

LAW ENFORCEMENT MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE

A STUDY OF TRAINING TRENDS IN  
LAW ENFORCEMENT:  
THE MATURING AND EDUCATION OF  
LAW ENFORCEMENT IN AMERICA  
1968 - 1991

A RESEARCH PAPER  
SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT  
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR  
MODULE III

SUBMITTED BY:  
JOHN A. CORBETT

HUTTO POLICE DEPARTMENT  
HUTTO, TEXAS  
OCTOBER, 1991

#46

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My thanks to the staff of the Law Enforcement Management Institute. I salute you for your desire to better law enforcement management in Texas. You are touching the future.

I would be remiss if I failed to acknowledge the memory of Mr. Adell Powell, who was for many years the Chief of Police in Bastrop, Texas. Chief Powell taught me "community-oriented policing" even before it was 'discovered'. Being a role model in the truest sense of the word, he taught me the love of being a **peace** officer and he gave me the desire to better myself. He believed in education.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|                           |    |
|---------------------------|----|
| ACKNOWLEDGMENTS . . . . . | i  |
| LIST OF TABLES . . . . .  | iv |
| ABSTRACT . . . . .        | v  |

### Chapter

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| 1. INTRODUCTION . . . . . | 1 |
|---------------------------|---|

Goals and Nature of the Study

|   |   |
|---|---|
| 2. A HISTORY OF LAW ENFORCEMENT EDUCATION . . . . . | 4 |
|---|---|

An Overview of the History of  
Law Enforcement in America

The law enforcement mind-set  
of the 1960's

The Omnibus Crime Bill and  
the Safe Streets Act

L.E.A.A./L.E.E.P.: A New Direction for  
Law Enforcement Education

|   |    |
|---|----|
| 3. EDUCATIONAL STANDARDS AND REQUIREMENTS . . . . . | 16 |
|---|----|

Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST)  
Agencies: A Comparison of Requirements

Standardized, Specialized, and  
Inservice Training

## TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

### Chapter

|   |    |
|---|----|
| 4. WHAT IS TO COME: THE FUTURE OF<br>LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING . . . . . | 27 |
|---|----|

A College Degree: Should it be Required  
for Employment?

|   |    |
|---|----|
| 5. SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . . | 33 |
|---|----|

### Appendix

|  |    |
|--|----|
| 1. ADDRESSES OF POST AGENCIES . . . . .                | 37 |
| 2. COPY OF QUESTIONNAIRE . . . . .                     | 43 |
| 3. COPY OF LETTER ACCOMPANYING QUESTIONNAIRE . . . . . | 46 |
| REFERENCE LIST . . . . .                               | 47 |
| SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .                        | 49 |

## LIST OF TABLES

| Table |  | Page |
|-------|--|------|
| 1.    | Years in Which Agencies were created . . . . .   | 19   |
| 2.    | A Comparison of Minimum Required Training Hours<br>for Basic Certification in the U.S. . . . . | 22   |

*To Tish and Sarah*

*Give instruction to a wise man, and he will be yet wiser:  
teach a just man and he will increase in learning.*

Proverbs 9:9

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

Education is generally defined as the act or process of educating, and the systematic development or training of the mind, capabilities or character through instruction or study. Education has long been viewed as the acquisition of knowledge or skills through training in a particular discipline. In the field of law enforcement, the education or training of officers has long been considered necessary.

This document reports the findings of research into the education of law enforcement personnel during the past fifteen years. Several times during the past fifteen years, the question of how much is enough has been the focus of research. Although views in this area conflict, there seems to be a common consensus that increased basic training requirements bring about officers which are better prepared to serve society.

#### Goals of the Study

The goal of this study was to explore the history of law enforcement education and training, to research the causative factors of change in this training, to compare basic training requirements in each state with requirements of the same state fifteen years ago, and to identify trends



in law enforcement training and education. Based on the trends identified in the paper, recommendations are made regarding anticipated changes in entry level requirements.

The recognition of needed training is directly reflected by the entry level requirements of various agencies. The agencies covering the broadest areas were found to be state POST (Police Officer Standard Training) regulatory agencies. Although these bear a number of titles, the function was found to be generally the same from state to state.

#### Nature of the Study

The research was accomplished using a two page questionnaire, which was mailed to each state law enforcement regulatory agency. A list of these agencies is included in the appendix section of this paper, along with a copy of the questionnaire. Of the fifty states contacted by mail, 18% (N = 9) failed to return the questionnaire, even though a second survey instrument was mailed. Additionally, 2% (N = 1) returned information which was not useable in this research.

In addition to the questionnaire, research of a number of previously published works brought this writer considerable insight into the thoughts of administrators of the sixties. Insight into the past can easily bring about insight, not only into the present, but into

the future as well. The law enforcement administrator who is content looking only at the present, fails to see the hazard in the road which lies just ahead. If the research contained herein helps to bring about meaningful insight into needed educational and training requirements, this effort will be rewarded.

## CHAPTER 2

### A HISTORY OF LAW ENFORCEMENT EDUCATION

"As times change and society becomes more complex, so do practices and procedures for police officers."<sup>1</sup> Since the time of Sir Robert Peel's Metropolitan Police Act, the emphasis of visionary law enforcement leaders has been on selection, education, and training. As our society has become more technologically advanced, an increasingly diverse socio-economic strata has emerged. Notably, the United States has been forced to deal with a widely diverse social structure since our founding. Accordingly, reform in law enforcement has followed closely the ever changing needs of that society. Society now demands that police officers be called upon daily to perform functions that just a few years ago were not considered a police responsibility. As society has demanded, law enforcement in America has been forced to evolve. This evolution has included basic training requirements.

#### An Overview of the History of Law Enforcement in America

It is commonly known that statutory law in America is based generally on British common law, which is in turn based on the Mosaic law of Biblical history. As the U.S. became independent of Britain, colonial law enforcement

retained three legacies of the British system. These legacies have become an integral part of contemporary policing in the United States. First, the idea of local policing as opposed to a national or central police force was used. As ex-Britons, the idea of a national police force probably never occurred to our founding fathers. As the United States became independent, the idea that political power could be divided became the basis of our government as this "republicanism" began the frame work which would develop later. Finally, colonial law enforcement retained another British development; crime prevention.<sup>2</sup> In 1750, Henry Fielding, a noted British novelist, considered to be the father of crime prevention, was named Bow Street Magistrate. He initiated a group of "thief-takers" called the Bow Street Runners. This was the first step toward a professional police force.

In 1829, Sir Robert Peel's Metropolitan Police Act brought about much needed reform in London, focusing on twelve tenets with much emphasis on recruitment, selection, and training of competent men. Unfortunately, more than 50 years would pass before these tenets would have notable effect on law enforcement in America. However, they would go on to become the very foundation of policing in America.

