

**REPORT OF THE  
VIRGINIA STATE CRIME COMMISSION**

**FUNDING OF REGIONAL  
CRIMINAL JUSTICE TRAINING  
ACADEMIES**

**TO THE GOVERNOR AND  
THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA**



**HOUSE DOCUMENT NO. 63**

**COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA  
RICHMOND  
1997**





# COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

## VIRGINIA STATE CRIME COMMISSION

John R. Isom  
Executive Director

General Assembly Building

December 10, 1996

TO: The Honorable George Allen, Governor of Virginia, and  
Members of the General Assembly:

MEMBERS:  
FROM THE SENATE OF VIRGINIA:  
Janet D. Howell, Vice-Chair  
Mark L. Earley  
Kenneth W. Stolle

FROM THE HOUSE OF DELEGATES:  
Clifton A. Woodrum, Chairman  
James F. Almand  
Jean W. Cunningham  
John J. Davies, III  
Raymond R. Guest, Jr.  
William S. Moore, Jr.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE GOVERNOR:  
Robert C. Bobb  
Terry W. Hawkins  
Robert J. Humphreys

ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE  
James S. Gilmore, III

House Joint Resolution 30, agreed to by the 1996 General Assembly, directed the Virginia State Crime Commission to study the funding of Regional Criminal Justice Training Academies, and to submit its findings and recommendations to the Governor and the 1997 session of the General Assembly.

In fulfilling this directive, a study was conducted by the Virginia State Crime Commission in 1996. I have the honor of submitting herewith the study report.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Clifton A. Woodrum".

Clifton A. Woodrum  
Chairman

CAW:sc



**MEMBERS OF THE VIRGINIA STATE CRIME COMMISSION**

**From the Senate of Virginia:**

Janet D. Howell, Vice-Chair  
Mark L. Earley  
Kenneth W. Stolle

**From the House of Delegates:**

Clifton A. Woodrum, Chairman  
James F. Almand  
Jean W. Cunningham  
John J. Davies, III  
Raymond R. Guest, Jr.  
William S. Moore, Jr.

**Appointments by the Governor:**

Robert C. Bobb  
Terry W. Hawkins  
Robert J. Humphreys

**Attorney General's Office:**

James S. Gilmore, III, Attorney General



**Members of the Law Enforcement Subcommittee**

Senator Janet D. Howell, Subcommittee Chair  
Delegate James F. Almand  
Mr. Robert C. Bobb  
Senator Mark L. Earley  
The Hon. James S. Gilmore, III  
The Hon. Robert J. Humphreys  
Delegate William S. Moore, Jr.

**Research Staff**

Susan B. Williams, Policy Analyst





HJR 30 - Funding of Regional Criminal Justice Training Academies Study

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Authority for Study .....	1
II.	Members Appointed to Serve .....	1
III.	Executive Summary .....	1
IV.	Study Design .....	2
V.	Background .....	3
VI.	Study Goals/Objectives .....	6
VII.	Findings and Recommendations .....	7
VIII.	Acknowledgements .....	11
Appendix A:	House Joint Resolution 30 .....	A-1
Appendix B:	On-Site Survey Instrument and Results .....	B-1
Appendix C:	User Satisfaction Survey Instrument and Results .....	C-1
Appendix D:	Regional Academy Population and Budget Data .....	D-1
Appendix E:	Funding Recommendation .....	E-1



## **I. Authority for Study**

During the 1996 legislative session, Delegate Clifton A. Woodrum sponsored House Joint Resolution 30 directing the Virginia State Crime Commission to study the funding of regional criminal justice training academies. *See Appendix A.*

Section 9-125 of the **Code of Virginia** establishes and directs the Virginia State Crime Commission "to study, report, and make recommendations on all areas of public safety and protection." Section 9-127 of the **Code of Virginia** provides that "the Commission shall have the duty and power to make such studies and gather information in order to accomplish its purpose, as set forth in Section 9-125, and to formulate its recommendations to the Governor and the General Assembly." Section 9-134 of the **Code of Virginia** authorizes the Commission to "conduct private and public hearings, and to designate a member of the Commission to preside over such hearings." The Virginia State Crime Commission, in fulfilling its legislative mandate, undertook the study of the funding of regional criminal justice training academies.

