



Committee On Training

Patrick Henry Building
East Reading Room
1111 E. Broad Street
Richmond, VA 23219

MINUTES

October 29th, 2021

Members Present

Chief Kelvin Wright
Captain Robert Holland
Mr. Eddie Macon proxy Kristi Wright
Ms. Tonya Chapman
Chief James Williams
Mr. Lamont Carrington
Superintendent William Smith
Ms. Mary Biggs

Members Absent

Sheriff Anthony Roper
Mr. Jagdish Katyal
Mr. Bryan Porter
Officer Bennie Evans
Mayor Carolyn Dull
Ms. Angie Carrera
Sheriff Vanessa Crawford

CRC Members Present:

Director John Cliborne, Crater Criminal Justice Training Academy
Director Andrew McNally, Central Shenandoah Criminal Justice Training Academy
Lt. Jonathan Williams, Chesapeake Police Training Academy
Lt. Edward Pierpont, Chesterfield County Police Training Academy
Lt. Jane Burns, Fairfax Country Criminal Justice Training Academy
Captain Rebecca Warren, Hampton Police Training Academy
Director Mike Harvey, Rappahannock Regional Criminal Justice Training Academy
Captain Robby Holland, Virginia State Police Training Academy

1. Call to Order.

Chief Wright called the meeting of the Committee on Training (COT) to order at 10:03 A.M.

2. Old Business.

Chief Wright stated there was no old business.

3. New Business: Training Standards Presentation and Review – Lois Kinch and the Law Enforcement CRC

- Ms. Lois Kinch, DCJS Training Standards Coordinator, stated updating the Compulsory Minimum Training Standards for Law Enforcement took 3 years and over 100 SMEs along with the Law Enforcement CRC members to reach this final stage of the process. Ms. Kinch went on to provide an overview of the process taken to update the Compulsory Minimum Training

Standards and Performance Outcomes for Law Enforcement Officers. The following Categories were presented and reviewed:

- Professionalism
 - Communication
 - Driver Training
 - Weapons (Firearms)
 - Officer Wellness
- No questions were asked by the COT members immediately following the presentation
 - Comments and questions submitted via email:
 - Professionalism:
 - Chief Vantrease noted that information on the referral process for DCJS to remove LEO certification and the appeals process should be included in Section 1.4 – ethical principles and standards as they relate to the law enforcement profession
 - Lieutenant Pierpont provided a response to emailed comments by Chief Vantrease - Criteria 1.10.3 (pg 30) already contains the decertification information
 - Discussion on emailed comment by Major Brooke Wright, concerns over pg. 22 in Professionalism, points b. and c. being out of place (b. routine encounters with citizens can escalate or turn deadly very quickly; c. bad choices in split-second decisions and responses)
 - COT determined that these points were not mutually exclusive and should be left in
 - Discussion on emailed comment by Major Brooke Wright, pg. 26 (1.7 LPG #5) she recommended adding “e. Prevents underreporting of crime”
 - COT recommended combining e. to d.: d. Build citizens’ confidence and communication in police/community relations and may or potentially prevent underreporting of crime
 - Chief Branch suggested changing “police officer” to “law enforcement officer”
 - Chief Wright suggested referring to the Code of Virginia on the correct term and wanted to know if SCOPs are considered Law Enforcement Officers. Ms. Kinch advised she will report back to the COT regarding those matters.
 - Kristi Wright (proxy for Mr. Macon) mentioned consistency in terminology for police officer vs law enforcement officer
 - Chief Williams questioned whether on pg. 3.c. “court decisions” should state appellate court decisions. COT wants to keep just “court decisions; and pg. 13 request added language 2.b.ii.1 a. (1). Practice good citizenship, (i.e., youth volunteer work, assist neighbors, be active in schools, or other community service, etc.)
 - Communication:
 - Emailed comments from Major Brooke Wright, Fairfax County Criminal Justice Academy regarding requesting an identification number: Chief Wright suggested removing 3.4(iv) on pg. 42 on obtaining identification number as it is not mandatory, consistency of process, consistency of outcomes
 - Lieutenant Pierpont provided an explanation that it was included but not obligatory