The civilian night watch continued in America from colonial times until the 1830's with little change. However, a few municipalities formed police forces which were usually

associated with a local problem areas. For example, New Haven, Connecticut, used a group of special constables centered at the iron works as early as 1668. Early municipal police forces were, and would continue to be for some time, very politically motivated and operated. The police officer was either elected or appointed to his position. This 'spoils system' would continue for many years and is, unfortunately, still in use in some areas.<sup>3</sup>

The only requirements to be a member of the night watch were that a citizen should be a responsible, good, and lawful man who had the honesty to execute the office without prejudice or favoritism and he should be able to understand what he ought to do. Further, the candidate should have "the ability as well as the substance to enable him to conduct himself with utility to the public".<sup>4</sup>

As police agencies were formed and became increasingly political, even these requirements were often set aside.

Until 1833, there continued to be no organized daytime police agencies in the United States. In that year, the first such agency was set up in Philadelphia when Stephen Girard willed to the city a large amount of money with instructions to establish a competent police force. As usual, this action was brought about due to crime, rioting, and violence, which was rampant, not only in Philadelphia but permeated all emerging American cities. Unfortunately, when the problems subsided, so did the daytime police force.

"When the urban violence subsided and the funds were exhausted, seemingly in unison, the force was disbanded."<sup>5</sup>

Between 1843 and 1845, New York restructured their various police forces along the lines of London's police, combining the daytime and night police, creating a Board of Police Commissioners, and began wearing of an eight pointed copper star for identification. Boston soon followed the example, along with numerous other cities across the nation.

The basic police system was set, although the organizational structure would continue to evolve. However, police agencies continued to overlook the most fundamental and needed reform - the need of competent, well-trained officers. Reform was spasmodic and broken, but continued in American law enforcement in spite of politics which continued to permeate the system. During this time, many changes were brought about by men of vision, such as Francis Tukey and Edward Savage, both of Boston. Tukey was the first to recognize the need for plain-clothes officers.<sup>6</sup> Savage initiated such reforms as increased officer pay, formal training, and instilling pride in the ranks.<sup>7</sup> Unfortunately, these leaders, like so many others, were often replaced for doing their jobs too well.

Throughout the history of law enforcement in the United States, politics and social unrest have continued to bring about changes, both good and bad. Training

requirements have continued to change in answer to social demands. Historically, reform in American law enforcement has been in response to social disorder and unrest, rapid influx of different cultures into a confined area (such as a developing urban area), political unrest, racial turmoil and changes in economics. "The pages of history are filled with accounts of urban upheaval, followed by citizen clamor for 'law and order', and corresponding attempts to upgrade the police."<sup>8</sup> Such moves toward reformation as the introduction of recruitment and selection requirements, decrease in political control, wearing of uniforms and badges as identification, and increases in formal training requirements have attempted to answer society's call for professional police service.

American law enforcement continued to change and evolve through the late 1800's and into the new century. Two notable administrators emerged during the early 1900's. August Vollmer assumed command of the Berkley, California Police Department and John Edgar Hoover was appointed to head the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Both leaders realized the value of high entry requirements, integrity, and education and training. The FBI under Hoover was one of the first agencies to require a college education at entry level. These men, being years ahead of their colleagues of the day, realized the importance of education, integrity and suitability. However, in spite of leaders

such as these, there continued to be instances of police corruption and scandal. Through these spasmodic movements, new entry requirements and personnel practices continued to emerge. When the 60's arrived, considerable change was brought about in a relatively short time.

#### The Law Enforcement Mind-Set of the 60's

The decade of the 1960's will always be remembered for its 'acid rock' music, rebellion of the youth against the 'establishment' (and all its representatives), increasingly open use of illicit drugs, student and race riots (such as the Watts riots in Los Angeles and Kent State University), and considerable increase in citizen dissatisfaction toward police intervention. Crime was rampant. The predominant attitude among police toward higher education was negative, often to the degree of ridiculing fellow officers who sought college degrees.

Law enforcement was facing changes in society of mammoth proportions. The tactics of only a few years prior were no longer being accepted by society and were no longer viable. America had reached puberty and was experiencing a change in attitudes and values such as had not been seen or imagined before. Before it was half through, the decade saw the rise and fall of 'Camelot', the escalation of an unpopular war, and civil unrest at a unprecedented level.<sup>9</sup>

In 1965, President Lyndon Johnson set up the



President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice "to conduct the most sweeping probing of crime and criminal justice since the Wickersham Commission."<sup>10</sup> The findings of this Commission were published in 1967, entitled Task Force Report: The Police, and covered more in a single volume than any such report previously done.

The findings challenged many long standing procedures, making such statements as:

"Fear of being accused of political interference and an awareness of the sensitive nature of the police task have often resulted in the mayor abdicating all responsibility for police operations by granting complete autonomy to his police department. Indeed, the mayors of several of the largest cities considering police autonomy to be a virtue, have campaigned for re-election on a platform stressing the independence which they have granted to their police agencies."

Early in American law enforcement, political dominance had brought about corruption. However, the autonomy had gone beyond reasonable accountability. The Commission report further states that in the past, police administrators had been chosen primarily based on their investigative skills, in lieu of their ability to handle administrative responsibility. Other findings reported by the Commission included very little minority recruiting, selection requirements which focused on physical attributes instead of intelligence or emotional suitability. In the area of training, the Commission findings concluded that active criminal justice personnel were not educated well enough to perform their duties satisfactorily, entry level

training was inadequate and inservice training was rare, little emphasis was placed on advanced education for policemen, especially board-based education, and lateral entry was discouraged because of the structural rigidity of personnel programs.<sup>12</sup>

Several recommendations were made, including the creation of minimum standards of training by each state, creation of career development programs, improvement of promotional practices, and an increase in salaries and improvement of benefit packages.

The government answered the Commission's recommendations by passing the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 with remarkable speed and foresight.

#### The Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act

The Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 would soon change the outlook of police toward higher education. This legislation provided for the creation of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) within the Department of Justice.<sup>13</sup> This agency had the responsibility of dispersing technical assistance and financial aid to cities and states which lacked the resources to fight crime. A massive amount of money was distributed for creation of programs and purchase of equipment. Another program created by the Omnibus Crime

Control and Safe Streets Acts was the Law Enforcement Education Program (LEEP), which was developed to provide financial aid to those students beginning or continuing a career in law enforcement.

