

T

LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION (LEAA)

POLICE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE REPORT

SUBJECT: Review of Revised Mandatory
Basic Training Curriculum

PROJECT NUMBER: 76-109/068

FOR: Colorado Law Enforcement
Training Academy

CONTRACTOR: Public Administration Service
1776 Massachusetts Avenue, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

CONSULTANT: Dr. Larry T. Hoover

CONTRACT NUMBER: J-LEAA-002-76

DATE: August 19, 1976

36432

FOREWORD

Requesting Agency: Colorado Law Enforcement Training Academy
Camp George West
15000 Golden Avenue
Golden, Colorado 80401

Agency Contact: Mr. Jan Engwis

Problem: Review of Revised Mandatory Basic Training Curriculum

Consultant: Dr. Larry T. Hoover
312 Droste Cr
East Lansing, Michigan 48823

Processing: LEAA Technical Assistance Request Via -

1. Mr. Paul Quinn
Director
Colorado Division of Criminal Justice
2. Mr. James Vetter
Police Specialist
Region VIII
Denver
3. Mr. Robert Heck
Police Desk
ORO
4. Public Administration Service
Washington, D. C.

CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
UNDERSTANDING OF THE PROBLEM	4
ANALYSIS OF THE PROBLEM	9
FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS	18
RECOMMENDATIONS	20

APPENDICES

A. Report of the Curriculum Revision Task Force	22
B. Scope of Program Sponsorship By Law Enforcement Training Commissions	26
C. State Department to Which Responding State Training Commissions are Attached	27
D. Ranges and Median of Mandated Training Hours from a National Sample of State Training Commission	28

SECTION I

INTRODUCTION

The Colorado Law Enforcement Training Academy (CLETA) is identified by statute to possess responsibility for establishing Peace Officer Standards and Training for the State of Colorado. In effect, however, CLETA does not function as a commission on peace officer standards and training, but rather as a unit of Colorado state government responsible for training officers from relatively small local jurisdictions. The Academy is organizationally defined as a Division of the Department of Local Affairs. However, it is functionally a responsibility of the Colorado State Patrol, organizationally a Division of the Department of Highways, with the Chief of the State Patrol identified as the Academy Superintendent. The Academy is actually administered by Captain Walter Whitelaw of the State Patrol, and staffed by four officers of the State Patrol, Mr. Jan Engwis--a civilian training specialist, and Mr. Bruce Sokolove--currently on intergovernmental leave from the Division of Criminal Justice relative to his responsibilities in the Academy. It should be noted that the State Patrol personnel have concurrent assignment to conduct basic and in-service training for that organization. The facilities are likewise on a shared-time basis with the State Patrol.

The statute defines an Advisory Board for the Academy of nine individuals (Attorney General, S.A.I.C. of the Denver office-FBI, three chiefs of police, three sheriffs, and one lay person). The Advisory

Board has statutory responsibility for establishing standards for training, training academies, and instructors. The statute is not specific with regard to any particular number of hours, curricular content, or the like.

The Academy physically provides training only for relatively small Colorado police agencies. The bulk of law enforcement officers in the state are trained at some nine regional academies. The regional academies include the police agencies of Aurora, Boulder, Colorado Springs, Denver, Greeley, Lakewood, Pueblo, and the Colorado State Patrol Academy (actually sharing personnel and facilities with CLETA). Although the statute provides that the CLETA Advisory Board has the authority to certify the regional academy programs, in practice any supervision is pro forma. The basic training programs offered by the regional academies in every case exceed considerably the minimums established by the CLETA Board. In addition, personnel resources are not available for supervision of regional academies, even if it were needed and desirable. Most of the regional academies are simply single-agency training programs, although it is this consultant's understanding that most are willing to accept personnel from other agencies, and at least two do so on a regular basis. Training costs are provided by the State, with a flow-through arrangement via CLETA for the regional academies. Salary of the trainee is a local jurisdictional responsibility.

