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Summary

Prior to the establishment of the Criminal Justice Center at the University of Alaska (renamed the Justice Center in 1979), no program has attempted to train and educate Alaska justice practitioners on a continuing basis and at all agency levels. The Alaska Criminal Justice Planning Agency, through the Governor's Commission on the Administration of Justice, has attempted to deal with this training problem on an interim basement through the Specialized Training Grant program, which enables "state and local police officers, correctional officers, prosecutors, public defenders, and court personnel [to obtain] specialized training sponsored by other agencies and institutions," often involving travel out-of-state for programs largely unavailable in Alaska. This study examines individualized grants funded for the years 1973–1979 as a means of measuring the effectiveness of the Specialized Training Grant program as an approach to the continuing professionalization of Alaska's criminal justice personnel.

Additional information

This report incorporates information from a prior report, An Examination of Specialized Training Grants Funded by the Alaska Criminal Justice Planning Agency 1973 through 1975 by Roger V. Endell (1976).
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Preface

In August of 1976 the author completed an analysis of the training grants awarded by the Alaska Criminal Justice Planning Agency over the three year period from 1973 through 1975 inclusive. That study was of benefit not only to the CJPA but also to the other agencies of justice within the state, and educational and training providers who would be addressing the continuing professional development needs of justice practitioners statewide for the next several years.

As stated in the Introduction to the original study, Alaska has had to develop rather unique techniques to meet the specific training needs of "the small town police officer, the urban center district attorney, the clerk of the court, the institutional correctional officer and the bush magistrate, to name a few, (who) all share the common need for continuing training and education." While the principal agencies of justice in Alaska are able to meet their mainstream training needs through routine budget and planning cycles, they cannot easily and efficiently provide for individualized training of persons whose professional expertise and/or interests may be highly specialized and yet essential to improving some part of the state's justice services.

The Criminal Justice Planning Agency requested that a second study of the specialized training grants be completed in order to evaluate the four year period which followed the initial report (1976, 77, 78, 79), and to compare and summarize
the results of the total seven years of administration of the
specialized training grants program.

In response to that request, this report is organized in
three parts. Part I consists of the entire original analysis
completed for the three year period 1973 through 1975. Part II
is the analysis now completed for the four year period including
1976 through 1979. Part III provides a summary and comparison
of the entire seven year period from 1973 through 1979 with a
narrative overview of expenditures, participating agencies,
types of training programs, comparisons of in-state and out-of-
state levels of participation and similar data.

The author wishes to recognize and thank Miss Denise Wike,
a student majoring in justice, for her very diligent and con-
scientious labors which resulted in the compilation of the
various tables contained in Part II of this study. She provides
an excellent example of the quality and quantity of work that
the Alaska justice agencies can expect from future professional
employees. Thanks too, must be addressed to Ms. Phyl Booth
whose capable and amazing skills permitted the report to be
efficiently presented in a readable format. Only the author
should be held accountable for any deficiencies which may exist
in the content of the study.
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PART I

SPECIALIZED TRAINING GRANTS 1973 THROUGH 1975
Alaskans are constantly reminded of the high cost of travel and difficulties in communication related to the State's vast geographic area, its relative remoteness from the contiguous 48 states, and its small disconnected centers of population. Criminal Justice system agencies must consider these problems when establishing policies and procedures for the performance of necessary services to Alaska's citizens.

In order to keep criminal justice practitioners abreast of current developments in legislation, research, standards and methodologies affecting long range planning and day to day operations of the justice system's agencies, it is necessary for system personnel to have access to pre-service and in-service training and education opportunities. The need for a continuing professional development program is essential to the delivery of high quality professional services. The small town police officer, the urban center district attorney, the clerk of the court, the institutional correctional officer and the bush magistrate, to name a few, all share the common need for continuing training and education. No single program yet has met the needs of all of these practitioners statewide. Although the recently established Criminal Justice Center at the University of Alaska is responding to this problem through the development of academic and continuing professional development curricula and delivery mechanisms, no other program within the State has attempted to train and educate justice prac-
tioners of the several agencies on a continuing basis and at all agency levels.

The Criminal Justice Planning Agency, through the Governor's Commission on the Administration of Justice, has attempted to deal with this training problem on an interim basis until more suitable resources could be developed. Under the category of "Manpower Development" and within the program "Criminal Justice Training" the CJPA has established each year, for the past several years, a Specialized Training Grant program. This program enables "...state and local police officers, correctional officers, prosecutors, public defenders and court personnel (to obtain) specialized training sponsored by other agencies and institutions..." Many participants must travel outside of the State to attend programs largely unavailable within Alaska. The grant program was apparently developed to insure that participation in the training programs by the State practitioners would be encouraged, and to assist agencies, whose budgets often did not permit expensive yet essential travel to distant training programs, by financing the greater share of costs.

According to the CJPA training fund grant for 1975, "...a balance will be achieved by ear-marking a reasonable ratio of available funds to each of the components of legal, police, and corrections. As a general rule, not more than $500 will be authorized in travel and per diem per person per training session." These statements roughly outline the framework for the purpose, intent and method of the Specialized Training Grant program.
PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

Because of the rather unique nature of this program, which has impact on the personnel of virtually every agency in the State's criminal justice system, an examination of the records of past participants may be valuable in assessing future training/education interests and may be potentially useful for programming and funding purposes. The intent of this study then, is to examine how the grant money has been utilized, what personnel have received grants, where training has taken place, which training programs have attracted Alaskan practitioners, how many practitioners have been reached via this program, and what was the quality of the program and its relevance to the criminal justice practitioners' work. Additional concerns include whether the specialized training grants are worthwhile in acquiring a fair return in terms of professional development for dollars expended, and whether there are meaningful differences in in-state vs. out-of-state training cost/benefit ratios. An examination of the individualized grants funded for the years 1973, 1974 and 1975 should provide a reasonable profile of the effectiveness of this program as one approach to the continuing professionalization of Alaska's criminal justice personnel.
DATA

Information was sought from the CJPA office's participant files in late May 1976. Data was gathered from copies made of all approval/claim forms and student evaluation of training forms completed by each individual participant taking part in the program in 1973, 1974 and 1975. This mass of material was reduced to tabular form for ease of analysis. The individualized data tables indicate the number of grants per year, the agencies, the topics of the training courses, the training organizations, where and when the training took place, the funding costs for each participant, and a rating of the training programs from excellent to poor based on the participant's evaluation.

The individualized information was then consolidated into total utilization figures for each year under the same categorized headings except that involvement by each agency, participation by topic and sponsoring training organizations were broken out for more meaningful scrutiny.

From the utilization tables a breakdown and comparison of data by system component and a comparison of in-state, out-of-state, and total program participation levels for each of the three years was facilitated.

The tabular data thus provides the opportunity to compare not only levels of individual and financial involvement for each year but also the involvement of the police, legal and correctional components for each year and all three years. A comparison of
in-state and out-of-state programming is also made possible through design of these tables.

Because records were sometimes incomplete, figures for any given year cannot be considered exact, but generally will closely reflect participation levels in manpower and money invested in specialized training for each of the three years. Expenditures reflect per diem and travel costs from federal funds and matching agency contributions, but do not include program enrollment costs which have been borne by the employee's sponsoring criminal justice agency. Neither do the expenditures represent costs associated with individuals' salaries, fringe benefits, time away from the job (which may have required overtime compensation to other employees or temporary loss of services) and similar matters related to the employee participating in a training program.
SPECIALIZED TRAINING GRANT UTILIZATION - 1973

Table 1 provides identification of each participant utilizing the grant fund for 1973 and program information for which each grant was provided. Of the 67 grants issued for specialized training in 1973, 143 individuals participated at a cost of $36,764.38. Of these individuals, 107 took part in training programs provided within Alaska at a cost of approximately $15,000, and 36 practitioners travelled outside the State for programs costing nearly $22,000. Costs for in-state participants averaged $140.00 compared to an average of $606.00 per outside training program participant (see Table 4).

Police, legal and correctional personnel participating in the 1973 grant program totaled 132 of the 143 participants for the year (Table 7). Of these the majority of police (64) and correctional (26) personnel took part in attendance at training programs offered within the state while legal personnel were slightly more evenly divided between in-state (9) and out-of-state (12) attendance. Of special interest from the 1973 figures is the fact that 41% of the expenditures for the year was directed to the 75% of all participants who took part in training within the State. Conversely, it required nearly 60% of the year’s training money to send 25% of the participants outside of the State for various programs.

Training topics drawing the greatest interest (Table 4) of criminal justice practitioners in 1973 were concerned with grant...
management, law enforcement management and narcotic training. Concurrently, the Civil Service Commission, the Drug Enforcement Administration, the Criminal Justice Planning Agency and the Anchorage Community College provided training to the largest groups of people dealing with these topics.

More specifically, four programs offered within the state drew the majority of in-state participants. The Drug Enforcement Administration offered training in which 21 criminal justice system employees participated, the U.S. Civil Service Commission attracted 34 personnel to a program entitled "Network Techniques for Program Management", Anchorage Community College brought 23 employees together for a seminar in "Communication in Law Enforcement Management", and CJPA sponsored a program attracting 20 participants to instruction in grant management. The remaining 9 practitioners attending training in Alaska via CJPA funding were of a singular interest nature. Of the 36 Alaskans attending "outside" programs, 15 were attorneys who attended various legal conferences and seminars dealing with such topics as trial tactics, indigent defense, and juvenile justice. The remainder of "outside" participants attended programs of individual interest ranging from FBI schools and arson and explosives programs to police intelligence and jail operations training.

Table 8 figures indicate that 53% of the 1973 expenditures were utilized by police agency personnel who comprised 56% of the total participants in all training programs. 22% of the year's expenditures were utilized by legal personnel. While corrections
provided 31 of the personnel receiving grants, the percentage of overall expenditures employed by these personnel (12%) was nearly the same as that for "other" agency personnel (13%) who sent only 11 people to various programs.

"Other" agency representatives include personnel from divisions or departments that are not directly involved in criminal justice system functions but may have peripheral interests or responsibilities with justice agencies. Examples within this category included personnel from the University of Alaska, the Division of Personnel, the State E.E.O. Office, the Budget and Management Division, auditors from Legislative Audit, budget and personnel analysts from the Departments of Administration and Personnel, supply and administrative officers from various departments other than criminal justice agencies, and representatives of the Alaska Transportation Commission, Human Rights Commission and the Department of Public Works.

The participatory data is not intended to separate grants awarded to the major agency categories for purposes of drawing conclusions that law enforcement personnel utilized more or less funding than did corrections or legal personnel. Costs of training in the various major component categories vary when consideration is given to the length of various training programs, the distance of the program from the employee's work station, and the comparative needs for training programs among the major components. An examination of funded levels of participation is useful only in establishing a factual picture of where the funds were allocated.
This study does not address the reason for differences that may or may not exist, or what guidelines, if any, may have been used to determine the allocation of the resources. Therefore, the data is helpful in indicating where the funds were expended but not why.

Of the 69 grants funded in 1973, 41 were evaluated as above average or excellent, 14 were rated average and 8 received poor ratings. No evaluations were submitted for four of the training programs. (Note: Several evaluation comments have been selected as examples to indicate the range of ratings from poor to excellent and the reasoning for the evaluation for each of the three one year grant programs. See Table 10.)

The level of involvement for both personnel and funding was greatest in 1973 in that the largest number of criminal justice personnel participated (143), the largest expenditures were made ($37,000), and the greatest participation in training programs took place within the State (75% of total participation).
In 1974 the CJPA funded 54 grants which provided individualized training for 61 criminal justice practitioners at a total funded level of $36,133.75. (Table 2) Almost $32,000 of the total expended was directed to 46 personnel enrolled in programs outside of the State. Fifteen personnel were enabled to seek training within the State at a funded level of just over $4,000. The average cost per participant in the State was $276.00 while out-of-state costs averaged $696.00 (Table 5). Only two individuals who received grants were from "other" agencies outside of the police, legal or corrections components. The Division of Motor Vehicles sent one of these individuals to an auto theft investigation school and the other, from the Alaska Transportation Commission, attended a program entitled "Administrative Law, Session II" at the National College of the State Judiciary, Reno.

The pattern of geographical participation established in 1973 was reversed in 1974 i.e.: 75% of all criminal justice practitioners attended specialized training programs out-of-state while 25% remained in Alaska for training. This reversal brought costs up while local participation went down. 88% of the expended funds went to out-of-state program participants who comprised 75% of all participants taking part in the program, while 12% of the funds paid for 25% of the participants who attended training in-state. (Table 7).

Criminal identification, legal defense, juvenile justice, and
criminal investigation were the topics drawing the greatest interest of Alaskan practitioners to training programs in 1974. There were no easily identifiable agencies drawing large numbers of personnel to training sessions as in 1973 but several organizations offered courses of a similar nature in a given topic area. The FBI, Alaska Peace Officers Association, Drug Enforcement Administration, Office of Child Advocacy, Practising Law Institute, Trial Lawyers of America, National Legal Defenders Association and the International Bomb Technician Association were typical training providers who attracted three or more Alaskans to their programs. Twenty-five additional training organizations each provided programs for one or two Alaskan personnel (Table 5).

Of the preceding identified training sponsors, the Drug Enforcement Administration provided training to two Alaskans, the Office of Child Advocacy attracted four personnel to a seminar on "The Child and the Law", the FBI (in conjunction with the Public Safety Academy) trained three practitioners at a seminar for instructors, a criminal intelligence seminar sponsored by the Alaska Peace Officers Association attracted four personnel, and the Alaska Association of Realtors attracted two Trooper personnel to a program in real estate fraud. These five entities drew all of the 15 justice personnel who participated in training programs via CJPA grants within the State in 1974. Although there was one more training "provider" within the State in 1974 than in 1973, there was significantly less participation. In 1973 in-state programs attracted 107 practitioners while 1974 programs attracted only 15
under the specialized training grant program.

The police agencies maintained approximately the same level of involvement and funding in 1974 as they had in 1973 (Table 8). 55% of the year's expenditures paid for the 56% of all participants, who were from police agencies, to attend training programs. Legal practitioners utilized 24% of the funds, corrections used 17%, and other agency personnel required 4% of the total expenditures. Again, the data indicates the utilization of funds among the agency categories but cannot be used to explain the rationale for the differences. Therefore, no conclusions should be drawn on the value of grant disbursement differentials.

Although correctional personnel utilized 17% of the funds for the year, only 13% of the participants attending specialized training programs were from corrections. For comparison, 1973 saw correctional personnel employ 12% of the funds for the year and this resulted in their representing 31% of all participants in specialized training. This difference is explained by examining Table 7. Twenty-six correctional personnel participated in training programs within Alaska in 1973 at an average cost of only $99 per person while the five who went out of state that year were funded at an average of $401.00. In 1974 no correctional personnel took part in training in-state, but eight traveled outside of Alaska at an average cost of $774 per participant. It is obvious that fewer personnel can participate and do so at a much higher cost in out-of-state programs than would be the case if training were available within the State.
Forty of the 61 criminal justice practitioners evaluated their training involvement at above average to excellent in quality. Average ratings were given to ten programs; 3 rated poor evaluation and 8 programs received no evaluation. (See Table 10 for sample comments).