#### LEAA / LEEP: A New Direction

With the inception of the LEAA and LEEP programs, large numbers of students entered collegiate criminal justice programs. However, several problems arose in the years immediately following the commencement of LEEP financial aid. Police agencies failed to recruit personnel with advanced education. Therefore, the shortage of personnel with collegiate education in law enforcement remained, which is precisely what LEEP was created to correct. In spite of this, a generation of police officers and administrators was created believing that higher education was indeed of great benefit to the average street officer. In 1972, there were 87,000 criminal justice students participating in programs in 990 colleges and universities.<sup>14</sup> Many of these students were already seasoned veterans of police service, which brought about another problem. As a result of the LEEP program, many agencies began to offer incentive pay for achievement of higher education, thereby increasing the number of college student which were police officers. This created the problem which was termed by Leonard Territo as

'bi-directional cultural shock', explained by Territo as:

"The police officer brought into the classroom a concern about a myriad of urban problems to which he wanted answers or at least some alternative solutions. The academician, on the other hand, was too frequently ill-prepared or not inclined to deviate or modify traditional lecture material, even in those courses which possessed the potential for addressing community problems. But part of it also stemmed from a complete lack of any real knowledge about the types of problems his law enforcement students encountered and the kinds of knowledge that they needed to function most effectively in their work."<sup>15</sup>

Subsequently, the law enforcement officers began to see collegiate criminal justice classes as not applying to them and their ability to perform assigned duties. While academicians felt that the goal of higher education should be geared toward "theoretical wisdom" which gives the individual officer the ability to understand social trends and their implications for criminal justice.<sup>16</sup>

The problem is easily understood. While members of the law enforcement community insist that educational curricula be job related and assist them with problem solving 'on the street', a strictly academic approach, focusing on theoretical or 'general' curricula, seems unable to consider the 'real life' problems of the police officer. It becomes obvious that neither end of this spectrum will best serve the criminal justice community.

"LEEP was a program to stimulate criminal justice personnel to attend college. In the case of the police, the brief was that better educated law enforcement officers would provide more responsive, more comprehensive, and more insightful police service. In the long term, as college educated officers rose

into police leadership positions, they would explore new approaches, with more creativity and better planning."

It seems the purpose of LEEP is being achieved, insofar as police officers which received education under the LEEP programs of the late 60's and early 70's are now becoming administrators. These administrators have come to realize the value of theoretical wisdom or 'liberal arts' education. By the mid-1970's, dramatic increases in the educational levels of personnel were found. College degrees became much more common among street officer in spite of prior problems. To say that LEAA and LEEP had an effect on law enforcement would be grossly understating the obvious.

Unfortunately, due to the number of problems, both the LEAA and the LEEP programs were disbanded during the mid-70's. However, the effect of the LEEP program continues to be felt in American law enforcement. A new direction of criminal justice programs has been realized since the days of LEEP.

In a short 200 years, American law enforcement had evolved from a civilian nightwatch, through its' infant years as political watchdogs, to the much more versatile structure it is today. Although, the problems of the past continue to rear their heads occasionally, the attitudes and education of police administrators has changed.

Educational and other entry level requirements have grown from simply being a honest male citizen to basic

requirements which recruit a much broader spectrum of applicants. Law enforcement in America is still on the move, evidenced by the number of facilities offering not only technical training, but also more liberal studies.

### CHAPTER 3

#### EDUCATIONAL STANDARDS AND REQUIREMENTS

Along with many others, one recommendation made by President Johnson's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice was that each state enact laws which set up minimum standards of training and eligibility. These training standards would hopefully help bring about the standardization of the profession. Each state responded by establishing regulatory agencies and certification programs to oversee basic entry level requirements for law enforcement officers. These agencies have continued to evolve and keep abreast of the ever changing needs of law enforcement. Many changes in basic requirements have been seen since 1968, beginning with a move away from brawn and hopefully toward better trained and more highly educated officers. Other changes include a move toward minority recruitment, moves toward specialty certification, and a major movement of police back to community policing, where an officer knows with whom he or she is dealing, instead of hiding in a mobile office.

Obviously, change has become the watchword in law enforcement during the past 15 years. "Cherished operational ideas were scrutinized by the revealing light

of scholarly research and evaluation. No concept, even the most revered historical notion, was safe from scrutiny by a nation looking for contemporary answers to nagging problems."<sup>18</sup> Such research as the Kansas City Preventive Patrol study, in which the effectiveness of high visibility patrol was brought into question. A standard operating procedure for many years, random patrol was thought to bring about an appearance of the police being everywhere (omnipresence). This thought proved to be, at least in Kansas City at that time, in error.

Other major research during this time period included the Kansas City Response Time Study and the RAND Study of Investigative Process. In San Diego, the Community Profiling Program, 1-2 Officer Patrol Experiment, and the FIR Experiments were conducted. These are only a very few of the many studies and research done since 1968.

The police community was rapidly moving away from the empiricism of the past. Reliance on past experience without the benefit of scientific research and study was being replaced in law enforcement. Law enforcement in the United States had moved out of its' childhood and had begun the journey toward adulthood. The confusion of the 1960's could be readily compared to a child's' adolescent years and the experiences found there. Law enforcement has by no means reached adulthood, but continues to move in that direction.



One of the many ways the maturity of law enforcement can be gauged is the basic entry requirements. A very large step in this direction was the creation of police officer standards and training (POST) agencies by each state legislature.

#### POST Agencies: A Comparison of Requirements

Table 1 shows that each state has seen the necessity of required minimum standards of training at a different time. While the standards of training nationwide have become more uniform, the number of required training hours has changed dramatically. A study of the subjects covered during basic training revealed (not surprisingly) that the general subject matter varies very little across the continental United States. This does not take into account the various state statutes and the required training having to do with those statutes.

Each state varies somewhat in the format of the regulatory agency. It was interesting to learn that the Commonwealth of Kentucky has no mandatory training requirements. However, a program has been set up there by which an officer electing to be part of the program can receive incentive pay for meeting certain training standards. The State of Hawaii has no state regulatory agency as such, but has been able to set up guidelines of training law enforcement officers employed there.

TABLE 1

Years in which state regulatory agencies/standardized training requirements were formed. Based on information from state agencies.<sup>19</sup> Dates in parenthesis show year in which training became mandatory.

|               |             |                |             |
|---------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|
| Alabama       | 1971        | Montana        | No Answer   |
| Alaska        | 1973        | Nebraska       | 1971        |
| Arizona       | 1969        | Nevada         | 1967        |
| Arkansas      | 1978        | New Hampshire  | 1971        |
| California    | 1959 (1964) | New Jersey     | 1962 (1965) |
| Colorado      | 1973        | New Mexico     | No Answer   |
| Connecticut   | 1965        | New York       | 1960        |
| Delaware      | 1970        | North Carolina | 1971        |
| Florida       | 1967        | North Dakota   | 1983        |
| Georgia       | 1970        | Ohio           | 1965        |
| Hawaii        | **N/A       | Oklahoma       | 1963 (1967) |
| Idaho         | No Answer   | Oregon         |             |
| Illinois      | 1965        | Pennsylvania   | 1974*       |
| Indiana       | 1967        | Rhode Island   | 1969*       |
| Iowa          | 1967        | South Carolina | 1972        |
| Kansas        | 1982        | South Dakota   | No Answer   |
| Kentucky      | **N/A       | Tennessee      | No Answer   |
| Louisiana     | No Answer   | Texas          | 1965 (1970) |
| Maine         | 1971        | Utah           | 1968        |
| Maryland      | 1966        | Vermont        | 1971 (1979) |
| Massachusetts | No Answer   | Virginia       | 1968 (1970) |
| Michigan      | 1965 (1966) | Washington     | No Answer   |
| Minnesota     | 1977        | West Virginia  | No Answer   |
| Mississippi   | 1981        | Wisconsin      | No Answer   |
| Missouri      | 1979        | Wyoming        | 1971 (1976) |

\* Indicates 'Municipal Officer Only' information.

