DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 165 860 JC 790 135

AUTHOR Mahoney, James R.; Rasmussen, Howard M.
TITLE The Quality of Police Education: An AACJC Response.
INSTITUTION American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Feb 79
NOTE 20p.; Papers presented at a National Symposium on Higher Education for Police Officers (Washington, D.C., February 6, 1979)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Associate Degrees; Bachelors Degrees; *Book Reviews; Community Colleges; Criminal Law; *Job Training; Junior Colleges; Law Enforcement; Legal Education; *Police; *Postsecondary Education; *Program Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS Quality of Police Education (Police Foundation)

ABSTRACT

These two symposium presentations are endorsed by the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges in response to the book, "The Quality of Police Education," which was prepared by the Police Foundation with support from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. Specifically, the papers refute allegations made in the book in criticism of community college police education programs. James R. Mahoney's response to the book points out the age and unverifiable nature of much of the data upon which the criticisms were based; contains quotes from Police Education Program administrators in response to specific claims made in the book; criticizes the stylistic tactics which, without evidence, cast a negative light on the programs; and points out the impracticality of the recommended baccalaureate degree requirements in police education. Additionally, the address points out the values of the study. Howard Rasmussen's presentation contradicts the premise of the study that the role of police education programs should be to educate police for institutional change, stating that the more important goal is the generation and dissemination of knowledge. Also questioned is the belief that a liberal-arts-oriented, full-time, residence education is the best model for police education programs. (AYC)

THE QUALITY OF POLICE EDUCATION: AN AACJC RESPONSE

American Association of Community and Junior Colleges

James R. Mahoney, Project Director
Education-Work Council Program

REMARKS PREPARED FOR THE

NATIONAL SYMPOSIUM ON HIGHER EDUCATION FOR POLICE OFFICERS

Howard M. Rasmussen, Director
Southeast Florida Institute of Criminal Justice
Division of Public Services
Miami-Dade Community College
Miami, Florida

Presented at a National Symposium on Higher Education for Police Officers, Sheraton Park Hotel, Washington, D.C., February 6, 1979

AACJC MEMORANDUM:

To: AACJC Member Presidents

From: Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr.

March 5, 1979

AACJC has vigorously counteracted unfair criticism of community college police education programs contained in a text, The Quality of Police Education, prepared by the Police Foundation with support from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. AACJC staff member James Mahoney delivered a sharp rebuttal at a national symposium on the book, his response shaped in part by feedback from 45 community college police educators. Howard Rasmussen, director of criminal justice programs at Miami-Dade Community College, also questioned the book at the meeting. The Chronicle of Higher Education on Feb. 13 gave very favorable coverage to the criticism rather than to the book itself. Other steps: Copies of the Mahoney and Rasmussen papers, enclosed with this memo, were mailed to 120 community college police educators; the April Journal is doing a news report, and a subsequent issue will include a major article; and an audio-taped rebuttal was produced and distributed to 500 radio stations (that tape is available for $2.50 from the AACJC Communications Office). In short, what we have done raises some serious questions about the credibility of the sections of the report dealing with community colleges.

THE QUALITY OF POLICE EDUCATION: AN AACJC RESPONSE

American Association of Community and Junior Colleges

James R. Mahoney
Project Director
Education-Work Council Program

Presented at
A National Symposium on Higher
Education for Police Officers

Sheraton Park Hotel
Washington, D.C.

February 6, 1979

This statement is delivered for the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. Much of it has been suggested by local community college police educators who accepted the Association's invitation to respond in writing to the book. Twenty police educators sent their detailed reactions for the purpose of helping us prepare this statement.

Also, you should know that the Association was not invited (nor any other broadly representative community college organization) to join the National Advisory Commission on Higher Education for Police Officers. The Association was asked to react to early drafts of Chapter 4. We responded in writing. The result was that some few changes were made by the Commission.

There is much of value in the book. It should be clear that in spite of the serious differences we have with the flow of thought in the text and some of the recommendations, the Association takes a positive view of the work. Police educators can learn much from it and, viewed appropriately, we feel it can provide a base from which progress can be made.

