

# **Committee On Training**

Patrick Henry Building – West Reading Room Richmond, VA 23219

# MINUTES (DRAFT)

December 6, 2018

## **Members Present**

Chief Kelvin Wright Sheriff Anthony Roper Mr. Patrick Bridge Captain Robert Holland Mr. Edward Macon Chief Tonya Chapman Chief James E. Williams Mr. Luke Black Superintendent William Smith Sheriff Vanessa Crawford Chief James Cervera Ms. Mary Biggs

### **Members Absent**

Ms. Angie Carrera Mr. Bryan Porter Mr. Robert Soles Mayor Carolyn Dull

### 1. Call to Order.

Chief Wright called the meeting of the Committee on Training (COT) to order at 10:02 a.m.

### 2. Approval of past minutes.

Chief James Williams made a motion, seconded by Sheriff Vanessa Crawford, to accept the minutes from the meeting on October 25, 2018. The motion was passed unanimously.

### 3. Division Update.

Ms. Teresa Gooch, Division Director, Division of Law Enforcement, informed the COT that there was no division update.

### 4. Old Business.

Chief Wright stated there was no old business.

### 5. New Business.

- a. Recertification as a Certified Crime Prevention Campus- Christopher Newport University (CNU) – Mr. Rick Arrington, Crime Prevention Program Manager, presented information for the recertification of CNU as a Certified Crime Prevention Campus. He provided some history of the university, including national rankings, as well as the fact that CNU has three Virginia Certified Crime Prevention Specialists and two nationally certified Crime Prevention Specialists. Mr. Arrington recommended the committee approve recertification. Chief Chapman made a motion, seconded by Mr. Luke Black, to approve the recertification. The motion passed unanimously.
- b. Recertification as a Certified Crime Prevention Community- City of Galax Mr. Rick Arrington presented information on the recertification of the City of Galax as a Certified Crime Prevention Community. He provided a history of efforts the city had made to become certified and noted that this is their fourth recertification. Mr. Arrington recommended the committee approve recertification. Ms. Biggs made a motion, seconded by Mr. Edward Macon, to approve the recertification. The motion passed unanimously.

#### c. Law-Enforcement Field Training

Mr. David Cotter, Director of Policy and Legislative Affairs, provided information on lawenforcement field training in the Commonwealth. He began by noting there was a dispute in the field over how law-enforcement field training must be conducted.

Mr. Cotter gave a brief history of the current requirement for field training. He noted that the current requirements provide that field training must be done in conjunction with responding to calls for law-enforcement service and have been in place since 1998 ever since the COT and the Board finished a three-year process of revising training standards in 1997. As a part of that revision, the number of required field training hours was increased from 60 to 100 hours.

The members of the COT then discussed the issue of how law-enforcement field training should be conducted and whether the DCJS interpretation of how field training should be conducted is consistent with the intention of the COT.

In response to questions from members of the COT, Mr. Cotter provided the following explanations:

- The reason for bringing the issue before the COT is because of confusion in the field regarding how DCJS was interpreting the law-enforcement field training requirements.
- The COT is the public body responsible for establishing the training standards for law-enforcement officers and the COT's interpretation of such standards is what is important.
- Although responding to calls for law-enforcement service is not defined in the training standards, the plain meaning of the term controls. As law-enforcement agencies that have the primary responsibility for law-enforcement functions in a jurisdiction are the agencies that receive calls for law-enforcement service, such agencies would be the ones to provide law-enforcement field training in accordance with the training standards.

Chief Wright then opened the floor to public comment on the issue of law-enforcement field training.

Several individuals voiced their disagreement with DCJS's interpretation of the lawenforcement field training requirements. The individuals expressing their opposition were Sherriff Arthur of Arlington County, Lt. John Burgess and Lt. Gelabert of the Arlington County Sheriff's Office, Sheriff Stacey Kincaid of Fairfax County, Sheriff Dana Lawhorne of Alexandria, and Mr. Ron Stanton, Director of the Central Virginia Criminal Justice Academy. In general, the individuals who disagreed with DCJS's interpretation of the law-enforcement field training requirements emphasized the scope of the field training completed by officers employed by law-enforcement agencies without primary law-enforcement authority and the difficulty such agencies would face in trying to have their officers complete law-enforcement field training at another agency. Specifically, Sheriff Kincaid stated that deputies employed by her office receive the same training as other law-enforcement officer and were performing all of the duties of a lawenforcement agency. Additionally, both Sheriff Arthur and Sheriff Lawhorne expressed that they would like there to be further discussions and a full study of the issue by the COT.

Several individuals voiced their agreement with DCJS's interpretation of the lawenforcement field training requirements. The individuals expressing their concurrence were Sheriff Brian Roberts of Brunswick County and Dana Schrad of the Virginia Association of Chiefs of Police. In general, the individuals who agreed with DCJS's interpretation of law-enforcement officer field training requirements emphasized the difference between the duties of law-enforcement officers who have primary lawenforcement functions and other officers. Specifically, Sheriff Roberts noted that jail officers can only complete 45 of the 96 law-enforcement officer field training outcomes and noted that there could be problems when a deputy transfers from one agency to another without having undergone the proper training. He also stated that the Chesapeake Sheriff's Office has an agreement with the Chesapeake Police Department to provide field training for its deputies.

In addition, Capt. Kirk Schaeffer of the Hanover County Sheriff's Office provided an overview of how Hanover provides training for its deputies who perform lawenforcement functions as well as training for its deputies who work in the jails or courtrooms.

After public comment, Chief Cervera noted that 100 hours of field training is not enough and provided examples of-law enforcement tasks that cannot be accomplished in a jail or courthouse setting.

Sheriff Crawford made a motion, seconded by Ms. Biggs, to table the issue until there is further discussion between DCJS and the sheriffs. The motion passed 7 to 5.

In response to a question from Mr. Macon about the effect of the motion, Chief Wright noted that DCJS should continue in applying its interpretation of the law-enforcement field training requirements until the COT renders a decision.

Chief Wright then suggested a small workgroup be convened to provide a recommendation on the interpretation of how law-enforcement field training is to be conducted. Chief Wright made a motion, seconded by Chief Chapman, to form a workgroup. The motion passed unanimously.

#### 6. Next Meeting.

The next meeting of the COT was not scheduled. The Board will vote on meeting dates at the upcoming meeting.

## 7. Adjournment.

Ms. Biggs made a motion, seconded by Chief Williams, to adjourn at 11:20 a.m. The motion passed unanimously.

Approved:	
	Chair
	Date