\*\*Indicates states' lack of specific mandatory training.

It should be noted that about 5% of answering states had chosen to create mandatory training standards and necessary overseeing agencies prior to the publication of the Commission findings. The earliest, according to information given, was California in 1959, the most recent being North Dakota in 1983. A time-span of 24 years passed between the creation of the two

states agencies mentioned. During this time period, only the two states of Kentucky and Hawaii (of those answering the questionnaire) have chosen other means to fill training needs.

A review of learning objectives required for basic certification (or in basic academies) for most states revealed the use of most or all of the following:

- U.S. Constitutional law
- State law
- Patrol procedures
- Traffic enforcement
- Force and its use
- Note taking
- Report writing
- Arrest, search, and seizure
- Mechanics of arrest
- Roles and responsibilities
- Alcohol laws and their enforcement
- Drug laws and their enforcement
- Recognition and handling of mentally / emotionally disturbed persons
- Emergency medical care
- Criminal investigation
- Interviewing and interrogation
- Crime scene search
- Firearms proficiency and safety
- Traffic and crowd control
- Vehicle operation
- Accident investigation
- Civil law and process
- Case preparation
- Courtroom demeanor.

Although this list is not complete for all states answering the questionnaire, it does show a relatively universal training curriculum. Another interesting finding was the number of hours required by various states, both at present and in 1976, which was chosen as being 15 years from the present. After the publication of the President's

Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice findings (Task Force Report: The Police) in 1967, which recommended minimum standards, each state began moving toward more uniform training across the nation. The minimum number of training hours required for certification has changed greatly since 1976. In Table 2 a comparison is shown of minimum basic training hours at the time of the agency's creation, in 1976, and at present. It will be noted that, without exception, there has been no downward revision of minimum training standards.

These mandatory training hours show a move toward better trained basic officers. The percentage of change between hours required in 1976 and current minimum standards is also shown.

TABLE 2

A COMPARISON OF REQUIRED MINIMUM TRAINING HOURS FOR BASIC CERTIFICATION<sup>21</sup>

| State         | Year created | Original | 1976 | Present   | % Increase <sup>a</sup> |
|---------------|--------------|----------|------|-----------|-------------------------|
| Alabama       | 1971         | 240      | 240  | 280       | 17                      |
| Alaska        | 1973         |          | 270  | 270       | 0                       |
| Arizona       | 1969         | 200      |      |           |                         |
| Arkansas      | 1978         | 280      |      | 280       | 0                       |
| California    | 1959         |          | 560  | 560       | 0                       |
| Colorado      | 1973         |          | 160  |           |                         |
| Connecticut   | 1965         | 40       |      | 560       |                         |
| Delaware      | 1970         | 272      | 498  | 498       | 0                       |
| Florida       | 1967         | 200      | 320  | 520       | 63                      |
| Georgia       | 1970         | 116      | 240  | 240       | 0                       |
| Hawaii        | d            |          |      |           |                         |
| Idaho         | b            |          |      |           |                         |
| Illinois      | 1965         | 120      | 240  | 400       | 67                      |
| Indiana       | 1967         |          | 240  | 480       | 100                     |
| Iowa          | 1967         | 160      | 400  | 400       | 0                       |
| Kansas        | 1982         | 320      |      | 320       | 0                       |
| Kentucky      | d            |          |      |           |                         |
| Louisiana     | b            |          |      |           |                         |
| Maine         | 1971         |          |      |           |                         |
| Maryland      | 1966         | 160      |      | 400       |                         |
| Massachusetts | b            |          |      |           |                         |
| Michigan      | 1965         | 240      |      |           |                         |
| Minnesota     | 1977         | 320      |      | 320       | 0                       |
| Mississippi   | 1981         | 328      |      | 360       |                         |
| Missouri      | 1979         | 640      |      | 120-1,000 |                         |
| Montana       | b            |          |      |           |                         |
| Nebraska      | 1971         |          |      |           |                         |
| Nevada        | 1967         | 120      | 120  | 480       | 300                     |
| New Hampshire | 1971         | 80       | 80?  | 400       | 400                     |
| New Jersey    | 1965         | 185      | 280  |           |                         |

TABLE 2 (Continued)

| State                     | Year created | Original | 1976 | Present | % Increase <sup>a</sup> |
|---------------------------|--------------|----------|------|---------|-------------------------|
| New Mexico                | b            |          |      |         |                         |
| New York                  | 1960         | 80       | 285  | 445     | 56                      |
| North Carolina            | 1971         | 160      | 160  | 432     | 170                     |
| North Dakota              | 1983         |          |      | 600+    |                         |
| Ohio                      | 1965         | 120      | 120  | 450     | 275                     |
| Oklahoma                  | 1963         | 0        | 300  | 300     | 0                       |
| Oregon                    |              |          |      |         |                         |
| Pennsylvania <sup>c</sup> | 1974         | 480      | 480  | 520     | 8                       |
| Rhode Island <sup>c</sup> | 1969         | 480      | 600  | 600     | 0                       |
| South Carolina            | 1972         | 0        | 320  | 400 (?) | 25                      |
| South Dakota              | b            |          |      |         |                         |
| Tennessee                 | b            |          |      |         |                         |
| Texas                     | 1965         |          | 400  | 400     | 0                       |
| Utah                      | 1968         |          |      | 440     | 0                       |
| Vermont                   | 1971         |          |      | 550     |                         |
| Virginia                  | 1968         |          |      |         |                         |
| Washington                | b            |          |      |         |                         |
| West Virginia             | b            |          |      |         |                         |
| Wisconsin                 | b            |          |      |         |                         |
| Wyoming                   | 1971         | 100      | 1001 | 400     | 300                     |

<sup>a</sup> Since 1976

<sup>b</sup> No Answer from State

<sup>c</sup> "Municipal Officers Only"

<sup>d</sup> No Statewide Requirements

Standardized, Specialized, and In-Service Training

As states have adopted mandatory minimum training at entry level, it became necessary to adopt means by which to keep these more highly trained officers up to date with an ever changing profession. Specialized schools and seminars have been one way regulatory agencies have found to meet these specific training needs. As mentioned before, basic training requirements across the United States have become fairly uniform. Most states indicate some reciprocity with other states. Simply put, an officer trained in Florida should be able to go to work in Washington state upon being schooled in the state law of Washington. There are exclusions to this, but overall the system has continued to move in this direction.

