriate.
DHS Comments:

DHS reported that it is committed to consistent oversight and transparency in order to ensure unity of effort, and encourage efficiency, effectiveness, and accountability. One way the Department is doing this is by strengthening the DHS accounting system to provide more consistency and transparency in managing and reporting the costs of training at all levels of the Department.

DHS Comments to Recommendation #1. DHS concurred with our report recommendation and stated that DHS cannot easily obtain reliable and repeatable data on training costs. The DHS OCHCO has worked with the DHS OCFO to improve the consistent use of accounting codes to more accurately and fully capture training costs in the budgeting and reconciliation processes. OCFO staff has provided training codes from the DHS Accounting Classification System and are currently working with OCHCO to conduct an analysis of how accurately and consistently these codes are being used. This work serves as the basis for joint efforts to develop and implement new guidelines concerning the use of these codes, with the end goal of providing visibility into the true cost of training at DHS. Estimated completion date: October 31, 2016.

OIG Analysis. We consider DHS’s proposed corrective action to be responsive to the recommendation. The recommendation is considered open and resolved and will remain open pending the completion of the corrective action and submission of adequate supporting documentation.

DHS Comments to Recommendation #2. DHS concurred with the recommendation and stated that the draft policy, Employee Training and Learning Development, establishes authority, responsibilities, and policies to manage workforce and organizational development. Upon final issuance of this DHS-wide directive and accompanying instruction, OIG should be able to consider this recommendation closed. Estimated completion date: June 30, 2016.

OIG Analysis. We consider DHS’s proposed corrective action to be responsive to the recommendation. The recommendation is considered open and resolved and will remain open pending the completion of the corrective action and submission of adequate supporting documentation.

DHS Comments to Recommendation #3. DHS concurred with the recommendation and agreed that the past studies’ recommendations should be examined to determine which are out of date, which have been or are being addressed, and which remain unaddressed. A newly established study team assessing DHS-wide operational education and training programs will work to
produce a detailed analysis of the status of the listed items and will determine a way forward for those recommendations being worked and those which remain unaddressed. Estimated completion date: February 29, 2016.

**OIG Analysis.** We consider DHS’s proposed corrective action to be responsive to the recommendation. The recommendation is considered open and resolved and will remain open pending the completion of the corrective action and submission of adequate supporting documentation.
Appendix A
Objective, Scope, and Methodology


We conducted an audit to determine whether DHS’ oversight of its workforce training ensures the most cost-effective use of resources. To achieve our audit objective, we interviewed officials in the DHS Directorate for Management, National Protection and Programs Directorate (Federal Protective Service), and the Office of Intelligence and Analysis. We also conducted interviews with training officials at DHS headquarters, FLETC, and DHS operational components including USCIS, CBP, U.S. Coast Guard, FEMA, ICE, TSA, and USSS. We conducted site visits to DHS headquarters and the following DHS components’ training centers:

- USSS Rowley Training Center, Laurel, MD
- CBP Advanced Training Center, Harpers Ferry, WV
- FLETC Training Center, Glynco, GA
- FLETC Training Center, Cheltenham, MD
- FEMA United States Fire Academy, Emmitsburg, MD
- FEMA Emergency Management Institute, Emmitsburg, MD
- OCHCO Learning and Development Institute, Washington, DC
- Office of the Chief Procurement Officer, Homeland Security Acquisition Institute, Washington, DC
- Office of Intelligence and Analysis, Intelligence Training Academy, Washington, DC

Additionally, we obtained and reviewed public laws, executive orders, DHS directives, strategic plans, congressional budget requests, DHS financial statements, OPM cost reported data relevant to our objective, DHS Training Facilities Consolidation Working Group data, and Federal real property records.