## **II. Members Appointed to Serve**

At the May 15, 1996 meeting of the Crime Commission, Chairman Delegate Clifton A. Woodrum selected Senator Janet D. Howell to serve as Chair of the Law Enforcement Subcommittee studying funding of criminal justice training academies. The following members were selected to serve on the Subcommittee:

James F. Almand  
Robert C. Bobb  
Mark L. Earley  
James S. Gilmore, III  
Robert J. Humphreys  
William S. Moore, Jr.  
Clifton A. Woodrum, ex officio

## **III. Executive Summary**

The Crime Commission conducted on-site surveys at each of the nine regional academies and a user satisfaction survey of all chiefs and sheriffs utilizing regional academies; compared state funding allocated for criminal justice training in Virginia to that provided in neighboring states; reviewed and updated information collected during the course of previous Crime Commission studies dealing with training issues; gathered and analyzed current funding and officer population data and considered future training requirements to conclude that the state funding provided to the regional academies is not adequate to meet present or anticipated future demands on the criminal justice training system. In addition, the

Commission carefully examined the funding formula presently used to disperse funds to the regional academies and determined that it is not an effective means by which to provide adequate funding that addresses realistic training needs. As a result, the Commission made the following recommendation:

State funding should be increased by \$1,002,563 in order to bring the total amount of state funding dispersed to the nine regional academies up to \$2,127,971 from the current \$1,125,408. The new total amount of state funding provided to the academies--\$2,127,971--should be dispersed to the nine regional academies solely on the basis of officer population; thus, the current funding formula should no longer be used. In addition, an annual set-aside of \$111,999 should be provided to the Department of Criminal Justice Services for distribution to the academies based on need.

The Commission considered alternative mechanisms to the state general fund for providing support to the nine regional academies. The Commission examined several potential alternative sources that would provide adequate and consistent funding and found that an assessment on court fees would be the most appropriate. Consequently, the Commission made the following recommendation:

A \$1.00 fee should be assessed on all convictions for traffic offenses, misdemeanors and felonies, and the proceeds--estimated at \$2,263,136 annually--should be used to increase the state funding allocated to the nine regional criminal justice training academies.

#### **IV. Study Design**

##### **A. Site Visits**

Surveys were conducted as part of site visits to the nine regional criminal justice training academies. The survey results are provided in Appendix B to this report and were incorporated into the Commission's final findings and recommendations. On-site surveys were completed in collaboration with the following academy executives and local law enforcement officials:

- Hampton Roads Regional Academy of Criminal Justice (Hampton)  
Frank J. Kowaleski, Director
- Central Shenandoah Criminal Justice Training Center (Waynesboro)  
Carl Demory, Director
- New River Criminal Justice Training Academy (New River)  
H. Gray Barnes, Director; Ron L. Lemons, Christiansburg Chief of Police; and Giles County Sheriff Larry W. Falls, Board Chairman

- Southwest Law Enforcement Academy (Bristol)  
Ron Davis, Director; Debra S. Hughes, Assistant Director; and  
City of Bristol Sheriff H.E. Barnes, Board Chairman
- Cardinal Criminal Justice Academy (Salem)  
Richard L. Schumaker, Director and Blacksburg Chief of Police  
William Brown, Board Chairman
- Central Virginia Criminal Justice Academy (Lynchburg)  
Terrell Griffin, Director and Lynchburg Chief of Police Charles  
Bennett, Board Chairman
- Crater Criminal Justice Academy (Petersburg)  
Boyd G. Griggs, Director
- Northern Virginia Criminal Justice Academy (Ashburn)  
Thomas L. Shaw, Director and Truman D. Wilcox, Assistant  
Director
- Rappahannock Regional Criminal Justice Academy (Fredericksburg)  
Edward Evers, Director

## **B. Crime Commission Meetings**

### **Law Enforcement Subcommittee Meetings:**

June 25, 1996  
August 27, 1996  
September 24, 1996  
October 22, 1996  
December 10, 1996

### **Full Crime Commission Meetings:**

May 15, 1996  
December 10, 1996

### **Crime Commission Public Hearings on Regional Academy Funding Issues**

November 12, 1996 (Richmond)  
November 20, 1996 (Roanoke)

## **C. User Satisfaction Survey**

Surveys were distributed to all Virginia Sheriffs and Chiefs of Police utilizing regional criminal justice training academies for their training needs. Survey results are provided in Appendix C to this report and were incorporated into the Commission's final findings and recommendations.