Total grants dropped from 67 in 1973 to 54 in 1974, participation dropped from 143 to 61, but expenditures dropped only slightly from $37,000 to $36,000. A major change took place from the previous year in that 88% of the funds for 1974 were utilized to fund 75% of all participants to outside of the state programs, a reverse of the previous year funding pattern.
Table 3 lists the 43 participants receiving specialized training grants for the 1975 program. The 40 grants, which required funding at $27,774.31, represent a much lower level of funding and personnel participation than the previous two years of the study. The most dramatic difference, however, in 1975 participation data, occurs in in-state vs. out-of-state funding and levels of involvement. Only one criminal justice practitioner was funded to attend a program provided within the state. This single program was funded at $347, which permitted the Hoonah Chief of Police to attend a Crisis Intervention Workshop, sponsored by the Criminal Justice Center at the University of Alaska. On the other side, 42 participants were funded at a total cost of $27,426.91 (or 99% of the total expenditures) to attend programs out-of-state. The average cost for these participants was $653 or almost double the cost per participant of the in-state trainee (Table 6).

The average cost per participant varied only slightly between trainees sent out-of-state from police agencies ($608) and the Division of Corrections ($619) but differed greatly from the average cost of legal practitioner training($846). These costs reflect actual average expenditures in 1974 for police, corrections and legal agencies. The comparison is useful in comparing the costs of enabling representative practitioners to take part in individualized programs. It should be remembered, however, that some types of training may be inherently more expensive per unit than are
others. Time, distance and comparative agency needs for training must also be considered.

It should be noted here that the average cost figure for all agencies sending personnel to out-of-state training programs for each of the 3 years was much higher than the costs for in-state training. Conversely, and more importantly, the average cost figures for in-state participation is significantly lower than for out-of-state training programs.

The topic of greatest interest for training in 1975 was in the area of civil rights, ie, EEO compliance. Juvenile justice, legal defense, and motor vehicle programs drew small groups of interested Alaskan practitioners. However, as in 1974, no single training program attracted relatively large numbers of practitioners as was the case in 1973. LEAA, in joint sponsorship with the International Association of Human Rights Agencies, the American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators and the National Council of Juvenile Judges attracted 13 of the 43 participants. The remaining 30 practitioners attended a variety of training programs singly or in pairs to learn more of subjects ranging from privacy and arson to consumer protection and explosives (Table 6).

The level of funding and level of personnel involved in training programs from police agencies dropped slightly from the previous year's 47% of the total expenditures. Legal practitioners' funding involved increases from 22% of the total spent for specialized training in 1973, and 24% of the 1974 expenditures to 27% of the 1975 money. Correctional personnel were funded at approximately
the same level as the previous year at 16% of the total expenditures (Table 3).

The evaluation of training programs attended by criminal justice practitioners during the 1975 grant year were incomplete in that 24 participants submitted no evaluation comments. Of those that were available, 5 programs were rated as excellent, 8 above average and 6 programs received average ratings. (Sample comments Table 10).

As stated previously, the 1975 grant year was significantly different in level of funding, level of participation by practitioners, and in training funded for in-state programs. Funding was eight to nine thousand dollars less than in 1973 and 1974. There were 100 fewer participants in 1975 than in 1973 and 18 less than in 1974. Only one individual received funding for an in-state training program in 1975 compared to 25% (15) of the participants in 1974 and 75% (107) of the 1973 participants.

Of course, one important consideration for the decrease in expenditures and numbers of justice practitioners utilizing specialized training grant funds in 1975 may be related to increased program opportunities and agency funding capabilities which provided training without the need for previous levels of CJPA funding. The Public Safety Academy certainly had expanded its programming during this period. Also, with the Criminal Justice Center at the University of Alaska coming into existence, additional programs were made available. The Center provided training in such topics as Law and Psychiatry for lawyers and doctors, Homicide Investigation for
police, district attorneys and medical personnel, Crisis Intervention for police, probation and social service personnel, Sentencing Alternatives for all criminal justice practitioners and the general public, and Law and the Judicial System for social workers. As these program offerings are increased with possibly different methods of funding, it may be that CJPA specialized training grants will address a much more specialized and specific type of training at even lower funding levels.
THREE YEAR COMPARISON

Over the three year period of the study a total of $100,672.44 was expended on specialized training for individuals and small groups of Alaskan criminal justice practitioners. The comparative figures (Table 9) indicate that costs for total program participation escalated from a low average of $257 per individual in 1973, to $592 in 1974 and finally to $646 in 1975. At the same time the numbers of those able to successfully obtain a share of the training funds declined from a high of 143 individuals in 1973 to 43 in 1975. The table indicates that overall participation in out-of-state and within-state training programs totaled almost the same number of personnel i.e., 123 in-state, 124 out-of-state, for the 3 year period. However, as pointed out earlier, the in-state training participation was greatest in 1973 (107 individuals) and declined dramatically to one individual in 1975. While the average costs of "outside" training were consistently higher, the in-state specialized training costs based on the use of these grants was consistently and significantly lower.

One may conclude from these comparative figures that out-of-state training costs totaled 4 times the amount required to train the same number of practitioners within-the-state. Of course, numbers of personnel and the amount of money required to permit individualized training to occur are not the only factors to be considered in making these comparisons.
A substantial justification for out-of-state participation in individualized training can be made, as noted by the Criminal Justice Planning Agency in its grant requests, by pointing to the fact that many of these programs have been unavailable within the State and yet are worthwhile (some are essential) to continuing professional development of criminal justice practitioners. Examples of such outside programs include the national level district attorney and public defender conferences, the annual meetings of the American Correctional Congress, the national conferences on juvenile justice, and a few specialized law enforcement programs available only at regional schools.

An average of $33,447.48 was expended each year for training an average of 82 participants. The average cost for each participant over the 3 year period was $403 per person per training session. However, these averages are useful only in terms of their potential use for planning for a future period on an overall system basis. They are not helpful in planning fund allocations toward a given agency or training effort.

Certain difficulties are inherent in the subjective classification of the evaluation remarks of the participants. The non-receipt, or non-availability, of 24 of 48 program participant evaluations for 1975, by example, reduces even a relatively subjective effort to questionable usefulness. It is not possible to compare the evaluation of in-state vs. out-of-state programs in any meaningful or dependable manner. A much more extensive and systematic effort should be made to establish a reliably sound and valid
evaluation format that would enable useful comparisons to be made. It may be quite helpful to know whether programs presented in-state were seen as more valuable than those "outside" and why, what subject matter was the most beneficial in terms of the relationship to actual job performance, and whether individual programs would be worthy of continued participation from Alaskan practitioners on a larger scale.
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

It would seem that if effective utilization of the specialized training grant program is to continue, certain essential decisions must be made. These decisions must relate to overall training issues identified by the examination of the data from this study. If a basic commitment to encouraging criminal justice agencies to follow a specific and well planned outline of personnel development is not required then the grant funds may become a "give-away" program which attempts to accomplish little.

Based on the comments and evaluative remarks submitted by the recipients of the grant money over the three year period, there is no question that the program is worthwhile and should continue. The participants' evaluations generally indicate that involvement in this program provides a valuable resource in the professional associations that are facilitated through interaction with other justice practitioners statewide and/or nationwide. This is repeatedly commented upon as being a positive benefit in addition to the specific purpose of the training for which the grant was intended. However, it may be argued that professional contacts can be facilitated independently from training programs and at lesser costs. Further, there may be distinct advantages in drawing nationally known and respected leaders in the criminal justice field to Alaska, to share knowledge with a much wider localized practitioner audience.
To be of the greatest benefit, training should relate to agency manpower development needs, hence agency needs assessment is critical to the design and/or selection and delivery of training programs. The Criminal Justice Center is attempting to gather information which will identify academic and continuing professional development needs of the several agencies statewide. A manpower research project being conducted by Dr. John Angell, Director of the academic component of the Center, indicates that of all criminal justice employees statewide (including professional, support and clerical) approximately 48% are involved in police agencies, 30% are law related personnel, and 23% are employed in the correctional field (Table 11).

Specialized training grants have been utilized on a slightly different percentage basis than is apparent from the distribution of criminal justice employees. Police personnel, who comprise 48% of all criminal justice system employees, have consumed an average of 55% of the funds facilitated by the training grant program over the 3 year period studied. Law related personnel, 30% of all systems employees, utilized 19% of specialized training funds and corrections, 22% of all system personnel, employed 19% of total funds.

Clearly, as these figures indicate, total expenditures have not been proportionate to the numbers of employees in the three major components of the criminal justice system. If an objective, as stated in the CJPA training fund grant for 1975 is that "...a balance will be achieved by ear-marking a reasonable ratio of available funds to each of the components of legal, police, and
corrections..." then this objective has not facilitated equal total expenditures. It may be questioned whether, in fact, it is important that equitable distribution of funds be mandated. Numbers of personnel within a component would not necessarily translate to the need for training. It is in examining the level of competency, past experience, professional preparation, and personnel performance standards that training needs can more easily and more meaningfully be defined. Need assessment would therefore appear to be more critical than the identification of the numbers of employees. Nevertheless, totally disproportionate funding among the components might require extensive justification. To be most effective the funds should reach those personnel with the greatest needs, therefore criteria, including the purpose of a training grant request in relationship to the employees' job function, would appear to be appropriate.

The greater percentages of employees, (69% of police employees and 78% of correctional staff, Table 11) are classified as professional practitioners while 55% of law related employees are clerical staff. Implications for training are thus clarified somewhat in that the effort should be continued to provide training for professional police and correction staff but clerical staff development must be provided to substantial numbers of legal agency employees.

In another related research project being conducted by Peter Ring, Director of Research at the Center, preliminary data gathered from a statewide survey of criminal justice agencies identifies priorities for continuing professional development subjects as indi-
cated by the various agencies. By far the chief priority for continuing professional development requested by the agencies was for training in the area of management and supervision. Investigation, community relations and criminal and substantive law were listed as second level priority topics of equal importance. The next priority level receiving equal requests were for training in English communication, criminal procedure, crime and alcohol, juvenile procedures, Native Alaska and narcotic and dangerous drugs topics. Courtroom procedures, family disturbances, correctional practices and the judicial system were topics receiving the fourth level of priority requests. Many additional topics were identified as singular requests for training. It is possible that the personal biases of the questionnaire respondents are reflected in these priorities. However, a sufficient cross-sampling of agencies reflected similar responses so that individual biases, if evident, at least reflect similarities of opinion.

The identification of training priorities requested by the agencies is of great importance to this study in that legitimate comparisons can be made between training priorities requested and training received by practitioners through the specialized training grants over the past three years (see Table 12). It is apparent that although management and supervisory training has been identified as the top priority for training, only in 1973 did significant numbers of criminal justice personnel take part in such training via the grant program. Programs in civil rights, criminal identification, trainer instruction, arson, explosives, motor vehicle, consumer
protection and security and privacy training were participated in throughout the three year period by practitioners yet none of these topics were identified in the four levels of priorities identified as topics requested. It could be argued that since training had been received in these topics that they are no longer considered priorities. There is the possibility, however, that participation in these programs was more a matter of opportunity than need. No conclusions are possible from this data.

Also worthy of note is that of the four levels of priorities identified as topics requested for training through the survey, several topics were not pursued in actual training received by grant participants. These topics included community relations, English communications, crime and alcohol, Native Alaska, courtroom procedures, family disturbances and an understanding of the judicial system.

Although these topical comparisons cannot be precise at this point it is nevertheless beneficial to examine general areas of topical training interests and levels of involvement in actual training received.

There would appear to be great advantages in developing training programs within the State that could be accessible to a much wider practitioner audience at a much lower cost than is possible by funding personnel to participate in programs offered elsewhere. Of course, there will always be the need to send selected personnel to selected programs of national scope outside of the State. National level conferences are unlikely to be offered in Alaska and it may
be essential that agency representatives attend these sessions. However, a strong effort should be made to bring training programs to the practitioner. Localized programs can provide the opportunity for a greater number of personnel to participate, it can localize problems and procedures and it can facilitate communications among Alaskan criminal justice system practitioners. The costs of such efforts would appear to be justified if manpower resources and continuing professional development are essential to providing high quality professional services to the citizens of Alaska.

In a review of the course titles of programs in which Alaskan personnel participated outside, it is apparent that many of the programs offered over the three year period could be presented within the State. Whether these topics might require "custom design" or whether training "packages" already in existence elsewhere might be brought to the practitioner is not a major issue. The important concern is that programs are offered on an ever-expanding basis to increasing numbers of criminal justice practitioners within the State and directed toward all practitioner levels from line staff to executive management. Priorities and guidelines should be developed to insure the "best" use of funds. An evaluation system designed to ascertain the impact of individual programs and their value toward improving the justice system in Alaska is essential.

On an individual basis, program participation might be facilitated for each employee when an accurate profile of his experience, education, training and job function is delineated. Questions
worthy of concern to an applicant for training funds might be concerned with how the training will relate to the job function, to the continuing professional development of the employee, the value of the training to the employee's agency, and finally its value to the public being served by the employee.

It would seem then that the Criminal Justice Planning agency has provided a valuable program where little other resources had existed. It will probably be necessary to continue the specialized training grant program until and unless the individual agencies and training facilities are able to develop sufficient resources of their own. CJPA is in an excellent position through its planning process to encourage the development of strong training programs within the State and to encourage practitioners to participate fully in them as they are developed. This should be done based on the assessed and expressed training needs of agency personnel as justified by the agency in an over-all continuing professional development plan. At the present time, the Criminal Justice Center, the Police Standards Council and the Alaska Public Safety Academy should work cooperatively with CJPA in the development of programs. The criminal justice system must be flexible and responsive in order to insure that duplication is eliminated and that a continuum of professional development training and academic programs are available to all criminal justice system practitioners across the State. Alaska can afford the best in criminal justice professional services and should actively pursue this goal through continuing professional development opportunities provided to all justice personnel.
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**CRIMINAL JUSTICE PLANNING AGENCY**

**SPECIALIZED TRAINING GRANTS**

**1973 INDIVIDUALIZED DATA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Presented By</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Evaluated</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Report</th>
<th>Comment Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>Par Admin</td>
<td>Basic Skills in Statistics</td>
<td>Civil Service Comm</td>
<td>Seattle, WA</td>
<td>1/21-25/74</td>
<td>529.54</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detective</td>
<td>Ktn PD</td>
<td>1st Natl Conf on Juven Justice</td>
<td>Natl Counc Juv Crt Jdgs &amp; Natl DA's Assoc</td>
<td>Nw Orlns, LA</td>
<td>1/27-31/74</td>
<td>545.00</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Section</td>
<td>10 AST, 12</td>
<td>Commun in Law Enforcement</td>
<td>Pol, 1 DOC Management</td>
<td>Anch Comm College</td>
<td>Anchor,AK</td>
<td>1/21-23/74</td>
<td>1210.00</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>Dep Law</td>
<td>Trial Tactics Seminar</td>
<td>Natl Conf of DA's</td>
<td>San Diego, CA</td>
<td>2/3-7/74</td>
<td>1125.39</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>Dep Law</td>
<td>1st Natl Conf, Mgmt of DA Ofe</td>
<td>Natl Coll DA's, Natl Ctr Wash, DC</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>2/6-18/74</td>
<td>1220.00</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>Pub Def</td>
<td>Legal Rights Mentally Handicapped</td>
<td>Practicing Law Inst</td>
<td>San Fran, CA</td>
<td>1/31-2/2/74</td>
<td>(did not attend)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigator</td>
<td>AST</td>
<td>Blood Stain Identif Seminar</td>
<td>Biscayene College</td>
<td>Miami, FL</td>
<td>2/24-3/1/74</td>
<td>1015.90</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detective</td>
<td>Fbi's PD</td>
<td>Theft Seminar</td>
<td>AST</td>
<td>Anchor,AK</td>
<td>2/20/74</td>
<td>126.00</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrolman</td>
<td>Ktn PD</td>
<td>NW Fire &amp; Arson Seminar</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eugene, OR</td>
<td>4/22-5/3/74</td>
<td>229.83</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrolman</td>
<td>Fbi's PD</td>
<td>2nd Ann Explos Ord Diap Conf</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sacramento, CA</td>
<td>3/16-23/74</td>
<td>493.00</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief</td>
<td>Jun PD</td>
<td>Police/Prosecution</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
<td>6/1-7/12/74</td>
<td>2470.00</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporal</td>
<td>Anch C C</td>
<td>Polygraph School</td>
<td>Keefer Polygraph Inst</td>
<td>Anch PD</td>
<td>4/13-5/2/74</td>
<td>1356.00</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>Local PD</td>
<td>Instructor Training</td>
<td>FBI</td>
<td>Anch PD</td>
<td>4/1-5/74</td>
<td>2152.00</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>Fbi's PD</td>
<td>Jail Operations Tng Methods</td>
<td>NA State Crim Just Ed &amp; Training Center</td>
<td>Anch PD</td>
<td>5/1-5/74</td>
<td>314.85</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person Analyst</td>
<td>Div Person</td>
<td>Compliance Feder. Guides, Test &amp; Selection</td>
<td></td>
<td>Answer,AK</td>
<td>5/20/24/74</td>
<td>706.37</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEO Office</td>
<td>Dep Law</td>
<td>EEO Workshop II</td>
<td>Civil Serv 'Commiss</td>
<td>Anchor,AK</td>
<td>5/20-22/74</td>
<td>235.00</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person</td>
<td>2-NSCT</td>
<td>CJPA Training</td>
<td>CJPA</td>
<td>Anch PD</td>
<td>4/11/74</td>
<td>410.17</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person</td>
<td>5-Corporal</td>
<td>Police/Patrol</td>
<td></td>
<td>Anch PD</td>
<td>4/12/74</td>
<td>186.00</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Officer</td>
<td>Anch PD</td>
<td>Drug Enforcement Seminar</td>
<td>Drug Enforce Admin</td>
<td>Anch PD</td>
<td>6/3-5/5/74</td>
<td>203.00</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CRIMINAL JUSTICE PLANNING AGENCY