- Director Harvey suggested re-wording 3.4(iv)
 - Ms. Chapman suggested “not required” vs “if available”
 - Chief Williams noted if simply asking is a deterrent and damaging to police/citizen relations
 - Chief Wright suggested “use caution” and modify language to indicate this is an optional step
 - Captain Holland asks his officers to use discretion, and consider if asking for a victim ID number will not hamper relationship or investigation
- Driver Training:
- Emailed comments from Major Wright, Fairfax County Criminal Justice Academy - Pg. 31 driving category 8.6.6.c. – update to “speed or driving behavior” COT recommended adding driving behavior as letter “d.” and moving the current language under “d.” to a new line as “e.”
- Weapons (Firearms):
- Emailed comments from Major Wright, Fairfax County Criminal Justice Academy: pg. 12 – 7.5.5. – posed question on weapon mounted light kits, change to “25 rounds must be with the use of agency issued flashlight or weapon mounted light with a 75% score”
 - Ms. Chapman recommended discussing the increased passing score from 70-75% and universal target first
 - CRC member Director Mike Harvey discussed responses from 15 states on higher qualification scores, looking for consistency across the state which does not currently exist based on types of service weapons, targets, qualifying scores. He explained that we currently have 10 qualification courses of fire and the CRC wants to reduce the number of options, for training and qualification consistency
 - Ms. Chapman has concerns over a higher qualification score failing women and minorities from recruit training. She wanted to know if any testing was done to justify the increase from 70% to 75%
 - Lt. Pierpont provided feedback regarding what their academy has done to test the validity of increasing the firearm score. He stated that since 2018, all recruits have qualified at 75%
 - Ms. Chapman responded that it is great that Chesterfield has the resources to train and provide remedial training, if needed, but she does not think all academies spend additional time to ensure a recruit will qualify
 - Chief Williams expressed concern over the 75% qualifying score not being based on research and why was 75% chosen
 - Ms. Kinch questioned how the current minimum training standard of a 70% qualification score even came about and brought up SMEs and CRC having many discussions on changing the qualifying score
 - Captain Holland sees both sides in wanting to increase the score but considering the impact on recruits, Administrative Code sets 70% qualifying score for existing officers qualifying each year and would potentially require a change to the Code for existing officers to also qualify at 75%. Captain Holland stated he loses 1-2 students each year because they are unable to qualify on firearms at 70% and the majority are females. What is the 75% score fixing? What about good officers who can’t qualify above 70% but have great communication skills?
 - Mr. Carrington suggested more data is needed

- Superintendent Smith concurs with Ms. Chapman, Captain Holland, and requests more research
 - Chief Wright urges differences in environments being policed be considered in weapons training and qualification scores, i.e. rural versus urban, distance versus close range
 - Ms. Chapman concurred with Chief Wright on considering distances and wants differences between regional and independent academies considered, particularly in the individual time that can be taken and resources available to help a recruit achieve a higher qualifying score
 - Ms. Kinch stated there was some testing on new target but information is not currently available
 - Captain Holland stated he does recommend using a universal target for consistency and notes differences between counting of rounds either within the bottle or on the paper in general. Notes that in a stressful situation consistency drops by half of qualifying score. Notes cost of time and equipment/rounds to bring recruits up to qualifying score, as well as access to a range
 - Chief Wright stated that COT is not ready to endorse raising the qualifying score from 70% to 75%
 - Discussion returned back to handheld flashlight training and qualifying
 - Ms. Chapman indicated that she is in favor of the use of weapon-mounted lights and wondered why a recruit would need to use a hand held flashlight, during qualification
 - Lieutenant Pierpont explained the rationale for requiring the use of a hand held flashlight as well as noted his concern over the trigger finger being used to operate weapon mounted light
 - Chief Williams mentioned concern over access to ammunition and being in an ammunition crisis, pg. 12 – 7.5.4 doubling and quadrupling the number of rounds needed for training
 - Director Harvey explained that most agencies set-aside 1000- 1,500 rounds for firearms training and this would not create addition spending. The modifications to the round count is for training recruits before they qualify
- Officer Wellness:
- Chief Vantrease raised concerns via email that section 9.3.1 on demonstrating ability to extract object of at least 150lbs from a vehicle to simulate a rescue may vary based on vehicle type and has concerns on how this might adversely affect recruits based on age/sex/race/body mass
 - Lieutenant Pierpont noted this exercise is to demonstrate the ability of the officer to dig deep and show physical capabilities
 - Ms. Kinch stated this training criteria was based on most recent JTA, mentioned 200lbs weight cap
 - Captain Holland noted the physical demands of the job, along with JTA this was a research based requirement
 - Lieutenant Jane Burns noted the difficulty of extracting a 150lbs from a vehicle for officers of smaller stature and that they may wait for a stronger officer to assist
 - Chief Wright questioned the statement that smaller officers would not attempt to extract a person in an emergency, and wanted clarification between a rescue situation and an officer dealing with a subject who is resisting

