

379
NB1d
NO. 3140

POLICE ACADEMIES AT COMMUNITY COLLEGES IN TEXAS

DISSERTATION

Presented to the Graduate Council of the
University of North Texas in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

By

David A. Wells, B.A., M.A.

Denton, Texas

December, 1989

Wells, David Andrew, Police Academies at Community Colleges in Texas. Doctor of Philosophy (Higher Education), December 1989, 156 pp., 14 tables, bibliography, 97 titles.

The problem of this study was selected aspects of public community college non-credit law enforcement training programs in Texas. Purposes of the study were: (a) to examine the development of police academies at community colleges in Texas; (b) to provide normative data describing the academies in terms of background, organization and administration, adequacy of facilities and equipment, personnel, student policies and practices, the program administrator's perceptions of internal and external support, involvement of outside forces and the extent of the program, and (c) to provide data which community colleges can use in organizing and developing police academies.

An 85 item questionnaire was developed and distributed to the population of the fifteen police academies licensed for full-time operation by the Texas Commission on Law Enforcement Officer Standards and Education.

All academies began operation as continuing education programs. The academies continue as continuing education programs with little assistance or involvement from academic criminal justice programs. A fundamental purpose of the programs is to provide state-required entry level training

and continuing education for police officers. The academies, on college campuses, are adequately equipped and supplied with acceptable instructional facilities.

The academies are too dependent on adjunct instructors. The colleges have yet to identify the place of the police academy student regarding student services and discipline. Unless they are involved in the law enforcement profession, the general public is usually not included in academy classes. Most academies are understood and supported by their governing board and administration, and their administrators feel accepted as part of the college community. They are unsure whether the faculty or the public understand the academies mission or programs.

Advisory committees at police academies are poorly organized and do not appear to fairly represent the community the academy is intended to serve. Academy administrators have general knowledge about their program and the characteristics of their service areas, but have little knowledge regarding the college's overall continuing education program.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|------|
| LIST OF TABLES | v |
| Chapter | |
| I. INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| Statement of the Problem | |
| Purposes of the Study | |
| Research Questions | |
| Significance of the Study | |
| Definition of Terms | |
| Organization of the Study | |
| II. REVIEW OF SELECTED LITERATURE | 12 |
| History of Police Education | |
| Higher Education and Law Enforcement | |
| Education | |
| Law Enforcement Education and | |
| Training in Texas | |
| III. PROCEDURES FOR DATA COLLECTION | 36 |
| Population | |
| Subjects | |
| The Survey Instrument | |
| Questionnaire Design | |
| Questionnaire Validation | |
| Modification of the Preliminary | |
| Instrument | |
| The Final Instrument | |
| Initial Contact | |
| Letters | |
| Procedure | |
| Data Analysis | |

| | | |
|------|---|-----|
| IV. | PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA | 43 |
| | Introduction | |
| | Demographic Data | |
| | Analysis of the Questionnaire and | |
| | Responses to Research | |
| | Questions | |
| | Research Question One | |
| | Research Question Two | |
| | Research Question Three | |
| | Research Question Four | |
| | Research Question Five | |
| | Research Question Six | |
| | Research Question Seven | |
| | Research Question Eight | |
| | Summary of Findings | |
| V. | SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, | |
| | AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY. | 106 |
| VI. | APPENDICES | 125 |
| VII. | REFERENCES | 146 |

LIST OF TABLES

| Table | Page |
|--|------|
| 1. Responses to Questions Regarding Participant Demographic Data | 46 |
| 2. Responses to Questions Regarding the Background of the Academy | 50 |
| 3. Responses to Questions Regarding the Organization and Administration of the Police Academy | 56 |
| 4. Responses to Questions Regarding Adequacy of Facilities and Equipment | 60 |
| 5. Responses to Questions Regarding Personnel (Questionnaire Section "D", Number 16 only). | 64 |
| 6. Responses to Questions Regarding Personnel (Questionnaire Section "D", Numbers 1-15). | 66 |
| 7. Responses to Questions Regarding the Student Policies and Practices of the Academy | 73 |
| 8. Responses to Questions Regarding the Administrator's Perceptions of Level of Internal and External Support. (Questionnaire Section "F", Numbers 1-3) | 81 |
| 9. Responses to Questions Regarding the Administrator's Perceptions of Level of Internal and External Support. (Questionnaire Section "F", Numbers 4-6) | 82 |
| 10. Responses to Questions Regarding the Administrator's Perceptions of Level of Internal and External Support. (Questionnaire Section "F", Numbers 7-9) | 83 |
| 11. Responses to Questions Regarding the Administrator's Perceptions of Level of Internal and External Support. (Questionnaire Section "F", Numbers 10-12) | 84 |

| | | |
|-----|--|----|
| 12. | Responses to Questions Regarding Outside Involvement in the Police Academy (Questionnaire Section "G", Numbers 1-16) . . | 88 |
| 13. | Responses to Questions Regarding Outside Involvement in the Police Academy (Questionnaire Section "G", Number 8) | 90 |
| 14. | Responses to Questions Regarding Extensiveness of the Program. | 94 |

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Perhaps no societal issue is of more concern to Americans today than crime. Residents of Texas are certainly among the most concerned since crime has reasserted itself in Texas as the number one social problem. Continuing the upward spiral which began in the 1970's, the rate of crime in Texas rose almost 14.9% in 1986. This change from 1985 represents the largest one-year increase in crime in Texas in a decade (Kingston, 1987). The continuing increase translates into a substantial loss of life and property and manifests itself as well in significant personal injury. Many of these costs cannot be expressed in dollars and cents, but the costs of property loss coupled with the costs of prison reform, and rehabilitating and caring for prisoners represents a staggering sum that runs well into the billions of dollars each year. To combat this problem society looks to our systems of justice and education. Both of these systems are inextricably involved in preventing and correcting these problems and in dealing with problems arising in the aftermath of crime.

As the rate of crime has increased, so too has there been a redoubling of efforts by the law enforcement and educational systems to better educate the law enforcement

officer. The law enforcement and the educational system have developed cooperative relationships to solve the problem, and more and more the law enforcement community is turning to the educational system to train its workforce and to better prepare it to deal with an almost impossible situation. It is an examination of the growth and development of a part of that relationship, the police academy at the Texas public community junior college, that this study provides.

One of the earliest attempts to educate law enforcement officers in America occurred in California. In what was also one of the first instances of involvement of higher education in law enforcement education, August Vollmer, Chief of Police of Berkeley, California, with the assistance of faculty members from the University of California, started a police school within his department (Griffin, 1980). But other schools across the nation were slow to develop and by 1960, only twenty-six institutions could boast full-time law enforcement programs (Griffin, 1980). It was not until the United States Congress passed the Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965 providing significant funding for police training and until the passage in 1968 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Street Act that a significant increase in the number of colleges offering law enforcement training can be noted. In 1969, over 6 million dollars was spent funding law enforcement education programs at more than 400 colleges and universities across the United

States. By 1971, over 900 colleges shared law enforcement education funding of over 20 million dollars (Griffin, 1980). In 1976, over 1,175 colleges were projected to offer some phase of criminal justice or law enforcement education (Fox & Ullmann, 1976).

This substantial increase in college programs relating to law enforcement education occurred during the time the community college experienced its period of most significant growth. According to statistics from the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, between 1960 and 1980, the number of public two year colleges in the United States increased from 405 to 1,049 (Cohen & Brawer, 1982). The two forces coincided at an opportune moment. The need for education for law enforcement personnel coupled with increased funding and public attention met the rapid growth of the community college movement head-on, and the two systems formed an educational relationship which expresses completely the avowed mission of the two year college to be a community-based, performance-oriented institution.

The mission of the public community college has often brought it strange bedfellows in its short history. Attempts to meet the needs and demands of its supporting public have required that community colleges fit differing molds; that they alter and change as they attempt to respond to local needs. An avid supporter of the community college, George Vaughn (1988) points out that these differences are

not differences of kind, rather they are differences of degree...that community colleges mirror the society in which they reside. His point is that the definition of any community college mission should be a local definition. In Texas, this local mission definition is apparent in the close affiliation between two year colleges and their local law enforcement communities.

The Texas Commission on Law Enforcement Officer Standards and Education (TCLEOSE) was first approved by the 59th Texas Legislature in 1965 and further strengthened by legislation in 1969 and following years. Since that time, the state has had an agency empowered to define the minimum educational, physical, mental and moral standards for admission to employment as a peace officer in Texas in a permanent or temporary status. This Commission is authorized to license law enforcement training and education programs, to certify law enforcement instructors, to direct research in the field of law enforcement, to recommend curricula for education and training at institutions of higher learning in the state, and to approve and license the establishment of all police training academies in the state (Criminal Justice Council, 1971).

Assisted by this state agency and encouraged by a need to respond to their local communities, many public community colleges throughout Texas have developed programs to train law enforcement officers. In many cases, these programs have become what we, today, recognize as academic programs

leading to associate degrees in Criminal Justice. Other associate degree programs have developed in related areas such as corrections, probation/parole, and security. Yet, as in many other fields of study provided by community colleges, a curricular dilemma affects the study of law enforcement. Typically, the issue which confronts academic administrators is one of defining the dividing line between academic-worthy education and training which is skill-oriented and non-academic in nature.

The response of many community colleges has been to accept the recommendations of a 1977 study by Hoover and Lund on criminal justice programs at community and junior colleges. This set of guidelines indicated that the solution to the curricular dilemma is one of separation of role preparation. The study indicated that

"... the paramount function of basic academic programming in this field is more appropriately preparation of personnel to make the discriminating social judgments inherent in the roles. Skill training should occur under a distinctive rubric...."
(Hoover and Lund, 1977, p.12).

It is an examination of that "distinctive rubric" at Texas public community colleges which this study provides. At present, TCLEOSE certifies academic programs at 48 Texas community colleges. However, at 20 of those same colleges, TCLEOSE certifies non-academic programming delivered by the institution's police academy. Five of these programs are

considered by TCLEOSE to be "contract" trainers, i.e., academies which conduct training solely through contracts with other agencies, and academies which do not have an on-going police training program.

The development of the police academies at community colleges in Texas has occurred, in most instances, due to attempts by the colleges to satisfy a local need. As law enforcement agencies in all parts of the state search for more cost-effective training and education for their employees, they look increasingly at the benefits to be derived from affiliation with the public community colleges in the state for their basic and skills training. The problem which the law enforcement agencies face, however, is that there is a shortage of data sources on which they may base their decision making for affiliation with educational institutions. Community colleges wishing to respond to this training need confront this same shortfall of information. As the need for coordinated funding sources occurs, and as the need for cooperative working relationships between colleges and law enforcement agencies for training increases, so too does the need arise for descriptive data and developmental information for decision making.

This problem merits further study because of the shortage of data and due to the need for coordination of resources. What passes for a data base for decision making is fragmented, uncoordinated and virtually non-existent.

Fox (1969) states:

in educational research there are two conditions which occurring together suggest and justify the descriptive survey: First, that there is an absence of information about a problem of educational significance, and, second, that the situations which could generate that information do exist and are accessible to the researcher. (p. 424)

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was selected aspects of public community college non-credit law enforcement training programs in Texas.

Purposes of the Study

The purposes of the study are (a) to examine the development of non-academic law enforcement training programs in public community colleges in Texas, (b) to provide normative data describing police academies in terms of background, organization and administration, adequacy of facilities and equipment, personnel, student policies and practices of the academy, the administrator's perceptions of internal and external support, involvement of outside forces and the extent of the program in a fashion which community colleges can use in evaluating their individual non-academic law enforcement programs, and (c) to provide data which community colleges can use in organizing and developing new, college-affiliated police academies.

Research Questions

In order to pursue the purposes of this study the following questions were asked regarding the practices and procedures involved in the development and operation of police academies offering continuing education recruit and/or in-service training through public community colleges in Texas.

1. What is the history of police academies in Texas community colleges?
2. How are the police academies organized?
3. What facilities and equipment does the college provide for the academy's programs?
4. What are the staffing and personnel policies of the academy?
5. What are the policies and practices of the academy with regard to selected student issues?
6. What are the perceptions of the respondent regarding the level of support for the program from the college and the community?
7. What are the types, kind, and the extent of the involvement of external forces (other than the regulatory influence of TCLEOSE) in the governance of the police academy?
8. What is the extent of the programs activity?

Significance of the Study

The study focuses on practices and procedures involved in the development and organization of police academies

affiliated with public community colleges in Texas. This study is significant in that it (a) focuses on the development, organization and administration and current status of police training academies at public community colleges in Texas, (b) serves as a data base for decision making for community colleges and law enforcement agencies for affiliation, (c) provides developmental information for the organization and administration of a community college police training academy, and (d) makes a contribution to the literature for both community colleges and law enforcement education.

Definition of Terms

The following terms are restricted in definition for the purposes of this study as:

Community College - a public two-year college offering freshman and sophomore level transfer courses and vocational-technical programs, as well as other programs and services; a public junior college.

Community College District - the geographic area of service of a community college as designated by the legal codes of Texas; used interchangeably with the term junior college district or public community college district.

Contact Hour - a one clock hour unit of instruction: for purposes of state funding, each clock hour of instruction for each student constitutes one contact hour.

Coordinating Board - refers to the Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System, which was established

by the Texas Legislature in 1965 and given certain jurisdictional powers over the colleges and universities of the State.

Non-credit - instructional programs at Texas colleges for which the state of Texas does not approve the awarding of college credit.

Police Academy - refers to an educational operation, the intent of which is to provide recruit and/or ongoing training to law enforcement officers. All police academies in Texas must have the approval of the Texas Commission on Law Enforcement Officer Standards and Education.

Texas Commission on Law Enforcement Officer Standards and Education (TCLEOSE) - established by the Texas Legislature in 1965, this state agency defines the minimum educational, physical, mental and moral standards for admission to employment as a peace officer in a permanent or temporary status. This commission is authorized to license law enforcement training and education programs, to certify law enforcement instructors, to direct research in the field of law enforcement, to recommend curricula for training at junior colleges and at institutions of higher learning in the state, and to approve the establishment of all police training academies in the state. TCLEOSE further recognizes three levels of peace officer expertise; Basic, Intermediate, and Advanced; awards certification of attainment for each of the levels and exercises approval

authority over education and training which is counted toward attainment of the levels.

Organization of the Study

This study is presented in the following format: Chapter I presents the introduction to the study, problem, purposes, research questions, significance of the study and definitions. Chapter II provides a review of the literature. The procedures used in collecting the data are presented in Chapter III. Chapter IV provides an analysis of the results, and Chapter V offers the summary of the findings, the conclusions, and implications and recommendations for future research.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF SELECTED LITERATURE

The literature review for this study provides background information which pertains to the development of education and training programs for law enforcement officers. The review focuses on the history of police education, moves on to a review of literature on the involvement of higher education with law enforcement education and concludes with an examination of the literature pertaining to general education and training of law enforcement officers in Texas with specific emphasis on research regarding education and training at law enforcement academies at Texas public community/junior colleges.

History of Police Education

Documentation of education and training for law enforcement officers in the United States does not begin until the late 1800's. Information regarding the existence of organized law enforcement forces prior to that time indicates that our system of justice included the sheriff and constable structures inherited from colonial America and England but no on-going police authority (President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, 1967; Smith, 1960). Walker (1977) and German, Day, and Gallati (1962) point out that our modern police, meaning a

system of law enforcement including a permanent agency with full time officers on continuous patrol in fixed areas, probably originated from an older practice of night watchmen. In the early 1800's in the North, this system grew out of municipal reaction to periods of significant civil unrest. Fry (1975) and Wade (1967) indicate that southern police systems originated as part of efforts to control slaves.

In the mid to late 1800's, formal education and training was virtually non-existent because police work was largely viewed as an unskilled occupation requiring little more than political loyalty and common sense. The newly employed officer received his training in the form of an on-the-street, orientation from a more experienced officer with whom he was paired (Eastman & McCain, 1981; Walker, 1977).

During the late nineteenth century, calls for the education and training of the police began to be heard and some cities began working to resolve the problem. In 1888, the National Prison Association's Standing Committee on the Police called for training for police officers (National Prison Association, 1888). Also in 1888, Cincinnati, Ohio began a centralized school of instruction for its police officers. Each officer was required to take seventy-two hours of instruction and to take mental and physical examinations (Walker, 1977). In 1891, the National Chiefs of Police Union, precursor to the International Association of Chiefs of Police, was formed and became a force in

emphasizing police classroom training (Carter, 1978). But even with that emphasis, for many law enforcement officers, the only training available was what they could read.

Published materials which may be considered educating for these earliest law enforcement officers and to which they may have had access, were relatively few and far between. From 1874 to 1885, Allan Pinkerton published several books on crime and criminals such as his Thirty Years as a Detective (1884). Professional Criminals of America (1886) by Thomas Byrnes, a detective with the New York Police Department was another such work. The Police Gazette was available during this time as were other books documenting the history of individual municipal police departments (e.g., Savage, 1865; Costello, 1885; Flinn, 1887; Spragel, 1887).

It was not until 1908 that the first formal school for police was established. Carte and Carte (1975) elaborate on the Berkeley Police School organized by August Vollmer in Berkeley, California in 1908. This first endeavor was followed during the next few years as police departments in New York, Detroit and Philadelphia established training schools and academies for their own officers (Carter, 1978). Frost (1959) reports that the Pennsylvania State Police established a two-month course of instruction in 1920, extended it to three months in 1921, and, with a reorganization in 1924, moved to a four month course. Chicago, Los Angeles and Wichita were also among the first

to establish police academies. Fogelson (1977) comments that this trend continued through what he refers to as "the second wave of reform" until by the late 1940's almost all of the larger departments could claim to have a training facility of one kind or another. Fogelson presents an excellent discussion of this drive toward a more educated police officer as does Gammage (1963) and the previously cited Walker (1977).

In the early 20th Century Raymond Fosdick's works, European Police Systems (1915) and American Police Systems (1920) were published. These works praising the European police system and criticizing the American system had a significant effect on the police reform movement which was occurring in early 20th century America. It was also during this time that the development of police training and education began to move in the direction of the institutions of higher education.

Higher Education and Law Enforcement Education

The involvement of higher education with police training and education is usually traced to the work of August Vollmer and his work with the University of California at Berkeley. Stephens (1976), however, cites research (Brandstatter, 1973; Farris, 1972; Foster, 1974; Mathias, 1976) indicating that the first recorded incident of "academic" criminal justice education in the United States occurred with the National Conference on Criminal Law and

Criminology which met in Chicago in 1909 and which was initiated by Northwestern University.

It was not until four years later, in 1913 when Vollmer began offering his first training classes utilizing college professors, that his documented work with higher education actually began, and it was not until 1916, that he established a formal relationship with the University of California. Under the terms of this relationship, Vollmer taught a series of summer session courses almost continuously until 1931, and in 1932, the program was extended to the regular academic year (Carte & Carte, 1974; Farris, 1972; Vollmer & Schneider, 1917). The program had its first graduate in 1923, with a baccalaureate in economics and a minor in criminology (Gammage, 1963). It was the first instance of even a minor in crime-related studies in the United States (Wiltberger, 1937).

Farris (1972) points out that just as the New York City Police Academy had become the prototype for the non-academic vocational skills training programs, the Berkeley school became the model for the "educational approach" to police training. Other programs followed, and, as was the case at the University of Southern California in Los Angeles in 1924, the University of Chicago in 1929, and at San Jose State College in 1930, many of the programs were established as a direct result of Vollmer's influence (Eastman & McCain, 1981; Gammage, 1963).

The program at San Jose State College was unique because at that time San Jose State was a combination of the San Jose District Junior College and the San Jose Teacher's College, two distinct but closely linked entities. The law enforcement student could receive an associate degree after completing a curriculum of almost entirely technical courses at the junior college. By 1935, the student could complete the associate degree, transfer to the four year college and, after completing a two year regimen of general courses, graduate with a baccalaureate degree (Eastman & McCain, 1981; Farris, 1965; Gammage, 1963).

