College Educational Requirements and the Impact on the Recruitment of Minority Officers

Lt. Ron Wood

Command College

Class 25

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

List of Tables ii

Introduction 1

Literature Review 1

Nominal Group Technique 19

Scenario I 24

Scenario II 27

Scenario III 28

Transition Management 30

Recommendations 34

LIST OF TABLES

Page

Trend Summary Table 21

Summary Event Table 23

Cross Impact Analysis Table 23

For much of this century there has been an ambivalent desire by various persons and groups to upgrade the quality of police officers in the United States. For many, there has been a desire to see law enforcement move from a blue collar vocation to a true profession. The effort toward professionalism for American law enforcement officers was undertaken as early as 1903 by August Vollmer (Baker 1995). However, early efforts were directed at law enforcement's officer's vocational skills. Most efforts were not really directed toward making law enforcement a profession in the traditional sense. Instead, it was a quest to improve the technical skills of law enforcement officers in order to increase their effectiveness. It was not until the formation of the Federal Bureau of Investigation that a higher education requirement for law enforcement officers was addressed. Prospective federal agents had to have not only college degrees, but advanced training as attorneys or accountants. The requirement for a college degree has become the standard for all federal law enforcement officers.

Many individuals, whether law enforcement executives or those in some way affiliated with law enforcement in some oversight or training capacity, often proudly point out the amount of training law enforcement officers undergo. In states such as California, these persons will quickly acknowledge the leadership role we enjoy in the police profession. Perhaps at this point some perspective is in order. Most police cadets receive around four hundred hours of basic training and an exceptionally well trained one will receive about eight hundred hours of basic training, and in one case, just more than thirteen hundred hours of basic training. Compare that to attorneys who receive more than nine thousand hours of instruction, doctors that receive more than eleven thousand hours, embalmers with more than five thousand hours of training or barbers with more than four thousand hours of training (Edwards 1993). Clearly in the area of education, law enforcement officers have a distance to go.

If there is ever to be a meaningful attempt to change law enforcement into a profession, everyone must have a common definition as to what defines a professional. To be a professional is not merely to be educated. The two terms are not interchangeable and a literature search for a succinct definition acceptable to everyone is destined to be frustrated (Dale 1994). Baker (1995) provided a definition that included most of the elements commonly accepted as necessary for a profession. They include:

- An organized body of knowledge based on theory;
- Advanced education;
- Ethical precepts;
- Prestige between peers and the community;
- Specific standards of admittance;
- Professional affiliation;
- A service objective.

The United States Census Bureau has adopted a broader interpretation for the persons it classifies as professionals. For their purposes, a professional is described as:

> "1. A professional is (a) one who performs advisory, administrative, or research work which is based upon the established principles of a profession or science, and which requires scientific or technical training equivalent to that represented by graduation from a college or university of recognized standing, or
>
> 2. One who performs work which is based upon science or art, and which work requires for its performance an acquaintance with the established facts, or

principles, or methods gained through academic study or through extensive practical experience, one or both."

If law enforcement has existed in this country in one form or another for more than four hundred years, why is anyone still concerned with professionalization? Certainly law enforcement has changed and will continue to change over the years as both internal and external forces act upon law enforcement agencies. As with many other occupations—such as teaching and nursing—some individuals within the field actively are working to move it from a vocation to a profession. As laudable as that vision is, there are more compelling reasons to professionalize law enforcement.

Law enforcement, as well as the rest of the world, is changing at an increasing pace and the public demands that law enforcement not only keeps up with change but anticipates change and makes accommodations for it. The public and its leaders are more apt to see that professionalization is taking place when (Bizzack 1993):

- The public has a high perception of law enforcement;
- Law enforcement officers are highly trained;
- Law enforcement officers are educated;
- Law enforcement competence is defined by professional standards;
- The professional community within law enforcement accepts only agencies that meet high standards of competence;
- Law enforcement officers are governed by standards that ensure integrity and proper conduct; and
- The primary goal of law enforcement is to serve the public interest.

Arguably the most important item of the professional qualifications is advanced education. It is from this that most of the other elements of professionalism flow. The belief that higher education is necessary for improvement and professionalization is hardly new. The Wickersham Commission in 1931 noted that increased education was a necessity for law enforcement. In the 1960's there were no less than three Presidential commissions that scrutinized law enforcement. Each of them, 1961 - The President's Commission on Civil Rights and Law Enforcement, 1967 - the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice, and 1968 - the President's Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence, spoke to the need for higher education among law enforcement officers (Brown 1974).

In the 1970's the Law Enforcement Education Program (LEEP) provided a great amount of funds for law enforcement officers to gain higher education. During this period, thousands of officers took the opportunity to earn baccalaureate degrees as well as graduate degrees. As valuable as it was, this entire effort was directed toward existing law enforcement officers. It did nothing to ensure that newly hired officers possessed any college education.

Several law enforcement executives recognized the need for better educated officers and instituted local requirements of at least some college education as a job requirement for new hires. By 1958 the San Jose Police Department required two years of college for new officers and the Oakland Police Department added the same requirement in 1960 (Moore 1972). Multnomah County, Oregon required a four-year degree in 1964, the first local law enforcement agency in the nation to do so (Men and Women of Letters 1997). January 1998, the Tulsa Police Department, which has required 108 semester units since 1981, will require officers to have a four-year degree as a term of employment, as will the Portland Police Department (Men and Women of Letters

1997). The Chicago Police Department has completely revamped its job requirements by developing a new entry level test as well as requiring applicants to be twenty-three years old and possess a college degree (New Test, Major Recruit Push Diversify Talent Pool in Chicago 1997).

At the state level, Minnesota led the way when it imposed a higher education requirement on all law enforcement applicants. The Minnesota Commission on Police Officer Standards and Training (POST) required that before an applicant may be hired by a police department that person must possess a state license. To obtain that license, an applicant must satisfy an academic and clinical (skills) requirement by:

1. Meeting the academic component of a two or four-year degree from a POST certified college or university–there are twenty in the state;
2. Attend a nine to twelve-week skills course at one of three POST approved centers; or
3. An applicant may attend one of the two colleges that supply the academic and skills requirement; and
4. The applicant must pass a state licensing examination.

Unlike in most states, the cost of this training must be borne by the applicant not the agency. Further, it is not until individuals possess a license that is good for three years that a person can work as a police officer in Minnesota. During the life of the three-year license, the license holder must complete forty-eight hours of academic and/or an agency sponsored continuing education (Men and Women of Letters 1997).

It seems obvious that many distinguished persons and commissions believe that higher education is something necessary for law enforcement officers, both present and future.

