

ATTITUDES AND OPINIONS OF POLICE
TRAINING DIRECTORS REGARDING
HIGHER EDUCATION FOR
LAW ENFORCEMENT
PERSONNEL

By

AL NEWPORT
"

Bachelor of Science

Oklahoma City University

Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

1980

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
Master of Science
July, 1982

Thesis
1982
N558a
Cop. 2



ATTITUDES AND OPINIONS OF POLICE
TRAINING DIRECTORS REGARDING
HIGHER EDUCATION FOR
LAW ENFORCEMENT
PERSONNEL

Thesis Approved:

Hayne B. James

Thesis Adviser

John K. Burt

Ernie W. Rugg

Norman N. Durham

Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many persons have contributed to this study. The writer regrets that space limitations preclude listing all who have made contributions. It is with sincere appreciation that the following are acknowledged:

Dr. Wayne James, major adviser, who provided guidance throughout the study and to Dr. John Baird and Dr. Cecil Dugger who served as members of the committee.

Dr. James Key, whose advice provided direction in research strategy and methodology.

The staff of the Oklahoma Telecommunications Interlibrary System, whose patient and cheerful assistance in locating research documents strengthened the study.

Dan Johnson, Assistant Director of the Oklahoma Council on Law Enforcement Education and Training, who provided invaluable assistance in the collection of data for the study.

Donna Hardridge who typed the early drafts.

Carol, my wife, who has borne the demands of her husband's academic pursuit.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	2
Purpose of the Study	2
Need for the Study	3
Questions of the Study	3
Definition of Terms.	3
Organization of the Study.	4
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	5
Historical Development of Police Training/Education	5
A Brief but Pronounced Increase in the Education Level of Police Personnel.	6
Criminal Justice Degree Programs	7
Before the Assistance of Federal Funding.	7
After the Assistance of Federal Funding.	8
The Effect of Increased Education.	11
Literature Skeptical of the Benefits of Education.	16
Literature Supporting Higher Education.	18
Summary	19
III. RESEARCH PROCEDURES.	20
Research Strategy.	20
The Survey Instrument.	20
Selection of the Questionnaire Topics.	21
Testing.	22
Population of the Study.	23
Administration of the Questionnaire.	24
Analysis of the Data	24
IV. PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS	26
Response Rate.	26
Tabulation of Responses.	26
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS.	39
Summary.	39

Chapter	Page
Conclusions.	42
Recommendations.	43
Recommendations for Practice.	43
Recommendations for Research.	44
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	45
APPENDIXES.	48
APPENDIX A - COVER LETTER AND QUESTIONNAIRE.	49
APPENDIX B - MEMBERSHIP ROSTER-NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE POLICE ACADEMY DIRECTORS	54
APPENDIX C - MEMBERSHIP ROSTER-NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE DIRECTORS OF LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING	61
APPENDIX D - COMMENTS BY RESPONDENTS	74

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Criminal Justice Area Academic Degree Programs in 1949	8
II. Criminal Justice Area Academic Degree Programs in 1957	9
III. Criminal Justice Area Academic Degree Programs	10
IV. Criminal Justice Degree Programs Available in 1978	12
V. Criminal Justice Personnel Enrollment in 1978.	14
VI. Responses to Question Concerning the Benefits of College Education	27
VII. Responses to Question Concerning the Role of Education in Applicant Selection.	28
VIII. Responses to Question Concerning Entrance Requirements	29
IX. Responses to Question Concerning How Police Education Standards Should be Established	30
X. Responses to Question Concerning Criminal Justice Curriculum	31
XI. Responses to Question Concerning the Awarding of College Credit for Police Training.	32
XII. Responses to Question Concerning Faculty Qualifications for Criminal Justice Programs.	33
XIII. Responses to Question Concerning Governmental Funding to Assist Criminal Justice Students	34

Table	Page
XIV. Responses to Question Concerning Education Requirements to Promotion.	35
XV. Responses to Question Regarding Educational Incentives.	36

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

To those who carry the dream of a profession, the challenge is clear. Every state must declare-through its laws-that the enforcement of law is a calling which only the capable and the informed may practice. Legislators can do no less for their constituents. Police administrators can do no less for their profession (Tamm, 1965, p. 6).

When Harvard University opened in 1636, a history of problem solving by academe began in American society. The industrial revolution probably would not have occurred without the assistance from institutions of higher learning in the development of technology. Increases in the production of farm products through the prevention of soil erosion and development of chemical fertilizers, and pest control were contributions from colleges and universities. Medical research in these institutions has increased our life expectancy and made life more comfortable. It is no mystery why higher education has attained a "revered place of honor in American society" (Mathias, 1976, p. 378).

It should have come as no surprise to anyone, when society turned to higher education for assistance in solving police problems. When President Lyndon Johnson established his commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice in 1965 (President's Commission, 1967) the American police were in trouble. They were under criticism from one segment of society for failure to control the ever-increasing crime rate; while other segments of society accused them of corruption, racism, and violations of the constitutional rights of citizens (Sherman et al., 1978).

A major recommendation by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice was for higher education for the police. "The ultimate aim of all police departments should be that all personnel with general enforcement powers have baccalaureate degrees" (President's Commission, 1967, p. 109). The idea of higher education for the police was supported by virtually all the commissions, committees, and groups which were organized to study the problems of American policing. These groups included the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence, the President's Commission on Campus Unrest, and the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals (National Advisory Commission, 1973).

The early applause for this idea of increasing the education level of law enforcement personnel began to diminish and by the late 1970s; police education was in trouble. "Higher education for police has been torn by internal strife among police educators and attacked by police administrators, academic, and several national study groups" (Sherman et al., 1978, p. x).

Statement of the Problem

There is no existing information regarding the attitudes and opinions of police training directors as a group regarding higher education for law enforcement personnel. No study or survey could be found which targets this group on this subject.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine how police training directors perceive higher education needs of their profession.

Need for the Study

Legislators and other decision makers who are charged with the responsibility for the establishment and maintenance of police standards, need information that is scientifically reliable upon which to base their decisions. Evidence such as that gained from this study should be beneficial to them in their endeavors.

Questions of the Study

This study attempted to determine the attitudes and opinions of police training directors regarding the following questions:

1. Can higher education improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the police?
2. What should be the minimum education level requirements for entry into the police service?
3. Should additional education be required for promotion?
4. Should the curriculum for criminal justice programs be vocational/technical or liberal arts/social science directed?
5. How should education standards for the police be established?
6. What should be the qualifications of faculty members in criminal justice programs?

Definition of Terms

The following definitions of terms are furnished to provide, as nearly as possible, clear and concise meanings of terms as they are used in this study:

Criminal Justice - A term used to identify matters dealing with official efforts to enforce standards of conduct in defense of individuals

and their property. The Criminal Justice System includes the police, the courts, and corrections.

Criminology - The scientific study of crime as a social phenomenon.

Criminal Process - The process by which a person charged with a public offense is accused and brought to trial and punishment.

Law Enforcement Personnel - Includes all persons who have legal authority to make arrests and are directly involved in the enforcement of law. Law enforcement personnel and police personnel are used interchangeably in this study.

Post-Secondary Institutions - Educational institutions which serve the education needs of persons beyond the high school level.

Police Training Directors - For the purpose of this study, this phrase is used in referring to both the members of the National Association of State Police Academy Directors and the members of the National Association of State Directors of Law Enforcement Training.

Organization of the Study

Chapter I introduced the study, presenting the background of the police quest for higher education, stated the problem which provided the stimulus for the study, and listed the need and questions of the study. Chapter II consists of a review of literature relating to police education and its problems. Chapter III reports the procedures utilized by this study, including research strategy, the survey instrument, selection of the survey population, and the collection of data. Chapter IV reports the tabulation and analysis of collected data. Chapter V presents a summary of the study, conclusions formed, and recommendations for future studies.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter traces the development of police training and education in this country from its beginning in the early 1900s through the years of federal assistance and the years of federal assistance diminished. The controversy surrounding the need for higher education is reviewed by presenting the views supporting higher education as well as those that are not so supportive.

Historical Development of Police Training/Education

Police training/education is a twentieth century phenomenon. August Vollmer is credited with starting academically-oriented police training in the United States. In 1908, while serving as the City Marshall of Berkeley, California, Vollmer initiated the first formal police training school in this country. It was a small effort at best, offering instruction in only four subjects: first-aid, photography, and elementary and criminal law; but it was a beginning. Two University of California professors: Helms and Kidd assisted Vollmer with the instructions, which was attended by police officers on their off-duty time (Gammage, 1963).

Academicians and law enforcement practitioners met formally for the first time in 1909 to discuss higher education needs for law enforcement personnel. The meeting, which was sponsored by Northwestern University, was conducted in Chicago. That meeting produced three resolutions which

resulted in: (1) establishment of the American Institute of Criminal Law and Criminology; (2) publication, beginning in 1910, of the Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology; and (3) translation into English of criminology literature by foreign scholars (Brandstatter, 1973).

Shortly following the Chicago conference, another form of police training began to emerge. In 1911, Detroit established a police academy; followed closely by the New York City Police Academy in 1914. These two academies did not follow the educational approach of Vollmer's school, but were designed to upgrade the vocational skills of police officers (Stephens, 1976).

The New York and Detroit training schools were models for the "state of the art" police training; while Vollmer's Berkeley program was the model for the "educational approach" (Farris, 1972). Thus began the controversy, which still exists, over what a police officer should know in order to perform efficiently and effectively. By the early 1930s, many of the larger police agencies had established training schools for their police officers; most of them followed the New York and Detroit model (Vollmer, 1936).

A Brief but Pronounced Increase in the Education Level of Police Personnel

One result of the Great Depression, which struck this country in the early 1930s was an increase in the educational level of police officers. Before the Depression, membership in police agencies was monopolized by the social lower class. During the Depression, the comparatively good salaries and secure position of police service became more attractive to the middle class. According to Niederhoffer (1967,

p. 16): "Young men chose police work in preference to occupations higher in the social scale because of the salary and security. It was lucrative and less expensive to attain than the position of lawyer or teacher".

Police administrators, generally were happy with this new development and entrance examinations were designed which stressed general knowledge and intelligence rather than technical knowledge, favoring the better educated recruit. Soon the police ranks began to include college graduates, i.e., teachers, engineers, lawyers, and others. Of the 300 hundred recruits appointed to the New York City Police Department in June, 1940, more than half held college degrees. However, a prosperity returned, the number of college graduates interested in becoming police officers declined sharply (Spring 3100, 1940).

Criminal Justice Degree Programs

Before the Assistance of Federal Funding

When World War II began, only seven criminal justice degree programs were available in the United States. They were: The University of California in Berkeley; the University of Southern California; California State University at San Jose (formerly San Jose State College); Michigan State University; Indiana University; Wichita State University; and Washington State University (Mathias, 1976).

In 1949, Boolsen (1950) conducted a survey of post-secondary institutions in this country offering programs in criminal justice. Of the 325 responses to his questionnaire, only 20 schools offered at least a two-year major in that discipline. Table I contains a listing of the 20 schools as adapted from Boolsen's work.

TABLE I
 CRIMINAL JUSTICE AREA ACADEMIC
 DEGREE PROGRAMS IN 1949

State	Institution	Degree Level	Degree Title
California	Bakersfield College	Associate	Police Science
	University of California at Berkeley	Bachelors	Criminology
		Masters	Criminology
	Fresno State College	Bachelors	Criminology
	Sacramento State College	Bachelors	Law Enforcement
	City College of San Francisco	Associate	Law Enforcement
	San Jose State College	Associate	Penology or Police Admin.
	College of the Sequoias Univ. of Southern California	Associate Bachelors	Law Enforcement Public Admin.
Indiana	Indiana University	Bachelors	Police Admin.
	Notre Dame University	Bachelors	Correctional Admin.
		Masters	Education, Minor in Corr. Admin.
Kansas	University of Wichita	Cert.	Police Science
Maryland	University of Maryland	Bachelors	Sociology, Minor in Psychology
		Doctorate	Soc./Criminology
Michigan	Michigan State University	Bachelors	Police Science, Police Admin.
	University of Michigan	Bachelors	Penology
Mississippi	University of Mississippi	Bachelors	Soc., Minor in Corrections
Nebraska	University of Neb.-Lincoln	Bachelors	Prison Work/Law Enforcement
Ohio	Ohio State University	Bachelors	Penology and Corrections
Washington	Olympic College	Associates	Police Admin.
	State College of Washington	Masters	Police Admin.
Wisconsin	University of Wisconsin	N/R	Soc./Corrections

Source: Boolsen (1950).

German (1957) found 56 institutions in 19 states which were offering programs leading to academic degrees in the criminal justice field. Table II contains a listing of the 56 Institutions according to Germann's findings.

TABLE II
CRIMINAL JUSTICE AREA ACADEMIC
DEGREE PROGRAMS IN 1957

State	No. Institutions	Associates	Baccalaureate	Masters	Doctorate
California	26	19	8	3	1
Illinois	2	0	0	1	2
Indiana	2	0	1	2	0
Iowa	1	0	0	1	0
Kansas	1	0	1	0	0
Maryland	1	0	1	1	1
Massachusetts	2	0	0	2	1
Michigan	2	1	1	1	0
Minnesota	1	0	1	0	0
Missouri	1	0	0	1	0
Nebraska	1	0	1	1	1
New Hampshire	1	0	1	1	0
New Jersey	1	1	0	0	0
New York	6	4	0	2	1
Ohio	2	0	2	1	1
Texas	2	0	2	1	0
Utah	1	0	0	1	0
Washington	2	1	1	1	1
Wisconsin	1	0	2	1	0
Totals	56	26	21	21	9

Source: Germann (1957).

