

**REPORT OF THE
DEPARTMENT OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE SERVICES**

Study on Alternative Training Delivery Methods for Criminal Justice Officers

**TO THE GOVERNOR AND
THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA**



HOUSE DOCUMENT NO. 58

**COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
RICHMOND
2004**

MEMO TO: The Honorable Vincent F. Callahan, Jr.
Chairman
House Appropriations Committee

The Honorable John H. Chichester
Chairman
Senate Finance Committee

Item 430 #1K, of the 2004 Appropriations Act (see *Appendix A*), directed the Department of Criminal Justice Services (DCJS) to prepare a report on the feasibility of allowing alternative training delivery methods, with a focus on distance learning and computer-based training, for entry-level and in-service training for criminal justice officers. The results of our study are hereby submitted for your review.

Sincerely,

Leonard G. Cooke
Director

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study was conducted by the Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services with assistance from the following individuals and organizations:

Virginia's Criminal Justice Academies

Town of Vinton

Town of Wytheville

Vinton Police Department

Fairfax Police Department

Virginia Beach Police Department

Danville Police Department

Rockingham County Sheriff's Office

Carole Schultz, EdD

Virginia Community College System

Dr. Rose H. Johnson

Virginia Community College System

Butch Eudailey

Department of Corrections Academy of Staff Development

Virginia Sheriff's Association

Virginia Chief's of Police Association

This study was staffed by the following members of the Department of Criminal Justice Services:

Ronald E. Bessent, Program Administrator of Training and Development

John C. Byrd, Program Manager,

Doug Cooley, Field Representative

William Edmundson, Field Representative

Item 430 K – Alternative Training Delivery Methods for Criminal Justice Officers

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Memo of Transmittal	2
	Acknowledgements	3
I.	Authority for Study	5
II.	Executive Summary	6
III.	Background	9
	A. Purpose and Design	9
	B. Goals and Objectives	9
	C. Criminal Justice Training Academy Design	10
IV.	Findings	11
	A. Issue Statement	11
	B. DCJS Policies and Rules	11
	C. Results of Other Studies	12
	D. Interviews	17
	E. Survey Results	20
	F. Public Hearings Summary	22
V.	Summary and Conclusion	25
VI.	Recommendations	26
	Appendices:	27
	<i>Appendix A:</i> Item 430 Appropriations Act	28
	<i>Appendix B:</i> Code of Virginia: §9.1-102	32
	<i>Appendix C1:</i> Agency Questionnaire Regarding Alternative Training Delivery	38
	<i>Appendix C2:</i> Academy Questionnaire Regarding Alternative Training Delivery	44
	<i>Appendix D:</i> DCJS Electronic Media Policy	49
	<i>Appendix E:</i> DCJS Policy for College Credit	54
	<i>Appendix F:</i> Public Hearing Rosters (F-1 through F-7)	55
	<i>Appendix G:</i> White Paper on Alternative Training Methods	62

I. AUTHORITY FOR STUDY

In the 2004 Appropriations Act, Paragraph K of Item 430 directed the Department of Criminal Justice Services (DCJS) to review and prepare a report on the feasibility of allowing alternative training delivery methods for criminal justice training. In conducting its review, the Department was directed to consult with state and local agencies and institutions of higher education including the Virginia Community College System. (See *Appendix A.*)

Title 9.1-102, Chapter 1, of the *Code of Virginia*, gives DCJS and the Criminal Justice Services Board the authority to adopt regulations establishing training requirements for criminal justice personnel and the certification of criminal justice training academies. (See *Appendix B.*)

II. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Department of Criminal Justice Services (DCJS) was directed by the 2004 Session of the General Assembly to review the feasibility of allowing alternative training delivery methods for entry-level and in-service training for criminal justice officers. The results of the review and any recommendations are to be submitted to the Chairmen of the Senate Finance Committee and the House Appropriations Committee.

As part of its review, DCJS conducted interviews with several state agencies employing distance learning techniques including the Department of Corrections (DOC), the Division of Forensic Sciences (DFS), and the Virginia Community College System (VCCS). In addition, police chiefs, sheriffs, and all criminal justice academies were surveyed to gain input on the use of alternative training methodologies, technologies, and the VCCS. Finally, public hearings were conducted to provide a forum for constituents to personally express their views, ideas, and suggestions on this topic.

DCJS has had an electronic media policy for in-service training for a number of years, and existing rules allow officers to obtain in-service training credit for college courses. Currently, DCJS is in the process of amending the in-service rules to allow unlimited training credit for distance learning programs, provided that the local agency administrators approve of the topics. As a result, there appears to be no major obstacle or concern for the use of alternative training delivery methods for obtaining in-service training.

Literary research on distance, or e-learning, indicates that there are many applications for this methodology. It is generally accepted that savings can be realized in time, travel, manpower, training costs, and by replicating programs in electronic format. Some studies indicate students learn better and more quickly and are more productive. However, these alternatives are expensive to develop, require a certain level of expertise, and often require high user or service fees. Additionally, extensive use would require end-users to acquire and maintain a minimum level of equipment and operating systems. Other concerns about providing criminal justice training by distance learning center around its applicability to skills training, accommodating differences in the learners' abilities, loss of personal inter-action with instructors and other students, costs, and lack of structure.

Additionally, interviews were conducted with the Division of Forensic Sciences, Department of Corrections, and the Instructional Technology and Workforce Development sections of the VCCS. These agencies are currently using various forms of distance learning technologies for training, meetings, and on-line courses. Most are realizing positive results and significant cost savings. Additionally, the VCCS has numerous technological resources and expertise available to assist academies or agencies with program development and implementation. Their Workforce Development section is available to help implement entry-level training for criminal justice officers as an alternative training delivery system. Their approach is totally customer-driven utilizing a steering committee composed of end-users, instructors from the profession, and adherence to all *Code* and regulatory requirements. The

Vice-Chancellor for this section is experienced in this type of program having come from North Carolina where entry-level training is provided by community colleges. However, there are many unanswered questions in terms of application, such as quality control, record keeping, skills training, and liability issues.

Local agency administrators and academy directors were surveyed to elicit their opinions regarding alternative training delivery methods. Their responses indicate that most use some form of e-learning for in-service training with varying degrees of cost savings. Most feel that alternative training is appropriate for non-skill related in-service training and should be explored further. However, there was universal agreement that it should not be used for hard skill or entry-level training. Likewise, they felt entry-level training should be conducted at criminal justice academies and not through the VCCS. Over 48 percent of those responding felt that substituting certain college courses for entry-level topics was acceptable.

The general sentiment expressed at virtually all of the seven regional public hearings held on this topic was that entry-level training should not be held at community colleges. Attendees composed of agency administrators, command staff, and training personnel voiced concern over the use of any alternative training delivery method for entry-level training. They felt there would be no cost savings, but possibly increased costs associated with having to re-train recruits to meet academy standards. There were numerous concerns with providing entry-level training through the VCCS. Some of these concerns dealt with the quality of instruction, program control, discipline and structure, liability issues, and the question of who would pay the costs. The latter was of particular concern if the burden shifts to the student. Many agency heads felt this would have a negative impact on recruiting. Those affected most would be minorities, people in their 30's seeking to change careers, or those in economically depressed areas. For these and other reasons, most participants opposed entry-level training in the community colleges.

Based on the information gathered from all sources, the following recommendations are presented:

Recommendation A:

The Department of Criminal Justice Services should continue the process of amending the In-Service Rules to allow incumbent officers to acquire their mandatory training through distance learning and other alternative training delivery methods.

Recommendation B:

The decision for application of e-learning or other alternative training delivery methods for entry-level training should remain as an option for local agency heads and their academies. Also, academies are encouraged to seek assistance, expertise, and resources available from local community colleges.

Recommendation C:

Given the complexity of the VCCS conducting entry-level training and the questions that remain unanswered, no change is recommended in the training system. However, if this continues to be of interest by the members of the General Assembly, further study should be conducted by JLARC before any efforts are made to totally change the training delivery system.

III. BACKGROUND

A. Purpose and Design

The purpose of this report is to review the feasibility of using alternative training delivery methods to reduce the cost of criminal justice training and/or increase its effectiveness and efficiency. Since a study on the Feasibility and Costs of Distance Learning Techniques for Law Enforcement Training (see *Senate Document No. 15, 2001*) was previously submitted to the General Assembly, this review focused on what options are available and the most practical applications. Emphasis was placed on the experience and input from end-users of training to determine the best alternatives to meet their needs.

In conducting this review, DCJS employed a variety of methods to gain information. Besides examining previous studies and reports, interviews were conducted to determine what technology is currently available and how it is being used by other agencies, its potential benefits, and what ramifications and drawbacks have been experienced. Also, a survey was distributed to numerous chiefs, sheriffs, and all certified criminal justice academies. The survey was designed to determine current or prior experiences they may have had with alternative training delivery methods, identify any limitations, obtain user opinions on different training options, and solicit suggestions on how to make the process more cost-effective and efficient. The results of these surveys are located in *Appendix C*.

Finally, regional public hearings were conducted to provide forums for interested individuals to express their concerns, ideas, and recommendations on this issue. These hearings were conducted in Richmond, Harrisonburg, Wytheville, Vinton, Fairfax, Danville, and Virginia Beach. By examining the totality of this information, this review attempts to identify potential alternatives for training delivery.

B. Study Goals/Objectives

Item 430 K. of the 2004 Appropriations Act directed DCJS to “. . . review the feasibility of allowing alternative training delivery methods.” The specific objectives focus on:

- distance learning and computer-based training (CBT) for both entry-level and in-service training for criminal justice officers;
- quality of training provided;
- cost-effectiveness; and
- impact on local units of government.

It further directed DCJS to consult with:

- affected local governments;
- state and local public safety agencies;
- training organizations; and
- higher education institutions including the VCCS.

C. Criminal Justice Training Academy Designs

The Virginia criminal justice training delivery system is a decentralized, locally controlled network of independent and regional academies. Each academy is operated independently with a variety of methods for implementation of training. There are six state agencies and 18 local departments with their own training academies, which are classified as independent academies and receive no state funds.

The ten regional academies are partially state-funded and located throughout the Commonwealth. Many of the regional academies operate satellite facilities to reduce the distance students must travel to training sites. Each of the regional academies is managed by a training director who reports to a board comprised of representatives from the academy's member agencies (usually chiefs, sheriffs, and agency administrators). Membership in regional academies consists of both public and non-governmental agencies. Public agencies are members through charter agreement while non-governmental agencies are contractual members. The regional academies provide a variety of training including basic, in-service, and specialized courses to all their member agencies. These regional academies are partially state-funded from two sources. General Fund allocations in 2004 were \$914,585 and the Special Fund allocations in 2004 were \$1,451,455. Independent academies receive no state funds.

IV. FINDINGS

A. Issue Statement

There are 35 criminal justice training academies in the Commonwealth responsible for providing entry-level and in-service training for all categories of criminal justice officers. Of these, ten are regional academies, which are partially state-funded. Since 1998, state funds have been reduced by \$274,385 while training costs continue to rise. As a result, the General Assembly has directed DCJS to explore alternative methods of training delivery to possibly reduce the costs of training. While the study was primarily directed to assist regional academies, any alternatives would impact all criminal justice academies.

Due to the scope of this topic, it would be impossible to adequately research and report on all issues involved with alternative training delivery methods. Thus, the focus of this report will center on the concept of distance learning techniques and the option of creating a new training delivery system through the Virginia Community College System (VCCS).

Without the benefit of knowing how these programs would be structured, and the lack of details on the impact these alternative training delivery methods may have on cost savings, make cost-benefit analysis extremely difficult to determine. In 2001, DCJS presented a report to the General Assembly on Evaluation of the Feasibility and Costs of Distance Learning Techniques for Law Enforcement Training. This report defined distance learning and provided estimated costs for the various methodologies. (See *SD-15, 2001*.) Additionally, we surveyed local agencies and academies to try and determine what costs have been incurred and if any savings were being realized from using various distance learning technologies. The results of those surveys will be explained later in this document.

In order to assess the various issues associated with alternative training delivery methods, interviews were conducted with other state agencies employing distance learning technologies and the VCCS; previous reports and research articles were reviewed; surveys were distributed to police chiefs, sheriffs, and academy directors; and public hearings were conducted. The results of this research are as follows.

B. DCJS Policies and Rules

Currently, DCJS has a policy that defines and governs the use of any electronic media for training. (*Appendix D*.) Under this policy, law enforcement officers may receive up to eight hours of in-service training credit, jailors may receive up to six hours of in-service training credit, courtroom security and civil process officers may receive up to four hours of in-service training credit, corrections officers may receive up to six hours of in-service training credit, and Department of Corrections lieutenants through facility directors may receive up to eight hours of in-service training credit. The policy is restrictive regarding methodology, oversight, testing, and reporting.

Additionally, certain designated academies are participating in a pilot study on the use of distance learning technology for in-service training with emphasis on CBT. Preliminary results appear to be favorable; however, the quality of the tested programs varies significantly. Many are very good, are interactive, and incorporate good learning techniques. Others are no more than text on a computer screen with poorly designed tests at the end. While it has been indicated that the programs could be enhanced, often it is the lack of ability of the receiving agency to download enhanced programs due to minimal equipment and poor modem speed.