#### SPECIALIZED TRAINING GRANTS

#### 1973

#### INDIVIDUALIZED DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Presented by</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>Eval</th>
<th>Adv</th>
<th>Suc</th>
<th>Comm</th>
<th>Side</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investigator</td>
<td>AST</td>
<td>Intelligence Analysts' School</td>
<td>CA Dept of Justice</td>
<td>Snta Barbara, CA</td>
<td>6/3-14/74</td>
<td>522.00</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief</td>
<td>Wrng PD</td>
<td>Drug Enforcement Seminar</td>
<td>Drug Enforce Admin</td>
<td>Frbnks, AK</td>
<td>6/3-5/74</td>
<td>352.00</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigator</td>
<td>Jun PD</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>282.00</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Officer</td>
<td>There PD</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>240.00</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>Cty BarJun Short course for Pros Attnys</td>
<td>Southwestern Law Inst</td>
<td>Dallas, TX</td>
<td>6/10-13/74</td>
<td>754.46</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detective</td>
<td>Ktn PD</td>
<td>Drug Enforcement Seminar</td>
<td>Drug Enforce Admin</td>
<td>Frbnks, AK</td>
<td>6/3-5/74</td>
<td>450.00</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Par Admin Officer</td>
<td>Par Ofc</td>
<td>Effective Letter Writ for Mngt Civil Serv Comm</td>
<td>Ptlnd, OR</td>
<td>6/3-6/74</td>
<td>(not approved)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>Ktn PD</td>
<td>Drug Enforcement Seminar</td>
<td>Drug Enforce Admin</td>
<td>Frbnks, AK</td>
<td>6/3-5/74</td>
<td>450.00</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>Ktn PD</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>920.00</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Analyst</td>
<td>Dep Admin</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>OKB A-102 Attach &quot;O&quot; Procuremt LEAA/CJPA</td>
<td>Anchor, AK</td>
<td>8/27-28/74</td>
<td>185.27</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply Officer</td>
<td>Dep H &amp; SS</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>185.27</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin Officer</td>
<td>Pub Safety</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>212.75</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditor</td>
<td>Logis Aud</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>190.27</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Officer</td>
<td>Pfls PD</td>
<td>FBI Instruct Develop Trng Crs</td>
<td>FBI/AST Academy</td>
<td>Sitka, AK</td>
<td>7/6-12/74</td>
<td>90.75</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief</td>
<td>June PD</td>
<td>Chief's Meeting</td>
<td>AK Chief Association</td>
<td>Juneau, AK</td>
<td>10/31-11/2, 74</td>
<td>110.00</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Officer</td>
<td>Kenai PD</td>
<td>St &amp; Local Law Enforce Trng</td>
<td>Drug Enforce Admin</td>
<td>Anch, AK</td>
<td>4/29-5/9, 75</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>Ktn PD</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>689.00</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Officer</td>
<td>Kenai PD</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>600.00</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Bethel PD</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>624.60</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Sldtna PD</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>339.00</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Juneau PD</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>621.00</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Wrangll PD</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>480.00</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Seward PD</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>(did not attend)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2

**Criminal Justice Planning Agency**

**Specialized Training Grants**

**1974**

**Individualized Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Presented by</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Usage</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Current Case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prob Ofc</td>
<td>Correct</td>
<td>19th Ann Juv Offrs Institute</td>
<td>Drug Enforcement Admin</td>
<td>U.S., Minoia</td>
<td>6/17-8/2,74</td>
<td>(canceled, not funded)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrolman</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Drug Enforcement Seminar</td>
<td>Frbnks, AK</td>
<td>6/3-5/74</td>
<td>385.54</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>#1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Police</td>
<td>Sewd PD</td>
<td>Law Enforcement Leadership Seminar</td>
<td>Intl City Mgrs Assoc</td>
<td>Seattle, WA</td>
<td>8/74</td>
<td>347.07</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigator</td>
<td>CIA/AK St</td>
<td>Homicide Seminar</td>
<td>Drug Enforcement Admin</td>
<td>Frbnks, AK</td>
<td>6/3-5/74</td>
<td>335.00</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigator</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>FBI</td>
<td>Mrysvill, CA</td>
<td>7/15-30/74</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst AG</td>
<td>Dept Law</td>
<td>Natl Conf Consum Ocs Admin</td>
<td>White House Consom Aff</td>
<td>Wash, DC</td>
<td>6/14-21/74</td>
<td>1566.60</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Correct</td>
<td>The Child &amp; the Law</td>
<td>Office of Child Advocacy</td>
<td>Anch, AK</td>
<td>6/16-19/74</td>
<td>1039.14</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trng Officer</td>
<td>Anch PD</td>
<td>FBI/AST Instructors School</td>
<td>FBI/AST</td>
<td>Anch, AK</td>
<td>7/9-12/74</td>
<td>307.67</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records &amp; ID Supv</td>
<td>Pub Saf</td>
<td>Identification Educ. Conf.</td>
<td>Intl Assoc for Identif</td>
<td>Wash, DC</td>
<td>7/20-9/2,74</td>
<td>748.05</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Public Defender Workshop</td>
<td>Practicing Law Inst</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>6/20-22/74</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief</td>
<td>Pitka SD</td>
<td>Short Course for Def Attyny</td>
<td>N.M. Univ Sch of Law</td>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
<td>7/8-12/74</td>
<td>630.00</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst AG</td>
<td>Dept Law</td>
<td>Natl In-Service Academy</td>
<td>FBI</td>
<td>Anch, AK</td>
<td>7/15-17/74</td>
<td>250.00</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Super Crt Judge</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>The Child &amp; the Law</td>
<td>Office of Child Advocacy</td>
<td>Anch, AK</td>
<td>6/17-18/74</td>
<td>784.21</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juven Offc</td>
<td>City Ketch</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magistrate</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>Jun PD</td>
<td>Trainers Seminar</td>
<td>FBI/AST</td>
<td>Sitka, AK</td>
<td>7/9-12/74</td>
<td>166.00</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td>Pub Def</td>
<td>Natl College of Advocacy</td>
<td>Assoc T.l. Lyts Amer</td>
<td>Cmbcge, CA</td>
<td>7/21-28/74</td>
<td>1500.00</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Correct</td>
<td>104th Congress of Corrections</td>
<td>Natl Congress of Corrc</td>
<td>Hustn, TX</td>
<td>8/18-22/74</td>
<td>554.47</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chef Xrs Team</td>
<td>FBxks PD</td>
<td>4th Annual Drug Trng Conf</td>
<td>Drug Enforcement Admins</td>
<td>Ft. Ldrcl, FL</td>
<td>10/28-31/74</td>
<td>(did not attend)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>Kxix PD</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>849.05</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>The High School Liaison Prgrm</td>
<td>LSU &amp; New Orleans PD</td>
<td>New Orleans, LA</td>
<td>11/24-27/74</td>
<td>819.26</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>Pub Def</td>
<td>Basic Trial Strategy</td>
<td>Practicing Law Inst</td>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
<td>8/26-26/74</td>
<td>751.00</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Discovery Techniques Workshop</td>
<td>Dallas, TX</td>
<td>9/5-5/74</td>
<td>747.00</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigator</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Auto Theft Invest Schl</td>
<td>Sn Jose, CA</td>
<td>1/20-24/74</td>
<td>733.60</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Pub Def</td>
<td>Natl Legal Aid-Defender Conf</td>
<td>Natl Legal Aid Def Assn</td>
<td>New Orleans, LA</td>
<td>11/13-16/74</td>
<td>1000.00</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Director</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>Pub Def</td>
<td>Crm Adv Inst/Victimrs Cr Conf</td>
<td>Practicing Law Inst/ABA</td>
<td>Sn Dgo/LA, CA</td>
<td>1/17-18/75</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1974 - continued