Most states indicated that means were available to achieve intermediate and advanced certification after furthering education and experience in that state. In Texas an officer can achieve intermediate certification with a Baccalaureate degree (or 120 training points) and 2 years experience. With the same degree and 6 years experience, an officer would achieve his advanced certificate. Training points in Texas are achieved with 20 classroom hours or 1 college semester hour.

Specialized schools such as breathalyzer (or Intoxalyzer) training, emergency driver training, radar operator, firearms certification, crime prevention

inspector, and drug recognition expert are just a few of the many available. Many states specifically noted that Instructor certification was available through specialized training.

A large percentage of states indicate that Executive training (for Chiefs or Sheriffs) was available and often required. Also, middle managers such as sergeants, lieutenants, and captains (also assistant chiefs, undersheriffs, and assistant sheriffs) have available to them specialized training. Others such as field training officer certification were also included.

It should here be noted that entry level educational requirements and in-service training are required by more than state regulatory agencies. The courts have now recognized the necessity of training. In the case of Grandstaff v. City of Borger, 767 F.2d 161 (5th Circuit, 1985), [480 U.S. 916 (1987)] "lack of training" became a liability factor. "The trend of using 'lack of training' as a basis for civil liability has developed into a major topic for police administrators".<sup>21</sup>

Civil courts recognize not only failure to train, but negligent training as well. Other commonly known cases such as Miranda v. Arizona, 384 U.S. 436, (1966), Terry v. Ohio, 392 U.S. 1 (1968), Tennessee v. Garner, 53 U.S.L.W. 4410, (1985) Travis v. City of Mesquite, Texas S.C. No. C-8576 (1990), and many others have been guideposts



to administrators, bringing about changes in policies, procedures, and training requirements.

The movement of law enforcement training is reminiscent of a stream or river. It flows along, gathering an ever increasing amount of water from various sources. When the stream eats away the bank, a tree or rock may fall into the stream, causing the stream to change its course. The general direction never changes, but the path is often detoured around the blockage. As law enforcement has moved from the days of the night watch, through the days as political watchdogs, and on to the early days of the 60's, changes have been gradual. However, as the stream of law enforcement coursed through the 1960's, changes came much more rapidly. Many landmark court cases changed not only the training needs of law enforcement, but the very basis of how law enforcement went about the day to day business of doing business. The stream of law enforcement training had moved into a steep and rocky canyon, becoming a torrent which moved with a rapidity which could hardly be recognized when compared to the placid stream of earlier.

However, the general direction has not changed. Law enforcement still moves toward professionalism in America.

## CHAPTER 4

### WHAT IS TO COME: THE FUTURE OF LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING

"Keeping the peace in our changing, litigious society is increasingly complex. With these complexities come greater demands for more law enforcement training and adding training hours creates additional operational pressures and expenses. Mastery of skills is essential to good law enforcement."<sup>22</sup> An enormous amount of research has been done recently in the area of law enforcement education and training, along with a large number of publications on this research being available. One hardly knows where to begin expounding the necessity of increases in training and education. These titles are here divided between the technical/vocational training of the academy atmosphere and the intellectual demands of the liberal arts perspective.

"The fundamental dilemma in devising a curriculum is the need to devise a specified body of knowledge which can be organized into a relevant...curriculum which, on the one hand, will provide a broad general education and, on the other hand, will educate a person to do something, that is, will provide both growth and expertise."<sup>23</sup>

The need for college curricula in police-related areas was realized as far back as 1931 in Berkley, California. This move was originally recommended by August Vollmer, then Chief of Police in Berkley and a visionary police administrator. As stated before, the 1930's began

the movement of police toward college education.

A College Degree: Should it be Required for Employment?

Although few members of the law enforcement community would argue the benefits of a college education, there are problems. Since the inception of the LEEP/LEAA programs, after the President's Commission recommended that a collegiate education be a entry level requirement, a large number of persons (both officers and those wishing to be) entered college. Not only did these programs encourage officers to seek higher education, but it brought about a change of attitude. As officers became college students and graduates, it was inevitable that these same graduate (or college educated) officers would move up in their respective departments. As this occurred, the old attitudes changed. No longer would older officers ridicule younger officers who had chosen to seek higher education. Now those same 'younger officers' were themselves become the 'older officers'.

For this reason alone, it is easily conceivable that there will be in the foreseeable future widespread use of at least some college course work as an entry level prerequisite.

During the 1970's and 1980's, an enormous amount of research was done in the area of higher education/training needs. Groups were set up to study the needs

of law enforcement in this area. These included: the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, the National Advisory Commission on Higher Education for Police Officers, and the FBI's Nationwide Law Enforcement Training Needs Assessment.

"The research suggested that higher education provided a number of benefits for law enforcement. In sum, the research found that college education achieved the following:

Developed a broader base of information for decision making;

Provided additional years and experiences for increasing maturity;

Inculcated responsibility in the individual through course requirements and achievements;

...Engendered understanding and tolerance for persons with different lifestyles and ideologies...

Made officer more innovative and more flexible when dealing with complex policing programs and strategies... "24

Although the above is only a partial list, benefits can easily be seen in having some college work. However, the following problems should be considered. While there are increases in the number of white students in college, the number of college-age blacks in America is shrinking. Additionally, the American Council of Education (ACE) reported "that Hispanics and Native Americans continue to earn degrees in numbers well below their proportion i in the total population"<sup>25</sup> While black students are seeking higher education, ACE further reported that "the vast majority of black students major in either the social sciences or education (roughly 80%). This trend, while increasing the number of college educated blacks, does

little to increase the number of college educated minority applicants seeking a career in law enforcement.

In addition to minority recruiting problems, it has been said that there is an intimate and necessary relationship between experience and education. During the days of LEEP, police officers entering the college classroom found curriculum and faculty that had little or no knowledge or understanding of the street officers needs. The police officer brought into the classroom questions. Frequently, these questions dealt with situational application of knowledge. However, the academicians were too frequently not prepared or inclined to change traditional course content, which was usually theoretical in nature. This created an atmosphere of animosity and distrust between the officers and faculty. Prolonged exposure to this incongruent atmosphere left many officers with the impression that college faculty lacked any real knowledge of what the problems were, very much less how to answer the questions (beyond their traditional knowledge). One can easily see where this situation could lead to distrust of the academic system.