The current mandated basic training program specified by the Advisory Board consists of 200 hours of designated instruction, 40 hours of departmental training, and the 24-hour standard first-aid course. CLETA provides the designated 200 hours for the small agencies, agencies are responsible for the 40 hours of departmental training, and agencies

and/or the individual officer are responsible for obtaining the standard first-aid course. There is a one-year grace period from date of employment to complete the training.

The request for the technical assistance summarized by this report emanates from the Board's desire to expand the basic 200-hour program. The Colorado Commission on Criminal Justice Standards recommended adoption of the nationally recognized 400-hour basic training minimum by 1977. It is the Board's desire to move toward adoption of that standard by incremental additions to the 200-hour curriculum. The first proposed addition is a 40-hour increment applicable for the coming year.

During the past months, a task force of selected Colorado criminal justice professionals has met on several occasions to develop recommendations for an expanded 240-hour basic training curriculum. (It should be noted that the 40-hour departmental training requirement as well as the first-aid requirement are also to be retained.) A preliminary curricular outline has been developed, and is included here as Appendix A. Description beyond course title and an associated number of hours has, however, only been developed for one segment of the curriculum--the Administration of Criminal Justice section.

The problem for which technical assistance was requested consists of two needs: (1) Review of the 240-hour basic training curriculum for general content recommendations and (2) Develop suggestions relative to "modularization" of the curriculum. In providing such assistance, this consultant met professionally with Mr. Jan Engwis of CLETA, Mr. Bruce Sokolove of the Colorado Division of Criminal Justice, and Captain Walter Whitelaw of the Colorado State Patrol, officer in charge of CLETA.

SECTION II

UNDERSTANDING OF THE PROBLEM

Scope of the Report

The problem as identified in the request for technical assistance is an accurate representation of one of the organization's needs. However, the range of problems encountered by this consultant in the process of reviewing curricular content with CLETA personnel exceeds the bounds of narrowly defined curricular issues. The ability of CLETA to offer both basic and in-service training of high quality is severely impinged by administrative and financial problems. One cannot in good conscience offer recommendations regarding curricular content and ignore problems which affect the quality of training of Colorado peace officers to a far greater extent than curricular specifics such as the number of hours devoted to one topic versus another. Thus, the narrative which follows addresses both curricular and administrative issues relative to CLETA programming. It was the consultant's understanding after interviewing the CLETA personnel identified above that it is their desire that the scope of the written report be enlarged to include both sets of issues.

Curricular Review

The present content of the CLETA 200-hour basic training curriculum has evolved from relatively unsystematic input from diverse sources over the past years. On balance, the 200-hour curriculum is

essentially sound. There are no glaring omissions of content, and the proportional attention provided the major topical divisions is within the normative range of similar basic training programs. However, when the CLETA Board decided to expand the program by 40-hour increments, a decision was wisely made to initiate a more systematic curriculum development effort. Rather than merely allocate an additional 40 hours among existing topics more or less by individual fiat, a task force of criminal justice professionals representative of both topical and geographic interests was formed to develop systematically a 240-hour program. The success of this task force effort has apparently been mixed. Initial meetings of the task force resulted in the draft curricular outline in Appendix A. However, enthusiasm has apparently waned somewhat, and efforts to have the task force develop more extensive and detailed guidelines have not been successful. Hence, beyond course titles, the only guidelines relative to the content of the mandated curriculum are lecture outlines and "handout" materials which have been "begged, borrowed, or stolen" from individual instructors by the CLETA staff. The picture must not be painted too black. There are certainly extensive resource materials available, particularly with respect to those aspects of the curriculum which parallel closely the State Patrol basic training program. However, a systematic and coherent set of course objectives, content outlines, and listings of relevant resources does not exist for the current 200-hour curriculum, much less the proposed 240 hours. It must be emphasized that this is not anyone's "fault"; staff time simply has not been available and efforts to accomplish the task via the curriculum revision task force have understandably not been successful.