## **V. Background**

### **A. Academy Structure**

Virginia's criminal justice training delivery system is a regionally-based network comprised of 34 training agencies. There are nine regional, partially state-

funded academies located throughout the Commonwealth, six state agencies, including the Virginia State Police Academy and the Department of Corrections Academy for Staff Development, that perform their own training, and 25 other training agencies classified as independent.

The nine regional academies operate a total of seven satellite facilities. A "satellite" facility is a training site used by a regional academy on a regular basis to provide training for students from member agencies. Satellite facilities are most frequently used to reduce the distance traveled by students.

Each of the nine regional academies is headed by a training director who reports to an academy board comprised of representatives from the academy's member agencies. The regional academies provide basic training, in-service training and advanced and/or specialized training to their member agencies and often to non-member agencies on a tuition basis.

## **B. History of Regional Academy Funding**

Prior to 1982, ninety percent of all funding for regional academies was provided by the state through the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) grant program. The amounts dispersed to the academies were not based upon a single formula uniformly applied to all the regional academies.

In FY 1981 - 82, when LEAA grants were being phased out by the federal government, the General Assembly agreed to fund 60 percent of the amount which had been funded by the LEAA grants on the condition that the local governments involved would provide a cash match of the remaining 40 percent. An appropriation was made to the Department of Criminal Justice Services (DCJS) to be distributed by the Department to the regional academies.

It then became necessary to develop a formula that could be used to distribute funds to the academies. The first formula, as applied in 1987, attempted to ascertain those expenses which were absolutely critical for the seven regional academies in existence at that time to operate. This "critical expense base" included such items as rent, electricity, water and personnel. The remaining funds were then distributed based upon a three year average of each academy's officer population. In FY 1987 - 88, using this formula, seven regional academies were funded from a total appropriation of \$965,954.

In 1988, two additional regional academies, Cardinal and Rappahannock, were approved for state funding. To determine the amount of funding to be appropriated to Rappahannock, the FY 1985 - 86 regional academy expenses as reported in the Gallagher Study, a private consultant's report on the training delivery system in Virginia, were utilized to establish a critical expense base.

However, an accurate critical expense base could not be determined for Cardinal using this methodology because the City of Salem was subsidizing a large percentage of Cardinal's budget. In order to develop a critical expense base for Cardinal, the average cost of utilities, rent and personnel experienced by the original seven regional academies was calculated, and this amount was added to Cardinal's FY 1985-86 budget expenses.

These critical expense bases were then multiplied by 60 percent to comply with the General Assembly's funding requirement. Next, the officer population served by each academy was multiplied by the required 60 percent. This amount was then added to each academy's respective critical expense base to determine the total funding allocation to each academy.

When the 1988 General Assembly appropriated funds for Cardinal and Rappahannock, instructive language, recommended in the Joint Conference Committee Report, was included in the budget bill specifically stating the amounts both academies were to receive. Consequently, the allocations for Cardinal and Rappahannock were addressed separately and thus were not included in the funding formula computations used to determine the allocations for the original seven academies.

In addition to the funds specifically designated for Cardinal and Rappahannock, the 1988 General Assembly appropriated an additional \$143,818 to be distributed to the seven remaining regional academies according to the funding formula. Utilizing the funding formula, allocations to the seven original regional academies could vary based on changes in officer population. However, allocations to Cardinal and Rappahannock would not vary according to changes in officer population.

In 1989, Cardinal and Rappahannock indicated that their officer populations had increased. At that time, Cardinal and Rappahannock were not subject to the general formula, applicable to the seven original regional academies, which used officer population to determine a portion of the funds allocated. Thus, for funding purposes, Cardinal and Rappahannock were being treated inequitably with respect to the other regional academies.

Upon the recommendation of the Liaison Committee of the Criminal Justice Services Board, and with all the regional academies concurring, the DCJS implemented a new funding formula, applicable to all nine regional academies and effective July 1, 1990, to address this inequity. A new base line allocation was established based upon \$1,283,625, the total amount appropriated for all regional academies in 1990. Any increase in the total appropriation would be allocated to the academies according to a three year average of each academy's respective officer

population. However, any decrease in the total appropriation would be applied equally to all academies.

After the new funding formula was adopted in 1990, no additional funds were appropriated by the General Assembly. Instead, a series of funding decreases were imposed. The total appropriation was ultimately decreased from \$1,283,625 to \$1,125,408, and the nine academies experienced equal reductions in their respective allocations. To date, these reductions, totaling \$158,217, have not been restored by the General Assembly.