However, one should not overlook the fact that collegiate academics are by their very nature theoretical and allow a student the opportunity to broaden his or her analytical and abstract thinking. These who advocate education which focuses on problem solving for street use

should consider that these problems change often and rapidly. The ability to view the problems abstractly may give an officer the ability to foresee problems and develop strategies to avoid them altogether. Perhaps in lieu of adding technical aspects to degree programs, they should become more diverse.

The problems mentioned and others have been much researched by several well known authorities. While parts of the research are found by this writer to be questionable due to the oversight of small agencies (where it is felt there is the greatest need for higher education), there are areas in which the writer readily agrees.

According to David L. Carter and Allen D. Sapp's research through the Police Executive Research Forum (PERF), an approximately equal number of respondents indicated that either they preferred a criminal justice degree versus some other degree (other than criminal justice).

"Comments from respondents suggested that many of those who preferred criminal justice graduates did so because of the graduates' knowledge of the criminal justice system and the policing profession. Some of those stating no preference said that they preferred a 'broader education' to prepare officers to deal with the wide range of policy situations not involving criminal law enforcement."<sup>26</sup>

The comments go further in saying that "the trend of the commentary was that the undergraduate degree should be focused to help the 'street officer', while the graduate degree should be a springboard for advancement into supervisory and management positions."<sup>27</sup>

Should a college degree be an entry level requirement for law enforcement? By definition, a profession is an occupation that properly involves a liberal, scientific, or artistic education.<sup>28</sup> Philosophically, if law enforcement is to be considered a profession, then higher education would be mandatory. However, due to problems already enumerated, consideration should be given to developing undergraduate degree programs which combine abstract education with some practical application.

## CHAPTER 5

### SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A profession is generally defined as an occupation with education. Education is generally defined as the act or process of educating, and the systematic development or training of the mind, capabilities or character through instruction or study. American law enforcement was born as a night watch which required only that you be a good and honest man. As an infant, law enforcement made its first attempts at walking as metropolitan areas such as Boston and New York moved toward unified day and night police departments. The adolescent years were spent as political watchdogs and lackeys, ever moving toward a more professional standing. The years of the 1960's were the teen-age years, full of indecision and confusion. Law enforcement has since moved toward a more mature standing. In this manner, the history of law enforcement can be compared to a child growing from its' pre-school years through grade school and high school, and now into college, simply by comparing the entry level requirements. As society has changed, so to have the needs and requirements of law enforcement. Law enforcement as a whole has changed in answer to difficult times in the history of our society.



As a whole, law enforcement now stands at yet another crossroad. Already, many agencies have begun requiring not only technical training in an academy setting, but theoretical education achieved in an academic setting. It has been noted before that officers who have met the challenge of a college education have shown themselves to be more flexible and tolerant of difficult situations.

Simply put, an officer with at least some college education has a broader base of knowledge from which to draw his decisions. This enables him to adapt to and overcome situations in which he is required to make independent decisions. In spite of the problems associated with police officers in a collegiate atmosphere, it would seem that the benefits outweigh these difficulties.

Of course, the problems cannot be completely laid at the door of academia. It is felt that in the days of LEEP, law enforcement entered the realm of academe with unrealistic expectations, seeking only the technical knowledge needed to survive in their employment. However, police officers have now begun to realize the overall benefits of collegiate endeavors.

As a police administrator, the writer has first-hand knowledge of the abilities of officers with college education as compared to officers with strictly technical training (as from an academy). The officer with collegiate education usually displays more innovation when dealing

with difficult situations. This can only increase the standing of the police in the eyes of the public. An increase in public support very readily translates into increases in needed monetary support of cities and counties for police programs.

It would be helpful to have a study of small departments (which make up a majority of the number of agencies and seem most needful of better education) to determine the abilities of these departments to provide or require entry level collegiate work.

Further, those involved in the technical aspects of police training and those involved in the theoretical area should develop a program in which undergraduate students wishing to become involved in a career in law enforcement could become knowledgeable in both areas. The synergistic effect of this type of training could produce abilities that were greater than the sum of both areas.

It has long been realized that law enforcement technical training is required to increase as society demands. Further, the professionalism of law enforcement is the desire of all those involved. Beginning slowly, collegiate work should become an entry level requirement, with promotional standards to include at least undergraduate degrees.

Programs such as the Law Enforcement Management

Institute obviously work toward exposing managers and administrators to more academic interests. This is precisely the type training this writer recommends, being equal parts of technical and theoretical instruction. The visionary administrators of tomorrow will be in need of innovative programs to increase their base of knowledge and in turn increase their ability to perform the most difficult of functions: the policing of a democracy.

## APPENDIX 1

## SOURCES CONSULTED

## Alabama Peace Officer Standards

Training Commission

Mr. John W. Anderson, Executive Secretary

472 South Lawrence, Suite 202

Montgomery, AL 36104

## Alaska Police Standards Council

Mr. Jack Wray, Executive Director

Box N

Juneau, AK 99811

## Arizona Law Enforcement Officer Advisory Council

Captain M. L. Risch, Business Manager

Box 6638

Phoenix, AZ 85005

## Arkansas Law Enforcement Standards and Training

Mr. Bobby Norman

Box 3106

East Camden, AR 71701

## California Commission on Peace Officer Standards

Mr. Norman Boehm, Executive Director

1601 Alhambra Blvd.

Sacramento, CA 95816-5328

## Colorado Law Enforcement Training Center

Mr. Robert Bing, Director

15000 Golden Road

Golden, CO 80401

## Connecticut Municipal Police Training Council

Mr. T. William Knapp, Executive Director

285 Preston Ave.

Meriden, CT 06450

## Delaware State Police

Captain Robert S. Walls, Director

Box 430

Dover, DE 19903-0430

## APPENDIX 1 (Continued)

Florida Department of Law Enforcement  
Division of Criminal Justice  
Mr. Jeffrey W. Long, Director  
Box 1489  
Tallahassee, FL 32302

Georgia Peace Officer Standards  
and Training Council  
Mr. Frankie H. Lovvorn, Executive Director  
351 Thornton Road, Suite 119  
Lithia Springs, GA 30037

Honolulu Police Department  
Research & Development Dept.  
Major Barry Fujii  
1455 South Beretania  
Honolulu, HA 98614

Idaho Peace Officer Standards and Training  
Mr. Larry Plott, Executive Director  
6115 Clinton Street  
Boise, ID 83704

Illinois Local Governmental Law  
Enforcement Training Board  
Mr. Albert Apa, Executive Director  
524 S. Second, Suite 400  
Springfield, IL 62701-1773