The challenge with this pilot and any subsequent use of electronic media for training is to ensure the programs meet a minimum threshold of quality standards. Meeting that challenge will require some authority or entity to determine what constitutes acceptable quality. DCJS has neither the personnel nor the resources to do this on a large scale for all 35 academies, police departments, and sheriffs' offices.

As a possible solution, DCJS is amending its in-service training rules to allow agency heads to determine the appropriateness of these programs for their officers. Under the proposed rules, agency heads could approve the appropriateness and quality of a CBT or other distance learning program for their officers' training. Officers may obtain all 40 hours of in-service training in this manner. Once completed, the training would be submitted to the agency's respective academy for reporting to DCJS. If these proposed rules changes are passed, then the issue of alternative training usage for in-service training becomes moot. It is expected that these changes will pass and take affect within the next 12 months.

In addition to the electronic media policy, DCJS has a policy provision that allows training credit for college courses. (*See Appendix E.*) Officers can simply take a related course and follow the prescribed procedures for reporting completion to DCJS. Thus, for the purpose of this review, acquiring in-service training by taking college courses is also a moot issue. Since the use of alternative training delivery methods for in-service training has been addressed by DCJS, the primary focus for this review is whether these methods are appropriate for entry-level training.

C. Results of Other Studies Senate Document 15

As previously mentioned, DCJS conducted a feasibility study on distance learning for the General Assembly in 2001. That study found that distance learning is a concept to be considered for any kind of training to provide uniformity, consistency, cost effectiveness, and convenience. The legislative directive of this study was to review the potential use of distance learning in entry-level law enforcement training. Distance learning can be defined as instructional delivery that does not constrain the student to be physically present in the same location as the instructor. More common delivery modes include audio, video, and computer technologies. Defining elements of distance learning include the:

- Separation of teacher and learner during at least a majority of each instructional process;
- Use of educational media to unite teacher and learner and to carry course content;

- Provision of two-way communication between teacher, tutor, or educational agency and learner.

Based on the legislative directives for this study, the following objectives were developed:

- Determine which curricula topics are best suited for distance learning.
- Determine the types of distance learning techniques currently being used by academies in Virginia.
- Determine the types of distance learning techniques currently available in Virginia.
- Determine the types of distance learning techniques currently available for law enforcement entry-level training.
- Determine the types of distance learning techniques feasible for law enforcement entry-level training.
- Determine approximate start-up and maintenance costs to implement distance learning techniques for law enforcement entry-level training in Virginia.
- Determine whether or not identified distance learning techniques would be likely to improve the quality and consistency of law enforcement entry-level training.

In considering the potential uses of distance learning, the performance outcomes of the current entry-level law enforcement training -- which could be used as part of this training -- were identified. With law enforcement training, it is critical to consider the ramifications of the actions of a law enforcement officer when a task is performed improperly or incorrectly. Historically, such training has become more performance-based, with the officer required to physically perform the task under the supervision of a certified instructor. The instructor then evaluates the officer's ability to perform the task in a legally defensible manner and evaluates the skill level of the officer.

It is further apparent that distance learning is a rapidly developing technology, which makes providing a definitive recommendation for a specific format extremely difficult. It may be assumed that, as the technology becomes more refined, options to be considered will change and costs will change as well. As is indicated within the body of the study, there are many options available for consideration. It is difficult to determine any kind of fixed costs for these options, as they are dependent upon the format for delivery, the number of programs considered, and the degree of customization to make a program Virginia-specific.

There are advantages and disadvantages to using distance learning techniques. Studies have shown that some of the advantages are:

- Student attitudes towards distance learning are usually positive.
- Students learn more quickly and retain more.
- Students express themselves better when responding electronically.
- Distance learning lends itself to different {not all} areas of training.
- Distance learning saves travel and housing costs.
- Distance learning enhances access to training information.
- Distance learning saves administrative costs of running an academy.

Some of the disadvantages are:

- Distance learning reduces interpersonal contact between students and eliminates face-to-face student-instructor interaction.
- It requires up-front purchase and maintenance of equipment to conduct training {telephone, one-way video and/or two-way audio, two-way computer hookups, or response terminals}.
- Instructors must master course design and presentation techniques using educational multimedia.
- Distance learning is costly to implement and maintain.
- Not all agencies have identical technical capabilities.
- More planning is required to ensure user acceptance and sustained use.
- The content is difficult to change.

As a result of this feasibility study, the following recommendations were made:

Recommendation #1:

The Department of Criminal Justice Services should develop, as an option, the capability to deliver appropriate portions of law enforcement entry-level training through distance learning techniques in order to ensure quality and consistency of delivery of instruction as recommended by the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission (JLARC).

Total Cost:

\$178,736 (1st year)

\$165,180 (2nd and subsequent years)

Recommendation #2:

The Committee on Training should develop guidelines for the development and delivery of certain portions of law enforcement entry-level training through distance learning techniques. Such guidelines should allow academies to develop distance learning programs at their own expense, and require approval by the Committee on Training in order to ensure a minimum level of quality and consistency. It must be noted that the selection of this recommendation does not address the need for uniformity and consistency as identified in the original JLARC report.

Cost: None to the Department of Criminal Justice Services or to the Commonwealth. Any costs would be incurred by the certified academy developing the program for board approval.

No action was taken by the General Assembly or the Administration as a result of this study.

Over the past several years, many studies on e-learning have been conducted. Most of the results have been similar and fairly consistent. Generally, the findings on e-learning are as follows:

- saves time without decaying learning, compresses training time/learning time from 30-60 percent on average;
- minimizes travel costs;
- minimizes time away from work;
- generally more cost effective;
- meets the training needs of geographically dispersed employees;
- provides consistent course delivery;
- offers more individualized instruction;
- produces higher learning results; and
- employees are more productive.

In Mr. Ron Kurtus' October 12, 2002 article, "*Return-on-Investment From Learning, CBT and WBT*," he compared several factors of conventional training development and implementation to those of e-learning. Based on an example of developing a 40-hour course, Mr. Kurtus indicated that, by using an e-learning approach, a savings of 20 percent the first year could be realized. The second and subsequent years could realize savings of up to 50 percent. This factored in not only development costs, but also the premise that training time is reduced by about 40 percent and learning increases by 15-20 percent.

The Institute of Employment Studies (IES) published a report on "*Exploring E-Learning*" to provide practical points on e-learning, the benefits that are claimed, potential pitfalls, and issues organizations need to consider when developing e-learning strategies. While many articles on e-learning seemed to be biased towards benefits that may or may not prove to be true, this report simply examines current research objectively combined with anecdotal information from the Institute's member agencies. For the purpose of this report, e-learning was defined as the delivery and administration of learning opportunities and support via computer, network, and web-based technology to help individual performances and development. As in many other studies, the IES report lists the advantages of e-learning as:

- just-in-time, just-enough, and just-for-you -- training to suit learner needs;
- cost-effective -- reports of 50 percent reduction in delivery costs;
- up-to-date -- can be updated easily from one source;
- quick -- time needed to learn a topic compressed as much as 50 percent;
- retainable -- smaller and more relevant learning is easier to capture and retain;
- risk-free -- an anonymous learning environment provides less fear of failure or socio-cultural bias;
- consistent -- everyone gets the same message;
- interactive and collaborative -- more enjoyable learning;
- easy to track -- administrative functions facilitate registrations, monitor progress, track testing, and keep records; and
- empowering -- increases IT skills.

Many of the potential drawbacks as listed by IES are similar to those expressed by the chiefs, sheriffs, and training personnel (which will be discussed later in this document). IES lists the drawbacks to e-learning as:

- technology dependent -- learners must have access to the appropriate hardware and software to fully benefit;
- incompatible with other systems and materials -- potential for fragmentation or confusion;
- unsuitable for some types of training -- some types of soft skills and most hard skills that rely on interpersonal contact;
- unsuitable for some types of learners -- often seen as cold and impersonal, and requires a high level of self-discipline and motivation;
- less interactive than it is cracked up to be -- some e-learning is no more than “photo-copied pages on the web,” difficult to follow, provides no feedback, and there is little learner support;
- expensive to set up -- both in terms of infrastructure and development costs, as well as the hidden costs of providing learner support; and
- still dependent on human support -- program development, help in using software, and to support trainee learning.

Finally, IES provides several factors to consider when developing strategies on the use of e-learning. Many of these apply to criminal justice training directly. Questions to consider are:

- Do you need both traditional and e-learning training? In the criminal justice environment, the answer would be **yes**. Much of the training that is done at academies is hard-skills development, needing instructor interaction and practice.
- Do you do it yourself or use a consultant? Off-the-shelf programs are not likely to be sufficient to meet training needs. Using external consultants to develop customized training is very expensive. Yet development in-house requires knowledgeable personnel, the appropriate hardware, and adequate developmental software. Often these are lacking for most academies.
- Will trainees need support? This becomes a problem at remote sites without adequate technical support.
- Will trainers be unhappy? Using e-learning techniques will significantly change the role of trainers. The impact is unknown, but undoubtedly some will see this as a threat.
- Finally, how can you tell if it is working? Usually, e-learning programs have a built-in testing component. However, the true test will be on the job results. This will be very difficult to measure.

The gist of the IES report is simply that there may be many benefits to e-learning. However, there are just as many drawbacks to consider. Additionally, there are many questions to consider when planning for the use of e-learning, many of which are not easily answered at this time.

D. Interviews

As part of our review, we contacted staff at agencies currently using some form of distance learning techniques. Agencies contacted included the Division of Forensic Sciences (DFS); the Department of Corrections (DOC), Academy for Staff Development; and the Virginia Community College System (VCCS), Instructional Technologies and Distance Learning and Workforce Development sections.

DCJS, Division of Forensic Sciences (DFS):

Recently, DFS instituted a PC-based training system for their lab personnel. This software system, called NetOP School, uses either a local area network (LAN) or a wide area network (WAN) to deliver instruction via personal computer stations. One PC is designated as a teacher station that controls instruction from a central location. The training is then accessed by any number of student PCs. The teacher can take control of any or the entire student PCs to view what the students are doing, or to provide assistance. Currently, this system of one teacher PC and 20 student PCs is being used by DFS to provide instruction and demonstrations to remote sites at their regional labs.

Additionally, DFS uses a videoconference setup at each lab to do training and conduct meetings. This setup consists of a video and audio feed from each lab, allowing real-time presentations to be broadcast and received. The total cost to set up all four labs in 2001 was \$77,838.

According to Mr. Doug Chandler at DFS, no hard data has been acquired on potential savings. However, he estimated that, over the past three years, significant reductions in travel have been realized by conducting electronic meetings and training. Mr. Chandler added that DFS has been able to disseminate information to the regional labs more quickly and more consistently. He feels there is no doubt that these two systems have saved time and money for DFS.

Department of Corrections (DOC), Academy for Staff Development:

DOC is one of the largest users of distance learning. Through its own network and a series of electronic classrooms, DOC has implemented not only training programs, but tele-justice and tele-medicine systems as well. There are over 115 remote sites, the furthest being over 400 miles from Richmond. Additionally, there are three primary electronic classroom sites other than the academy and headquarters in Richmond. These e-classrooms are fully equipped to broadcast and receive real-time audio and video signals. Primary control of all broadcasts is located at DOC's headquarters on Atmore Road in Richmond. Secondary control is administered at their academy in Goochland County. These two sites control all usage.

Each electronic classroom is equipped with recessed audio speakers, four microphones, two-to-four TV monitors, two cameras, a computer, VCR, DVD, and an Elmo-digital overhead projector. The average cost for each classroom is \$15,000 - \$20,000. The cost for the control system at Atmore was approximately \$75,000.

According to Mr. Butch Eudailey at the DOC Academy, this system has multiple uses and advantages. As a training tool, electronic classrooms provide virtually the same environment as a traditional classroom, allowing total student-teacher interaction. With distant learning and e-classrooms, a single instructor can reach more trainees at remote locations and economy of effort can be realized without having to travel to each site. Thus, instructor resources can be maximized, there is significant savings in travel costs of instructors and students as well, limited academy services (room and board) are not stressed, time is saved, and training programs can be recorded and rebroadcast for maximum usage. In addition, the smaller teleconference systems at each DOC facility are being used to get out critical information quickly as changes occur, allowing all managers to receive the same information simultaneously without having to travel hundreds of miles to a meeting in Richmond. Using this system is reported to be less expensive than conducting a telephone conference call with facility managers.

In addition to savings on training costs, the teleconference system at each facility is being used to acquire medical evaluations and treatments for inmates. It is also being used in court for hearings, interviews, and other legal actions. This saves significantly on the cost of transporting inmates and reduces security risks.

However, according to Mr. Eudailey, there are some limitations. Trainers are still in a learning mode on how best to use distance learning and how to conduct their training using the e-classroom. Programs are currently limited to in-service training dealing primarily with computer-related topics, procedural issues, procurement topics, written driver education safety topics, or any other standardized topics. The system is currently **not** being used for basic officer training conducted at their academy. It requires someone designated full-time to implement, provide technical assistance, and maintain the program. However, Mr. Eudailey believes the potential benefits for them in a centralized setting outweigh the drawbacks.

Virginia Community College System (VCCS):

As directed by the language in the Appropriations Act, DCJS contacted the VCCS to discuss two separate issues. The first centers around what technology and distant learning options are available. The second involves the possibility of the VCCS conducting entry-level law enforcement training and how this might look conceptually.