**C. Current Regional Academy Funding**

Total General Fund Allocation: ..... \$1,125,408

Allocation to each academy:

Cardinal (Salem) .....	\$71,657
Central Shenandoah (Waynesboro) .....	\$132,450
Central Virginia (Lynchburg) .....	\$88,273
Crater (Petersburg) .....	\$82,654
Hampton Roads (Hampton) .....	\$209,866
New River (New River) .....	\$112,987
Northern Virginia (Ashburn) .....	\$268,160
Rappahannock (Fredericksburg) .....	\$81,329
Southwest (Bristol) .....	\$78,032

**VI. Study Goals/Objectives**

House Joint Resolution 30, sponsored by Delegate Clifton A. Woodrum, directed the Crime Commission to study the funding of regional criminal justice training academies. More specifically, HJR 30 directed the Commission to study:

- the development of an appropriate funding formula for regional academies to assure each is funded equitably and sufficiently;
- the current statutory structure of the current funding mechanism as related to realistic training needs; and
- the adequacy of funding statewide

The Law Enforcement Subcommittee emphasized the following issues:

- adequacy of current state funding to regional academies and
- development of an appropriate formula for disbursement of funds to regional academies



## **VII. Findings and Recommendations**

### **Finding A**

According to the results of a user satisfaction survey developed by the Crime Commission and distributed to all chiefs of police and sheriffs utilizing regional academies\*:

- 91.6% are satisfied with the amount of input they have in the operation of their academies
- 94.6% are satisfied with the quality of training provided by their respective academies
- 89.8% are satisfied with the variety and number of courses provided by the academies
- 79.6% are satisfied with the training facilities, including technologies and/or equipment used for training
- 40.7% indicated that the formula used to provide funding to the regional academies is not appropriate
- 59.3% indicated that the current level of state funding to their academy is not adequate to provide mandated training
- 80.8% would support an alternative funding source to the general fund for criminal justice training purposes

*\*Note: Of the 264 surveys distributed, 167 (or 63.3% of) chiefs and sheriffs responded.*

### **Finding B**

According to the results of an on-site survey developed by the Crime Commission and responded to by each of the nine regional academy directors:

- 77.8% indicated that the formula presently used to provide state funding to the regional academies is not appropriate
- 100% indicated that the current level of state funding to their academy is not adequate to provide mandated training

- 66.7% indicated that the level of state funding received by their respective academies is not adequate due to a combination of insufficient funds and the current funding formula, whereas 33.3% indicated that the level of state funding is not adequate due to insufficient funds only

### **Finding C**

According to information collected and reported by the International Association of Directors of Law Enforcement Standards and Training and analyzed by the Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services:

- Virginia ranks second to last among the mid-Atlantic states in the amount of state general funds allocated per local law enforcement officer for criminal justice training  
Tennessee, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Delaware, Rhode Island and West Virginia all rank higher than Virginia. Of the mid-Atlantic states, only North Carolina ranks lower than Virginia.
- Virginia ranks third to last among the Southeastern states in the amount of state general funds allocated per local law enforcement officer for criminal justice training  
Kentucky, South Carolina, Tennessee, Mississippi, Arkansas, Georgia, Florida and Alabama all rank higher than Virginia. Of the Southeastern states, only Louisiana and North Carolina rank lower than Virginia.

### **Finding D**

According to the Virginia State Crime Commission's 1993 Report on Law Enforcement Training:

- The amount of state funding provided for training to the Virginia State Police in 1993 was \$1,021 per officer, whereas the state funding provided to the regional academies was \$119 per officer. However, due to an increase in the officer population served by the regional academies with no corresponding increase in state funding, the state funding provided to the regional academies is currently down to \$109 per officer annually.