Several researchers (Brandstatter, 1963; Brereton, 1961; Eastman & McCain, 1981; Farris, 1972; Foster, 1974; Mathias, 1976; Stephens, 1976) and at least one national report (National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement [also referred to as the Wickersham Commission], 1931) chronicle the growth of law enforcement programs at institutions of higher learning in the years between the 1909 National Conference on Criminal Law and Criminology in Chicago and the outbreak of World War II. Programs began at Harvard University and at Northwestern University in 1925, and at the University of Wisconsin in 1927. The first university curriculum for police training was established at the University of Chicago in 1929, and in 1930, the University of California at Berkeley established its first degree program in police science. Other programs were begun

at Michigan State University and Indiana University in 1935, and at the University of Washington in 1936.

Goldstein (1977) reports that during the 1930's, police agencies began to experience a significant increase in the number of college educated recruits. But this circumstance was caused less by increased pressures for higher educated employees than by the impact of the depression. According to Carter (1978), a similar phenomenon occurred after World War II when a flood of returning veterans, many holding college degrees, inundated the job market, and once again law enforcement became an employment target. Carter goes on to indicate that following the war, more and more institutions began offering degree programs in law enforcement and criminal justice studies, and the level of education for police officers steadily increased. At present, however, only seven of the programs in existence prior to the beginning of World War II, continue to operate: the University of California at 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.

In 1950, Boolsen reported the results of a 1949 survey of every post-secondary institution in the country. In this study he attempted to determine how many schools were offering programs in the field of criminology. Of the 325 responses, only 20 institutions met his basic requirement of

offering at least a two-year major in the broadly defined field of criminology (Boolsen, 1950; Foster, 1974; Stephens, 1976). But later in the 1950's, substantial growth occurred in law enforcement programs so that by the time Germann surveyed American institutions of higher learning in 1957, he was able to identify 56 institutions in 19 states offering 77 programs leading to academic degrees in the criminal justice field (Germann, 1957).

The 1960's begin what Carter (1978) refers to as the "third generation of police education" and became a time of phenomenal growth of associate degree law enforcement programs. This tremendous growth, brought on by a surge in the numbers of public community colleges increased the opportunities for millions of adults to participate in higher education. Hoover and Lund (1977) argue that it was this spurt of growth, this opportunity, this development of the community college as a viable institution of higher learning that allowed criminal justice to emerge as a major recognized field of study in higher education. In 1900, there were no public two-year colleges in the United States. By 1940, there were just over 250. Between 1940 and 1960, the number had grown to 405. In the 1960's the number doubled as 442 more two year public schools were opened, and by 1980, there were 1,050 public community and junior colleges in operation (Cohen & Brawer, 1982).

The upper level institutions continued to be involved in the movement to provide more education and training for

law enforcement officers throughout the 1960's. Saunders (1970) reports that from 1963-1968 alone, the number of baccalaureate degree programs nearly doubled, but it was the public community and junior college that appeared to reap the benefit of increased student enrollment in law enforcement programs. Foster (1974) found that almost 60% of all crime-related degree programs were offered by two-year institutions.

One of the factors which encouraged the growth of programs for law enforcement education in the 1960's was a trend toward mandatory training or minimum training standards or requirements. Farris (1972) points out that New York was the first of the states to initiate minimum peace officer training standards. Other states were quick to follow. A second force driving the increased levels of law enforcement educational programs in the 1960's was the passage of the Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965, the issuance of a series of reports by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice in February 1967, and the passage of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968.

Wilson (1975) points out that the increased public and governmental concern over the educational levels of the police grew from the turmoil the nation found itself in during the decade of the 1960's. He points out that the "youth rebellion", race riots, assassinations of political leaders, changing attitudes toward drug usage and political

activism of more persons coupled with a liberal Supreme Court and a rising crime rate caused more and more concerned citizens and politicians to take a closer look at the education and training required of law enforcement officers.

Special commissions were set up and in 1967, the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice recommended that effective immediately, the minimum requirement for all supervisory and executive positions should be a baccalaureate degree. The Commission further recommended that the ultimate aim of all departments should be that all personnel with general law enforcement powers have baccalaureate degrees. This report fueled a growing debate within the law enforcement community focusing on the value of a college degree for law enforcement officers. Despite the controversy that ensued, the federal government acted on the recommendations of the Commission.

Prompted by the Commission's report, the federal government moved to supply large amounts of money to finance the college education of police officers; police agencies adopted incentive plans, and the police departments began aggressively recruiting for college educated employees (Goldstein, 1977). The Crime Control Act of 1968, through its establishing of the Law Enforcement Education Program (LEEP) administered by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA), allowed the distribution of funds to colleges and universities for the development of law enforcement and/or criminal justice degree programs. In its

first year of operation, LEEP provided financial assistance for 20,602 students. The impact of LEEP was phenomenal and in 1973, over 95,000 students were assisted (LEAA, 1973).

The influx of students and monies to the colleges was not without its own set of problems. Evaluation and guideline criteria had to be established. Stinchcomb and Crockett (1968) developed a set of guidelines for law enforcement education programs at two-year schools. Styles and Pace (1969) identified guidelines for work experience for community colleges to use in working with programs in the criminal justice system. Fox (1969) addressed guidelines for corrections programs in two-year schools, and Pace, Stinchcomb, and Styles (1970) addressed the problem of skills training versus academic preparation in the law enforcement field.

Burrow (1977) pointed out that the stimulus of the LEEP program had a significant impact on the mean educational level of police officers in the United States. Despite the increased funding and despite the attention given the importance of increased educational levels, in 1973, the police were again accused of having low educational requirements and for failing to pursue the college graduate as an employee (National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, 1973). The report went on to recommend for immediate implementation, a goal that by 1982, every police agency should require, at initial employment, the completion of a baccalaureate degree or at least 120

semester hours of education. A recent study by Sapp (1988) indicated that this recommendation is far from being achieved. Sapp found that while the results indicate an increase over the 3.4 percent reported in the early 1970's, only about 15 percent of the nations larger police agencies were found to require or even prefer any college education for entry level employment.

Logan (1975) cautioned law enforcement agencies about poor quality programs at all institutions of higher learning and as the profession began to move into the 1980's, concern was expressed that in moving to college campuses, police training had moved too far from the field it was designed to support. In 1978, another national report, The Quality of Police Education (also known as the Sherman Report or the Police Foundation Report), called the colleges to task for placing too much emphasis on vocational skills in the college law enforcement curriculum, for staffing programs with moonlighting criminal justice practitioners and identified nine principal shortcomings of institutions of higher learning and their police-oriented programs. These major failings included: (1) weak institutional commitment to the programs, (2) poor administrative practices, (3) inadequate faculty, (4) unbalanced curricula, (5) part-time attendance outside working hours, (6) two year programs that were terminal rather than preparatory for a baccalaureate, (7) poor police attitude at the departmental level toward higher education, (8) the absence of accreditation, and (9)

flaws in LEAA's Law Enforcement Education Program (LEEP) (National Advisory Commission on Higher Education for Police Officers, 1978). This report fueled the fires of the degree versus no degree controversy once again, and prompted substantial debate within both the higher education and the police communities.

The following year, 1979, many of the findings of the Sherman Report were debated in the National Symposium on Higher Education for Police Officers, but no real answer to the issue was postulated other than an agreement that the funding for educational programs provided by LEEP should be reinstated (Proceedings, 1979). Indeed, the argument over the value of the academic degree to the law enforcement officer and the role of the institutions of higher education has continued through the eighties.

Seitzinger (1981), concerned that with cutbacks in federal and state training dollars many community colleges would be decreasing their level of support for police education and training, encouraged law enforcement agencies to reestablish training programs of their own. Potts (1981) agreed that the kind of broad education a college degree program provides is important for a career in policing, but criticized colleges for failing to include ethics courses in the law enforcement curriculum. LeDoux, Tully, Chronister and Gansneder (1984) suggest that while higher education for law enforcement officers has grown, the value of the college experience for the officer is uncertain. Swan (1984) and,

more recently, Burden (1988) and Reed (1988) argue that higher education and its accompanying academic degree constitute management tools for supervisors and become personal advantages for the police officers themselves.

In the midst of this controversy over the value of the college degree for the law enforcement officer, a curious thing happened as, in the rhetoric surrounding the issues, many of the reports and much of the published research grouped skills training with academic education courses. Perhaps this was because during the 1960's and 1970's, the federal funding supported both types of education; perhaps this blurring of function was intentional. But as early as 1966, Clark and Chapman pointed out that there was a distinct difference between training and education as practiced in degree programs. Tenney (1971) addressed the differences as did Hoover and Lund (1977), and Fischer (1981) pointed out that even as late as 1978, while the Sherman Report noted the difference between academic and training curricula, it failed to note the fundamental distinction between education and training.

Significant advances were being made during the 1960's and 1970's which involved law enforcement agencies with institutions of higher learning, but as Aaron (1965) indicates, for the most part, the programs were usually confined to highly urbanized areas of the country and usually developed in areas of the country with more of a social consciousness than other areas. The growth of the

community colleges and their offering of both academic courses and skills training courses helped meet the training needs of smaller departments in suburban and rural areas. But there were still agencies that chose to develop their own training centers and administer their own training programs, and a body of research and literature grew to support the activities of these agencies.

O. W. Wilson (1963) provided a discussion of training and its place in the departmental organization in his widely read volume on police administration. Other practitioners provided an examination of the training function of the department in more detail. Frost (1959) was among the first to provide a relatively complete overview of the personnel selection and training process. This work was followed by others (Klotter, 1963; Harrison, 1964; Adams, 1964; Hansen and Culley, 1973; Earle, 1973; O'Neill & Martensen, 1975; Klotter & Rosenfield, 1979; Trautmann, 1987) designed to provide assistance to the police trainer in the development of departmental education programs and to provide a theoretical and practical basis for the delivery of instruction. Among many departments instruction in the form of short courses for continuing education and skills upgrading continue to be developed and taught by a departmental training officer.

Nationally, research on police academy training is relatively sparse. Typically, research done on law enforcement programs examines some aspect of the law

enforcement/higher education academic congruence such as much of the work cited previously. Sanderson's 1977 study of the relationship of college education to job performance of police officers is one such treatment. Other studies of a similar nature include Smith and Locke (1970), Territo (1975), Logan (1975), Goldstein (1977), Stinchcomb's (1977) assessment of the involvement of the two-year college in law enforcement between 1966 and 1976, and Sapp's (1988) inquiry into the educational levels of police officers.

The skills training offered in an academy setting has more often been the subject of comment or criticism and only occasionally been the subject of research. There are, however, some dissertations and research studies involving police academy programming. The first attempt at studying police entry level training was by Barry (1929) who completed the first recorded dissertation on police training (Meadows, 1987). Harris (1973) published his dissertation as an insider's view of the police academy, basing his comments on a basic training program he went through as a sociology graduate student. Gilsinan (1974) also described the sociological implications of passage through a police academy. Bertram (1975) attempted to predict police academy performance and on the job performance with the use of a recruit screening measure. In 1975, Horn studied police recruit training programs and examined the development of their curricula, and in 1986, Talley published the results

of his 1984 dissertation evaluating the curriculum of the Oakland, Michigan Police academy.

Law Enforcement Education and Training in Texas

Law enforcement in Texas has changed significantly since Stephen F. Austin organized the first Texas Rangers in 1823 (Robinson, 1974). This small group of Rangers earned a well-deserved reputation as fearless and effective preservers of law and order in old Texas. It was from these early roots that grew the "one riot - one ranger" story and countless other legends firmly ensconcing the image of the Texas lawman in the folklore of the state and nation (Webb, 1935).

But crime and public safety are not legend or folklore. They are very real concerns confronting our society and our communities. We expect an answer from the state's system of law enforcement, but that system is still, in many ways, in its infancy. The development of law enforcement as a profession has taken innumerable twists and turns since the birth of the Rangers, but the education of police officers has only recently been an organized and controlled function of state government in Texas.

Formal training of police officers in Texas had its beginning in Fort Worth in 1926 with a course conducted by the Fort Worth Police Department. Austin's first class was held in 1928, and in Houston, the first class was conducted in 1930. An instructor was employed in 1938 by the Texas Vocational Board of Education (TVBE) to conduct police

courses throughout the state. In 1939 the legislature granted Texas A&M University the legislative authority to conduct law enforcement training on a state wide basis, and the TVBE instructor was transferred the following year to Texas A&M's Engineering Extension Service. At that point, A&M began a tradition of conducting police training which has continued to the present (Robinson, 1974; TCLEOSE, 1981).

In 1935, realizing that the state's role in crime prevention and traffic control was disorganized and often inadequate, the Legislature created the Department of Public Safety. This same legislative action allowed the DPS to create its Bureau of Education to operate schools for the training of county and municipal police officers and to educate the general public in matters of highway safety. (DPS, 1985; Robinson, 1974). In 1937, the Texas DPS began formal training of its own newly appointed officers in an academy, a practice which was copied almost immediately by the offering of recruit classes for the metropolitan police department of Dallas in 1938, and for Houston and San Antonio in 1939 (Beasley, 1969). Austin also offered recruit training, and regional training was conducted in the lower Rio Grande Valley and in the Dallas County area for personnel working in smaller law enforcement agencies. (TCLEOSE, 1981).

But most smaller departments received no training. There was no minimum statutory training requirement for the

peace officer. The training of the local law enforcement officers was still often archaic at best. Even as late as the mid 1950's, in many communities in Texas the training of the law enforcement officer amounted to not much more than handling the newcomer a badge and a gun and placing him with a seasoned veteran for a few days before he was turned out on his own (Wilson, 1988). In fact, as late as 1967 an estimate of trained officers indicated that 50 per cent of the state's peace officers had no training at all for the jobs they were called on to perform, and of the remaining 50 per cent, most had less than 140 hours of instruction (Weddle, 1970).

In 1965, however, the seed was planted to begin a change in law enforcement education in Texas. In that year, in what was probably the single most important step ever taken by the State with regard to law enforcement, the Texas Legislature created the Texas Commission on Law Enforcement Officer Standards and Education (TCLEOSE). The Commission received no funding for its operation and developed no minimum training standards until 1969. In that year, the State Legislature enacted a requirement that all persons who were appointed as peace officers in Texas had to complete a 140 hour basic training program within one year following the initial appointment (TCLEOSE, 1981). That minimum training requirement was increased to 240 hours in 1973, to 320 hours in 1981, and to 400 hours in 1986.

Relationships between law enforcement agencies and institutions of higher learning were established in the 1930's in Texas. Shortly following its organization in 1935, the Texas Department of Public Safety, through its Bureau of Identification and Records, established a working relationship with the University of Texas for chemical laboratory work (DPS, 1985). As already noted, Texas A&M received a legislative mandate to conduct training in the state in 1939, but prior to that time had already conducted conferences on improving police service in Waco in 1933, Wichita Falls in 1934, and in El Paso in 1935 (Beasley, 1969). In 1947, the University of Houston established a program of police education which lasted until 1963 and other universities and junior colleges slowly but steadily added programs (Beasley, 1969; Mahaney, 1973).

As the Law Enforcement Education Program (LEEP) became a national reality in 1967, a substantial number of new students coming to Texas colleges were police officers. As colleges began modifying schedules and blending career education with traditional curricula, it became apparent that a new curriculum for law enforcement was needed. As a result, a seven core curriculum was developed jointly by TCLEOSE and the Coordinating Board of Texas Colleges and Universities and adopted in 1972 (Burrow, 1978). Roberts (1973) indicates that this was the first state-mandated core curriculum in law enforcement in the nation. Each college offering a degree in law enforcement was required to offer

the seven foundation courses: (1) Legal Aspects of Law Enforcement, (2) Police Role in Crime and Delinquency, (3) Police Organization and Administration, (4) Introduction to Law Enforcement, (5) Criminal Investigation, (6) Criminal Evidence and Procedure, and (7) Police-Community Relations (Taylor & Matlock, 1979).

The fall semester of the 1969 school year saw 905 peace officers enrolled in degree programs in 16 community/junior colleges and at Sam Houston State University. By the fall semester 1971, of the 9,149 students enrolled in law enforcement degree programs in 43 schools in Texas, over 2,700 of these were law enforcement officers (Beasley, 1969; Weddle, 1970). Five years later, in the State's 44 community/junior colleges and 32 upper level institutions, of over 13,500 students who had declared law enforcement/criminal justice as their major, over 2,700 were peace officers and almost 2,300 degrees were conferred on peace officers (TCLEOSE, 1976). By 1986, all 48 Texas Community/Junior colleges had academic degree programs approved by TCLEOSE for the awarding of credit. (TCLEOSE, 1986).

As the 1970's drew to a close the funding provided by the federal government to colleges and regional training centers through LEAA began to decline significantly, the emphasis by law enforcement agencies on education began to focus less on college education and more on securing skills training for their officers. More and more the pursuit of

the baccalaureate degree was left to the individual preferences of the officer, while the satisfaction of the initial recruit training became the prime focus of the agency.

Hoover (1986) points out that a complicating factor in the new emphasis placed on academy training versus academic education had to do with the increasingly litigious society of the 1980's. In fact, he goes on to point out, even TCLEOSE was concerned over its own liability in vicarious liability suits which alleged negligence by training agencies. Central to this issue was the question of whether or not the academic program including the seven core curriculum adopted in 1972 could adequately prepare one to perform the skills and abilities a recruit had to bring to the job. Because the academic core curriculum could be used as a means of waiving basic training, many officers were found lacking in the fundamental skills of report writing, firearms training and personal defense.

The response of many agencies was to send everyone to basic recruit academies regardless of formal education and the net effect was a lessening of the importance agencies placed on recruiting students with degrees. Between 1980 and 1984, TCLEOSE conducted an elaborate basic training review process finding that the seven core curriculum was inadequate as a complete preparation for police work. In addition to instituting a licensing exam, TCLEOSE also recommended revision of the academic curricula. As a

result, a new core curriculum was developed and a "bridge" course of 190 hours of "mini-basic training" was instituted in 1986 at the academy level to teach skills to those graduates of the academic program (Hoover, 1986).

Research on Texas' police training academies has been sparse reflecting the similar situation at the national level. For the most part, source documents come from the TCLEOSE records, or are published in the Texas Police Journal. Other than those previously cited in the review of law enforcement and higher education in Texas and general program status reports such as Beasley (1968) and TCLEOSE (1981), only one document was found in a published source that described a police academy at a community college in Texas; Sorrell's 1976 descriptive survey of the East Texas Police Academy at Kilgore College.

In summary, the construction of background information via a review of the literature indicates a significant degree of interest in the relationship between institutions of higher learning and the study of law enforcement. Much has been written on the subjects of professionalism, higher education as a characteristic of a professional, and the attempt to create a meaningful academic curriculum for the peace officer. There is a smaller body of knowledge available on the police academy, its role in the preparation of the law enforcement officer and its characteristics generally. And there is an even smaller body of knowledge available regarding the development of education and

training for the law enforcement agencies of the state of Texas, regarding their relationship with institutions of higher learning in the state, and regarding the development and operation of police academies at community/junior colleges in Texas.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES FOR DATA COLLECTION

Population

The population for this study was all TCLEOSE (Texas Commission on Law Enforcement Officer Standards and Education) licensed and approved, non-contract, police academies operating at public community colleges in the state of Texas which provide recruit and/or non-credit training for law enforcement officers. TCLEOSE identifies contract academies as those which conduct training for agencies and/or other organizations on a contract basis. Contract academies were not considered in this study.