Dr. Carole Schultz, Assistant Vice-Chancellor for Instructional Technologies and Distance Learning, indicated that the VCCS has a myriad of delivery options for distance learning. They currently use and can provide assistance in CBT, facilitate teleconferencing, e-classrooms, CD and recorded programs, web and internet-based instruction. The decision on which technology to use is based on the topic, instructor involvement, necessary student ability

and needs, and whether the instruction can stand alone or needs some higher level of involvement/interaction. Dr. Schultz further indicated that she and her staff could provide the expertise to help make these decisions if needed. She and her staff offered to help DCJS or the academies in addressing the best use for distance learning technology.

The obvious advantages for using the VCCS are that they already have the technology and expertise in place. The disadvantages are that there are costs associated with using their services, and access to their facilities are very limited for outside agencies.

In addition to consulting the VCCS about their technology capabilities, Dr. Rose Johnson, Vice-Chancellor for Workforce Development Services, was contacted to discuss law enforcement entry-level training. Dr. Johnson came from North Carolina's Community College System and is very familiar with law enforcement training. She indicated that the workforce development area of the VCCS operates differently than the academic side in that the customer drives the content of the training and the development process. Depending on the needs or desires of the customer, a program can be set up either as non-academic or for college credit. The latter would lend itself towards a degree and a more professional development path for officers. While this option may have additional academic requirements, it would not impact the "training" requirements for an entry-level officer.

According to Dr. Johnson, an entry-level program would conceptually work as follows:

- A steering committee composed of end-users (chiefs and sheriffs), training personnel, and DCJS staff would work with VCCS staff to structure the training.
- Instructors would be drawn from existing law enforcement trainers meeting DCJS certification.
- The curriculum would be driven by DCJS training standards and any other requirements identified by the steering committee.
- Applicants would have to be either sponsored or hired by a local agency. They would undergo a background check and have to meet all the hiring requirements as set forth by the Virginia *Code*, DCJS, or the agency hiring/sponsoring the candidate.
- Once a class is formed, they stay together and undergo a strict regimen of training including physical fitness.
- The program would be highly structured and disciplined. All criteria set by DCJS and the committee would have to be met.

However, Dr. Johnson indicated that it might be a challenge for VCCS to provide driver training and firearms training. Liability and record keeping are issues that bear some discussion. Dr. Johnson stated that elements to address liability for training could be incorporated. The college is required to maintain records of all training materials and lesson plans. Copies of all training and evaluation documents would be sent to the hiring agency as well. However, it was unclear whether the college or local agency would maintain individual files on officers.

Finally, the issue of how tuition would be paid was discussed. Dr. Johnson explained that, in North Carolina, the state paid the tuition costs. If this option were to be explored further, the feeling of VCCS is that either the state or the local agency would pay for training, not the

trainee. One possible scenario would have DCJS act as a pass-through agency for tuition, operating under a Memorandum-of-Understanding with VCCS. The costs and funding mechanism for this kind of arrangement remain to be determined. While these and other questions remain, it appears that the VCCS have a different approach to workforce training than academic-degree programs.

E. Survey Results

In order to determine the past and current experiences local agencies have had with alternative training delivery, DCJS sent a survey to chiefs, sheriffs, and other agency administrators. We asked them to provide not only their experiences, but also their opinions on what and how best to use various alternative training options for both in-service and entry-level officer training. We asked for their opinions on both technology-based training options and the use of colleges to provide training. In addition to the agency heads, we surveyed all of the certified criminal justice academies. While the surveys are similar, the academies' surveys differed slightly, focusing more on application. The results of these surveys are as follows.

Local Agency Survey Results:

Well over 300 surveys were sent to local criminal justice agencies; 87 responses were returned to DCJS. The results are as follows:

- Eighty-four percent have **not** used alternative training delivery methods for entry-level training.
- Sixty percent have used it for some form of in-service training.
- Likewise, 86 percent currently do not use it for entry-level training.
- Fifty-six percent currently use alternative training for in-service (Note: There is a four percent drop from past usage to current use).
- The primary reason given for not using alternative forms of training delivery was that either the programs or the resources needed were unavailable {50 percent}.
- The vast majority {86 percent}, used computer-based training (CBT) as an alternative method, followed by college courses {35 percent}.
- Most of the CBT programs were developed by academy staff {55 percent}, or acquired from other training organizations {41 percent}.
- Officers received training at numerous locations including their academies {63 percent}, their agencies {61 percent}, designated off-site locations {41 percent}, or education facilities {31 percent}.
- Usage of alternative methods was monitored by a combination of means; primarily by academy staff {63 percent}, or by computer log-on registries {51 percent}.
- It is significant to note that passing a test was required for satisfactory completion by **100 percent** of the agencies using alternative training.
- Also significant is the belief by local agencies that DCJS reviews alternative training programs for quality {84 percent}; when in fact, we review very few programs. Also, 53 percent responded that either the academy staff or agency staff reviews programs as well.

- The agencies reported that 170 entry-level officers and 965 incumbent officers used alternative training programs.
- Sixty-seven percent indicated they realized a cost savings by using alternative methods of training.
- Most cost savings came from reduced travel costs {37 percent}, or manpower/time saved {37 percent.}
- The savings ranged from a few hundred dollars to more than \$10,000.
- Sixty percent responded that distance learning methods were **not** a viable training option for entry-level training. The primary reasons were that recruits needed instructor interaction, the training required practical exercises, and entry-level training needs a high level of structure.
- Conversely, 82 percent indicated that it was appropriate for in-service training.
- Respondents reported that alternative training should **not** be used for practical skills areas in high liability topics {36 percent}, or any entry-level training {30 percent}. They further indicated that it could be used for academic-oriented topics {78 percent}, or criminal justice specific topics {69 percent}.
- Most agencies, 62 percent, reported having resources available in order to use alternative training delivery methods.
- Surprisingly, there was a fairly even split on whether certain college courses could be substituted for entry-level training. Forty-eight percent agreed, while 39 percent responded “no”. The majority, 53 percent, did not think it would reduce training costs.
- There were no consistent responses to the final six questions (#19 - #24) seeking opinions on how to make alternative training methods, including college courses, useful; how academies can reduce costs; or ways to make training more cost-effective and consistent. These responses and those for the entire survey can be found in *Appendix C-1*.

Academy Survey Results:

Of the 35 certified criminal justice academies, 19 responded to the survey. The following is a summary of their responses, which are very similar to those of agency administrators.

- Most responding academies {13} do not use alternative-training delivery for entry-level training, while 15 do use it for in-service training.
- CBT is the most widely used method of alternative training; 13 academies reported using some form of computer training.
- Most academies purchased training programs that were either commercially developed {eight}, or used programs developed by academy staff {six}.
- Academies reported that many of the programs and/or subscriber services were expensive. Costs ranged from a low of \$20 for a single CD program to over \$140,000 plus man-hours. Equipment costs averaged approximately \$16,500 and service fees ranged from \$670 to over \$10,000 per year.
- Most of the academies offered their courses on-site {ten}, and used on-site staff and log-on registries to monitor usage.

- It is significant to note that 11 academies required passing a test to successfully complete the course, while 100 percent of the agency administrators indicated testing was required.
- Another discrepancy lies in the number of officers reported to have used alternative training. The academies reported 2,110 entry-level officers and 4,720 in-service officers using alternative training. This would seem to be the most accurate since academies are responsible for tracking training.
- Six academies reported a cost savings as a result of using alternative training, ranging from \$2,000 per year to \$155,000 in salaries. Eight academies reported no cost savings.
- Like the agency administrators, the majority of academies responding {11} do not think that distance learning is appropriate for entry-level training. However, 18 felt that it was an appropriate option for in-service training.
- Likewise, the academies felt that alternative training should not be used for high-liability skills-oriented training {12}, or any entry-level training {5}.
- They also agreed with agency heads that it could be used effectively for academic topics and/or criminal justice specific topics.
- Twelve out of the 19 academies responding indicated they had adequate resources to utilize alternative training.
- The vast majority of responding academies {15} indicated that they would **not** realize cost savings by using college courses for part of their entry-level training.
- As with the agency responses, the academies provided no consistent responses on how alternative training could be cost-effective or useful. The complete responses for this question and the rest of the academy surveys can be found in *Appendix C-2*.

F. Public Hearings Summary

In order to provide additional opportunities for our constituents to participate in this study, DCJS conducted seven regional public hearings. To ensure all areas of the state were covered, open forums were held in Richmond, Fairfax, Harrisonburg, Vinton, Wytheville, Danville, and Virginia Beach. The rosters of attendees at each of these hearings are located in *Appendix F*. Each of the hearings was similar in that there were more questions and concerns expressed than definitive answers provided.

Since the vast majority of attendees agreed that distance learning, college courses, and other forms of alternative training delivery are appropriate for in-service training, and since DCJS is in the process of amending its in-service training rules to allow use of alternative methods, the central theme of the meetings was entry-level training.

Opposition to using distance or e-learning methods for entry-level training was consistent throughout the state. The major concerns expressed are as follows:

- Students have different learning styles and not everyone can benefit from computer-based instruction.
- There is real concern over the quality and consistency of programs, and who will approve them.

- The agency or training staff cannot evaluate a recruit through e-learning; nor can a recruit fully evaluate the requirements of being an officer.
- Instructor interaction is critical at the entry level in order to effect behavioral change in the recruit; e-learning cannot do this. Personal interaction at this level is more productive and provides an avenue for idea exchange that cannot occur with e-learning.
- Recruits cannot develop and learn life skills and how to interact with people using CBT. The basic academy provides this crucial training.
- The use of e-learning opens the door for the possibility of fraud, cheating, and collusion.
- E-learning potential should be evaluated after its full implementation for in-service training. It is too soon to determine its effectiveness for entry-level training.

There were also concerns expressed regarding the use of community colleges for part or all of entry-level training. While many of the concerns mirrored the survey results, other issues surfaced. These fall into the general categories of quality control and assurance, liability, and the costs involved and its relationship to recruiting. In spite of explaining the difference between the traditional college approach to education and the current approach VCCS now takes to workforce development as noted earlier, many of the comments appear to address conventional course delivery.

Quality Control and Assurance:

Several comments regarding the quality of instruction provided at academies versus colleges were made during all seven hearings. Concerns were expressed about who would control the curriculum and course content. The general feeling was that law enforcement would lose control to academics, and theory would prevail over practical experience. Additionally, there was concern over consistency of courses from one campus to another, that information (particularly legal topics) would not be law enforcement specific, or address the critical areas new officers need to know to function on the job. There were questions about how mandatory training standards and objectives would be enforced and how much oversight would DCJS be able to exercise to enforce them. Another concern was the quality of instructors, specifically the use of academics versus law enforcement instructors who have actually worked in the job.

A major concern dealt with structure and student behavior. Many current recruits lack discipline, life skills, the ability to effectively deal with people, or understand the concept of teamwork. The consensus from the hearings was that colleges cannot provide the structure, control, and discipline needed to develop these characteristics in new recruits. It was felt that only academies in a para-military environment could effect change in behavior and provide those skills necessary to make life-and-death decisions on the streets.

Liability Concerns:

As several chiefs and sheriffs noted, they are ultimately responsible for the actions of their officers. In the academy setting, they feel in control over the training and know what is

taught and could later defend an officer's actions if necessary. If training were to be conducted at community colleges, administrators question where the liability would lie . . . with the colleges or the agency heads? They want assurance that all pre-requisite knowledge would be provided consistently from campus-to-campus. They also expressed concern over training records, lesson plan retention, and the security of each. Agency administrators felt they would have more control and could defend their officers better if training were conducted at a basic academy.

Cost and Recruiting:

The question of who would pay for training delivered in the VCCS was raised. Many chiefs of smaller agencies felt that they could not pay high tuition rates for officers. They believe they get a better bargain by paying fees to the academies for all the training needed. However, their greater concern was that the costs might be shifted to the students and, if that were the case, agencies' ability to recruit would be severely hampered. Their concern was that many young people could not afford to pay for the training, that it would negatively impact minority recruitment, and that agencies would lose good candidates from the 30+ age group who may need to support their families while transitioning into the law enforcement profession. One of their main recruiting benefits is that the agencies provide training for new officers. Without this benefit, the administrators fear that the recruiting pool, particularly in economically depressed areas, would disappear. Administrators were adamant about not shifting the burden to pay for basic training to the recruits. Instead of any mandatory system through the VCCS, they recommended the enhancement and promotion of the "pre-employment" training option through the academies. With this program, an individual could seek employment in law enforcement by paying his or her own training costs and obtain certified academy training. This would not impact an agency's ability to recruit and pay for an individual's training, but would provide additional options for potential new hires.

Finally, during the public hearing in Vinton, Mr. Richard Schumaker, Director of Cardinal Criminal Justice Training Academy, presented a "White Paper" addressing the issue of alternative training delivery. Mr. Schumaker asked that this paper be included in the DCJS report. The paper addresses the academies' efforts in distance learning and the appropriateness of this methodology; it concludes that basic training should remain exclusively in the academies and presents arguments for this conclusion. The paper in its entirety can be found in ***Appendix G***.