### **Finding E**

According to information collected in connection with the Virginia State Crime Commission's ongoing study on Funding of Regional Training Academies (pursuant to HJR 30):

- Since 1990, state funding to the regional academies has decreased by \$158,217 from \$1,283,625 to \$1,125,408, whereas the officer population served by the regional academies has increased by 1,113 officers from 9,248 officers in 1990 to 10,361 officers in 1996.
- Prior to 1982, 90% of all funding for regional academies was provided by the state through the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) grant program. In FY 1981-82 when the LEAA grants were being phased out by the federal government, the General Assembly agreed to fund 60 percent of the amount which had been funded by the LEAA grants on the condition that the local governments involved would provide a cash match of the remaining 40 percent.
- On average, state funds presently account for 29.9% of **total** regional academy budgets. The amount of state funding ranges from 12.9% to 42.6% of total academy budgets.\*
- On average, the **total** training cost per officer for the regional academies is \$424. The total training cost per officer ranges from \$238 to \$1312.\*

*\*Note: The **total** regional academy budget figures used for this calculation include rent/mortgage. See Appendix D for full text.*

### **Finding F**

Criminal justice training in Virginia utilizes a job task analysis to examine the requirements of a position in order to determine the necessary knowledge, skills and abilities required for job performance. In its 1993 Report on Law Enforcement Training, the Crime Commission recommended that the Department of Criminal Justice Services be provided one position, along with the necessary resources, with the sole responsibility of conducting job task analyses at regular intervals. The Commission's objective was to ensure that training is current and relevant to the job tasks which are being performed. The General Assembly subsequently approved a budget amendment to fund this position. At that time, the most recent job task analysis for law enforcement officer training had been completed in 1982.

A job task analysis is currently underway by the Department of Criminal Justice Services to promulgate performance outcomes which will in turn direct modified training objectives effective in January of 1998. The new training objectives will require certified criminal justice academies to significantly revise their current entry-level course curriculums.

### **Recommendation 1**

- State funding should be increased by \$1,002,563 in order to bring the total amount of state funding dispersed to the nine regional academies up to \$2,127,971 from the current \$1,125,408. The new total amount of state funding provided to the academies--\$2,127,971--should be dispersed to the nine regional academies solely on the basis of officer population; thus, the current funding formula should no longer be used. In addition, an annual set-aside of \$111,999 should be provided to the Department of Criminal Justice Services for distribution to the academies based on need. *See Appendix E for full text.*

### **Finding G**

At present, state funding to the nine regional academies is provided for out of the general fund. The current appropriation fails to provide adequate funding to the regional academies.

An assessment of one percent on fire and fire-related insurance will produce an estimated \$11 million in FY97 for fire programs. One million dollars will be made available for grants to local fire training centers; \$2,125,000 will go to the localities in the form of training programs or in support of training programs; \$375,000 will be allocated to operate the Department of Fire Programs and the remaining \$7,500,000 will be allocated, based on a funding formula, to the localities for special services, including, but not limited to, fire training and equipment.

The Commission considered several potential alternative funding sources, including assessments on liability insurance premiums, driver's licenses and court costs. The Commission ultimately concluded that a small fee added to the costs of court would be the most appropriate mechanism by which to ensure an adequate and consistent source of funding other than the general fund.

### **Recommendation 2**

- A \$1.00 fee should be assessed on all convictions for traffic offenses, misdemeanors and felonies, and the proceeds--estimated at \$2,263,136 annually--should be used to increase the state funding allocated to the nine regional criminal justice training academies

## **VIII. Acknowledgements**

**Bristol Sheriff's Office**

**The Hon. H.E. Barnes, Sheriff**

**Blacksburg Police Department**

**William Brown, Chief of Police**

**Cardinal Criminal Justice Academy**

**Richard L. Schumaker, Director**

**Central Shenandoah Criminal Justice Training Center**

**Carl Demory, Director**

**Central Virginia Criminal Justice Academy**

**Terrell Griffin, Director**

**Christiansburg Police Department**

**Ron L. Lemons, Chief of Police**

**Crater Criminal Justice Academy**

**Boyd G. Griggs, Director**

**Giles County Sheriff's Department**

**The Hon. Larry W. Falls, Sheriff**

**Hampton Roads Regional Academy of Criminal Justice**

**Frank J. Kowaleski, Director**

**Lynchburg Police Department**

**Charles Bennett, Chief of Police**

**New River Criminal Justice Training Academy**

**H. Gray Barnes, Director**

**Northern Virginia Criminal Justice Academy**

**Thomas L. Shaw, Director**

**Truman D. Wilcox, Assistant Director**

**Rappahannock Regional Criminal Justice Academy**

**Edward Evers, Director**

Southwest Law Enforcement Academy  
Ron Davis, Director  
Debra S. Hughes, Assistant Director

Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services  
Lex Echenrode,  
Ron Bessent, Division of Training and Standards

**The Crime Commission also expresses its sincere appreciation to each of the local law enforcement and training academy officials who participated in the two regional public hearings.**

# **APPENDIX A**





1996 SESSION

966967492

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 30

Offered January 15, 1996

Requesting the Virginia State Crime Commission to study funding of criminal justice training academies.