#### Page 2

**CRIMINAL JUSTICE PLANNING AGENCY**

**SPECIALIZED TRAINING GRANTS**

**1974**

**INDIVIDUALIZED DATA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Presented by</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>UEA</th>
<th>PAU</th>
<th>Call</th>
<th>Exec</th>
<th>777</th>
<th>Declare Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>Palmer PD</td>
<td>Civil Emergency Ofer Survival</td>
<td>CA Specialized Trng Ins</td>
<td>Sn Luis,CA</td>
<td>1/5-1/3/75</td>
<td>804.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prob/Parl Ofer</td>
<td>Correct</td>
<td>2nd Natl Conf Juven Justice</td>
<td>Juvenile Judges/D A Assoc</td>
<td>Nw Orlns,LA</td>
<td>3/9-3/13/75</td>
<td>927.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>Pb Scf Aca</td>
<td>Police Instructors Course</td>
<td>Northwestern Univ</td>
<td>Evntsnt,IL</td>
<td>2/17-3/7,75</td>
<td>3411.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIT</td>
<td>AST</td>
<td>Real Estate Trng (Fraud)</td>
<td>AK Assoc.Realtors</td>
<td>Anch,AK</td>
<td>2/17-2/22/75</td>
<td>250.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer</td>
<td>Div Aviatn</td>
<td>3rd Ann Bomb Tech &amp; Inv Conf</td>
<td>Int Assoc Bomb Tech &amp; I</td>
<td>Phoenix,AZ</td>
<td>4/7-11/75</td>
<td>1276.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Hearing Ofer</td>
<td>AK Transpn.</td>
<td>Administrative Law Session II</td>
<td>Natl Coll State Judicry</td>
<td>Reno,NV</td>
<td>11/12-17/75</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrar</td>
<td>Mtr V Div</td>
<td>AAUVA Annual Regn IV Conf</td>
<td>An Assoc Natl Veh Admins</td>
<td>Albuquerque,NM</td>
<td>5/18-22/75</td>
<td>735.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>Ktn PD</td>
<td>Police Instructor Training</td>
<td>Centrl Missouri Stat Un</td>
<td>Univsbrg,MO</td>
<td>3/3-31/75</td>
<td>932.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Investig.</td>
<td>AST</td>
<td>Arson Investigator's Seminar</td>
<td>Int Assoc Arson Invs</td>
<td>Lincoln,NE</td>
<td>4/21-25/75</td>
<td>895.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOD Specialist</td>
<td>AST</td>
<td>EOD Conference</td>
<td>Int Assoc EOD Techs</td>
<td>Phoenix,AZ</td>
<td>4/7-11/75</td>
<td>744.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigator</td>
<td>Pub Def</td>
<td>Sminon on Investigatve Techiq</td>
<td>Natl Legal Aid &amp; Def As</td>
<td>Milwaukee,WM</td>
<td>4/22-4/26/75</td>
<td>463.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. &amp; I Supervisor</td>
<td>Pub Saf</td>
<td>Identification Conference</td>
<td>Int Identification Ass</td>
<td>Biscayne,FL</td>
<td>7/27-31/75</td>
<td>(did not attend)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detective</td>
<td>Ktn PD</td>
<td>Western Crime Intellig Semin</td>
<td>Western Crime Intell Ass</td>
<td>Boise,Id</td>
<td>5/11-14/75</td>
<td>484.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detective</td>
<td>Anch PD</td>
<td>Auto Theft Investig School</td>
<td>Auto Theft Investig School</td>
<td>San Diego,CA</td>
<td>6/2-6/5/75</td>
<td>267.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>Correct</td>
<td>Correctional Institut Conf</td>
<td>Univsrsity of Minnesota</td>
<td>Minnepa, MN</td>
<td>6/16-2/1/75</td>
<td>579.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prob Ofer (Frbks)</td>
<td>Correct</td>
<td>Juvenile Officers Institute</td>
<td>S. J. U. Dept Adminisms</td>
<td>Boise, ID</td>
<td>5/18-21/75</td>
<td>597.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prob Ofer (Ktn)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigator</td>
<td>Div M V</td>
<td>15th AK Crime Intell Semin</td>
<td>Crimin Investig Bureau</td>
<td>Frbnks,AK</td>
<td>6/11-13/75</td>
<td>260.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>Correct</td>
<td>Correctional Institut Conf</td>
<td>West Central Supets Conf</td>
<td>Boise, ID</td>
<td>5/18-21/75</td>
<td>680.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigator</td>
<td>AST</td>
<td>Advanced Auto Theft School</td>
<td>San Jose University</td>
<td>Sn Jose, CA</td>
<td>6/2-6/5/75</td>
<td>695.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm Patrl Div</td>
<td>Ktn PD</td>
<td>Crime Intelligence Seminar</td>
<td>AK Peace Ofcers Assoc</td>
<td>Frbnks,AK</td>
<td>6/11-13/75</td>
<td>542.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief</td>
<td>Ktn PD</td>
<td>FBI Associates Retraining</td>
<td>FBI</td>
<td>Slt Lk Cty,UT</td>
<td>7/20-23/75</td>
<td>545.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>BozvCityJun</td>
<td>Short Course for Pros Attorny</td>
<td>S E Law Enforcement</td>
<td>Dallas, TX</td>
<td>6/23-26/75</td>
<td>800.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>Jun PD</td>
<td>Crime Intelligence Seminar</td>
<td>AK Peace Ofcers Assoc</td>
<td>Frbnks,AK</td>
<td>6/11-13/75</td>
<td>345.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief</td>
<td>Sltc PD</td>
<td>In-Service Training Seminar</td>
<td>FBI Natl Academy Assoc</td>
<td>S L Cty, UT</td>
<td>7/20-23/75</td>
<td>501.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief</td>
<td>Sord PD</td>
<td>Crime Intelligence Seminar</td>
<td>AK Peace Ofcers Assoc</td>
<td>Frbnks,AK</td>
<td>6/11-13/75</td>
<td>348.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief</td>
<td>Palmer PD</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>159.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Correct</td>
<td>Congress of Correc Meeting</td>
<td>Amer Assoc Corr Admins</td>
<td>Luisvelo, KY</td>
<td>8/17-21/75</td>
<td>(did not attend)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrstate Con Coor</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>569.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm Detect Div</td>
<td>Ktn PD</td>
<td>Crime Intelligence Seminar</td>
<td>Western State College</td>
<td>Billings, MT</td>
<td>5/16-19/76</td>
<td>476.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Presented by</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Evalutee</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Comment Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tng/EEO Ofcr</td>
<td>Correct</td>
<td>Civil Rts Compl Trng</td>
<td>LEAA/IAOMRA</td>
<td>Seatl, WA</td>
<td>11/15-17/75</td>
<td>396.78</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>#1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person Ofcr</td>
<td>Courts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>408.00</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>St EEO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>630.00</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dep Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exec. Director</td>
<td>Pub Bd</td>
<td>Amer Corr Assoc Ann Mtg</td>
<td>Amer Corr Assoc</td>
<td>Lousville, KY</td>
<td>8/17-21/75</td>
<td>750.00</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>#2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detective</td>
<td>Ktn. P D</td>
<td>Law Enforce School (Drugs)</td>
<td>D.E.A.</td>
<td>Butte, MT</td>
<td>9/29-10/10/75</td>
<td>597.00</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigator</td>
<td>AK St Trp</td>
<td>Burgly Investig Seminar</td>
<td>Sacramnto Cty Sher Ofc</td>
<td>Sacramnto, CA</td>
<td>9/2-5/75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehab Couns</td>
<td>Pub Def</td>
<td>Prisons, Psychi &amp; the Law</td>
<td>Acad of Psych &amp; Law</td>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
<td>10/23-26/75</td>
<td>865.00</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hot Line Coord</td>
<td>Ktn Y Ad</td>
<td>1st Ntl Conf on Delin Preven</td>
<td>Natl Fed Yth Serv Bur</td>
<td>Ning F, NY</td>
<td>10/14-17/75</td>
<td>682.00</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Ofcr</td>
<td>Pbks PD</td>
<td>Civil Rts Compl Trng</td>
<td>LEAA/IAOMRA</td>
<td>Seatl, WA</td>
<td>10/15-17/75</td>
<td>445.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehab Director</td>
<td>Hum Rts C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>525.02</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juv Probation</td>
<td>Correct</td>
<td>Juven Justice Workshop</td>
<td>Natl Coun Juv Judges</td>
<td>Reno, NV</td>
<td>10/19-24/75</td>
<td>616.97</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tng Supvr</td>
<td>I Level Treatment Trng</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>526.15</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ass AG Cons Protec</td>
<td>Dept Law</td>
<td>Cons Protect Comm Seminar</td>
<td>Natl Assoc A G's</td>
<td>Ashvle, NC</td>
<td>10/26-29/75</td>
<td>750.55</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Investig</td>
<td>Pub Def</td>
<td>Investigation Conference</td>
<td>Natl Leg Aid Def Ass</td>
<td>Seatl, WA</td>
<td>11/12-14/75</td>
<td>525.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>CJC,UA</td>
<td>Ninth Prgrm for Lawyers</td>
<td>Harvard Law School</td>
<td>Cambrgo, MA</td>
<td>7/23-30/76</td>
<td>1278.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief</td>
<td>Moohn PD</td>
<td>Crimes Intervention Wkshop</td>
<td>Crim Just Ctr, UA</td>
<td>Anchor, AX</td>
<td>11/2-5/75</td>
<td>347.40</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>#4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Prob/Parole</td>
<td>Correct</td>
<td>Natl Sen Crts &amp; Adult Prob</td>
<td>Natl Coun Juv Judges</td>
<td>Denver, CO</td>
<td>1/20-23/75</td>
<td>781.81</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prob Ofcr</td>
<td>3rd Natl Conf on Juv Jstc</td>
<td></td>
<td>Natl Coun Juv Judges</td>
<td>Denver, CO</td>
<td>1/20-23/75</td>
<td>781.81</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup Juv Prov Ofcr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1262.00</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>#5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R &amp; I Superv</td>
<td>Pub Sfty</td>
<td>Security &amp; Privacy Trng</td>
<td>Theorem Institute</td>
<td>Las Veg, NV</td>
<td>1/15-16/76</td>
<td>606.12</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petrolman</td>
<td>Ktn. P D</td>
<td>Fire Investigator I School</td>
<td>Calif St Fire Acad</td>
<td>Carmel, CA</td>
<td>2/5-13/76</td>
<td>429.00</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisc/Admin Ofcr</td>
<td>Pub Def</td>
<td>Defender Hagtment Workshop</td>
<td>Natl Col Crim Def Layr</td>
<td>Wash, DC</td>
<td>2/19-22/76</td>
<td>355.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Vehic Srvc</td>
<td>Pub Saf</td>
<td>Regl Conf AMVWA</td>
<td>Am Ass Motor Veh Admn</td>
<td>Las Veg, NV</td>
<td>5/5-7/75</td>
<td>574.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pub Def, Bethel</td>
<td>Pub Def</td>
<td>Adv Evid Probs &amp; Crs Examin</td>
<td>Natl Col Pub Defdr</td>
<td>Wash, DC</td>
<td>2/26-29/76</td>
<td>1045.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir, Motor Vehic</td>
<td>Pub Saf</td>
<td>Ann Amer Assot Mct Veh Admn</td>
<td>Region IV AMVWA</td>
<td>Las Veg, NV</td>
<td>5/3-7/76</td>
<td>278.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regl. Fire Marshl</td>
<td>Pub Saf</td>
<td>IAAI Seminar</td>
<td>Natal Assn Arsn Invest</td>
<td>Indnapls,IN</td>
<td>4/19-23/76</td>
<td>759.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arson Investigr</td>
<td>Pub Saf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>759.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief, Auth Air Sect</td>
<td>Pub Mkks</td>
<td>IAAAP Annual Conference</td>
<td>Int4 Ass Air &amp; Sea Pol</td>
<td>Vancvr, BC</td>
<td>5/24-28/76</td>
<td>570.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief of Security</td>
<td>Pub Saf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>516.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigator</td>
<td>Pub Saf</td>
<td>Annual Tran Conf</td>
<td>Calif Narc Info Mat</td>
<td>Montry, CA</td>
<td>4/21-23/76</td>
<td>570.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst Attty Genl</td>
<td>Dep Law</td>
<td>Spec Meet Cons Prot Committee</td>
<td>Natl Assoc A G's</td>
<td>C6rnt Cty, NV</td>
<td>3/31-4/2/76</td>
<td>601.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Course Title</td>
<td>Presented by</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Dates</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir, State EEO</td>
<td>EEO Ofc</td>
<td>Affirmative Action Workshop</td>
<td>Am Assoc Affirm Act</td>
<td>San Diego, CA</td>
<td>4/21-23/76</td>
<td>506.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEO Ofcr</td>
<td>Pub Wrks</td>
<td>Ann Conf IABTI</td>
<td>Intl Ass Bomb Tech Inv</td>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
<td>5/30-6/4/76</td>
<td>667.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATIS Director</td>
<td>Dep Admin</td>
<td>Security &amp; Privacy Seminar</td>
<td>Search Group, Inc</td>
<td>San Fran, CA</td>
<td>4/29-30/76</td>
<td>451.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup Pub &amp; Invest</td>
<td>Pub Saf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>455.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Police</td>
<td>Ktn PD</td>
<td>Retraining Session</td>
<td>FBI Natl Acad</td>
<td>Boise, ID</td>
<td>7/18-21/76</td>
<td>479.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bomb Technician</td>
<td>Arch PD</td>
<td>Annual Conference</td>
<td>Intl Ass Bomb Tech Inv</td>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
<td>5/30-6/4/76</td>
<td>732.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Crime Coord</td>
<td>Pub Saf</td>
<td>Tech Development Workshop</td>
<td>Intl Ass Chiefs Police</td>
<td>Wash, DC</td>
<td>5/16-28/76</td>
<td>1541.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir, Mun Veh Divan</td>
<td>Pub Saf</td>
<td>Annual Conference</td>
<td>Am Ass Mun Veh Admins</td>
<td>Las Veg, NV</td>
<td>5/3-7/76</td>
<td>695.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Attorney</td>
<td>Pub Def</td>
<td>Trial of a Criminal Case</td>
<td>Natl Coll Crim Def Lwr</td>
<td>Houston, TX</td>
<td>5/17-18/76</td>
<td>1272.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Specialized Training Grants

#### Utilization for 1973

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. Grants</th>
<th>No. Participants</th>
<th>No. Participants By Agency</th>
<th>No. Participants By Topic</th>
<th>No. Participants By Spons Grp</th>
<th>In-State-Participation</th>
<th>Out-of-State Participation</th>
<th>Total Program</th>
<th>Eval. of Prgrm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>107</td>
<td>$14,944.79 $140.00 $21,819.59 $606.00 $36,764.38 $257.00</td>
<td>20 21 14</td>
<td>8 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Corrections**: 28
- **Pub Sfty**: 13
- **Dept. Law**: 11
- **Pub Def**: 9
- **A.S.T.**: 8
- **Par. Br.**: 4
- **Courts**: 3
- **Cty Admin**: 3
- **Dept. H & S**: 2
- **Dept. Prc**: 2
- **An Conv Col**: 1
- **Act: Mgt**: 1
- **Cty: Box Jn**: 1
- **Dept. Admin**: 1
- **Lkn Audit**: 1
- **Vol Opt**: 66
- **Unact MD**: 12
- **Anch MD**: 11
- **Ktn PD**: 8
- **Fkks PD**: 7
- **Juneau PD**: 4
- **Kodiak PD**: 3
- **Palmer PD**: 3
- **Wrangl PD**: 3
- **Seward PD**: 2
- **Prlsbg**: 2
- **Kenai PD**: 2
- **N. Pole PD**: 2
- **Sitka PD**: 1
- **Cordova PD**: 1
- **Metla PD**: 1
- **Nome PD**: 1
- **Homer PD**: 1
- **Bethel PD**: 1
- **Soldna PD**: 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Grant Mgt</th>
<th>Cv Stc Com</th>
<th>35</th>
<th>0.00</th>
<th>0.00</th>
<th>0.00</th>
<th>0.00</th>
<th>0.00</th>
<th>0.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>$14,944.79</td>
<td>$140.00</td>
<td>$21,819.59</td>
<td>$606.00</td>
<td>$36,764.38</td>
<td>$257.00</td>
<td>20 21 14</td>
<td>8 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Total Cost**: $14,944.79
- **Ave. Cost**: $140.00
- **Total Cost**: $21,819.59
- **Ave. Cost**: $606.00
- **Total Cost**: $36,764.38
- **Ave. Cost**: $257.00
## Specialized Training Grants
### Utilization for 1974

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Correct PIN</td>
<td>Identify</td>
<td>F.B.I</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1,411.82</td>
<td>276.00</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>31,991.93</td>
<td>696.00</td>
<td>36,133.75</td>
<td>592.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Correct PIN</td>
<td>Investigate</td>
<td>Thrd party</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>240.00</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>421.93</td>
<td>129.00</td>
<td>566.00</td>
<td>58.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Correct PIN</td>
<td>Investigate</td>
<td>Thrd party</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>120.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>408.00</td>
<td>129.00</td>
<td>537.00</td>
<td>58.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Correct PIN</td>
<td>Investigate</td>
<td>Thrd party</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>120.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>408.00</td>
<td>129.00</td>
<td>537.00</td>
<td>58.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Correct PIN</td>
<td>Investigate</td>
<td>Thrd party</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>120.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>408.00</td>
<td>129.00</td>
<td>537.00</td>
<td>58.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Correct PIN</td>
<td>Investigate</td>
<td>Thrd party</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>120.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>408.00</td>
<td>129.00</td>
<td>537.00</td>
<td>58.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Correct PIN</td>
<td>Investigate</td>
<td>Thrd party</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>120.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>408.00</td>
<td>129.00</td>
<td>537.00</td>
<td>58.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Correct PIN</td>
<td>Investigate</td>
<td>Thrd party</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>120.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>408.00</td>
<td>129.00</td>
<td>537.00</td>
<td>58.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Correct PIN</td>
<td>Investigate</td>
<td>Thrd party</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>120.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>408.00</td>
<td>129.00</td>
<td>537.00</td>
<td>58.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Correct PIN</td>
<td>Investigate</td>
<td>Thrd party</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>120.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>408.00</td>
<td>129.00</td>
<td>537.00</td>
<td>58.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Specialized Training Grants

Utilization for 1975

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>No. Participants</th>
<th>No. Participants by Agency</th>
<th>No. Participants by Spons Grp</th>
<th>In-State-Participation</th>
<th>Out-of-State Participation</th>
<th>Total Program</th>
<th>Eval of Prgm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Pub Sf/cy</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Civ Acts</td>
<td>LTA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$347.40</td>
<td>$347.00</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correctns</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Juv Just</td>
<td>Am Ass Nkt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pub Pol</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Defenctns</td>
<td>Veh Ad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F.E.O. Of</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Not Veh</td>
<td>Ntl Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pub Workvs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Scm/Priv</td>
<td>Juv Judges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A.S.T.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Arson</td>
<td>Sac City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dpt Law</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Correctns</td>
<td>Shor Off</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Courts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Investgns</td>
<td>Ntl Ass Ads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Razzle Rs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nsckatics</td>
<td>Ntl Acad Cr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ntl Yth Ad</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Consum Pro</td>
<td>Def Lanvs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dpt Adm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Arpt &amp; Scm</td>
<td>Ntl Assoc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hum At Con</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Explosives</td>
<td>Arson In</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cr Jst Ctr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>Ntl As Air</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pol Dpts</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Crises Intr</td>
<td>/Scm Pol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FBI</td>
<td>Int Assoc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Atn PD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tech Devel</td>
<td>Bomb Tch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pub PD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Srch Grp In</td>
<td>Ntl Car As</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Noonah PD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Org Smf Adm</td>
<td>Ntl Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anch PD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 6**
### Specialized Training Grant Participation

**Comparison by System Component 1973-1975**

#### Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1973</th>
<th>1974</th>
<th>1975</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>In-State Participation</td>
<td>Out-of-State Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Expenditure</td>
<td>Ave Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>$9,977.80</td>
<td>$156.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>950.96</td>
<td>106.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrections</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2,586.28</td>
<td>99.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>13,515.04</td>
<td>137.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Agencies</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1,429.75</td>
<td>179.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>14,944.79</td>
<td>140.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1973</th>
<th>1974</th>
<th>1975</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>In-State Participation</td>
<td>Out-of-State Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Expenditure</td>
<td>Ave Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$3,357.61</td>
<td>$280.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>784.21</td>
<td>261.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrections</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6,194.31</td>
<td>774.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4,141.82</td>
<td>276.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Agencies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,235.93</td>
<td>618.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4,141.82</td>
<td>276.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1973</th>
<th>1974</th>
<th>1975</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>In-State Participation</td>
<td>Out-of-State Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Expenditure</td>
<td>Ave Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$347.40</td>
<td>$347.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7,609.55</td>
<td>846.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrections</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4,333.71</td>
<td>619.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>347.40</td>
<td>347.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Agencies</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2,794.44</td>
<td>466.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>347.40</td>
<td>347.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Specialized Training Grants

Percentage Participation & Expenditure by Agency
1973-1975

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. of Participants</th>
<th>% of Total Participants</th>
<th>Expenditures by Agency</th>
<th>% of Total Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>$19,279.78</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8,017.46</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrections</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>4,591.89</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Agencies</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4,875.25</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>36,764.38</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. of Participants</th>
<th>% of Total Participants</th>
<th>Expenditures by Agency</th>
<th>% of Total Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>19,988.64</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>8,714.87</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrections</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6,194.31</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Agencies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1,235.93</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>36,133.75</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. of Participants</th>
<th>% of Total Participants</th>
<th>Expenditures by Agency</th>
<th>% of Total Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>13,036.61</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>7,609.55</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrections</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>4,333.71</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Agencies</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>2,794.44</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>27,774.31</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Specialized Training Grant Utilization