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The preponderance of the research suggests that there is potential for the use of alternative training delivery for criminal justice training. Whether technology-based training or a shift to the VCCS for part or all of training would be any more cost-effective or of a better quality is less clear. Based on all the information considered, we believe that virtually any form of alternative training may be appropriate for in-service officer training. This is reflected in our current practice of allowing training credit for college courses and, on a limited basis, for training obtained by electronic media. As noted earlier, we are in the process of amending the in-service rules to allow unlimited training credit for e-learning. As a result, there does not seem to be any major concern with using alternative training delivery for in-service training.

Conversely, the majority of agency administrators feel that neither e-learning nor training through the VCCS would be appropriate for entry-level training. Research tends to support that e-learning is not appropriate for all training, particularly hard-skills training. While there may be some limited applications for e-learning in entry-level training, further study is needed to determine how best to consistently integrate it into the overall basic training received at the academies.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation A:

The Department of Criminal Justice Services is currently amending the *In-Service Training Rules* to allow officers to acquire any or all of their mandatory training through various forms of distant-learning methodologies. The quality and appropriateness of the training will be the decision of the local agency head. This allows greater local control over the training that is determined necessary for any given officer and how it is to be presented. The DCJS should continue the process of amending the *In-Service Training Rules* in accordance with the Administrative Process Act.

Recommendation B:

While there may be some valid applications of e-learning methodologies for entry-level training, this decision should be left up to the local agency administrators and their academy directors. There are obvious economies of effort and resources that may be realized by partnering with the VCCS. If appropriate, academies are encouraged to seek and utilize the expertise and resources available through the VCCS.

Recommendation C:

DCJS knows from the experiences of other states, and from discussions with the VCCS, that entry-level training can be delivered through community colleges. However, any move in this direction would require a major change in the way we currently conduct training. Many questions would have to be answered before such a major change could be made in Virginia, not the least of which deals with funding. This issue has generated many more questions than answers. Given the overwhelming negative responses from local agencies and academies, major work would be required to implement a system in which administrators would have confidence. This issue requires further study and research. As a result, DCJS recommends that, if the members of the General Assembly are interested in pursuing this option any further, the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission (JLARC) be directed to conduct an in-depth study to ascertain if this truly is a viable option.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Department of Criminal Justice Services (140)

430.	Financial Assistance for Administration of Justice Services (39000)	66,559,178 67,424,428
	Financial Assistance to Localities for Administration of Justice Services (39001)	66,559,178 67,424,428
Fund	General	
Sources:		25,496,512 26,361,762
	Special	100,000 100,000
	Trust and Agency	10,000,000 10,000,000
	Dedicated Special Revenue	6,405,261 6,405,261
	Federal Trust	24,557,405 24,557,405

Authority: Title 9.1, Chapter 1, *Code of Virginia*.

A. This appropriation includes an estimated \$12,000,000 the first year and an estimated \$12,000,000 the second year in federal funds pursuant to the Omnibus Crime Control Act of 1968, as amended. Of these amounts, nine percent is available for administration, and the remainder is available for grants to state agencies and local units of government. The remaining federal funds are to be passed through as grants to localities, with a required 25 percent local match. Also included in this appropriation is \$829,930 the first year and \$829,930 the second year from the General Fund for the required matching funds for state agencies.

B. The Department of Criminal Justice Services is authorized to make grants and provide technical assistance out of this appropriation to state agencies, local governments, regional, and nonprofit organizations for the establishment and operation of programs for the following purposes and up to the amounts specified:

1.a. Regional training academies for criminal justice training: \$914,585 the first year and \$914,585 the second year from the General Fund, and an estimated \$941,797 the first year and an estimated \$941,797 the second year from non-General Funds. The Criminal Justice Services Board shall adopt such rules as may reasonably be required for the distribution of funds and for the establishment, operation, and service boundaries of state-supported regional criminal justice training academies.

1.b. The Board of Criminal Justice Services, consistent with §9.1-102, *Code of Virginia*, and § 6VAC-20-20-61 of the Administrative Code, shall not approve or provide funding for the

establishment of any new criminal justice training academy from July 1, 2004 through June 30, 2006.

2. Virginia Crime Victim-Witness fund: \$5,124,059 the first year and \$5,124,059 the second year from dedicated special revenue.

3. Court Appointed Special Advocate programs: \$928,750 the first year and \$975,000 the second year from the General Fund.

C.1. Out of this appropriation, \$19,439,828 the first year and \$20,258,828 the second year from the General Fund is authorized to make discretionary grants and to provide technical assistance to cities, counties or combinations thereof to develop, implement, operate and evaluate programs, services and facilities established pursuant to the Comprehensive Community Corrections Act for Local-Responsible Offenders (§[53.1-182.1](#), *Code of Virginia*) and the Pretrial Services Act (§[19.2-152.4](#), *Code of Virginia*). Funding for local-responsible offenders shall be limited to programs, services, and facilities targeting those offenders specified in §[19.2-303.3](#), *Code of Virginia*. Funds for pretrial programs or other alternatives to incarceration programs shall be limited to those established or expanded pursuant to paragraph E 2 of Item 64. Out of these amounts, the Director of the Department of Criminal Justice Services is authorized to expend no more than five percent per year for state administration of these programs.

2. The Department of Criminal Justice Services, in conjunction with the Office of the Executive Secretary of the Supreme Court and the Virginia Criminal Sentencing Commission, shall conduct information and training sessions for judges and other judicial officials on the programs, services and facilities available through the Pretrial Services Act and the Comprehensive Community Corrections Act for Local-Responsible Offenders.

3. The Department of Criminal Justice Services shall provide an annual report on its progress in implementing the Pretrial Services Act and the Comprehensive Community Corrections Act for Local-Responsible Offenders to the Chairmen of the House Courts of Justice, Health, Welfare and Institutions, and Appropriations Committees and the Senate Courts of Justice, Rehabilitation and Social Services, and Finance Committees.

D. In the event the federal government should make available additional funds pursuant to the Violence Against Women Act, the Department shall set aside 33 percent of such funds for competitive grants to programs providing services to domestic violence and sexual assault victims.

E. Subject to the conditions stated in this Item and with the prior written approval of the Director of the Department of Planning and Budget, there is hereby re-appropriated the unexpended balances remaining in the appropriations made in the Financial Assistance for Administration of Justice Services program on June 30, 2004 and June 30, 2005. These re-appropriations shall be used only for the purposes of the original appropriation for grants made by the Criminal Justice Services Board. This provision shall apply to funds obligated to and in the possession of state agency sub-grantees and the Department of Criminal Justice Services.

F. From such federal funds as may be available, the Department shall provide a grant of up to \$500,000 each year to the Department of Juvenile Justice for regional and statewide training and technical assistance to localities in the development and evaluation of programs established under the Virginia Juvenile Community Crime Control Act.

G. The Department shall provide a grant of up to \$1,300,000 the first year and \$1,300,000 the second year from federal funds to the Department of Corrections, to continue intensive substance abuse treatment services in correctional facilities.

H.1. Out of this appropriation, \$1,490,000 the first year and \$1,490,000 the second year from the General Fund, and \$1,710,000 the first year and \$1,710,000 the second year from such federal funds as are available shall be deposited to the School Resource Officer Incentive Grants Fund established pursuant to §[9-171.1](#), *Code of Virginia*. Localities shall match these funds based on the composite index of local ability-to-pay. The Department shall give priority to localities requesting school resource officers in high schools.

2. The Director of the Department of Criminal Justice Services is authorized to expend \$357,285 the first year and \$357,285 the second year from the School Resource Officer Incentive Grants Fund to operate the Virginia Center for School Safety, pursuant to §[9.1-110](#), *Code of Virginia*.

I. Out of this appropriation, \$520,000 the first year from the General Fund and \$1,560,000 in the first year from such federal funds as are available, and \$520,000 the second year from the General Fund and \$1,560,000 the second year from such federal funds as are available are included to support drug court programs statewide.

J. The department shall provide a grant of up to \$2,000,000 the first year and up to \$2,000,000 the second year in federal grant funds to the Department of Corrections to develop and implement the initial phases of an integrated offender management system; the first phase of which shall be the purchase and implementation of a system to replace the current offender time computation system.

K. The Department of Criminal Justice Services shall review the feasibility of allowing alternative training delivery methods, with a focus on distance learning and computer-based training, for entry level and in-service training for criminal justice officers. In determining the feasibility of alternative training delivery methods, the Department shall consider the quality of training provided, cost effectiveness, and the impact upon local units of government. The Department shall consult with affected local governments, state and local public safety agencies, training organizations, and higher education institutions, including the Virginia Community College System. The results, including details on potential cost savings and cost avoidance, shall be reported to the Chairmen of the House Appropriations and Senate Finance Committees by December 1, 2004.

L. The Department of Criminal Justice Services shall prepare a report on fees assessed by all regional criminal justice training academies for training services provided to non-governmental

agencies or organizations. The report shall include an assessment of whether fees charged non-governmental agencies or organizations fully recognize the total costs of training provided. The report shall also provide options for recovering the cost of the state-supported training services provided to non-governmental agencies or organizations by regional criminal justice training academies. The Department shall consult with affected local governments and government and non-government public safety agencies or organizations that utilize the regional criminal justice training academies. The results shall be reported to the Chairmen of the House Appropriations and Senate Finance Committees by December 1, 2004.

§ 9.1-102. Powers and duties of the Board and the Department

The Department, under the direction of the Board, which shall be the policy-making body for carrying out the duties and powers hereunder, shall have the power and duty to:

1. Adopt regulations, pursuant to the Administrative Process Act (§ [2.2-4000](#) et seq.), for the administration of (i) this chapter including the authority to require the submission of reports and information by law enforcement officers within the Commonwealth or (ii) §§ [18.2-268.6](#), [18.2-268.9](#), [19.2-188.1](#), [19.2-310.5](#) and for any provisions of the *Code* as they relate to the responsibilities of the Division of Forensic Sciences. Any proposed regulations concerning the privacy, confidentiality, and security of criminal justice information shall be submitted for review and comment to any board, commission, or committee, or other body which may be established by the General Assembly to regulate the privacy, confidentiality, and security of information collected and maintained by the Commonwealth or any political subdivision thereof.
2. Establish compulsory minimum training standards subsequent to employment as a law enforcement officer in (i) permanent positions and (ii) temporary or probationary status, and establish the time required for completion of such training.
3. Establish minimum training standards and qualifications for certification and re-certification for law enforcement officers serving as field training officers.
4. Establish compulsory minimum curriculum requirements for in-service and advanced courses and programs for schools, whether located in or outside the Commonwealth, which are operated for the specific purpose of training law enforcement officers.
5. Establish (i) compulsory minimum training standards for law enforcement officers who utilize radar or an electrical or microcomputer device to measure the speed of motor vehicles as provided in § [46.2-882](#) and establish the time required for completion of the training, and (ii) compulsory minimum qualifications for certification and re-certification of instructors who provide such training.
6. Establish compulsory training courses for law enforcement officers in laws and procedures relating to entrapment, search and seizure, evidence, and techniques of report writing, which training shall be completed by law enforcement officers who have not completed the compulsory training standards set out in Subdivision 2, prior to assignment of any such officers to undercover investigation work. Failure to complete the training shall not, for that reason, constitute grounds to exclude otherwise properly admissible testimony or other evidence from such officer resulting from any undercover investigation.
7. Establish compulsory minimum entry-level, in-service and advanced training standards for those persons designated to provide courthouse and courtroom security pursuant to the provisions of § [53.1-120](#), and to establish the time required for completion of such training.

8. Establish compulsory minimum entry-level, in-service and advanced training standards for deputy sheriffs designated to serve process pursuant to the provisions of § [8.01-293](#), and establish the time required for the completion of such training.
9. Establish compulsory minimum entry-level, in-service, and advanced training standards for persons employed as deputy sheriffs and jail officers by local criminal justice agencies and for correctional officers employed by the Department of Corrections under the provisions of Title 53.1, and establish the time required for completion of such training.
10. Establish compulsory minimum training standards for all dispatchers employed by or in any local or state government agency, whose duties include the dispatching of law enforcement personnel. Such training standards shall apply only to dispatchers hired on or after July 1, 1988.
11. Consult and cooperate with counties, municipalities, agencies of the Commonwealth, other state and federal governmental agencies, and with universities, colleges, community colleges, and other institutions, whether located in or outside the Commonwealth, concerning the development of police training schools and programs or courses of instruction.
12. Approve institutions, curricula and facilities, whether located in or outside the Commonwealth, for school operation for the specific purpose of training law enforcement officers; but this shall not prevent the holding of any such school whether approved or not.
13. Establish and maintain police training programs through such agencies and institutions as the Board deems appropriate.
14. Establish compulsory minimum qualifications of certification and recertification for instructors in criminal justice training schools approved by the Department.
15. Conduct and stimulate research by public and private agencies which shall be designed to improve police administration and law enforcement.
16. Make recommendations concerning any matter within its purview pursuant to this chapter.
17. Coordinate its activities with those of any interstate system for the exchange of criminal history record information, nominate one or more of its members to serve upon the council or committee of any such system, and participate when and as deemed appropriate in any such system's activities and programs.
18. Conduct inquiries and investigations it deems appropriate to carry out its functions under this chapter and, in conducting such inquiries and investigations, may require any criminal justice agency to submit information, reports, and statistical data with respect to its policy and operation of information systems or with respect to its collection, storage, dissemination, and usage of criminal history record information and correctional status information, and such criminal justice agencies shall submit such information, reports, and data as are reasonably required.