After the Assistance of Federal Funding

Recommendations by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement

and Administration of Justice stimulated major movement in the United States Congress and in 1968 the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act was passed into law. This law created the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) and brought about the establishment of the Law Enforcement Education Program (LEEP) as an arm of LEAA. The purpose of LEEP was to:

. . . help fully professionalize the law enforcement and correctional staffs of local government in every part of the country, through the administration of a program of grants and loans to finance college degree studies by criminal justice personnel and promising students preparing for careers in the field (LEAA, 1969, p. 29).

LEEP funding brought about a tremendous increase in the number of institutions offering criminal justice degree programs. Table III lists the institutions and degree programs available in the United States for the years 1966 through 1978.

TABLE III
CRIMINAL JUSTICE AREA ACADEMIC
DEGREE PROGRAMS

Director	Associate	Baccalaureate	Masters	Doctorate	Number of Institutions
1966-1967	152	39	14	4	184
1968-1969	199	44	13	5	234
1970-1971	257	55	21	7	292
1972-1973	505	211	41	9	515
1975-1976	729	276	121	19	664
1978-1980	1,209	589	198	24	816

Source: Kobetz (1978)

Table IV contains a list of institutions and degree programs by state, which were available in the criminal justice area in 1978. The number of criminal justice personnel enrolled in criminal justice degree programs in 1978 are presented in Table V. A comparison of these tables with Table II identifies the number of colleges and universities which began offering criminal justice programs after federal funding became available.

LEEP funding grew from \$6.5 million in fiscal year 1969 (LEAA, 1973), to \$40 million per year for fiscal years 1972 through 1974 (Police Chief, 1975), then began to decrease until, in fiscal year 1979, slightly over \$29 million was available and finally LEAA was abolished by the Justice System Improvement Act which was signed into law in December, 1979 (LEAA, 1980). Peak enrollment under LEEP funding occurred in 1975 when 97,000 students were being educated with LEEP assistance (Police Chief, 1975). That figure decreased to just over 58,000 by 1978 (Kobetz, 1978). Much greater decreases in criminal justice students are inevitable when the remaining commitment of LEEP funding has been depleted.

The Effect of Increased Education

Did LEEP improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the American police? There appears to be differences of opinion in the literature regarding the question. Controversy exists over the quality of police education, primarily in the areas of curriculum and faculty involved, but controversy also exists over the amount of education needed as well as the purpose to be served in upgrading the education level of police.

TABLE IV
 CRIMINAL JUSTICE DEGREE PROGRAMS
 AVAILABLE IN 1978

States, Commonwealths, & Territories	No. of Schools	Cerif- icates	Asso- ciates	Bacca- laureate	Mas- ters	Doct- torate
Alabama	20	3	31	31	19	
Alaska	4	1	20	1		
Arizona	13	6	21	9	9	
California	80	79	180	31	21	3
Colorado	12	12	10	4	6	1
Connecticut	10	3	19	6	3	
Delaware	5	1	11	2		
District of Columbia	1		2	2	2	
Florida	33	22	71	16	11	1
Georgia	19	1	20	16	4	
Guam	1	2	2	2	1	
Hawaii	5		4	3		
Idaho	2	3	3			
Illinois	40	19	40	29	9	
Indiana	9	1	20	12	4	
Iowa	15	4	16	9		
Kansas	16	3	30	12	6	
Kentucky	8		16	17	6	2
Louisiana	9	1	7	6	2	
Maine	4		6	1		
Maryland	12	16	21	2	2	2
Massachusetts	18	2	14	12	4	2
Michigan	27	6	41	24	5	2
Minnesota	14	2	10	9	2	
Mississippi	13	3	9	8	3	1
Missouri	28	13	44	41	7	1
Montana	3		2	2	1	1
Nebraska	9	1	9	7	3	
Nevada	4	2	8	2		
New Hampshire	3	2	4	3		
New Jersey	18	2	23	11	1	1
New Mexico	5		6	2		
New York	48	10	64	43	13	2
North Carolina	36	2	50	12	1	
North Dakota	1		3			
Ohio	32	6	38	25	3	
Oklahoma	16	7	22	15	3	
Oregon	11	4	20	8	8	1
Pennsylvania	34	23	51	33	12	2

TABLE IV (Continued)

States, Commonwealths, & Territories	No. of Schools	Certif- icates	Asso- ciates	Bacca- laureate	Mas- ters	Doct- torate
Puerto Rico	1		1			
Rhode Island	3		2	3	1	
South Carolina	16	1	12	6	1	
South Dakota	5		4	5	1	
Tennessee	12		13	15	3	
Texas	44	16	71	30	7	1
Utah	2	1	3	5	2	
Vermont	2		1	1		1
Virgin Islands	1		2			
Virginia	22	17	31	7	2	
Washington	22	7	46	19	7	
West Virginia	9	2	10	5	1	
Wisconsin	21	8	12	21	1	
Wyoming	6		16	2		
U.S. (total)	810	317	1,198	589	197	24
Canada (total)	6	9	11		1	
GRAND TOTAL	816	326	1,209	589	198	24

Source: Kobetz (1978)

TABLE V
 CRIMINAL JUSTICE PERSONNEL
 ENROLLMENT IN 1978

States Commonwealth, & Territories	Police Personnel	Judicial Personnel	Correctional Personnel
Alabama	605	72	198
Alaska	10	2	2
Arizona	423	17	35
Arkansas	221	8	47
California	9,324	553	2,331
Colorado	449	39	137
Delaware	78	21	23
District of Columbia	NR	NR	NR
Florida	2,081	262	835
Georgia	485	76	244
Guam	3	1	
Hawaii	257	1	16
Idaho	26	2	2
Illinois	1,031	45	128
Indiana	262	12	101
Iowa	118	13	49
Kansas	312	16	91
Kentucky	1,712	115	450
Louisiana	266	2	40
Maine	100		
Maryland	1,316	54	404
Massachusetts	928	58	135
Michigan	1,326	135	265
Minnesota	104	8	107
Mississippi	310	20	122
Missouri	1,033	83	454
Montana	30		
Nebraska	88	6	20
Nevada	243	12	178
New Hampshire	41	3	5
New Jersey	1,331	58	191
New Mexico	97	10	5
New York	4,807	210	822
North Carolina	1,026	51	268
North Dakota	27	2	14
Ohio	1,343	91	590
Oklahoma	206	10	328

TABLE V (Continued)

States Commonwealth, & Territories	Personnel	Personnel	Correctional Personnel
Oregon	471	23	193
Pennsylvania	2,272	176	737
Puerto Rico	144	1	
Rhode Island	NR	NR	NR
South Carolina	365	20	70
South Dakota	180	26	24
Tennessee	730	17	44
Texas	2,041	306	809
Utah	300	10	60
Vermont	1	1	1
Virgin Islands	75	20	5
Virginia	1,677	38	432
Washington	430	1,192	150
West Virginia	248	23	134
Wisconsin	986	9	66
Wyoming	95	2	25
U.S. (total)	42,233	3,941	11,494
Canada (total)	204	75	200
GRAND TOTAL	42,437	4,016	11,694

Literature Skeptical of the Benefits of Education

Miller and Fry (1978,) found that the support for higher education for police was at least partially a result of the federal money involved and vested interests in non-monetary factors. They believe that some police administrators view increased educational levels as a matter of prestige gained from the perceived greater professionalism within their agency. This also alleviates some of the problems of political interference. Other administrators, who are themselves well-educated, believe that increasing the education level of the rank and file in their department will add support for their own perspectives. Miller and Fry conclude with the following statement: "Clearly educators and educational institutions support increased interaction for reasons that are partly altruistic and partly self-serving, with the amount of LEEP money certainly an issue here" (p. 32).

Smith and Ostrom (1974) conducted a study to determine if increased training and education improved police attitudes and performance. Their findings were disappointing to advocates of increased education. They found the relationship between education and improved officer attitudes weak to negligible. In regard to the relationship between increased education and police officer performance, as evaluated by citizens, the findings were also negligible.

Frost (1955, p. 138) not only thought a college degree unnecessary except for certain specialized positions, but felt that higher education might be a disadvantage because ". . . a person with a college degree is in grave danger of becoming frustrated when he finds himself delegated to performance of routine police work, as is frequently done".

One line of thought which was originally advanced was that increased education and professionalism of the police would result in higher arrest rates and lower crime rates. This has been referred to as the "legalistic style" of police logic (Eskridge, 1977). One study actually did show that officers with higher educations made more arrests than officers with lower educations (Wilson, 1968). However, to the contrary, Eskridge quotes a study by Finckenauer, which indicates that college educated officers differ from non-educated officers in the use of discretion in that college-educated officers are less likely to invoke the criminal process than their less educated colleagues (Eskridge, 1977).

Gross (1973) quotes a study by Tenney as stating that more than 50 percent of police chiefs surveyed disagreed with an entrance requirement calling for a minimum of two years college and only fifteen percent favored a baccalaureate degree requirement for entry into the police service. Gross, an outspoken critic of the movement to increase the education level of police states:

To summarize the evidence indicated that the goals of the President's Commission of broadening, through college, the capacities of police to handle rapid change, diversity, and innovation in challenging crime are not being attained (p. 480).

Probably the most publicized criticisms of higher education for the police under LEEP funding came from Misner and Sherman. Misner (1975, states:

The horror stories in criminal justice are legion; most members of the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences can surely list ten or so instances, of their own knowledge, in which institutional accreditation meant virtually nothing as far as criminal justice education programs were concerned (p. 14).

Sherman and the National Advisory Commission on Higher education

for Police Officers conducted a study on the quality of police education under LEEP funding. This study was extremely critical of specialized criminal justice programs, especially those administered in two-year colleges. Sherman et al. (1978) argued for a more general curriculum for police personnel.

Literature Supporting Higher Education

Guller (1972) conducted a study of the attitudinal differences between freshman and senior police students and found that increased education will improve police work attitudes. Another study dealing with the police attitudes was conducted by Dalley. This study revealed that senior officers with a college degree exhibited more positive attitudes toward their work than did senior officers with a degree. However, the difference was not so apparent between junior officers with a degree and junior officers without a degree (Dalley, 1975).

Girand (1977, p. 29) argues that ". . . the college-educated policeman is better equipped to deal with his duties than his less educated, technically trained counterpart". He draws on analogy of a sheetmetal mechanic (artisan) who can build and install an air conditioning system, but does not need to know the physical forces which are involved in its design. He does not need to know the whys, they are the responsibility of a college-educated engineer (theorist). Girand claims that we not only require the hows of policing but an understanding of the whys.

Sanderson (1975) conducted a study of the relationship of college education to police performance. He found a positive relationship between increased education and five performance categories: (1) police academy performance; (2) disciplinary history; (3) absenteeism;

(4) involuntary termination; and (5) career development.

"The police officer of tomorrow; the one with a Ph.D. in literature or political science, is here today, and he may even be in your hometown" (Lewin, 1982, p. 5). This statement is the caption of an article which claims that a number of intellectual police chiefs are working to revolutionize policing in such areas as restricting the use of force by police officers, recruitment of minorities into the police service, upgrading police training and management practices, and soliciting more community involvement in police policy formulation and operational practices. Listed as examples of highly educated police administrators, who are bringing about "spectacular reforms" in policing are: Hubert Williams, Director of Police in Newark, New Jersey; David Couper, Police Chief of Madison, Wisconsin; Lee Brown, Commissioner of Public Safety of Atlanta, Georgia; Anthony Bouza, Police Chief in Minneapolis, Minnesota; and Joseph McNamara, Police Chief at San Jose, California.

Summary

Police education began in the early 1900's, but its growth was very slow until federal funding became available in 1969. Between 1969 and 1979 a phenomenal increase in police education was experienced. From the beginning a controversy has existed over whether or not higher education is beneficial to the policing system. How much and what kind of education is needed by law enforcement has also been subjects of controversy. Studies reflecting the benefits of education have been conducted; while other studies have disputed those claims.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH PROCEDURES

This chapter describes the procedures used in collecting the data for this study. Included are: (1) research strategy, (2) the survey instrument, (3) selection of the questionnaire topics, (4) testing, (5) population of the study, (6) administration of the questionnaire, and (7) analysis of the data.

Research Strategy

The researcher considered the three general methods that educators utilize to solve problems: historical, descriptive and experimental. According to Brunner et al. (1959), description is the first step in the development of research in any discipline. "Descriptive research can be used to determine the nature of prevailing conditions, practices, and attitudes, and its objective is to obtain accurate descriptions of activities, objects, processes, and persons" (Brewster, 1972, p. 91-92). This type of research assists future research by suggesting hypotheses and lines of inquiry (Bruner, 1959). The descriptive method was selected for use in this study.

The Survey Instrument

In this study, a questionnaire was used to collect the data. There was no instrument available which satisfied the stated purposes of this

study; therefore, it was necessary to construct the instrument. Van Dalen and Meyer (1966) describe three types of research questionnaires: closed, open, and pictorial. After the advantages and disadvantages were considered, the closed-form questionnaire was chosen to facilitate tabulation of responses. However, space was provided for comments.

A closed-form questionnaire, consisting of ten questions/statements and an eleventh space for comments was developed as the survey instrument. Four possible responses to each question/statement were listed. The questionnaire included instructions to the respondent directing him to select the response which best expressed his attitude or opinion regarding the question/statement. Each questionnaire was accompanied by a cover letter explaining the purpose of the questionnaire. The cover letter also included a request for a return of the questionnaire by a specified date.