Patrons—Woodrum and Cranwell

Referred to Committee on Militia and Police

WHEREAS, professional training for law-enforcement officers is provided by regional criminal justice training academies located throughout the state; and

WHEREAS, it is necessary that such training be the best possible for every student and should be uniformly excellent no matter where provided; and

WHEREAS, training costs differ from locality to locality; and

WHEREAS, adequate funding should be assured statewide in order that all criminal justice professionals in the Commonwealth receive the training necessary to enable them to properly serve the citizens of the Commonwealth; and

WHEREAS, the budgeted amount for such training has actually decreased since FY 90/91 in spite of increased need for such funds; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED by the House of Delegates, the Senate concurring, That the Virginia State Crime Commission study (i) the development of an appropriate funding formula for regional academies to assure each is funded equitably and sufficiently, (ii) the current statutory structure of the current funding mechanism as related to realistic training needs, and (iii) the adequacy of funding statewide. The Commission shall be assisted by other agencies of the Commonwealth at the request of the Commission. The Department of Criminal Justice Services will be requested to assist in the study.

The Commission shall complete its work in time to submit its findings and recommendations to the Governor and the 1997 Session of the General Assembly as provided in the procedures of the Division of Legislative Automated Systems for processing documents.

966967492

HJ30

Official Use By Clerks	
<b>Passed By</b> <b>The House of Delegates</b> without amendment <input type="checkbox"/> with amendment <input type="checkbox"/> substitute <input type="checkbox"/> substitute w/amdt <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Passed By The Senate</b> without amendment <input type="checkbox"/> with amendment <input type="checkbox"/> substitute <input type="checkbox"/> substitute w/amdt <input type="checkbox"/>
Date: _____	Date: _____
_____ Clerk of the House of Delegates	_____ Clerk of the Senate

1/16/96 21:12



# **APPENDIX B**



## On-Site Survey Results: Regional Criminal Justice Training Academies

1. Is the formula presently used to provide funding to the regional criminal justice training academies appropriate?
  - 2 YES
  - 7 NO
  
2. If not, what would you recommend as a more appropriate formula?
  - 1 Per capita distribution
  - 1 Mandated training plus law enforcement officer population
  - 1 Law enforcement population only
  
3. Which of the following variables do you think should be included in the formula?
  - A. Operating expenses.
  - B. Law enforcement officer population.
  - C. Total number of training hours per year (including entry level training AND mandatory in-service retraining hours).
  - D. Entry level training hours only.
  - E. Other. Please specify.
    - 2 A and B
    - 1 A, B plus in-kind services, maintenance and growth
    - 1 A, B and C
    - 3 B only
    - 1 B and C
    - 1 No response
  
4. Is the current level of state funding to your academy adequate to provide mandated training?
  - 0 YES
  - 9 NO
  
5. If the funding level is not adequate is it due to the funding formula, insufficient funding from the state or a combination of both?
  - 0 Funding formula only
  - 3 Insufficient funds only
  - 6 Combination of insufficient funds and funding formula
  
6. Please discuss any recommendations you have for alternative funding sources (i.e., other than the general fund) that could be created or tapped to increase funding to the regional academies.
  - A. Fee added to summonses
  - B. Fee added to insurance premiums (home and auto)
  - C. Portion of lottery proceeds
  - D. Additional court costs

- E. Fee added to vehicle registration, driver's license and/or inspection stickers**
- F. Portion of proceeds from asset seizure and forfeiture**
- G. Fee added to breathalyzer and/or blood alcohol tests**
- H. Fund similar to literary fund established for law enforcement training with monies flowing from several different sources**

7. How many law enforcement officers are members of the academy for state funding purposes?

<b>Hampton Roads</b>	<b>1703</b>
<b>Crater</b>	<b>850</b>
<b>Central VA</b>	<b>858</b>
<b>New River</b>	<b>948</b>
<b>NOVA</b>	<b>1452</b>
<b>Rappahannock</b>	<b>1384</b>
<b>Cardinal</b>	<b>946</b>
<b>Central Shenandoah</b>	<b>1736</b>
<b>Southwest</b>	<b>645</b>