However, many law enforcement executives are openly antagonistic to increased educational requirements and professional requirements for law enforcement agencies, despite the fact that many of their command staffs are highly educated (Bizzack 1993). Apparently law enforcement officers, if not executives, have been listening, at least to some degree. In 1988 a Police Executive Research Forum (PERF) revealed that in 1970 only 14.6% of police officers had two years of college. By 1988 that number had grown to 44.7%. In Minnesota, where an educational requirement was in place during this period, 71.4% of the police officers had two years or more of college (Breci 1994).

For some, this increase in education for police officers is encouraging, but for others it is appalling. They believe that educational standards have historically been too low (Sparling 1975). Never a fan of law enforcement, the American Bar Association stated that police departments must be staffed with individuals that possess intellectual curiosity, analytical ability, and articulateness (Sparling 1975). The 1973 recommendations of the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals called for the following:

1. Every police department should immediately require thirty semester units from an accredited college or university;
2. No later than 1975, every police department should require sixty semester units;
3. No later than 1978, every police department should require ninety semester units;
4. No later than 1982, ever police department should require one hundred-twenty semester units or a baccalaureate from an accredited college or university.

As 1998 begins no such nationwide requirements exists. The 1990 Law Enforcement Management and Administration Statistics Study revealed that 96 percent of all police

departments had educational requirements, but 98 percent of that number requires only a high school equivalency. Only 6 percent of police departments require more than a high school diploma and less than one-half of 1 percent requires a four-year degree.

In its 1973 report, the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals succinctly identified a problem that still exists today when they noted (Bell 1979):

> "The recognition of the critical need for higher education for police officers as advocated by observers outside the police profession is dramatically different from the acceptance of that need by the practitioners within the police profession."

Minnesota POST, while leading the way among states for requiring higher education, stops short of requiring that applicants have a four-year degree. It supports in principle the need for officers to attain a baccalaureate degree, but it does not mandate it as a prerequisite for licensing (Breci 1994).

This lack of concern for an educational requirement beyond high school is evidenced by the International Association of Chiefs of Police's position on education as stated in their legislative recommendations to the 105th Congress. They strongly supported funding for current police officers to enhance their education as provided for by Title XX of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994. However, they take no stand on minimum education standards (New Test, Major Recruit Push Diversify Talent Pool in Chicago 1997).

This reluctance seems to be driven by several reasons. Many police executives from smaller departments worry that college requirements, even modest ones, will make it impossible to compete with larger police departments. They worry, with some justification, that they cannot match the pay and benefits package of larger departments. (Carter, Sapp, and Stephens 1988).

In some cases police executives worry that if officers are too intelligent or too highly educated they will make poor officers because they are apt to become bored with police work or they will question orders (Can You Be Too Smart To Be a Public Safety Officer? 1997). There is also concern that college educated officers will not fit in with older less educated officers, although this difference is diminishing as the general educational level of the public increases. Finally, there is belief by some that highly educated officers would not be able to cope with street level demands, that is, it takes one to know one (Sparling 1975). This type of thinking is especially unfortunate. Without overtly stating it, it presumes that law enforcement can never be considered a profession because only less intelligent working class individuals are suited for police work. It completely ignores the possibilities of what law enforcement might become in the future. It also fails to examine the historical perspective of other professions such as nursing, teaching, or attorneys and fails to observe how they have evolved into much more than they once were. This type of thinking becomes a self-fulfilling prophesy as police executives continue to find ways to lower standards for entry level police officers instead of raising them.

A substantial portion of this resistance appears to come from the inability of anyone to be able to quantify or qualify the value of higher education for police officers. Thus far, no one has been able to prove to everyone's satisfaction the benefits of increased educational levels for police officers (Bell 1979). There is a fear by many law enforcement executives that potentially "good" police officers will be dropped from consideration because they do not meet a requirement for higher education. The argument that a requirement for higher education will eliminate some good candidates that do not have the requisite amount of education is probably true. However, it is a very narrow view of the question (Carter, Sapp, and Stephens 1988).

When examining the need for police officers with higher education, the issue is not qualitative versus quantitative. A review of crime in the United States for the last fifty years reveals that police have not been able to cope with crime, much less the social problems with crime or the rapidly changing demands for police services (Bell 1979). Instead, the issue that we should be concerned with is what educated officers bring to the law enforcement.

It is a mistake to evaluate officers merely by quantitative measures. That old style of measurement leads to the belief that a "better" officer is one that makes more arrests and writes more tickets. For that paradigm, an officer with a high school education would probably be adequate, but not for the problems that faces law enforcement in the twenty-first century. Studies indicate that college educated law enforcement officers tend to be "better" not only in the conventional sense but also qualitatively. There is evidence that college educated police officers receive fewer citizens' complaints, fewer terminations, have increased performance levels and improved behavior (Schuster 1995). There are indications that when college and non college educated police officers of similar cultural background were compared, the college educated officers were less authoritarian. Overall, college educated officers were less dogmatic, had higher self-esteem, and were less punitive toward others and tended to have a higher success rate (Sparling 1975).

If these self-imposed limitations were not enough, many law enforcement executives found other reasons to back away from educational requirements for their officers. They worry about the impact of higher educational requirements on minorities and women applicants (Carter, Sapp, and Stephens 1988). The reasons for this concern vary. For some, there is legitimate belief that women and minorities are excluded from access to higher education and would then be excluded

from law enforcement because of a requirement that they could not fulfill. Other executives worry that a college requirement leaves their departments open to liability for claims of discrimination against women and minorities. Both concerns have validity.

It has been stated that "All roads in American criminology eventually lead to Race." This is true in law enforcement as well. Blacks make up 12 percent of the American population, but they have become particularly urbanized and now are a major part of the populations in all large urban areas (Walker and Brown 1995). Law enforcement must gain the acceptance of minority populations as it has never had to in the past.

Many believe educational policies toward minorities and their treatment by the educational system has long been found wanting and that condition still exists. Because of it, there have been and will be serious consequences (Altbach and Lomotey 1991). Much of the educational gains made by minorities has been lost in recent years. Beginning in the 1960's minorities began gaining ground in what had largely been a homogeneous White educational system. This growth peaked in 1985 when the largest numbers of minorities were in the higher education system. This growth was partially through gains in the numbers of Blacks in colleges and universities, but it was partially at the expense of what had traditionally been Black colleges and universities. However, since 1985 the number of minorities, with the exception of Asian students, in higher education has been dropping (Altbach and Lomotey 1991).

Asian students, both American born and foreign born, are rapidly growing in numbers within the higher educational system. They are generally ignoring the soft sciences and humanities for engineering and hard sciences. They are now a large minority in the most

prestigious and select schools. This fact is causing controversy between Asian students and other minorities (Altbach and Lomotey 1991).