At the time of this study, there were five public community colleges in Texas identified as contract institutions. These academies were: Houston Community College, Houston, Texas; North Harris County College, Kingwood, Texas; San Antonio College in cooperation with the University of Texas at San Antonio, San Antonio, Texas; Tyler Junior College, Tyler, Texas, and Wharton County Junior College, Wharton, Texas.

The fifteen academies comprising the population were identified from records provided by the Texas Commission on Law Enforcement Officer Standards and Education. This

population included: Alvin Community College, Alvin, Texas; Brazosport College Law Enforcement Academy, Lake Jackson, Texas; Central Texas Regional Academy at American Technological University, Killeen, Texas; College of the Mainland Regional Academy, Texas City, Texas; Del Mar Police Academy at Del Mar College, Corpus Christi, Texas; East Texas Police Academy at Kilgore College, Kilgore, Texas; Heart of Texas Regional Academy at McClennan Community College, Waco, Texas; Laredo Junior College Regional Academy, Laredo, Texas; Middle Rio Grande Law Enforcement Academy at Southwest Texas Junior College, Uvalde, Texas; NorTex Regional Academy at Vernon Regional Junior College, Vernon, Texas; Panhandle Regional Law Enforcement Academy at Amarillo College, Amarillo, Texas; Tarrant County Junior College Academy, Fort Worth, Texas; Texoma Police Academy at Grayson County Junior College, Denison, Texas; Texas Southmost College Regional Academy, South Padre Island, Texas and Victoria College Law Enforcement Academy, Victoria, Texas.

Subjects

Subjects for this study were individuals identified by TCLEOSE and the researcher as the most qualified persons to address organization and administrative questions for the school. In all cases, these individuals had day to day responsibility for operation of the academy. These individuals were most familiar with the role and scope of the institution's police academy, its development,

organization, administration, operation, and the degree of its involvement with the law enforcement community.

The Survey Instrument

Although a lack of comprehensive data was revealed in the review of existing literature, it appeared that such information was available and could be gathered by means of an appropriately designed questionnaire.

Questionnaire design.

A questionnaire which utilized a descriptive survey method was constructed to gather data to be used in answering the research questions (see Appendix B). Questions asked were based on previous research and drawn from the personal experiences of the author. The questionnaire asked for objective data, but allowed for the presentation of narrative data regarding the history of the academy's development at the institution. Current administrators at community colleges with and without police academies, and current administrators of community college police academies were asked for assistance in the construction of the instrument.

Questionnaire validation.

A panel of five leaders in law enforcement training, community college administration and/or non-credit programs were asked to review and evaluate the questionnaire in order to establish its content validity. Each person was contacted by phone or in person to determine willingness to serve as a validation panelist. A letter explaining the

nature, scope and population of the study and a copy of the preliminary questionnaire were hand carried to each person. The panelists were encouraged to make suggestions to improve the questionnaire and were asked to evaluate the questionnaire in terms of design, item clarity, item appropriateness, and wording. This panel included:

1. Mr. Tommy Hunnycutt, Objective Manager of Training Academies, Texas Commission on Law Enforcement Officer Standards and Education.
2. Mr. Dave Keel, Director of Training, Heart of Texas Regional Academy, McLennan Community College, Waco, Texas.
3. Dr. Horace Griffiths, Director of Research, Tarrant County Junior College, Ft. Worth, Texas.
4. Dr. Fred Voda, former President, Worthington College, Worthington, Minnesota and presently, Dean of Community Services, Tarrant County Junior College, Ft. Worth, Texas.
5. Dr. Gale Neff, Director of Program Development, Tarrant County Junior College, Ft. Worth, Texas.

Each panelist was allowed one week to review the instrument. As soon as the review process was completed, the researcher conducted a personal interview with each panelist. Comments and concerns were discussed and questionnaires were collected.

An item was retained if at least three of the panelists concurred on its validity. All comments were reviewed and if, in the opinion of the researcher, they were deemed to

improve or clarify the questionnaire, they were implemented. Reliability of the instrument was deemed limited due to the pilot nature of the study.

Modification of the Preliminary Instrument

The comments deriving from the validation process were extremely helpful in terms of questionnaire appearance and design. The physical appearance of the questionnaire was altered and by rearranging items, the document was shortened. Two questions were added and two questions were dropped. There were 56 questions in which changes in wording were made to provide better item clarity, but in 37 of these questions, the change involved substitution of the word "college" for another term.

The Final Instrument

The final instrument consisted of 85 questions covering the following areas:

| | |
|------------------------------------|--------------------|
| A. background of the academy | 9 questions |
| B. organization and administration | 7 questions |
| C. facilities & equipment | 3 questions |
| D. personnel | 16 questions |
| E. student policies & practices | 13 questions |
| F. perceptions of support | 12 questions |
| G. outside involvement | 16 questions |
| H. extensiveness of the program | <u>9</u> questions |
| Total questions | 85 |

The above list corresponds to the order in which the questions were asked.

In addition to the above questions, certain items of information about the respondent were requested in an attempt to establish a profile of academy coordinators. These items included title, number of years in present position, number of years experience as a full-time peace officer, number of years full-time experience in higher education, highest degree held, major field for last degree, and gender.

Initial Contact

Because the population for the study was small (15), phone calls were placed to each of the subjects immediately prior to mailing the questionnaires. The purpose of these calls was to establish a personal contact with the subjects, to briefly explain the study in an attempt to involve them, and to ask personally for their assistance with the study.

Letters.

A letter introducing the researcher and explaining the nature of the study accompanied each questionnaire sent to the subjects (see Appendix C). Instructions for completion and return of the questionnaire were provided in the letter and a postage-paid, self-addressed envelope was included. A second letter (see Appendix D) was sent as a follow-up and also included a self-addressed, stamped return envelope for the subject's convenience.

Procedure

On May 18, 19 and 22, 1989, the telephone calls were placed and the questionnaire and letter of introduction

(Appendices B and C) were mailed to the subjects. Each respondent was asked to respond to the questionnaire and to return it promptly in the envelope provided. After fifteen days had lapsed, eight of the questionnaires were in and on June 6, 1989, a follow-up phone call was made. In three cases, a follow-up letter together with a duplicate questionnaire was sent to subjects for whom responses had not been received. All written correspondence was sent via first-class mail, utilizing the United States Postal Service. Subjects were given a total of 30 days from the initial mailing to respond to the questionnaire. In five cases, data was missing or unclear and attempts to gain the necessary information were made by means of a personal interview or telephone call to the subject.

On June 30, 1989, the institutions to which instruments were mailed were categorized into respondent and nonrespondent schools. By that date, the response was adequate (86.7%, $N = 13$), and no further effort was made to obtain data.

Data Analysis

Upon receipt of 86.7% of the questionnaires returned in usable form and on June 22, 1989, data were compiled. Raw data obtained from the questionnaires were entered into an IBM microcomputer using the dBASE III+ database software package published by Ashton Tate. Construction of tables in Chapter IV show the subject's responses to each set of survey questions. Total number of responses and percentages of responses were included for each item.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

This study proposed to examine the development and operation of police training academies at public community junior colleges in Texas with the intent of examining selected aspects of those non-credit training programs. The study sought to examine the development of these non-credit law enforcement training programs and to provide normative data describing the police training academies. Areas which were examined included background of the academy, organization and administration of the program, adequacy of facilities and equipment for carrying out the training, personnel practices, student policies and practices, the administrator's perceptions of internal and external support for the academy, the extent of involvement by outside forces in the operation of the academy, and the extensiveness of the program as measured by enrollment data. As a result of this study, descriptive data were gathered which both community colleges and law enforcement agencies may use in decision-making for training affiliation. The study also provided comparative data in organizational and administrative areas for colleges currently operating police

training academies, and provided developmental data for colleges planning to begin such an academy.

Data for this study were obtained from completed questionnaires returned by the administrators of the police training academies at the selected institutions. Those institutions participating in the study included all Texas Commission on Law Enforcement Officer Standards and Education (TCLEOSE) licensed and approved, non-contract, police academies operating at public community colleges in the state of Texas which provide recruit and/or non-credit training for peace officers.

A total of 15 questionnaires were mailed. Of the 15 questionnaires distributed, 13 were appropriately completed and returned, thus, a return rate of 86.7% was established.

The findings presented in this chapter are the results of the collected data. Each research question is presented and discussed, with analysis pertaining to the research question. Each research question was addressed in a separate section of the questionnaire. Each section asked the respondent related to the research question addressed by the section. Data are presented in tabular form, so as to answer the research questions established in Chapter I.

Demographic Data

The initial part of the questionnaire requested information about the respondent. Presented in Table 1 are the demographic characteristics of the 13 respondents who completed and returned the questionnaire.

The majority of those who responded held the title "Director" (61.5%, $n = 8$). The second most common title, "Coordinator", was held by four respondents (30.8%), and only one respondent (7.7%) held the title of "Department Chair". In terms of education level, most respondents held a master's degree (69.2%, $n = 9$) while the bachelor's degree was the only other degree held by the remainder (30.8%, $n = 4$). A majority of the respondents held a major in criminal justice or in law enforcement (84.6%, $n = 11$). Only two respondents held any other type major, and both of those were in education (15.4%). All respondents were male.

A majority (38.5%, $n = 5$) of the respondents reported having held their current position for five years or less. Three respondents (23.1%) indicated holding the position for 6 - 10 years, three others reported holding the position for 11 - 15 years, and two (15.4%) indicated having held their position for 16 - 20 years. The mean length of time in the same position is nine years.

All respondents indicated they had spent time as law enforcement officers. The mean number of years experience as a law enforcement officer was 17 years, but this score is skewed by the fact that only five (38.5%) respondents reported length of service over 16 years. The majority (61.5%, $n = 8$) of respondents reported lengths of services as a full time police officer of less than 15 years and, in fact, the majority of all respondents (38.5%, $n = 5$) reported 6 - 10 years experience. The median for years of

experience was 12; the mode 10 years. Only one respondent reported serving fewer than five years as a peace officer.

In years of full-time experience in higher education, the majority (38.5%, $n = 5$) had over 15 years experience. The mean for this category was 11 years, the mode was five years and the median was 10 years.

Table 1

Responses to Questions Regarding Participant
Demographic Data

| Variable | N | Percentage |
|--------------------------|----|------------|
| Title | | |
| Director | 8 | 61.5 |
| Coordinator | 4 | 30.8 |
| Department Chair | 1 | 7.7 |
| Educational Level | | |
| Master's | 9 | 69.2 |
| Bachelor's | 4 | 30.8 |
| Major Field | | |
| Criminal Justice | 9 | 69.2 |
| Law Enforcement | 2 | 15.4 |
| Education | 2 | 15.4 |
| Sex | | |
| Male | 13 | 100.0 |
| Female | 0 | 0.0 |

(table continues)

| Variable | <u>N</u> | Percentage |
|--|----------|------------|
| Years in Current Position | | |
| 1-5 | 5 | 38.5 |
| 6-10 | 3 | 23.1 |
| 11-15 | 3 | 23.1 |
| 16-20 | 2 | 15.4 |
| Mean | 9 | |
| Years as Full-time Peace Officer | | |
| 1-5 | 1 | 7.7 |
| 6-10 | 5 | 38.5 |
| 11-15 | 2 | 15.4 |
| 16-20 | 1 | 7.7 |
| Over 20 | 4 | 30.8 |
| Mean | 17 | |
| Years Full-time in Higher Education | | |
| 1-5 | 4 | 30.8 |
| 6-10 | 3 | 23.1 |
| 11-15 | 1 | 7.7 |
| 16-20 | 5 | 38.5 |
| Mean | 11 | |
| Number Requesting Abstract | | |
| Yes | 13 | 100.0 |
| No | 0 | 0.0 |

All of the respondents requested an abstract of the study. This response indicated a high level of interest in the subject matter of the survey.

Summary

The data indicated that the persons responsible for non-credit police training at the community colleges are interested in the field, are all male, and for the most part hold the title of "Director". Most of them have a degree in some area of criminal justice or law enforcement, have held their current position an average of nine years, served as a peace officer full time for several years and have several years experience employed full time in higher education.

Analysis of the Questionnaire and Responses

To Research Questions

This study involved the investigation of eight research questions (developed and presented in Chapter I) which served as a guide for gathering information and data. The following section includes an analysis of the data gathered and provides an answer to each research question, based on the data obtained by the questionnaire.

Research Question One:

What is the History of Police Academies

In Texas Community Colleges

The data presented in Table 2 reflects the responses of the surveyed group to nine questions designed to determine the history of the police academy at the community college in Texas. The information is presented and an

analysis provided with the following caveat. It was impossible to collect data from institutions which had opened a police academy and then closed it. The data presented reflects information collected from 13 of the 15 community college police academies whose lifespan has continued uninterrupted since their inception.

The data presented in Table 2 represents the responses of the surveyed group to questions regarding: (A) the beginning year of operation, (B) whether the academy had been in continuous operation since that time, (C) cause for beginning operations, (D) nature of courses offered by the academy in its first five years of operation, (E) the department the academy reported to during its first five years of operation, (F) sources of guidance used in the initial organization of the academy, and (G) whether there have been any injuries or fatalities in the academy's training programs.

In reviewing the responses to the beginning date of the police academies, it was found that the majority of the academies (76.9%, $n = 10$) came into existence between 1968 and 1979. In fact, this time period also marked not only the period of increased growth in community colleges, but also a period of significant growth in law enforcement academic programs at all colleges and universities, and also marked the period of the infusion of millions of dollars in federal funds into law enforcement training. In Texas, this time period also included the beginning of funding for non-

credit adult vocational programs. An analysis of the data indicates that all the programs reported to the continuing education officer during their first five years of operation. Further examination of the data indicates that all of the academies surveyed have been in continuous operation since their inception and although they have operated under various TCLEOSE approval numbers, the change was the result of re-numbering by TCLEOSE.

Table 2

Responses to Questions Regarding the Background
of the Academy (Questionnaire Section "A")
(Research Question 1)

| Question number and variable | <u>N</u> | Percentage |
|---------------------------------|----------|------------|
| 1. Beginning year | | |
| 1968 - 1969 | 4 | 30.8 |
| 1970 - 1979 | 6 | 46.1 |
| 1980 - 1989 | 3 | 23.1 |
| 2. Continuous operation | | |
| Yes | 13 | 100.0 |
| No | 0 | 0.0 |
| 3,4. Other TCLEOSE # | | |
| Yes | 13 | 100.0 |
| No | 0 | 0.0 |

(table continues)

| Question number and variable | N | Percentage |
|----------------------------------|----|------------|
| <hr/> | | |
| 5. Cause for beginning operation | | |
| Community request | 4 | 30.8 |
| State agency request | 1 | 7.7 |
| College initiative | 4 | 30.8 |
| COG request | 7 | 53.8 |
| Local agency request | 6 | 46.1 |
| 6. Nature of 1st courses offered | | |
| Basic peace officer | 13 | 100.0 |
| In-service training | 12 | 92.3 |
| Community service | 3 | 23.1 |
| Other | 2 | 15.4 |
| 7. Department reported to | | |
| Continuing education | 8 | 61.5 |
| Academic department | 1 | 7.7 |
| Other | 4 | 30.8 |
| 8. Sources of guidance | | |
| None | 4 | 30.8 |
| Visits at other agencies | 5 | 38.5 |
| In-state educational | 5 | 38.5 |
| In-state governmental | 3 | 23.1 |

(table continues)

| Question number and variable | <u>N</u> | Percentage |
|------------------------------|----------|------------|
| Out of state education | 2 | 15.4 |
| Out of state government | 0 | 0.0 |
| Paid consultants | 0 | 0.0 |
| Unpaid consultants | 2 | 15.4 |
| Advisory committee | 8 | 61.5 |
| Written studies | 1 | 7.7 |
| 9. Fatalities | 0 | 0.0 |
| Injuries | | |
| Students | 3 | 23.1 |
| Instructors/Staff | 0 | 0.0 |

The academies began operation as the result of various influences. Listed as the most common impetus for beginning the program was as a result of a request from a local council of governments (53.8%, $n = 7$). At the request of a local law enforcement agency (46.1%, $n = 6$) was the second most cited reason for beginning operation, and community request and college initiative (30.8%, $n = 4$ each) was the third most cited reason. Only one academy indicated that it began as a result of a request from a state agency.

During their first five years of operation, all academies offered the Basic Peace Officer's Training Course (Appendix E). This course is designed to equip the student

with the entry level skills and knowledge required of the peace officer. A majority of the academies (92.3%, $n = 12$) also offered in-service training courses as continuing education for peace officers. Very few (23.1%, $n = 3$) of the academies offered classes for the general public. Two academies (15.4%) offered programs for other public agencies and included programs such as training for private investigators or security officers and court clerks.

In regard to sources of guidance used to develop and organize the academy, a majority (61.5%, $n = 8$) of the institutions reported the use of advisory committees for assistance. Five agencies (38.5%) reported visits at other agencies. All five visited in-state educational institutions, three visited in-state governmental facilities, and three who visited other agencies looked at out of state educational institutions. None of the respondents paid consultants for assistance although two (15.4%) reported using unpaid consultants. Only one agency reported utilizing any kind of written documentation as assistance in organizing the program, but it failed to note any specific documents. Surprisingly, four respondents (30.8%) reported that they used no guidance other than that provided by TCLEOSE.

Since it reflects on their attention to detail and hence the credibility of their program, an issue of extreme importance and sensitivity to academy administrators is their ability to conduct training programs without injuries

or fatalities. An interesting statistic emerging from the study is the fact that in the cumulative training years, (183 years) for all academies responding to the study, only three injuries requiring hospitalization were reported. While the majority of the peace officer training courses occur in a classroom environment, firearms training is a requirement of all Basic Peace Officer Courses, and firearms training as well as physical tactics are often the subjects of in-service training. None of the respondents reported fatalities for students, instructors or staff.

Research Question Two:

How are the Police Academies Organized

Research Question Two explores information about the organization and administration of the police academy. The data presented in Table 3 indicates the answers of respondents to seven questions designed to determine: (A) the title of the person with day to day responsibility for the police academy, (B) the title of the administrator to whom the police academy administrator reports, (C) the depth within the administrative structure the position responsible for the police academy is located, (D) the related academic programs the college offers, (E) the involvement of academic instructors with the police academy, (F) affiliations between the police academy and other agencies, and (G) whether the academy is dependent on other agencies for a majority of its students.

An examination of the data regarding the title of the person with day to day responsibility for the police academy indicates the majority (53.8%, $n = 7$) hold the title of "director". Of the remainder, five (38.5%) are "coordinators" and one (7.7%) is a "department chair".

The person with day to day responsibility for the police academy reports to a person with the title of "dean" in a majority (61.5%, $n = 8$) of responding institutions. At three institutions (23.1%) he/she reports to a "director" and at two other institutions (15.4%) reports to an academic program administrator.

The depth within the organization the police academy administrator is located is significant. As the programs surveyed are non-credit and as at community colleges the non-credit programs are traditionally supposed to be highly responsive to the needs of the community, the ability of the program administrator to obtain a decision from the institution's chief executive officer without going through many other intermediate administrators may well be a determinate of a programs success. At a majority (61.5%, $n = 8$) of the responding institutions, the academy administrator is four positions deep within the organization. At three institutions (23.1%) the administrator is three positions deep and at two institutions, (15.4%), the administrator is five positions deep.