Time permits only a few specific reactions. Highlights of these follow:

First, much of the data used in the book is old. A lot of what is said is based upon pre-conceptions, opinion surveys, selective references, anecdotes, and, in a place or two, inflamatory invective (Dr. Misner's quotes). I submit that the report lacks the very kind of scholarship which our resident elitist, Dr. Newman, suggests is the cornerstone of the university professoriate.*

Had a more thorough investigation been applied to the field as it now operates, a very different sort of picture of community college contributions might have emerged. The response letters and telephone conversations we

* Dr. Donald J. Newman, Dean, School of Criminal Justice, State University of New York at Albany, stated in an earlier presentation that university professors compose an elite corps of intellectuals whose primary allegiance is to the university and whose central purpose is to contribute to the discipline's body of knowledge through research and publication. Teaching, he said, should be left to the lower divisions.

received from community college police educators indicate this. Some edited excerpts from their written responses follow:

From Pennsylvania:

The college has made the same financial commitments to the Police Science Administration Program as it has for all programs. The curriculum meets all the criteria for college-wide programs and has a heavy liberal arts requirement. Its students take all core courses along with other college students. Part-time faculty provide expertise not available with full-time college faculty; lawyers, police administrators, FBI officials, the District Attorney, and other degreed professionals meet college-wide faculty requirements.

From New Jersey:

We have, under the auspices of the Department of Higher Education, a master plan for law enforcement education. This plan covers most of the points set forth in the book and the vast majority of colleges in the state, at all levels, comply with its recommendations.

From Wyoming:

In the seven years in which the college's law enforcement program has existed, the college has committed more than $325,000 of its budget to the program. Funds have been available for all library acquisitions the program faculty desired. The teaching load is identical with other college departments. Most of our in-service students do not go beyond the associate degree, because there is no 4-year degree granting institution reasonably nearby and personnel demand in the area is high. Pre-service students typically go on to the state university without losing a single credit. The full-time to part-time faculty ratio is 5-1.

From Georgia:

To receive a 2-year criminal justice degree from a University System institution, a student must complete requirements in a core curriculum, including humanities, natural science and math, social and behavioral science, and criminal justice. The criminal justice curriculum has been standardized for three years. Training courses in police academies cannot be accepted for academic credit. There are no criminal justice training programs in the curriculum. All full-time and part-time faculty in all disciplines must have as a minimum a masters degree.

From New York:

The college inaugurated its program in 1963, long before the birth of LEAA and LEEP. We have 5 full-time faculty members, all of whom have masters degrees. Student-faculty ratio is approximately 40-1. Full-time to part-time faculty ratio is 5-1. Library acquisitions have kept pace with other disciplines in the college. The great majority of our pre-service and in-service graduates have gone on to 4-year institutions where they have done exceedingly well.

Given these details, the text's broadly negative indictment of community college programs seems unjustified. It suggests further that the study team's investigation of current program characteristics was not thorough.

Secondly, to point out one of the serious weaknesses of the text, I would like to focus on the "cooling out" theory. When the idea is first introduced, it is offered only as a possibility. The writer admits that there is no hard data to substantiate it. Later, the quotes are dropped from the term and the theory is presented as an accepted fact. An idea does not become a fact simply because it is stated so. This stylistic tactic is particularly unhelpful because it is so negative. Further, frequently in the literature when the cooling out theory is raised, it is balanced with a discussion of reverse transfer trends. In simple terms, reverse transfers are those students who move from attendance at 4-year institutions to 2-year colleges. In Illinois, for example, it is reported that 25.4% of the state's community college enrollment in the fall of 1978 was composed of reverse transfers (Student Enrollment Data and Trends in Public Community Colleges of Illinois: Fall 1978, p. 18). Nearly 80% of the students were from public 4-year institutions. In other studies (Community College Review. ERIC, 1976), it is reported that this trend has increased in the last decade. In 1970, nearly 10% of the community college population was reverse transfers; in 1977 it was estimated that community colleges accepted as many reverse transfers as they transferred students to 4-year institutions.

It would not require a great leap of the imagination to conclude from these facts (in much the same manner employed by the book's writers to reach their conclusions) that maybe community colleges are doing something right and that "senior" institutions need to examine their approaches.

Third, the notion that the minimum requirement for police manpower should be a baccalaureate degree with a liberal arts cast appears impracticable, even

absurd when taken to the extreme. Liberal arts programs have traditionally been and appear to remain the special preserve of the middle-class. To require such a degree, then, flies in the face of national equal opportunity policies. The recommendation appears to be unrealistic in terms of attracting, in Vollmer's terms, "truly exceptional men" (p. 31) and in Bouza's language, "Renaissance men" (p. 42), partly because of the significant numbers of smaller, rural departments across the country whose pool of manpower and baccalaureate opportunities are limited and partly because of the nature of police work itself.

Regarding the latter point, Jerry Wilson (former District of Columbia police chief) is quoted as saying that much of police work is routine and dull. As a result, liberal arts educated police officers are likely to experience frustration and disenchantment which could lead to early resignation and/or unacceptable behavior.