Excluding Asians, there are a number of reasons for the general decline in minorities in higher education. Many critics are quick to blame what seems to be a reversal in the acceptance of affirmative action programs designed to move minorities into higher education. Altbach and Lomotey (1991) believe that for the first time in several years "subtle" racism has become more acceptable. It seems to them that it takes the form of White voiced resentment about special programs for minorities in higher education and against affirmative action. Without question the alteration or elimination of affirmative action programs will effect the number of minority college applicants, but largely the impact will be at the most select and sought after schools, not second and third tier colleges and universities and certainly not at two-year colleges (Browne-Miller 1966).

The problem begins long before minorities or women attempt to enter college. By age eight or nine Black students are twice as likely as White students to be two grades behind in school. By age sixteen Black students are three times as likely to be two grades or more behind White students. Unfortunately Black students often lack the role models to inspire success in elementary and secondary education. About 30 percent of all Black students have at least one parent that did not finish high school (George 1993).

Minority students leak out of the educational system at several points along the way. The first point is at the completion of high school. The demographics of students graduating from high school have been changing for over one-hundred years. In 1890, seventeen-year-olds were only 2 percent of the population and few graduated from high school. By 1930, seventeen-year-

olds were 30 percent of the population and by 1940, 50 percent of all seventeen-year-olds graduated from high school. By 1960, 75 percent of all seventeen-year-olds graduated from high school, but in 1980 it had dropped to 71.8 percent (Altbach and Lomotey 1991).

By 1995, one-half million of the high school students enrolled in 1994 had dropped out of school by October 1995. Hispanic students are the most likely to leave at a 37 percent dropout rate. Black students are next most likely with a 15 percent dropout rate closely followed by Whites with a 10 percent dropout rate. The gap between Whites and Blacks has been slowly closing and continues to do so (National Center for Education Statistics 1995).

Although the number of Black students finishing high school is approaching the same percent as White students, they continue to leak out of the educational system after graduation from high school. Once in college, most minority groups experience a lower retention and graduation rate than Asian or White students (Carter and Sapp 1992). The dropout rate from college is substantially higher for Black students than White students and it is higher for Hispanic students than Black students. Black students have a college dropout rate that is two-thirds higher than White students. The Hispanic student dropout rate is two-thirds higher than Black students and three times higher than White students (Justiz, Wilson, and Bjork Ed.s 1994).

The reasons for this phenomenon are varied and complex. Often there has been inadequate preparation by the student and the high school the student attended. Also, minority students often graduate from high school with an unrealistic expectation of higher education. They enter college with poor study habits, expecting college to simply be nothing more than an extension of high school. Once there, they learn that it requires more study and self-discipline that is lacking in many students of color because of poor habits learned in high school. A commonly

found reason for poor retention in college is that too many students of color have been heavily recruited by colleges only to feel abandoned once they are in the college system. They are made to feel special during the recruitment process only to find they are lost in the crowd when they arrive at college. Often they find they are very much in the minority on the campus and feel more alone with no one to turn to for guidance. Commonly there is a gender imbalance. There are generally far more women of color in college than men of color. If the women wish to date only within their own race, they are left in a social vacuum at a time and place in their lives where the majority around them is experiencing a rich social life. They leave college because they are lonely (Johnson and Ottens (Ed.s.) 1996)

The evidence seems clear, although it varies with different groups, most minorities are to some degree disproportionately disadvantaged with regard to higher education. How much they are impacted varies with the group, the individual, and their personal history. Without a doubt, a requirement for higher education for entry level officers is a discriminatory requirement. It discriminates against all males regardless of their race or ethnicity as well as females regardless of their race or ethnicity.

Since it has been shown that an educational requirement does disproportionally impact a race or ethnic group–that is, it discriminates–does that mean that we in law enforcement should abandon the quest for professionalism through higher education? Not at all. Certainly there are law enforcement agencies that have and are currently elevating their educational requirements for new officers and officers seeking promotion. However, higher education requirements cannot be imposed by executive fiat. In this area as in most things in the personnel area there are procedures to follow and regulations to be met. Failure to do so will certainly lead to a court

challenge by any number of groups that have political agendas that are threatened by higher education requirements for those seeking entry or promotion in law enforcement. We must be aware that policing takes place in an economic and political context and is often governed by individual perceptions of the parties involved. Accusations of bias, prejudice and unequal treatment emerge from the perceptions of these relationships (Lumb 1995).

Many law enforcement executives worry that a firm higher educational requirement is a violation of Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and of the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission (EEOC) guidelines. Each of those are things that must be heeded but they are not absolutes nor are they bars to doing business in an efficient or effective manner.

The law recognizes that employers must have ways to select the best employees for hire. However, the federal government and the courts have taken great pains to ensure that testing and job requirements are job-related. If they are not, they may be discriminatory. Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act allows for the use of ability and aptitude tests for employment decisions if there is no intent to discriminate (Pynes 1994). The EEOC Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures hold the fundamental principle that if employer practices and procedures have an adverse impact on the hiring and promotion of members of minority groups, they are considered illegal under Title VII (Felkenes and Unsinger 1992). In 1971 the EEOC, the Civil service Commission, the Department of Labor and the Department of Justice adopted the Uniform guide on Employment Selection Procedures. The Uniform Guidelines held that if the passing rate for any group was less than 80 percent of the passing rate for the highest passing group, a disparate impact is demonstrated (Pynes 1994).

Never one to be left out of a chance to muddy the waters the U.S. Supreme Court entered the fray early on. In Griggs v. Duke Power Company (1971) they ruled that it was not enough that a practice was not intentionally discriminatory. Even if the practice was fair in form but had the effect of being discriminatory, the practice was illegal. It was this case decision from which most of the early challenges to job testing and requirements flowed.

For law enforcement, the big test for educational requirements came in 1979 when Davis v. City of Dallas was tried in the Federal Court for the Northern District of Texas. In this case Davis lost in his contention that the forty-five college units that Dallas Police Department required for employment were on its face discriminatory against minorities because they have not had an equal chance at higher education. An important assertion in the case was that college education requirements constituted discriminatory selection in police hiring. In 1985 the case went to the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals, where the Court had interesting things to say about law enforcement and the need for higher education.

The test was if the college education constituted a business necessity. If the requirement for college education could not be shown to be related to job performance then it was illegal. This could have been a major sticking point for the City of Dallas. Studies about the effect of college education on job performance have been inconsistent. It is general thought by those that recommend higher education as a requirement for police employment that it makes for better officers. That belief seems to rest on the faith that education makes one a better person but supporters are unable to offer quantitative proof. The belief rests on the principal of vicarious learning, which is in contrast to the belief by many in law enforcement that one must personally experience something to learn it (Palombo 1995).