It is necessary to point out in some detail the status of curricular development because of its relevance to the requested technical assistance. More specifically, it is possible to make content recommendations only in a broad topical format. Although more detailed recommendations might be desirable, absent reviewable documentation such recommendations would require the development of sets of instructional objectives on a topic-by-topic basis--a task quite obviously far beyond the scope of this technical assistance project.

Modularization

In addition, the lack of specificity in curricular guidelines prevents any genuine effort to modularize the curriculum. This situation was discussed quite extensively with the CLETA staff. A modular curriculum involves building-block units of instruction, such that initial units are complete learning experiences--independent of instruction which might follow in additional enrichment units. If, for instance, a curriculum contains two modular two-hour units of "Law of Arrest," then the first two hours of instruction are designed to bring trainees to a particular knowledge level which engenders sufficient skill to function in a particular way or perform at a specified level. Such an initial module is presumed to be self-sufficient relative to the specified performance level; i.e., it is independent of any additional instruction. The second modular unit would, on the other hand, depend upon prerequisite knowledge gained in the first unit, and presumably would bring the trainee to an expanded performance level. Underlying this concept are designated minimum levels of performance.

Taking "Law of Arrest," it is meaningless to create a module which involves fewer hours than are essential for providing Colorado peace officers sufficient knowledge to perform their duties by reasonably approximate standards to due process mandates. Hence, if one hour of instruction could only provide definition of terms, it is not a modular unit in a curricular sense. An hour of instruction may be a "unit" in the sense of a divisible time frame, but it is not an instructional module.

In this example, it is assumed that two hours is necessary to achieve minimal standards of performance, and hence that is the initial module. It is further assumed that an additional two hours of instruction regarding "Law of Arrest" is needed or useful in certain situations, and hence constitutes a second module. Keep in mind, however, that certain topics in a police basic training curriculum do not lend themselves to modularization. This is the case when a minimal level of performance concurrently constitutes an entirely sufficient level of performance. An example is the one-hour unit on the "Federal Firearms Act." Minimal knowledge level and completely sufficient knowledge level are in this case the same. The topic is exhausted within the single minimal unit of instruction. However, the term "module" is often used to refer concurrently to single-unit topics as well as to those divisible.

Modularization of curriculum is desirable whenever a training program must be spread across time--and one wants to assure minimal levels of performance during intervals, or when certain trainees have need for, or can afford, certain levels of training, while other trainees possess a need for expanded instruction. The latter situation currently

exists relevant to the CLETA curriculum. It is the apparent desire of the Advisory Board and staff to design a program based upon 40-hour increments which would allow certain trainees to terminate after a designated minimal period. Such a modularized curricular design would allow expansion of basic training to the desirable 400-hour level without demanding that in "hardship situations," such as single-person town marshal "agencies," a peace officer complete all ten weeks of an Academy. This is an appropriate and laudable goal.

However, it should be obvious from the preceding discussion that curriculum modularization requires content specificity. One can teach two "Law of Arrest" modules, for instance, by either covering lightly an entire range of issues in the first module, then expanding upon each of them in the second, or by covering in depth certain fundamental issues in the first module, then covering other peripheral or unique issues in the second. Which of the two techniques used depends, of course, upon desired performances--but in either case "modularization" is meaningless without detailed course guidelines. Since the CLETA curriculum is outlined only in broad topical format, genuine modularization is not currently possible. Hence, what this consultant actually provided the CLETA staff was assistance in developing an ideal or model schedule for the 240-hour proposed program.

SECTION III

ANALYSIS OF THE PROBLEM

Administrative Issues

There were three areas of concern relative to administrative issues encountered by the consultant in the interviews with CLETA staff: (1) financial support of the program, (2) relationship of CLETA to criminal justice programs in institutions of higher education in Colorado, and (3) statutory definition of "peace officer." In addition to these concerns, it appears it would be useful to note certain observations regarding the organizational role and setting of CLETA. Each of these issues is discussed below in turn.