Selection of the Questionnaire Topics

The topics included in the questionnaire were selected to address matters which, according to the literature, were topics of controversy regarding police education. Question number one asked the respondent to what extent he thinks education is beneficial to police personnel. Question numbers two, three and four addressed the issue of police educational entrance standards for police applicants. Question number five inquired regarding the curriculum of criminal justice programs. Question number six asked for opinions and attitudes regarding the awarding of college credit for police training. Question number seven addressed the very controversial issue of faculty qualifications for criminal justice programs. Question number eight asked the respondent's

opinion about governmental grants and loans for criminal justice students. Question number nine solicited opinions and attitudes regarding education requirements for promotion within the police service. Educational incentives was the subject of question number ten. Number eleven asked for comments.

Testing

The questionnaire was constructed to collect the data for the study and was pretested with a group of 32 high-ranking police officers who were attending a seminar in Ponca City Oklahoma during November, 1981. The objective of the pretest was basically to determine the clarity of the instrument. None of the members of the pretest group were representatives of the population to be used in the study. However, due to their rank and positions of authority in law enforcement organizations, it was felt that they would be sufficiently familiar with issues in police education as well as the terminology used, to render an opinion as to clarity of the questions/statements and how thoroughly the instrument addressed the subject in question.

Members of the population to be used in this study were not included in this pretest for three reasons. The first was that the subjects might object to completing the questionnaire twice. The second reason was that it was feared that exposing the participants to the pretest might add bias or cause second thoughts, reducing the likelihood of securing reliable results. The third reason was just a matter of expediency, the pretest could be conducted and accomplished at one time; thus, precluding the necessity of mailing the questionnaire for this purpose. The value of using a group for pretesting which is not included

in the study population, may be questionable, but it is a recognized research procedure (Wiersma, 1969).

The pretest group was asked to read the instructions, read the questions, and return the material to the researcher with their comments regarding the clarity and applicability of the instrument. Only slight modification in wording with the questionnaire was needed as a result of the pretest.

The improved questionnaire was submitted to the staff of the Robert R. Lester Center for Training and Education in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma. The staff reviewed the material and found no difficulty in understanding any part of the questionnaire. It was believed that the questionnaire could then be administered to the population of the study. See Appendix A for a copy of the final questionnaire and cover letter.

Population of the Study

Before attempting to obtain data for the study, it was necessary to identify the population. The size and nature of the population were important factors in determination of the procedures to be used in the collection of data. It was decided that the members of the two major law enforcement training associations in the United States would be used as the population for this study.

One association was made up of persons who were employed by state level law enforcement organizations, commonly called State Police or Highway Patrol. These persons have the assigned responsibility to provide training to their own organization and normally assist with the training of local (city and county) police personnel. This group formed an association in 1980, with the name National Association of State

Police Academy Directors (NASPAD). Appendix B contains a copy of the NASPAD membership roster at the time of this study. The second group was comprised of the top administrators of the organization in each state which had the statutory responsibility for the regulation and certification of police training in their respective states. This group is referred to as the National Association of State Directors of Law Enforcement Training (NASDLET). Appendix C contains a copy of the NASDLET membership roster at the time of the study. Both of these groups were involved not only in the training of law enforcement personnel, but were instrumental in the formulation of organization policy matters relating to training and education. It seemed appropriate that both groups be included in this study.

Administration of the Questionnaire

The writer, as a member of NASPAD, personally administered the questionnaire to members attending the association's annual meeting March 9 - 12, 1982, at the University of North Florida in Jacksonville. The questionnaire was mailed to the NASPAD members who were not present at the meeting. Dan Johnson, Assistant Director of the Oklahoma Council on Law Enforcement Education and Training, the Oklahoma representative of NASDLET, administered the questionnaire to members of NASDLET who attended their meeting at Quantico, Virginia during March 28 - April 1, 1982. As with the NASPAD group, the questionnaire was mailed to members of NASDLET who did not attend the meeting.

Analysis of the Data

Analysis of the data contained in the returned questionnaires

consisted of: compiling the responses of each group represented in the study population, organization of the responses according to the numerical sequence of the questions included in the questionnaire listing the responses in table format using number and percentages, and a narrative summary of each questionnaire item. Additionally, comments by the respondents were listed.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

The purpose of this study was to determine how police training directors perceive higher education needs of their vocation. This chapter presents the findings of the study by reporting the questionnaire response rate and presenting the data contained in the returned questionnaires. The data is organized sequentially according to the listing of the questions in the questionnaire and presented in table format using number and percentage of responses. A narrative summary of each questionnaire item is also included.

Response Rate

Questionnaires were distributed to the 58 members of NASPAD and the 145 members of NASDLET. Forty-one (or 71 percent) of the NASPAD members responded and 114 (or 79 percent) of the NASDLET members responded. In all, 203 questionnaires were distributed and 155 responses were received. This represented a response rate of 76 percent.

Tabulation of Responses

Table VI contains a listing of responses to Question 1 concerning the benefits of college education. Sixty-three percent of the survey population which responded thought college education was beneficial to police officers. Thirty-three percent felt college education was very

beneficial. Only five percent responded that college education was not very beneficial and there were no responses that higher education was not beneficial. Overall 96 percent of the respondents had positive feelings about the benefits of college education to law enforcement officers.

TABLE VI
RESPONSES TO QUESTION CONCERNING THE
BENEFITS OF COLLEGE EDUCATION

Responses	Number of Responses	Percentage of Responses
A. Very Beneficial	51	33
B. Beneficial	97	63
C. Not Very Beneficial	7	5
D. Not Beneficial	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	155	101 *

*Due to Rounding

Table VII contains a listing of responses to Question 2 regarding the role education should play in police applicant selection. Fifty-six percent of the training directors who responded felt that an applicant with some college education should be preferred over an applicant with no college education. Thirty-four percent thought some college education should be required for entrance into the police service. Ten percent responded that college education should not be considered in the selection process and less than one percent thought an applicant with no

college education should be preferred over an applicant with some college education.

TABLE VII
RESPONSES TO QUESTION CONCERNING THE ROLE
OF EDUCATION IN APPLICANT SELECTION

Responses	Number of Responses	Percentage of Responses
A. College Not Considered	15	10
B. Some College Preference	86	56
C. Some College Required	52	34
D. No College Preference	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
Total	154	101 *

*Due to Rounding

Table VIII contains a listing of responses to Question 3 concerning the minimum education entry level for police service. It was the opinion of 45 percent of the respondents that a specified amount of college education should not be a part of the entrance standards for police service. However, 34 percent felt a minimum number of college credit hours (such as an associate degree or its equivalent) with a baccalaureate degree within a specified period of time be established as the minimum education standard. Sixteen percent of the respondents had the opinion that no more than 60 college credit hours should be required for entry. In all 56 percent of those responding felt entrance requirements should include some specified amount of college education.

TABLE VIII
 RESPONSES TO QUESTION CONCERNING
 ENTRANCE REQUIREMENTS

Responses	Number of Responses	Percentage of Responses
A. Baccalaureate Degree	10	6
B. Provisional	52	34
C. No College	68	44
C. No More than Sixty Hours	<u>25</u>	<u>16</u>
Total	155	101 *

*Due to Rounding

Table IX contains a listing of responses to Question 4 concerning how police education standards should be established. Forty-five percent of the respondents felt that police education standards should be established by state statutes. Thirty-three percent thought education standards should be promulgated by each state's statutory body representing the National Association of State Directors of Law Enforcement Training. Sixteen percent responded that these standards should be left to individual department policy. Seven percent of the survey population which responded felt that standards should be addressed by the governmental unit under which the police agency functions.

Table X contains a listing of responses to Question 5 concerning criminal justice curriculum. Seventy-three percent of the respondents felt criminal justice should be an identified discipline with about one-third of the curriculum devoted to criminal justice, law enforcement subjects and the remainder to a general nature. Fourteen percent

thought a liberal arts/social sciences curriculum should be pursued by law enforcement personnel. Criminal justice should not be an identified discipline until more research has been accomplished in the field. The other two listed choices, (C) The police community should provide police education in police academies teaching police skills; and (D) The entire curriculum should be technical/vocational; received nine percent and four percent of the responses respectively.

TABLE IX
RESPONSES TO QUESTION CONCERNING
HOW POLICE EDUCATION STANDARDS
SHOULD BE ESTABLISHED

Responses	Number of Responses	Percentage of Responses
A. State Law	67	45
B. Governmental Unit	10	7
C. NASDLET	49	33
D. Department Policy	<u>24</u>	<u>16</u>
Total	150	101 *

*Due to Rounding

Table XI contains a listing of responses to Question 6 concerning the awarding of college credit for police training. Sixty-nine percent of those responding felt that college credit should be awarded for police training courses only after review by the accrediting institution of course content; contact hours devoted to the course; methods of instruction; and instructor qualifications. Eleven percent felt that

courses taught in a recognized legitimate training academy should be accredited. Ten percent thought credit for police training courses was of no concern. Nine percent responded that we should be extremely cautious in this area. Only courses taught by faculty members of the accrediting institution and courses which satisfy the requirements of time (contract hours) and other academic standards should be accredited. Seventy-eight percent of the respondents apparently believe that the awarding of college credit for police training courses should not be automatic, but the care should be taken to insure academic standards are met by those courses which are accredited.

TABLE X
RESPONSES TO QUESTION CONCERNING
CRIMINAL JUSTICE CURRICULUM

Responses	Number of Responses	Percentage of Responses
A. Not an Identified Curriculum	22	14
B. Identified Discipline	112	73
C. Police Community	14	9
D. Technical/Vocational	<u>6</u>	<u>4</u>
Total	154	100*

*Due to Rounding

Table XIII contains a listing of responses to Question 7 concerning faculty qualifications for criminal justice programs. Thirty-eight percent of the respondents thought substitution of criminal justice experience for degree requirements for faculty members in criminal

justice programs was an acceptable practice. However, 36 percent felt that a graduate degree should be required for faculty members in four year programs with the baccalaureate degree a requirement for two-year programs. Seventeen percent thought a master's degree should be required in two-year programs with the doctorate a requirement in four-year programs. Overall, 62 percent did not support the substitution of experience for degree requirements. In addition, there were several comments that criminal justice experience should also be a part of the requirements for faculty members in criminal justice programs.

TABLE XI
 RESPONSES TO QUESTION CONCERNING
 THE AWARDING OF COLLEGE CREDIT
 FOR POLICE TRAINING

Responses	Number of Responses	Percentage of Responses
A. Caution Advised	14	9
B. No Concern	16	10
C. Academy Courses Accredited	17	11
D. Credit with Review	<u>106</u>	<u>69</u>
Total	153	99

*Due to Rounding

Table XIII contains a listing of responses to Question 8 concerning governmental funding to assist criminal justice students. Fifty-seven percent of the respondents felt that no more consideration regarding financial assistance should be afforded criminal justice students

than is afforded other students. Twenty-one percent thought some combination of governmental grants and/or loans should be provided for criminal justice students. Fourteen percent felt that governmental loans should be provided to criminal justice students, with a requirement that the student repay the loan. Seven percent thought governmental grants should be provided to criminal justice students to defray direct education costs.

TABLE XII
RESPONSES TO QUESTION CONCERNING
FACULTY QUALIFICATIONS FOR
CRIMINAL JUSTICE PROGRAMS

Responses	Number of Responses	Percentage of Responses
A. Graduate Degree - 4 yr. Program		
Baccalaureate - 2 yr. Program	54	36
B. Substitution of Experience		
Acceptable	57	38
C. Doctorate - 4 yr. Program		
Masters - 2 yr. Program	13	9
D. Masters Degree	<u>15</u>	<u>17</u>
Total	149	100

Table XIV contains a listing of responses to Question 9 concerning education requirements for promotion. Forty-three percent of the respondents thought a candidate for a top management position (usually major or above) with a baccalaureate degree should be given preference over a candidate without a baccalaureate degree. Thirty-two percent felt that

at least a baccalaureate degree should be required for ranks in the upper mid-management and top-management levels (usually captain and above). Seven percent of those responding thought at least a baccalaureate degree should be required for promotion to the first line supervisor position; with a graduate degree required for advancement above that level. It was the opinion of 19 percent of the respondents that the education level of a promotion candidate should not be a consideration in promotion selection. Apparently, over 80 percent of those responding thought higher education should be a part of promotion selection systems in the police service; especially in the upper ranks.

TABLE XIII

RESPONSES TO QUESTION CONCERNING
GOVERNMENTAL FUNDING TO ASSIST
CRIMINAL JUSTICE STUDENTS

Responses	Number of Responses	Percentage of Responses
A. Governmental Grants	11	7
B. Grants and/or Loans	33	21
C. Loans	22	14
D. No Separate Treatment	<u>88</u>	<u>57</u>
Total	154	99 *

*Due to Rounding

Table XV lists the responses to Question 10 concerning educational incentives for police personnel. Thirty-five percent of the respondents thought an escalating salary scale should be established based on the

number of college credit hours through the graduate degree level. Twenty-five percent had the opinion that additional salary should not be provided, but special consideration regarding shift scheduling, etc., should be given to encourage personnel to attend college. Only 17 percent felt that no additional salary should be provided or special consideration given for educational purposes. Eighty-three percent of the training directors responding apparently felt that police personnel should be encouraged, in tangible ways, to further their education.