Researchers have attempted to validate the need for a college requirement by using empirical or criterion validation–improvement in specific performance tasks by increasing the level of college education. Other researchers have used content validation–the relationship between the level of education and tasks to be performed successfully on the job. A third approach has been a blend of criterion, content and a construct validation–an example would be an examination of the relationship between higher education and the overall performance during academy training. The level of performance during academy training is thought by some to be a valid indicator of future job performance (Palombo 1995).

These three validation concepts are important because the EEOC has adopted these requirements for the employer to use in the validation of job requirements. The concepts were developed for the EEOC by the American Psychiatric Association and while the interpretations are not necessarily mandatory, they are viewed with a great deal of weight (Carter, Sapp, and Stephens 1988). The EEOC has noted or applied them in various federal hiring standard cases (Palombo 1995).

In Davis v. City of Dallas, the department acknowledged that Black applicants were statistically significantly disparately impacted by the educational requirement. However, they contended that the issue was one of professionalism (Carter, Sapp, and Stephens 1988). The 5th Circuit Court agreed. The Court noted that police officers hold a position that is unique with respect to the public risk and responsibility. Therefore, higher standards of qualification can be established as job related because decision making requires the added dimension of judgement. They said:

> "The position of the police officer is unlike those of vocational skills and labor positions. We regard this distinction as critical and (that the) educational requirement bears a manifest relationship to the position of police officer." (Davis v. City of Dallas, 777 F.2d. 205 (5th Cir. 1985) at 2/1)

In reaching this determination, the Fifth Circuit Court looked to other significant court cases that supported the need for education for police officers and the uniqueness of their position in society. The belief that an educational requirement cannot be quantitatively validated was held in Arnold v. Ballard (1975). There the court noted that while educational requirements might be somewhat arbitrary in nature, they indicate accomplishment and ability which are necessary for police officers. In Rice v. City of St. Louis (1978) the court supported conceptual arguments for higher education. They agreed that higher education is not absolutely indicative of success but agreed that the requirement was job related. Later in 1978, Lightfoot v. Trustees of Prince George Community College (1978) was decided along the same lines as Rice. Aguilera v. Cook County Police and Corrections Board (1984) found there was a substantial similarity between police and correctional officers. The court supported the notion that an "educated" person is afforded added judgement in making discretionary decisions.

The Davis decision did not do away with the need to validate job related requirements for law enforcement that were in place under Griggs and the EEOC's guidelines. It did however change two requirements for law enforcement. It allowed the validation process to be accomplished through qualitative or content means. It also acknowledged that because of the public risk and responsibility factors, the burden is lighter for law enforcement in establishing job-relatedness of the educational requirement for police officers.

When a department is contemplating increasing educational requirements but is hesitant it should take note of what is happening in society. Overall, the absolute number of people in the general population with some higher education is growing. In spite of this, the percentages in all groups, except Asians and women, that are attending college are dropping. With regard to the level of education of police officers or the incidence of minorities and women on police departments, percentages tend to reflect the general population. Educationally, the average amount for law enforcement officers is growing. Women police officers are in better shape educationally than their male counterparts, averaging one full year more of education. The educational level of police officers by gender is (Carter, Sapp, and Stephens 1988):

	Men	Women
Mean Years of Education	13.6	14.6
No College	34.8%	24.1%
Some College	61.7%	45.7%
Graduate Degree	3.3%	30.2%

Although there are still conflicting opinions as to how closely the racial/ethnic make-up of a police force should mirror the specific communities they serve, minority officers are drawing close to the racial distribution of the general population. If we are to continue to close this gap and improve the quality of law enforcement officers and move toward true professionalism we must have a plan.

Nominal Group Technique

Because of the subject I chose a panel that was composed of minorities and women. It consisted of a Black male lieutenant that has a Masters in Public Administration and Juris Doctorate degree; a Black male sergeant that has a Masters in Public Administration; a male

Hispanic sergeant with a Baccalaureate degree; a Black female detective with a Baccalaureate degree; a White female sergeant with a Baccalaureate degree and with work in progress toward her Masters in Business Administration; and a civilian Black female supervisor with a Masters in Public Administration. Educationally, this group was not representative of their racial groups or of the educational level of police officers in general because they were as a group higher educated than the majority of their peers. However, because of their membership in protected classes, their achievements in higher education, and positions of leadership both within the police department and the community, they were qualified to sit on a panel that looked at the impact on minorities if the entry level educational requirements for police officers were increased. One half of the members has obtained a four-year degree before joining the police department and in some cases completed graduate degree while employed by the Inglewood Police Department. The other members completed their degree after their employment, but they had differing numbers of college semester hours when they were hired.

Before beginning the process, each of the panel members received a packet the day before the Nominal Group Technique (NGT) took place that explained the process. The cover sheet for the packet included the issue that we were going to discuss, **Will Increased Minimum Educational Requirements Have an Impact on Minority and Women Recruitment by the Year 2007**. The packet included working definitions for the terms we would be using during the NGT. The definitions included those for police professionalism, trends, events, and trend driven events. As part of the packet, panel members received a copy of the NGT format so that they understood the basics of the process.

At the beginning of the NGT the issue was again explained to the panel members. The facilitator clarified his role in the process and again explained the working definitions.

The NGT process began by having the NGT panel members identify trends they believed would impact the issue. Panel members took about twenty minutes writing trends. Once they finished, the trends were displayed on an easel pad for each to consider. This allowed panel members to visualize all of the trends identified by the panel. The group was able to identify seventeen trends and then prioritize to arrive at seven trends they thought important enough to be considered in this exercise.

A problem that appeared during the trend analysis portion and continued somewhat during events analysis was the inability of some of the panel members to stay focused on the issue. It might have been because of the somewhat emotional nature of the topic or the group's racial and ethnic composition, but two individuals continued to try to introduce trends and events that, while important in the area of race relations, had nothing to do with the topic at hand.

Overall, the biggest problem was with time management. The subject proved too rich with areas to speculate upon. It was difficult to move things along and to stay within the time we had—we spent four hours—and yet not shut the group down when they were making solid progress.

Trends that were identified:

1. Vacancies due to market competition for educated minorities.
2. College enrollment because of anti-affirmative action laws.
3. Reliance on standardized tests for entry into college.
4. Level of exposure to law enforcement career opportunities in inner city schools.

5. Impressions of law enforcement by educated minorities.

6. Pay differentials between officers with higher education and less educated officers.

7. Necessary computer skills for higher educational opportunities for minorities.

Trend Summary Table

	-5 years	Today	+5 years	+10 years	Concern (1-10)
Trend 1	-62	100	26	11.6	9
Trend 2	81	100	52	19	9
Trend 3	-51	100	33	13	4
Trend 4	-40	100	3	9	7
Trend 5	51	100	-40	-12	5
Trend 6	-39	100	32	27	2
Trend 7	-69	100	17	-2	4

Events that were identified:

1. State and Federal Governments cut funding by half to state colleges.

2. One time Federal subsidy for students that enter law enforcement.

3. California legislature gives free education to all students that maintain a "C" average.

4. A downsized military releases thousands of educated minority commissioned officers into the work pool with preferences for public service.