19. Conduct audits as required by § [9.1-131](#).
20. Conduct a continuing study and review of questions of individual privacy and confidentiality of criminal history record information and correctional status information.
21. Advise criminal justice agencies and initiate educational programs for such agencies with respect to matters of privacy, confidentiality, and security as they pertain to criminal history record information and correctional status information.
22. Maintain a liaison with any board, commission, committee, or other body which may be established by law, executive order, or resolution to regulate the privacy and security of information collected by the Commonwealth or any political subdivision thereof.
23. Adopt regulations establishing guidelines and standards for the collection, storage, and dissemination of criminal history record information and correctional status information, and the privacy, confidentiality, and security thereof necessary to implement state and federal statutes, regulations, and court orders.
24. Operate a statewide criminal justice research center, which shall maintain an integrated criminal justice information system, produce reports, provide technical assistance to state and local criminal justice data system users, and provide analysis and interpretation of criminal justice statistical information.
25. Develop a comprehensive, statewide, long-range plan for strengthening and improving law enforcement and the administration of criminal justice throughout the Commonwealth, and periodically update that plan.
26. Cooperate with, and advise and assist, all agencies, departments, boards and institutions of the Commonwealth, and units of general local government, or combinations thereof, including planning district commissions, in planning, developing, and administering programs, projects, comprehensive plans, and other activities for improving law enforcement and the administration of criminal justice throughout the Commonwealth, including allocating and sub-granting funds for these purposes.
27. Define, develop, organize, encourage, conduct, coordinate, and administer programs, projects and activities for the Commonwealth and units of general local government, or combinations thereof, in the Commonwealth, designed to strengthen and improve law enforcement and the administration of criminal justice at every level throughout the Commonwealth.
28. Review and evaluate programs, projects, and activities, and recommend, where necessary, revisions or alterations to such programs, projects, and activities for the purpose of improving law enforcement and the administration of criminal justice.

29. Coordinate the activities and projects of the state departments, agencies, and boards of the Commonwealth and of the units of general local government, or combination thereof, including planning district commissions, relating to the preparation, adoption, administration, and implementation of comprehensive plans to strengthen and improve law enforcement and the administration of criminal justice.

30. Do all things necessary on behalf of the Commonwealth and its units of general local government, to determine and secure benefits available under the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (P.L. 90-351, 82 Stat. 197), as amended, and under any other federal acts and programs for strengthening and improving law enforcement, the administration of criminal justice, and delinquency prevention and control.

31. Receive, administer, and expend all funds and other assistance available to the Board and the Department for carrying out the purposes of this chapter and the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended.

32. Apply for and accept grants from the United States government or any other source in carrying out the purposes of this chapter and accept any and all donations both real and personal, and grants of money from any governmental unit or public agency, or from any institution, person, firm or corporation, and may receive, utilize and dispose of the same. Any arrangements pursuant to this section shall be detailed in the annual report of the Board. Such report shall include the identity of the donor, the nature of the transaction, and the conditions, if any. Any moneys received pursuant to this section shall be deposited in the state treasury to the account of the Department. To these ends, the Board shall have the power to comply with conditions and execute such agreements as may be necessary.

33. Make and enter into all contracts and agreements necessary or incidental to the performance of its duties and execution of its powers under this chapter, including but not limited to, contracts with the United States, units of general local government or combinations thereof, in Virginia or other states, and with agencies and departments of the Commonwealth.

34. Adopt and administer reasonable regulations for the planning and implementation of programs and activities and for the allocation, expenditure and sub-granting of funds available to the Commonwealth and to units of general local government, and for carrying out the purposes of this chapter and the powers and duties set forth herein.

35. Certify and decertify law enforcement officers in accordance with §§ [15.2-1706](#) and [15.2-1707](#);

36. Provide forensic laboratory services as detailed in Article 2 (§ [9.1-117](#) et seq.) of this chapter.

37. Establish training standards and publish a model policy for law enforcement personnel in the handling of family abuse, domestic violence, sexual assault and stalking cases, including standards for determining the predominant physical aggressor in accordance with § [19.2-81.3](#).

38. Establish training standards and publish a model policy for law enforcement personnel in communicating with and facilitating the safe return of individuals diagnosed with Alzheimer's disease.
39. Establish compulsory training standards for basic training and the re-certification of law enforcement officers to ensure sensitivity to and awareness of cultural diversity and the potential for biased policing.
40. Review and evaluate community-policing programs in the Commonwealth, and recommend where necessary statewide operating procedures, guidelines, and standards which strengthen and improve such programs, including sensitivity to and awareness of cultural diversity and the potential for biased policing.
41. Publish and disseminate a model policy or guideline that may be used by state and local agencies to ensure that law enforcement personnel are sensitive to and aware of cultural diversity and the potential for biased policing.
42. (Effective until July 1, 2005) Assist, as necessary, in the administration of the Live In Our Community Police Housing Program and Fund established pursuant to Chapter 8.1 (§ [36-140.1](#) et seq.) of Title 36.
43. Establish a Virginia Law enforcement Accreditation Center. The Center shall, in cooperation with Virginia law enforcement agencies, provide technical assistance and administrative support, including staffing, for the establishment of voluntary state law enforcement accreditation standards. The Center may provide accreditation assistance and training, resource material, and research into methods and procedures that will assist the Virginia law enforcement community efforts to obtain Virginia accreditation status.
44. Promote community policing philosophy and practice throughout the Commonwealth by providing community policing training and technical assistance statewide to all law enforcement agencies, community groups, public and private organizations and citizens; developing and distributing innovative policing curricula and training tools on general community policing philosophy and practice and contemporary critical issues facing Virginia communities; serving as a consultant to Virginia organizations with specific community policing needs; facilitating continued development and implementation of community policing programs statewide through discussion forums for community policing leaders, and development of law enforcement instructors; promoting a statewide community policing initiative; and serving as a statewide information source on the subject of community policing including, but not limited to, periodic newsletters, a website and an accessible lending library.
- 45.g Establish, in consultation with the Department of Education and the Virginia State Crime Commission, compulsory minimum standards for employment and job-entry and in-service training curricula and certification requirements for school security officers, which training and certification shall be administered by the Virginia Center for School Safety pursuant to § [9.1-184](#). Such training standards shall include, but shall not be limited to, the role and responsibility

of school security officers, relevant state and federal laws, school and personal liability issues, security awareness in the school environment, mediation and conflict resolution, disaster and emergency response, and student behavioral dynamics. The Department shall establish an advisory committee consisting of local school board representatives, principals, superintendents, and school security personnel to assist in the development of these standards and certification requirements.

46. Establish training standards and publish a model policy and protocols for local and regional sexual assault response teams.

47. (Effective July 1, 2005) License and regulate property bail bondsmen and surety bail bondsmen in accordance with Article 11 (§ [9.1-185](#) et seq.) of this chapter.

48. (Effective October 1, 2005) License and regulate bail enforcement agents in accordance with Article 12 (§ [9.1-186](#) et seq.) of this chapter.

49. Perform such other acts as may be necessary or convenient for the effective performance of its duties.

(1981, c. 632, § 9-170; 1982, c. 473; 1984, cc. 515; 779; 1986, c. 128; 1988, cc. 46, 560; 1990, c. 632; 1991, c. 345; 1994, cc. 850, 905; 1996, cc. 154, 866, 952; 1998, cc. 31, 471, 523; 1999, cc. 307, 495; 2000, c. 561; 2001, cc. 162, 210, 434, 458, 844; 2002, cc. 490, 810, 818, 836, 868; 2004, cc. 397, 460, 972, 980, 1016.)

ALTERNATIVE TRAINING DELIVERY QUESTIONS
LOCAL AGENCIES

Definition: For the purpose of this questionnaire, alternative training delivery methods would include any methods other than the traditional academy instructor/classroom, practical exercise, and practice-oriented skill training methods. This may include, but not limited to, computer-based training, electronic classroom, any form of distance training, TV or video format used as the primary mode of delivery (not videos used as an aid and/or part of regular instructions) such as LETN, teleconferencing, college or university courses, or any other form of non-conventional academy training.

Total Responses: 87

1. Have you or any of your officers ever used alternative training delivery methods for:

Entry-level training?	Yes <u>6 (7%)</u>	No <u>73 (84%)</u>
In-service training?	Yes <u>52 (60%)</u>	No <u>27 (31%)</u>

2. Do you or any of your officers currently use alternative training delivery methods for:

Entry-level?	Yes <u>5 (6%)</u>	No <u>75 (86%)</u>
In-service training?	Yes <u>49 (56%)</u>	No <u>33 (38%)</u>

3. If no, why not? **Not available: 32 (43%); availability of resources/equipment: 5 (7%); regional academy provides training: 11 (15%); entry-level training requires interaction with instructor: 3 (4%); cost prohibitive: 3 (4%).**

4. If yes, what types and how many programs of each have been used in the past calendar year?
Enter total number by all that apply.

<u>11 (22%)</u>	electronic classroom
<u>10 (20%)</u>	teleconferencing
<u>42 (86%)</u>	computer-based training (CBT)
<u>4 (8%)</u>	subscriber services such as LETN
<u>17 (35%)</u>	college courses

5. If you or any of your officers have used CBT programs, how were they acquired?

<u>6 (12%)</u>	purchased/rented commercially developed programs
<u>27 (55%)</u>	developed by your academy staff

- 7 (14%) specially developed by private contractor for you or your academy
- 20 (41%) shared from other training academies/organizations
- 3 (6%) other (describe) **FEMA**

6. How much did your CBT programs cost? Please list all used and the cost for each. If developed at the academy, please include costs they may have charged and any implementation costs to you such as purchase of equipment, etc. If you use a subscriber service/rent, what is your monthly charge?

\$0 – 31 (63%) CBT - \$600 Computer trng. - \$100
\$276 / officer/year Haz Mat \$100 Blood Borne Pathogens \$100

7. Where have you received alternative training programs offered? (check all that apply)

- 31 (63%) at your academy
- 20 (41%) at specified/designated off-site locations
- 30 (61%) at your agency
- 15 (31%) education-oriented sites such as high schools, community colleges, universities, etc. Please indicate specific locations used.
- _____ other (list) _____
- FMEA ; Any on-line computer: 3 (6%)**

8. How is usage monitored?

- 5 (10%) log book
- 12 (24%) on-site monitor
- 25 (51%) computer log-on/log-off
- 31 (63%) academy staff
- _____ other (list) **On-line test 2; certificate 2; supervisor; professor**

9. What constitutes successful completion?

- 19 (39%) attendance for complete program
- 13 (27%) programmed advancement through each section/unit based on completion of previous section/unit
- 49 (100%) completing and passing a test
- _____ other (list) **receiving certificates: 2; doing the course work.**

10. How is the quality of alternative training programs determined?

- 9 (18%) product reviews
- 26 (53%) academy/agency staff review (who does the reviews?)
- 41 (84%) DCJS approval
- 9 (18%) professional association endorsement
- 12 (24%) college certification
- _____ other (list) **other evaluation: 3; personal contact with instructor; Federal mandated training.**

11. In the past year, how many officers at your agency have used alternative training programs?
170 entry-level
965 in-service
12. Have you realized any cost savings as a result of using alternative training delivery?
33 (67%) Yes (estimate amount saved, and how)
How: Saved Travel cost: 18 (37%); Manpower saved: 15 (31%); Didn't have to pay for training: 2 (2%);
Savings: \$100-\$150/officer; \$500/wk/officer - 2 (2%); \$7,000; \$8,100 (salary); \$10,000 - 2 (2%); Thousands - 5 (10%)
23 (47%) No
13. How and who tracks training credits awarded for alternative training programs?
28 (57%) designated agency training officer
7 (14%) supervisor
45 (92%) academy
 _____ other: (list)
14. Do you think distance learning is a viable training alternative method for:
 Entry-level training? Yes 21 (24%) No 52 (60%)
 Why or why not? **(N) Recruits need instructor interaction - 21 (24%); (N) practical exercises require academy - 16 (18%); (N) Need structure of academy - 9 (10%); (N) other responses: quality and retention of subject matter reduced, cost, access to computers, must ensure recruits receive training that fulfills DCJS requirements, students have difficulty with CBT & unfriendly programs, most important aspect of the job is communication skills which distance learning doesn't provide.**
(Y) Can help with time, travel, and cost - 6 (7%); (Y) Valid if done well - 3 (3%); (Y) More productive and flexible - 2; (Y) Other responses: could use good instructors in other areas; can add variety; available 24/7; self-paced; tested by Federal agencies and it works; quality and diversity a plus; for educational type classes only.

 In-service training? Yes 71 (82%) No 5 (6%)
 Why or why not? **(Y) Cost savings and effective - 16 (18%); (Y) More time on patrol - 8 (9%); (Y) Reinforces what already learned - 6 (7%); (Y) More flexible - 5 (6%); (Y) Other responses: Officers are rarely given new information and this could provide more advanced courses;**

opportunity to obtain better instructors; applicable to agency programs; only for seasoned officers; topics have same impact on students.
(N) Cost; access to computers limited; students need an environment where can share experiences with officers from other areas.

15. Do you think there are limits where alternative training should **NOT** be used? Please list them and the reasons why not.