It was obvious from the initiation of discussions with CLETA staff that a significant impediment to effective programming was the level of financing received by the agency. The current support level is simply not adequate to conduct programs of the best possible quality regardless of curricular design or the efforts of staff. Because of the shared personnel arrangement with the State Patrol Academy, there is only one individual who devotes full-time effort to CLETA--Mr. Jan Engwis--and he is currently supported by LEAA dollars. That is not to say that Captain Whitelaw and the State Patrol staff do not devote all possible effort and resources to CLETA programming--precisely the opposite is true. However, the State Patrol staff is only nominally adequate to conduct training for an agency the size of the State Patrol, much less contribute the

preponderance of effort necessary to administer CLETA. Additional financial resources are imperative. Such resources are necessary to expand the State Patrol staff, expand civilian staff assigned to CLETA, purchase adequate library and resource materials, and provide funds to remunerate part-time instructional staff.

The significant problem encountered by CLETA staff with regard to part-time instructors merits elaboration. Because of the full-time staff shortage, and the need for specialists to instruct certain aspects of the curriculum, a significant number of part-time instructors teach at the Academy. Because of a lack of funds, it is necessary for CLETA staff to solicit voluntary participation. This situation results all too often in instruction which is either deficient, or in some cases completely inadequate.

First of all, many potential instructors who could provide the best quality teaching are unable or unwilling to participate on a voluntary basis. One can react by alluding to lofty principles, and assert that "if they aren't concerned enough to teach voluntarily, then we don't want them"--but a more important principle might be "the best possible training for Colorado peace officers." To expect upwards of 50 to 75 hours annually of voluntary instruction from certain key individuals is simply not reasonable. As a consequence, the Academy must often settle for an extremely poor second best.

A second major problem regarding the use of voluntary instructors is scheduling. As one might expect, an individual who volunteers hours usually requests that the schedule meet her/his convenience. What this often means is that subjects are taught in marathon blocks--a situation

not conducive to learning. In fact, in working with the CLETA staff to develop an "ideal" schedule, the primary impediment to developing a schedule premised upon the two fundamental learning principles of "spaced practice" and "novelty as a stimulant to attention" was the unwillingness of voluntary instructors to make repeated visits to the Academy. In addition, certain courses are often taught out of proper sequence, violating the principle of prerequisite knowledge as fundamental to maximum learning.

It is recognized that the use of part-time staff will always engender to some degree these problems. However, provision of sufficient financial resources to allow payment of part-time staff would considerably alleviate them.

CLETA currently provides only minimal training programming to Colorado peace officers. Most other states are providing significantly more opportunity for professional development to their peace officers. See Appendix B for documentation of the scope of programming offered nationally. Keep in mind that this information is three years dated-- the scope of programming has expanded even more since. Financial resources are essential for CLETA if Colorado is to keep pace.

The second major administrative issue discussed with CLETA staff was the relationship of CLETA to higher educational programs in criminal justice. The particular concern is with police science programs located in community colleges. Like law enforcement community college programming everywhere in the country, the curricula in Colorado are vocationally oriented and often duplicative of basic training. Recruits who have graduated from these programs complain during basic training

that they have already been taught much of the material. Time does not allow an expanded discussion of this topic. Suffice it to say that this consultant feels rather adamant that degree programming ought to be analytic in nature, and hence duplicative of only a relatively small portion of basic training curriculum. However, the reality of the situation is quite the contrary--and is likely to remain so for some time. Hence, whenever sufficient staff time is available, it would behoove CLETA to explore three alternative modes of involvement of academic degree programs with the mandated basic training curriculum: Degree programs might

1. Incorporate all basic training objectives in their curricula, treating certain skill areas (self-defense, firearms) as laboratory courses. Graduates would then be eligible for certification upon graduation.
2. Only incorporate aspects of the basic training objectives in a set of required courses. An abbreviated program, consisting of mostly skill topics, could then be offered by either CLETA or the educational institution to degree graduates.
3. Not attempt to incorporate basic training objectives in regular courses, but offer a pre-service academy as a final aspect of a degree program.