5. Introduction of a four-year police college.

6. Forced Regionalization of police forces.

Summary Event Table

	Year 0	Plus 5 years	Plus 10 years	Impact	Concern Priorities
Event 1	0	25%	35%	Negative	7
Event 2	0	20%	30%	Positive	5
Event 3	0	25%	32%	Positive	5
Event 4	0	20%	20%	Negative	6
Event 5	0	5%	7%	Positive	4
Event 6	0	2%	5%	Positive	2

Cross Impact Analysis

	Trend 1			Trend 2			Trend 3			Trend 4		
Event 1	Y	50	Neg	Y	75	Neg	Y	25	Neg	N	NA	NA
Event 2	N	NA	NA	Y	35	Neg	Y	20	Neg	Y	30	Neg
Event 3	Y	60	Pos	Y	20	Pos	Y	45	Pos	N	NA	NA
Event 4	Y	80	Pos	N	NA	NA	N	NA	NA	N	NA	NA
Event 5	Y	100	Pos	Y	25	Pos	N	NA	NA	Y	30	Pos
Event 6	N	NA	NA	N	NA	NA	N	NA	NA	N	NA	NA

	Trend 5			Trend 6			Trend 7		
Event 1	Y	33%	Neg	N	NA	NA	Y	40%	Neg
Event 2	Y	25%	Pos	Y	10%	Neg	N	NA	NA
Event 3	Y	45%	Pos	Y	23%	Neg	N	NA	NA
Event 4	Y	10%	Neg	Y	20%	Neg	N	NA	NA
Event 5	Y	60%	Pos	Y	20%	Neg	Y	25%	Neg
Event 6	N	NA	NA	N	NA	NA	N	NA	NA

Surprisingly, the panel did not think that the requirement for higher education would have much of an effect on women. In that respect, they somewhat agreed with the literature. Women are attending college at a rate almost equal to men and are more likely to graduate than men. Additionally, the pay and benefits for law enforcement places it well ahead of some traditional professions–such as nursing and education–women enter upon college graduation. The Census Bureau listed a degree in law enforcement as the fifth most lucrative degree field with an average monthly income of $2331 as compared to a nursing degree valued at $2080 or education at $1699 (Average Monthly Earnings by Field of Degree 1993).

The panel saw a somewhat different outcome for minority males. If law enforcement excluded minority males with little or no college because of a requirement for two or four-year degrees then law enforcement would find a drastically reduced labor pool. The panel concluded that law enforcement would then have to compete with private enterprise for the more highly educated minorities. Further, because of the traditional distrust found in many minority communities toward law enforcement and better compensation packages, minority workers would generally rather work in the private sector.

Scenarios

The panel by virtue of their insight generated several ideals that were developed into scenarios.

Scenario 1

In a step characterized by many as "unusual leadership," the Governor signed a bill that took the first step in moving law enforcement from what many call a vocation to a profession. The new law, similar to the Minnesota Model, would require all law enforcement officers to have at least sixty units of college education with a grade of "C" as a requirement for employment.

Unlike the Minnesota model, after five years that requirement would increase to a four-year degree.

This step removes from local control the objections that have been presented for years as reasons to retain the requirement for only a high school education. Many of the arguments have been political objections that have been grounded in local control issues.

While this new requirement removes the ability of local governments to set minimum education standards, there are also many cost benefits to those entities. No longer is there a need to provide educational incentives to attract officers with college educations or to encourage serving officers to upgrade their educations. It also removes the problem that many jurisdictions have faced as they tried maintaining staffing levels while providing flexible schedules to officers that were trying to earn college units.

For some smaller jurisdictions increased educational requirements is likely to put the local police department out of business. Unable to provide pay and benefits packages sufficient to attract a qualified labor pool they would be forced to turn to contract law enforcement. This promises to be a boon to some sheriff's departments as they must grow to provide contract law enforcement to smaller cities within their counties.

This new requirement also offers some interesting challenges for colleges. In order to attract students that are considering entry into law enforcement, many universities are considering new programs fitted to the needs of these individuals. Proposed is a program that would combine both a degree program with a basic police academy to meet the Peace Officer Standards and Training education requirements that are already in place. The program would resemble the

ROTC program used by the armed forces to train new officers. Minority training by local jurisdictions would then bring new law enforcement officers up to speed.

This competition among colleges is intensified by the opening of California State University Pacoima. This pilot university is the first four-year police college in the nation. It will be similar to police colleges found in Europe. Although other colleges and universities offer law enforcement or administration of justice majors, CSUP is the first university specifically dedicated to the study of all aspects of law enforcement studies.

Upon entering the program undergraduate students would be required to meet all POST minimum requirements for entry into law enforcement except skills and education. Besides completing a degree program, the program would provide police academy skills training to students desiring to enter a law enforcement major. Naturally, students with majors such as forensics would not be held to such rigid standards, and they could not become sworn police officers upon graduation. But for those elite students that chose to become law enforcement officers, graduation from the four-year program would give the students preferential entry into a California law enforcement agency.

This new educational requirement for peace officers as well as the police college is widely hailed as a step in the right direction to curb many of the law enforcement abuses that some groups believe occur because law enforcement officers lack the education necessary to bring them to a professional standard.

Scenario 2

As the armed forces continued the reduction in strength forced upon them by an increasingly out-of-touch Congress, what to do with the thousands of personnel released from the service becomes increasingly urgent. An idea rapidly gaining favor is the absorption of these men and women by public safety agencies.

It has been noted that these military personnel are highly trained and in many cases have received superior educations from armed forces educational programs. This is especially true of the junior company grade officers that will be the first to be released by the upcoming reduction in force. Most of the officers already possess some college education, and many have undergraduate and graduate degrees. The same is true of many of the enlisted personnel and noncommissioned officers.

The proposed hiring preferences are truly preferential in nature, not the addition of five or ten points for veterans. They would have a profound effect on the hiring practices of law enforcement agencies across the nation. If qualified, the veteran would go to the head of any hiring list. This would have far reaching effects on the hiring of women, minorities, consent decrees that are in effect as well as the long time effort to upgrade educational requirements for law enforcement officers.

With the influx of mature educated military personnel the need for mandatory educational requirements would become less important for the immediate future. This would be a moderate setback for proponents of professionalization that believe that higher education for law enforcement officers is indispensable. With more educated personnel waiting in the wings, some critics believe there would not be the need to mandate increased educational requirements. As

many law enforcement executives and politicians believe, there is no need to limit the applicant pool because of educational requirements. They insist that since the educational levels of officers are rising without increased requirements, why fix it if it isn't broken.

