

# Leadership White Paper (LWP) – Outline

**Author:**

**Alex Zurfas**

**Topic:**

**Drug Testing for Narcotics Officers**

Is a 2<sup>nd</sup> Review Needed

Yes  No

## Introduction Section

What is the concern your paper is addressing?	Frequent, mandatory drug testing for narcotics officers	<b>Did you...</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Explain topic <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Explain importance of topic <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (Opt) Give background info <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> State thesis
Why is the topic important to the field of law enforcement and criminal justice?	Many agencies come into contact with drug enforcement operations. Officers who investigate drug offenses need to be accountable and maintain public credibility.	
What is the thesis statement? (Should be a "should" statement)	LEA's should mandate frequent drug testing of peace officers assigned to work narcotics investigations.	

## Position Section

<b>Position Point 1: Ensures complete representation of officers. Better than random sampling.</b>
<b>Citation</b> Green-Ceisler (2002); Smalley (2006); (Bernstien (2011)
<b>Position Point 2: Maintains integrity of officers and departments</b>
<b>Citation</b> Martin (2011); Buckley (2008); Morales (1991)
<b>Position Point 3: Increases accountability for self-reporting and accidental exposures</b>
<b>Citation</b> National Institute on Drug Abuse (2011)
<b>Position Point 4: (Optional)</b>
<b>Citation</b> (Required if Position Point 4 is provided)

## Counter Argument Section

<b>Counter Argument 1: It's prohibited by law</b>
<b>Citation</b> Mattox (1991)
<b>Rebuttal to Counter Argument 1</b> Not according to case law

Citation Treasury Employees v. Raab (1989); Skinner v. Railway Labor Unions' Association (1989); Marble Falls ISD v. Eddie Shell (2003)	
<b>Counter Argument 2: Expensive/Cost not justified</b>	
Citation Berstein (2011)	
Rebuttal to Counter Argument 2 Not compared to lawsuits and liability issues	
Citation Green-Geisler (2002); Brittan & Muller (2012)	
<b>Counter Argument 3: (Optional)</b>	
Citation (Required if Counter Argument 3 is provided)	
Rebuttal to Counter Argument 3 (Required if Counter Argument 3 is provided)	
Citation (Required if Counter Argument 3 is provided)	
<b>Counter Argument 4: (Optional)</b>	
Citation (Required if Counter Argument 4 is provided)	
Rebuttal to Counter Argument 4 (Required if Counter Argument 4 is provided)	
Citation (Required if Counter Argument 4 is provided)	

### Recommendation Section

<p><b>Summary of Conclusion/Recommendation</b></p> <p>There are concerns about implementing frequent, mandatory drug testing, but evidence outweighs those concerns. Addressing this concern will save money for the city and the public's respect. This will encourage accountability, integrity, and peace of mind. Agencies should have mandated drug testing and policies should outline a schedule, and they should alternate types of testing. They should include details like self-reporting and give strict guidelines to follow. They should clearly communicate that it's for protection of officer, agency, and public and is not punitive.</p>	<p><b>Did you summarize...</b></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Thesis</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Positions</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Counter arg.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rebuttals</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plan of action and/or policy recommendation</p>
---	---

### References Section

<b>13</b> Number of References Provided (At least 10 required)
--

**Content Editor Notes**