Indiana Law Enforcement Academy  
Col. Arthur Raney, Executive Director  
Box 313  
Plainfield, IN 46168

Iowa Law Enforcement Academy  
Mr. Ben Yarrington, Director  
Box 130  
Johnston, IA 50131

Kansas Law Enforcement Training Center  
Mr. Larry Welch, Director  
Box 647  
Hutchinson, KS 67504-0647

Kentucky Department of Criminal Justice Training  
Mr. Charles R. Sayre, Director  
Administrative Division  
Kit Carson Drive  
Richmond, KY 40475-3131

## APPENDIX 1 (Continued)

Louisiana Commission on Law Enforcement  
Mr. Michael Renatza, Director  
2121 Wooddale Blvd.  
Baton Rouge, LA 70806

Maine Criminal Justice Academy  
Mr. Maurice Harvey, Director  
93 Silver Street  
Waterville, ME 04901

Maryland Police and Correctional  
Training Commission  
Mr. Jack Schuyler, Executive Director  
3085 Hernwood Road  
Woodstock, MD 21163

Massachusetts Criminal Justice Training Council  
Mr. Patrick Hamilton, Executive Director  
1115 Central Ave.  
Needham, Mass. 02192

Michigan Law Enforcement Officers Training Council  
Mr. Wesley Hoes, Acting Executive Secretary  
7426 North Canal Road  
Lansing, MI 48913

Minnesota Board of Police Officers  
Standards and Training  
Mr. William R. Carter III, Executive Director  
1600 University Ave., Suite 200  
St. Paul, MN 55104-3825

Mississippi Law Enforcement Training Center  
Mr. Richard Allen, Training Officer  
5000 Hwy. 468 East  
Pearl, Mississippi 39208

Missouri Department of Public Safety  
Mr. Gary Maddox, Assistant Director  
P.O. Box 749  
Jefferson City, MO 65102

Montana Peace Officers Standards  
and Training Council  
Mr. Clayton Bain, Executive Director  
303 North Roberts Street  
Helena, MT 59620

## APPENDIX 1 (Continued)

Nebraska Commission on Law Enforcement  
and Criminal Justice  
Box 94946  
Lincoln, NE 68509-4946

Nevada Peace Officer Standards and Training  
Department of Motor Vehicles  
Mr. Larry Stout, POST Coordinator  
555 Wright Way  
Carson City, NV 89711

New Hampshire Police Standards  
and Training Council  
Mr. Earl Sweeney, Director  
17 Fan Road  
Concord, NH 03301

New Jersey Division of Criminal Justice  
Mr. Leo Culloo, Administrator  
Hughes Justice Complex  
C.N. 085  
Trenton, NJ 08625-0085

New Mexico Law Enforcement Academy  
Mr. Ken Iskow, Director  
4491 Cerrillos Road  
Santa Fe, NM 87505

New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services  
Mr. John W. Herritage, Deputy Commissioner  
Executive Park Towers  
Stuyvesant Plaza  
Albany, NY 12203-3764

North Carolina Department of Justice  
Criminal Justice Standards Division  
Mr. David Cashwell, Director  
Box 149  
Raleigh, NC 27602

North Dakota Bureau of Criminal Investigation  
Office of Attorney General  
Chief Agent Michael L. Quinn  
P.O. Box 1054  
Bismarck, ND 58502

## APPENDIX 1 (Continued)

Ohio Peace Officer Training Council  
Mr. Keith Haley, Executive Director  
1560 State Route 56 SW  
P.O. Box 390  
London, Ohio 43140

Oklahoma Council on Law Enforcement  
Education and Training  
Mr. Johnnie F. Dirck, Director  
P.O. Box 11476  
Cimarron Station  
Oklahoma City, OK 73136

Oregon Board on Police Standards and Training  
Mr. Steve Bennett, Executive Director  
550 North Monmouth Ave.  
Monmouth, OR 97361

Pennsylvania Municipal Police Officers Education  
and Training Commission  
Mr. Frank Startoni, Management Technician  
P.O. Box 480  
Hershey, PA 17033

Rhode Island Municipal Police Training Academy  
Mr. Raymond J. Shannon, Executive Director  
Flanagan Campus  
Lincoln, RI 02865

South Carolina Criminal Justice Academy  
Mr. William C. Gibson, Director of Training  
5400 Broad River Road  
Columbia, SC 29210

South Dakota Division of Criminal Investigation  
Mr. Tom Disberg, Training Coordinator  
East Hwy. 34  
Pierre, SD 57501

Tennessee Law Enforcement Training Academy  
Mr. Roger Farley, Director  
Box 140229  
Donelson, TN 37214

Texas Commission on Law Enforcement Officer  
Standards and Education  
Mr. Fred Toler, Executive Director  
1033 La Posada (La Costa Green)  
Austin, Texas 78752



## APPENDIX 1 (Continued)

Utah Peace Officer Standards and Training  
Mr. Clyde Palmer, Director  
4525 South 2700 West  
Salt Lake City, UT 84119

Vermont Criminal Justice Training Council  
Vermont Police Academy  
Mr. R. J. Elrick  
RR #2, Box 2160  
Pittsford, VT 05763-9712

Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services  
Mr. Lindsay G. Dorrier, Jr., Director  
805 East Broad Street, 10th Floor  
Richmond, VA 23219

Washington State Criminal Justice  
Training Commission  
Mr. James Scott, Executive Director  
Mail Stop PW-11  
Olympia, WA 98504

West Virginia Criminal Justice  
Highway Safety Division  
Mr. Don Davidson  
5790-A McCorkel Ave.  
S. E.  
Charleston, WV 25304

Wisconsin Training and Standards Bureau  
Mr. Dennis Hanson, Director  
Box 7857  
Madison, WI 53707

Wyoming Peace Officer Standards and Training  
Mr. Don Pierson, Executive Director  
1710 Pacific Ave.  
Cheyenne, WY 82002

## APPENDIX 2

## COPY OF QUESTIONNAIRE SENT TO STATES' POST AGENCIES

1. List the officer certification levels available and requirements to achieve them:
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
2. List the specialized certification levels available and requirements to achieve them:
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
3. List all certifications available **in 1976** and the requirements to achieve them: (if regulatory agency not in existence, please note any requirements then in existence)
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
4. Please note the year your regulatory commission was founded and the original certification requirements:
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
5. Number of law enforcement agencies in the state: (Please break down as to function: example: Municipal agency, County, etc.)