However, it would not be as damaging to the professionalization movement as an outright abandonment of the concept. Although the military will release several thousand officers and men in a relatively short time, most of them will not opt for law enforcement. The glut of candidates with higher education will quickly flatten out. Within just a couple of years this number will dwindle to a trickle leaving law enforcement officials with the same problems that they currently face.

Scenario 3

In a rare showing of cooperation, police unions, police executives, and community activists successfully defeated a bill that would have increased the minimum education requirements for individuals to become law enforcement officers. This objection seems curiously at odds with the stated desire of all three groups to increase the quality and professionalism of law enforcement officers.

The bill would have immediately increased education requirements from a high school diploma to sixty college units. Within five years the requirement for entry into law enforcement would have been increased to a bachelor's degree. Another portion of the bill that was adamantly opposed was the requirement that officers and supervisors undertake continuing education and take periodic certification tests. The certification tests would have been designed to ensure that officers and supervisors remained current with developments in their profession.

One union official claimed that it has never been shown that college educated officers were better officers than those without college. The official believed that elitists in academia created such a requirement and would create an elitist group of law enforcement officers. The difference would be magnified as officers with college educations began working with officers that entered the profession with less education.

The police unions also said that the proposed certification testing was unnecessary and demeaning to their membership. "Our officers prove their qualification daily in the life and death environment in which they are forced to work," claimed one official, "To force them to prove it in the classroom and the streets is an insult."

Police executives, whom it seems would benefit most from better educated officers, opposed the bill for different reasons. Fearing the continued loss of home control to the Peace Officer Standards and Training Commission, local politicians and law enforcement executives strongly fought a state-mandated increase of entry-level education requirements.

Law enforcement executives as a group believed that they would not be losing the benefit of better educated officers, but that they would lose the flexibility to decide what type of person was best suited for employment at individual agencies. A spokesman for the group pointed out that the education level for police officers, as for the public overall, has been growing for years. He noted that the current education level for police officers was equal to a college sophomore. If they were getting better educated officers without increasing the education requirements, then there was no reason to limit the applicant pool by raising the level.

Finally, many community activists openly stated they believed the bill was a thinly veiled attempt to wipe out the gains made by women and minorities in gaining entry into law

enforcement. While they agreed that education was a good thing for law enforcement officers to have, they insisted that inequities in the educational system would limit the number of minority applicants that could meet the educational requirements. Minority candidates would be excluded from consideration before they had achieved equality in the field.

Transition Management

Why Change?

While some areas of law enforcement have changed so rapidly, in others it has dragged its feet. It seems clear that for some in local and state arenas of both politics and law enforcement the change to a requirement for increased educational requirements in law enforcement is threatening. If the requirements were raised for the entry level officers, then certainly those in leadership positions must also rise at least to that level and probably above it. Even if they support an increased educational requirement there are sure to be political and administrative battles to be fought in order to justify the need for higher education for law enforcement officers. Perhaps persons in leadership positions are more uncomfortable with change and challenge than they are with the problems that lack of change is certain to bring.

As many try to shrink from requirements for higher education, many reasons have been given for not making the change. Some feel that it will remove qualified "good" people from the applicant pool. The same argument can be made for medical school, but no one seems to resist the notion that more education generally makes for better doctors. On a lesser level the same holds true whether with nurses, educators, or social workers and a host of other social service professions. In those fields no one argues that the requirement for a college education lessens the potential applicant pool. Where they differ with most law enforcement agencies is they

acknowledge and embrace that without education there is no substantive growth in their professions. They have realized that they must be more than just technically proficient to bring depth of purpose and understanding to their clients.

In the last twenty years the same tired old argument–we will lose good people–has been fortified with a new weapon, the assertion that educational requirements are discriminatory. Without question educational requirements eliminate many people from consideration that might make good police officers in most areas of endeavor. Also without question a college education will not assure that a person has the potential to be a "good" police officer. All of society is losing "good" people as they leak out of the educational system at various points. It seems clear that the educational system is failing many groups in many areas, not just where minorities are concerned. We must do something to remedy that problem as well as other related social ills. However, law enforcement cannot stand still to wait for the rest of society to improve. Law enforcement must lead not follow.

No longer can we refuse to believe that persons with a higher education are in general broader in their approach to life. They have demonstrated a willingness to stick with difficult tasks. They have been exposed vicariously to a multitude of opinions, points of views, and disciplines. They tended to be less dogmatic, showed less negative self-esteem, and expressed less punitive attitudes toward others. We in law enforcement must ask ourselves how in the waning years of the twentieth century can we in law enforcement still argue that persons with higher education–those in the upper quadrant of society–can not help deal with the chaos of an ever faster changing society? Like it or not, law enforcement has become an element heavily involved in social change, and often as an unwilling follower not a leader. As such, law

enforcement can never be at the forefront of change if it continues to be dragged by societal changes.

The Present

As law enforcement stands today pitifully few local agencies require any college semester hours and even fewer require a four-year degree. This is despite the fact that within the country's population there are more individuals that have attended at least some college than at any time in our country's history. This has been fortunate for law enforcement because of trickle-down. The educational level of its officers has been creeping up along with the general population's. However, if we in law enforcement just follow trends, what will we do if the educational level of the general population drops? At what educational level do we refuse to sink below?

In the future law enforcement officers must be better educated, without formal education law enforcement can never truly become a profession. This fact seems abundantly clear to the various commissions that have studied law enforcement that this is a fundamental need. It is also clear to researchers that have studied law enforcement and it relationship to the communities it serves. They certainly believe that formally educated officers bring intangible qualities to the profession. It seems oblivious to observers outside of law enforcement and to many within law enforcement that overall, formally educated officers are better officers in areas other than the traditional "hook and book" mentality. That means increasing the educational requirement for entry into law enforcement with an ultimate goal of all officers having a college degree.

For law enforcement to become a profession and meet the demands of the new millennia, officers will have to have a higher level of formal education. To achieve this, the educational requirement for entry level officers must be raised, with the ultimate goal being that all officers

have a college education. A higher entry level of education in the future will means that law enforcement leaders will need at least a four-year degree to be first line supervisors and nothing short of a graduate degree should be accepted for middle managers and executives.

However, the reality for law enforcement agencies now and in the future is one of interrelated issues. Law enforcement agencies must move from the present in which nothing more is expected in the area of education than for police officers to attain a high school equivalency to one where officers are college educated. To do this, law enforcement officials must take a realistic approach because they cannot act as if they were unaffected by the societal environment in which they exist.