TABLE XIV
RESPONSES TO QUESTION CONCERNING
EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS
FOR PROMOTION

Responses	Number of Responses	Percentage of Responses
A. Baccalaureate Degree Required	48	32
B. Education Not Considered	28	19
C. Preference to Baccalaureate	64	43
D. Baccalaureate for First Line, Graduate Above First Line	<u>10</u>	<u>7</u>
Total	150	101 *

*Due to Rounding

In addition to the questions/statements calling for a response in the questionnaire, a space was provided for comments. Seventy-four comments were received from the survey respondents.

Question 1, regarding the benefits of higher education to law

enforcement officers in the performance of their duties, generated the greatest number of comments. Seventeen comments were received concerning that question. Eleven of the comments were supportive of higher education.

TABLE XV
RESPONSES TO QUESTION CONCERNING
EDUCATIONAL INCENTIVES

Responses	Number of Responses	Percentage of Responses
A. Escalating Salary Scale Through Baccalaureate Level	37	25
B. No Special Consideration	26	17
C. Schedule Consideration	34	23
D. Escalating Salary Scale Through Graduate Level	<u>53</u>	<u>35</u>
Total	150	100

There were 13 comments about Question 10, which addressed the issue of educational incentives for police personnel. Ten of the comments favored educational incentives, but a few of them were provisional, i.e., experience and police training certificates should be included in the incentive program. One comment supported educational incentives, but expressed the opinion that increased salary was not a good incentive.

Question 7, concerning faculty qualifications for criminal justice programs, and Question 9, which inquired regarding educational requirements for promotion each generated ten comments. Most of the comments

about Question 7 were supportive of degree requirements for faculty members, but included the opinion that criminal justice experience should be included in the requirements. A majority of the comments regarding higher education requirements for promotion were in opposition to the idea.

Question 5, regarding criminal justice program curriculum, stimulated seven responses. Three of the comments listed topics the respondents felt should be included in the curriculum. Two of the comments were critical of existing criminal justice programs in higher education institutions. One expressed the opinion that criminal justice curriculum should include a balanced mixture of criminal justice and general academic subject matter. One comment advanced the idea that existing criminal justice programs were too general in nature.

There were five comments to Question 3, which was concerning a minimum education level for entry into the police service. Three of the comments were opposing the inclusion of higher education into police entry requirements, while two comments were in support of higher education requirements for entry.

Question 8, concerning governmental funding to assist criminal justice students drew two comments. One comment was in support of the governmental fundings, the other simply asked the question "Why governmental?"

One comment each was received regarding Question 2, concerning the role higher education should play in applicant selection; Question 4, concerning the method for establishing educational standards for the police; and Question 6, regarding college accreditation for police training. Each of these comments were explaining the respondents reasons for

his response selection in the questionnaire.

There were seven comments received which did not address a specific questionnaire topic, but were of a general philosophical nature. Appendix D contains a listing of each respondent's comments.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter discusses the study and its results. The discussion consists of three parts. The first part is an overview and summary of the study. Next, conclusions which were formed as a result of the study are presented. The third and final part of the chapter consists of recommendations for research and practice.

Summary

Two forms of police training emerged in the early 1900s. One form was "pure" police training (i.e. vocational skills). The other was a combination of skills training and academic education. Controversy has existed since then regarding what type and how much training/education is needed by law enforcement personnel.

Strong public sentiment concerning this country's crime problem and concern about the ineffectiveness and practices of the police, resulted in the establishment of a presidential commission in 1965 to study these problems. One recommendation of that commission was for increased higher education for law enforcement personnel. This recommendation was supported by other commissions; the academic community; and generally by law enforcement administrators.

Governmental grants were provided to assist police personnel in furthering their education. Many police administrators directed

special consideration be given in shift scheduling, etc., to those wishing to attend college. Pay incentives, based on the amount of college education, became a popular method of encouraging college attendance by law enforcement personnel.

By the late 1970s, police education had come under severe criticism by many police and academic administrators, and by several national study groups. The program, providing federal grants to criminal justice college students, was discontinued.

Decision makers who had the responsibility for establishing police standards need reliable information upon which to base their decisions. There was no existing information regarding the attitudes and opinions of police training directors, as a group, concerning the higher education need of law enforcement personnel. The purpose of this study was to provide such information.

The study population selected consisted of the members of two major associations of police training directors in the United States: The National Association of State Police Academy Directors and the National Association of State Directors of Law Enforcement Training.

A review of pertinent literature was undertaken to gain a better perspective of the questions surrounding the police education issue. This review produced evidence which was supportive of higher education for police, but it also produced evidence which was not so supportive.

The descriptive method of research was selected for the study. One of the primary reasons for selecting this method was that it suggests hypothesis and lines of inquiry for future research. A questionnaire was constructed, tested, and administered to the population. A return of 76 percent of the distributed questionnaires was experienced.

The data gathered from the returned questionnaires was tabulated, organized in table format and presented in Chapter IV.

While a clear consensus of opinion within the population was obtained regarding some of the issues addressed in the survey, there was considerable division of opinion in other areas.

A large majority of the survey population felt college education was beneficial to law enforcement personnel. However, the trainers were divided in their opinions concerning higher education requirements for entry-level personnel. There was division not only in the amount of college education which should be required but whether or not college education should be a part of police entrance requirements.

There was a wide division in the opinions of respondents regarding how police education standards should be established. However, respondents' perception of two of the listed responses could be responsible for some of the division of opinion. One listed response had state law establishing a minimum education level, while the other response in question would have a state regulatory agency promulgating the standard. Since regulations must be approved by state legislatures, a number of respondents apparently saw no significant difference in the two responses.

In the matter of criminal justice program curriculum, a sizeable majority of the respondents thought criminal justice should be an identified discipline, with about one-third of the curriculum devoted to criminal justice/law enforcement subjects and the remainder two courses of general nature. A commanding majority of the respondents saw a need for caution in the awarding of college credit for police training courses.

Over half of the survey participants felt degree requirements were needed for faculty members in criminal justice programs. They did not support the practice of accepting criminal justice experience in lieu of degree requirements. However, this issue generated several comments indicating a strong feeling that criminal justice experience should be a part of faculty qualifications, in addition to degree requirements.

Opinions were divided among the respondents on the question of governmental grants and loans to assist criminal justice students. More than one-half of those responding expressed the belief that no more consideration should be afforded criminal justice students than is afforded other students. While opinions differed regarding the amount of education and in the rank or position in which it should be required, a large majority of the respondents indicated a feeling that higher education should be a part of the criteria in promotion selection. The matter of educational incentives for law enforcement personnel seemed to stimulate above normal interest among the respondents, as evidenced by the number of additional comments received on this question. Strong feelings were expressed both in support of and in opposition to incentive programs. Still, 60 percent of the respondents supported some type of escalating salary scale to encourage college attendance and other respondents favored incentive programs which did not include salary increases. In all, over 80 percent of those participating in the survey, indicated support for some type of incentive program to encourage officers to further their education.

Conclusions

Conclusions formed as a result of this study were as follows:

1. The purpose of the study was accomplished. The attitudes and opinions of police training directors were determined regarding many of the critical questions surrounding the issue of police education.

2. While opinions differed on some of the questions, the trainers, as a group, have positive feelings regarding the value of higher education to law enforcement.

3. Police training directors as a group, will not, at this time, support the recommendation of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice that all personnel with general enforcement powers have baccalaureate degrees.

4. Existing research does not provide conclusive evidence that college education significantly increases the efficiency and effectiveness of police, especially at the patrolman level.

Recommendations

The results of this study have implications for practice and additional research.

Recommendations for Practice

1. Task analyses should be conducted to identify those positions in law enforcement agencies which can benefit most from higher education.

2. Police agencies should review entrance and promotion selection systems. If their policies and procedures in those areas do not include systematic provisions for educational preference, they should consider establishing such provisions.

3. State legislatures should address the issue of educational standards for police; and either establish statutory minimums or provide authority to a regulatory body for the establishment of standards.

Recommendations for Research

1. Additional general research should be conducted into the relationship of college education to police officer performance.
2. Research, targeting the effect of college education on specific police functions, should be conducted.
3. Research should be conducted into the effect of accepting specific college course completion in lieu of certain police training, for certification purposes.
4. Reserach should be conducted into the cost-effectiveness of educational incentive programs.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Boolsen, F. M. Directory of University and College Criminology Programs. Columbus, Ohio: Society for Advancement of Criminology, p. 4.
- Brandstater, A. F. "History of Police Education in the United States." Report of the Standards Committee, Vol. II. Atlanta: Georgia State University, 1973.
- Brewster, James Hiram. "A Study of An Emerging Occupational Group-State Directors of Law Enforcement Training: Their Backgrounds and Perception of Their Role." (Unpub. Ed.D dissertation, The Georgia Washington University, 1972.).
- Brunner, Edmund de S., David S. Wilder, Corinne Kirchner, John S. Newberry. An Overview of Adult Education Research. Chicago: Adult Education Association of the U.S.A., 1959.
- Dalley, A. F. "University Vs Non-University Graduated Policemen: A Study of Police Attitudes." Journal of Police Science and Administration, Vol. 3, No. 4 (December 1975), p. 458-468.
- Eskridge, Chris W. "Problems in the Use of Educational Standards: Another Side of the Controversy." The Police Chief, Vol. XLIV, No. 8 (August 1977), p. 36-38.
- Farris, E. A. "A History of Criminal Justice Education: Seven Decades (1900-1970)." Report of the Standards Committee: Volume 1. Atlanta: Georgia State University, 1972.
- Frost, Thomas. "Selection Methods for Police Recruits." The Journal of Criminal Law Criminology and Police Science, Vol. 46, No. 1 (May-June 1955), p. 133-145.
- Gammage, Allen Z. Police Training in the United States. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, Publisher, 1963.
- Germann, A. C. "Law Enforcement Education and Training in the United States." The Police Chief, Vol. XXIV (October 1957), p. 22-28.
- Girand, Dan. "What is Right for Education in Law Enforcement?" The Police Chief, Vol. XLIV (August 1977), p. 28-30.
- Gross, Solomon. "Higher Education and the Police: Is There a Need for a Closer Look?" Journal of Police Science and Administration, Vol. 1, No. 4 (December 1973), p. 36-38.

- Guller, Irving B. "Higher Education and Policemen: Attitudinal Differences Between Freshmen and Senior Police College Students." Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, Vol. 63, No. 3 (September 1972), pp. 396-401.
- Kobetz, Richard W. Criminal Justice Education Directory: 1978-1980. Gaithersburg, Maryland: International Association of Chiefs of Police, 1978.
- LEAA: Fifth Annual Report. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1969.
- LEAA: Fifth Annual Report. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973.
- LEAA: Eleventh Annual Report. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1980.
- Lewin, Julie. "Future Cop." Daily Oklahoman-Parade, March 12, 1982, pp. 4-5.
- Mathias, William J. "Higher Education and the Police." The Ambivalent Force: Perspectives on the Police. Ed. Arthur Niederhoffer and Abraham S. Blumberg, Second Edition. Hinsdale, Illinois: The Dryden Press, 1976, pp. 377-385.
- Miller, Jon and Lincoln Fry. "Some Evidence on the Impact of Higher Education for Law Enforcement Personnel." The Police Chief, Vol. XLV, No. 8 (August 1978), pp. 30-33.
- Misner, Gordon E. "The Need for Quality Control for Criminal Justice Degree Programs." The Police Chief, Vol. XLII, No. 8 (August 1975), pp. 14-16 and 78.
- National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals. A National Strategy to Reduce Crime. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973.
- Niederhoffer, Arthur. Behind the Shield: The Police in Urban Society. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1967.
- President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967.
- Sanderson, B.E. "Police Officers: The Relationship of College Education to Job Performance." (Unpub. M.S. thesis, California State University at Los Angeles, 1975.)
- Sherman, Lawrence, and the National Advisory Commission on Higher Education for Police Officers. The Quality of Police Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1978.

- Smith, Dennis, and Elinor Ostrom. "The Effects of Training and Education on Police Attitudes and Performance: A Preliminary Analysis." The Potential for Reform of Criminal Justice. Vol. III. Beverly Hills: SAGE Publication, 1974, pp. 45-81.
- Spring 3100. Vol. II, No. 8 (October 1940), p. 4-8.
- Stephens, Gene. "Criminal Justice Education: Past, Present and Future." Criminal Justice Review, Vol. 1, No. 1 (Spring 1976), pp. 91-120.
- The Police Chief. Vol. XLII, No. 6 (June 1975), p. 42.
- Tamm, Quin. "Training Polictical or Critical Need?" The Police Chief, Vol. XXXII (August 1965), p. 6.
- Van Dalen, Deobold B., and William J. Meyer. Understanding Educational Research: An Introduction. 2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1966.
- Vollmer, August. The Police and Modern Society. Berkeley, California: The University of California Press, 1936.
- Wiersma, William. Research Methods in Education: An Introduction. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott, Co., 1969.
- Wilson, James Q. Varieties of Police Behavior. Cambridge, Massachuetts: Harvard University Press, 1968.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

COVER LETTER AND

QUESTIONNAIRE



Oklahoma Department of Public Safety

PAUL W. REED, JR.
Commissioner

P. O. BOX 11415
OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA. 73136

DARRELL WIEMERS
Assistant Commissioner

Dear :

The attitudes and opinions of police training directors regarding higher education for law enforcement personnel has been selected as the subject for a master's thesis.

The population of this study is small (NASPAD and NASDLET members) and response by each member is very important to survey validity. Please fill out the enclosed questionnaire and return it in the self-addressed, stamped envelope by May 14, 1982. The results of the study will be made available to NASPAD and NASDLET.