Further, although the goal is understandable and commendable, the fact is that there are few "truly exceptional men," "Renaissance men," or, to continue the references in Plato's terms, "philosopher-kings" or queens, available in the world generally. Most of us are "toilers in the vineyards." Could you imagine the turmoil and confusion if by some fluke even a single police department were peopled with individuals who were at once: cognizant of the intricacies of social systems; expert in the latest counseling modalities as they apply to social units; familiar with the theories of ethics, epistomology, morality, semantics; management/organization scholars; psychologists? And even more far-fetched, can you imagine officers who possessed the wherewithall to apply all of this information in practical situations?

It is a more reasonable view to see police work, as well as other sorts of professional enterprises, as work which requires a whole range of variously trained and educated individuals. There is need in police work for "Renaissance"

persons, as there is a need for other specially educated individuals, as there is a need for the specially trained technician. It seems logical to assume that more than one sort of uniquely educated person is required to improve the effectiveness of police departments and to help them respond to the work's complexity. The professional models to which the text refers help make this point. Just a cursory examination of the medical, legal, engineering, and architectural professions (the Dictionary of Occupational Titles will do for these purposes) will reveal that while there is a cadre of persons who might be classified as "truly exceptional persons," the professions include in very important ways gallaxies of technicians, para-professionals, and others who provide the services essential in allowing the "truly exceptional persons" to function at the highest level. Even though the terminology in the commission's text attributes different values for the practitioners who work at different levels, the fact is that without technicians and para-professionals the philosopher-kings and queens would not be able to ply their special skills. They are very important pieces in the whole professional scheme.

Community colleges have proven their capacity to train and educate these technicians and para-professionals as they have proven their ability to provide quality transfer programs.

Fourth, the text ignores the special circumstances and needs of the large numbers of police departments which serve rural areas.

Fifth, the writers either do not understand or do not accept the unique function and service of community colleges.

In spite of these concerns, however, there is much of value in this text. It makes at least three important contributions.

First, while there are many weaknesses, viewed positively, the text suggests the large array of important research which remains to be done, the

results of which will help us make changes of the appropriate kind and take steps in the right direction. A myriad of research issues are raised. In fact, it appears through this text that we do not know a great deal. Efforts should certainly be directed at prioritizing research needs, enlisting appropriate institutions and individuals to conduct the research, and finding funds to support it.

Second, the text is a useful resource for the issues surrounding police higher education. In a comprehensive fashion, the text captures many of the singificant thoughts and questions relevant to the field. It can help police educators (and students when other balanced materials are included) examine the issues, arrive at individual conclusions, and thereby sharpen thinking. It can provide a valuable stimulus for a more complete and concrete study of the entire field and its relationships with other segments of higher education, the community, and police administration.

Third, the text can provide the incentive for community college police educators to act more strongly as a unit. The broad, negative, and biased brush stroke which was used to paint community college contributions to police higher education clearly indicates that, in spite of your numbers, you have not exerted your potential influence, you have not broadcast your achievement, and you have let a small number of university authorities dominate professional organizations, the national commissions which have generated police education policies over the past two decades (not the least of which is the commission which oversaw the writing of this text), and the professional journals. The text makes our weaknesses in these areas apparent and serves an important function if it results in the more active participation of community college police educators in the range of professional activities noted here. The energy for this more active and organized role must come from the colleges themselves and

from you who teach and administer local programs. The Association stands ready, as it can, to help you in whatever activities you wish to initiate.

Finally, the accusations and implicit (explicit at times) anger which permeates the text are unhelpful. Much of what is offered in police education programs in community colleges today is excellent by any standard and falls within the boundaries of many of the book's recommendations. We need to have a fairer, more comprehensive, current look at the field so that more credible conclusions can be made, so that whatever changes are necessary will be firmly based on reliable information. To achieve this important aim, community colleges and the Association are ready to work with other higher education institutions and organizations, in the spirit of collaboration, and with the joint goals of improving both police higher education and the quality of police work.

We agree that police work is increasingly complex. We agree that police education, at all levels and in all institutions, needs to be improved. We are convinced that the improvement must come as the result of the involvement of representatives from all postsecondary institutions. We know that community colleges have already contributed significantly. We are willing to continue to contribute in partnership with others.

Remarks Prepared for the

National Symposium on Higher Education for Police Officers

February 6, 1979

Howard M. Rasmussen, Director

Southeast Florida Institute of Criminal Justice

Division of Public Services

Miami-Dade Community College

Miami, Florida

The subject of change is always a difficult topic. Difficult for those who are in the field of Law Enforcement and Policing and difficult for those of us in Police Education. Change and proposals for change are threatening. They threaten many individuals and institutions because they imply by the nature of the suggestions for change that we have been doing something wrong in the past.