Practical/hands-on/skills/high liability areas – 31 (36%); Entry-level – 26 (30%); Computers provide no way for questions, thus can't be sure students understand material – 7 (8%); None – 4 (5%); Instructor re-certification – 3; interview and interrogation.

16. Do you think alternative/distance learning can effectively be used for training: (check all that apply)

18 (21%) skills-oriented topics?
68 (78%) general academic-oriented topics?
59 (69%) criminal justice/law enforcement specific topics?
_____ Other **Legal updates – 3; leadership/communication; instructor in-service; refresher training.**

17. Do you currently have the resources to take advantage of training delivered via alternative methods? Yes **54 (62%)** No **26 (30%)**

If not, what are your limitations and what would you need to correct them?

Equipment - 13 (50%); Need computer and satellite capabilities – 6 (23%); Funding – 6 (23%); Internet capability – 6 (23%); no training room – 3 (12%); not offered by our academy.

18. Would substituting certain college courses for entry-level topics be an acceptable method of acquiring training? Yes **40 (48%)** No **34 (39%)**

Why or why not? **(Y) Must be DCJS certified and cover all training objectives – 9 (23%); (Y) Promotes getting degree – 5 (13%); (Y) Colleges provide the same level of training – 4 (10%); (Y) other responses: better for career development; English skill continue to be a problem, CC's can help; specializing courses more challenging; CC's are local; best possible solution; limit to academic courses like law.**

(N) Doesn't cover DCJS objectives and/or have structure needed – 14 (41%); (N) Entry-level training is more practical experiences – 8 (24%); (N) colleges teaches theory and not Va. specific material – 5 (16%); (N) no way to know if courses are

equivalent to training –4 (10%); (N) other responses: liability needs to be attached; training objectives need to be tested at 100%; methods of learning not suited for everyone.

Would it reduce your training costs? Yes **14 (16%)** No **46 (53%)**

If yes, by how much per school? (Please give an estimated percentage cost and a dollar figure.)

25 % or about \$3,000; 50% of salary

19. Please indicate what it would take for any alternative training method to be useful and cost effective for your agency: **State provide funding and equipment – 12 (14%); Standardized and approved by DCJS – 10 (11%); be available and assessable – 10 (11%); delivery methods that would take officers away from job – 8 (9%); cost effective – 7 (8%); video-conferencing to save travel cost – 5 (6%); other responses: needs to be hands-on interactive – 3; use only for in-service –3; topics should be current with full tech. support – 3; CBT – 2; compatible with training schedule –2; be relevant to department needs –2; be able to train at agency office –2; needs further study –2.**
20. How do you think colleges can be used to more effectively obtain certain areas of training? **Provide more advanced training for seasoned officers – 7 ; provide short specialized training via e-learning – 5; CC’s need to obtain DCJS certification on specific courses – 5; give classes in 4-8 hour blocks –4; increase available related courses – 4; cannot, training and academics are separate – 7; Much is the same as academy training and would be good for electronic class room – 3; use police trainers to teach.**
21. Do you think criminal justice academies should share information, training programs, ideas, resources, etc., with each other in order to enhance training and reduce costs?
Yes **78 (90%)** No **2**
22. What do you think academies can do to reduce costs, yet maintain quality training? **Share resources and training programs – 12 (14%); have already cut as much as they can – 7 (8%); use distance learning delivery methods to cut cost – 5; use more department instructors that are skilled and creative –5; focus and strengthen basics/necessities (what agencies need) and eliminate the excess – 4; become more standardized statewide – 3.**

23. What, if any, changes would you recommend to the way training is delivered in Virginia so as to be more cost effective, consistent, and ensure quality? **Need better and more uniform standards for continuity in academies – 8 (10%); use alternative train methods – 8; no problem, leave as is – 6; DCJS approve training, but streamline process – 4; need to out more money into training –3.**
24. Please add anything else you think would be helpful in assessing alternative training delivery methods as it relates to costs, usage, quality control, effectiveness, or other considerations: **No consistent responses, some of different ideas are as follows: Administer alternative training through DCJS; award training credit for internet courses; utilize other nationally recognized sources for basic and in-service training; have paid instructors at regional academies, not volunteers – 2; in-service can be conducted cheaper with electronic means; has already been proven effective; state needs to fund academies adequately; making a mistake to allow training on-line, students miss opportunity to interact with each other; more topics for dispatchers; need more training on available data bases used for investigating crime; have a compiled list of what is available and successful –2; more cost effective to use academy for small agencies; get away from military style training; all DCJS certified academies should have equal status with training universally accepted by all agencies; all lesson plans should be available on-line; agencies need more funding for training and equipment; don't like idea of alternative training methods.**

ALTERNATIVE TRAINING DELIVERY QUESTIONS
CRIMINAL JUSTICE ACADEMIES

Definition: For the purpose of this questionnaire, alternative training delivery methods would include any methods other than the traditional academy instructor/classroom, practical exercise, and practice-oriented skill training methods. This may include, but not limited to, computer-based training, electronic classroom, any form of distance training, TV or video format used as the primary mode of delivery (not videos used as an aid and/or part of regular instructions) such as LETN, teleconferencing, college or university courses, or any other form of non-conventional academy training.

1. Have you ever used alternative training delivery methods for:

Entry-level training? Yes 5 No 12

In-service training? Yes 15 No 4

2. Do you currently use alternative training delivery methods for:

Entry-level? Yes 4 No 13

In-service training? Yes 15 No 4

3. If no, why not?

Academy prefers to do entry-level training (2); Not all students can access the internet (2); Don't have the technology to provide service (2); Not cost effective (3); Approval process.

4. If yes, what types and how many programs of each do you offer? Enter number by all that apply.

1 electronic classroom

3 teleconferencing

13 computer-based training (CBT)

2 subscriber services such as LETN

4 college courses

5. If you use CBT programs, how were they acquired?

- 8 purchased/rented commercially developed programs
- 6 developed by academy staff
- 2 specially developed by private contractor for your academy
- 5 shared from other training academies/organizations
- 2 other (describe) FEMA; Attorney General's Office

6. How much did your CBT programs cost? Please list all used and the cost for each. If developed at the academy, please include staff time and salary, technical costs, any software purchased to develop the program, and any implementation costs such as purchase of equipment, etc. If you use a subscriber service/rent, what is your monthly charge?

\$140,000 plus man-hours \$100,000 initially & \$5,000/yr. \$38,000/yr. Staff \$10,000/yr \$18,500 Equipment & \$25,000 Development \$15,000 Equip. & \$130/yr DSL service \$15,000 vendor fee \$15,000 Equip. & \$7,500 subscription fee \$10,000 Web CT & \$30/hour \$9,000/yr. Staff \$670 program fee \$20 for CD

7. Are alternative training programs offered? (check all that apply)

- 10 at the academy
- 6 at specified/designated off-site locations
- 5 at local member agencies (regional academies)
- 2 education-oriented sites such as high schools, community colleges, universities, etc. Please indicate specific locations used.
- 3 other (list) anywhere there is internet access (2); FBI academy

8. How is usage monitored?

- 3 log book
- 9 on-site monitor
- 7 computer log-on
- 6 other (list) Test completion (3); registration (2); officer reports to supervisor (1)

9. What constitutes successful completion?

- 6 attendance for complete program

- 3 programmed advancement through each section/unit based on completion of previous section/unit
- 11 completing and passing a test
- 1 other (list) certificate

10. How is the quality of alternative training programs determined?

- 3 product reviews
- 12 academy staff review
- 10 DCJS approval
- 3 professional association endorsement
- 1 college certification
- 3 other (list) student evaluations

11. In the past year, how many officers at your academy have used alternative training programs?

- 2110 entry-level
- 4720 in-service

12. Have you realized any cost savings as a result of using alternative training delivery?

 6 Yes (estimate amount saved, and how) \$2,000/yr; \$108,810 to member agencies; \$155,000 salaries alone.

 8 No

13. How and who tracks training credits awarded for alternative training programs?

Academy staff or agency training officer – (11); Web CT software & TREX – (5); not tracked, no in-service credit awarded.

14. Do you think distance learning is a viable training alternative method for:

Entry-level training? Yes 7 No 11

Why or why not?

Yes: opens additional options for delivery (2); self-paced and provides foundation to build upon (2); consistency of material covered (2); time & cost savings (2); better trained & informed students; provides more practical experience scenarios; more creative; larger audience base; can take advantage of existing programs and can create quality programs for the future.

No: recruit has one opportunity to prepare for complex job & need academy structure (7); need interaction with instructor and other students (4); the academies still have to instruct all of the DCJS objectives, having a mix of

students using alternative learning and academy instruction would not save the academy any time or money, mixing would lose quality control.

In-service training? Yes 18 No 0

Why or why not? Time and cost savings (5); better trained student (4); more delivery options (3); helps reinforce knowledge (3); agencies can keep officers available to respond to emergencies (3); routine topics can be covered with distance learning leaving more time for academies to do more specialty training (3); increased availability of career development training (2); more consistent; larger audience; newer officers are more computer oriented learners.

15. Do you think there are limits where alternative training should **NOT** be used? Please list and reasons why not. High liability/practical/hands-on training (12); all entry-level training (5); instructor development; physical/fitness training.

16. Do you think alternative/distance learning can effectively be used for training: (check all that apply)

5 skills-oriented topics?

15 general academic-oriented topics?

11 criminal justice/law enforcement specific topics?

3 Other specialized topics (2); in-service requiring only delivery of information and no instructor interaction.

17. Do you currently have the resources to develop/purchase and deliver training via alternative methods? Yes 12 No 7

18. Would substituting certain college courses for entry-level topics reduce your training delivery costs? Yes 3 No 15

Why/how or why not? No: we would still have to train those not completing college (9); we still have to teach I.A.W. & department policy (2); would cause problems with consistency (2); college not based on DCJS objectives (2); education vs. training (2); different instructors have their own method of presenting material, is academies are to be accountable, they need to have control over content, instructors, and testing; who would pay?

Yes: absolutely, take seriously; any courses taken at a college would reduce what had to be taught at the academy; would not only benefit entry-level, but also kick start personal development.

If yes, by how much per school? (Please give a percentage cost and a dollar figure.)

No answers were provided.

19. Please indicate what it would take for any alternative training method to be useful and cost effective for your academy: DCJS must develop, approve, and administer it (2); increase funding (4); use for very specific topics such as ADA, Blood borne pathogens, etc.; in-service by satellite; adequately trained academy staff to develop; must be successful in dissemination of information; all students would have to get training outside of academies and DCJS would have to create another "Option" status; need to purchase, install, and maintain all systems; state pay for all licensing fees; have in-service credit approved for alternative training; this applies to individuals with certain distinctive learning characteristics, not all recruits possess these skills.
20. Please add anything you think would be helpful in assessing this option as it relates to costs, usage, quality control, effectiveness, or other consideration: D.G.I.F is implementing CBT and LETN (Law Enforcement Television Network); State Police is implementing the Learning Management System including teleconferencing capabilities; Central Shenandoah academy doesn't believe colleges will keep attendance and that is no consistency in grading causing academies to have to do remedial training to catch them up; Capitol Police does not think alternative methods are a substitute for academy training because of the lack of interaction with instructors and other students; good idea, but not practical when funds are continually being cut; need time and money, both are in short supply; need study of start-up cost vs. long-term savings for CBT and distance learning; need comparison study of actual learning effectiveness of CBT vs. traditional training; help academies join together to purchase or contract for resources such as Blackboard.

ELECTRONIC MEDIA POLICY
DECEMBER 1997

Effective January 1, 1994, the Department of Criminal Justice Services will initiate a program to approve electronic media programming under the provisions and conditions indicated as follows.

I. Definitions Section

For the purpose of these guidelines, the following definitions will apply:

Alternative Receive Site -- Any public safety facility, classroom, or meeting facility that is capable of receiving or generating tele-media programs, or any college or university tele-media department of computer lab.

Certified Training Academy-- Any criminal justice training academy maintaining current certification by the Department of Criminal Justice Services, Division of Training and Standards, and which provides instruction of at least the minimum training standards mandated by the Board.

Distance Learning -- The acquisition of knowledge and skills through mediated information and instruction, encompassing all technologies and other forms of learning at a distance. Distance education incorporates all instructional methods and media, but the instructional delivery does not constrain the student to be physically present in the same location as the instructor.

Electronic Classroom -- The use of a form of distance education to affect learning, in which the instructor and the students are separated, electronic media is used in the classroom to unite instructor and students, and there is a simultaneous two-way communication (audio or audio/visual) between the instructor and the students.

Electronic Media Programming -- Any telemedia programs capable of being transmitted by microwave, satellite, fiber optics, or other means of telecommunication; interactive computer-based training; or interactive video training.

Interactive Programs -- Any electronic media training program which allows the student to converse, ask and answer questions, or exchange information (interact) with the presentation source, either verbally or electronically.

Live Broadcast -- Any telemedia conveyed by microwave, satellite, or fiber optics in a broadcast format being received and viewed during the actual broadcast time. This does not

include a retransmission of the programs by videotape or other recording formatted at a time other than initial broadcast.

Stand-Alone Training -- Any training or telemedia program designed and delivered as complete within itself on any given topic.

User Agency -- Any certified criminal justice training academy, local police, sheriff, or other criminal justice agency that subscribes to or uses any electronic media for in-service training purposes.