Your cooperation is very much appreciated.

Sincerely,

Al Newport
Director of Training

AN/dh

Enclosure



POLICE EDUCATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Name _____ Agency _____

Please select the response which best expresses your opinion regarding the following questions or statements and indicate your selection by placing an "X" in the blank preceding the letter A, B, C, or D.

1. Generally speaking, to what extent is college education beneficial to police personnel in the performance of their duties?

- ___ A. Very beneficial
- ___ B. Beneficial
- ___ C. Not very beneficial
- ___ D. Not beneficial

2. Regarding applicants for entry into the police service:

- ___ A. College education should not be a consideration
- ___ B. Providing other qualifications are equal, an applicant with some college education should be preferred over an applicant with no college education
- ___ C. Some college education should be required
- ___ D. Providing other qualifications are equal, an applicant with no college education should be preferred over an applicant with some college education

3. Regarding a minimum education level as an entrance requirement for the police service:

- ___ A. A baccalaureate degree should be required
- ___ B. A minimum number of college credit hours (such as an associate degree or its equivalent in hours), with the provision that the applicant complete the requirements for a baccalaureate degree within a specified period of time should be established
- ___ C. No college education should be required
- ___ D. No more than sixty college credit hours should be required

4. An educational standard for police service should be addressed as follows:

- A. State law should specify the minimum
- B. The governmental unit (state-city-county) under which the police organization functions should address the issue through laws, ordinances, or regulations
- C. Standards should be established by each state's statutory body representing the National Association of State Directors of Law Enforcement Training (NASDLET).
- D. Standards should be established by individual department policy

5. Regarding higher education curriculum for criminal justice/law enforcement programs

- A. Criminal justice should not be an identified discipline. Until more research has been accomplished in the field, a general liberal arts/social sciences curriculum should be pursued
- B. Criminal justice should be an identified discipline with about one-third (or other specified amount) of the curriculum devoted to criminal justice/law enforcement subjects and the remainder to a general nature
- C. Police education should be accomplished by the police community, in police academies utilizing police instructors, teaching police skills
- D. The entire curriculum should be technical/vocational (criminal justice/law enforcement)

6. Regarding the awarding of college credit for police training:

- A. We should be extremely cautious in this area. Only courses taught by faculty members of the institution awarding the credit and courses which satisfy the requirements of time (contact hours) and other academic standards should be accredited
- B. College credit is of no concern
- C. Training courses taught in a recognized legitimate police training academy should be accredited
- D. Credit should be awarded for police training courses only after review, by the accrediting institution, of course content, contact hours devoted to the course, methods of instruction (lesson plan, etc.) and instructor qualifications

7. Regarding faculty qualifications for criminal justice programs:

- A. A graduate degree should be required of all faculty members in four-year institutions with the baccalaureate degree a requirement in two-year programs
- B. Substitution of criminal justice experience for degree requirements of faculty members is an acceptable practice
- C. At least a master's degree should be required for faculty in two-year institutions; with the doctorate a requirement for the faculty of four-year programs (full-time and part-time faculty members)
- D. At least a master's degree should be required of all full-time and part-time faculty members

8. Regarding governmental funding to assist criminal justice students:

- A. Governmental grants should be provided to criminal justice students to defray the cost of tuition, books, and other direct education expenses
- B. Some combination of governmental grants and/or loans especially for criminal justice students should be provided
- C. A system for government-guaranteed loans should be provided for criminal justice students, with a requirement that the student repay the loan
- D. No more consideration regarding financial assistance should be afforded criminal justice students than is afforded other students

9. Regarding education requirements for promotion:

- A. At least a baccalaureate degree should be required for ranks in the upper mid-management and top management levels (usually captain and above)
- B. The education level of a candidate should not be a consideration in promotion selection
- C. A candidate for promotion to a top management position (usually major and above) with a baccalaureate degree should be given preference over a candidate without a baccalaureate degree
- D. At least a baccalaureate degree should be required for promotion to the first line supervisor position; with a graduate degree required for advancement above that rank

10. Considering educational incentives for police personnel:

- A. An escalating salary scale should be established based on the number of college credit hours through the baccalaureate degree level
- B. There should be no additional salary provided or special consideration given for educational purposes
- C. Additional salary should not be provided, but special consideration regarding shift schedule, etc. should be given to encourage personnel to attend college
- D. An escalating salary should be established based on the number of college credit hours through the graduate degree level

11. Comments: _____

APPENDIX B

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE

POLICE ACADEMY DIRECTORS

MEMBERSHIP ROSTER

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE POLICE
ACADEMY DIRECTORS

MEMBERSHIP ROSTER

Alabama

Alaska

Major A. Korhonen
 Alaska Dept. of Public Safety
 P.O. Box 6188 Annex
 Anchorage, Alaska 99501

Captain Joe DeTemple
 Training Director
 Alaska State Troopers
 Public Safety Academy
 P.O. Box 119
 Sitka, Alaska 99835

Arizona

Major Ernie Johnson
 Commander, Training Division
 Arizona Dept. of Public Safety
 P.O. Box 6638
 Phoenix, Arizona 85005
 602/ 262-8311

Captain George John
 Training Director
 Navajo Div. of Public Safety
 Drawer "J"
 Window Rock, Arizona 86515
 602/ 871-4191

Arkansas

Lieutenant Joe Jacobs
 Director of Training
 Arkansas State Police
 P.O. Box 5901
 Little Rock, Arkansas 72215
 501/ 224-2943

Paul Hamilton
 Assistant Director
 Arkansas L.E. Training Academy
 P.O. Box 3106
 East Camden, Arkansas 71701
 501/ 574-1810

California

John Anderson
 Assistant Chief
 Northern Division
 California Highway Patrol
 2501 Cascade Blvd. - P.O. Drawer AC
 Redding, California 96099

Captain Bill Carlson
 California Highway Patrol Academy
 3500 Reed Avenue
 Bryte, California 95605
 916/ 372-5620

Colorado

Captain James A. Yarrington
 Colorado L.E. Training Academy
 15000 Golden Road
 Golden, Colorado 80401

Lieutenant Ronald Vogt
 Colorado L.E. Training Academy
 15000 Golden Road
 Golden, Colorado 80401

Connecticut

NASPAD Roster
2Delaware

Lieutenant James R. Spillan
Director of Training
Delaware State Police
P.O. Box 430
Dover, Delaware 19901
302/ 736-5903

Lieutenant Dan Simpson
Troop Commander—Troop 3
Delaware State Police
R.D. #1
Dover, Delaware 19901
302/ 736-4863

Florida

William Westfall
Florida Criminal Justice
Standards and Training
Florida Dept. of L.E.
P.O. Box 1489
Tallahassee, Florida 32302
904/ 488-8556

Russell J. Arend, Director
Institute of Police Traffic
Management
University of North Florida
4567 St. Johns Bluff Rd., S
Jacksonville, Florida 32216
904/ 646-2722

Everett M. James
Director of Police Programs
Institute of Police Traffic
Management
4567 St. Johns Bluff Rd., S
Jacksonville, Florida 32216
904/ 646-2722

Duane M. "Butch" Kramer
Director, Administrative
Services
Institute of Police Traffic
Management
University of North Florida
4567 St. Johns Bluff Rd., S
Jacksonville, Florida 32216
904/ 646-2722

Carl Legursky, Supervisor
International Division
Institute of Police Traffic
Management
University of North Florida
4567 St. Johns Bluff Rd., S
Jacksonville, Florida 32216
904/ 646-2722

Richard E. Stephens
Director of Curriculum
Development
Institute of Police Traffic
Management
University of North Florida
4567 St. Johns Bluff Rd., S
Jacksonville, Florida 32216
904/ 646-2722

Jim Coffron
Training Specialist
Institute of Police Traffic
Management
University of North Florida
4567 St. Johns Bluff Rd. S
Jacksonville, Florida 32216
904/ 646-2722

Georgia

Ben Jordan
Georgia Police Academy
959 East Confederate Avenue
Atlanta, Georgia 30301
404/ 656-6105

Captain J.H. Presley
Training Officer
Georgia Dept. Public Safety
959 East Confederate Avenue
Atlanta, Georgia 30301
404/ 656-7270

NASPAD Roster

3

Idaho

Curt Williams
 Training Coordinator
 Idaho Dept. of Public Safety
 6111 Clinton
 Boise, Idaho 83704
 208/ 334-2162

Illinois

Capt. Laimutis A. Nargelenas
 Commander, District #11
 Illinois State Police
 Route 159
 Maryville, Illinois 62062
 217/ 786-6902

Joe Dakin
 Deputy Director D.L.E.
 and Director of Training
 Illinois Dept. of L.E.
 3700 East Lakeshore Dr.
 Springfield, Illinois 62707
 217/ 786-6902

IndianaIowa

Phil Pitzen, Jr.
 Training Officer
 Iowa Dept. of Public Safety
 Wallace State Office Bldg.
 Des Moines, Iowa 50319
 515/ 281-8167

KansasKentucky

Major Dennis Goss
 Support Services
 Kentucky State Police
 New State Office Bldg.
 Frankfort, Kentucky 40601
 502/ 564-3000

Captain David Butler
 Commander
 Kentucky State Police Academy
 Frankfort, Kentucky 40601
 502/ 564-4973

Louisiana

Captain Jim Leboeuf
 Training Officer
 Louisiana State Police
 P.O. Box 66614
 Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70896
 504/ 925-6121

MaineMaryland

Major Henry A. Cumberland
 Field Operations Bureau
 Maryland State Police
 Pikesville, Maryland 21208
 301/ 486-3101 X 213

Major W.T. Travers, Jr.
 Legal Counsel Unit
 Maryland State Police
 Pikesville, Maryland 21208

Captain Edward V. Clark
 Training Director
 Maryland State Police
 Pikesville, Maryland 21208
 301/ 486-3101 X 240

MassachusettsMichigan

Captain George R. Gedda
Michigan State Police Academy
7426 Canal Road
Lansing, Michigan 48913
517/ 322-1200

Minnesota

Captain Roger Lenz
Director of Training
Minnesota State Patrol Academy
1900 County Road I
New Brighton, Minnesota 55112
612/ 636-4990

Mississippi

Kent McDaniel, Director
Mississippi Law Enforcement
Officers Training Academy
Route 6, Box 132
Pearl, Mississippi 39208
601/ 939-3943

Don Hill
Mississippi Law Enforcement
Officers Training Academy,
Route 6, Box 132
Pearl, Mississippi 39208
601/ 939-3943

Missouri

Captain Charles Whitehead
Training Director
Missouri State Patrol
P.O. Box 568
Jefferson City, Missouri 65102
314/ 751-3313

MontanaNebraska

Lieutenant John Thompson
Director of Training
Nebraska State Patrol
3510 N.W. 36th St.
Lincoln, Nebraska 68524
402/ 470-2404

NevadaNew HampshireNew JerseyNew Mexico

Captain Alex Quintana
Commander, Training Division
New Mexico State Police
P.O. Box 1628
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501
505/ 827-5104

New York

Major Dave F. Van Aken
Director of Training
New York State Police
State Campus
Albany, New York 12226

North Carolina

Captain Clay Fox
Director of Training
North Carolina Highway Patrol
P.O. Box 27687
Raleigh, North Carolina 27611
919/ 779-1704

NASPAD Roster
5North Dakota

Colonel Norm Evans
Superintendent
North Dakota Highway Patrol
Capitol Building
Bismarck, North Dakota 58505
701/ 224-2455

Major Jim Martin
Training Academy
North Dakota Highway Patrol
Capitol Building
Bismarck, North Dakota 58505
701/ 224-2420

Ohio

Major Ted Gentry
Training Director
Ohio State Highway Patrol
660 E. Main St.
Columbus, Ohio 43205
614/ 466-4896

Oklahoma

Al Newport, Director
Robt. R. Lester L.E. Training
Oklahoma Dept. of Public Safety
P.O. Box 11415
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73136
405/ 427-8341

Oregon

Lieutenant Robert R. Moine
Personnel Services Division
Dept. of State Police
Public Service Building
Salem, Oregon 97310

PennsylvaniaRhode Island

Sergeant John Moy
Training Officer
Rhode Island State Police
P.O. Box 185
North Scituate, R.I. 02857

South Carolina

Captain Leo McSwain
South Carolina Highway Patrol
P.O. Drawer 191
Columbia, South Carolina 29202
803/ 758-2602

South Dakota

Sergeant Keith Christensen
South Dakota Highway Patrol
118 West Capitol
Pierre, South Dakota 57501
606/ 773-3105

Major Jim Jones
Training Officer
South Dakota Highway Patrol
118 West Capitol
Pierre, South Dakota 57501
605/ 773-3105

Tennessee

NASPAD Roster
6

Texas

Captain Jim Taylor
Director of Training
Texas Dept. of Public Safety
P.O. Box 4087
Austin, Texas 78773
512/ 452-0331 X 3304

Tom Pfluger
Staff Development Specialist
Training Academy
Texas Dept. of Public Safety
P.O. Box 4087
Austin, Texas 78773
512/ 465-2000 X 3315

Utah

Vermont

Virginia

Captain Letcher Graham
Director of Training
Virginia State Police
P.O. Box 27472
Richmond, Virginia 23261
804/ 323-2040

Washington

Captain Austin "Al" Jerpe
Washington State Patrol Academy
Route 10, Box 490
Shelton, Washington 98584