### Three Year Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Grants</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>In-State Participation Expenditure</th>
<th>Ave Cost</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Out-of-State Participation Expenditure</th>
<th>Ave Cost</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Total Program Participation Expenditure</th>
<th>Ave Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>$14,944.72</td>
<td>$140.00</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>$21,819.59</td>
<td>$606.00</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>$36,764.38</td>
<td>$257.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4,141.82</td>
<td>276.00</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>31,991.93</td>
<td>686.00</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>36,133.75</td>
<td>592.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>347.40</td>
<td>347.00</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>27,426.91</td>
<td>653.00</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>27,774.31</td>
<td>646.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Year Total</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>19,433.94</td>
<td>158.00</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>81,238.43</td>
<td>655.00</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>100,672.44</td>
<td>408.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Specialized Training Grants

**Comments 1973-1975**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Code</th>
<th>1973</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Helped to face some of realities as opposed to fictions of the criminal justice process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Evaluations ranged from excellent to satisfactory. There were several comments concerning disillusionment with the curriculum. Suggestions were made that the participants be surveyed for curriculum content wishes prior to design of instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Better planning, organization, and scheduling is necessary. Set out to accomplish too much for diversity of participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Well presented, highly beneficial, encouraged professionalism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Conference too large for interaction on meaningful basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Information and informal methods valuable, subgrantee training should continue, exchange of problems and recommendations very helpful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Very helpful in learning of other chiefs' problems and resources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Code</th>
<th>1974</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Every officer should attend periodically. Should be held in winter months to enable more to participate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Standard procedures discussed, speakers excellent, information of considerable use. Instructor should limit participation to experienced public defenders with administrative responsibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Repetitive, poorer instruction than past conferences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Enriching, worthwhile, systematic, particularly recommended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Advanced extensive instruction, classroom and practical training. Enables more effective instruction. Time too short.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Personal interaction most valuable, Alaska's situation good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mix of police and probation officers valuable experience, program best for police officers with 1-5 years experience.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Code</th>
<th>1975</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bring program to Alaska - localize.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>National interaction, workshops, materials excellent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Too many management level personnel attend. Should only send investigators. Should continue yearly attendance as long as remain in investigations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Police officers should have this training, like to attend more programs of similar nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fair coverage Title 28 re criminal histories, audits etc. Poor instructional organization.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Specialized Training Grants
Manpower/Funding Comparisons
1973-1975

Table 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>% Criminal Justice Employees by Component*</th>
<th>% Funding for Spec. Train. Grants</th>
<th>% of Personnel Within Each Component*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>69% Professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>55% Clerical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrections</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>78% Professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Preliminary figures from manpower research being conducted by Dr. John Angell, Criminal Justice Center, University of Alaska, Anchorage, Alaska
Specialized Training Grants
Comparison of Training Request Priorities
With Training Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>Management and Supervision</td>
<td>Grant management, law enforcement management, narcotics</td>
<td>Criminal Identification Legal Defense, Juvenile Justice, Investigation</td>
<td>Civil Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>Investigation, community relations</td>
<td>Prosecution, Investigation EEO</td>
<td>Instructor Training Corrections, Narcotics</td>
<td>Juvenile Justice Legal Defense, Motor, Vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>English communications, criminal procedure, crime and alcohol, juvenile procedures, Native Alaska, narcotics and dangerous drugs</td>
<td>Juvenile justice, Legal defense FBI, Corrections, Administration</td>
<td>Management explosives FBI, Training</td>
<td>Security privacy arson, corrections investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>Court room procedures, family disturbances correctional practices, judicial system</td>
<td>Identification, instructor training arson, explosives</td>
<td>Consumer protection motor vehicle administrative law, arson, prosecution</td>
<td>Narcotics consumer protection motor vehicle administrative law, arson, prosecution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12
PART II

SPECIALIZED TRAINING GRANTS 1976 THROUGH 1979
INTRODUCTION

As in Part I of this study, Part II will provide an analysis of the data acquired from all approval/claim forms and evaluation of training forms completed by students awarded specialized training grants during the years 1976, 1977, 1978 and 1979. The same format has been followed in Part II in order to facilitate a comparison and analysis of the two time periods but also so that each of the two studies might be utilized independently of the other.

The data acquired from the official documents for the four year period was reduced to tabular form for ease of analysis (see Part II Appendix, List of Tables). As in Part I of this study, the individualized data tables indicate the number of grants per year, the agencies, the topics of the training courses, the training organizations, where and when the training took place, the funding costs for each participant, and a rating of the training programs from excellent to poor based on the participant's evaluation.

The individualized information has been consolidated into total utilization figures for each year under the same categorized headings except that involvement by each agency, participation by topic and sponsoring training organizations have been identified in order to facilitate analysis.

From the utilization tables a breakdown and comparison of data by system component and a comparison of in-state, out-of-state, and total program participation levels for each of the
four years was facilitated, the same as in Part I of the study.

The tabular data provides the opportunity to compare not only levels of individual and financial involvement for each year but also the involvement of the police, legal and correctional components for each year and all four years. A comparison of in-state and out-of-state programming is also made possible through design of these tables.

Figures for each year closely reflect participation levels in manpower and money invested in specialized training for each of the four years. Expenditures reflect the per diem and travel costs from federal funds and matching agency contributions, but they do not include program enrollment costs which have been borne by the employee's sponsoring criminal justice agency. Expenditures do not reflect any costs associated with an individual's salary, fringe benefits, time away from the job (which may have required overtime compensation to other employees or temporary loss of services) or similar cost factors which may be related to the employee's participation in a training program.
Table 1 following provides the identification of each participant by position who utilized the grant fund for 1976 as well as program information for which each grant was provided. Of the 20 grants issued for specialized training in 1976, 24 individuals participated at a cost of $14,473.19. Of these individuals, only 4 took part in training programs provided within Alaska at a cost of $970.00, and, conversely, 20 practitioners traveled outside the state for programs costing approximately $13,500. Costs for the in-state participants averaged $242.50 compared to an average of $675.15 per Outside training program participant (see Table 5).

Police, legal and correctional personnel participating in the 1976 grant program totaled 18 of the 24 participants for the year (Table 10). Of these, the police (12) and correctional (2) personnel took part in attendance at training programs offered outside the state while legal personnel were divided between in-state (1) and out-of-state (9) attendance. Of special interest from the 1976 figures is the fact that 93% of the expenditures for the year was directed to the 83% of all participants who took part in training outside the state. Conversely, only 7% of the year's training money was directed to permit 17% of the participants to attend programs within the state.

Training topics drawing the greatest interest (Table 5) of criminal justice practitioners in 1976 were concerned with computer technology, law enforcement investigation and juvenile
justice. However, none of these topics attracted more than four individuals and only the International Association of Chiefs of Police (as a sponsoring group) attracted as many as three persons to their offerings.

More specifically, of the four persons who took part in programs offered within the state, two attended an abused women's aid session in Anchorage, one took part in a "Microdata" production, and the fourth person attended a youth theory workshop (the latter two programs also in Anchorage). Of the 20 Alaskans attending "outside" programs, 12 were law enforcement officers who attended various conferences and seminars dealing with such topics as homicide investigation, computer capabilities, arson, bomb investigations, and juvenile justice. The remainder of "outside" participants (8) attended programs of individual interest ranging from juvenile diversion to sentencing.

Table 10 figures indicate that 58% of the 1976 expenditures were utilized by police agency personnel who comprised 50% of the total participants in all training programs. 13% of the year's expenditures were utilized by legal personnel. While corrections provided 2 of the personnel receiving grants, the percentage of overall expenditures employed by these personnel (10%) was less than that for "other" agency personnel (19%) who sent 6 people to various programs.

"Other" agency representatives include personnel from divisions or departments that are not directly involved in criminal justice system functions but may have peripheral interests or responsibilities with justice agencies.
As explained in Part I of this study, the participatory data is not intended to separate grants awarded to the major agency categories for purposes of drawing conclusions that law enforcement personnel utilized more or less funding than did corrections or legal personnel. Costs of training in the various major component categories vary when consideration is given to the length of various training programs, the distance of the program from the employee's work station, and the comparative needs for training programs among the major components. An examination of funded levels of participation is useful only in establishing a factual picture of where the funds were allocated. This study does not address the reason for differences that may or may not exist, or what guidelines, if any, may have been used to determine the allocation of the resources. Therefore, the data is helpful in indicating where the funds were expended but not why.

Of the 22 program evaluations received in 1976, 15 were evaluated as above average or excellent, 6 were rated average and 1 received a poor rating. (Note: Several evaluation comments have been selected as examples to indicate the range of ratings from poor to excellent and the reasoning for the evaluation for each of the four one year grant programs. See Table 12.)

The level of involvement for both personnel and funding in 1976 was about average for the four year period in that an average number of criminal justice personnel participated (24), the expenditures were moderate ($14,473.19), and a greater amount of participation in training programs took place outside
the state (83% of total participation) for the four year period 1976 - 1979 inclusive.
SPECIALIZED TRAINING GRANT UTILIZATION - 1977

In 1977 the CJPA funded 20 grants which provided individu­
alized training for 23 criminal justice practitioners at a total
funded level of $18,151.40 (Table 6). Just over $16,300.00 of
the total expended was directed to 19 personnel enrolled in
programs outside of the state. Four personnel were enabled to
seek training within the state at a funded level of just over
$1,800. The average cost per participant in the state was
$457.30 while out-of-state costs averaged $859.06 (Table 6).
Only three individuals who received grants were from "other"
agencies outside of the police, legal or corrections components.
The Juneau Teenage Club sent one of these individuals to a
National Youth Workers Conference, another from the Division of
Data Processing (Department of Administration) attended a program
entitled "Virtual Sequential Access Method" and the third was
the Director of the Office of Volunteer Services who attended a
national forum on volunteers in criminal justice.

The pattern of geographical participation established in
1976 was the same in 1977; i.e., 83% of all criminal justice
practitioners attended specialized training programs out-of­
state while 17% remained in Alaska for training. 90% of the
expended funds went to out-of-state program participants who
comprised 83% of all participants taking part in the program,
while 10% of the funds paid for 17% of the participants who
attended training in-state (Table 9).

Criminal investigation and resource management topics
attracted four and three participants respectively and officer survival, securities fraud and arson topics each attracted two participants. 13 other topics attracted single person involvement only. There were no easily identifiable agencies drawing large numbers of personnel to training sessions, but the International Association of Chiefs of Police offered courses which were attended by six Alaskans in various topic areas. California State University, John Reid College, University of California at Davis, Northwestern University and the Justice Center of the University of Alaska at Anchorage all attracted Alaska justice practitioners. This involvement in training and education programs offered on campuses of higher education appears in 1977 as an indication of the expansion of offerings in the justice related curriculum in university programs across the nation (Table 6).

Of the identified training sponsors, the Los Angeles Police Department S.W.A.T. Team provided training to two Alaskans, the Justice Center, UAA, attracted the Director of the Craig Department of Public Safety to a seminar on "Criminal Justice Management," and another Justice Center offering, on "Substantive Criminal Law," brought the Police Chief of the City of Savoonga to Anchorage as a student/participant. These three programs drew all four of the justice personnel who participated in training programs via CJPA grants within the state in 1977. There was the same number of training "providers" attracting grant recipients within the state in 1977 as there was in 1976, and the same level of in-state grant participation. As stated above, in 1976 in-state programs
attracted 4 practitioners while 1977 programs attracted the same number under the specialized training grant program.

The police agencies were recipients of an increased level of involvement and funding in 1977 as compared to 1976 (Table 10). 70% of the year's expenditures paid for the 70% of all participants, who were from police agencies, to attend training programs. Legal practitioners utilized 13% of the funds, corrections used none, and other agency personnel required 17% of the total expenditures. Again, the data indicates the utilization of funds among the agency categories but cannot be used to explain the rationale for the differences. Therefore, no conclusions should be drawn on the value of grant disbursement differentials.

Of special interest is that correctional personnel utilized none of the funds for the year or, stated differently, none of the participants attending specialized training grant funded programs were from corrections. For comparison, 1976 saw correctional personnel employ 10% of the funds for the year and this resulted in their representing 8% of all participants in specialized training.

Twelve law enforcement personnel participated in training programs out-of-state in 1976 at an average cost of $698.88 per person. In 1977, 12 law enforcement officers went to out-of-state programs at an average cost of $901.58 per person. Also in 1977, police in-state participation (4) had cost an average of $457.30. It is obvious that police personnel participate and do so at a much higher cost in out-of-state programs than within the state.

Sixteen of the 23 criminal justice practitioners evaluated
the training involvement at above average to excellent in quality. Average ratings were given to six programs; none rated poor evaluations and one program received no evaluation. (See Table 12 for sample comments.)

Total grants numbered 20 in both 1976 and in 1977. The number of participants dropped from 24 to 23, but expenditures increased from $14,473.19 to $18,151.40. The major change that took place from the previous year was that 70% of the funds for 1977 were utilized to fund 70% of all participants who were from law enforcement agencies. This was not a reversal of the previous year's funding pattern but an expansion of it.
Table 3 lists the 28 participants receiving specialized training grants for the 1978 program. The 20 grants, which required funding at $13,579.93, represent a much lower level of funding but a greater number of personnel participation than the previous two years. The most dramatic difference, however, in 1978 participation data, occurs in in-state vs. out-of-state funding and levels of involvement when compared to the previous two years. Twelve criminal justice professionals were funded to attend programs provided within the state. These programs were funded an average of $308 which permitted five of these twelve participants to attend a Youth Alternative Services Network Conference in Anchorage and the remaining seven to take part in various law enforcement courses in-state. Conversely, 16 participants were funded at a total cost of $9,872.25 (73% of the total expenditures) to attend programs out-of-state. The average cost for these participants was $617.02 or double the cost per person of the in-state trainee (Table 9).

The average cost per grantee varied not only between trainees sent out-of-state from police agencies ($573) and the legal components ($809), but also differed greatly from the cost of correctional training, which was zero for the second consecutive year. These costs reflect actual average expenditures in 1978 for police, corrections and legal agencies. The comparison is useful in comparing the costs of enabling representative practitioners to take part in individualized programs. It should
be remembered, however, that some types of training may be inherently more expensive per unit than are others. Time, distance and comparative agency needs and resources for training should also be considered.

As illustrated in the Part I study covering the period 1973-1975, it should be noted here that the average cost figure for all agencies sending personnel to out-of-state training programs for each of the 4 years in this Part II study was much higher than the costs for in-state training. Conversely, and more importantly, the average cost figures for in-state participation is significantly lower than for out-of-state training programs.

The topic of greatest interest for training in 1978 was in the area of prevention services for juveniles. Police liability, security, fraud, police internal affairs, criminal investigation, fire and arson, officer survival and trial techniques programs drew small groups of interested Alaskan practitioners. However, no single training program attracted relatively large numbers of practitioners. The Southern Police Institute trained four Alaskans under the grant program, while 5 pairs of participants were drawn toward programs offered by five other agencies in-state and out. The remaining practitioners attended a variety of training programs singly to learn more of subjects ranging from shoplifting and police fleet management to canine training and drug enforcement (Table 7).

The level of funding and level of personnel involved in training programs from police agencies increased still further
from the previous years' 70% of the total expenditures. Legal practitioners' funding involved increases from 13% of the total spent for specialized training in 1976, and 13% of the 1977 expenditures to 18% of the 1978 money. Correctional personnel were not funded, the same as the previous year (Table 10).