Given any of these alternatives, CLETA might impose an additional requirement that the basic training examination currently being developed be passed. However, it does not appear practical to allow challenge of only aspects of the basic training curriculum by degree graduates, with concurrent Academy attendance only for those subjects not successfully

challenged. The administrative and scheduling problems appear to prohibit such a system.

The third administrative concern is a relatively minor one--the statutory definition of "peace officer." The definition proposed in the revised CLETA legislation appears to be so broad as to include reserve and part-time officers. Consideration should be given to redrafting the legislation to exclude such personnel from training requirements--so long as they are working under the direct supervision of a full-time peace officer. In addition, CLETA should consider developing in the future an abbreviated basic training program for such personnel, perhaps 40 hours in length and emphasizing subjects such as the proper use of force.

The final administrative issue to be considered is the organizational role of CLETA. The organizational setting of CLETA is explained in Section I. The ambiguity with regard to the role of CLETA is apparent even in its title. The organization is identified as an academy, yet the statutory authority provided CLETA identifies its function as something more akin to a state standards and training commission. The primary problem faced by the organization is that it cannot be both a training academy and a POST commission at the same time. The problem manifests itself in both staff and Advisory Board difficulties.

As cited earlier, sufficient staff to conduct CLETA programs are not available. Mr. Sokolove's temporary assignment to CLETA to simply keep the agency afloat is sufficient documentation of the severity of the staff shortage. Mr. Engwis has more than a full-time job simply keeping up with the paper work involved in certification of peace officers throughout the state--part of the role of a POST staff. In

addition to these responsibilities, however, an "outreach" in-service training program must be conducted, as well as several basic programs a year. Even with the State Patrol staff working at capacity via the shared personnel arrangement, sufficient resources simply do not exist to perform both roles. As a result, CLETA for all practical purposes does not function as a POST commission--its hypothetical statutory mandate--but rather as a training academy for small Colorado agencies.

Further evidence of this role conflict emerged when working with the staff to develop an ideal curriculum schedule. What actually developed was an ideal schedule which accounted for the operational constraints of the Academy at Camp George West--not an ideal schedule relative to the curriculum as it might be taught at any academy in the state. As noted earlier, monitoring of programs at the "regional academies" is pro forma, if it exists at all.

Advisory Board membership is yet another issue which is indicative of the confused role of CLETA. Apparently a problem with regard to Board membership is whether the representatives of the chiefs and sheriffs are CLETA "users," i.e., whether they send their recruits to the academy at Camp George West. Unfortunately, the issue is not currently resolvable, since it isn't at all clear whether the legislature wishes CLETA to function as an academy or a POST commission.

Now, to exceed the bounds of this report's stated purpose a bit further it is suggested that an administrative study of CLETA's role is in order. The organization will never realize its potential, i.e., have the felt positive impact of POST commissions in other states, until resolution of the organizational role issue is sought. The initial

reaction after three days on site is that careful consideration should be given to creation of a separate civilian division of the Department of Local Affairs to function as a POST commission, while leaving the Academy per se under the very able administration of Captain Whitelaw and the State Patrol staff. Time constraints prohibit extensive elaboration on the rationale for this suggestion--and in addition it would not be appropriate to consider only this alternative absent consideration of others. Suffice it to note that the organizational placement of CLETA, if it is truly a POST commission, is not a preferred one: See Appendix C for a categorization of the placement of 27 other state training commissions that responded to an administrative survey.