II. Virginia Certified Training Academy Application

Electronic media programming may be incorporated into an approved mandated training program delivered by a certified academy designed for officers to comply with compulsory in-service training standards. A certified instructor must be present during application or broadcast of the program, with all other criteria for receiving in-service credit being met. The certified instructor shall incorporate appropriate copies of the course objectives and all applicable informational material into the course lesson plan.

III. Alternative Receive Site Application

A. Partial in-service training credit for electronic media programming may be authorized for compulsory in-service training standards annually as follows:

Law Enforcement Officer:	8 hours maximum
Jailor or Custodial Officer	6 hours maximum
Courtroom Security Officers and Process Service Officers:	4 hours maximum

Officers of the Department of Corrections, Division of Adult Institutions:	
Corrections Officers and Sergeants:	6 hours maximum
Lieutenants through Facility Director	8 hours maximum

B. Partial in-service training credit for any stand-alone interactive video or computer-based training program must be pre-approved by DCJS. All requests for approval of interactive video or computer-based training must be submitted to the Division of Training and Standards at DCJS at least 90 days prior to implementation of training. The DCJS Technology Committee will preview these programs to determine if they are appropriate for use in criminal justice training. Appropriate partial in-service training credit hours will be determined by multiplying the average length of time it takes to complete the program by four. Stand-alone, non-interactive videotaped programs shall not be approved for partial in-service training credit.

C. Partial in-service credit for any pre-approved training/instruction provided in an electronic classroom setting will be considered the same as regular classroom instruction. Partial

in-service training credit hours will be awarded on a one-for-one basis. If a practical exercise involving demonstration of a physical skill is part of the instruction, a certified instructor must be present in the classroom with the students to assist with demonstrations and application of techniques. This also applies to any college course approved by the chief, sheriff, or agency administrator as appropriate for in-service training that is delivered through the use of an electronic classroom.

D. Trainees shall be given a post-test on all electronic media programming. A minimum score of 70 percent shall be attained on all tests. In accordance with Section 7, Paragraph B, of the Rules Relating to Compulsory In-Service Training Standards, sheriffs, chiefs of police, and agency administrators are not required to take a post-test. However, this does not relinquish the responsibility of each viewer for properly using any training information obtained in accordance with any applicable law, regulation, or policy.

E. A DCJS certified instructor, designated agency training officer, or supervisor must be present at all times whenever telemedia programs are being viewed by persons who are doing so for partial in-service training credit. The certified instructor, designated agency training officer, or supervisor shall be responsible for recording attendance and administering and grading prescribed tests. Each DCJS certified instructor, designated agency training officer, or supervisor shall be provided a copy of the course objectives and all applicable instructional material by the chief of police, sheriff, or agency administrator. The chief of police, sheriff, or agency administrator shall ensure that training records are maintained and are available for inspection and review. The chief of police, sheriff, or agency administrator shall also be responsible for ensuring that electronic media programming is appropriate for departmental employees and is in compliance with agency policy.

F. An officer must view a minimum of four hours of telemedia programming or a combination of other electronic media programming in order to obtain partial in-service training credit. No partial in-service credit will be authorized for training of less than four hours total. Fifty minutes of programming constitutes an in-service credit hour.

G. Partial in-service credit for electronic media training may be applied to career development training unless otherwise approved by DCJS.

IV. User Agency Record and Reporting Requirements

A. An attendance roster must be recorded for each telemedia or distance education programming session for which the user agency desires partial in-service training credit. The attendance roster shall only indicate those individuals who were present during the entire broadcast segment.

B. A user log shall be kept for all other electronic media program applications and shall record the user's name, social security number, time logged on, time logged off, and name of the training program. Partial in-service training credit will only be awarded for completed training

programs. If a program has multiple training segments, all segments must be completed in order to obtain in-service training credit.

C. The chief of police, sheriff, or agency administrator shall obtain course programming information to include subject matter, date and times of the broadcast or presentation, and the instructor's name from the appropriate source of origination of the approved programming.

D. A post test, answer guide, lesson plan, course objectives, and any other applicable instructional material must be obtained and kept on file by each agency for all programs approved for partial in-service training credit.

E. The chief of police, sheriff, or agency administrator shall be responsible for ensuring that electronic media used by criminal justice officers for partial in-service training credit is in compliance with agency policy.

F. The chief of police, sheriff, or agency administrator shall submit all electronic media training material as requested by and in the format specified by their academy. The academy will submit a Form 41 to DCJS indicating compliance with in-service training requirements as provided by these guidelines.

G. All records relating to electronic media for which partial in-service training credit is approved shall be maintained in accordance with the requirements established by the Virginia State Library and DCJS.

V. Certified Academy Record and Reporting Requirements

A. Upon receipt of certification from the chief of police, sheriff, or agency administrator of satisfactory completion of the minimum four hours of approved programming, the director of each certified academy shall be responsible for processing training records of officers from their participating agencies who have completed electronic media programming for partial in-service training credit.

B. The governing body of a certified regional academy or the agency administrator of an independent certified academy shall designate by policy the manner, format, and time frame for submission of documentation necessary to ensure credit for attendance and satisfactory completion of mandated in-service training requirements. This information shall be submitted to each member agency's administrator.

C. Upon completion of all mandated in-service training, including any credit received for electronic media, a Form 41 reporting roster, indicating completion of all such requirements shall be submitted to DCJS.

VI. Monitoring and Inspection

A. All facilities, documents, and materials associated with electronic media programming for partial in-service training credit shall be subject to inspection and review by staff of the Department of Criminal Justice Services.

B. Failure to abide by the provisions of these guidelines shall invalidate all or part of the electronic media training applied to compulsory in-service training requirements.

NOTE: These guidelines supersede previous policies/guides: *Program Guidelines For Approval Of DCJS Teleconference To Meet In-Service Training Requirements*, dated October 1991; and *Pilot Program Guidelines For Approval Of LETN Programming To Meet In-Service Training Requirements*, dated December 1991.

{Rev. 01/12/1998}

DCJS POLICY FOR COLLEGE CREDIT

In-Service Credit For College Courses

Officers may request in-service credit for completion of college courses. Officers must complete and submit for CC-1 to DCJS. Form CC-2 must be completed by the appropriate professor and submitted to DCJS along with CC-1.

College Credit For Entry-Level Law Enforcement Training

A. Many colleges and universities have procedures for awarding credit for learning attained outside the college classroom. This includes learning acquired from work and life experiences, independent reading and study, and participation in formal courses sponsored by associations, businesses, training providers, and government. Through an extensive review process, the American Council on Education (ACE) has determined that Virginia law enforcement entry-level training courses are college-level instruction and has recommended credit for them.

B. Each college sets its own policies, and these may vary from place to place. Contact your college advisor to learn about the process for obtaining credit. If your advisor is not familiar with ACE's credit recommendations for workplace education, you and/or your advisor may call ACE directly at (202) 939-9727 or refer to the National Guide to Educational Credit for Training Programs.

LIST OF ATTENDEES
RICHMOND PUBLIC HEARING
AUGUST 3, 2004

R. L. Schumaker, Director Cardinal Criminal Justice Academy	Beth Simonds University of Richmond Police Department
Donald L. Hunter Piedmont Regional Jail	Lewis W. Barlow Piedmont Regional Jail
Robert Pugh Piedmont Regional Jail	Carter Burnett Petersburg Police Department
Steve Mahoney Crater Criminal Justice Academy	Crystal Hicks Riverside Regional Jail
Eugene A. Claiborne, Jr. Department of Criminal Justice Services, Jails Training	Guillermo B. Novo Department of Criminal Justice Services, Jails Training
Keith Pirog Peumansend Creek Regional Jail	Walter Minton Riverside Regional Jail
Mike Wagner Albemarle County Police Department	Dave Hutton Chesterfield County Sheriff's Office
Kevin Smith Chesterfield County Police Department	Michael S. Rubio Chesterfield Sheriff's Training Academy
Vince Ferrara, Director Hampton Roads Criminal Justice Training Academy	John LeClaire James City County Police Department
Charles V. Talley Henrico County Sheriff's Office	George M. Epps Petersburg Sheriff's Office
Stewart M. Meredith, Jr. Henrico County Police Department	John C. Coover Henrico County Police Department
Stuart Kitchen Sussex County Sheriff's Office	Ed Frankenstein Prince George County Police Department
George C. Daniels, Jr. Virginia State Police	Charles Lowe Longwood University Police Department
Earl Williams Henrico County Sheriff's Office	Gerald P. Eggleston DOC / Academy for Staff Development
Thomas M. Woody Hanover County Sheriff's Office	John Kuplinski Virginia Peninsula Regional Jail
Barbara Walker Virginia Commonwealth University Police Department	

LIST OF ATTENDEES
HARRISONBURG PUBLIC HEARING
AUGUST 12, 2004

Doug Fry Staunton Police Department	Becky Haslacker Winchester Police Department
Rick Bush Winchester Police Department	Debbie Fadeley Shenandoah County Emergency Communications Center
Bill Flink, Director Central Shenandoah Criminal Justice Training Academy	Bud Levin Waynesboro Police Department
Don Farley Rockingham County Sheriff's Office	Nelson Herring Rockingham County Sheriff's Office
Debbie Campbell Amherst County Department of Public Safety	Jack Ball Amherst County Department of Public Safety
Leslie Miller Staunton Police Department	Ron Staton, Director Central Virginia Criminal Justice Academy
R. L. Schumaker, Director Cardinal Criminal Justice Academy	Doug Davis Waynesboro Police Department

LIST OF ATTENDEES
WYTHEVILLE PUBLIC HEARING
AUGUST 17, 2004

W. H. Price Bristol, Virginia Police Department	Martin R. Alford, Director New River Criminal Justice Training Academy
R. L. Schumaker, Director Cardinal Criminal Justice Academy	Debra Hughes Southwest Law Enforcement Academy
Jack Weisenburger Bristol, Virginia Sheriff's Office	Rick Clark Galax Police Department
Ron Houk Independence Police Department	Steve Williams Hillsville Police Department
Mark H Arrington Radford University Police Department	Doug King Wythe County Sheriff's Office
Kermit Osborne Wythe County Sheriff's Office	Albert Newborry Town of Wytheville
Tammy Whitt Montgomery County Sheriff's Office	Brian Wright Montgomery County Sheriff's Office
Bob Bauco Virginia Tech Police Department	Gary W. Roche Pulaski Police Department
Harry Z. Ayers Wytheville Police Department	Rick Arnold Wytheville Police Department

LIST OF ATTENDEES
VINTON PUBLIC HEARING
AUGUST 18, 2004

R. L. Schumaker, Director Cardinal Criminal Justice Academy	Herb Cooley Vinton Police Department
Ray Lavinder Roanoke County Police Department	William H. Brown Blacksburg Police Department
Martin Alford, Director New River Criminal Justice Training Academy	Jim Bryant Salem Police Department
Garry Roche Pulaski Police Department	Ronald N. Sprinkle Botetourt County Sheriff's Office
Jeffrey Lamar Roanoke Police Department	Debbie Hogan Ferrum College Police Department

LIST OF ATTENDEES
FAIRFAX PUBLIC HEARING
AUGUST 26, 2004

Lieutenant Steve Kovacs Fairfax County Sheriff's Office / Academy	Gary Newcomb Alexandria Police Department
Truman D. Wilcox Northern Virginia Criminal Justice Academy	Bonnie Mahoney Fairfax County Sheriff's Office / Academy
Steve Lipovsky Fairfax County Police Department / Academy	Captain Joan McCall George Mason University Police Department
Susan Culin Fairfax County Police Department / Chief's Office	Joe Ryan Prince William County Police Department / Academy
Ken Stott Prince William County Police Department / Academy	Joe Hughes Fairfax County Police Department
Terri Allen Fairfax County Police Department / Academy	Captain William N. Horn Frederick County Sheriff's Office
Sergeant Robert Lutz Arlington County Sheriff's Office	

LIST OF ATTENDEES
DANVILLE PUBLIC HEARING
AUGUST 27, 2004

Harvey Hoyle Chase City Police Department	Norman J. Hudson South Hill Police Department
Ricky E. Wilkinson Clarksville Police Department	Danny R. Fox Mecklenburg Sheriff's Office
Cliff Jacrop (?) Henry County Sheriff's Office	Frank Carroll Henry County Sheriff's Office
Charles Long Piedmont Regional Criminal Justice Training Academy	Ron Staton, Director Central Virginia Criminal Justice Academy
Steve Draper Martinsville Sheriff's Office	Mike Rogers Martinsville Police Department
Tim Porter Martinsville Police Department	Laura Hopkins Martinsville Sheriff's Office
Phillip Broadfoot Danville Police Department	Ronald Ball Danville Sheriff's Office
Kelly Johnson Danville Sheriff's Office	Doug Young Danville Emergency Communications Center

LIST OF ATTENDEES
VIRGINIA BEACH PUBLIC HEARING
SEPTEMBER 2, 2004

Lewis Johnson Western Tidewater Regional Jail	George C. Daniels, Jr. Virginia State Police
Jay Sexton Williamsburg Police Department	Mike Yost Williamsburg Police Department
Danny Diggs York / Poquoson Sheriff's Office	Emmett Harmon James City County Police Department
Vince Ferrara, Director Hampton Roads Criminal Justice Training Academy	Nolan Cutler Hampton Roads Criminal Justice Training Academy
Peter Maisonave Norfolk Police Department	Joe Branning Norfolk Police Department
Sandi Baum Virginia Beach Police Department and Training	Michael Dodson Virginia Beach Police Department and Training
John A. Lamm Virginia Beach Police Department and Training	Debbie Jones Hampton Sheriff's Office
John LeClaire James City County Police Department	Jake Jacocks Virginia Beach Police Department
Shane Roberts Portsmouth Sheriff's Office	William T. Riley, III Newport News Police Department

White Paper:

Is This the Best Way to Develop, Deliver, and Manage Criminal Justice Training?