The evaluations of training programs that were attended by criminal justice practitioners during the 1978 grant year were complete except that two participants submitted no evaluation comments. Of those that were available, 7 programs were rated as excellent, 12 above average and 7 programs received average ratings. (Sample comments, Table 12.)

As stated previously, the 1978 grant year was significantly different from the previous two years in level of funding, level of participation by practitioners, and in training funded for in-state programs. Funding was one thousand to four thousand-five hundred dollars less than in 1976 and 1977. There were four more participants in 1978 than in 1976 and five more than in 1977. Twelve individuals (43%) received funding for in-state training programs in 1978 compared to 17% (4) of the participants in 1977 and 17% (4) of the 1976 participants.

One important consideration for the decrease in expenditures and increase in the numbers of justice practitioners utilizing specialized training grant funds in 1978 may be related to increased program opportunities in-state and increased agency funding capabilities which provided training without the need for previous levels of CJPA funding.
In light of the CJPA goal stated earlier that "... a balance will be achieved by earmarking a reasonable ratio of available funds to each of the components of legal, police, and corrections. . . ", it seems apparent that funding practices did not meet this goal in any of the previous three years. For example, police in 1976 received 58% of all grant expenditures, 70% of all 1977 grant money and 78% of the 1978 funds from this program. At the same time corrections received 10% of the 1976 funds but received no funds or grants at all in either 1977 or 1978. No explanations or deductions are reasonably available, from the material being analyzed, to explain this gap between goal and practice.
In 1979 the Criminal Justice Planning Agency provided $16,160.07 worth of specialized training grants. This amount provided 28 grants for 28 justice practitioners, the same number of grants that were awarded in the previous year. As in the previous three years no one program topic attracted a large number of grant recipients.

Twenty-one of the 28 justice participants took part in out-of-state programs at a total cost of nearly $14,000 (or an average of $666 per person cost) while the remaining seven attended in-state programs at a cost of approximately $2100 or an average cost of $310.67 per person (Table 8).

Police, legal and correctional personnel totaled 15 participants for the year while the balance of recipients came from "other" agencies (13). Neither the four legal nor the three correctional personnel took part in in-state programs and only two police personnel were funded for in-state offerings. Seven from justice related agencies participated in programs within Alaska.

In 1979 a change occurred in regard to the percentages of funds directed toward the separate units of the justice system. Table 10 indicates that law enforcement expenditures dropped dramatically from the previous three years' percentage allocation, (58% in 1976, 70% in 1977 and 78% in 1978), to a 30% share in 1979. Expenditures for legal personnel remained nearly the same as in previous years (15%), corrections jumped from zero in 1977 and
1978 to 16% in 1979. "Other" agencies received a substantial increase from only 4% in 1978 to a full 39% of all 1979 expenditures.

Juvenile justice topics accounted for four training grants while three persons each were enabled to attend programs on topics including family violence and corrections. Two each attended sessions on women in crisis and white collar crime. The remaining funded participants were involved individually in courses that ranged in topics from extradition and data processing to sexual assault and experimental education (Table 8).

Geographically 87% of the 1979 training funds went to out-of-state program involvement and conversely, 13% of the funds were provided to personnel to receive their training within the state. Interestingly the 39% of total expenditures for 1979 grants provided for almost half of all participants (48%) who were from "other" agencies than police, legal, or corrections units. These "other" personnel represented such agencies or groups as Family Intervention Services, Anchorage Child Abuse Board, Juneau School District, Suicide Prevention and Crisis Center, Aware, Inc., Anchorage Council on Alcohol, S.T.A.R., Bering Sea Women's Group, Alaska Wilderness School and four different group homes or teen clubs from Bethel, Fairbanks, Sitka and Seward.

Again, apparently, as in the previous three years, no one training sponsor attracted a significant number of participants. (Note: Unfortunately 16 of the individual data sheets did not indicate the sponsoring groups so that it is possible that this conclusion is erroneous or at least inadequate.)
The majority of courses were rated as above average (6) or excellent (12) while six participants rated their programs as average. None of the 1979 programs were given a poor rating by the participants; however, there were four programs which were not evaluated or for which no evaluation form was available for assessment (see Table 8).

The pattern established in earlier years was repeated in 1979 with regard to the ratio of the average costs per participant of in-state and out-of-state programs. In 1979 that average per person cost for out-of-state programs ($666) was at least double the average per person cost for in-state participation ($310).
FOUR YEAR COMPARISON

Over the four year period analyzed in Part II of this study a total of $61,905.59 was expended on 81 specialized training grants for individual Alaska criminal justice practitioners. The comparative figures (Table 11) indicate that costs for total program participation ranged from a low average of $485 per individual in 1978, to $789 in 1977. At the same time the numbers of those able to successfully obtain a share of the training funds totaled a high of 28 individuals in 1978 to a low of 23 in 1977, not a broad range. The table indicates that overall participation in out-of-state and within-state training programs totaled 27 in-state and 75 out-of-state for the four year period. The in-state training participation was greatest in 1978 (12 individuals) and declined to four individuals in both 1976 and 1977. While the average costs of "outside" training were consistently higher, the in-state specialized training costs based on the use of these grants was consistently and significantly lower.

The average out-of-state training costs totaled double the amount required to train the average practitioner within-the-state. Of course, numbers of personnel and the amount of money required to permit individualized training to occur are not the only factors to be considered in making these comparisons.

As concluded in Part I of this study, a substantial justification for out-of-state participation in individualized training has been made. Many programs have been unavailable within the state and yet are worthwhile (some are essential) to the continuing professional development of criminal justice practitioners.
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Examples of such outside programs have included the national level district attorney and public defender conferences, the annual meetings of the American Correctional Congress, the national conferences on juvenile justice, and a few specialized law enforcement programs available only at regional schools.

An average of $15,476.40 was expended each year of the four year period for training an average of 26 participants. The average cost for each participant over the four years was $712 per person per training session. These averages are useful only in terms of their potential use for planning for a future period on an overall system basis. They are probably not very useful in planning fund allocations toward a given agency or training effort.

There are difficulties inherent in the subjective classification of the evaluation remarks of the participants and the non-receipt, or non-availability, of 16 of 28 program participant evaluations for 1979 reduces even a relatively subjective effort to questionable usefulness. As we stated in Part I, it is not possible to compare the evaluation of in-state vs. out-of-state programs in any meaningful or dependable manner. A much more extensive and systematic effort should be made to establish a reliably sound and valid evaluation format that would enable useful comparisons to be made. To reiterate our earlier suggestion, it may be quite helpful to know whether programs presented in-state were seen as more valuable than those "outside" and why, what subject matter was the most beneficial in terms of the relationship to actual job performance, and whether individual programs would be worthy of continued participation from Alaskan
practitioners on a larger scale.

It would also be quite helpful to receive suggestions or ratings from participants about the potential usefulness of bringing certain outstanding speakers and/or programs to the state. It seems clear that more persons could benefit and at lower cost if trainers were brought to the trainees rather than the reverse whenever possible.
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### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Presented By</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Excelent?</th>
<th>Average?</th>
<th>Poor?</th>
<th>Comment Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>Ketchikan PD</td>
<td>National Homicide Institute</td>
<td>CORMC</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>9/14-17</td>
<td>595.00</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Family Connection</td>
<td>Juvenile Diversion</td>
<td>Human Resource Development</td>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>10/4-6</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse</td>
<td>Div. of Mental Health</td>
<td>Mental Health for the Convicted Offender, Patient &amp; Prisoner</td>
<td>North Carolina Medical Society</td>
<td>Raleigh, NC</td>
<td>10/27-29</td>
<td>698.93</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>Alaska Judicial Coun.</td>
<td>Sentencing</td>
<td>Nat’l Coll. of State Judiciary</td>
<td>Reno, NV</td>
<td>11/14-19</td>
<td>471.10</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>Juneau PD</td>
<td>Criminal Investigation</td>
<td>Regional Crim Just. Trng Center</td>
<td>Modesto, CA</td>
<td>1/17-28</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>Ketchikan PD</td>
<td>EEQ/Developing Police Computer Cap.</td>
<td>IACP</td>
<td>Las Vegas, NV</td>
<td>1/10-2/3</td>
<td>822.00</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Officer</td>
<td>Anchorage PD</td>
<td>Developing Police Computer Cap.</td>
<td>IACP</td>
<td>Las Vegas, NV</td>
<td>1/10-13</td>
<td>918.05</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>Public Safety</td>
<td>1st Annual A.P.P.R.O. Conf.</td>
<td>Assn of Police Planning &amp; Res. Officers</td>
<td>San Diego, CA</td>
<td>3/31-4/2</td>
<td>603.32</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>Public Safety</td>
<td>Computer Capabilities</td>
<td>IACP</td>
<td>Las Vegas, NV</td>
<td>1/10-13</td>
<td>841.85</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Dir.</td>
<td>Juneau Comm. on Assaults Against Women</td>
<td>Violence in the Home: Battering Women</td>
<td>Abused Women’s Aid in Crisis</td>
<td>Anchorage</td>
<td>3/25-36</td>
<td>250.00</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Off.</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOD Spec.</td>
<td>Dept of Pub Works</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrol Sgt.</td>
<td>Anchorage PD</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detective</td>
<td>Alaska Judicial Coun.</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Lab Supvr.</td>
<td>Public Safety</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>Ketchikan Youth Adv.</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex: Director</td>
<td>Dept of Comm. &amp; Econ.</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Examiner (2)</td>
<td>Dept of Comm. &amp; Econ.</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SPECIALIZED TRAINING GRANTS
### 1977
### INDIVIDUALIZED DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Presented By</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Above Ave</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Comment Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Teenage Club</td>
<td>Nat'l Youth Workers Conf</td>
<td>Nat'l Youth Organization</td>
<td>Washington DC</td>
<td>6/7-10</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers (2)</td>
<td>Fairbanks PD</td>
<td>Officer Survival</td>
<td>Los Angeles S.W.A.T. Team</td>
<td>Anchorage</td>
<td>8/15-18</td>
<td>979.00</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenants</td>
<td>Ketchikan PD</td>
<td>84th Ann IACP Conf</td>
<td>IACP</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>10/1-6</td>
<td>864.00</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst Atty Gen (2)</td>
<td>Dept of Law</td>
<td>Securities Fraud Seminar</td>
<td>No. Am. Securities Admin Assn</td>
<td>St Petersburg, FL</td>
<td>8/23-25</td>
<td>1190.26</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detective</td>
<td>Fairbanks PD</td>
<td>Burglary Prevention</td>
<td>California State Univ.</td>
<td>Long Beach, CA</td>
<td>10/12-14</td>
<td>943.00</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detective</td>
<td>Ketchikan PD</td>
<td>Crim. Interrogation &amp; Beh. Analysis</td>
<td>John Reid College</td>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
<td>10/10-17</td>
<td>955.00</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone Chief</td>
<td>AST</td>
<td>Police Manpower &amp; Res Mngt Wkrshp</td>
<td>IACP</td>
<td>Atlanta, GA</td>
<td>9/19-23</td>
<td>820.00</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Craig Dept of Pub Saf</td>
<td>CJ Mngt Seminar for Practitioners</td>
<td>CJC</td>
<td>Juneau</td>
<td>8/29-30</td>
<td>298.24</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Anchorage PD</td>
<td>Police Labor Relations Seminar</td>
<td>IACP</td>
<td>St Louis, MO</td>
<td>10/17-21</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juv Officer</td>
<td>Ketchikan PD</td>
<td>Police Juv Procedures Workshop</td>
<td>IACP</td>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
<td>8/22-26</td>
<td>794.00</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Off of Vol Services</td>
<td>7th Ann Nat'l Forum on Vol in CJ</td>
<td>Office of Volunteer Services</td>
<td>Dallas, TX</td>
<td>11/05-14</td>
<td>541.04</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Chief</td>
<td>City of Savoonga</td>
<td>Subs Crim Law &amp; Law Enf Off</td>
<td>Northwestern Univ</td>
<td>Anchorage</td>
<td>12/19</td>
<td>541.96</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detective</td>
<td>Fairbanks PD</td>
<td>Homicide &amp; Maj Crime Scene Inv</td>
<td>Southern Police Institute</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
<td>2/20-24</td>
<td>1157.50</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Inv</td>
<td>Dept of Pub Saf</td>
<td>Homicide Investigation Seminar</td>
<td>IACP</td>
<td>Los Vegas, NV</td>
<td>2/20-24</td>
<td>560.00</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigator</td>
<td>Wrangell PD</td>
<td>Arson Seminar</td>
<td>Int'l Assn of Arson Inv</td>
<td>Anaheim, CA</td>
<td>4/23-28</td>
<td>751.00</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief</td>
<td>Metro Unit</td>
<td>Mgmt of Multi-Agency Inv Units</td>
<td>Int'l Assn of Arson Inv</td>
<td>Anaheim, CA</td>
<td>4/23-28</td>
<td>751.00</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SPECIALIZED TRAINING GRANTS**  
**1978**  
**INDIVIDUALIZED DATA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Presented By</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Grade Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>Dept of Pub Safety</td>
<td>Police Civil Liability Workshop</td>
<td>AELE</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>5/21-24</td>
<td>519.00</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenan</td>
<td>Fairbanks PD</td>
<td>Seminar on Securities Fraud</td>
<td>Ak Div of Banking &amp; Securities</td>
<td>Juneau</td>
<td>4/3-6</td>
<td>578.50</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenan</td>
<td>Dept of Pub Safety</td>
<td>Internal Affairs</td>
<td>Southern Police Institute</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
<td>6/19-30</td>
<td>250.00</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigator I</td>
<td></td>
<td>Homicide Investigation Seminar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6/5-16</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief of Police</td>
<td>Ketchikan PD</td>
<td>Work on Police Civil Liability</td>
<td>AELE</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>5/21-24</td>
<td>620.00</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief of Police</td>
<td>Homer PD</td>
<td>19th Ann NW Arson Seminar</td>
<td>Oregon Fire Chiefs Assn</td>
<td>Eugene, OR</td>
<td>5/8-12</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigator</td>
<td>Dept of Pub Safety</td>
<td>Police Fleet Mgmt Workshop</td>
<td>IACP</td>
<td>Jackson, MI</td>
<td>6/19-21</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst Atty Gen</td>
<td>Dept of Law</td>
<td>14th Annual Conference</td>
<td>Nat'l Assn of Extradition Off</td>
<td>Atlanta, GA</td>
<td>5/21-24</td>
<td>764.29</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer</td>
<td>Mun. of Anchorage</td>
<td>6th Ann Canine Trainers Seminar</td>
<td>St. Paul Police Dept Canine Unit</td>
<td>St Paul, MN</td>
<td>5/19-21</td>
<td>700.87</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst Dist Atty(2)</td>
<td>Dept of Law</td>
<td>Trial Techniques Seminar</td>
<td>Nat'l Coll of Dist Atty</td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
<td>3/14-18</td>
<td>1662.92</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief</td>
<td>Anchorage PD</td>
<td>FBI Nat'l Academy Ass Trng Sem</td>
<td>FBI</td>
<td>Port Angeles, WA</td>
<td>7/16-19</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>Sitka PD</td>
<td>Drug Enforcement School</td>
<td>Dept of Justice</td>
<td>Anchorage</td>
<td>7/24-8/4</td>
<td>480.08</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigator</td>
<td>Dept of Pub Safety</td>
<td>Int'l Assn of Auto Theft Inv Sem</td>
<td>Int'l Assn of Auto Theft Inv</td>
<td>Mobile, AL</td>
<td>8/6-11</td>
<td>1078.50</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>Anchorage PD</td>
<td>Officer Survival</td>
<td>University of Alaska</td>
<td>Fairbanks</td>
<td>8/3-5</td>
<td>287.02</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Marshall I</td>
<td>Dept of Pub Safety</td>
<td>Fire and Arson Inv Seminar</td>
<td>University of Alaska</td>
<td>Fairbanks</td>
<td>8/3-5</td>
<td>288.58</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporal</td>
<td>Juneau PD</td>
<td>Officer Survival</td>
<td>Anchorage PD</td>
<td>Anchorage</td>
<td>8/21-25</td>
<td>255.00</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trng Officer</td>
<td>Homer PD</td>
<td>Field Training Officer School</td>
<td>Youth Alternative Service Network</td>
<td>Anchorage</td>
<td>10/16-21</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Bethel Group Home</td>
<td>Preventive Services Conference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Petersburg Youth Prgm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Nome Cam Yth Prgm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Petersburg D C Yth Prgm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Ketch Youth Adv Prgm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SPECIALIZED TRAINING GRANTS
### 1979