Table 3

Responses to Questions Regarding the Organization
and Administration of the Police Academy
(Questionnaire Section "B")
(Research Question 2)

| Question number and variable | N | Percentage |
|--|----|------------|
| 1. Academy administrator title | | |
| Coordinator | 5 | 38.5 |
| Director | 7 | 53.8 |
| Department Chair | 1 | 7.7 |
| 2. Academy administrator reports to: | | |
| Dean | 8 | 61.5 |
| Director | 3 | 23.1 |
| Division Chair | 2 | 15.4 |
| 3. Depth of academy within the organization | | |
| 5 administrative levels | 2 | 15.4 |
| 4 administrative levels | 8 | 61.5 |
| 3 administrative levels | 3 | 23.1 |
| 4. Associate degrees offered in: | | |
| Criminal Justice | 13 | 100.0 |
| Probation and parole | 0 | 0.0 |
| Corrections | 4 | 30.8 |

(table continues)

| Question number and variable | N | Percentage |
|--|---|------------|
| 5. Credit programs w/responsibility in the police academy | | |
| Criminal justice (13) | | |
| Admin responsibility | 3 | 23.1 |
| Teaching responsibility | 3 | 23.1 |
| Probation and parole | | |
| Admin responsibility | 0 | 0.0 |
| Teaching responsibility | 0 | 0.0 |
| Corrections (4) | | |
| Admin responsibility | 0 | 0.0 |
| Teaching responsibility | 1 | 25.0 |
| 6. Organizational Affiliation | | |
| Local law enforcement agency | 0 | 0.0 |
| Regional council/governments | 5 | 38.5 |
| State law enforcement agency | 0 | 0.0 |
| 7. Depends for most students on: | | |
| Single law enforcement agency | 0 | 0.0 |
| Regional council of governments | 4 | 0.0 |
| State law enforcement agency | 0 | 0.0 |

A review of data reported regarding related academic programs, indicates that all institutions reported offering academic programs in criminal justice. Four of the

responding institutions (30.8%) indicated having associate degree programs offered in corrections, but none reported offering programs in probations and parole.

Questions asked to determine relationships between credit programs and the police academy indicate that there is little staffing interchange between the non-credit police academy and the credit criminal justice and related programs. At institutions offering credit degree programs in criminal justice, (100%), only three (23.1%) report administrative responsibility for the police academy and three report teaching responsibility in the police academy. A majority of the respondents report no police academy administration/teaching responsibility for persons in the criminal justice degree program. Of the institutions offering degree programs in corrections, the majority (75%, $n = 4$) indicated no administrative/teaching responsibility in the police academy. Only one institution (25%) reported that an instructor in its corrections program had a teaching responsibility in the police academy.

None of the respondents indicated an organizational affiliation with either a local law enforcement agency or a state law enforcement agency. However, five respondents (38.5%) indicated an organizational affiliation with a regional council of governments.

None of the responding institutions indicated a dependence on either a single local law enforcement agency or a state law enforcement agency for its students.

However, four of the respondents (30.8%) indicated that they depend on their regional council of governments for the majority of their students.

Research Question Three:

What Facilities and Equipment Does the College Provide
For the Academy's Programs

In order to answer Research Question Three, a series of three questions was included in the survey instrument. One question inquired about the physical location of the academy, one inquired about the academy's facilities and equipment, and a third solicited the respondent's perception about the adequacy of the academy's facilities and equipment. The results of the responses to these questions are given in Table 4.

The ability of the police academy to operate and function as a fairly autonomous training entity is sometimes necessary. Oftentimes, police departments are paying the students a salary while they are in training and the police academy becomes, in essence, the trainees primary duty station. Breaks between semesters, extended holidays, and closures due to weather are not characteristic of the law enforcement officers profession and such interruptions may not be viewed favorably during a training time. As a result, many police academies at community colleges must function at times when other college operations are closed. A training center with the autonomy to function for a brief period of time without having to depend on other offices for

support may, therefore, be a measure of the success of the program.

Each respondent was asked if the academy was located on a college campus and if the response was "no", was asked to provide the location. A majority (84.6%, $n = 11$) indicated that the academy was located on a college campus. Two (15.4%) indicated that the academy was located off campus, and one of these identified the location as being the same as the offices of the regional council of governments.

Table 4

Responses to Questions Regarding Adequacy of Facilities and Equipment (Questionnaire Section "B")
(Research Question 3)

| Question number and variable | <u>N</u> | Percentage |
|-----------------------------------|----------|------------|
| 1. Location on college campus | 11 | 84.6 |
| 2. Academy facilities & equipment | | |
| Have own classrooms | 10 | 76.9 |
| Share classrooms | 5 | 38.5 |
| Have own building | 5 | 38.5 |
| Share building | 8 | 61.5 |
| Have own firing range | 7 | 53.8 |
| Borrow firing range | 8 | 61.5 |

(table continues)

| Question number and variable | <u>N</u> | Percentage |
|--|----------|------------|
| Use driving pad/track | 4 | 30.8 |
| Own weapons | 7 | 53.8 |
| Students bring weapons | 12 | 92.3 |
| Have own A/V | 12 | 92.3 |
| Share college's A/V | 6 | 46.1 |
| Have own library | 12 | 92.3 |
| Printing support from college | 13 | 100.0 |
| Have own gym | 3 | 23.1 |
| Share gym facilities | 10 | 76.9 |
| Appropriateness of facilities and equipment | | |
| Outstanding | 5 | 38.5 |
| Acceptable | 5 | 38.5 |
| Marginal | 3 | 23.1 |
| Unacceptable | 0 | 0.0 |
| Very unacceptable | 0 | 0.0 |

In order to determine what facilities and equipment the academy had, respondents were given a multiple checklist of options. The amount and degree of support provided to the police academies varies widely and from institution to institution. Ten respondents (76.9) had their own classrooms, but 38.5% had to share their classrooms with the

rest of the campus. Only 38.5% had their own building and 61.5% had to share the building they use with other campus programs. Seven of the respondents (53.8%) had their own firing range, but eight (61.5%) borrow a range off campus. Few of the respondents (30.8%, $n = 4$) use a driving track or pad. The majority of the respondents (53.8%, $n = 7$) own their own weapons, but twelve (92.3%) allow students to bring their own weapons to firearms training classes. Twelve (92.3%) of the respondents have their own audio visual equipment and six (46.1%) share this equipment with the rest of the institution. Library facilities are located at twelve (92.3%) of the academies, all obtain printing support from the college, three (23.1%) have their own gymnasium facilities and ten (76.9%) share the gym facilities with the rest of the college.

In order to determine the respondents perception about the adequacy of the facilities and equipment, respondents were asked to what extent they believed their academy's facilities and equipment are appropriate for the program for which they are responsible. An equal number (38.5%, $n = 5$) responded with a perception of either "outstanding" or "acceptable". Only three respondents (23.1%) indicated they felt the facilities and equipment were marginal and none reported a perception of either "unacceptable" or "very unacceptable".

Research Question Four:

What are the Staffing and Personnel Policies
of the Academy

Research Question Number Four was an inquiry into the staffing and personnel policies of the academies. Responses to these items on the questionnaire are displayed in Table 5 and Table 6. Section "D" of the questionnaire posed 16 questions which may be divided into the following: (A) questions relating to numbers of employees and their full and/or part time status, (B) questions relating to adjunct instructors, (C) questions relating to professional development, and (D) questions relating to the maintenance of personnel records.

Respondents were asked to provide information regarding themselves and their current full time staff. The following information was requested: Title, highest education level, major field for their highest degree, and total years of experience as a full and/or part time peace officer. Responses to this question are displayed in Table 5.

Respondents reported 18 current employees, including themselves, at the 13 academies. Ten respondents each reported information on only a single person at their academy. In each case, this was the individual responding to the survey. Two respondents reported staff size of two persons each (see above number 1 and 2 at one academy and number 3 and 4 at the other) and one respondent reported a staff size of four (numbers 15, 16, 17, and 18 above).

Table 5

Responses to Questions Regarding Personnel(Questionnaire Section "D", Question #16)(Research Question 4)

| Title | Education | | Years police experience | |
|-----------------|------------|------------------|-------------------------|-----------|
| | Level | Major | Full-time | Part-time |
| 1. Director | Masters | Counseling | 15 | 10 |
| 2. Basic Coor. | H.S. Dip. | | 15 | 15 |
| 3. Dept. Chair | Masters | Criminal Justice | 21 | 9 |
| 4. Instructor | Bachelors | Criminal Justice | 10 | 5 |
| 5. Coordinator | Bachelors | Criminal Justice | 30 | 0 |
| 6. Coordinator | Masters | Criminal Justice | 10 | 0 |
| 7. Director | Bachelors+ | Criminal Justice | 35 | 0 |
| 8. Coordinator | Masters | Criminal Justice | 6 | 0 |
| 9. Director | Bachelors | Criminal Justice | 10 | 13 |
| 10. Director | Bachelors+ | Criminal Justice | 4 | 0 |
| 11. Director | Masters | Criminal Justice | 9 | 0 |
| 12. Director | Masters | Law Enforcement | 12 | 18 |
| 13. Coordinator | Bachelors | Criminal Justice | 34 | 6 |
| 14. Director | Masters | Criminal Justice | 17 | 0 |
| 15. Coordinator | Masters | Education | 8 | 0 |
| 16. Ass't Coor. | Masters | Criminal Justice | 15 | 0 |
| 17. Ass't Coor. | Bachelors | Criminal Justice | 8 | 0 |
| 18. Ass't Coor. | Bachelors | Chemistry | 0 | 0 |

A review of the titles reported indicate that, other than the respondents themselves, one staff member (number 2 above) was identified as a "Basic Coordinator", i.e., the individual with instructional and supervisory responsibility for only the Basic Peace Officer Course; one staff member (number 4 above) was identified as an instructor, and three staff members (numbers 16, 17, and 18 above, were identified as assistant coordinators. A closer examination of their duties indicated that number 16 is "Assistant Coordinator of the Basic Program", number 17 is "Assistant Coordinator of the Firearms Program", and number 18 is "Assistant Coordinator for In-Service and Breathalyzer Training".

Only one staff member has only a high school diploma. The remainder hold either a bachelors degree (44.4%, $n = 8$) or a masters degree (50.0%, $n = 9$). As may be expected, a majority (77.8%, $n = 14$) hold their highest degree in criminal justice or law enforcement. All staff members except one have full time experience as police officers. Years of full time experience range from 4 to 35 years with a mean of 15 years for those reporting full-time experience. Seven reported staff members with part time experience. The mean of years of part-time experience was 11, and ranged from 5 years to 18 years for those reporting. Data on the remaining 15 questions asked in Section "D" of the questionnaire is provided in Table 6. In this table are responses to additional questions regarding staffing, and questions regarding adjunct instructors, professional

development including membership in professional organizations, and maintenance of personnel records.

The academies responding to the survey have 11 full-time administrative, 10 full-time faculty and five full-time classified employees. Respondents indicated 192 part-time faculty and four classified employees whose time is devoted 100% to the police academy. Permanent college employees working part-time for the police academy numbered five administrative, four faculty and seven classified personnel.

Table 6

Responses to Questions Regarding Personnel

(Questionnaire Section "D", Questions 1-15)

(Research Question 4)

| Question number and variable | <u>N</u> | Percentage |
|--------------------------------------|----------|------------|
| 1. Total 100% fulltime at academies | | |
| Administrative | 11 | - |
| Faculty | 10 | - |
| Classified | 5 | - |
| 2. Total 100% part-time at academies | | |
| Administrative | 0 | - |
| Faculty | 192 | - |
| Classified | 4 | - |

(table continues)

| Question number and variable | N | Percentage |
|---|------------|-------------|
| 3. Total permanent part-time at academies | | |
| Administrative | 5 | - |
| Faculty | 4 | - |
| Classified | 7 | - |
| 6. Adjuncts wear weapons to class | 9 | 69.2 |
| 7. Are all instructors paid? | 7 | 53.8 |
| 8. Instructor records of teaching | 13 | 100.0 |
| 9. Visit other college academies | 10 | 76.9 |
| 10. Staff development other places | 9 | 69.2 |
| 11. TCLEOSE instructor courses | 13 | 100.0 |
| 12. Non police instructor courses | 9 | 69.2 |
| 13. Member of adult/CE organizations | 10 | 76.9 |
| 14. Members of professional law enforcement training groups | 10 | 76.9 |
| 15. Personnel paperwork at college | 8 | 61.5 |
| 4. % instruction by: | | |
| | Range | Median Mean |
| Adjunct instructors | 10% - 100% | 90% 77% |
| Full-time instructors | 0% - 90% | 10% 23% |
| (table continues) | | |

| Question number and variable | <u>N</u> | Percentage | |
|---|------------|------------|------|
| 5. Adjunct education level | Range | Median | Mean |
| Without H.S. diploma | 0% - 0% | 0% | 0% |
| With only H.S. diploma | 0% - 10% | 0% | 2% |
| Less than 2 years college but no associate | 0% - 70% | 10% | 19% |
| With 2 year degree | 0% - 40% | 2.5% | 11% |
| Less than 4 years college but no associate | 0% - 30% | 10% | 11% |
| Bachelors or higher. | 10% - 100% | 55% | 57% |

Based on the fact that for question number 2, one agency reported 150 part-time faculty and 40 were reported by another, and in consideration of the percentages of use of adjunct instructors indicated later in the table in question 4, it is probable that this question was misinterpreted by the respondents. Its intent was to ascertain the numbers of persons who worked only for the police academy when they worked with the college and would have provided an estimate of the numbers of part-time instructors used.

Adjunct instructors are heavily used in most academies. As indicated by an examination of the data, of those responding to a question regarding the percent of

instruction adjunct instructors teach ($n = 11$), a majority, (81.8%, $n = 9$) report using adjunct instructors for over 50% of their instruction. In fact, six (54.5%) of the respondents to the question use adjunct instructors for over 90% of their instruction. Only two respondents to the question (18.2%) reported using adjunct instructors for less than 50% of the instruction delivered. The respondents reported that the percentage of instruction provided by adjunct instructors ranged from 10% to 100% with a median of 90%, a mode of 100% and a mean of 77%. Three responding institutions (27.3%) report using these adjunct instructors for 100% of their instruction. The percentage of instruction provided by full-time instructors ranged from 0% to 90% with a median of 10%, a mode of 0% and a mean of 23%.

Most adjunct instructors have a bachelor's degree or higher. Three survey respondents failed to complete this section or indicated the information was not available. Respondents reported percentages for adjunct instructors with bachelors or higher ranging from 10% to 100% with a median of 55% and a mean of 57%. Adjunct instructors with less than four years of college, but no associate degree ranged from 0% to 30% with a median of 10% and a mean of 11%. The percentage of adjunct instructors with a two year college degree ranged from 0% to 40% with a median of 3% and a mean of 11%. The percentage of adjunct instructors with less than two years of college ranged from 0% to 70% with a median of 10% and a mean of 19%. There were no adjunct

instructors reported without a high school diploma, but the percentage of adjunct instructors with only the high school diploma ranged from 0% to 10% with a median of 0% and a mean of 2%.

Adjunct instructors are valuable assets to police training programs, especially the Basic Peace Officer Course. The best ones bring a sound knowledge of subject matter and an understanding of the teaching/ learning process to the classroom. Often adjunct instructors will teach at an academy as a part of their regular work day. On those occasions, they are considered to be working and many academies (69.2%, $n = 9$) allow them to wear their firearms into the classroom environment.

The keeping of records relating to personnel matters, payroll concerns, and the maintenance of instructional records are usually determined by college policy. An examination of the data indicates that the percentages of those who pay for all instruction at the academy (53.8%, $n = 7$) is slightly more than those who do not pay for instruction (46.1%, $n = 6$). All survey respondents indicated that they maintain records which indicate the names of all persons who teach for any length of time in the academy whether they are paid or not. But only eight respondents (61.5%) indicate that the college has personnel paperwork for all instructors who teach at the academy.

Professional development for the faculty and staff of the police academies was the subject of six questions on the

questionnaire. A majority of the respondents (76.9%, $n = 10$) have had employees visit at other community college academies to observe their program and/or teaching. A majority of respondents (69.2%, $n = 9$) allow travel for staff development opportunities for their employees to programs at other locations.

TCLEOSE sponsors instructor courses at various location around the state and all respondents reported participation in those programs. Most respondents indicated that a high percentage of their instructors had attended these courses. The percentage of instructors attending the TCLEOSE instructor courses ranged from 50% to 100% with a mean of 86%, a median of 95%, and a mode of 100%.

Not as many instructors participate in other instructor courses. A majority of respondents (69.2%, $n = 9$) reported that some of their instructors had participated in "train the trainer" course conducted by non-law enforcement training agencies, but the range of percentages in attendance was not nearly as great as the range of those participating in TCLEOSE sponsored instructor courses. The participation ranged from 2% to 100% with a mean of 19% and a median of 11.5%.

A majority of the respondents (76.9 %, $n = 10$) participate in state and/or national training or adult or continuing education professional organizations. Among those specified were the Community College Criminal Justice Educators of Texas, the Texas Junior College Teacher's

Association, the Texas State Teacher's Association, the Texas Administrators of Continuing Education at Community and Junior Colleges, and the Texas Association for Community Services and Continuing Education.

A majority of the respondents (76.9%, $n = 10$) belong to professional law enforcement organizations at both the state and national levels. Among those specified were the Sheriff's Association, the Texas Police Association, the Association of Texas Law Enforcement Educators, the American Society of Law Enforcement Trainers, the National Rifle Association, the International Association of Firearms Trainers, and the International Association of Chiefs of Police.

Research Question Five:

What are the Policies and Practices of the Academy
With Regard to Selected Student Issues

The data presented in Table 7 represents the information gathered from respondents in seeking an answer to Research Question Five. This question inquired into student issues and the stance of the police academies with regard to those issues. The questionnaire included thirteen questions in this section, two of which were multiple checklist items. Questions in this section addressed the following issues: (A) admissions requirements and the means of publicizing those requirements, (B) student services, (C) student discipline and student guidelines, and (D) the

awarding of academic and/or Continuing Education Unit (CEU) credit for participation in non-credit police training.

Table 7

Responses to Questions Regarding the Student

Policies and Practices of the Academy

(Questionnaire Section "E")

(Research Question 5)

| Question number and variable | <u>N</u> | Percentage |
|---|----------|------------|
| <hr/> | | |
| 1. Students attending academy from | | |
| General public | 4 | 30.8 |
| Sworn officers | 10 | 76.9 |
| Agency referrals | 6 | 46.1 |
| Agency sponsors | 11 | 84.6 |
| Law enforcement agency employee | 12 | 92.3 |
| 2. Publish admission requirements | 9 | 69.2 |
| 3. Services provided academy students by institution | | |
| Background | 2 | 15.4 |
| Psychological | 1 | 7.7 |
| Physical | 1 | 7.7 |
| Advisement | 7 | 53.8 |
| Personal counseling | 7 | 53.8 |
| Career counseling | 7 | 53.8 |

(table continues)

| Question number and variable | <u>N</u> | Percentage |
|---------------------------------|----------|------------|
| Family counseling | 1 | 7.7 |
| Financial aid | 5 | 38.5 |
| Veterans benefits | 7 | 53.8 |
| Handicapped assistance | 2 | 15.4 |
| LD assistance | 7 | 53.8 |
| Tutoring | 6 | 46.1 |
| Health services | 2 | 15.4 |
| Placement | 4 | 30.8 |
| Student activities | 4 | 30.8 |
| Food service | 8 | 61.5 |
| Housing | 3 | 23.1 |
| Transcripts | 7 | 53.8 |
| Ammunition | 11 | 84.6 |
| 7. Student handbook | 10 | 91.7 |
| 5. Academy guidelines | 12 | 92.3 |
| 6. Addressed in guidelines | | |
| Dress code | 11 | 91.7 |
| Profanity | 11 | 91.7 |
| Absenteeism | 12 | 100.0 |
| Controlled substance | 9 | 75.0 |
| Counseling | 7 | 58.3 |
| Academic standards | 12 | 100.0 |
| Firearms in class | 11 | 91.7 |

(table continues)

| Question number and variable | <u>N</u> | Percentage |
|--------------------------------|----------|------------|
| Grading scale | 12 | 100.0 |
| Cheating | 12 | 100.0 |
| Use of alcohol | 8 | 66.7 |
| Privacy of records | 8 | 66.7 |
| Admission standards | 10 | 83.3 |
| 4. Discipline handled by | | |
| College's due process | 7 | 53.8 |
| Agency referral | 12 | 92.3 |
| Both | 6 | 46.1 |
| 8. Credit by exam | 4 | 33.3 |
| 9. Credit by experience | 5 | 41.7 |
| 10. Credit for other academy | 4 | 33.3 |
| 11. Satisfy other requirements | 7 | 58.3 |
| 12. Award C.E.U.'s | 9 | 69.2 |

A review of the information presented in Table 7 indicate that a majority (69.2%, $n = 9$) of the respondents do not accept students who are not associated in some way with a law enforcement agency. A majority (92.3%, $n = 12$) of respondents accept students who are employees of a law enforcement agency. Eleven respondents (84.6%) will accept students who are sponsored by a law enforcement agency. A student sponsored by a law enforcement agency is one for

whom the agency pays the tuition and fees and whom the agency intends to hire upon the student's successful completion of the Basic Peace Officer's Course. Six (46.1%) respondents accept students referred by a law enforcement agency. An agency referral student is again in the Basic Peace Officer's Course, but usually pays his/her own tuition and fees and who is allowed to enter a program based on the referral of a law enforcement agency, but who also has no job guaranteed upon completion of the training. Ten respondents (76.9%) accept sworn officers, or trained and certified officers currently employed as peace officers. Only four of the respondents (30.8%) accept members of the general public.