West Virginia

Lt. Col. Jack R. Buckalew
West Virginia State Police
Headquarters Building
725 Jefferson Road
South Charleston, W. V. 25309

Captain George Young
W. V. State Police Academy
P.O. Box 307
Institute, W. V. 25112
304/ 348-3558

Wisconsin

Captain Richard Kildahl
Wisconsin State Patrol
Academy
Building 1256— Ft. McCoy
Sparta, Wisconsin 54656
608/ 388-2942

Wyoming

Captain Jim Michaelis
Safety and Training Officer
Wyoming Highway Patrol
Cheyenne, Wyoming 82001
307/ 777-7301

Canada

Commissioner Francios Volpe'
New Brunswick Police Commission
98 Prospect St. W.
Fredericton, New Brunswick
Canada E3B 2T8
506/ 453-2069

Inspector Mervyn Markell
Officer in Charge, Traffic
Section
Royal Canadian Mounted Police
"K" Division
P.O. Box 1320
Edmonton, Alberta
Canada T5J 2N1

APPENDIX C

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE DIRECTORS

OF LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING

MEMBERSHIP ROSTER ACTIVE

MEMBERS ASSOCIATE

MEMBERS

**NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE DIRECTORS
OF LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING**

President
William G. McMahon
Division of Criminal Justice
Services
Executive Park Tower
Stuyvesant Plaza
Albany, New York 12203
(518) 457-2666

First Vice-President
Larry B. Piott
Beira, Idaho

Second Vice-President
Gary F. Egan
Boston, Massachusetts

Executive Secretary
Stephen J. Mandra
Mass. Criminal Justice
Training Council
One Ashburton Place
Boston, Massachusetts 02108
(617) 727-7827

Treasurer
Kenneth Vanden Wymelenberg
Madison, Wisconsin

Immediate Past President
Darrell R. Carnes
Atlanta, Georgia

MEMBERSHIP ROSTER

ACTIVE MEMBERS

ALABAMA

James Jackson, Executive Secretary
Alabama Peace Officers Standards &
Training Commission
472 South Lawrence Street, Suite 202
Montgomery, Alabama 36104
(205) 832-6760

ALASKA

James F. Mayer, Executive Director
Alaska Police Standards Council
Pouch N
Juneau, Alaska 99811
(907) 465-4378

ARIZONA

Ralph T. Milstead, Director
Arizona Department of Public Safety
P.O. Box 6638
Phoenix, Arizona 85005
(602) 262-8011

ARKANSAS

Harold R. Zook, Deputy Director
Law Enforcement Standards and
Training
3703 West Roosevelt Road
Little Rock, Arkansas 72204
(501) 371-8129

CALIFORNIA

Norman C. Boehm, Executive Director
California Commission on Peace Officer
Standards and Training (P.O.S.T.)
7100 Bowling Drive, Suite 250
Sacramento, California 95823
(916) 445-4515

COLORADO

Colonel C. Wayne Keith, Superintendent
Colorado Law Enforcement Training
Academy
15000 Golden Road
Golden, Colorado 80401
(303) 279-2511 Ext. 236, 757-9401

CONNECTICUT

Richard M. Hannon, Executive Director
Connecticut Municipal Police Training
Council
Connecticut Police Academy
285 Preston Avenue
Meriden, Connecticut 06450
(203) 238-6505

DELAWARE

Captain James R. Spillan, Director
Delaware State Police
P.O. Box 430
Dover, Delaware 19901-0430
(302) 736-5903

Revised 10/81

NASDLET

FLORIDA

G. Patrick Gallagher, Director
 Florida Department of Law Enforcement
 Division of Criminal Justice Standards
 and Training
 Post Office Box 1489
 Tallahassee, Florida 32302
 (904) 488-8556

GEORGIA

Derrell R. Carnes, Executive Director
 Georgia Peace Officer Standards and
 Training Council
 4301 Memorial Drive, Suite 1
 Decatur, Georgia 30032
 (404) 656-6134

IDAHO

Larry Plott, Executive Director
 Peace Officers Standards and
 Training
 6113 Clinton Street
 Boise, Idaho 83704
 (208) 334-3623

ILLINOIS

Albert A. Apa, Executive Director
 Illinois Local Governmental Law
 Enforcement Officers Training
 Board
 Lincoln Tower Plaza, Suite 400
 524 South Second Street
 Springfield, Illinois 62706
 (217) 782-4540

INDIANA

Arthur R. Raney, Jr., Exec. Director
 Law Enforcement Training Board
 Indiana Law Enforcement Academy
 Post Office Box 313
 Plainfield, Indiana 46168-0313
 (317) 839-5191

IOWA

John F. Callaghan, Director
 Iowa Law Enforcement Academy
 P.O. Box 130, Camp Dodge
 Johnston, Iowa 50131
 (515) 278-9357

KANSAS

Maynard L. Brazeal, Director
 Kansas Law Enforcement Training Center
 P.O. Box 647
 Hutchinson, Kansas 67501
 (316) 662-3378

KENTUCKY

Robert K. Bird, Commissioner
 Kentucky Department of Justice
 Bureau of Training
 Stratton 354, ECU
 Richmond, Kentucky 40475
 (606) 622-2756

LOUISIANA

Elmer Litchfield, Executive Director
 Louisiana Commission on Law Enforcement
 Peace Officer Standards & Training
 Council
 1885 Wooddale Blvd., Room 610
 Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70806
 (504) 925-4942

MAINE

Maurice C. Harvey, Director
 Maine Criminal Justice Academy
 93 Silver Street
 Waterville, Maine 04901
 (207) 873-2651

MARYLAND

John A. Schuyler, Executive Director
 Maryland Police and Correctional
 Training Commissions
 3085 Hernwood Road
 Woodstock, Maryland 21163-1099
 (301) 442-2700

MASSACHUSETTS

Gary F. Egan, Executive Director
 Massachusetts Criminal Justice Training
 Council
 One Ashburton Place, Room 1310
 Boston, Massachusetts 02108
 (617) 727-7827

MICHIGAN

Leslie Van Beveren, Executive Secretary
Michigan Law Enforcement Officers Train-
Council
7426 N. Canal Road
Lansing, Michigan 48913
(517) 322-1946

MINNESOTA

Mark K. Shields, Executive Director
Minnesota Board of Peace Officers
Standards & Training
500 Metro Square Building
7th & Robert Streets
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101
(612) 296-2620

MISSISSIPPI

Mackey Hopkins, Director
Criminal Justice Planning
Watkins Building
510 George Street
Jackson, Mississippi 39201
(601) 354-6041

MISSOURI

Edward D. Daniel, Director
The Department of Public Safety
Post Office Box 749
Jefferson City, Missouri 65102-0749
(314) 751-4905

MONTANA

Clayton Bain, Executive Director
Montana Peace Officers Standards
and Training Advisory Council
303 N. Roberts
Helena, Montana 59620
(406) 449-3604

NEBRASKA

Garold M. Miller, Director
Nebraska Law Enforcement Training
Center
Rt. #3, Box 50
Grand Island, Nebraska 68801
(308) 381-5700

NEVADA

William V. Burgess, POST Coord
Department of Motor Vehicles/Peace
Officer Standards & Training
555 Wright Way
Carson City, Nevada 89711
(702) 985-3283

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Henry C. Bird, Director
New Hampshire Police Standards &
Training Council
15 Far Road
Concord, New Hampshire 03301
(603) 271-3493, 271-3354, 271-2781

NEW JERSEY

Leo A. Culloo, Executive Secretary
New Jersey Police Training Comm.
Richard J. Hughes Justice Complex
C.N. 085
Trenton, New Jersey 08625
(609) 984-4975

NEW MEXICO

Stephen L. Slater, Director
New Mexico Law Enforcement Academy
P.O. Box 2323
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87503
(505) 827-2877

NEW YORK

William G. McMahon, Deputy Comm.
New York State Division of Criminal
Justice Services
Bureau for Municipal Police
Executive Park Tower; Stuyvesant
Plaza
Albany, New York 12203
(518) 457-6101

NORTH CAROLINA

Justus C. Rudisill, Jr., Director
N.C. Department of Justice; Criminal
Justice Standards Division
Post Office Box 149
Raleigh, North Carolina 27602
(919) 733-2530

NORTH DAKOTA

Michael L. Hill, Director
Criminal Justice Training and
Statistics Division
Attorney General's Office
State Capitol
Bismarck, North Dakota 58505
(701) 224-2594

OHIO

Wilfred Goodwin, Executive Director
Attorney General, Ohio Peace Officer
Training Council
30 East Broad Street, Suite 2616
Columbus, Ohio 43215
(614) 466-3081

OKLAHOMA

Kermit O. Rayburn, Director
Council on Law Enforcement
Education and Training
P.O. Box 11476, Cimarron Station
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73111
(405) 521-3991 or 3992

OREGON

Paul Bettiol, Executive Director
Board on Police Standards and Training
325 13th Street NE, Suite 404
Salem, Oregon 97310
(503) 378-3674

PENNSYLVANIA

Leon D. Leiter, Director
Bureau of Training and Education
Pennsylvania State Police
State Police Academy
P.O. Box AA
Hershey, Pennsylvania 17033
(717) 533-9111

RHODE ISLAND

Raymond J. Shannon, Executive Director
Rhode Island Municipal Police Training
Academy
Community College of Rhode Island
Lincoln Campus
Lincoln, Rhode Island 02865
(401) 277-3753

SOUTH CAROLINA

Clifford A. Moyer, Executive Director
South Carolina Criminal Justice
Academy
5400 Broad River Road
Columbia, South Carolina 29210
(803) 758-6168

SOUTH DAKOTA

Thomas Fahey, Training Coordinator
Division of Criminal Investigation
3444 East Highway 34
Rol Kebach Criminal Justice Training
Center
Pierre, South Dakota 57501
(605) 773-4610

TENNESSEE

Herman L. Yeatman, Director
Tennessee Law Enforcement Training
Academy
P.O. Box 140229
Donelson, Tennessee 37214-0229
(615) 741-4448

TEXAS

Fred Toler, Executive Director
Texas Commission on Law Enforcement
Officer Standards and Education
1106 Clayton Lane, Suite 220-E
Austin, Texas 78723
(512) 459-1171

UTAH

Joe M. Borich, Director
Utah Peace Officer Standards &
Training
4525 South 2700 West
Salt Lake City, Utah 84119
(801) 965-4368 or 4099

VERMONT

Richard M. Gordon, Executive Dir.
Vermont Criminal Justice Training
Council
Vermont Police Academy
P.O. Box 38
Pittsford, Vermont 05763
(802) 483-6202

VIRGINIA

L. T. Eckenrode, Assistant Director
Criminal Justice Services Commission
Finance Building, Third Floor
Capitol Square
Richmond, Virginia 23219
(804) 786-2139

WASHINGTON

Garry E. Wegner, Assistant Director
Washington State Criminal Justice
Training Commission
Campus of St. Martin's College
Mail Stop PW-11
Olympia, Washington 98504
(206) 459-6342

WISCONSIN

Kenneth A. Vanden Wymelenberg, Director
Training & Standards Bureau
Wisconsin Department of Justice
P.O. Box 7857
Madison, Wisconsin 53707-7857
(608) 266-7780; (608) 266-8800

WYOMING

Ernest L. Johnson, Director
Wyoming Law Enforcement Academy
Box 1020
Douglas, Wyoming 82633
(307) 358-3617

FBI - NASDLET LIAISON

Special Agent Larry Monroe
FBI Academy
Quantico, Virginia 22135
(703) 640-6131

RAILROAD POLICE NASDLET LIAISON

Carl R. Ball, Chief Special Agent
Atchinson, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway
80 East Jackson Blvd.
Chicago, Illinois 60604
(312) 347-2907



NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE DIRECTORS OF LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING

President
 William G. McMahon
 Division of Criminal Justice
 Services
 Executive Park Tower
 Stuyvesant Plaza
 Albany, New York 12203
 (518) 457-2666

First Vice-President
 Larry B. Platt
 Boise, Idaho

Second Vice-President
 Gary F. Egan
 Boston, Massachusetts

ALABAMA

ALASKA

ARIZONA

Donald L. Skousen, Chairman
 Arizona Law Enforcement Officer
 Advisory Council
 P.O. Box 6638
 Phoenix, Arizona 85005
 (602) 262-8312

* Lt. Mel Risch, Business Manager
 Arizona Dept. of Public Safety
 P.O. Box 6638
 Phoenix, Arizona 85005
 (602) 262-8309

Charles R. Serino, Sergeant
 Field Representative Supervisor
 Arizona Dept. of Public Safety
 P.O. Box 6638
 Phoenix, Arizona 85005
 (602) 262-8309

Mike Townsend, Sergeant
 Bid-Program Coordinator
 Phoenix Police Department
 P.O. Box 6638
 Phoenix, Arizona 85005
 (602) 262-8312

MEMBERSHIP ROSTER

ASSOCIATE MEMBERS

Executive Secretary
 Stephen J. Mendra
 Mass. Criminal Justice
 Training Council
 One Ashburton Place
 Boston, Massachusetts 02108
 (617) 727-7827

Treasurer
 Kenneth Vanden Wymelenberg
 Madison, Wisconsin

Immediate Past President
 Derrell R. Carnes
 Atlanta, Georgia

Major E. R. Johnson, Trng. Div. Commander
 Arizona Dept. of Public Safety
 P.O. Box 6638
 Phoenix, Arizona 85005
 (602) 262-8311

ARKANSAS

Walter F. Simpson, Chief of Police
 Little Rock Police Department
 700 West Markham Street
 Little Rock, Arkansas 72002
 (501) 371-4261