### INDIVIDUALIZED DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Presented By</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Exclusively Above Average Poor Comment Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family Intervention Services</td>
<td>Family Intervention: Homebuilders Trng Class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Therapist</td>
<td>Anch Child Abuse Bd</td>
<td>Violence in Families Nat'l Symp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Officer</td>
<td>Ketchikan PD</td>
<td>6th Nat'l Conf on Juv Just</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hot Springs, AR</td>
<td>10/29-11/11</td>
<td>804.75</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation Off III</td>
<td>Corrections</td>
<td>Prob/Parole Practice</td>
<td></td>
<td>San Diego, CA</td>
<td>2/4-8</td>
<td>953.00</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Juneau School Dist</td>
<td>6th Nat'l Conf on Juv Just</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tuscon, AZ</td>
<td>1/14-20</td>
<td>705.26</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Juneau School Dist</td>
<td>6th Nat'l Conf on Juv Just</td>
<td></td>
<td>San Diego, CA</td>
<td>2/4-8</td>
<td>682.08</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Suicide Prev &amp; Crisis</td>
<td>Nat'l Conf of Info and Referral Services</td>
<td>Fordham Univ</td>
<td>Phoenix, AZ</td>
<td>4/5-8</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Fire</td>
<td>Dept Pub Safety</td>
<td>1979 Arson Inv Seminar</td>
<td>Int'l Assn of Arson Inv</td>
<td>Williamsburg, VA</td>
<td>5/21-25</td>
<td>934.00</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>Dept of Law</td>
<td>1979 Nat'l Symposium on Pre-Trial Services</td>
<td>Nat'l Assn of Pre-Trial Services</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
<td>4/27-5/1</td>
<td>935.98</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer</td>
<td>Dept of Transportation</td>
<td>7th Ann Int'l Assn of Bomb Techs &amp; Investigators</td>
<td></td>
<td>San Jose, CA</td>
<td>5/27-6/1</td>
<td>666.20</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Aware, Inc.</td>
<td>Workshop of Aiding Battered Women</td>
<td></td>
<td>Anchorage, AK</td>
<td>4/28-29</td>
<td>281.14x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst Atty Gen</td>
<td>Dept of Law</td>
<td>1979 Nat'l Assn of Extradition Off</td>
<td>Nat'l Assn of Extradition Off</td>
<td>Carson City, NV</td>
<td>5/20-23</td>
<td>503.52</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Chief</td>
<td>Seward PD</td>
<td>1979 Western States Regional Trng Session for FBI Nat'l Academy Grads</td>
<td></td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
<td>7/8-11</td>
<td>444.43x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info Specialist</td>
<td>Anch Counc on Alcohol</td>
<td>Women in Crisis Conf</td>
<td>Americans for Effective Law Enhf</td>
<td>NY, NY</td>
<td>5/17-19</td>
<td>681.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>Ketchikan PD</td>
<td>Police Civil Liability</td>
<td></td>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>5/14-16</td>
<td>872.00</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prob Officer</td>
<td>Corrections</td>
<td>Degree Program - Probation Practice</td>
<td>Fordham Univ</td>
<td>Tuscon, AZ</td>
<td>6/24-31</td>
<td>1357.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Systems Coor</td>
<td>Anchorage PD</td>
<td>31-Hour Corresponder</td>
<td>Data Processing Mgmt Assn</td>
<td>Anchorage, AK</td>
<td>5/30-6/1</td>
<td>375.00</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paralegal Asst</td>
<td>Dept of Law</td>
<td>2nd Comp Trng Course on White Crime</td>
<td></td>
<td>Seattle, WA</td>
<td>6/24-30</td>
<td>453.15x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Analyst</td>
<td>S.T.A.R.</td>
<td>Nat'l Coalition Against Sexual Assault Conference</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lake Geneva, WI</td>
<td>8/24-26</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporal</td>
<td>Juneau PD</td>
<td>Uniformed Investigator School</td>
<td>Anchorage PD</td>
<td>Anchorage, AK</td>
<td>8/27-31</td>
<td>415.00</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Vol in Corrections</td>
<td>1979 Nat'l Assn of Vol in Corr Forum</td>
<td>Anchorage PD</td>
<td>Biloxi, Miss</td>
<td>10/7-10</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Director</td>
<td>Boring Sea Women's Group</td>
<td>North West Women's Action on Family Violence</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tacoma, WA</td>
<td>9/19-21</td>
<td>628.92x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Alaska Wilderness Sch</td>
<td>7th Ann Conf on Experiential Ed</td>
<td></td>
<td>Portsmouth, NH</td>
<td>10/14-16</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor</td>
<td>Bethel Group Home</td>
<td>Conf on Prev Youth Services</td>
<td>Youth Alternative Services Network</td>
<td>Anchorage, AK</td>
<td>11/7-9</td>
<td>407.00</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presbyterian Hosp House</td>
<td>Workshop on Crisis Intervention</td>
<td>Youth Alternative Services Network</td>
<td>Anchorage, AK</td>
<td>11/7-9</td>
<td>407.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Sitka Teen Club</td>
<td>Conf on Prev Youth Services</td>
<td>Youth Alternative Services Network</td>
<td>Anchorage, AK</td>
<td>11/7-9</td>
<td>496.55</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seward Teen Club</td>
<td>Workshop on Cm Education Prog Development &amp; Staff Development</td>
<td></td>
<td>Anchorage, AK</td>
<td>11/7-9</td>
<td>496.55</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detective</td>
<td>Fairbanks PD</td>
<td>White Collar Crime Enfment Strategies</td>
<td>Nat'l Center on White Collar Crime</td>
<td>Seattle, WA</td>
<td>6/24-30</td>
<td>459.00</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Specialized Training Grants

**Utilization for 1976**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. Grants</th>
<th>No. Participants</th>
<th>No. Participants By Agency</th>
<th>No. Participants By Topic</th>
<th>In-State-Participation</th>
<th>Out-of-State Participation</th>
<th>Total Program</th>
<th>Eval of Prsps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Investig 3</td>
<td>GORMA 1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$970.00</td>
<td>$13,503.19</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Juv Jstc 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$422.50</td>
<td>$175.15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Corntin 1</td>
<td>Correctns 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
<td>$675.15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Div of Sentencing 1</td>
<td>Nat'l Col of</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$603.05</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ment Hlth 1</td>
<td>Computers 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AK Judicial</td>
<td>Arson 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$800.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>Plan &amp; Res 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Correctns 1</td>
<td>Battered</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$900.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Juneau PD 1</td>
<td>Women 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Anch PD 2</td>
<td>Explosives 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$900.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Sfty 5</td>
<td>Organizat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Juneau Com</td>
<td>Theory 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>on Asslts</td>
<td>Identif. 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>agnst Harm 2</td>
<td>Secur 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dept of Fraud</td>
<td>Assn of Pol</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$700.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pub Wrks 1</td>
<td>Off Conf 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frtnks PD 1</td>
<td>Abusd Wns</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ketch Yth</td>
<td>Aid in Crisis 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adv 1</td>
<td>Int'l Assn of</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parole Bd 1</td>
<td>Bomb Techs 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dept of Cr &amp; Econ Dev 2</td>
<td>Microdata 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NW Univ 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Int'l Assn for Ident 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AK Yth Alt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Serviccs 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Amer Corr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assn 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Not indic)
## Specialized Training Grants

### Utilization for 1977

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. Grants</th>
<th>No. Participants</th>
<th>By Agency</th>
<th>No. Participants</th>
<th>By Topic</th>
<th>No. Participants</th>
<th>By Spons Grp</th>
<th>In-State-Participation</th>
<th>Out-of-State Participation</th>
<th>Total Program</th>
<th>Eval of Proj</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Trade Clb 1</td>
<td>Yth Wrkrs 1</td>
<td>Nat'l Yth Org 1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,829.20</td>
<td>$457.30</td>
<td>$16,322.20</td>
<td>$859.06</td>
<td>$18,151.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frbnke PD 5</td>
<td>Offcr Surv 2</td>
<td>IA SWAT Tm 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ketch PD 3</td>
<td>IMP Conf 1</td>
<td>IACP 6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dept of Lw 2</td>
<td>Sec Fraud 2</td>
<td>NA Sec Admin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dept of Admin 1</td>
<td>Data Proc 2</td>
<td>Assn 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Admin 1</td>
<td>Burg Prev 1</td>
<td>Jn Reid Coll 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AK Jd Cncl 1</td>
<td>Inv 4</td>
<td>UC Davis 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AST 1</td>
<td>Research 1</td>
<td>CJC 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Craig Dept of PS 1</td>
<td>Res Mngt 3</td>
<td>Vol Servcs 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Anch PD 1</td>
<td>Juv Proc 1</td>
<td>So Pol Inst 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vol Servcs 1</td>
<td>Vol in CJ 1</td>
<td>Int'l Assn of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DHSS 1</td>
<td>Police-Soc 1</td>
<td>Arson Inv 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City of Savoonga 1</td>
<td>Work 1</td>
<td>Cal St Univ 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public 1</td>
<td>Law 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Safety 3</td>
<td>Arson 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wrangell PD 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>In-State Participation</td>
<td>Out-of-State Participation</td>
<td>Total Program</td>
<td>Eval of Prog</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>AELS</td>
<td>$3,707.68</td>
<td>$308.97</td>
<td>$9,872.25</td>
<td>$617.01</td>
<td>$13,579.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Specialized Training Grants

**Utilization for 1979**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. Grants</th>
<th>No. Participants</th>
<th>No. Participants By Agency</th>
<th>No. Participants By Topic</th>
<th>In-State-Participation</th>
<th>Out-of-State Participation</th>
<th>Total Program</th>
<th>Eval of Prgrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1 Family</td>
<td>Fordham Univ</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$2,174.69</td>
<td>$310.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Violence</td>
<td>Crim Adv Inst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$13,985.38</td>
<td>$665.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 Correctns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$16,160.07</td>
<td>$577.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Def Violent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Crimes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Dist refer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Public Def</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Serv</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Suicide Prev</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Public Sfty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Dept of Law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Dept of Trans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Powre Inc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Seward PD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Anch Coupe on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Alcoholism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Anch PD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Attty Gen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 S.T.A.R.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Juneau PD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Vol in Corr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Bering Sea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Womens Grp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 AK Widms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Bethel Grp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Hume</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Presby Hsp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Sitka Teen Club</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Seward Teen Club</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Frinks PD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Specialized Training Grant Participation
Comparison by System Component 1976-1979

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Component</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Ave Cost</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Ave Cost</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Ave Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Police</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$8,386.59</td>
<td>$698.88</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$8,386.59</td>
<td>$698.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,601.10</td>
<td>533.70</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,851.10</td>
<td>462.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corrections</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,535.55</td>
<td>767.77</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11,773.24</td>
<td>654.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Agencies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,979.95</td>
<td>659.98</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2,699.95</td>
<td>450.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13,503.19</td>
<td>675.16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14,473.19</td>
<td>603.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total Program Partic.</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Component</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Ave Cost</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Ave Cost</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Ave Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Police</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,829.20</td>
<td>$457.30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$10,819.00</td>
<td>$901.58</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$12,708.20</td>
<td>$794.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,301.63</td>
<td>767.21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,301.63</td>
<td>767.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corrections</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,829.20</td>
<td>457.30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13,120.63</td>
<td>874.70</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15,009.83</td>
<td>789.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Agencies</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3,201.57</td>
<td>800.39</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3,201.57</td>
<td>800.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16,322.20</td>
<td>859.06</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18,151.40</td>
<td>789.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total Program Partic.</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Component</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Ave Cost</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Ave Cost</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Ave Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Police</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$3,207.68</td>
<td>$458.24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$7,445.04</td>
<td>$572.70</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$10,652.72</td>
<td>$532.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,427.21</td>
<td>809.07</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,427.21</td>
<td>809.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corrections</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3,207.68</td>
<td>458.24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9,872.25</td>
<td>617.02</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13,079.93</td>
<td>568.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Agencies</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7,072.68</td>
<td>308.97</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13,579.93</td>
<td>484.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total Program Partic.</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Component</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Ave Cost</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Ave Cost</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Ave Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Police</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$790.00</td>
<td>$395.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$4,328.63</td>
<td>$721.44</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$5,118.63</td>
<td>$639.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2,392.65</td>
<td>598.16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2,392.65</td>
<td>598.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corrections</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,562.44</td>
<td>854.15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,562.44</td>
<td>854.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9,283.72</td>
<td>714.13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10,073.72</td>
<td>671.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Agencies</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,384.69</td>
<td>276.94</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4,701.66</td>
<td>587.71</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6,086.35</td>
<td>468.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13,985.38</td>
<td>665.97</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16,160.07</td>
<td>577.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total Program Partic.</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>No. of Participants</td>
<td>% of Total Participants</td>
<td>Expenditures by Agency</td>
<td>% of Total Expenditures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1976</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$8,386.59</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>1,851.10</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrections</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1,535.55</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Agencies</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>2,699.95</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>14,473.19</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1977</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>12,708.20</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2,301.63</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrections</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Agencies</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>3,201.57</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>18,151.40</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1978</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>10,652.72</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2,427.21</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrections</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Agencies</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>13,579.93</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1979</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>4,659.63</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>2,392.65</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrections</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2,562.44</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Agencies</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>6,086.35</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>15,701.07</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Specialized Training Grant Utilization

### Four Year Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Grants</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Ave Cost</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Ave Cost</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Ave Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$970.00</td>
<td>$240.00</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$13,503.19</td>
<td>$675.16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$14,473.19</td>
<td>$603.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,829.20</td>
<td>$457.30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$16,322.20</td>
<td>$859.06</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>$18,151.40</td>
<td>$789.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$3,707.68</td>
<td>$308.97</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$9,872.25</td>
<td>$617.02</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>$13,579.93</td>
<td>$484.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$2,174.69</td>
<td>$310.67</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$13,526.38</td>
<td>$676.32</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>$15,701.07</td>
<td>$581.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Four Year Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>87</strong></td>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,681.57</strong></td>
<td><strong>321.54</strong></td>
<td><strong>75</strong></td>
<td><strong>53,224.02</strong></td>
<td><strong>709.65</strong></td>
<td><strong>102</strong></td>
<td><strong>61,905.59</strong></td>
<td><strong>711.56</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Specialized Training Grants

**Comments 1976-79**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Code</th>
<th>1976</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Increased familiarity with subject.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Too much time was spent emphasizing other states particular systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Was made more aware of other jurisdiction's problems and solutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Felt more time should be spent on problem solving exercises.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Enhanced awareness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Felt the workshop was good and had the tools necessary to formally organize and accomplish much in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Topic did not relate to Alaska.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Code</th>
<th>1977</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Was much better than last year's conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Made it possible for this officer to detect mistakes he and other policemen were making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The seminar was not always entirely on point. The seminar suffered from having instructors that weren't well versed in the area of criminal law.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Too much emphasis was placed on Florida law.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Subject matter had been well researched and organized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The course should have been longer. The instruction seemed to be pointed to a very large department.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Code</th>
<th>1978</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A lot of information was received merely by associating with members of other police depts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>There were some classes that did not pertain to Alaska.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The course lacked in practical exercises and in general was designed for the beginning investigator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Any police fleet manager who does not avail himself of this course will be operating in a vacuum and will waste time and money making mistakes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Code</th>
<th>1979</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The institute was beneficial in some respects and not too beneficial in others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The program was in some instances much too general and in other instances it was too highly specialized.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Specialized Training Grants

Manpower/Funding Comparisons

1976-1979

Table 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>% Criminal Justice Employees by Component*</th>
<th>% Funding for Spec. Train. Grants</th>
<th>% of Personnel Within Each Component*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>1976-1979</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>69% Professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>55% Clerical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrections</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>78% Professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Agencies</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figures from manpower research completed by Dr. John Angell, Justice Center, University of Alaska, Anchorage, 1978.
PART III

SPECIALIZED TRAINING GRANTS 1973 THROUGH 1979
A SEVEN YEAR OVERVIEW

Three hundred forty-nine state and local government personnel have been the recipients of the Criminal Justice Planning Agency's Specialized Training Grants over the seven year period from 1973 through 1979 inclusive. A total of $162,578.03 was distributed over this period to enable criminal justice practitioners from courts, the legal community, corrections and police agencies, as well as those from agencies having at least peripheral interest in justice affairs, to attend training or education programs in-state and out. If the total expenditures were divided by the total number of participants, each grant would have been awarded at an average expenditure of $465.84.