To determine DHS’ training costs for FYs 2014 and 2015, we obtained and analyzed DHS training data reported to OPM. To verify the accuracy and completeness, we performed limited data reliability tests. We judgmentally selected data for August 2014 and January 2015 from three representative components based on training costs reported. To test this data, we obtained training information directly from the three components for the same 2 months and compared them with data reported to OPM.
As a result of the incomplete data DHS reported to OPM, we requested the training cost amounts from DHS’ Office of the OCFO. Due to system limitations, DHS’ Office of the OCFO sent a data call to the components for the requested information, and provided the information received to the audit team. We performed limited data reliability testing by comparing the OPM and OCFO reported data with DHS’ enacted budget amounts.

We conducted this performance audit between March and September 2015 pursuant to the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, and according to generally accepted government auditing standards. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based upon our audit objectives. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based upon our audit objectives.
Appendix B
DHS Comments to the Draft Report

December 2, 2015

MEMORANDUM FOR: John Roth
Inspector General

FROM: Jim H. Crumpacker, CIA, CFE
Director
Departmental GAO-OIG Liaison Office

SUBJECT: OIG Draft Report: “DHS’ Oversight of its Workforce Training Needs Improvement”
(Project No. 15-071-AUD-MGMT)

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on this draft report. The U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS) appreciates the Office of Inspector General’s (OIG) work in planning and conducting its review and issuing this report.

DHS has a wide variety of missions, each with unique skill requirements — law enforcement, baggage screening, intelligence, cyber security, emergency response, canine search, protection, water rescue, and more — our training is in large part delivered by Components, which are closest to the needs of the employees performing these vital missions. This approach has ensured relevancy and applicability of training.

DHS is committed to consistent oversight and transparency in order to ensure unity of effort, and encourage efficiency, effectiveness, and accountability. One way the Department is doing this is by strengthening the DHS accounting systems to provide more consistency and transparency in managing and reporting the costs of training at all levels of the Department.

The draft report contained three recommendations with which the Department concurs. Specifically OIG recommended that the Under Secretary for Management:

Recommendation 1: Develop and implement a process to accurately capture and report training information across DHS.

Response: Concur. DHS cannot easily obtain reliable and repeatable data on training costs. In response to previous U.S. Government Accountability Office reports, the DHS Office of the Chief Human Capital Officer (OCHCO) has worked with the DHS Office of
the Chief Financial Officer (OCFO) to improve the consistent use of accounting codes to more accurately and fully capture training costs in the budgeting and reconciliation processes.

OCFO staff have provided training codes from the DHS Accounting Classification System and are currently working with OCHCO to conduct an analysis of how accurately and consistently these codes are being used. This work serves as the basis for joint efforts to develop and implement new guidelines concerning the use of these codes, with the end goal of providing improved visibility into the true cost of training at DHS. Estimated Completion Date (ECD): October 31, 2016.

**Recommendation 2:** Establish an effective governance structure at DHS and component levels with clear guidance and authority for training and development.

**Response:** Concur. As the draft report notes on pages 6-7, OCHCO’s draft policy Employee Training Learning and Development, “…establishes authority responsibilities, and policies to manage workforce and organizational development.” Upon final issuance of this DHS-wide directive and accompanying instruction, OIG should be able to consider this recommendation closed. ECD: June 30, 2016.

**Recommendation 3:** Evaluate past working group recommendations and create an implementation plan for recommendations that will improve the management of DHS training.