A discussion of issues related to alternative training delivery methods for criminal justice personnel.

July 2004
Richard L. Schumaker
Director
Cardinal Criminal Justice Academy
rschumaker@cardinalacademy.org

Background

During the recent General Assembly session, Delegate Watkins Abbott, of Appomattox, introduced budget language that tasked the Department of Criminal Justice Services to conduct a study of alternative training delivery methods for criminal justice officers. For the purposes of this study, alternative training delivery methods included any methods other than the traditional academy instructor/classroom, practical exercise, and practice-oriented skill training methods. This included computer-based training, electronic classroom, any form of distance training, TV or video format used as the primary mode of delivery (not videos used as an aid and/or part of regular instruction) such as LETN, teleconferencing, college or university courses, or any other form of non-conventional academy training. During the past two months, agency administrators and academy directors throughout the state received a survey from the Department of Criminal Justice Services (DCJS) concerning this issue. DCJS will also be conducting seven public forums at locations throughout the state to gather additional information for this study. The forums will consider whether methods such as distance learning and community colleges class exemptions can be used as alternative methods to deliver criminal justice training to both in-service and entry-level criminal justice personnel.

Alternate Training Methods Already Available For In-Service Training

The use of alternative delivery methods for in-service training is not a new concept in Virginia. For many years, DCJS and academies throughout the state have actively supported the use of alternative delivery methods for in-service training. In fact, pending changes to the in-service training requirements were designed to encourage the use of technology and to streamline the approval processes for alternative training delivery methods. Several academies recently participated in a successful pilot program to develop the use of on-line in-service training programs. Existing in-service training regulations provide for the use of a variety of alternative delivery methods including:

1. Interactive CD-ROM courses
2. On-line training courses
3. Satellite presentations
4. LETN
5. Completed college courses

The use of these alternative delivery programs as a compliment to existing in-service classroom training opportunities have proven to be a benefit in a variety of manners including:

1. Reduction in the need for classroom instructional support
2. Officers remain available for emergency service while participating in on-line programs
3. Training courses are available 24 hours per day -- 7 days per week
4. Increased availability of career development training to all interested persons
5. Availability for use as a remedial training tool

6. Pre-course knowledge enhancement training
7. Significant reduction in training man-hours required to meet mandated in-service training requirements
8. Increase knowledge retention

During the past two years, several academies have developed active on-line training programs that cover a wide variety of in-service topics including:

1. Delivery of pre-requisite training requirements in such areas as instructor development, firearms instructor certification, and crowd control
2. Forty-hour in-service courses for law enforcement and jailor/court services personnel
3. Stand-alone cultural diversity, legal updates, flying armed, and blood-borne pathogens training
4. Combination CD-ROM course content and on-line testing for weapons of mass destruction and terrorism training

Despite the many benefits of using these alternate training methods for in-service instruction, discretion must be exercised when selecting which training topics are suitable for delivery using these methods. Each course should be evaluated prior to using alternative methods of delivery to insure that the material can be delivered effectively. The quality of the delivery and the integrity of the training program should be the primary consideration for agency administrators and training personnel. Issues such as reduced training costs and the reduction of training man-hours should be considered ancillary benefits.

Additionally, training professionals should resist the temptation to believe that all training delivery methods are suitable for all students. Experience has demonstrated that, although the vast majority of students rate their on-line training experience as positive, some students simply do not learn well in a non-traditional learning environment. Placing a “square peg” student in a “round hole” training environment defeats the ultimate purpose of training, which is to impart knowledge in a manner that will help the student retain a high percentage of the information. In the case of on-line training, the programs are typically reading intensive. A student who experiences difficulty retaining information that he has read will not benefit from participation in an on-line program, regardless of the benefit to the employing agency.

Finally, each academy or agency must do a cost-benefit analysis before starting any type of alternative delivery training program. Some programs, such as interactive CD-ROM training, involve a nominal one-time investment. However, the information contained in these programs is often very generic or may quickly become dated. On-line training programs provide the opportunity to tailor the curriculum to fit the needs of the academy’s member agencies but it also has some pitfalls. The primary hurdle that must be overcome is the cost. The training agency must either purchase or lease a dedicated server and contract to have the server hosted on the Internet. The training delivery software that provides the infrastructure for the programs normally costs \$10,000 - \$15,000 per year. Finally, the academy must either hire or contract with personnel who are qualified to design course content and administer the on-line training software. Despite these issues, six of the ten regional academies, with a combined population of

over 10,000 officers, are currently operating on-line training programs. Obviously, the 275 agencies whose officers benefit from participating in an academy that operates an on-line training program believe that benefit is worth the expense.

Is Alternate Training Delivery a Good Idea for Entry Level Students?

Academies throughout the state normally have 4 - 6 months to transition a newly hired individual into a fully functioning criminal justice officer. This includes instilling the knowledge and skills necessary to serve in one of the few occupations in which society bestows the legal authority to restrict a citizen's freedom and use deadly force in the performance of their duties. Over the years, our profession has done remarkably well in the effort to accomplish this task. We have developed comprehensive entry-level programs that instill knowledge, skills, ethics and values in recruit officers. This is accomplished through the use of a systematic approach where every aspect of the training program is strictly controlled, including the training environment, course content, instructional methods, and the evaluation processes. Each class builds upon the foundation that was laid by the preceding classes and, in the end, the student should be prepared to deal effectively with the complexities of the profession. If any component of the system is removed or replaced with a block of instruction that doesn't accomplish the expected goals for a given class, all future classes and the overall quality of the program may be impacted.

In this period of dwindling resources, agency administrators are being forced to re-examine the methods, effectiveness, and costs of existing programs. Naturally, one might ask if it would be practical to adopt some of the alternative training delivery methods that have been successful for in-service training to the entry-level training environment.

One such concept that has been periodically suggested over the years is to grant entry-level training exemptions to recruits who have completed college courses. Problems arise when administrators mistakenly begin to view "education" and "training" as synonymous processes. While these two processes share some common ground in that the goal of both is to impart knowledge, there is a vast difference in approach that is used to accomplish this goal. Educational institutions tend to approach the learning process from a theoretical perspective that is intended to stimulate thought and broaden a student's perspective on a given issue. Training academies take a more practical approach to the learning process. For example, while a constitutional law professor may encourage an examination of the logic and points of law involved in a given court ruling, a training academy would tend to focus on the impact of the ruling on law enforcement procedures. While both approaches have merit, they are not interchangeable.

However, at first blush, this may be an attractive concept to an administrator who envisions reduced training costs and a shorter training academy. Unfortunately, after examining the practical aspects of implementing this concept, it becomes apparent that the agency will not realize either of these benefits. Regional academies receive recruit officers and deputies from many different agencies with a wide variety of employment policies and educational requirements. As a result, unless all of the students in a given class had successfully completed a given college course and were exempted from a given block of instruction, the academy would

still have to conduct the class as part of the normal curriculum. In fact, most of the college courses that have been mentioned, as examples of college courses that would be eligible for exemption credit (i.e., constitutional law, cultural diversity, etc.) would be lecture-formatted courses. As such, the number of students attending the course does not have a significant impact on the cost of delivering the course.

Another consideration is that exempting certain students from scheduled blocks of academy training would actually cause logistical problems for the employing agency. Students who receive an exemption from a class would have to be scheduled for some other departmental assignment while their classmates attend the regularly scheduled block of instruction at the academy. It may also present problems for the exempted student later in the academy when the student will be required to pass practical examinations. The evaluation criteria for the practical examinations are based on the instruction that the non-exempted students received at the academy, not the instruction that an exempted student received at an alternative training site.

To this point we have discussed the practical problems that would be created by exempting recruit officers from entry-level training based on completed college courses. However, there are other intrinsic issues that must be considered. Criminal justice agencies, through their respective training academies, are expected to prepare a recruit officer with little or no job experience for one of the most responsible and demanding professions in our society in approximately six months. As such, the entry-level academy is more than a place to instill information in the new recruit officers. The academy also serves as an indoctrination center to teach the new recruits to function in a quasi-military environment. During the entry-level training session, the academy staff endeavors to instill discipline in the recruits with an emphasis on following orders from superior officers and working within a chain of command. These concepts may be entirely foreign to a new recruit whose job experience is limited to serving as a lifeguard at the local pool during the summer. While attending the academy, each recruit is instilled with an understanding of how teamwork and esprit de corps can positively impact the accomplishment of organizational goals. Finally, during entry-level training, recruit officers form the foundation for a network of law enforcement contacts that will serve them throughout their career. These relationships are forged through the sharing of challenging experiences. Students who attend entry-level training under a training option frequently lament that they never really have a sense of “belonging” to the class because they are not present to share in all of the experiences of their class. Fortunately, only previously certified officers currently qualify for a training option, so they have already experienced the positive aspects of sharing an entry-level training experience. This would not be the case if students were exempted from training based on previously attended college courses.

Are the Colleges Prepared to Take on the Challenge?

In 1983, DCJS adopted the first performance based training system for entry-level training throughout Virginia. Recruit officers were required to demonstrate proficiency in each of the tasks (training objectives) that were identified during a job task analysis (JTA). Eventually, a similar system was developed for entry-level jailor/court services and dispatcher recruits. In 1998, DCJS completed an updated JTA that identified a revised list of over 1700 mandated

“training criteria” for entry-level law enforcement training. DCJS is currently in the process of revising the jailor/court services curriculum. Training academies throughout the state are required to document that each recruit officer received instruction on each mandated criteria, and subsequently demonstrated proficiency in each criteria by successfully completing a written or practical testing instrument. In most college environments, this type of instruction and evaluation system would be inconsistent with present course protocols.

Although most community colleges have some standards established for recording attendance, students report that adherence to attendance requirements vary widely depending on the professor. Professors also exercise broad discretion in the evaluation and grading systems that are used. College-level education professionals also tend to cherish their academic freedom and may not willingly embrace the aforementioned training and evaluation requirements. In addition, professors who instruct entry-level training equivalent courses may be included in the liability loop during civil actions where an officer’s training is called into question.

Assuming that the issues discussed above could be worked out, another area of concern would be compliance monitoring of the participating educational institutions. Under current regulations, representative from DCJS inspect the facilities and records of each certified academy in Virginia every third year. If an academy is found to be deficient in some area, the academy is usually given sixty to ninety days to correct the deficiency. The academy must correct the deficiency and be in full compliance prior to being re-certified. In addition, DCJS field coordinators are required to monitor training at all certified training facilities. The addition of numerous educational institutions to this process would definitely over-tax the present DCJS resources, which are barely able to manage the existing workload. These are just a few procedural issues that should be considered before moving forward with this concept.

Agency administrators might also give some consideration to some other issues that they may take for granted under the current training system. Under the existing system, agency administrators enjoy significant control over the content and operation of the training facilities, regardless of whether they are a member of a regional academy or operate an independent training academy. Administrators have access to lesson plans and course handouts upon request. This may not be the case if entry-level students are permitted to take entry-level training equivalent college courses as a substitute for academy training. It is not uncommon for some universities to employ professors who use the classroom as a forum to promote a personal political agenda that may be inconsistent with the goal of training entry-level criminal justice officers. Administrators may have little or no control over the course content, professional experience, or political inclination of the professor. Although this may create a healthy environment for discussion in an academic environment, it would not foster a healthy learning environment for criminal justice officers who are trying to master the basics of their chosen profession.

The final issue to consider, regarding entry-level training equivalent college courses, is how will DCJS determine which courses will meet the test for credit? One student related an experience he had while attending criminal justice classes at a major mid-western university. He enrolled in a constitutional law class that ended up having nothing to do with criminal procedures. The entire course was built around Supreme Court cases regarding interstate commerce and

employment related issues. The point being that his college transcript would show that he successfully completed a constitutional law class and, unless additional documentation were required, one might assume that he could be exempt from the constitutional law issues in entry-level training.

Conclusion

During previous discussions of the entry-level training equivalent college credit issues, proponents have pointed to Florida and other states that have successfully integrated criminal justice training into their community college system. However, what they fail to consider is that, over thirty years ago, Virginia made a choice to develop a system of regional and independent academies to provide criminal justice training throughout the state. The state and local governments have a significant investment in this system and these academies continue to provide outstanding training and value when compared to other states.

One of our chiefs is fond of saying, “If you want to ride the train, you have got to buy a ticket.” Fortunately, the cost of the ticket for training an entry-level criminal justice officer in Virginia is very reasonable by any standard. However, the only way to insure that the entry-level training program continues to accomplish the desired goals is to require recruit officers to attend all of their mandated training at the academy. Remember, most recruit officers have only one opportunity to attend entry-level training during their careers. The foundation of knowledge and skills that will be laid during entry-level training will support their development throughout the balance of their careers.