Curricular Issues

The first aspect of the technical assistance provided relative to curricular issues was a review of the basic content and balance of the proposed 240-hour curriculum. As noted earlier, the curriculum recommendations developed by the Task Force were fundamentally sound. The content balance was comparable to that developed in other states: Compare Appendix A, the CLETA proposed curriculum, with Appendix D, an enumeration of the ranges and median number of hours devoted to basic training from a national survey of state training commissions. Nevertheless, several specific content recommendations were made. A number of these were simply suggestions for specific content which might be included under a general topical title listed in the curriculum outline. A sampling of the suggestions follows:

1. Include discussion of plea bargaining and other adjudicative problems in the "Administration of Justice" section.
2. Include discussion of adolescent psychology and delinquency causation in the "Juvenile" section.
3. Eliminate as a topical heading "Supreme Court Decisions," unless such a unit is meant to cover legal reasoning and case analysis.
4. Include Law of Arrest with the Search and Seizure section, expanding the number of hours.
5. Expand the number of hours devoted to Rules of Evidence.
6. Add a specific unit in the legal section on Admissions and Confessions.
7. Include a specifically identified unit in the Firearms section on discretion--"when to shoot."
8. Specify topics in the Human Relations, Discipline and Professionalism, and Family and Job Related Problems units such as exercise of discretion, culture shock, crime fighting versus social work role conflict, gratuities, administrative versus operational conflict created by "mandate of substantive law" phenomenon.

Other minor suggestions were made orally.

In Section II the issue of modularization was discussed extensively. As noted, the technical assistance provided related instead to the development of an ideal schedule given certain operational constraints. In developing the schedule, five criteria were applied:

1. Individual topics should be scheduled in small time blocks to stimulate attention. When possible, a topical time limit of two hours should not be exceeded.
2. Topics should be scheduled to account for necessary pre-requisite knowledge.
3. The schedule should provide variation in routine--lecture versus discussion topics versus skill practice to provide novelty to enhance learning.
4. Skill topics should be taught in increments in order to space practice and hence enhance learning.
5. Topics should be scheduled when possible to provide congruence on the examinations.

A draft schedule was developed to near completion through the application of these criteria while accounting for necessary constraints.

SECTION IV

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

The content and balance of the proposed 240-hour curriculum are generally sound. However, certain specific content modifications as enumerated in Section III are suggested. The revised 240-hour program reflects considerably more attention to social problems and issues confronting law enforcement than did the previous 200-hour program. This is definitely a positive development, and is encouraged. Several suggestions relative to the specific content of the "social issues" segments of the curriculum were provided CLETA personnel as outlined in Section III.

Modularization of the curriculum is not feasible at this time. A necessary prerequisite to modularization is specificity regarding course objectives and content. In lieu of genuine modularization, an ideal schedule was developed applying the criteria described in Section III.

In addition to the curricular issues, four administrative problems were reviewed with CLETA staff. First, it was noted that financial constraints severely limit the potential of the agency. The impact of these constraints includes staff shortages, a lack of needed library and resource materials, and an inability to pay necessary part-time instructional staff. Second, potential for articulation between community college degree programs in law enforcement and the CLETA curriculum exists. The consultant has serious reservations regarding the

appropriateness of degree programming paralleling basic training curricula. However, should the CLETA Advisory Board and institutions of higher education deem it desirable, then articulation arrangements should place responsibility for offering specially modified versions of the basic training program upon higher educational institutions, not CLETA. Third, revised legislation should provide reserve and part-time officers special status with regard to required training, as outlined in Section III. Finally, it is clear that ambiguity regarding the organizational role of CLETA is the agency's primary problem. Consideration should be given to modification of the current legislation. One possible alternative is to separate administration of the Academy at Camp George West from the peace officer standards and training commission function. Such functional separation should account for both staff and Advisory Board roles.

SECTION V

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. CLETA staff should recommend to the Advisory Board the curricular modifications enumerated in Section III.