**Response:** Concur. OCHCO agrees that the past studies’ recommendations should be examined to determine which are out of date, which have been addressed, which are currently being worked on, and which remain unaddressed. A newly established study team assessing DHS-wide operational education and training programs will work to produce a detailed analysis of the status of the listed items and will determine a way forward for those recommendations which are being worked and are unaddressed. ECD: February 29, 2016.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on this draft report. Technical comments were previously provided under separate cover. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions. We look forward to working with you in the future.
Appendix C  
DHS Training Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DHS Components</th>
<th>Budget Request FY 2014 - Enacted</th>
<th>Budget Request FY 2015 - Requested</th>
<th>CFO Data Call FY 2014</th>
<th>CFO Data Call FY 2015*</th>
<th>OPM Reporting FY 2014</th>
<th>OPM Reporting FY 2015*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TSA</td>
<td>$362,190</td>
<td>$246,290</td>
<td>$45,137</td>
<td>$37,260</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USCG</td>
<td>325,289</td>
<td>306,766</td>
<td>104,490</td>
<td>74,025</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLETC</td>
<td>258,730</td>
<td>259,595</td>
<td>3,745</td>
<td>1,548</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMA</td>
<td>233,654</td>
<td>102,269</td>
<td>25,141</td>
<td>19,863</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEBP</td>
<td>172,343</td>
<td>162,440</td>
<td>43,094</td>
<td>10,904</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USSS</td>
<td>60,498</td>
<td>60,972</td>
<td>8,478</td>
<td>8,506</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICE</td>
<td>No line item in budget request</td>
<td>10,074</td>
<td>3,628</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPS (NPPD)</td>
<td>No line item in budget request</td>
<td>12,997</td>
<td>12,803</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>586</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USCIS</td>
<td>No line item in budget request</td>
<td>8,868</td>
<td>9,362</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHS HQ</td>
<td>No line item in budget request</td>
<td>**4,553</td>
<td>**1,873</td>
<td>**176</td>
<td>**197</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIG</td>
<td>No line item in budget request</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>194</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Nuclear Detection Office</td>
<td>No line item in budget request</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and Technology</td>
<td>No line item in budget request</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>194</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DHS Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,412,704</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,138,332</strong></td>
<td><strong>$267,615</strong></td>
<td><strong>$180,517</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,872</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,289</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*October 1, 2014, through June 30, 2015  
**HQ data consists of Management, Office of Health Affairs, and Analysis and Operations  
***OPM data does not specify what components are included in this category
Appendix D
Previous DHS Workforce Training Recommendations

DHS Training Facility Study Recommendations (October 29, 2004):

1. Consider feasibility of reorganizing DHS training along functional lines.
2. Set policies and standards to unify DHS organizational elements.
3. Identify the core course requirements for DHS law enforcement employees.
4. Implement a National DHS Training Plan that applies across all DHS training organizations.
5. Conduct a National DHS Training Conference to allow organizational elements to meet and learn about training capabilities within DHS.
6. Establish a working group to study requirements for an executive development program to address leadership training needs for DHS managers and executives.
7. Consolidate canine training within DHS.
8. Align the Noble Training Center mission to the Center of Domestic Preparedness’ (CDP) mission and consolidate Noble and CDP facilities and missions.
9. Assess potential uses of FLETC Charleston Training Center; study training capacity across DHS.
10. Assess methods and effectiveness of all recruit training at DHS training facilities.
11. Study cost effectiveness of alternative training sources.
12. Increase use of technology-based training delivery.
13. Increase use of technology-based training management.
15. Explore additional alternative training sites and facilities for scenario-based exercises.

DHS Enterprise Learning & Development Capability Study Recommendations (May 18, 2010)

1. Establish a DHS Training Institute to provide DHS-standard, DHS-centric resident (instructor-led, classroom), satellite, and distance training.
2. Standardize the DHS instructional systems design (ISD) approach for resident (instructor-led classroom), distance, and blended training.
3. Establish DHS satellite and/or intermittent training sites.
4. Standardize the DHS approach for evaluating externally provided training.
5. Launch standardization of professional training in a prototype set of disciplines.
6. Coordinate senior level external training.
7. Optimize the use of existing DHS training facilities.
8. Optimize the use of existing DHS training competencies.
9. Optimize the use of existing DHS training resources.
10. Develop DHS performance measures for training integration.
11. Measure DHS workforce training.
12. Include DHS training integration in executive performance management evaluations.
13. Engage training staffs as a continuous resource for department personnel.

DHS Training Facilities Consolidation Working Group Recommendation (October, 2014):

1. The working group recommended that DHS end the lease for the Dallas, TX, ICE Training Academy facility at the conclusion of FY 2015.
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