In response to a question regarding the publication of admission requirements to the general public, four (30.8%) respondents indicated that they did not publish their admission requirements to the general public. One other agency indicated that it provided that information to the general public only if it is requested, but the majority (69.2%, $n = 9$) indicated that they did publish this information using newspapers, brochures and catalogs.

Services provided to students by the various academies vary widely from academy to academy, but few seem to provide police academy students with the level of student services generally extended to most credit students. The fact that the data indicate that only two (15.4%) respondents conduct background investigations and only one respondent each

provided a psychological profile and/or a physical examination as student services is understandable. These are requirements peculiar to police training, are required by law for entry into state approved police basic training, and are most often the responsibility of the student or of the police departments themselves.

What is less understandable, however, is the fact that only seven (53.8%) of the respondents provide advisement, personal counseling, career counseling, or learning disabled assistance, and family counseling is available at only one (7.7%) of the institutions. Eleven (84.6%) of the respondents provide ammunition to academy students, eight (61.5%) have food service available, and seven (53.8%) provide academy students with transcripts and/or with assistance in seeking veterans's benefits. Tutoring is available from six (46.1%) respondents; assistance with financial aid from five (38.5%), and at four institutions (30.8), academy students are provided access to the colleges placement services and/or, are allowed to participate in student activities. Three institutions (23.1%) have housing available, two (15.4%) have assistance available for the physically handicapped, and another two respondents allow academy students access to the colleges's health services.

Four questions in this section of the questionnaire were asked regarding student conduct and the availability and nature of student guidelines. A majority (76.9%, $n = 10$) of the respondents indicated they have a general student

handbook setting forth rules and regulations for student conduct and behavior. Twelve of the respondents (92.3%) also indicated that they had student guidelines written specifically for academy students; one (7.7%) reported having no set of guidelines specific to academy students.

From a multiple checklist, the twelve respondents having specific guidelines indicated that all addressed the issues of absenteeism, academic standards, a common grading scale, and cheating. Eleven (91.7%) reported guidelines addressing a dress code, the use of profanity and firearms in the classroom. Ten (83.3%) addressed admission standards, nine (75.0%) addressed the possession and/or use of controlled substances, and eight (66.7%) addressed both the use of alcohol and the privacy of students records. Seven (58.3%) reported a section of the guidelines addressing counseling.

Because police academy students are often employees of law enforcement agencies, or, are at the training facility at the direction or on the recommendation of a law enforcement agency, the handling of discipline problems becomes complicated. Respondents were asked to identify the discipline process in the event a student associated with a law enforcement agency becomes a discipline problem or is guilty of misconduct. A majority (92.3%, $n = 12$) of respondents indicated that the student is referred to the sponsoring agency. But seven of these institutions also indicated that the student is not allowed to participate in

the college's policy of due process. Six respondents (46.1%) indicated that they utilize both due process and referral to the sponsoring agency as a method of handling the troublesome student.

The final series of questions relating to Research Question Five was concerned with the academic and continuing education credit offered students successfully completing classes at the police academies. Seven respondents of twelve answering these questions indicated that they would award academic credit for successful completion of the peace officer basic course with semester hours ranging from 6 - 14 hours, with a mode of 9 hours. Four (33.3%) respondents indicated that they would offer credit by exam with a range of 6 to 9 semester hours. Five (41.7%) of the twelve respondents indicated that they would offer credit by experience with a range of 6 to 14 semester hours. Four (33.3%) respondents reported offering a range of 6 to 9 hours for basic training completed at an academy other than their own. All seven respondents reporting that they would offer the credit by examination/experience for successful completion of the basic course indicated that the student requesting the credit would have to satisfy other college requirements prior to posting of the semester hours to their records. Respondents were also asked if they awarded continuing education units (CEU's) to eligible students and a majority (69.2%, $n = 9$) responded affirmatively.

Research Question Six:

What are the Perceptions of the Respondent Regarding
the Level of Support for the Program From
the College and the Community

The answer to Research Question Six was determined by asking the respondents perceptions to a series of questions regarding how well they felt their program was supported and understood by the college's internal and external community. Twelve questions were asked and respondents were provided the opportunity indicate whether they strongly agreed, agreed, were not sure, disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. The statements explored the respondents perceptions about the governing board; the administration; the non-law enforcement, academic faculty at the college; the public in the college's service area, and the extent to which the staff of the police academy felt accepted as a part of the college community.

The data provided by the respondents is found in Tables 8, 9, 10, and 11. Responses are coded as Strongly Agree = SA, Agree = A, Not Sure = NS, Disagree = D, and Strongly Disagree = SD. The number in the column below the response codes totals the respondents perceptions regarding the question. Some respondents did not provide answers to some of the questions, probably because of a failure to understand that the questions required different answers in each category.

Table 8

Responses to Questions Regarding the Administrator's
Perceptions of Level of Internal and External Support
(Questionnaire Section "F", Numbers 1-3)

| Question number and variable | Responses | | | | |
|--|-----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| | SA | A | NS | D | SD |
| The governing board of the college: | | | | | |
| 1. understands the mission of the of the police academy. | <u>5</u> | <u>5</u> | <u>1</u> | <u>1</u> | <u>1</u> |
| 2. understands as much as it needs to about the police academy. | <u>2</u> | <u>7</u> | <u>0</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>1</u> |
| 3. would support the police academy more with better understanding. | <u>1</u> | <u>4</u> | <u>5</u> | <u>0</u> | <u>0</u> |

An examination of the data in Table 8 indicates that a majority of respondents (76.9%, $n = 10$) feel positive about their governing board's understanding of the mission of the police academy. A similar percent (75%, $n = 9$) feel comfortable with the governing board's understanding of the police academy. While half of the respondents ($n = 5$) believe that if the governing board understood the police academy better it would provide more support for the program, the remaining 50% are not sure that would happen.

The implication is that the governing board either provides adequate support now, or might lessen some of its support.

Table 9

Responses to Questions Regarding the Administrator's Perceptions of Level of Internal and External Support (Questionnaire Section "F", Numbers 4-6)

| Question number and variable | Responses | | | | |
|---|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|
| | <u>SA</u> | <u>A</u> | <u>NS</u> | <u>D</u> | <u>SD</u> |
| The administration of the college: | | | | | |
| 4. understands the mission of the police academy. | <u>5</u> | <u>5</u> | <u>1</u> | <u>1</u> | <u>1</u> |
| 5. understands as much as it needs to about the police academy. | <u>2</u> | <u>5</u> | <u>0</u> | <u>4</u> | <u>1</u> |
| 6. would support the police academy more with better understanding. | <u>1</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>5</u> | <u>0</u> | <u>1</u> |

An examination of Table 9 indicates that a majority of the respondents (76.9%, $n = 10$) believe the administration understands the mission of the police academy. However, in contrast to the earlier belief of the board's understanding as much as it needs to about the police academy, only 58.3% ($n = 7$) of the respondents believe the administration understands as much as it needs to. The remaining 41.7% believe the administration needs to understand the program

better, and that same percentage of respondents believe the administration would support the police academy more if it understood it better. Half of the respondents were unsure of the actions of the board if it understood the program better, and half of the respondents to this question are unsure about the action of the administration if it had a better understanding of the program.

Table 10

Responses to Questions Regarding the Administrator's Perceptions of Level of Internal and External Support (Questionnaire Section "F", Numbers 7-9)

| Question number and variable | Responses | | | | |
|---|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|
| | <u>SA</u> | <u>A</u> | <u>NS</u> | <u>D</u> | <u>SD</u> |
| The non-law enforcement faculty: | | | | | |
| 7. understands the mission of the police academy. | <u>0</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>5</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>2</u> |
| 8. understands as much as they need to about the police academy. | <u>0</u> | <u>5</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>2</u> |
| 9. would support the police academy more with better understanding. | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>7</u> | <u>0</u> | <u>0</u> |

An examination of the data reported in Table 10 indicates there is general agreement among the respondents

regarding their perception of the non-law enforcement faculty at the college. As many believe the faculty do not understand the police academy's mission (38.5%, $n = 5$) as are unsure where the faculty stand. Only 23.1% feel positive about the faculty's understanding of their mission. While 41.6% ($n = 5$) feel positively that the faculty understands as much as it needs to about their program, the same number (42%) feel positive that the faculty does not understand as much as it needs to about the program. While a small majority (58.3%, $n = 7$) are not sure that the faculty would support the program if they knew more about it, 41.6% are positive they would.

Table 11

Responses to Questions Regarding the Administrator's Perceptions of Level of Internal and External Support (Questionnaire Section "F", Numbers 10-12)

Question number and variable

Responses

The public in the college's service area:

| | <u>SA</u> | <u>A</u> | <u>NS</u> | <u>D</u> | <u>SD</u> |
|--|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|
| 10. understands the mission of the police academy. | <u>0</u> | <u>5</u> | <u>6</u> | <u>1</u> | <u>1</u> |

(table continues)

| Question number and variable | Responses | | | | |
|---|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|
| <hr/> | | | | | |
| The public in the college's service area: | | | | | |
| | <u>SA</u> | <u>A</u> | <u>NS</u> | <u>D</u> | <u>SD</u> |
| 11. understands as much as it needs to about the police academy. | <u>0</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> | <u>5</u> | <u>0</u> |
| The staff of the police academy: | | | | | |
| 12. is fully accepted as a part of the college community. | <u>3</u> | <u>6</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>1</u> | <u>0</u> |

The respondents at 38.5% ($n = 5$) of the institutions believe the public in their service area understands the mission of the police academy, but at 46.1% of the institutions, the respondent is not sure. And at two of the institutions (15.4%), the respondents are sure the public in their service area do not understand their mission. Three of the respondents (25%) believe the public understands as much as it needs to about their program, five respondents (41.6%) believe the public needs to know more about the program, and four respondents (33.3%) are unsure.

Perhaps because most respondents believe the governing board and the administration understand their mission and their program and despite the fact that they are unsure about the level of understanding on the part of the faculty and general public, a high percent of respondents believe

that the staff of the police academy is fully accepted as a part of the college community.

Research Question Seven:

What are the Types, Kind and the Extent of the Involvement
of External Forces in the Governance of
the Police Academy

The answer to Research Question Seven derives from the data reported in Tables 12 and 13 from sixteen questions about the program's advisory committee. The success of a police academy program may be traced to a number of influences. Certainly the program's administrator and staff are critical as is the support of the administration and the governing board. There are many contributors to the success of a program such as a police academy, and the programs advisory committee is one of the most critical. It is in this forum that external elements have the greatest opportunity to make themselves heard and in which to provide positive input and guidance pertaining to the direction of the police academy. It is here too, that external influence detrimental to the program may be exerted.

An examination of the data indicates that all 13 responding institutions have advisory committees or advisory boards. At four of the institutions (30.8%) the same advisory committee providing assistance to the police academy also functions as an advisory group for a credit academic program. Nine of those respondents (69.2%) report that their college has a document of policy regarding its

advisory committees, and at eight (61.5%) of those institutions, the specific policies of the police academy advisory committee have been reduced to writing.

Ten of the responding institutions (76.9%) report having an advisory committee policy pertaining to membership on the committee. Five respondents (38.5%) report that more than one law enforcement officer from the same agency may serve on the committee at the same time, and eleven (84.6%) respondents indicate that it is possible for a member of the advisory committee to serve an indefinite number of terms. The length of terms on the committee is limited by most respondents to a range of from one to three years, but at six (46.1%) institutions, there is no limit placed on the length of the term. Respondents are fairly evenly divided about the level of activity of their advisory committees; a slight majority (53.8%, $n = 7$) believe their committee is more active than most others at the college while six (46.1%) believe theirs is as least as active as others.

Seven respondents (53.8%) report that the college controls membership on the committee while three others, (23.1%) place that control in the hands of the advisory committee members themselves. The other two respondents (15.4%) indicate that selection of members to the committee is a joint function carried out by both the college and the committee. All respondents (100%, $N = 13$) report that their chief educational officer appoints members to the academy advisory committee, and even though all report he has never

refused to make a recommended appointment, eight (61.5%) believe he makes informed choices.

Table 12

Responses to Questions Regarding Outside Involvement
in the Police Academy (Questionnaire Section "G")
(Research Question 7)

| Question number and variable | N | Percentage |
|--------------------------------------|----|------------|
| 1. Use advisory committee | 13 | 100.0 |
| 2. Same committee/other program | 4 | 30.8 |
| 3. Committee policies in writing | 9 | 69.2 |
| 4. College advisory committee policy | 8 | 61.5 |
| 5. Policy on membership | 10 | 76.9 |
| 6. Allow members from same agency | 5 | 38.5 |
| 15. Can serve indefinite # of terms | 11 | 84.6 |
| 16. Term of service | | |
| 1 year | | |
| 2 years | | |
| 3 years | | |
| unlimited | 6 | 46.1 |
| 9. Level of activity | 7 | 53.8 |
| 10. Control of committee | | |
| College | 7 | 53.8 |
| Committee | 3 | 23.1 |

(table continues)

| Question number and variable | <u>N</u> | Percentage |
|------------------------------------|----------|------------|
| 12. CEO appoint members | 13 | 100.0 |
| 13. CEO not refused recommendation | 13 | 100.0 |
| 14. CEO make informed choices | 8 | 61.5 |
| 11. Outside agency interference | 0 | 0.0 |
| 7. Administrator support | | |
| Institution | 6 | 46.1 |
| TCLEOSE | 7 | 53.8 |
| 8. Total number of members | 145 | |
| Mean (average) | 13.2 | |

None of the respondents believe any outside agency attempts to influence or direct the affairs of the advisory committee. Because of the close affiliation between the police academies and TCLEOSE, the academies regulatory agency with the State of Texas, and the fact that the role of the advisory committees is controlled to an extent by TCLEOSE, respondents were asked who they would support in the event of a clear conflict between college policy and TCLEOSE. The data indicate more of the administrators (53.8%, $n = 7$) would support TCLEOSE than their college.

Respondents were asked to provide the number of advisory committee members. Eleven (84.6%) responded to the

question and the data indicates that while all respondents have advisory committees, the size varies from six to twenty members. The average number of members for the advisory committees is 14 while the total of all police academy advisory committee members is 145.

Respondents were also asked to provide information about their advisory committees indicating ethnic background of members, sex, whether civilian or law enforcement officer, and if law enforcement officer, whether the member was an agency head or an officer holding some other rank.

Table 13

Responses to Questions Regarding Advisory Committees

(Questionnaire Section "G", Question 8)

(Research Question 7)

| Ethnic Origin | Head of Law <u>Enforcement agency</u> | | Other rank <u>Peace officer</u> | | <u>Civilian</u> | | |
|------------------|--|--------|------------------------------------|--------|-----------------|--------|-------|
| | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female | |
| Anglo | 45 | 1 | 22 | 0 | 29 | 6 | (103) |
| Hispanic | 15 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 1 | (23) |
| Black | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | (1) |
| Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | (1) |
| Totals | 60 | 1 | 23 | 0 | 35 | 9 | (128) |

$n = 11$, two (2) not responding

A review of the data in Table 13 indicates that the advisory committees for the majority (84.6%, $n = 11$) of the police training academies in Texas are controlled largely by anglo males. Of the 128 places available on advisory committees at the eleven institutions reporting, 96 (75.0%) are held by anglo males. Hispanics occupy the second highest number of slots (18.0%, $n = 23$). In all the academies responding to this question, only one African American held an advisory committee slot, a civilian female. Males dominate the advisory committees with a total of 118 (92.2%) of the 128 slots reported.

Heads of law enforcement agencies held the majority of the committee slots (47.7%, $n = 61$). Civilians were the next most numerous with 44 slots (34.4%), and other ranked peace officers held the fewest slots on the advisory committees with 23 slots (18.0).

Research Question Eight:

What is the Extent of the Program's Activity

Research Question Eight explores the extent or size of the police academy's service to its community. The data presented in Table 14 was gathered as a result of nine questions which requested information regarding the nature of courses offered to the general public, if any; the size and student population of the college's service area, the number of students trained from inside and outside the college's service area, and statistical information about

enrollments, contact hours, sections, and performance of students on the TCLEOSE Licensing Exam.

For many questions in this section of the questionnaire, there was no response given or the respondent indicated that the information was either unknown to him or not available. Of the 221 possible answers which could have been filled by the 13 respondents, 93 responses (42.1%) of "not available" or "unknown" were recorded. The effect of this missing information is that it causes some concern if there is an attempt to generalize to the broader population. Reporting of ranges, medians, totals and means was done only in cases where the number of respondents to a questions was seven (53.8%) or greater.

Fewer than one-fourth (23.1%, $n = 3$) of the academies offer classes to the general public. Of the classes which are offered by these three academies, the only class offered by more than one institution was a course in firearms. Some respondents indicated that they provided classes in law enforcement related instruction such as security officer training or child abuse, but the majority (76.9%, $n = 10$) of the academies offer only police related courses.

All thirteen respondents knew how many counties constituted their college's service area, however, those who knew the law enforcement officer population in the college's service area was not as great. Ten (76.9%) knew the size of their market. For these, the peace officer population ranged from 250 to 4,000 and in these 10 areas, the total

population was 12,928. The median size was 689, the mean was 1,293 and the mode was 500.

Eleven respondents (84.6%) knew how many peace officers they trained from their service area in the 1987-88 college year. These ten trained 5,534 peace officers. The numbers of peace officers trained from their service areas ranged from 35 to 3,000 with a mean of 503 and a median of 250.

Eight of the respondents (61.5%) knew the number of counties outside their college's service area represented in their student population. These eight respondents reported training a total of 50 students from outside their college's service area. They reported outside counties represented ranging from 1 to 12, each averaged training students from six outside counties; the median was five.

Each respondent was asked the size of the law enforcement population in the counties they had provided training to which were outside their college's service area. None of the respondents were able to answer the question.

Seven respondents (53.8%) reported training peace officers from outside their college's service area. The number trained totalled 215, ranged from 6 to 100 peace officers and the seven respondents had a mean of 31 and a median of 18.