- Ms. Chapman mentioned adrenaline of in-the-moment versus training environment
 - Director Harvey stated this exercise was intended as a mock rescue, and that he has been conducting a rescue extraction with 150lbs dummy for 8 years with no adverse effects based on age/race/sex of recruits at Rappahannock Regional CJA
 - Lt. Williams mentioned that the 150lb object is a standardized commercial human-shaped dummy
 - Major Wright, Fairfax emailed concerns: the obstacle course does not measure a level of fitness or growth of knowledge, and not being based on realities of duties of LEO, DCJS should pursue fitness standards that apply scientific knowledge such as functional fitness, injury prevention, and nutrition
 - Ms. Kinch noted that these standards are not created by DCJS but by the SMEs, CRC, and the COT, although it is often the perception that DCJS should focus on different aspects, and legislators also make mandates
 - Chief Wright stated Officer Wellness is new to the profession and there is need to take a step forward with this new topic
 - Lieutenant Pierpont mentioned there are differences across academies, this is a start for universal officer wellness in a basic sense for physical wellness
 - Chief Wright wanted to know if the regional and independent academies felt the current standards were do-able
 - Director Harvey explained the topic was originally much broader but was paired down by the CRC; SMEs originally included financial wellness, nutrition, etc. and this is a start, with some of these topics being more appropriate for agencies and academies to address individually
 - Ms. Kinch stated concerns over various methods of engaging in physical fitness and the complete lack of mandates around this topic for the basic academy which is why the CRC included a minimum of 60 hours of physical fitness activity
 - Northern Virginia Regional Academy emailed concerns about mandating 60 hours of physical activity and an obstacle course and provided statistics on their test of obstacle course with recruits
 - Ms. Kinch reiterated 60 hours is just a minimum
 - Obstacle course is based on by JTA
- Request for any comments or questions from the COT members
 - Kristi Wright suggested that under Professionalism, change should be made from General District Court to District Court on pg. 19 under State System (ii.3) or adding Juvenile Domestic Relations District court as point 4. and renumbering; Making Commonwealth's Attorneys its own section and renumbering on pg. 19; and pg. 20 adding magistrates under 3.a. as (i). Courts (ii). Magistrates
 - ~~Kristi Wright~~ Chief Wright suggested that under Professionalism, change should be made from General Chief Wright, under Officer Wellness, pg. 6 under point 3 add "one's faith"
- Public Comment:
 - Major Brooke Wright, Fairfax County Regional Academy:
 - Voiced concerns over the obstacle course creating a disproportionate failure rate of females versus male by at least half over scaling 5ft wall portion of obstacle course
 - Stated concerns over flashlight versus weapons mounted light in qualifying, understands the need to train on the transition from flashlight to firearm but if

an officer is issued weapons mounted light they should be able to complete the qualifying course with their weapon mounted equipment

- Ms. Chapman agreed with 5ft wall concerns and disproportionate adverse effects for female officers
- Dr. David Bever- LawFit/FireFit, LLC
 - Provided an overview of his decades of work in the area of professional standards for fitness for first responders
 - Advocated fitness for preventing line of duty deaths and injuries positively impacting bottom line of agency budget
 - Noted fitness required for job performance
 - Suggested work performance testing should be required

- **Next Meeting.**

The next meeting is November 19, 2021 at 10:00 A.M.

- **Adjournment.**

Chief Williams adjourned the meeting at 12:19 P.M.

Approved:



Chair

11-22-2021

Date