Of the 349 grant recipients, 190 (55%) were from police agencies, 61 (17%) were from the court or legal components, 51 (15%) were from corrections, and 47 (13%) were from "other" agencies having justice interests or obligations.

While these seven year averages may be of general interest, it should be noted that there were significant differences in funding levels from year to year, from one component to another, and from the initial three year study period to the second four year study period.

For example, from 1973 through 1975 there were 247 participants funded at a cost of $100,672.44 or an average expenditure of $408.00 per person. From 1976 through 1979, 102 people received grants totaling $61,905.59 or an average expenditure of $711.56 per participant. In 1973 75% (107) of the 143 grantees attended
programs within the state which resulted in an average cost per participant for that year of $257, the lowest average cost for all seven years and the year of the greatest total number of participants. In contrast, there were 42 personnel (99% of all grant recipients) who received a grant for an out-of-state program in 1975 and that year's average cost per participant was $646. In general, there is a pattern which emerges over the seven year period which indicates that as in-state participation increases, more people participate and this in turn tends to lower the average cost per person for each year. In other words, more people participate at less cost for in-state programs than for out-of-state programs.

While 1973 and 1974 reflected program costs of 36.7 and 36.1 thousand dollars respectively, the expenditures for 1975 dropped to approximately 27.8 thousand dollars. Participation levels too, dropped from a high of 143 in 1973 to 61 in 1974 and finally 43 in 1975.

The second segment of the study, the four year period 1976 through 1979, saw further drops in expenditures and participation levels. For example, in 1976 $14.4 thousand was expended on the individualized grants. In 1977 the figure was raised somewhat to $18.1 thousand but dropped again to $13.5 thousand in 1978 and finally back up slightly to $16.1 thousand in 1979. In no case, however, did the 1976-1979 period witness expenditures even close to the earlier three year period. Participation levels also dropped to an average of approximately 26 for the four year period.
Another obvious area of interest extracted from the data is the fluctuation of the number and total value of grants awarded to the representatives of various agencies over the seven years. Except in the last year of the seven year period (1979) police participants have in every year received approximately half the total funds for that year. However, in certain years they received 70% (1977) and 78% (1978) of the total expenditures. Only in 1979 were the law enforcement applicants funded at a low of 30% of the total expenditures. Even this lowest level of police funding was greater than the percentage of funds directed to other justice segments in any one year of the previous six years; i.e., no other justice unit had been granted as much as 30% of the funds in any of the previous years (Table 2). An exception occurred only in 1979 when "other" agency representatives received 39% of the total funds awarded that year.

As Table 4 indicates, an average of 55% of the expenditures over the total seven year period was awarded to representatives of police agencies even though police personnel make up 48% of the number of criminal justice professionals in the state. The legal personnel who represent 30% of all criminal justice personnel received an average of 20% of the seven years of funding, and the correctional component, 22% of all criminal justice employees, received 12% of all specialized training grants between 1973 and 1979 inclusive. Although it is difficult, if not impossible, to estimate the number of "other" agency personnel having criminal justice interests or responsibilities, it is known that this segment of participants received an average of
13% of the funds over the seven year period.

It may be useful to re-examine the substantial differences in awards made from year to year to in-state participant in relationship to the higher costs associated with funding personnel to attend "outside" programs. This seems to be the second of meaningful and obvious patterns of differences identified in the data (the first being differential funding by criminal justice components described above).

In every year of the seven years of the study the average cost per in-state grant recipients was at least half, and in one year (1973) one-fourth, the average cost of sending an individual to an out-of-state program. Further, the percentage of total expenditures allocated to in-state participation always enabled proportionately more individuals to attend programs in-state. As examples, in 1973 41% of the funds for that year enabled 75% of the year's participants to attend various training sessions within Alaska, in 1974 12% of the funds sent 25% of the grantees to in-state sessions and finally in 1979 13% of the funds enabled 25% of the personnel receiving grants to remain in-state for training.

It is clear, then, that this second major pattern should be considered if stretching the decreasing and limited funds is to be an important factor in future funding strategies.

An examination of the topics which attracted criminal justice personnel from 1973 to the end of the decade is useful in that the areas of professional interest can be assessed. Clear patterns of interest are indicated in the year 1973 (see Part I, Table 4)
when large numbers of grant recipients were involved in grant management, law enforcement management, and narcotics training programs. Even in 1974, programs such as criminal identification, legal defense, investigation, and juvenile justice attracted an identifiable majority of state and municipal personnel. In 1975 (Part I, Table 6) it becomes more difficult to distinguish between topics by level of participation because of fewer total grantees and a range of topics which attracted fewer numbers to each program than in previous years.

In the following four year period, 1976 through 1979, there are no clearly defined topics which attracted large numbers of grant recipients. Except for a new topic area which had not appeared in earlier years, battered women - women in crisis - sexual assault, the topics for the four year period are compatible with those offered in the earlier three year period.
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A few conclusions can be drawn from the seven years of data, which may be of general value for planning the future direction of the program effort. No value judgments or priorities are intended in these statements which are based on the analysis of the data in Parts I and II of this study.

1. The police or law enforcement component of the criminal justice system in Alaska, has consistently (i.e., for six out of the seven years of the study period) received at least 50% of all expenditures for each year. The one exception was in 1979 when a low of 30% of the funds were directed to police personnel. However, no other justice unit had been granted as much as 30% of the funds in any year.

2. The average per person cost of sending criminal justice personnel to out-of-state training programs has been, in every year, approximately double the average per person cost for in-state program participants.

3. Related to # 2 above, consistently more personnel have participated in local productions (within the state) at less cost. That is, for each and every year of the study a lower proportion of the total expenditures for each year enabled a greater percentage of personnel to attend in-state programs. As examples, in 1973 41% of the total expenditures sent 75% of the total number of participants to in-state productions and in 1979 only 13% of the total funds enabled 25% of all participants to attend training within the state.
4. Evaluations completed by participants have consistently indicated satisfaction with the training programs that were attended. This conclusion, however, may be of dubious usefulness since it does not address the issue of the source of funding. That is, if the participants were able to garner the financial support from their own agencies or some resource other than the CJPA, it would undoubtedly have no effect on the evaluation of the session which was attended. It is clear however that many of the participants were able to attend the various programs because these funds were available.

5. Closely related to item #1, but a distinct finding in its own right, total expenditures for the program have not been proportionate to the number of employees in the three major components of the criminal justice system. The police who represent 48% of all justice personnel in the state received an average of 55% of the funds over the seven year period, legal personnel (30% of all justice practitioners) received 20% of the funds, and corrections (22% of all justice personnel) received 12% of all funds. Participants from "other" (peripheral) agencies acquired 13% of all grant funds. Except for the earlier quoted objective (see Part I, page 22-23) of equitable distribution of available funds among the agencies of justice "... legal, police, and corrections. . .", this conclusion might otherwise be of little significance.
6. While there have been a few minor shifts in topical interest from year to year there is little indication of major change in direction of training participation or emphasis over the seven year period. That is, there tends to be a great deal of similarity of training topics which attract Alaska justice personnel over most of the past decade. For example, someone is sent every year, year after year, to arson training programs, explosives programs, and narcotics programs. The data and the consistency of this phenomenon would lead to a conclusion that this is a standardized practice and that it apparently only requires a decision as to "who" should attend each year.

These general conclusions, and others which may be gleaned from the available data, can be utilized to formulate a set of recommendations which might be used as a starting point for reviewing the objectives of the specialized training grant program. After seven years of administration, noticeable patterns have emerged which can be evaluated as to their present value and timeliness. As training and educational opportunities within Alaska improve and as the funding pattern and the emphasis on training improve within the major agencies of justice within the state, it is perhaps time to reconsider overall training needs and resources statewide.

At the conclusion of Part I of this study a discussion and recommendations were presented which appear to be relevant to the expanded study. Those recommendations do appear to have validity when measured against the conclusions enumerated above.
The results of this study including the six general conclusions above could be utilized as the nucleus for discussions within and among the various justice agencies toward the goal of establishing objectives and priorities for the future of the specialized training grants program. It seems that to simply repeat past years' practices may be wasteful of limited resources. There is no doubt that a continuing need exists to enable the small town police chief or bush magistrate to participate in training programs. But it does seem that economic considerations would dictate that justice personnel acquire the greatest benefit possible from limited dollars. It seems questionable that it is good policy to continue to send personnel to the same kinds of programs "outside" year after year when those programs might be better utilized if brought to Alaska where more could attend and at lesser expense.

It would seem to be important to justify the balance or imbalance of spending directed to the three major components of the justice system - legal, police and corrections. It might be helpful to coordinate all training and educational opportunities through a central clearinghouse office within the state, but not attached to any one particular justice unit.

These and other issues which imply the structuring and prioritizing of certain value judgments with regard to training should be taken into consideration in a total review of continuing professional development practices, needs, and resources within the State of Alaska.
The specialized training grant program administered by the Criminal Justice Planning Agency over the past several years has provided both a valuable service and a financial resource to many professionals who might not otherwise have been able to continue their professional development. This study would suggest however, that it is now time to rethink both the purpose and the direction of that program in order to give it a new direction and more meaningful purpose.
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Specialized Training Grant Participation
Comparison by System Component 1973-1979

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1973</th>
<th>1974</th>
<th>1975</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In-State Participation</td>
<td>Out-of-State Participation</td>
<td>Total Program Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Expenditure</td>
<td>Ave Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>$9,977.80</td>
<td>$156.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>950.96</td>
<td>105.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrections</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2,586.28</td>
<td>99.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>13,515.04</td>
<td>137.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Agencies</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1,429.75</td>
<td>179.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>14,944.79</td>
<td>140.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Partic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued next page)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Component</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>In-State Participation</th>
<th>Out-of-State Participation</th>
<th>Total Program Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Expenditure</td>
<td>Ave Cost</td>
<td>Expenditure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Police</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corrections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Agencies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$720.00</td>
<td>$240.00</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$970.00</td>
<td>$242.50</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prgm Partic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Police</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,829.20</td>
<td>$457.30</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$2,301.63</td>
<td>$767.21</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corrections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,829.20</td>
<td>$457.30</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Agencies</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$3,201.57</td>
<td>$809.07</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$3,707.68</td>
<td>$308.97</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prgm Partic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Police</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$3,207.68</td>
<td>$458.24</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$2,427.21</td>
<td>$809.07</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corrections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$3,207.68</td>
<td>$458.24</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Agencies</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$3,707.68</td>
<td>$308.97</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prgm Partic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Police</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$790.00</td>
<td>$395.00</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$2,392.65</td>
<td>$598.16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corrections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$790.00</td>
<td>$395.00</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Agencies</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$1,384.69</td>
<td>$276.94</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$2,174.69</td>
<td>$310.67</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prgm Partic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Specialized Training Grants
Percentage Participation & Expenditure by Agency
1973-1979

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No. of Participants</th>
<th>% of Total Participants</th>
<th>Expenditures by Agency</th>
<th>% of Total Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>$19,779.78</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Police 21</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>$8,017.46</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corrections 31</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>$4,591.89</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Agencies 11</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>$4,875.25</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total 143</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$36,764.38</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>$19,988.64</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Police 17</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>$8,714.87</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corrections 8</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>$6,194.31</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Agencies 2</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>$1,235.93</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total 61</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$36,133.75</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>$13,036.61</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Police 9</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>$7,609.55</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corrections 7</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>$4,333.71</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Agencies 6</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>$2,794.44</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total 43</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$27,774.31</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued on next page)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Police</th>
<th>Legal</th>
<th>Corrections</th>
<th>Other Agencies</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$8,386.59</td>
<td>$1,851.10</td>
<td>$1,535.55</td>
<td>$2,699.95</td>
<td>$14,473.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$12,708.20</td>
<td>$2,301.63</td>
<td>$2,427.21</td>
<td>$3,201.57</td>
<td>$18,151.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$10,652.72</td>
<td>$2,427.21</td>
<td>$2,562.44</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$13,579.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$4,659.63</td>
<td>$2,392.65</td>
<td>$2,562.44</td>
<td>$6,086.35</td>
<td>$15,701.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3: Specialized Training Grant Utilization

#### Seven Year Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Grants</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>In-State Participation Expenditure</th>
<th>Ave Cost</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Out-of-State Participation Expenditure</th>
<th>Ave Cost</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Total Program Participation Expenditure</th>
<th>Ave Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>$14,944.72</td>
<td>$140.00</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>$21,819.59</td>
<td>$606.00</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>$36,764.38</td>
<td>$257.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4,141.82</td>
<td>276.00</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>31,991.93</td>
<td>695.00</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>36,133.75</td>
<td>592.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>347.40</td>
<td>347.00</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>27,426.91</td>
<td>653.00</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>27,774.31</td>
<td>646.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>19,433.94</td>
<td>158.00</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>81,238.43</td>
<td>655.00</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>100,672.44</td>
<td>408.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Grants</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Ave Cost</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Ave Cost</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Ave Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$970.00</td>
<td>$240.00</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$13,503.19</td>
<td>$675.16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$14,473.19</td>
<td>$603.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,829.20</td>
<td>457.30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16,322.20</td>
<td>859.06</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18,151.40</td>
<td>789.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3,707.68</td>
<td>308.97</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9,872.25</td>
<td>617.02</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13,579.93</td>
<td>484.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2,174.69</td>
<td>310.67</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13,526.38</td>
<td>676.32</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15,701.07</td>
<td>581.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8,681.57</td>
<td>321.54</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>53,224.02</td>
<td>709.65</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>61,905.59</td>
<td>711.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Seven Year Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Ave Cost</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Ave Cost</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Ave Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>28,115.51</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>134,462.45</td>
<td>675.69</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>162,578.03</td>
<td>465.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>% Criminal Justice Employees by Component*</th>
<th>% Funding for Spec. Train. Grants</th>
<th>% of Personnel Within Each Component*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>1973-1979</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>69% Professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>55% Clerical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrections</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>78% Professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Agencies</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figures from manpower research completed by Dr. John Angell, Justice Center, University of Alaska, Anchorage, 1978.