CALIFORNIA

David Y. Allan, Assistant Director
 Legal Information Center
 Office of the Attorney General
 555 Capitol Mall, Suite 290
 Sacramento, California 94550
 (916) 323-5052

Gerald Townsend
 1263 Norwood Place
 Livermore, California 94550
 (415) 447-2878

COLORADO

Captain James A. Yarrington, Director
 Colorado Law Enforcement Training Academy
 1500 Golden Road
 Golden, Colorado 80401
 (303) 279-2511 Ext. 236

CONNECTICUT

DELAWARE

Revised 10/81

NASDLET

* Active Member Designee

Thomas J. Jurkanin, Police Training
Specialist
Illinois Local Governmental Law
Enforcement Officers Training
Board
Lincoln Tower Plaza - Suite 400
524 South 2nd Street
Springfield, Illinois 62706
(217) 782-4540

INDIANA

Frank B. Roberts, Director of Training
Charles C. Burch, Program Director
David W. Wantz, Training Director
Planning & Research
Law Enforcement Training Board
Indiana Law Enforcement Academy
Post Office Box 313
Plainfield, Indiana 46168-0313
(317) 839-5191

IOWA

Ben K. Yarrington, Assistant Director
Iowa Law Enforcement Academy
P.O. Box 130 (Camp Dodge)
Johnston, Iowa 50131
(515) 278-9357

KANSAS

KENTUCKY

William R. Edmundson, Director
Training Programs Division
Bureau of Training
Kentucky Department of Justice
Stratton 354 EKU
Richmond, Kentucky 40475
(606) 622-1328

LOUISIANA

Mickey Phillips, POST Training Coordinator
LA Commission on Law Enforcement
1885 Wooddale Blvd., Room 610
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70608
(504) 925-4942

MAINE

Steven R. Gioretti
In-Service Training Supervisor
Maine Criminal Justice Academy
93 Silver Street
Waterville, Maine 04901
(207) 873-2651

David Giampetruzzi
Basic Police Training Supervisor
Maine Criminal Justice Academy
93 Silver Street
Waterville Maine 04901
(207) 873-2651

MARYLAND

William E. O'Hara
Assistant Exec. Dir. for Certification
Maryland Police & Correctional
Training Commissions
3085 Hernwood Road
Woodstock, Maryland 21163-1099
(301) 442-2700

Vacant - to be filled
Assistant Exec. Dir. for Training
Maryland Police & Correctional
Training Commissions
3085 Hernwood Road
Woodstock, Maryland 21163-1099
(301) 442-2700

MASSACHUSETTS

Stephen J. Mandra, Executive Secretary
James M. Canty, Asst. to Exec. Director
Susan Donnelly, Admin. Unit Head
Judith A. Panora, Dir. In-Service/
Spec. Training
Thomas J. Chuda, Director, Crime Prevention
Brian J. Daley, Assoc. Planner
William M. Deyermond, Program Director
Harold E. Ameral, Asst. Prog. Director
William T. Hogan, III, Trng. Coordinator
Gerard F. Malone, Trng. Coordinator
Barbara A. McLelland, Trng. Coordinator
Robert S. Melesciuc, Trng. Coordinator
John Quirke, Trng. Coordinator
Karen Creedon, Staff Assistant
Charles Ahern
Arthur A. Montuori, Academy Director
Massachusetts Criminal Justice Training
Council
One Ashburton Place, Room 1310
Boston, Massachusetts 02108
(617) 727-7827

MICHIGAN

Patrick Judge, Chief
 Employment Standards Section
 Michigan Law Enforcement Officers
 Training Council
 7426 N. Canal Road
 Lansing, Michigan 48913
 (517) 322-1946

MINNESOTA

Richard W. Setter, Chief of Police
 St. Louis Park Police Department
 5005 Minnetonka Blvd.
 St. Louis Park, Minnesota 55416
 (612) 920-3000, Ext. 59

William R. Carter, III, Stands. Coord.
 Minnesota Board of Peace Officer
 Standards & Training
 500 Metro Square Building
 7th & Robert Streets
 St. Paul, Minnesota 55101
 (612) 296-4401

Phillip L. Davis
 Continuing Education Coordinator
 Minnesota Board of Peace Officer
 Standards & Training
 500 Metro Square Building
 7th & Robert Streets
 St. Paul, Minnesota 55101
 (612) 297-2356

Dale W. Dysinger, Evaluator
 Minnesota Board of Peace Officer
 Standards & Training
 500 Metro Square Building
 7th & Robert Streets
 St. Paul, Minnesota 55101
 (612) 296-7545

MISSISSIPPI

Kent McDaniel, Director
 Mississippi Law Enforcement Officers
 Training Academy
 Route 6, Box 132
 Pearl, Mississippi 39208
 (601) 939-3943

MISSOURI

*L. June Baker, Program Assistant
 Peace Officer Standards and Training Program
 The Department of Public Safety
 Post Office Box 749
 Jefferson City, Missouri 65102-0749
 (314) 751-4905

Larry Brockelsby
 c/o University of Missouri
 Columbia, Missouri 65211
 (314) 882-6021

MONTANA

Clark Price, Chief
 Montana Law Enforcement Academy
 620 South 16th Avenue
 Bozeman, Montana 59715
 (406) 994-3918

NEBRASKA

Robert L. Harness, Deputy Director
 of Training
 Edward F. Clinchard, Deputy Director
 of Administration
 NE Law Enforcement Training Center
 Rt. #3, Box 50
 Grand Island, Nebraska 68801
 (308) 381-5700

NEVADA

Larry D. Baker, Training Officer
 Department of Motor Vehicles/Peace
 Officer Standards & Training
 430 Jeanell Drive
 Carson City, Nevada 89710
 (702) 885-4404

NEW HAMPSHIRE

David H. Bastian
 Chief Field Representative
 New Hampshire Police Standards
 and Training Council
 15 Fan Road
 Concord, New Hampshire 03301
 (603) 271-3493, 271-3354, 271-2781

NEW JERSEY

Geri Schaeffer, Chief, Training Services
 New Jersey Police Training Commission
 Richard J. Hughes Justice Complex
 C.N. 085
 Trenton, New Jersey 08625
 (609) 984-4975

NEW MEXICO

Frank A. Mulholland, Deputy Director
 New Mexico Law Enforcement Academy
 P.O. Box 2323
 Santa Fe, New Mexico 87503
 (505) 827-2877

Lt. Ben Sanchez, Training Director
Farmington Police Department
P.O. Box 50
Farmington, New Mexico 87401

NEW YORK

Joseph A. McGraw, Supervisor of
Police Training
New York State Division of Criminal
Justice Services, Bureau for
Municipal Police
Executive Park Tower; Stuyvesant Plaza
Albany, New York 12203
(518) 457-6101

Frederick W. Smith, Jr.
Supervisor of Police Administrative
Services
New York State Division of Criminal
Justice Services, Bureau for
Municipal Police
Executive Park Tower; Stuyvesant Plaza
Albany, New York 12203
(518) 457-6101

*William M. Mohr, Associate Training
Technician
New York State Division of Criminal
Justice Services, Bureau for
Municipal Police
Executive Park Tower; Stuyvesant Plaza
Albany, New York 12203
(518) 457-6101

NORTH CAROLINA

*Raymond A. Giezma, Deputy Director
NC Department of Justice
Criminal Justice Standards Division
Post Office Box 149
Raleigh, North Carolina 27602
(919) 733-2530

Perry Powell, Director
NC Justice Academy
P.O. Drawer 99
Salemburg, North Carolina 28385
(919) 525-4151

NORTH DAKOTA

Richard R. Tessier, Training Coordinator
CJ Training and Statistics Division
Attorney General's Office, State Capitol
Bismarck, North Dakota 58505
(701) 224-2594

John E. Jacobson, Asst. Attorney General
Attorney General's Office
State Capitol
Bismarck, North Dakota 58501
(701) 224-3404

OHIO

R.T. Tyson, Assistant Executive Director
Attorney General, Ohio Peace Officer
Training Council
P.O. Box 309, State Route 56
London, Ohio 43140
(614) 466-7771

John Borgia, Chairman
Attorney General, Ohio Peace Officer
Training Council
Huron County Courthouse
Norwalk, Ohio 44857
(419) 663-2828

Howard Silver, Asst. Attorney General
Attorney General of Ohio
P.O. Box 365
London, Ohio 43140
(614) 466-8767

OKLAHOMA

Dan Johnson, Assistant Director
Council on Law Enforcement
Education & Training
P.O. Box 11476, Cimarron Station
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73111
(405) 521-3991 or 3992

OREGON

Karel Hyer, Chief, Academy Programs
Board on Police Standards and Training
325 13th Street, NE, Suite 404
Salem, Oregon 97310
(503) 378-3674

C. Jerry McNew, Chief, Standards
and Certification
Board on Police Standards and
Training
325 13th Street, NE, Suite 404
Salem, Oregon 97310
(503) 378-3674

FLORIDA

Reuben M. Greenberg, Deputy Director
 Florida Department of Law Enforcement
 Division of Criminal Justice
 Standards and Training
 Post Office Box 1489
 Tallahassee, Florida 32302
 (904) 488-8556

William S. Westfall, Bureau Chief
 Standards Bureau
 Florida Department of Law Enforcement
 Division of Criminal Justice
 Standards and Training
 Post Office Box 1489
 Tallahassee, Florida 32302
 (904) 488-8556

Daryl G. McLaughlin, Bureau Chief
 Training Bureau
 Florida Department of Law Enforcement
 Post Office Box 1489
 Tallahassee, Florida 32302
 (904) 488-8556

James S. Trunzo
 Florida Department of Law Enforcement
 Post Office Box 1489
 Tallahassee, Florida 32302
 (904) 488-8556

GEORGIA

Henry S. Pinvan, Assistant Administrator
 Criminal Justice Coordinating Council
 7 Martin Luther King Drive, S.W.
 Suite 145
 Atlanta, Georgia 30334
 (404) 656-1721

Robert L. Lowe, Jr., Assistant to the
 Executive Director
 Georgia Peace Officer Standards and
 Training Council
 4301 Memorial Drive, Suite 1
 Decatur, Georgia 30032
 (404) 656-6134

Richard Harper
 Robert S. Sanderson, III
 Steve Bowers
 Richard Guerreiro
 Jacquelyn H. Barrett
 David N. Rannefeld
 Georgia Peace Officer Standards and
 Training Council
 4301 Memorial Drive, Suite 1
 Decatur, Georgia 30032
 (404) 656-6134

Bob Awtrey
 Georgia Police Academy
 P.O. Box 1456
 Atlanta, Georgia 30371-2302

Ed Byers
 ABAC Regional Police Academy
 Tifton, Georgia 31794
 (912) 386-3257

Wayne E. Welch
 Coastal Georgia Police Academy
 4141 Norwich Street
 Brunswick, Georgia 31520

Dale Mann
 Albany Regional Police Academy
 P.O. Box 447
 Albany, Georgia 31702

Major Louis Graham
 Fulton County Police Department
 183 Central Avenue, S.W.
 Atlanta, Georgia 30303
 (404) 572-3211

IDAHO

Bob Gholson, Training Coordinator
 Peace Officer Standards and Training
 6113 Clinton Street
 Boise, Idaho 87304
 (208) 377-9247

ILLINOIS

Terrance Tranquilli, Asst. Director
 Illinois Local Governmental Law
 Enforcement Officers Training
 Board
 Lincoln Tower Plaza - Suite 400
 524 South 2nd Street
 Springfield, Illinois 62706
 (217) 782-4540

Charles P. Runkel, Admin. Assistant
 Illinois Local Governmental Law
 Enforcement Officers Training
 Board
 Lincoln Tower Plaza - Suite 400
 524 South 2nd Street
 Springfield, Illinois 62706
 (217) 782-4540

Leonard Skinner, Chief
 Research and Management
 Board on Police Standards and
 Training

325 13th St., NE, Suite 404
 Salem, Oregon 97310
 (503) 378-3674

Don Webb, Lead Coordinator
 Board on Police Standards
 and Training
 550 North Monmouth Ave.
 Monmouth, Oregon 97361
 (503) 378-2100

Bill Bell, Chief, Regional Training
 Board on Police Standards and
 Training

325 13 th St., NE, Suite 404
 Salem, Oregon 97310
 (505) 378-3674

PENNSYLVANIA

* Robert A. Nardi, Administrative Office
 Pennsylvania State Police
 Municipal Police Officer's Education
 & Training Commission
 State Police Academy
 P.O. Box AA
 Hershey, Pennsylvania 17033
 (717) 533-5959

John R. Dallusky, Captain
 Pennsylvania State Police
 State Police Academy
 P.O. Box AA
 Hershey, Pennsylvania 17033
 (717) 533-9111

Robert E. McElroy, Lieutenant
 Pennsylvania State Police
 State Police Academy
 P.O. Box AA
 Hershey, Pennsylvania 17033
 (717) 533-9111

Daniel J. Latorre, Accountant
 Pennsylvania Budget Office
 Municipal Police Officer's Education
 & Training Commission
 Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17033
 (717) 783-5540

RHODE ISLAND

SOUTH CAROLINA

* William R. Dixon, Deputy Director
 South Carolina Criminal Justice
 Academy
 5400 Broad River Road
 Columbia, South Carolina 29210
 (803) 758-6168

William E. Jones, Director of Training
 South Carolina Criminal Justice Academy
 5400 Broad River Road
 Columbia, South Carolina 29210
 (803) 758-6168