2. Future basic training schedules should reflect adherence to the five criteria described in Section III, albeit modified due to certain constraints. CLETA staff should publish and distribute to the regional academies a "model" or "ideal" schedule, and suggest that program schedules be designed similarly such that certain principles of learning are incorporated in the sequencing of instruction.

3. Efforts should be initiated to obtain staff support for the specific purpose of writing course guidelines for the basic training curriculum. Such guidelines would provide the base for systematically upgrading the quality of instruction at both the Academy at Camp George West and the regional programs. Input should be sought from current instructors in the various topical areas at both Camp George West and the regional academies. Such input is not only useful, but will assure acceptance of published guidelines by current instructional staff. It is the consultant's experience that the publication of course guidelines delineating general objectives, content, and resources is welcomed-- given the fact that opportunity for input has been provided. Staff responsible for the development of these guidelines should fully utilize

similar materials already formulated by other POST commissions. As a footnote, it should be observed that current staff do not have time to complete this task and maintain their ongoing responsibilities.

4. Following the completion of course guidelines, modularization of the curriculum should be pursued.

5. Legislation should be reintroduced to provide a surtax on certain criminal and traffic fines as a means to fund a sufficient peace officer standards and training program. If corrections training is to be financed from the same fund thus generated, then a specified proportion should be allocated directly to the Department of Corrections.

6. No immediate effort should be made to implement articulation arrangements with degree programs in law enforcement. If specific institutions of higher education express interest, then a program proposal should be solicited as described in Section III.

7. Legislation should be introduced to clarify the status of reserve and part-time peace officers vis-à-vis CLETA standards. A modified training program of short duration (40-80 hours) should be developed for such officers.

8. An administrative study should be initiated to determine the most effective organization for expanding CLETA impact. There exists a very inappropriate assumption that the training offered by the "regional academies" is of acceptable quantity and quality. Although the consultant did not monitor any of these programs, the experience of other states uniformly indicates that the assumption is not correct. There is a prima facie need for CLETA to function as a genuine POST commission. However, before this is possible, organizational redefinition would appear necessary.

A P P E N D I C E S

APPENDIX A
Report of the Curriculum Revision Task Force

I.	<u>Orientation</u>	2
II.	<u>Administration of Criminal Justice</u>	
	Overview/History of American and Colorado Law Enforcement	1
	Introduction to Colorado Criminal Justice Process	1
	<u>Law Enforcement Module</u>	
	Federal Law Enforcement Jurisdiction	1
	State Law Enforcement Agencies	1
	County Law Enforcement Agencies	1
	Municipal Law Enforcement Agencies	1
	C.C.I.C./N.C.I.C.	1
	<u>Legal Module</u>	
	Colorado Attorney General's Office	1
	District Attorney	1
	Defense Counsel	1
	<u>Adjudication Module</u>	
	Colorado Court Structure and Process	2
	Federal Court Structure	1
	Sentencing and Probation	2
	<u>Corrections Module</u>	
	County Jails	1
	State Institutions (Correctional Services)	1
	Parole/Parole Board	1
	Community Based Corrections	1
	<u>Juvenile Justice Module</u>	
	Juvenile Justice - History/Philosophy	1
	Colorado Juvenile Justice Process	6

III. Basic Law

U. S. Constitutional History	1
U. S. Constitution - Articles/Amendments	2
U. S. Supreme Court Decisions	3
Colorado Constitution	2
Colorado Criminal Law Introduction	1
Colorado Criminal Law Title 12/18	11
Colorado Criminal Procedure Title 16	4
Colorado Criminal Law Title 17	1
Liquor Laws	2
Search and Seizure	6
Rules of Evidence	4
Legal Research	2
Civil Law and Liabilities	1
Civil Process	2
Offenders Rights	2
Federal Firearms Act	1
Moot Court	<u>8</u>
	53