Since, in the end, it will appear that my comments and response to the report are somewhat negative, it is important that I preface my remarks with some words of appreciation.

I would like to thank and express my appreciation to the Police Foundation for taking the risks involved in sponsoring and funding this important study of Police Higher Education in the United States. I would also like to thank the Office of Criminal Justice Education and Training of LEAA for sponsoring this symposium, so that we would have an opportunity to react to the report and its recommendations.

Such a study, published report, and this symposium are valuable. By advocating a particular view of the past, present, and future, it generates and crystalizes other views, probes scholars to engage in further research, and focuses discussion and debate. This is a valuable contribution to the state of the art.

Before I review chapter six, I think it's important to go back to some of the foundations laid in previous chapters. The major problem with this whole report is the assumption that the purpose of higher education for the

police is, "educating the police for institutional change." Other aims are discussed; but this one purpose emerges as the major objective.

Neither the authors nor the researchers demonstrate any substantial concensus for such an objective. The statement that, "most of the objectives offered for police education are compatible" with this objective and primary concerns of the commission is also not demonstrated or substantiated.

I reviewed a number of the books in higher education listed in the bibliography and used for footnotes and others not listed due to more recent publication dates. I find little support for such a major objective. The most frequently stated goals, objectives, and purposes of higher education evolve around the generation and dissemination of knowledge.

Eble states, "there is no single aim for education. It is even difficult to conceive of higher educational institutions serving single purposes." [1]

Although, the purposes and aims of higher education for police were not specifically assigned for comment, this narrow and limited objective permeates the whole report. The components of curriculum, faculty, student experiences, etc., are judged against this objective. This objective also becomes the basis for many of the subsequent recommendations.

It would appear that Dr. Bennis' influence can be observed in this regard. He has authored a number of outstanding and excellent books on change. His writings obviously reflect this orientation. I have to admit that I have used both the second and third editions of The Planning of Change[2] in my so-called "occupationally oriented" criminal justice courses.

I believe that personal, group, institutional, and social change are important and the concepts and processes should be taught in police education. However, it should not be the primary purpose of education.

Therefore, if we disagree regarding this purpose of police education, we will quite naturally disagree with many of the findings of this report, its basis for judging quality and performance, and its recommendations, especially those relating to student activities and experiences.

Since I find very few other disciplines held to, judged, and measured by such an objective, I for one do not support "educating the police for institutional change," as the major or primary objective. I support change, if improvement takes place. However, the more important goal is the generation and dissemination of knowledge. Responsible and positive institutional changes may then evolve as a sub-goal of this educational process. Such a view of higher education for police is the foundation for the remainder of my remarks.

Chapter six, Student Experiences, is also based upon this change objective. However, another underlying foundation of the commission's judgements and recommendations is the emphasis on liberal arts. Although I earned my bachelor's degree from a liberal arts college in sociology and psychology and found it an appropriate model and route for me, I would never suggest that it should be adopted as the one and only model of higher education.

In fact, the liberal arts model is currently under severe attack. Feldman has said that as a nation, "we are every year sacrificing thousands of young people on the altar of our doubtful and exclusive obsession with the so-called liberal arts."[3]

I had obtained my Bachelor of Arts and completed all course work needed for the masters degree at Michigan State University's School Of Criminal Justice before joining a police department. However, there were many times that I wished I had had a mixture of practical experience in police work as I worked toward these degrees. There is no question that this model contains several advantages, but it also has some disadvantages. The problem is that police education is too new and incredibly little data exist to support any model over another.

I believe, therefore, it is too soon to make such a significant decision. History may prove that the occupational model was the better alternative. I would not want to preclude that possibility by advocating one model and eliminating all others.

The commission appears to ignore the current trends in higher education. It would seem that some members do not function in higher educational institutions, are unaware of trends and issues, or chose to ignore those that did not support their views. Most of you can recall the "good old days" stories and cartoons. The report reminds me of several. It would appear that the commission is recommending that police education should "return to jail, do not pass go, and do not collect $200.00" from LEEP and begin where the rest of higher education was in the early 1960s'. We will soon be entering the 1980s' and I would hope that police education would catch up rather than regress to the world of the good old days of full-time students, dormitories, (the noise level was so loud I couldn't study), in other words, the concept of residential education. By the way, the research on college students who live at home was kind of interesting.