SOUTH DAKOTA

Andy B. Comer, Field Training Coordinator
 Division of Criminal Investigation
 3444 East Highway 34
 Rol Kebach Criminal Justice Training
 Center
 Pierre, South Dakota 57501
 (605) 773-4613

TENNESSEE

TEXAS

Jack L. Ryle, Director of Certification
 Texas Commission on Law Enforcement
 Officer Standards and Education
 1106 Clayton Lane, Suite 220-E
 Austin, Texas 78723
 (512) 459-1171

James C. Fann, Director of Training
 Texas Commission on Law Enforcement
 Officer Standards and Education
 1106 Clayton Lane, Suite 220-E
 Austin, Texas 78723
 (512) 459-1171

O. Dale Williams, Director of Training
 Texas Commission on Law Enforcement
 1106 Clayton Lane, Suite 220-E
 Austin, Texas 78723
 (512) 459-1171

Wordie W. Burrow, Director of Career
Education
Texas Commission on Law Enforcement
Officer Standards and Education
1106 Clayton Lane, Suite 220-E
Austin, Texas 78723
(512) 459-1171

WYOMING

UTAH

Carl Berensen, Assistant Director
Utah Peace Officer Standards &
Training
4525 South 2700 West
Salt Lake City, Utah 84119
(801) 965-4369

VERMONT

Thomas H. Rotella, Training Assistant
Vermont Criminal Justice Training
Council
Vermont Police Academy
P.O. Box 38
Pittsford, Vermont 05763
(802) 483-6202

VIRGINIA

R. H. Geisen, Executive Director
Criminal Justice Services Commission
Finance Building, Third Floor
Capitol Square
Richmond, Virginia 23219
(804) 786-2139

WASHINGTON

James C. Scott, Executive Director
Washington State Criminal Justice
Training Commission
Campus of St. Martin's College
Mail Stop PW-11
Olympia, Washington 98504
(206) 459-6342

WISCONSIN

Dennis E. Hanson, Assistant Director
Training & Standards Bureau
Wisconsin Department of Justice
P.O. Box 7857
Madison, Wisconsin 53707-7857
(608) 266-7780, 266-8800

APPENDIX D

COMMENTS BY RESPONDENTS

Regarding the Benefits of College Education to Police Personnel:

1. "Although distinct relationships between higher education and job performance have not yet been established via research, an officer's willingness to seek educational opportunities provides insight into the officer's motivation and career development potential."
2. "I believe education will help any individual. However, every individual being different requires judgement be made on performance; usually the advanced individual (individual with advanced education) will make a better showing, but not always."
3. "I think a distinction should be made between police training and education. A college degree, at any level, is not necessarily a good standard upon which to judge the capabilities of an individual."
4. "At present, a person who has some college or a degree is more valuable, not because of what was taught, but because of the type of person he may be in terms of initiative."
5. "I feel common sense, in most cases, is more desirable than education. I'm not anti-education, but I feel it should be placed in proper perspective. People capable of doing an excellent job should not be penalized because they lack a degree."
6. "If law enforcement is to become a profession and keep pace with our society on an economic and social scale - if police misconduct is to be reduced, we must increase the number of college educated people in law enforcement."
7. "Education is very important, but so are many other things. Education should be considered only as one of the desirable attributes. Also, the degree should be job related."
8. "There is no question in my mind about the value of college education for law enforcement personnel. However, I recognize that in small departments (1-20 personnel) it is probably of little value, and in some cases may be counterproductive if required at the entrance level. As a training administrator, I can say that those with degrees can usually be more effectively and efficiently trained."
9. "A college education is beneficial to the individual. It is not necessarily beneficial to a police agency. Loyalty, dedication, esprit de corps, and common sense are beneficial to both the individual and the agency."
10. "My responses are of questionable validity. I am torn between utopia and practically. I have taken a middle-of-the-road position in responding to some areas in the questionnaire, based on what communities and law enforcement are ready to accept. In other areas, I have been more idealistic. It is most difficult to apply the same statement to a large metropolitan department and a rural one-man department."

11. "I am definitely in favor of encouraging education and feel that officers with college education, generally speaking, are more professional."
12. "Education is important."
13. "I believe that depends on the agency and the individual's rank and/or responsibility."
14. "I think education, to the baccalaureate level, can be advantageous provided the person is a very qualified applicant. The key is to get the right type of person for law enforcement."
15. "College educated officers are needed to deal with changing society."
16. "College education is not very beneficial to police personnel in the performance of their duties. As a former full time instructor at a state university, I am appalled that some graduates of four year programs don't have practical knowledge regarding the system."
17. "College education must be considered very beneficial, 'if we are ever to reach that illusive pinnacle called 'professionalism' because academic preparation is one of the three cornerstones upon which every professional society rests."

Regarding Applicants for Entry into the Police Service:

1. "Some college education should be required, "would be desirable, but that would be tantamount to trying to run before learning to walk; therefore, (applicant with some college should be preferred over an applicant with no college education) is the logical choice as a reasonable and practical step toward professionalization."

Regarding a Minimum Education Level as an Entrance Requirement for the Police Service:

1. "Ultimately, I feel a minimum of a baccalaureate degree should be required. However, the profession (climate) is not ready for it; in many areas."
2. "College requirements for entrance into the police service usually restricts the number of qualified applicants. For many organizations, this would severely hinder recruitment efforts."
3. "College education should not be required for entry-level personnel, until such time as criminal justice is uniformly recognized in all states as an identified discipline with a well established academic program."

4. "A recent job-related, entry-level test developed in our department, indicates that educational requirements are discriminatory. College or degrees do not guarantee success. Selection should be based on ability and job-related testing. Let college education and background information fall where they may in the selection process."
5. Requiring a baccalaureate degree "would be the optimum choice. However, practicality dictates (a minimum number of college credit hours such as an associates degree or its equivalent in hours, with the provision that the applicant complete the requirements for a baccalaureate degree within a specified period of time should be established) even then it is a forgone reality that it is not realistically enforceable in the smaller departments."

Regarding the Method of Establishing Educational Standards for Police:

1. "Since the various states are so autocratic and individualistic that they cannot be counted upon to agree on such mundane matters as which side of the road to drive, (Standards should be established by each state's statutory body representing NASDLET) becomes the only logical choice if the second cornerstone of professionalism is to be established."

Regarding Higher Education Curriculum for Criminal Justice/Law Enforcement Programs:

1. "My primary concern is that prospective law enforcement officers be directed into liberal arts programs and dissuaded from pursuing criminal justice and police science programs, which in my opinion, are highly questionable both from an academic and vocational viewpoint."
2. "Community college law enforcement/criminal justice programs include too many 'how to' courses, e.g., criminal investigation, traffic enforcement, etc. These topics are more appropriate for a police academy. Given the obvious deficiencies of our recruit officer's, more college time (perhaps a core curriculum) should be required in basic communication skills, psychology, government, etc. (The children of the television age cannot read or write)."
3. "Criminal justice majors are a dime-a-dozen. Give me a sociology personnel, business, or education major. I would prefer to have an expert rather than an eclectic."
4. "Behavioral sciences should be advocated or mandated."
5. "Police work requires multidiscipline skills. The human relations area is the area that is probably most aided by exposure to college level work, along with the environment of the college campus."

6. "Criminal justice program curriculum should include: higher mathematics, business topics, and concentrate on communications skills."
7. "A well balanced wedding of criminal justice operational subjects and general academic curriculum would act to both prepare the officer for duty and provide a solid foundation to support future growth."

Regarding the Awarding of College Credit for Police Training:

1. Credit should be awarded for police training courses only after review, by the accrediting institution of course content, contact hours devoted to the course, methods of instruction, lesson plan, etc., and instructors qualifications - "Knowledgeable and competent instructors need not necessarily be faculty members of the accrediting institution. Quite to the contrary, those who have exposure through experience, and who are good instructors, are better equipped than those who have only the academic background. Ideally the student officer benefits most from a balanced exposure to both."

Regarding Faculty Qualifications for Criminal Justice Programs:

1. "Criminal justice/law enforcement experience should be required along with degree requirements."
2. "The ability to teach well should be more important than an advanced degree."
3. Substitution of criminal justice experience for degree requirements, "above the baccalaureate degree level, is an acceptable practice."
4. "Law enforcement experience is very important when they are instructing related courses."
5. "In some cases it (substitution of criminal justice experience for degree requirements) is preferred. Some institutions have persons teach specific skills because they hold a degree, even though they are totally inexperienced in the task/skill, e.g., fingerprinting."
6. "Some flexibility is needed to allow for provisional teaching without an advanced degree."
7. "It depends on the subject matter. Law enforcement experience is more important for a police operations course, but a course in mental retardation requires an instructor with graduate training."
8. "A criminal justice program should be taught by persons who are subject matter experts as a result of initiative, experience, training, and education; and who have been taught to teach. Unfortunately, most faculty members have no idea how to make learning happen."

9. "A combination of a baccalaureate degree and criminal justice experience should be required."
10. "I do not believe a degree is necessarily a concrete prerequisite to faculty status. Degrees, regardless of level, are not dependable indicators of instructional competence."

Regarding Governmental Funding to Assist Criminal Justice Students:

1. "Why governmental?"
2. "The demands of the law enforcement occupation compel the attraction of the most able and competent raw material. In contradiction, salaries and fringe benefits are notoriously insufficient to provide inducement to career seekers. (A system for government-guaranteed loans should be provided for criminal justice students, with a requirement that the student repay the loan) would offer an additional incentive without creating a government give-away program."

Regarding Education Requirements for Promotion:

1. The education level of a candidate for promotion should not be a consideration. "I feel that certain training should be successfully completed before someone is promoted."
2. "I believe education should be considered, but I don't believe college education should be required."
3. "If education has been of any value to the officer, it should show up in his/her day-to-day work and ability to do the job."
4. A college degree should be considered in promotion selection "only if the person's performance is increased by the degree."
5. "Promotion consideration should be based on an evaluation of the use an officer makes of his education; as regards his job proficiency and worth to the agency."
6. "Experience should be considered along with education."
7. "A better education should place the officer in a good position on the promotion list because of better job performance."
8. "Education in and of itself should not be used as criteria by which job proficiency or promotability is judged. Judgements regarding aptitude for police work and promotability should be made on the basis of job-related abilities, knowledge, and skills."
9. Salary increases for college education should be "only to the extent the college education is proven beneficial."

10. "Education incentive pay programs should also include provisions for experience."
11. "A combination of education, experience, and training should qualify an officer for a yearly bonus, but not salary increases."
12. "An escalating salary should be provided for obtaining Basic, Intermediate, and Advanced Certificates."
13. An escalating salary should be established based on the number of college credit hours through the graduate degree level. "This type of incentive is sorely needed to encourage law enforcement personnel to broaden educational horizons. If properly funded, it would also serve to retain personnel upon completion of degree programs."

General Comments Regarding College Education and Law Enforcement:

1. "A college degree in criminal justice or any other discipline should not be regarded as entry-level police training. Universities and colleges cannot instill self-discipline practical application or other accepted training needs. While continuing education does broaden one's knowledge, it does not develop or expand skills."
2. "Eighty percent of officers decertified in (name of state) have only high school diplomas or GED certificates. They represent 60 percent of (name of state) law enforcement population. Meaning? I'm not sure of full impact. This state has incentive pay for all local and state officers, including correctional officers: \$80 per month for a B.A. and \$30 monthly for an A.A., \$20 for each 80 hours (apparently above those levels), if approved by management."
3. "A police program should encompass both education and training. Topical divisions would entail specific orientation to learning theory, knowledge, skills and attitudes."
4. "Some of the issues addressed in the survey do not have applicability to the peace officer training program in (name of state)."
5. "The college education issue will become important when two things occur: A. When there is incentive in terms of salary and benefits on the job that justify the work and expense of obtaining a degree, and B. When criminal justice programs provide both theory and useful skills as other programs do."
6. "While I question the need for required college education for 'street level' officers, there are many specialist areas; and certainly all management levels that can benefit from college education. A comprehensive study, based on job requirements (tasks) can identify education/training needs."

7. Special consideration should be given for education "only to the extent that the education is proven beneficial. Some officers are self-educated and perform well without a college degree."

2
VITA

Al Newport

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: ATTITUDES AND OPINIONS OF POLICE TRAINING DIRECTORS
REGARDING HIGHER EDUCATION FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT
PERSONNEL

Major Field: Occupational and Adult Education

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Cleveland, Oklahoma, January 30, 1932, the son of Alvin and Viola Newport.

Education: Graduated from Fairfax High School, Fairfax, Oklahoma in May, 1950; recieved a Bachelor of Science degree from Oklahoma City University in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma in December, 1980; completed requirements for the Master of Science degree, with a major in Occupational and Adult Education, at Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, in July, 1982.

Professional Experience: Commissioned as a Trooper in the Oklahoma Department of Public Safety, Division of Highway Patrol in August, 1960; promoted to Second Lieutenant (field supervisor) in January, 1967; promoted to First Lieutenant (district commander) in March, 1971; promoted to Captain (zone commander) in September, 1973; reassigned as administrative assistant to the Chief in January, 1974; promoted to Lieutenant Colonel (assistant chief) in September 1975; retired from Highway Patrol division in August, 1979, to accept current position as Director of Robert R. Lester Law Enforcement Training Center of the Oklahoma Department of Public Safety.

Professional Organizations: International Association of Chiefs of Police, American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators, National Transportation Research Board-Traffic Law Enforcement Committee, and National Association of State Police Academy Directors.