While is it desirable to increase the educational level of all law enforcement officers it cannot be done over night. Law enforcement agencies are expected to reflect the communities that the serve in terms of demographics, gender balance and community concerns. This is made more difficult because opinions as to what it means to "reflect the community" differ so greatly. To many it may mean that the percentage of each minority group in a specific community must be replicated within the agency. At the same time, court decisions that recognize that despite legal boundaries, in many metropolitan areas such demographic distinctions are blurred at best. The courts have complicated narrowly drawn definitions as court decisions have broaden requirements to include surrounding geographic areas (Hammond v. Barry 1987).

Regardless of the definitions used or percentages established, law enforcement agencies must take steps to see that women and minorities are not excluded whether inadvertently or by design. As law enforcement requires its officers to have college education efforts must be taken

to see that college educated minorities and women are actively recruited and educated about the challenges and benefits of a career in law enforcement.

Recommendations

Law enforcement must evolve into a true profession, society is changing too much for it to remain as a vocation with a "hook and book" mentality. The first step toward that goal is to raise the educational standards of the members. And it must be remembered that educational requirements are discriminatory, as are all job or professional requirements. They are designed to insure that the best qualified persons are accepted into the job or profession. What must be upper most in importance is that these discriminatory qualifications be legitimately related to the job and in no way designed, intentionally or de facto, to exclude anyone because of race, gender, or ethnicity.

As law enforcement executives attempt to upgrade the educational requirements for their agencies they must first prepare to face challenges from several directions. It is almost an axiom that people resist change. It is probably more correct to state that people resist change if they cannot see how it is in their best interest to change. That will be the true test of leadership. The visionary must be able to share the vision with others and convince them it is in their best interest to change from the status quo.

Chief executives must realize that the impact of upgrading educational requirements will be far reaching and effect more than the officers. It will at a minimum effect the community at large. As a practical matter, chief executives that decide to raise educational minimums should know that they will be not be able to do so without arriving at some type of consensus with internal and external stakeholders. It is conceivable that internal agreements will have to be

reached with labor organizations and the agencies' governing body such as a mayor and city counsel. Externally, there are also community groups to consider. Many community groups and political activists have political agendas that include increasing the statistical percentage of various minorities, ethnic groups, genders or sexual preferences. A chief executive and command staff must be able to convince these groups that an increased educational requirement would not adversely impact a specific group but instead would benefit everyone in the long run. That need for consensus building would be eliminated if a statewide educational upgrade is legislated, the implications could be much broader.

If a modest increase in educational requirements to sixty semester units — two years of college or an AA degree — is mandated by the state, it would have less of an impact on any agency since there are a large number of community colleges throughout the state to meet the educational needs of potential applicants. However, a requirement for a four-year degree could severely negatively impact small departments. Leaders of small departments could possibly not afford to compete with salary and benefits offered by larger agencies. It might be very difficult to attract college graduates to law enforcement jobs that offer little opportunity for advancement. If small departments could not meet a state educational mandate they might be forced to disband in favor of a contract law enforcement arrangement or be absorbed by the county sheriff's department. Leadership of the local agency and the sheriff's department would be faced with new problems not directly related to educational requirements but arising because of them.

However, for larger departments and those in urban areas, law enforcement leaders as well as local elected officials could compete on a more even footing. With higher education being a

state-mandated requirement there would be no need to continue paying educational incentives to encourage officers to increase their educations.

Assuming the decision to increase educational requirements is made on a local basis, it must be decided by how much to raise them. The step from requiring a high school diploma to a college degree is probably too large an initial step. It makes far greater sense to establish a time line where both the educational requirements for applicants will increase and the educational requirements for officer promotion will also increase at least as fast, if not faster. This first step takes vision and a long term commitment by members of the organization. In this day of transient chief executives it is probable that the person that started such a project will have moved on before it is finished. Therefore it is imperative that supervision and command staff alike become vested in the program.

Before the requirement for higher education is put into place, an agency must develop an educational policy (Carter and Sapp 1992). This area must be carefully thought out if law enforcement executives are to minimize any adverse effect on minority applicants. Law enforcement agencies are bound by EEOC guidelines. Agencies must comply with EEOC guidelines to the extent that the courts have modified the burden of compliance for law enforcement agencies. The development of an educational policy allows an agency to do a great deal of self reflection. An agency must give thought to community needs and the available human resources. The failure to develop an educational policy places the agency at risk for a legal challenge to the policy.

It does not matter what the specifics of the educational policy are, but the policy must define a college education as a bona fide occupational qualification. The bona fide occupational

qualification will allow agencies to meet the balancing test between the qualitative and quantitative validation tests for the educational requirement.

Once an educational requirement is in place the challenge remains to attract applicants, and minimize the impact of the requirement on women and minorities. Especially challenging is the effort to recruit educationally qualified women and minorities. With an admittedly smaller pool of qualified candidates to draw from recruiting must be aggressive and innovative. When planing recruitment strategies chief executives must keep several things in mind. Court decisions as well as California's Proposition 209 have severely narrowed the venues in which race/gender-conscious practice can survive a constitutional challenge. Proposition 209 bans the use of race or gender as a condition of employment much as Title VII did in 1964 before federal court decisions altered the language and intent of the legislation. Besides Proposition 209 in California, recent federal court decisions require that race/gender-conscious programs be "narrowly tailored." Before a program can be adopted, it must survive several tests (Cohn 1996):

1. Were race-neutral alternatives considered before adopting race-conscious measures;
2. Was the adopted race-conscious measure flexible and of limited duration;
3. Were any numerical goals related to the appropriate labor market; and
4. Were the race-conscious measures a burden to third parties?

When forming the recruiting team, agency executives must identify how they are attempting to diversify their agencies. Although many are encompassed by the term minority, minority groups are not interchangeable. Each has have different needs and concerns. Recruiters representing specific groups may be needed. The Tucson Police Department found that

recruitment of Black and Hispanic officers increased dramatically when they appointed recruiters of the racial or ethnic group they were seeking (Grant, Miline, and White 1975).

Before recruiting begins there should be an action plan which defines goals and objects, time lines for recruiting efforts, budgets, and recruiting accountability (Schuster 1995). Additionally, the local political climate and community economic conditions must be factored into any planning.

Planners must identify what has been missing from previous recruiting efforts. Perhaps an agency must form a partnership in various academic programs with a college to help minority students decide on law enforcement as a viable career path. Above all, recruiters must be inventive. They must look where they have not looked before to broaden the applicant pool. In a previously mentioned scenario it was noted that the military will soon have a large reduction in force. All military bases have personnel offices charged with the legal responsibility to assist departing service personnel with transitioning into civilian life. The police recruiters or a coalition of recruiters from smaller agencies can arrange the first interviews with the soon-to-be civilians. By going to the source recruiters will have access to highly educated minority personnel. Other equally innovative options must be identified and explored.