I'm not sure how relevant it was to what we are doing here, but it was interesting

I don't believe that such a recommendation is realistic. Most community college campuses are not residential in design or function. The commission also ignores that one of the relatively new trends in state universities is upper division only, junior and senior commuter campuses.

As Milton Stern has said "full-time studenthood is going the way of full-time motherhood".[4] The part time student is fast becoming the majority in our college classrooms. It appears that this trend will continue in the foreseeable future.

Although the commission reports some research to substantiate its support of full-time, residency education, the research is not conclusive or exhaustive. I agree that a lot of learning takes place outside of the classroom, however, many full-time students do not even avail themselves of these opportunties. My experience in teaching in a state university and two community colleges is that the full-time employed/part-time student is generally better motivated and more challenging to teach, than the full-time and/or pre-service student. If we move toward all pre-service students, we would miss the mix that can enrich the learning of all students in the classroom.

Another criticism that I have of the commission, is the way the report attacks the community colleges. It is a lot of fun to be a Monday morning quarterback and the commission must have thoroughly enjoyed this role. The report basically ignores the purposes, functions, goals, and objectives of the community college.

The significant contribution of community colleges is well documented. They exist to respond to and serve both the educational and training needs of the community whether that means university parallel or career education. They were willing to get into police and criminal justice education in the 1950s' and 1960s' before federal LEEP funds became available and when most of the colleges and universities that the commission seems to favor, refused to get their hands dirty.

Hoover and Lund state that, "the growth in baccalaureate and graduate programming has followed by two and three years previous expansion in associate level programming leading to the conclusion that programming in senior institutions is more a product of the demand generated by associate degree graduates than other factors."[5]

Community colleges are obviously not represented on the commission, very few were invited and/or were able to appear at the regional public forums, and the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges was not involved either. I find such a lack of representation and input to be reflected in this report.

I am also concerned about the commission's heavy criticism of some of the early pioneers and leaders of this field. Although, on page 81, the commission acknowledges "an important act of leadership," I believe the criticism is unfair when viewed from the perspective of the historical development of police and criminal justice education. Academic wasteland and "intellectual aridity" to the contrary, the contributions of individuals such as Tom Crockett, Jim Stinchcomb, Denny Pace and Jimmy Styles deserve our sincere appreciation and thanks.

As I stated in the beginning, the overall flavor of my remarks has probably appeared negative. This is probably the result of my disappointment with the report. It supports, apparently on purpose, a very provincial and narrow perspective of the future of higher education for police. It generally advocates one model prematurely as all facts are not in. All these wonderful Ph.D.'s in the liberal arts who are to be "re-tooled" (God knows how), do not appear to have contributed very much research to the problems of educating the police.

There is no question that academics outside of criminal justice have contributed significantly to the field of criminal justice, but so have people within the faculty ranks of the discipline of criminal justice. I don't see hordes of arts and science faculty interested in teaching police. I do, however, see the need to expose pre-service and in-service police students to these faculty through the prevalent general education and social science approach utilized in most community colleges and universities.

The field of police and criminal justice has many needs and problems. It is in need of educated personnel from many diverse educational experiences and disciplines. New employees should have as much college education as possible. In-service personnel should continue their education. Education and learning, both formal and informal, should be a lifelong continuing process. Learning should never stop. Provision must be made to ensure that police personnel continue their education throughout their careers. Learning and education are and should not be <u>terminal</u>. Diverse majors should be encouraged. Personnel are needed at all levels of the organization who have degrees in: Sociology, Psychology, Business, Political Science, Public dministration, etc., and Police and Criminal Justice.

Personnel with a variety of educational majors can be a real asset to the police organization, provided the knowledge is utilized by the organization.

A multiplicity of higher educational models should be encouraged and funded. Substantial research into all models and other factors regarding police education should continue. All of us must redouble our efforts if we are to succeed. We must work together - police administrators and practitioners, educators, educational administrators, government agencies, LEEP, and students----(most especially students) - to ensure that excellence in police education becomes our objective and ultimately our accomplishment.

1. Eble, Kenneth E. Professors As Teachers. San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers, 1972 p. 133.

2. Bennis, Warren G., Kenneth D. Benne, Robert Chin, and Kenneth E. Corey. The Planning of Change. Third Edition. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976.

3. Feldman, Marvin J. "The Relevance Gap in American Education". The Conference Board Record 9 (June 1972) p. 28.

4. Stern, Milton R. "Working With Older Students". Ohmer Milton and Associates. On College Teaching. San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers, 1978. p. 340.

5. Hoover, Larry T. and Dennis W. Lund. Guidelines For Criminal Justice Programs in Community and Junior Colleges. Washington, D.C. American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1977 p. 9