8. What is the total number of hours of mandated training provided annually by your academy?

A. Hours of entry-level training

B. Hours of in-service training

<b>Hampton Roads</b>	<b>3689 (A); 3646 (B)</b>
<b>Crater</b>	<b>78,297 man-hours (A and B)</b>
<b>Central VA</b>	<b>2040 (A)</b>
<b>New River</b>	<b>71,787 man-hours (A and B)</b>
<b>NOVA</b>	<b>135,180 man-hours (A)</b>
<b>Rappahannock</b>	<b>83,752 man-hours (A and B)</b>
<b>Cardinal</b>	<b>2500 (A)</b>
<b>Central Shenandoah</b>	<b>2337 (A)</b>
<b>Southwest</b>	<b>3600 (A and B) plus specialized training</b>

9. What is your academy's total annual operating budget?

<b>Hampton Roads</b>	<b>\$627,188</b>
<b>Crater</b>	<b>\$250,000</b>
<b>Central VA</b>	<b>\$300,000</b>
<b>New River</b>	<b>\$252,154</b>
<b>NOVA</b>	<b>\$2,100,000</b>
<b>Rappahannock</b>	<b>\$508,097</b>
<b>Cardinal</b>	<b>\$232,132</b>
<b>Central Shenandoah</b>	<b>\$612,956</b>
<b>Southwest</b>	<b>\$183,032</b>

10. Of that amount, what percentage comes from the state?

<b>Hampton Roads</b>	<b>33%</b>
<b>Crater</b>	<b>30%</b>
<b>Central VA</b>	<b>less than 20%</b>
<b>New River</b>	<b>41.73%</b>
<b>NOVA</b>	<b>12%</b>
<b>Rappahannock</b>	<b>16%</b>
<b>Cardinal</b>	<b>31%</b>
<b>Central Shenandoah</b>	<b>21.16%</b>
<b>Southwest</b>	<b>40%</b>





# APPENDIX C



**User Satisfaction Survey: Regional Criminal Justice Training Academies  
Surveys Distributed: 264/Total Respondents: 167 (63.3%)**

**Chiefs - 90  
Sheriffs - 77**

1. Which regional academy do your officers from your jurisdiction attend?

8	Cardinal	4.8%
33	Central Shenandoah	19.8%
26	Central Virginia	15.6%
12	Crater	7.2%
15	Hampton Roads	9.0%
23	New River	13.8%
11	Northern Virginia	6.6%
18	Rappahannock	10.8%
21	Southwest	12.6%

2. (a) Is your agency a member of the regional academy or do your officers attend the regional academy on a per diem/tuition basis?

153	Member	91.6%
12	Per diem/tuition basis	7.2%
2	No response	1.2%

(b) What is the amount of the per diem/tuition charged by the academy per officer?

3	Less than \$100	1.8%
4	\$100 - \$149	2.4%
62	\$150 - \$199	37.1%
1	\$200 - \$249	.6%
4	\$250 - \$299	2.4%
1	\$300 - \$349	.6%
9	\$500 or more	5.4%
83	No response	49.7%

3. (a) Do you serve on the regional academy board?

62	No. I do not serve on the academy board.	37.1%
94	Yes. I am a member of the academy board.	56.3%
6	Yes. I am chairman of the academy board.	3.6%
5	No response	3.0%

(b) How often are board meetings held?

23	Monthly	13.8%
1	Bi-monthly	.6%
32	Quarterly	19.2%
33	Annually	19.8%
13	Semi-annually	7.8%
65	No response	38.9%

(c) How often does the academy executive board/committee meet?

31	Monthly	18.6%
2	Bi-monthly	1.2%
27	Quarterly	16.2%
2	Annually	1.2%
18	As needed	10.8%
87	No response	52.1%

(d) Who schedules these meetings?

43	Academy Director	25.8%
29	Board Chairman	17.4%
1	Executive Board/Committee	.6%
25	Chairman/Director	15.0%
69	No response	41.3%

(e) Who sets the agenda for these meetings?

37	Academy Director	22.2%
23	Board Chairman	13.8%
33	Chairman/Director	19.8%
74	No response	44.3%

4. Are you satisfied with the amount of input you have in the operation of the academy?

153	Yes	91.6%
10	No	6.0%
4	No response	2.4%

5. Are you satisfied with the quality of training provided by the regional academy?

158	Yes	94.6%
7	No	4.2%
2	No response	1.2%

6. Are you satisfied with the variety and number of courses provided by the regional academy?

150	Yes	89.8%
15	No	9.0%
2	No response	1.2%

7. Are you satisfied with the training facilities, including technologies and/or equipment used for training?

133	Yes	79.6%
31	No	18.6%
3	No response	1.8%

8. (a) Are you familiar with the formula used to allocate funds to the regional academies?