Finally, a through search for educationally qualified women and minorities takes a committed effort and that takes time. It has been estimated that it takes one to one-and-a-half months longer to find educationally qualified women and minorities than it does comparably qualified male White candidates. It will not be enough for recruiters to place ads in minority newspapers and radio stations. While that should be done, it is not enough and is being done by every other police department that is seeking a larger share of a limited labor pool.

For law enforcement the times are not changing, they have changed. It seems that daily there is new legislation or court decisions that remove yet another bit of law enforcement's discretion and the ability to shape it's own destiny. Doubtlessly this is because we on the inside have refused to listen to what those on the outside have been telling us. This refusal to learn has led to numerous lost lawsuits and consent decrees that mandate unrealistic conditions for law enforcement agencies that are often impossible to meet. Perhaps if we in law enforcement would listen to those on the outside trying to give guidance on the matter of education for our perspective officers and approach it with right intentions we can be inclusive of women and minorities and have minimal impact on their chances of joining the law enforcement community.

References

Books

Altbach, Philip and Lomotey, Kofi 1991. The Racial Crisis in American Higher Education. Albany: State of New York Press.

Baker, Stephen. 1995. Effects of Law Enforcement Accreditation. Westport: Praeger Publishers.

Barr, Michael. ed. 1996. Leveling the Playing Field: Promoting Academic Success for Students of Color. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Bizzack, John. 1993. Professionalism and Law Enforcement Accreditation: The First Ten Years. Lexington: Autumn House Publishing.

Browne-Miller, Angela. 1996. Shameful Admissions: The Losing Battle to Serve Everyone in Our Universities. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc..

Dunham, Roger and Geoffery, Alpert. 1997. Critical Issues in Policing: Contemporary Readings. 3rd. Ed. Prospect Heights, Illinois: Waveland Press, Inc..

Felkenes, George and Unsinger, Peter. 1992. Diversity, Affirmative Action and Law Enforcement. Springfield: Thomas Books.

George, J. Carroll. 1993. The Black Male Crisis. Cincinnati: Zulema Enterprises.

Justiz, Manuel, Wilson, Reginald, and Bjork, Lars. ed.s. 1994. Minorities in Higher Education. Phoenix: Oryx Press.

Leong, Fedrick. 1995. Career Development and Vocational Behavior of Racial and Ethnic Minorities. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Moore, Harry. 1972. Critical Issues in Law Enforcement. Prospect Heights, Illinois: Waveland Press, Inc.

Morton, Bard, Shellow, Robert (Ed.s). Issues in Law Enforcement, Reston Publishing Company, Reston, VA,

Palombo, Bernadette. 1995. Academic Professionalism in Law Enforcement. New York: Garland Publishing.

Saunders, C. (1970). Upgrading the American Police. Washington D.C.: The Brookings Institute.

Shusta, Robert, Levine, Deena, Harris, Philip, and Wong, Herbert Ed.s. 1995. Multicultural Law Enforcement. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Journals

Bell, Daniel. 1979. The Police Role and Higher Education. Journal of Police Science and Administration: 7(April): 467-475.

Brown, Lee. 1974. The Police and Higher Education: The Challenge of the Times. Criminology: 12(January): 114-124.

Carter, David, Sapp, Allen, & Stephens, Darrel. 1988. Higher Education as a Bona Fide Occupational Qualification (BFOQ) for Police: A Blueprint: American Journal of Police: 7 (February), 1-27.

Dale, Allen. 1994. Professionalism and the Police: The Police Journal: July, 209-217.

Dalley, A. F. 1972. University vs. Non-university Graduated Policeman: A Study of Police Attitudes. Journal of Police Science and Administration: 3 (April): 458-468.

Donahue, Michael. 1992. Crisis in Police Ethics: Is Professionalization an Answer. American Journal of Police: 11 (April): 47-70.

Edwards, Terry. 1993. State Police Basic Training Programs: An Assessment of Course Content and instructional Methodology. American Journal of Police: 12 (April), 23-45.

Grant, Robert, Miline, Richard, and White, Kenneth. 1975. Minority recruitment: The Tucson Police Experience: Journal of Police Science and Administration: 3 (February): 197-201.

Lumb, Richard. 1995. Policing Culturally Diverse Groups: Continuing Professional Development Programs for Police. Police Studies: 18 (January): 23-43.

Sparling, Cynthia. 1975. The Use of Educational Standards as Selection Criteria in Police Agencies: A Review: Journal of Police Science and Administration 3(March): 332-335.

Pynes, Joan. 1994. Police Officer Selection Procedures: Speculation for the Future. American Journal of Police: 13 (Feburary): 103-107.

Polk, O. Elmer. 1995. The Effects of Ethnicity on Career Paths of Advanced/Specialized Law Enforcement Officers. Polices Studies: 18(January): 1-22.

Walker, Samuel and Brown, Molly. 1995. A Pale Reflection of Reality: The Neglect of Racial and Ethic Minorities in Introductory Criminal Justice Textbooks. Journal of Criminal Justice Education: 6 (January): 61-77.

Winters, C. (1992). Socio-Economic Status, Test Bias and Selection of Police: The Police Journal: April, 125-135.

Ed.s (1997). Association Establishes Legislative priorities for 105th Session of Congress: Police Chief: April, 1-6.

Government Reports

National Center for Education Statistics. 1995. Dropout Rates in the United States: 1995. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of Commerce. 1993. What's it Worth? Field Training and Economic Status 1993. Washington, DC: U.S. Governement Printing Office.

Court Cases

Aquilera v. Cook County Police and Corrections Board 582 F. Supp. 1053 (Ill 1984).

Arnold v. Ballard 390 F. Supp. 723 (Ohio 1975).

Davis v. City of Dallas, 48 F. Supp. 54, 56(N.D. Tex. 1979).

Griggs v. Duke Power Company, 401 U.S. 424 (1971).

Rice v. City of St. Louis 464 F. Supp. 138 (ED Mo 1978).

Internet Resources

Minor, T. Instruments of Change: Workforce Diversity, Spring 1997. <http://www.eop.com/ccwd/art-wd.html.> Accessed 9/29/97.

Social Statistics Briefing Room: Average Monthly Earnings by Field of Degree (Bachelor's). <hhtp://www.census.gov/ftp/pub/hhes/www/edugraph.html> Accessed 9/29/97.

Periodicals and Newspapers

Carter, David and Sapp, Allen. 1992. College Education and Policing: Coming of Age: FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin 61 (January): 1-8.

Men and Women of Letters. Law Enforcement News. 1997. 30 November, 1.

New Test, Major recruit Push Diversify Talent Pool in Chicago. Law Enforcement News. 1997. 15 November, 1.

Can You Be Too Smart To Be a Public Safety Officer? Trends in Public Safety 1997. 1.