

# WA State CJ Faculty – Fall Meeting

November 1, 2018 at Highline College

**Time:** 1p.m. – 4:30 p.m.

## General Information

- Been working two years on the CJ core curriculum.
- Employment opportunities for criminal justice graduates.
- 13 CTC colleges represented today out of 20, which is a big improvement.
- Zoom Recording of full meeting [https://pierce-college.zoom.us/recording/share/2CemAkBjva-WB\\_tZWtKGVbtSr58Q\\_QjI\\_JbrwZWM-p8](https://pierce-college.zoom.us/recording/share/2CemAkBjva-WB_tZWtKGVbtSr58Q_QjI_JbrwZWM-p8)

## Ryan Davis: Basic Law Enforcement Training Study – RFQQ 18-700

Outcomes: Ryan Davis wants feedback from our 20 programs on whether this could be an option and to gather information on our current programs. Steve Lettic (Highline), Ryann Leonard (Big Bend) and Linda Crerar (Center of Excellence) met with him on October 3 to discuss the overview of his project. He will also be meeting with CJTC Executives and our State Board Director and her Executive Staff. Representative, Peter Guzman, State Board Policy staff has been assigned the lead liaison role for this study w/our CTC programs and the Center.

Background: The state legislature requested that a study be conducted to evaluate law enforcement training by community and technical colleges that includes an overview of the basic law enforcement training program currently provided by the Criminal Justice Training Commission (CJTC) as well as an evaluation of basic law enforcement training through student paid programs by the community and technical colleges, including:

- a) anticipated similarities and differences with the training currently provided by the CTJC;
- b) estimated student tuition and fees;
- c) anticipated enrollment;
- d) capital investments needed, including estimated costs and construction schedules;
- e) operating budget impacts, one-time and ongoing; and
- f) benefits and risks to the state of Washington.

Also to review the model's other states use to provide basic law enforcement training.

Presentation 11/1/18: 50 state survey on basic law enforcement training. Excited about the common core curriculum. Understands that students move around the state and go into different programs. Center for Skilled Workforce has been around for 27 years. Tasks include: Competency credentialing work. Helps with community colleges to identify credentialing. Identifies promising practices in certain communities. 10-year project on rebuilding the city of Detroit. Economic development system. Study in Washington state in the use of Drones. Proactive and not reactive in creating systems. Projects going on in 11 states.

OFM Study and Labor Market Insights – proviso from legislature to study provision of basic law enforcement training by community colleges. Did a study from other states law enforcement training models. Provide an evaluation of current systems and curriculum. Document the costs in capital and operating budgets. Best policies to fund this study/program. Third party to conduct study. Provide facts and legislature will hold sessions to go over the findings. Not looking at any of the highway patrols or other sectors that have their own separate training. This is just basic law enforcement.

Senator Honeyford is the reason the proviso exists. Not privy to the behind the scenes of how the proviso was drafted up or created. In past year, 116 agencies advertised positions. 11,078 commissioned officers employed in 2017. Only 1,104 were women. This excludes federal and military positions. Used Burning Glass that looks at job postings. Multiple positions would not necessarily show up. Pool of applicants not used. Active recruitments.

Hiring process in the state of Washington. You have to be sponsored by an agency to be accepted in a training program. Washington one of the few states that does this.

50 state survey – Common trends

Hawaii is an outlier – wild west.

Reportage of shortage of applicants. Similar background checks on citizenship. Most states have embraced problem-based learning to help train law enforcement officers. The treatment of marijuana use is not uniform. It varies from state to state. Social issues have contributed to the shortage of applicants.

Types of academy models – looked at the 50 states to see how they operate their law enforcement academy. Central academy are mostly rural states; however, Oregon, Washington, and North Carolina are the exception. These three states have large metropolitan areas.

Wisconsin and Minnesota have two-year programs where students have to complete or complete a certain amount of credits before they can be accepted in a basic law enforcement training academy.

To even enter a basic law enforcement academy, a student will need to first be hired by a police department. 46% of states require a sponsorship (employment) before being able to enter a BLEA.

Capturing the best practices from academies or states can be difficult. Smaller agencies do not have the budget to send someone to an academy while also paying them a salary. These are not well documented, so it is hard to quantify the data.

There is an increase in number of hours that are required from the academy. Since 2006, the hours have increased to 80 hours. Instructors tend to be on loan from other departments or academies. Technical colleges have the highest completion rate. Transfer rate is lower, but too significant.

The RFQQ study has looked into different states on how they recruit and train potential law enforcement officers. Looked at different training models.

Someone who pays their own way can end being a 50/50 chance of getting hired by an agency.

How can we minimize the possibility of students going through a two-year program, then not being able to get hired by a law enforcement agency?

Next Steps: Currently the CJ training commission has academies for different areas, is this study based on law enforcement or CJ ctc system? The answer is the study is just looking at BLEA.

Could the community colleges have the capacity to do the two-week training model? Are there other entities that can be covered?

Every state has their own post commission on finalizing the training. The community college will need many entities to sign off.

Moving students on to four-year university, instructors are looking at competency based and instructors. How do we operate on a policy issue?

How can we have the outcomes fit multiple models? Quality of programs tend to vary from county to county.

What are the drawbacks that could occur? If we have CTC do basic academy training, who is going to vet these people into the program? What if we get push back from the criminal justice training commission?

How will graduates be able to compete for promotions? There will be some resentment from past graduates competing with the current graduates. Do not want the system to end up being too bureaucratic.

Note: Send Ryan's PowerPoint out to everyone.