Table 14
Responses to Questions Regarding
Extensiveness of the Program
(Questionnaire Section "H")
(Research Question 8)

| Question number and variable | <u>N</u> | Percentage |
|-------------------------------------|----------|------------|
| 1. Classes for General Public | 3 | 23.1 |
| 3. Counties in colleges area | 13 | 100.0 |
| R = 1 - 35 X = 8 | | |
| T = 108 Median = 4 | | |
| 4. Peace officer population in area | 10 | 76.9 |
| R = 250 - 4,000 X = 1,293 | | |
| T = 12,928 Median = 689 | | |
| 5. Trainees from college's area | 11 | 84.6 |
| R = 35 - 3,000 X = 503 | | |
| T = 5,534 Median = 250 | | |
| 6. Counties outside service area | 8 | 61.5 |
| R = 1 - 12 X = 6 | | |
| T = 50 Median = 4 | | |
| 7. Peace officer population in area | 0 | 0.0 |
| 8. Trainees from outside area | 7 | 53.8 |
| R = 6 - 100 X = 31 | | |
| T = 215 Median = 18 | | |

(table continues)

| Question number and variable | <u>N</u> | Percentage |
|----------------------------------|----------|------------|
| 9. Non-credit course enrollment | 3 | 23.1 |
| 10. Non-credit police enrollment | 11 | 84.6 |
| R = 25 - 3415 X = 589 | | |
| T = 6,478 Median = 361 | | |
| 11. NC police sections offered | 8 | 61.5 |
| R = 2 - 230 X = 44 | | |
| T = 354 Median = 21 | | |
| 12. Total all funded hours | 1 | 7.7 |
| 13. Total police funded hours | 2 | 15.4 |
| 14. Sections police Basic | 10 | 76.9 |
| R = 2 - 8 X = 3.2 | | |
| T = 32 Median = 2.5 | | |
| 15. Basic enrollments | 6 | 46.1 |
| 16. TCLEOSE Exam failures | 11 | 84.6 |
| R = 0 - 33 X = 10 | | |
| T = 105 Median = 5 | | |
| 17. Sections police in-service | 6 | 46.1 |
| 18. In-service enrollments | 5 | 38.5 |

One question in this section requested the total non-credit enrollment for the college, the other asked for the total number of state-funded student contact hours generated by the college's non-credit adult vocational program. Only

three of the respondents (23.1%) reported the non-credit enrollment and only one (7.7%) reported the non-credit contact hours. In fact, only two (15.4%) reported the non-credit contact hours for police training. These questions were asked to allow a comparison of the size of the total continuing education program with the police academy program, but because of the lack of information reported, this comparison was not possible.

A majority of respondents (84.6%, $n = 11$) provided information on enrollments in the academy's police training classes. The total peace officers trained by the eleven respondents, during the time period covered by the survey, was 6,478. The number of peace officers trained by the individual academies during this time ranged from a low of 25 to a high of 3,415, giving a median of 361 and a mean of 589.

A majority of the respondents (61.5%, $n = 8$) reported information on the total number of non-credit sections of police training offered. The eight respondents reported a total of 354 sections offered ranging from 2 at one institution to 230 at another. The median number of sections offered was 21, the mean was 44. Ten respondents (76.9%) reported offering a total of 32 section of the Basic Peace Officer Course with the number of sections offered at each institution ranging from 2 to 8 providing a median of 2.5 and a mean of 3.2. Only six (46.1%) reported numbers of enrollments in the basic courses. Six (46.1%) of the

respondents reported numbers of sections of police inservice, but only five (38.5%) reported numbers of inservice enrollments.

An important statistic for all respondents is the pass/fail rate on the Basic Peace Officer Course Certifying Examination given by TCLEOSE at the end of the Basic Course. A majority of the respondents (84.6, $n = 11$) reported information on failures. At these eleven academies, out of the total number of failures on the examination during the year covered by the survey was 105. One academy reported zero failures and the range went as high as 33 at another academy. The median was 5 and the mean was 10. Respondents were not asked how many students attempted the certifying examination, but they were asked about enrollments in the Basic Course. The six institutions reporting enrollments in the Basic Course had a total of 478 enrollments. At these same six institutions, there were 64 failures. If it is assumed that all who enrolled at these six academies took the examination, indications are that 13.4 percent of the students failed the test.

Summary of Findings

The following is a summary of the major findings from this study.

Based on the data collected to answer Research Question One, most of the academies began during the period of time from 1968 - 1979, and have been in continuous operation since that time. Most began operation at the request of a

regional council of governments or local law enforcement agency. In their first five years of operation, the academies were supervised by the continuing education administration. All of the respondents offered the Basic Peace Officer Course and almost all offered in-service or continuing education programs for law enforcement agencies but little else. Most depended on advisory committees for organizational assistance and many visited other agencies, most often educational institutions in state, for guidance in establishing their program. No written materials or studies were cited as resources. No fatalities in training were reported, but three instances of injuries requiring hospitalization of students were reported.

Based on the data, the police academy is supervised most often by an administrator with the title "director". He/she reports to a dean in the majority of institutions and the program continues to report to continuing education in most cases. The supervision of the police academy is usually placed four positions deep within the organization. All responding institutions also offer associate degrees in criminal justice and four offer associate degrees in corrections. None offer associate degrees in probation and parole. Persons associated with the institution's academic program have little responsibility in the police academy in either teaching or administration. In only a few cases is there either an organizational relationship between an academy and an outside agency or is there a relationship in

which the academy is dependent on a single source for students. In these few cases, the relationships exists between an academy and a regional council of governments.

Most respondents have an academy located on a college campus. The data also indicate that most academies have their own classrooms, share the building they are in with other campus programs, allow students to bring their own guns to firearms classes, have their own audio visual equipment, have a learning resources center, obtain print support from the college, and share the colleges's gym facilities with the remainder of the campus. About an equal number have a firing range as borrow one off campus, about as many own their own firearms as don't, few of the academies use a driving pad or track and few have their own gym facilities.

Supervisors are pleased with the support the programs receive from their college with a majority rating the appropriateness of the facilities and equipment as acceptable or better. The data indicates that the programs are blended fairly well with the colleges in terms of sharing facilities and equipment and that given the situations of semester breaks, extended holidays and weather closures, could function as autonomous units for brief periods of time.

The data indicate that most police training academies have very few full-time administrative, faculty or classified staff members other than the program

administrator. The programs are heavily dependent on adjunct instructors, perhaps dangerously dependent. Over 77% of the instruction taking place in these academies is being done by adjunct instructors. This appears to be an excessive amount. The danger has nothing to do with the fact that the adjunct instructors are allowed to wear their firearms in most classrooms; that is just an affirmation of the fact that for most adjunct instructors, education is not uppermost in their minds. The situation with adjunct instructors is particularly troublesome for those academies who depend on adjunct instructors for 100% of their instruction, or who are overly dependant on a local law enforcement agency for instructors, or who have the same problem as one respondent who remarked, "We have no control over who the agency sends to teach a particular course."

Most adjunct instructors appear to be well educated with a bachelors degree or higher or at least some college hours, but their treatment at the academies varies widely. Only about half of the respondents report paying the adjunct instructors for their instruction and only slightly more than half even bother to maintain personnel paperwork on all their instructors. The academies all maintain records which indicate the names of all persons who teach for any length of time in the academy whether they are paid or not. No reason was given for maintenance of these records, but if it is not to simply meet a requirement of TCLEOSE perhaps the records are used to assist students or to evaluate and

improve instruction. More likely, however, the names are kept so the administrator will know who to call next to instruct the same class.

All respondents reported that their instructors had participated in TCLEOSE instructor courses. Most reported that they provided staff development opportunities for their employees at other locations and that their employees had visited other community college academies to observe their programs and teaching. Most respondents reported that instructors had participated in instructor course conducted by non-law enforcement training agencies, and most reported that they are members of state and national and sometimes international educational and professional law enforcement organizations.

The majority of the students participating in police academy programs are seldom members of the general public. Advisory committees are required by TCLEOSE to determine admission requirements for the police academy and most limit courses to law enforcement related programming and limit enrollment to law enforcement related students. This restriction on students may account for the fact that some respondents do not actively publish information about their programs to the general public. Because the academy's students do not come from a general public audience, the marketing of the program and thus the information about the admission requirements is usually disseminated to an audience already in the law enforcement profession.

The feeling of segmentation and separation of the police academy student into a semi-autonomous training program with little connection to a credit counterpart program is strengthened by an examination of the student services available to the police academy student. A slender majority of respondents provide basic student services to police academy students. Also noteworthy is the fact that while most respondents provide students with a set of guidelines or a student handbook addressing such things as conduct and behavior, in six of the 13 institutions responding, the students are denied access to the college's policy of due process in discipline matters.

For those students successfully completing police training courses, the awarding of CEU's is done in a majority of institutions. In over half of the responding institutions, students can be awarded academic credit through either credit by examination or experience for having successfully completed the program.

The majority of the respondents perceive that the governing board and the administration both understand the mission of the police academy programs and the programs themselves. But in both cases, a significant number of the respondents also are unsure that the either the board or the administration would provide more support if they understood the programs better. Likewise, a number of respondents are not sure that the faculty or the public in their service area either understand the mission of the academy or

comprehend its programs. While the staff of the police academy is perceived to be fully accepted as a part of the college community, indications are that the programs would benefit from a clear articulation of the programs mission and a widespread distribution of information about the various training programs the academy provides. From examining earlier data, it is apparent that there is little coordination between academic programs, even those in the same general field, and the police academy programs. However, the understanding by its various publics of the academy, its mission and its program would almost certainly benefit from closer coordination between these similar arms of the college.

The respondents believe that their advisory committees are not controlled by outside elements. On the other hand, almost half allow more than one person from the same agency to serve on the committee at the same time, all but two allow members to serve unlimited terms on the committee and six others do not limit the length of terms. All academies have advisory committees appointed by their chief educational officer, who despite, or perhaps because of, the fact that he/she is making uninformed choices 38.5% of the time, has never failed to appoint a recommended member. Most academies serve only the police academy, have their policies in writing for advisory members, and feel that their committee is at least as active if not more so than other advisory committees at the college.

Despite the fact that most respondents seem to feel in control of their advisory committee, some institutions have created the opportunity for external control to exist through unlimited terms, more than one representative from the same agency, and by failing to establish a limit on the length of a term of service. CEO's who fail to make informed choices about police academy members may be as much as fault as the committees themselves in allowing an opportunity for abuse to develop. Abuse of the community by the committee and, by extension, by the college may be also seen in the failure of some academies to appoint members of minority groups, protected classes, peace officer ranks other than agency heads, and civilians to advisory committees.

A basic assumption made in this study was that if the respondents had access to the information requested, it would be reported, however the degree of knowledge of the academy administrators regarding certain fundamental program statistics is limited. Most respondents reported that they did not offer classes to the general public. All respondents reported training peace officers from the counties in their college's service area and a smaller number reported training peace officers from counties outside their college's service area. Most reported the peace officer population inside their college's service area, but none knew the peace officer population in the counties they served outside their area.

Most respondents knew the number of peace officers trained from both inside and outside their service area. A majority knew how many enrollments they had in non-credit police classes, but only 3 respondents (23.1%) knew the size of the college's non-credit program so most would be unable to determine if they represented a significant share of that enrollment. Only two (15.4%) knew the number of state funded contact hours their program generated and only one knew how many hours the college's program of non-credit adult vocational courses generated. Again, this prevents the academy administrator from determining the degree of his contribution to the college's overall program of continuing education and community service.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

Summary

The problem which this study was concerned with was selected aspects of public community college non-credit law enforcement training programs in Texas. The study had three purposes: (1) to examine the development of non-academic law enforcement training programs in public community colleges in Texas; (2) to provide normative data describing police academies in terms of background, organization and administration, adequacy of facilities and equipment, personnel, student policies and practices of the academy, the administrator's perceptions of internal and external support, involvement of outside forces in the academy, and the extent of the program in a fashion which community colleges can use in evaluating their individual non-academic law enforcement programs, and (3) to provide data which community colleges can use in organizing and developing new, college-affiliated police academies.

To collect this data, eight research questions were developed and are presented in Chapter I. In order to answer these questions, data were gathered on a

questionnaire developed for the study. The procedures used in developing and refining the questionnaire are described in Chapter III. The questionnaire was a descriptive survey instrument designed to gather responses from the individual identified by the Texas Commission on Law Enforcement Officer Standards and Education (TCLEOSE) as the person responsible for the day to day administration of the academy. The study was limited to fifteen institutions having an on-going, TCLEOSE licensed and approved, non-contract, police training academy providing recruit and/or non-credit training for law enforcement officers.

Thirteen institutions responded to the survey. The two institutions which failed to return the questionnaire within the prescribed time frame were mailed follow-up questionnaires and after a follow-up period had elapsed, were contacted by telephone. Neither institution responded to either follow-up contact. An 86.7% usable response rate was achieved. Data were tabulated and presented in tabular form in Chapter IV.

An analysis and discussion of the data are also presented in Chapter IV.. Numbers and percentages of responses are charted in tables in order to facilitate interpretation of data.

Summary of Findings

Based on the data obtained from this study, the information which follows is a summary of the major findings.

1. All surveyed institutions began operation between 1968 and 1983 although the majority began operation between 1968 and 1979. All programs have been in continuous operation since the time of their inception. Most programs began as a result of a request from a regional council of governments and in their first five years of operation, reported to the college's continuing education administrator. All programs offer the Basic Peace Officer Training Course and most offer in-service training as well. Most depended heavily on advisory committees for assistance in beginning operations. No written materials or studies were cited as resource materials. No training-related fatalities were reported and few injuries were noted.

2. Most academies are organized under continuing education programs, are administered by a "director" four levels deep in the college's administrative structure and report to a "dean." All institutions also offer criminal justice associate degree programs, but report little administrative or instructional contact between the academic program and the police academy. In the few cases where an academy has close student or organizational ties with an outside agency, that agency is a regional council of governments.

3. Most academies are located on a college campus with dedicated classroom space, learning resources center, and equipment. Some facilities are shared with other operations of the college. About half have their own firing range, few

use a driving track or pad and few have dedicated gym facilities. The programs's administrators rate their equipment and facilities as acceptable or better and most programs appear to be able to function as autonomous units for brief periods of time.

4. Most programs have few full-time staff members and are heavily dependent on adjunct faculty. Most adjunct instructors have at least some college hours and many hold a bachelors degree or higher. Only about one-half of all academies pay adjunct instructors and./or maintain personnel paperwork for them. All academies maintain records of instructors and the subjects they teach and all report that their instructors have participated in various instructor training courses. Most respondents reported membership in various state and national professional and educational organizations.

5. Most academies do not admit members of the general public to their programs; instead they take only students affiliated with law enforcement agencies. Thus, most of their marketing efforts and distribution of admission information goes to an audience composed almost exclusively of members of the law enforcement profession. The basic student services commonly offered to students at community colleges are not usually extended to students at police academies. While students at most academies receive written guidelines and/or student handbooks, at 46% of the institutions, students are denied access to the college's

policy of due process. For students completing programs, continuing education units (C.E.U.'s) are awarded, and at over half of the responding institutions, students can receive academic credit either through credit by exam or experience for having successfully completed the Basic Peace Officer's Course.

6. Academy administrators perceive that the governing board and administration understands both the mission of the police academy and its programs, but in the case of both groups, the administrators are unsure if better understanding would promote better support. Most academy administrators are unsure whether the faculty or the public in their service area either understand the mission or comprehend its programs. The perception of the academy administrator is that the police academy staff is fully accepted as a part of the college community, but the data indicate that the program may benefit from a clear articulation of the programs mission and widespread dissemination of information about the various training programs.

7. Most academy administrators believe that their advisory committees are not influenced by outside elements, but the data indicate that more than half create conditions which may allow that influence to occur. The college's chief educational officer makes all appointments, but the academy administrators believe that the decision is uninformed 38% of the time. Many of the institutions fail

to appoint members of minority groups, protected classes, peace officer ranks other than agency heads, and civilians to advisory committees.

8. Most academy administrators were able to report general information about the size and scope of their program's operation, but most were unable to identify information which would allow a comparison between the police academy program and the overall continuing education program at the college.

Discussion of Findings

The data and research indicate that police training academies at Texas community colleges which are active today have been in operation continuously since 1968. In fact, most of the academies began operation between 1968 and 1979. This time period, marked nationally by an infusion of funding for training and education of police officers, was important in Texas because of the increase in the number of public community colleges. It was also in 1968 that the State of Texas adopted a statewide plan for the development of community colleges and their mission. The plan identified continuing education as one of the three principal responsibilities of the community college mission, and in 1974, the Texas Legislature adopted a method of funding based on contact hours which included continuing education under the aegis of vocational-technical courses.

The continuing education programs have the mission to provide public service programs in response to community

interest and need and it is this expression of need from the community coupled with the opportunity to receive state support for educational programs which led to the development of the police academies at the community colleges. Because the continuing education office has the ability to respond most flexibly and most quickly to identified community needs, it is not surprising that it was the continuing education program which initially began most of the academies and to which they continue to report at present.

The police academies, usually administered by an individual (all were males in this study) with the title Director, have little connection to the administrative or instructional personnel in academic programs even though all respondents to the survey reported also having academic criminal justice programs at their colleges. Each academy offers the state required entry level training for police officers as well as on-going continuing education and in-service classes. The programs appear to be responding to the needs of their community, but the seemingly natural interchange between the academic program and the continuing education program does not appear to exist at most academies. Perhaps this is evidence of Hoover and Lund's "distinctive rubric" for skill training (see Chapter I of this study).

Based on the perceptions of the police academy administrators, the colleges provide at least acceptable and

facilities and equipment. Because of the peculiar nature of police recruit training, i.e. training is often a the recruit's paid job, police academies require a certain degree of autonomy. They must be able to function over short periods of time, such as usual college semester breaks or some holidays, without interrupting their training cycle and most academies meet this requirement. Most of the program administrators believe they have adequate resources to accomplish their program's objectives.

Most academies have few full-time faculty and rely heavily on adjunct instructors; at some academies, adjunct instructors provide 100% of the instruction. Despite the fact that most of these part-time instructors have completed some kind of instructor training course, the academies create the potential for a problem with instruction to occur. This is the same criticism leveled at colleges by the 1978 National Advisory Commission on Higher Education for Police Officers (the Sherman report on the quality of police education).

While it is true that police officers can oftentimes bring realism to a classroom and while it is true that in many cases, the size of the college's program does not allow for full-time instructional staff in the police academy, it is also true that for these instructors, the teaching is a sideline; a part-time job that cannot demand their exclusive attention as would be the case with a full-time instructor.

There are many fine police officers who are also fine teachers, but a police teacher is also affected by shift changes, professional duties and emergency situations which affect his ability to do his job as a teacher and which affect the students in the classroom. If the fine teacher is not replaced with an equally competent and prepared instructor; if the class cannot be rescheduled; if there is no one else; a lesser educational experience occurs. Great things happen at these police academies.

It appears from a review of the data that the handling of personnel matters at the community college police academy in Texas could well use some improvement. Adding full-time faculty members and thereby reducing the dependence on adjunct instructors; employing the instructors; assuming full control over the educational process while maintaining cooperative helpful relationships and continuing to provide a broad range of professional development opportunities for full and part-time instructors and staff members may seem like an overwhelming task, but it must be done to assure quality training and professional education.

Because academies do not usually admit members of the general public their program marketing is directed mostly toward law enforcement agencies and professionals. This distinctive audience for police training programs is also a distinctive group with regard to access to student services and disciplinary matters. At community colleges, students are usually provided access to a broad range of student

services ranging from assistance with physically handicapped or learning disabled students to financial aid. Even though they do not usually pay a student activities fee, continuing education students at many schools are allowed access to basic student services. The data and research indicate, however, that students involved in police training are not usually provided access to most student services. While the provision of these services may not be feasible in some case, personal and family counseling opportunities should certainly be provided at the very least.

The administration of student behavior guidelines and student discipline is another area in which the police training student may find him or herself segregated. Failure by some of the academies to provide the police training students with access to the college's policy of due process for disciplinary concerns separates these students from others and would appear to help create a sense of segmentation and isolation for the students. In all aspects of student life, academies should make an attempt to incorporate their students as much as possible into the college's student community.