## APPENDIX 2

## COPY OF QUESTIONNAIRE (Continued)

6. Number of officers in the state: (Please, break down as above)
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
7. Salary ranges for officers: (if possible)
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
8. Reciprocity requirements, if available:
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
9. State Population:
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
10. Explain academy system for the state (i.e., regional, area, state, etc.):
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
11. Percent of state covered by 9-1-1 telephone system:

## APPENDIX 2

## COPY OF QUESTIONNAIRE (Continued)

12. Do you have any current legislation that is significant to your agency or law enforcement in the state?
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
13. Please include what measures, if any, are available to insure compliance with requirements.
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
14. Please feel free to include any other information that you feel is pertinent to this survey, including required subject outlines, basic entry requirements, required inservice, etc.:



# CITY OF HUTTO

Telephone: 512/846-2200  
Post Office Box 266  
HUTTO, TEXAS 78634

## APPENDIX 3

A COPY OF THE LETTER WHICH ACCOMPANIED EACH QUESTIONNAIRE

February 2, 1991

Dear \_\_\_\_\_,

Enclosed please find a short survey in reference to the training requirements in the state of \_\_\_\_\_. I would be most pleased if you could complete the survey instrument and return it. Please feel free to include printed material if it would simplify answering the survey. The information will be used in completion of a thesis in which a state-by-state survey is being conducted to learn each states' training requirements and compare national trends. I would be happy to send you a copy of my findings, if you wish. Please feel free to contact me at the address above if you have any questions. Thank you very much for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

John A. Corbett,  
Chief

#### WORKS CITED

<sup>1</sup>Tim Perry, Basic Patrol Procedures (Seattle, WA: Palladin Publishers, Inc., 1984), 13.

<sup>2</sup>David Ralph Johnson, American Law Enforcement: A History (St. Louis, MO: Forum Press, 1981), 1.

<sup>3</sup>Robert C. Trojanowicz and Samuel L. Dixon, Criminal Justice and the Community (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1974), 30-36.

<sup>4</sup>Paul B. Weston and Kenneth M. Wells, Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice: An Introduction (Pacific Palisades, CA: Goodyear Publishing, Inc., 1972), 22.

<sup>5</sup>Raymond B. Fosdick, American Police Systems (New York, NY: The Century Co., 1921), 63-64, 69.

<sup>6</sup>Weston and Wells, Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice: An Introduction, 29.

<sup>7</sup>William Bopp and Paul Whisenand, Police Personnel Administration 2nd ed. (Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1980), 20.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., 16.

<sup>9</sup>Dr. Morgan Robnett, Ph.D. and Lt. Ron Trygstad, Duncanville Police Department, interview by author, Notes taken, Denton, Texas, 14 May 1991.

<sup>10</sup>William Bopp and Paul Whisenand, Police Personnel Administration, 27.

<sup>11</sup>The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, Task Force Report: The Police (Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967), 30.

<sup>12</sup>William Bopp and Paul Whisenand, Police Personnel Administration, 28.

<sup>13</sup>Ibid., 28.

<sup>14</sup>Donald E. Santarelli, "Educations for Concepts - Training for Skills" The Police Chief, (August 1974), 20.

## WORKS CITED (Continued)

<sup>15</sup>Leonard Territo, "The Communication and Credibility Gap Between Police Administrators and Criminal Justice Educators" The Police Gap, (August 1976): 26

<sup>16</sup>David L. Carter, J.D. Jamieson, and Allen D. Sapp, "Issues and Trends In Criminal Justice Education" Criminal Justice Monograph, Vol. VIII No.5, (1978), 4.

<sup>17</sup>David L. Carter and Allen D. Sapp, Police Education & Minority Recruitment: The Impact of a College Requirement (A PERF Discussion Paper Washington D.C. : Police Executive Research Forum, 1991), 1.

<sup>18</sup>William Bopp and Paul Whisenand, Police Personnel Administration, 29.

<sup>19</sup>Information from questionnaire to state Police Officer Standards and Training agencies, see appendix for list of addresses.

<sup>20</sup>Ibid.

<sup>21</sup>Charles W. Flemins, "Times Change for Small Towns" Texas Town & City (September, 1990): 8.

<sup>22</sup>Norman C. Boehm, "Developing Better Law Enforcement Officers", The Police Chief (November, 1987): 40.

<sup>23</sup>Gerald W. Lynch, "Criminal Justice Higher Education: Some Perspectives," The Police Chief (August, 1976): 65.

<sup>24</sup>David L. Carter and Allen D. Sapp, Police Education & Minority Recruitment: The Impact of a College Requirement (A PERF Discussion Paper Washington D.C. : Police Executive Research Forum, 1991), 2-3.

<sup>25</sup>American Council on Education, Minorities in Higher Education: Sixth Annual Status Report. Washington, D.C. (1987)

<sup>26</sup>David L. Carter and Allen D. Sapp, "The Evolution of Higher Education in Law Enforcement: Preliminary Findings From a National Study" Journal of Criminal Justice Education, Vol. 1 No. 1 (March, 1990): 77-78.

<sup>27</sup>Ibid., 78.

<sup>28</sup>Funk & Wagnalls Standard Desk Dictionary, (New York, NY: Funk & Wagnalls, Inc., 1974): s.v. "profession".

#### SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Boehm, Norman C. "Developing Better Law Enforcement Officers." The Police Chief, November, 1987.
- Bopp, William and Paul Whisenand. Police Personnel Administration 2nd ed. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1980.
- Carter, David L. and Allen D. Sapp. Police Education & Minority Recruitment: The Impact of a College Requirement A PERF Discussion Paper, Washington D.C.: Police Executive Research Forum, 1991.
- Carter, David L. and Allen D. Sapp. "The Evolution of Higher Education in Law Enforcement: Preliminary Findings From a National Study." Journal of Criminal Justice Education, Vol. 1 No. 1, March, 1990.
- Carter, David L., J.D. Jamison, and Allen D. Sapp. "Issues and Trends In Criminal Justice Education." Criminal Justice Monograph, Vol. VIII, No. 5, 1978.
- Flemins, Charles W. "Times Change for Small Towns." Texas Town & City, September, 1990.
- Fosdick, Raymond B. American Police Systems New York, NY: The Century Co., 1921.
- Johnson, David Ralph. American Law Enforcement: A History St. Louis, MO: Forum Press, 1981.
- Lynch, Gerald W. "Criminal Justice Higher Education: Some Perspectives." The Police Chief, August, 1976.
- Perry, Tim. Basic Patrol Procedures, Seattle, WA: Palladin Publishers, Inc., 1984.
- Santarelli, Donald E. "Educations for Concepts - Training for Skills." The Police Chief, August 1974.
- Territo, Leonard. "The Communication and Credibility Gap Between Police Administrators and Criminal Justice Educators." The Police Gap, August, 1976.



## SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY (Continued)

Trojanowicz, Robert C. and Samuel L. Dixon, Criminal Justice and the Community Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1974.

Weston, Paul B. and Kenneth M. Wells, Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice: An Introduction Pacific Pallisades, CA: Goodyear Publishing, Inc., 1972.