## **Discussion of Statewide Curriculum**

Goal for the core curriculum is to have a set of core courses that can be used across the colleges in the state. This is to help establish for employers what skills CJ graduate students will have when they graduate.

Core Curriculum is not a mandate but a recommendation where colleges can tie assessment outcomes and program goals.

Five core courses (from here on known as The Core):

- 1.) CJ & 101 Introduction to Criminal Justice
- 2.) CJ & 104 Introduction to Policing – Being submitted to SBCTC for Common Course Numbering
- 3.) CJ & 105 Introduction to Corrections
- 4.) CJ & 106 Juvenile Justice
- 5.) CJ & 110 Criminal Law

Columbia Basin College and Big Bend Community College has adopted all outcomes. It was passed through their curriculum committees this year.

Ryann Leonard has proposed a document for changing a common course curriculum to go through the CTC system. Proposed common course ID CJ&104 to be proposed common course title of Introduction to Policing. The colleges present at the meeting agreed with submitting the document for Common Course Numbering to SBCTC. The other colleges added their policing classes to the application for common course numbering.

Curriculum with a common core consistency will strengthen our curriculum in the eyes of the four-year colleges.

For the CJ 101 we could probably reduce the outcomes as well. But if the original outcomes are already aligned then they do not need to be adjusted.

Conclusion: At this point 15 of our 20 colleges have stated they agree with The Core and will be using or relating their current course outcomes to The Core.

## **Next steps**

### **Mapping Outcomes**

One step is to map out outcomes for core courses. A survey will be sent to the colleges to facilitate the mapping and allow for colleges to note that they are not using any of the core curriculum. Faculty who choose to not use the model outcomes can map their current outcomes to the core and still participate in The Core project.

The overall goal is to go to employers and tell them the knowledge, skills, and abilities CJ graduates will obtain from a CJ program. If we can standardize the core courses, we can create shared marketing and the Center can better present our programs and students to potential employers.

### **Core Competencies/Core Outcomes**

A second step is to assign Outcomes to The Core. We need to determine if we assign competencies to specific courses or require them to be completed by the conclusion of The Core.

The goal would be to put some competencies in place that could be assessed as outcomes or skills. We know from employers that students are lacking the soft skills (e.g. critical thinking, communication, collaboration). How do we assess these competencies? With these competencies, we could highlight them for marketing. Embedded competencies can strengthen the program and students' skills. It provides marketability for students looking to get hired in the field.

We need an overall list of competencies to see where they could fit within certain courses. Most colleges have general education outcomes that are assessed at an institutional-level and measured at an institutional-level as students complete their degrees. In most colleges, the outcomes are related to Communication (written and verbal), Computation, Human Relations, and Critical Thinking/Problem Solving. These outcomes are also tied to the Related Instruction Outcome requirements listed in WAC 250-61-100 for Professional Technical/Workforce programs. Criminal Justice programs are required to have program outcomes and these are different than the General Education outcomes and are assessed by program faculty. Typically, multiple classes within a program are tied to each program outcome. Then each course within The Core have course-level outcomes that are specific to the content being covered in the course.

We developed four core competencies with outcome statements at our meeting. These competencies fell in line with the General Education competencies at most CTCs. There was discussion related to whether the four competencies should be assigned to specific courses within The Core or completed by the end of The Core. As a starting place, we could have the competencies assessed as students completed The Core.

Goal: The goal eventually would be to collect some assessment statewide to show that students are meeting the basic competencies after completing The Core. This could be marketed to potential employers and strengthen our programs for these skills. This is a bit of an “extra” as many of us don’t naturally assess these at a program-level; however, I think with minimal discussion we would see we already assess each of these competencies in some way within these courses already. There would be NO requirement to assess these competencies in a specific way so as to protect academic freedom.

<b>Core Competency</b>	<b>Outcome Statement</b> At the end of The Core, students will be able to:
<b>Communication</b>	Execute effective oral and written communication skills related to their discipline (e.g. report writing).
<b>Computation</b>	Execute mathematical reasoning using methods to the profession.
<b>Human Relations</b>	<p><b>(WE NEED TO WORDSMITH.</b> This is the “plays well with others” outcome.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recognize or articulate personal/interpersonal aspects of, or connections between diverse, cultural, social, or political contexts.</li> <li>• Demonstrate teamwork, ethics, appropriate safety awareness and/or workplace specific skills.</li> <li>• Demonstrate an appropriate, calm, and respectful demeanor in interpersonal interactions.</li> <li>• Demonstrate even temperament with all human contacts.</li> <li>• Collaborate, have ethical and professional conduct, and understand cultural diversity.</li> </ul>
<b>Critical Thinking/ Problem Solving</b>	Students will be able to solve problems by gathering, interpreting, combining and/or applying information from multiple sources relevant to the discipline.

### Work to be Completed Before We Meet Again

1. **Complete The Core mapping survey** to map current course outcomes at the colleges to The Core outcomes. Colleges can also indicate they do not have a course from The Core or choose to not participate at all in The Core project.
2. **Agree to Core Competencies.** We need to wordsmith the Human Relations Outcome Statement and then decide whether
  - a. We tie the outcomes to specific courses in The Core.
  - b. We assess the outcomes as students complete The Core. Several within the meeting stated this would be the preferred but there is concern about whether a student who transfers and completes The Core elsewhere would actually complete all four competencies if there is not some discussion about how competencies are assessed.
3. **Provide input regarding the unique factors of our programs.** I want to be able to market these things for marketing as well as for advising for students. College Administration does not know about or understand what we do. We need to show the strength of our programs and especially with the RFQQ, we need to show relevancy of our programs and colleges.