83	Yes	49.7%
79	No	47.3%
5	No response	3.0%

(b) Is the formula used to provide funding to the regional academies appropriate?

32	Yes	19.2%
68	No	40.7%
67	No response	40.1%

9. Which of the following variables do you think should be included in the formula?

70	Operating Expenses	41.9%
94	Officer Population served	56.3%
40	Number of entry level training hours conducted per year	24.0%
71	Total number of training hours conducted per year (including entry level and in-service hours)	42.5%
16	Other	9.6%

(b) If you indicated above that more than one variable should be included in the formula, please explain how the variables should be used in conjunction with each other (i.e., what percentage should be allocated to each variable).

10 (a) Do you know the current amount of state funds allocated to your academy?

90	Yes	53.9%
74	No	44.3%
3	No response	1.8%

(b) Is the current level of state funding to your academy adequate to provide mandated training?

13	Yes	7.8%
99	No	59.3%
55	No response	32.9%

11. Would you support an alternative funding source to the general fund for training criminal justice training purposes?

135	Yes	80.8%
5	No	3.0%
27	No response	16.2%



# APPENDIX D





## Nine Regional Criminal Justice Training Academies: Population and Budget Data

Regional Academy	Officer Population as of 10/17/95	% of Total Officer Population	Current Officer Population	% of Total Officer Population	Allocation from General Fund	Total Academy Budget (FY 96)	% of State Funding	Current Avg. Cost/Officer
Cardinal	934	8.9	758	7.3	\$71,657	\$232,132	30.9	\$306
Central Shenandoah	1,699	16.3	1,699	16.4	\$132,450	\$612,956	21.6	\$361
Central Virginia	904	8.7	982	9.5	\$88,273	\$317,071	27.8	\$323
Crater	827	7.9	732*	7.1	\$82,654	\$254,399	32.5	\$348
Hampton Roads	1,749	16.7	1,749	16.9	\$209,866	\$627,188	33.5	\$359
New River	927	8.9	935	9.0	\$112,987	\$270,727	41.7	\$290
Northern Virginia	1,581	15.1	1,581	15.3	\$268,160	\$2,074,888	12.9	\$1312
Rappahannock	1,155	11.1	1,155	11.2	\$81,329	\$320,120	25.4	\$277
Southwest	680	6.5	770	7.4	\$78,032	\$183,032	42.6	\$238
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>10,456</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>10,361</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>\$1,125,408</b>	<b>\$4,892,513</b>	<b>29.9</b>	<b>\$424</b>



# **APPENDIX E**



### Recommendation 1

Academy	% of Officer Population	Proposed State Funding (w/ Set-Aside)	Proposed Increase	% from Gen. Fund	Proposed State Funding (w/o Set-Aside)	Proposed Increase	% from Gen. Fund
Cardinal	8.9	\$189,389	\$117,732	89.5	\$199,357	\$127,700	94.2
Central Shenandoah	16.3	\$346,859	\$214,409	69.3	\$365,115	\$232,665	72.9
Central Virginia	8.7	\$185,133	\$96,860	59.7	\$194,877	\$106,604	62.9
Crater	7.9	\$168,110	\$85,456	75.2	\$176,958	\$94,304	79.1
Hampton Roads	16.7	\$355,371	\$145,505	59.8	\$374,075	\$164,209	62.9
New River	8.9	\$189,389	\$76,402	72.4	\$199,357	\$86,370	76.2
Northern Virginia	15.1	\$321,324	\$53,164	16.6	\$338,235	\$70,075	17.5
Rappahannock	11.1	\$236,205	\$154,876	61.2	\$248,637	\$167,308	64.4
Southwest	6.5	\$138,318	\$60,286	86.8	\$145,598	\$67,566	91.3

Total academy budgets less rent/mortgage	\$3,733,284
	<u>          x .60</u>
At 60% state funding	\$2,239,970*
	<u>          x .05</u>
5% set-aside	\$ 111,999
 Academy budgets at 60% state funding	 \$2,239,970
Less 5% set-aside	<u>      \$ 111,999</u>
	\$2,127,971

**\*Additional Funds Required: \$1,114,562**