Academy administrators are generally comfortable with the support and understanding they receive from the governing board and administration of the college. The fact that they are unsure about the degree of support and understanding they receive from the faculty at the college and the general public should come as no surprise since the

faculty is not usually included in their activities, nor do they make their activities generally known to the public through the usual college marketing channels. If the academy administrators value the support and understanding of their peers in the college community and of the general public, they should take aggressive steps to inform both groups of their mission and the importance of their programs.

Advisory committees provide an opportunity for the police academy and the college leadership to obtain information, guidance and advice from the community they serve. The data and the research indicate that most of the police academy administrators are not concerned about an excessive degree of outside influence. The advisory committee is required by TCLEOSE, but the college retains the right to exercise its authority over the committee.

Despite this fact, it appears from the data that most colleges do not exercise a necessary degree of authority. Multiple committee members from the same agency, members who may succeed themselves for indefinite lengths of time, CEO's who make uninformed choices about members and committee members with terms of service with no specified end date may be contributory factors in the creation of a committee that serves not interests of the college or the interests of the community, but the interests of the advisory committee members themselves.

The failure of the college to exercise authority over the advisory committees is paralleled by a similar situation regarding the organization the academy administrators would support in the event of a conflict of policy. Seven of the thirteen respondents indicated that they would support TCLEOSE rather than the college for which they work. Six of the respondents indicated they would support the college. There should be clear direction for all the academy administrators regarding this issue.

An additional problem identified with regard to the program's advisory committee structure is the failure by the college to insure that the committee accurately reflect the community it serves. Special attention needs to be paid to including more civilians and minorities and protected classes on the committees and to extending membership to law enforcement officer ranks other than heads of agencies.

Most program administrators were familiar with information relating to their specific program, but failed to provide information or did not have access to information which would allow them to determine their place in the overall mission of the college. While knowing how many students had failed the TCLEOSE examination on the first try is an important piece of information for the academy administrators, there are certain other equally crucial bits of knowledge a well-informed administrator should know: (a) population of target audience is critical for marketing, (b) knowledge of enrollments and contact hours is vital if a

program administrator properly tracks enrollment trends and makes budget projections, and (c) knowledge of the scope of the college's continuing education program and where the police academy's activities fit within it are important to a recognition of program importance and to the ability of the academy administrator to successfully manage his program.

Conclusions

Based on the data collected and the findings of this study, the following conclusions are warranted.

1. The programs were established as continuing education programs in response to a community need. The fact that the programs continue to operate is an indication that the need continues to exist.
2. A fundamental purpose of the programs is to provide state-required entry level skills training and continuing education for peace officers, an often dangerous task which the academies accomplish with a high degree of safety.
3. Police academies continue to be organized and administered by the college's continuing education program, and although they offer related instruction, there is little interchange between academic programs such as criminal justice programs and the police academies.
4. Police academies located on college campuses are adequately equipped and supplied with acceptable instructional facilities.
5. Police academies are too dependent on adjunct instructors.

6. Unless they are involved in the law enforcement profession in some fashion, the general public is usually not included in any classes the academies offer.

7. Colleges have yet to identify the place of the police academy student with regard to student services and discipline.

8. Most academies are understood and supported by their governing board and administration, and they feel comfortable that they are accepted as a part of their college community. They are unsure, however, whether the faculty or the public in their service area either understand the mission or comprehend its programs.

9. Advisory committee structure is poorly organized and developed and does not appear to fairly represent the community the academy is intended to serve.

10. Academy administrators have general knowledge about the extent of their immediate program and the characteristics of their service area, although they exhibit a lack of knowledge about some of the audience for police academy programs, statistical information about their programs, or the role of the police academy in the college's overall continuing education program.

Implications

Providing support for its law enforcement community by establishing and operating a law enforcement officer training academy can be one of the most rewarding activities of a public community college in Texas. There are, however,

certain segments of this activity which must be done well and which must be clearly thought out before beginning such a program. Any such program originated by a community college should be clearly identified as a part of that college's overall mission in its community, and that mission must be determined by the community the college serves. The ability of the college to provide a quality training academy will depend on its location, its physical and fiscal resources, its community support and the support of the college community itself. Other significant considerations which the college must keep clearly in mind in beginning and operating a successful police academy program include:

1. Organization: The program should report to a department of the college that has the flexibility to accommodate non-traditional activities and instruction. All of the respondents began operation, and most continue to operate, through the continuing education arm of the college. This should remain an acceptable organizational structure provided some of the concerns expressed below are monitored.

2. Developmental Information: There is a shortage of written information available to colleges planning to develop and operate a police training academy. They will find it necessary to visit other academies and in many cases learn from the mistakes and the successes of other programs.

3. Facilities and Equipment: As previously mentioned, physical facilities are imperative to the operation of a

high quality program. The college must be willing to commit the necessary fiscal resources to insure that the program has a state-of-the-art training facility.

4. Internal Support: The college should insure the development and distribution of a mission statement for the police academy and should actively seek ways to acquaint the college community and the population of its service area with information about the police academy's programs.

5. Personnel: The college should insure the employment of a trained, capable, qualified academy staff able to win the respect and support of the law enforcement community and the college community. The college should insure that professional development opportunities are available for these employees. The college should insure that the academy is sufficiently staffed with full-time employees and instructors and does not have to depend heavily on adjunct instruction. When adjunct instructors are used, they should be trained in instructional methodology and techniques, and they should be paid as employees of the college for the time they spend in the classroom.

6. Participation in Professional Organizations: The college should recognize that the exchange of information at professional organizations is an important part of operating a high quality program. Because much of the field of police training changes frequently, academy employees should be encouraged to join and attend professional organizations at

local, state, regional and national levels and the college should provide the necessary financial support to allow this necessary professional development to occur.

7. Marketing: If it is important for the general public and the college community to understand the academy's mission and programs, the college should insure that the police academy's marketing plan parallels the academy's mission.

8. Involvement of Related Instructional Programs: The college should insure that the related academic programs are included and involved in the activities of the police academy where and when possible. This cooperation should include shared instruction and administrative assistance where feasible.

9. Student Policies and Practices: The college should examine its policy of student services, activities and governance in an attempt to clearly define the status of continuing education students. If its decision is that it should, a concerted effort should be made to disseminate information about these services and this policy to all students. If its decision is that it should not, the college should insure that, at a minimum, counseling services are provided even if it means increasing fees to accommodate them.

10. Awarding of Experiential Credit: If it is concerned about using the police academy as a first step for students entering academic programs, the college must review

its policy of awarding credit for experience and credit by examination to insure that credit for certain training activities involving law enforcement officers are included.

11. Acceptance of Program and Employees: The college should insure that the mission of the academy and information about its program and its staff is publicized in the community and in the college and should take action to insure that the academy staff are viewed and recognized as members of the college community.

12. External Influences: The college should assume a positive role in the organization and operation of the police academy advisory committee. The college should insure that the committee serves the interests of the community and represents the community it serves. The college should insure representation on the committee of all segments of the community and the law enforcement community. The college should insure that the advisory committee is a fair, positive, and productive part of the program.

13. Statistical Support: The college should insure that the academy administrator is provided with and educated in the proper use of statistical data regarding his or her program, its market, its place in the overall college programs, and the contribution it makes to the mission of the college.

Recommendations for Further Study

Based on the findings and conclusions of this study, the following recommendations for further study are made.

1. Because this was a state-wide study, it is recommended that similar studies be conducted in other states.

2. It is recommended that a study be conducted of police academies operated in other higher education institutions in Texas and by other agencies in the state.

3. It is recommended that a study be made of those police academies which have terminated operation in Texas to determine if common factors influenced their demise.

4. It is recommended that a study be conducted into the status of continuing education students at Texas community colleges with regard to access to student services and student rights.

5. It is recommended that a study be made of advisory committees at Texas public community colleges to determine representation by minority and protected classes.

6. It is recommended that test scores on the state licensing examination be made available (to academies and researchers) by TCLEOSE in a format conducive to comparative research and analysis.

APPENDIX A

TCLEOSE CERTIFIED POLICE ACADEMIES AFFILIATED WITH
PUBLIC COMMUNITY JUNIOR COLLEGES
IN TEXAS

TCLEOSE Certified Police Academies Affiliated
With Public Community Junior Colleges
in Texas

Alvin Community College
Alvin, Texas

Brazosport College Law Enforcement Academy
Lake Jackson, Texas

Central Texas Regional Academy
American Technological University
(Central Texas College)
Killeen, Texas

College of the Mainland Regional Academy
Texas City, Texas

Del Mar Police Academy
Corpus Christi, Texas

East Texas Police Academy
Kilgore College
Kilgore, Texas

Heart of Texas Regional Academy
McClennan Community College
Waco, Texas

Laredo Junior College Regional Academy
Laredo, Texas

Middle Rio Grande Law Enforcement Academy
Southwest Texas Junior College
Uvalde, Texas

NorTex Regional Academy
Vernon Regional Junior College
Vernon, Texas

Panhandle Regional Law Enforcement Academy
Amarillo College
Amarillo, Texas

Tarrant County Junior College Academy
Fort Worth, Texas

Texoma Police Academy
Grayson County Junior College
Denison, Texas

Texas Southmost College Regional Academy
South Padre Island, Texas

Victoria College Law Enforcement Academy
Victoria, Texas

APPENDIX B
QUESTIONNAIRE

POLICE ACADEMY QUESTIONNAIRE

DIRECTIONS: Please respond in some fashion to each question. Use "NA" for not applicable. "0" for not available.

Unless otherwise noted, questions asked using phrases such as "the past year" or "the fiscal year" refer to the year covered by the dates September 1, 1987 through August 31, 1988.

NOTE: The college name, person name, and phone number are requested for follow-up purposes only. No individual or college will be identified.

COLLEGE: _____

CURRENT TCLEOSE ACADEMY NUMBER: _____

PERSON COMPLETING THIS SURVEY

DO YOU WISH TO RECEIVE AN ABSTRACT OF THIS STUDY?

_____ YES _____ NO

NAME: _____

PHONE: _____ () _____ TITLE _____

NUMBER OF YEARS IN CURRENT POSITION: _____

NUMBER OF YEARS EXPERIENCE AS A FULL-TIME PEACE OFFICER: _____

NUMBER OF YEARS FULL-TIME EXPERIENCE IN HIGHER EDUCATION: _____

HIGHEST DEGREE HELD: _____ Doctorate _____ Bachelor's

_____ Master's _____ Other

MAJOR FIELD: _____ for last degree

SEX: _____ Male _____ Female

A. BACKGROUND OF THE ACADEMY

1. In what year did your academy offer its first non-credit police training classes? _____

2. Has your academy been in continuous operation since that time?
 - _____ yes
 - _____ no (If no, provide dates of inactivity and explain inactivity)

3. Has your academy ever had another TCLEOSE Certification or license number?
 - _____ yes [please indicate former number(s) _____]
 - _____ no (go to question # 5)

4. If you answered "yes" to question number 3, what caused the former number(s) to cease being active?
 - _____ TCLEOSE action
 - _____ College initiative
 - _____ Enrollment decline
 - _____ Other; specify _____

5. Did your academy begin operation as a result of: (check all that apply)
 - _____ Community request
 - _____ State Agency request
 - _____ College initiative
 - _____ Request of a Council of Governments
 - _____ Local law enforcement agency request
 - _____ Other; specify _____

6. Nature of the courses your academy offered during its first five years of operation: (check all that apply)
 - _____ Basic Peace Officer Course
 - _____ In-service training courses
 - _____ Community Service courses for the general public
 - _____ Other; specify _____

7. Department of the college your academy reported to during its first five years of operation: (check all that apply)
 - _____ Continuing Education
 - _____ Academic Department, specify department _____
 - _____ Other; explain _____

8. Other than Rules and Regulations and guidance provided by TCLEOSE, what other sources of information were used as a guide for implementing your academy? (Check as appropriate)

None
 Visits at other academies
 In state at educational institutions
 In state at government agencies
 Out of state at educational institutions
 Out of state at government agencies
 Paid consultants
 Unpaid consultants
 Advisory Committees
 Written studies or documents; specify _____

9. Have any of your staff/instructors/students ever been killed or injured requiring hospitalization during your academy's exercises?

| | | <u>Fatality</u> | | <u>Injured Requiring Hospitalization</u> | | |
|------------|--------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|--|-------|--------------------------|
| | yes | # | no | yes | # | no |
| Instructor | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Students | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Staff | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> |

B. ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF THE ACADEMY

1. Title of the person responsible for the day to day operation of your police academy?

Coordinator of _____
 Director of _____
 Department Chair of _____
 Division Chair of _____
 Other; specify _____

2. Title of person to whom the administrator of your police academy reports?

3. Provide the organizational flow from the college's governing board to the police academy administrator.

Governing Board , to _____ , to _____ , to _____
 _____ , to _____ , to _____ , to _____

4. In which of the following areas does your college offer associate degrees in law enforcement and related areas.

Criminal Justice
 Probation and Parole
 Corrections
 Other; specify _____

5. Do instructors in any of the following degree fields at your college have any responsibility for the police academy:

| <u>Degree Fields</u> | <u>Responsibility</u> | | |
|----------------------|-----------------------|----------|-------|
| | Administrative | Teaching | None |
| Criminal Justice | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Probation & Parole | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Corrections | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Other; Specify | _____ | _____ | _____ |

6. Is your academy affiliated organizationally with:

| Yes | No | |
|-------|-------|------------------------------------|
| _____ | _____ | A local law enforcement agency? |
| _____ | _____ | A regional council of governments? |
| _____ | _____ | A state law enforcement agency? |

7. Is your academy dependent upon one or more of the following type agencies for a majority of its students?

| Yes | No | |
|-------|-------|---------------------------------------|
| _____ | _____ | A single local law enforcement agency |
| _____ | _____ | A regional council of governments |
| _____ | _____ | A state law enforcement agency |
| _____ | _____ | Other; specify _____ |
| _____ | _____ | Other; specify _____ |

C. ADEQUACY OF FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT

1. Is your academy situated on an college campus? _____ yes
 If no, specify _____

2. Does your academy:

| Yes | No | |
|-------|-------|---|
| _____ | _____ | have its own classrooms |
| _____ | _____ | share its classrooms with the rest of the college |
| _____ | _____ | have its own building |
| _____ | _____ | share its building with the rest of the college |
| _____ | _____ | have a firing range |
| _____ | _____ | borrow a firing range off campus |
| _____ | _____ | use a driving pad/track |
| _____ | _____ | own its own weapons |
| _____ | _____ | allow students to bring their own weapons |
| _____ | _____ | have dedicated audio/visual equipment |
| _____ | _____ | share its audio/visual equipment with the rest of the college |
| _____ | _____ | have a learning resources center (library) |
| _____ | _____ | get printing support from on campus facilities |
| _____ | _____ | have its own gym facilities |
| _____ | _____ | share the facilities with the rest of the college |

3. To what extent do you believe your academy's facilities and equipment are appropriate for the program you are responsible for?

- () outstanding
- () acceptable
- () marginal
- () unacceptable
- () very unacceptable

D. PERSONNEL: FACULTY AND STAFF

1. Number of full-time college employees whose time is devoted 100% to the police academy?

_____ administrative _____ faculty _____ classified

2. Number of part time college employees whose time is devoted 100% to the police academy?

_____ administrative _____ faculty _____ classified

3. Number of permanent college employees who work part time for the police academy?

_____ administrative _____ faculty _____ classified

4. Approximately what per cent of the instructor contact hours are generated by?

_____ adjunct instructors
 _____ full time instructors

5. Please provide estimated percentages for your adjunct instructors:

- _____ % without high school diploma
- _____ % with only high school diploma
- _____ % with less than two years of college
- _____ % with a two year college degree
- _____ % with less than 4 years of college, but no associate degree
- _____ % with a bachelors degree or higher

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| Yes _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ | No _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ | 100% 6. Are adjunct, law enforcement professionals allowed to wear weapons in the non-firing range classroom environment? 7. Are all instructors reimbursed by the college for teaching in the academy? 8. Do you or the college maintain records which indicate the names of all persons who teach for any length of time in the academy whether they are paid or not? 9. Have any of the employees of your college visited other community college academies to observe their program and/or teaching? 10. Do you provide staff development opportunities for your employees at locations other than your college? 11. Have any of your instructors participated in instructor courses conducted by TCLEOSE? If yes, what percent: _____ |
|--|---|--|

- Yes No
- ___ ___ 12. Have any of your instructors participated in "training the trainer" or "how to teach" courses conducted by non-law enforcement training agencies? If yes, what percent _____
- ___ ___ 13. Are you, or any of your staff, members of any training or adult or continuing education professional organizations statewide or nationwide? If yes, specify _____
- ___ ___ 14. Are you, or any of your staff, members of professional law enforcement education organizations at the state or national level? If yes, specify _____
- ___ ___ 15. Does the college have personnel paperwork for all instructors who teach at the academy? If "no" explain _____

16. Please respond to the following with regard to yourself and your current full-time staff.

| Title | Highest Education Level | Major Field | Number of years | |
|-------|-------------------------|-------------|---|-----------|
| | | | Experience as a peace officer Full-time | Part-time |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

E. STUDENT POLICIES AND PRACTICES OF THE ACADEMY

1. Students may attend classes at your academy if they are:

- ___ members of the general public
- ___ sworn officers
- ___ agency referrals
- ___ agency sponsors
- ___ employees of a law enforcement agency
- ___ other; specify _____

2. Do you publish your admissions requirements to the general public?

- ___ yes; how _____
- ___ no

3. Services provided by the institution for academy students:
(Check if provided)

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------|
| ___ Background investigations | ___ tutoring |
| ___ psychological profiles | ___ health services |
| ___ physical examinations | ___ placement |
| ___ advisement | ___ student activities |
| ___ personal counseling | ___ food service |
| ___ Career counseling | ___ housing |
| ___ family counseling | ___ transcripts |
| ___ financial aid | ___ ammunition |
| ___ veterans benefits | ___ other, _____ |
| ___ physical handicapped assistance | ___ other, _____ |
| ___ learning disabled assistance | ___ other, _____ |
| ___ other, _____ | ___ other, _____ |

4. In the event a law enforcement agency sponsored student becomes a discipline problem or is guilty of misconduct, is he/she processed through the college's policy of due process, or is he/she referred directly to the sponsoring agency?

_____ due process _____ referral to agency _____ both

5. Does your academy have a set of written student guidelines?

_____ yes _____ no; go to question 7

6. Which of the following are addressed in the guidelines?

| | |
|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| _____ dress code | _____ firearms in class |
| _____ use of profanity | _____ grading scale |
| _____ absenteeism | _____ cheating |
| _____ controlled substance | _____ use of alcohol |
| _____ counseling | _____ privacy of records |
| _____ academic standards | _____ admission standards |

Yes No

- _____ 7. Does your college have a student handbook which sets forth rules and regulations for student conduct and behavior which cover academy students?
- _____ 8. With regard to students successfully completing a non-credit peace officers basic course, does your college provide credit by exam?
If yes, maximum hours _____
- _____ 9. With regard students successfully completing a non-credit peace officers basic course, does your college provide credit by experience.
If yes, maximum hours _____
- _____ 10. Does your college provide credit by experience/exam for students completing the peace officer basic course at another academy?
If yes, maximum hours _____
- _____ 11. Does your college require satisfaction of other requirements prior to posting the credit?
- _____ 12. If the college awards credit by experience/exam, what is the most number of credit hours a student may earn for successful completion of only the peace officer's basic course? _____ semester hours
- _____ 13. Does your college award Continuing Education Units (C.E.U.'s) to eligible students?

F. INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL SUPPORT

Please indicate your perceptions regarding the following statements.

| | Strongly Agree | Agree | Not Sure | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|--|-------------------|-------|-------------|----------|----------------------|
| 1. The governing board of the college understands the mission of the police academy. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 2. The governing board of the college understands as much as it needs to about the police academy. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 3. The governing board of the college would support the police academy more if they understood it better. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 4. The administration of the college understands the mission of the police academy. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 5. The administration of the college understands as much as it needs to about the police academy. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 6. The administration of the college would support the police academy more if they understood it better. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 7. The non-law enforcement, academic faculty at the college understands the mission of the police academy. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 8. The non-law enforcement, academic faculty at the college understands as much as they need to about the mission of the police academy. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 9. The non-law enforcement, academic faculty at the college would support the police academy more if they understood it better. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 10. The public in the college's service area understands the mission of the police academy. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 11. The public in the college's service area understands as much as it needs to about the mission of the police academy. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 12. The staff of the police academy is fully accepted as a part of the college community. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |

G. OUTSIDE INVOLVEMENT

- Yes No
- ___ ___ 1. Does your academy utilize an advisory committee/board?
- ___ ___ 2. Does your academy advisory committee/board also function as the advisory group for any other college program?
If yes; specify _____
- ___ ___ 3. Are the policies governing your academy advisory committee/board stated in writing?
- ___ ___ 4. Does your college have a document of policy regarding its advisory committees?
- ___ ___ 5. Do you have an advisory committee/board policy pertaining to membership on the committee?
- ___ ___ 6. May more than one law enforcement officer from the same agency, serve on your committee at the same time?
- ___ ___ 7. In the event of a clear conflict between college policy and TCLEOSE regulation, which would the academy administrator support?

___ institution ___ TCLEOSE

8. Identify the make-up of your academy advisory committee/board.

___ total members

| | lenf agency head | | other rank lenf officer | | civilian | |
|------------------|------------------|--------|-------------------------|--------|----------|--------|
| | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |
| Anglo | | | | | | |
| Hispanic | | | | | | |
| African American | | | | | | |
| Other | | | | | | |

9. Describe the activity of your academy advisory committee/board.

___ less active than other advisory committees at the college
 ___ more active than other advisory committees at the college
 ___ equally active with other advisory committees at the college

10. Who controls membership on the advisory committee/board?

___ college
 ___ advisory committee

- ___ ___ 11. Does any outside agency (local, regional, or state law enforcement agency other than TCLEOSE) attempt to direct the affairs of the advisory committee?

___ yes; explain _____

- ___ ___ 12. Does your chief educational officer appoint members to the academy advisory committee/board?

- ___ ___ 13. Has he/she ever refused to make a recommended appointment?

Yes No

___ ___ 14. Do you believe he/she makes informed choices/selections about these appointees?

___ ___ 15. Is it possible for a member of the advisory committee to serve an indefinite number of terms?

16. What is the term of service on the academy advisory committee?

___ 1 year ___ 2 years ___ 3 years
 ___ other; specify _____

H. EXTENSIVENESS OF THE PROGRAM

1. Does your academy offer classes for the general public (e.g. firearms, hunter safety, burglar prevention, etc)?

___ yes ___ no; go to question 3

2. List the 5 subject areas with the heaviest general public enrollment. (Averages may be estimates)

| <u>course and title</u> | <u>average # sections made per yr.</u> | <u>enrollment per section</u> |
|-------------------------|--|-------------------------------|
| _____ | _____ | _____ |
| _____ | _____ | _____ |
| _____ | _____ | _____ |
| _____ | _____ | _____ |
| _____ | _____ | _____ |

3. How many counties constitute your college's service area?
 _____ counties

4. What is the law enforcement officer population in your college's service area?
 _____ officers (include reserves)

5. How many officers, including reserves, did you train from this service area during this past fiscal year?
 _____ officers

6. How many counties outside your service area have you provided training for during the most recent fiscal year?
 _____ counties

7. What is the law enforcement officer population in these counties?
 _____ officers (include reserves)

8. How many officers, including reserves, did you train from this area during this past fiscal year?
 _____ officers

9. For the following, please respond for the year September 1, 1987 - August 31, 1988. Please be as accurate as possible.

_____ Total course enrollment in all non-credit classes offered at your college.

_____ Total course enrollment in only non-credit police training classes

_____ Total sections offered in only non-credit police training

_____ Total state funded contact hours for all non-credit classes

_____ Total state funded contact hours for non-credit police classes

_____ Number of sections of police basic course made

_____ Total course enrollments

_____ Number of students not passing the TCLEOSE Licensing Exam on first attempt.

_____ Number of sections of Police In-Service Courses made.

_____ Enrollment

APPENDIX C
LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL FOR THE STUDY

Date: May 1, 1989

To: The Administrator of the Police Academy

As a doctoral candidate at The University of North Texas, I am currently pursuing a doctorate in the Administration of Higher Education.

Enclosed is a questionnaire developed as a part of a dissertation study. The questionnaire is designed to gather information about the development and operation of police academies at community colleges in Texas, their interaction with law enforcement agencies, their support from the college they are affiliated with and information about the extensiveness of their programs. Information gathered in this study will become part of a dissertation and will be displayed in the dissertation in the form of frequency distributions, tables, graphs, summaries and discussions.

All responses will be kept confidential, and the names of individuals, agencies and institutions will not be identified with their responses. You may elect not to participate with no penalty to you or your institution.

This is the first study of the development of the police academy at community colleges in Texas and your participation is requested. Please complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it in the attached self-addressed, stamped envelope provided for that purpose. You should be able to complete the questionnaire in from 30 minutes to 1 hour. Please return the questionnaire by May 15, 1989.

If you desire additional information regarding the survey or if you wish question clarification, please do not hesitate to call one of the numbers provided below. Your comments are welcome and your assistance is appreciated.

Sincerely,

David A. Wells
1303 Snow Mountain Circle
Keller, Texas 76248
H (817) 485-2253
W (817) 877-9265

Dr. Howard Smith
Professor, Department of
Higher Education
The University of North Texas
P.O. Box 13857, NT Station
Denton, Texas

Enclosure

THIS PROJECT HAS BEEN REVIEWED BY UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS COMMITTEE FOR THE PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS (PHONE: 565-3940)

APPENDIX D
FOLLOW-UP LETTER

May 15, 1989

TO: The Administrator of the Police Academy

Several days ago, I sent you a questionnaire and accompanying letter requesting your participation in a dissertation study of police academies at community colleges in Texas. The study is limited only to those community colleges in Texas which have TCLEOSE certified police academies providing non-credit recruit and/or inservice police training. The study is designed to examine the development and operation of these programs and their relationships within the college and with local law enforcement agencies. The study is being conducted under the direction of Dr. Howard Smith, Professor of Higher Education at North Texas State University and has the support of the Texas commission on Law Enforcement Officer Standards and Education.

At this time, your questionnaire has not been received. Your response to the request for information is highly valued and important. Your assistance in making this a truly comprehensive study is sincerely appreciated.

Enclosed is a duplicate questionnaire and a self-addressed, stamped envelope for your convenience. Please take a few minutes to respond to the questionnaire and return the information today. Your individual responses will be kept confidential, and in no way will your answers be identified in the study.

Should you require clarification or assistance, please feel free to call one of the numbers listed below. If your response is already in the mail, please disregard this letter and accept my thanks. Your efforts are sincerely appreciated.

Sincerely,

David Wells
1303 Snow Mountain Circle
Keller, Texas 76248
H (817) 485-2253
W (817) 877-9265

Enclosure

APPENDIX E
CURRICULUM FOR BASIC PEACE OFFICER'S COURSE

BASIC PEACE OFFICER TRAINING COURSE

| Subject | Hours |
|--|-------|
| Introduction and Classroom Notetaking | 4 |
| Peace Officer Role in Society | 8 |
| Code of Criminal Procedure | 16 |
| Penal Code | 40 |
| First Aid/CPR | 16 |
| Constitutional Law | 4 |
| Family Code | 8 |
| Arrest, Search & Seizure | 20 |
| Alcoholic Beverage Code | 4 |
| Dangerous Drugs & Controlled Substances | 8 |
| Traffic Law Enforcement | 36 |
| DWI Enforcement | 4 |
| Interviewing and Interrogation | 3 |
| Use of Force | 8 |
| Field Notetaking and Report Writing | 12 |
| Civil Process | 12 |
| Case Preparation | 2 |
| Courtroom Demeanor and Testimony | 6 |
| Firearms | 40 |
| Criminal Investigation | 32 |
| Crime Scene Search | 7 |
| Driving | 8 |
| Recognizing and Handling Abnormal People | 6 |
| Crime Prevention | 10 |
| Patrol Procedures | 28 |
| Communications/Patrol Procedures | 3 |
| Traffic Direction and Control | 4 |
| Crowd Control | 2 |
| Jail Operations | 2 |
| Traffic Accident Investigation | 28 |
| Evaluations, Examinations | 15 |
| Crisis Intervention/Patrol Procedures | 4 |
| Defensive Tactics/Mechanics of Arrest | 40 |
| Total Hours | 440 |

References

- Aaron, T.J. (1965). Education and professionalism in American law enforcement. Police. November-December, 37-41.
- Adams, T.F. (1964). Training officer's handbook. Springfield: Charles Thomas.
- Barry, A.G. (1931). Needs and goals of police training. Journal of criminal law & criminology. 22, 42-46.
- Beasley, W.D. (1968). Police education in Texas: A status report. Texas police journal. 16(9), 15-19.
- Beasley, W.D. (1969). Police education - the key to professionalization. Texas police journal. 17(6), 15-19.
- Bertram, F.D. (1975). The prediction of police academy performance and on the job performance from police recruit screening measure. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Marquette University, WI.
- Boolsen, F.M. (Ed.). (1950). Directory of university and college criminology programs. Society for Advancement of Criminology.
- Brandstatter, A.F. (1973). History of police education in U.S. In Report of the standards committee: Volume II. Atlanta: Georgia State University.

- Brereton, G.H. (1961). The importance of training and education in the professionalization of law enforcement. Journal of criminal law, criminology, and police science. 52(1), 111-121.
- Burden, O.P. (1988). Recruiting police from college. FBI law enforcement bulletin. 57(3), 1-5.
- Burrow, W.W. (1977, April). Untitled. Speech presented at Pan American University, Edinburg, TX.
- Burrow, W.W. (1978). Law enforcement core curriculum: Conviction vs persuasion. Texas police journal. 26(9), 1-5.
- Byrnes, T. (1969). Professional criminals of America. New York: Chelsea House. (Original work published 1886)
- Carte, G. E., & Carte, E. H. (1975). Police reform in the United States: The era of August Vollmer, 1905-1932. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Carter, D. L. (1978). Issues and trends in higher education for police officers. Criminal justice monograph. 8(5).
- Clark, D.E., & Chapman, A.B. (1966). A forward step: Educational backgrounds for police. Springfield: Charles Thomas.
- Cohen, A.M., & Brawer, F.B. (1982). The American community college. San Francisco, CA.: Jossey-Bass.
- Costello, A. E. (1972). Our police protectors. Montclair: Patterson Smith. (Original work published 1885)

- Criminal Justice Council. (1971). 1971 Criminal justice plan for Texas. Austin: Author.
- Earle, H. H. (1973). Police recruit training. Springfield: Charles Thomas.
- Eastman, G.D., & McCain, J.A. (1981). Law enforcement in historical perspective. Journal of police science and administration. 9(2), 119-130.
- Farris, E. (1965). The role of the junior college in police education in California. Unpublished master's thesis, University of California, Berkeley, CA.
- Farris, E.A. (1972). A history of criminal justice education: Seven decades (1900-1970). In Report of the standards committee: Volume I. Atlanta: Georgia State University.
- Fischer, R.J. (1981). Is education really an alternative?: The end of a long controversy. Journal of police science and administration. 9(3), 313-316.
- Flinn, J. J. (1887). History of the Chicago police. Chicago: Police Book Fund.
- Fogelson, R. M. (1977). Big-city police. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Fosdick, R. B. (1969). European police systems. Montclair: Patterson Smith. (Original work published 1915).
- Fosdick, R. B. (1920). American police systems. New York: The Century Co.

- Foster, J.P. (1974). A descriptive analysis of crime-related programs in higher education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Florida State University.
- Fox, D.J. (1969). The research process in education. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Fox, J.W. & Ullmann, R.W. (1976). Criminal justice manpower survey. National criminal justice educational consortium. 11. AZ.
- Fox, V.B. (1969). Guidelines for corrections programs in community and junior colleges. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges.
- Frost, T. M. (1959). A forward look in police education. Springfield: Charles Thomas.
- Fry, G. (1975). Night riders in black folk history. Knoxville: University of Tennessee.
- Gammage, A. (1963). Police training in the United States. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Germann, A.; Day, F.; & Gallati, R. (1962). Introduction to law enforcement. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Germann, A.C. (1957). Law enforcement education and training in the United States. Police chief. 24(10), 22-28.
- Gilsinan, J.F. (1974). The making of a policeman: Social world constructions in a police academy. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Colorado, Boulder.

- Goldstein, H. (1977). Policing in a free society.
Cambridge, MA.: Ballinger Publishing Company.
- Griffin, G.R. (1980). A study of relationships between level of college education and police patrolman's performance. Saratoga, CA.: Century Twenty One Publishing.
- Hansen, D.A. & Culley, T.R. (1973). The police training officer. Springfield: Charles Thomas.
- Harris, R.N. (1973). The police academy: An inside view.
New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Harrison, L.H. (1964). How to teach police subjects: Theory and practice. Springfield: Charles Thomas.
- Hoover, L.T. (1986). Texas' new program for pre-service law enforcement basic training. Texas police journal. 34(1), 6-11.
- Hoover, L.T., & Lund, D.W. (1977). Guidelines for criminal justice programs in community and junior colleges.
Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.
- Horn, W.G. (1975). A study of police recruit training programs and the development of their curricula.
Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University.
- Kingston, M. (1987). Crime and punishment: Crime in Texas. 1988-1989 Texas almanac. Dallas: The Dallas Morning News.

- Klotter, J. C. (1963). Techniques for police instructors.
Springfield: Charles Thomas.
- Klotter, J. C. & Rosenfield, J. (1979). Criminal justice instructional techniques. Springfield: Charles Thomas.
- Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. (1973). 5th Annual report, fiscal year 1973. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Ledoux, J., Tully, E., Chronister, J.L., & Gansneder, B.M. (1984). Higher education for Law Enforcement: Half a century of growth. The police chief. 51, 22-24.
- Logan, J.F. (1975). Law enforcement education and the community college. The police chief. 42, 26-30.
- Mahaney, C.C. (1973). The challenge of law enforcement training and education. Texas police journal. 21(1), 7-9.
- Mathias, W.J. (1976). Higher education and the police. In A. Niederhoffer & A. Blumberg (Eds.), The ambivalent force: Perspectives on police. (2nd ed.). New York: Gina & Co.
- Meadows, R.J. (1987). Beliefs of law enforcement administrators and criminal justice educators toward the needed skill competencies in entry-level police training curriculum. Journal of police science and administration. 15(1), 1-9.

- National Advisory Commission on Higher Education for Police Officers. (1978). The sherman report: The quality of police education. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement. (1931). Report 14: Police. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- National Prison Association. (1971). Proceedings of the annual congress of the national prison association of the United States: Selected articles. New York: Arno. (Original work published 1888)
- Niederhoffer, A. & Blumberg, A. (Eds.). (1967). The ambivalent force: Perspectives on police. Hinsdale, IL: Dryden Press.
- O'Neill, M. E. & Martensen, K. R. (1975). Criminal justice group training. La Jolla, CA: University Associates, Inc.
- Pace, D.F., Stinchcomb, J.D., & Styles, J.C. (1970). Law enforcement training and the community college: Alternatives for affiliation. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges.
- Pinkerton, A. (1975). Thirty years as a detective. Montclair: Patterson Smith. (Original work published 1884).
- Potts, L.W. (1981). Higher education, ethics, and the police. Journal of police science and administration. 9(2), 131-134.

- President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice. (1967). Task force report: The police. Washington: U.S.GPO.
- Robinson, J. (1974). The DPS story: History of the development of the department of public safety in Texas. Austin, TX: Department of Public Safety.
- Reed, W. E. (1988). Higher education for police officers: A management tool and a personal advantage. The police chief. 55(11) 32-35.
- Sanderson, B.E. (1977). Police officers: The relationship of college education to job performance. The police chief. 62-63.
- Sapp, A.D. (1988). Education and training requirements in law enforcement: A national comparison. Texas police journal. 36(2), 8-9.
- Saunders, C. (1970). Upgrading the American police. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution.
- Savage, E. H. (1971). Police records and recollections. Montclair: Patterson Smith. (Original work published 1873).
- Seitzinger, J. (1981). Police training: Increasing productivity in the 80's. Texas police journal. 28(12), 8-11.

- Smith, A. & Locke, B. (1970). Authoritarianism in policemen who are college graduates and non-college police. Journal of criminal law, criminology and police science. 61(2), 313.
- Smith, B. (1960). Police systems in the United States. New York: Harper.
- Sorrell, B.D. (1976). Survey of the east Texas police academy. Texas police journal. 24(9), 7-9.
- Sprogel, H. O. (1974). The Philadelphia police: past and present. New York: AMS Press. (Original work published 1887)
- Stephens, G. (1976). Criminal justice education: Past, present and future. Criminal justice review. 1(1), 91-120.
- Stinchcomb, J.D. (1977). The two-year community college: An assessment of its involvement in law enforcement from 1966-1976 - with future projections. Texas police journal. 25(3), 6-14.
- Stinchcomb, J.D., & Crockett, T.S. (1968). Guidelines for law enforcement education programs in community and junior colleges. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges.
- Styles, J.C., & Pace, D.F. (1969). Guidelines for work experience programs in the criminal justice system. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges.

- Swan, R. D. (1984). An academic degree: Alternative means toward traditional goals. The police chief. 51, 24-27.
- Talley, R. A. (1996). A new methodology for evaluating the curricula relevancy of police academy training. Journal of police science and administration. 14(2), 112-120.
- Taylor, J.B. & Matlock, D.T. (1979). Development of advanced standing exams for criminal justice courses in Texas. Texas police journal. 27(3), 3-6.
- Tenney, C.W. (1971). Higher education programs in law enforcement and criminal justice. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Texas commission on law enforcement officer standards and education. (1976). Enrollment data: Texas colleges and universities - law enforcement/criminal justice programs. Austin, TX.: TCLEOSE.
- Texas commission on law enforcement officer standards and education. (1981). State of Texas law enforcement training study. Austin, TX: TCLEOSE.
- Texas commission on law enforcement officer standards and education. (1986). Junior colleges 1986 (TCLEOSE ADP number). Austin, TX.: TCLEOSE.
- Texas Department of Public Safety. (1985). Program of the 50th anniversary celebration of the department of public safety. Marceline, MO.: Wadsworth.

- Trautman, N. E. (1986). Law enforcement training.
Springfield: Charles Thomas.
- Vaughn, G.B. (1988). The community college mission.
Community, technical, and junior college journal. 58
(4), 25-27.
- Vollmer, A., & Schneider, A. (1917). A school for police as
planned at Berkeley. Journal of criminal law,
criminology and police science. 7, 877-898.
- Wade, R. C. (1967). Slavery in the cities. New York:
Oxford University Press.
- Walker, S. (1977). A critical history of police reform:
The emergence of a profession. Lexington, MA: D.C.
Health.
- Webb, W.P. (1935). The Texas rangers: A century of
frontier defense. New York: Houghton Mifflin.
- Weddle, R.S. (1970). New standards in training of Texas
police officers. Texas police journal. 18(9), 11-21.
- Wilson, J. (1988). Chief of police (ret), Euless, Texas.
Interview, March 10, 1988.
- Wilson, J.Q. (1975) Thinking about crime. New York:
Random House.
- Wilson, O. W. (1963) Police administration. 2nd ed. New
York: McGraw-Hill.