IV. Police ProceduresBackground Preparation

Discipline and Professionalism	2
Crime Causation	2
Crime Prevention	2

Basic Criminal Investigation

Basic Investigation Techniques	2
Charting and Reporting	4
Scientific Aids	4
Evidence Collection/Preservation	1
Latents and Casting	3
Burglary Investigation	2
Larceny Investigation	2
Robbery Investigation	2
Homicide Investigation	2
Narcotics Investigation	2
Rape Investigation	2
Mock Crime Scene	8
Crime Report Writing	6

Patrol Procedure

Patrol Procedures (Overview)	1
One Man Patrol	1
Observation and Patrol	2
Field Survival	6
Routine/Felony Vehicle Stops	4

Traffic Control

Motor Vehicle Law	4
Accident Investigation	4
Accident Report Writing	3
D.U.I.	4
Auto Theft	<u>1</u>

76

V. Skill Training

Firearms Safety	1
Firearms Maintenance	1
Defensive Driving (Class)	2
Pursuit Driving (Class)	2

Pursuit Driving (Field)	16
Firearms (Range)	16

Defensive Tactics	<u>16</u>
-------------------	-----------

54

VI. Interpersonal Relations

Peace Officer - Family and Job Related Problems <i>i</i>	8
--	---

Social Service Agencies	1
Relations With Mentally Ill	2
Family Disturbances/Civil Disputes	4

Community Relations	6
Officer Violator Relations	2

Interview and Interrogation	4
Testifying in Court	<u>2</u>

29

VII. Optional/Electives

10

VIII. Quizzes/Exams

Quiz - First Week
Quiz - Second Week
Mid-Term - Third Week
Quiz - Fourth Week
Final - Sixth Week

1
1
2
1
2
7

APPENDIX B

SCOPE OF PROGRAM SPONSORSHIP BY LAW
ENFORCEMENT TRAINING COMMISSIONS

Type of Program	Number of Agencies	Percentage of Agencies	Average Length (hrs.)
Basic	38	100	242
Advanced	18	47	54
Investigation	19	50	56
Traffic	21	55	66
Juvenile	12	32	36
Human Relations	13	34	31
Civil Disorders	12	32	23
Instructor	22	58	57
Supervision	24	63	57
Management	26	68	57
Executive	14	37	51

Source: Dennis Catlin and Larry T. Hoover, "Role of Law Enforcement Training Commissions in the United States," Journal of Criminal Justice 1,4 (Winter 1973): 347-352.

APPENDIX C

State Department to Which Responding State Training Commissions
Are Attached:

State Police or Public Safety	Office of Attorney General	Office of the Governor	Education
Georgia*	Montana	New York	Kansas
Michigan*	North Carolina	Arkansas	
Maine	Wyoming	Rhode Island	
Florida	Minnesota	Illinois	
Colorado	Ohio	Alabama	
Missouri	New Jersey	Alaska	
	Wisconsin	Oregon	
		New Hampshire	
		Texas	
		Tennessee	
		Oklahoma	
		Nebraska	
		South Carolina	
		Idaho	

*These agencies are located in their respective departments for administrative purposes only.

Source: Gary M. Walker, "A Budgetary Survey of Law Enforcement Training in the United States," unpublished research paper, Michigan State University, 1976.

APPENDIX D

Ranges and Median of Mandated Training Hours From
a National Sample of State Training Commissions

Category	Range	Median
Criminal Investigation	4-82	32
Legal	6-65	31
Field Training	4-52	27
Fire Arms	8-42	23
Traffic	4-75	21
Patrol	6-85	18.5
Physical Training	2.5-50	18
Other	2-70	13
Criminal Evidence	2-25	10
First Aid	8-29	10
Self Defense	2-36	10
PCR	2-28	9.5
Psychology & Sociology	2-45	6
Int. & Orient.	2-22	5
Juvenile	1-16	4

Source: Charles R. Wall and Leo A. Cullo, "State Standards for Law Enforcement Selection and Training," Journal of Police Science and Administration 1,4 (December 1973): 425-432.

END

7. 10/22/1960