

## Department of Planning and Budget 2019 Fiscal Impact Statement

**1. Bill Number:** HB2142H1

**House of Origin**     Introduced     Substitute     Engrossed  
**Second House**     In Committee     Substitute     Enrolled

**2. Patron:** Thomas

**3. Committee:** House Committee Militia, Police and Public Safety

**4. Title:** Definition of school protection officer and specified minimum training standards.

**5. Summary:** This bill defines a school protection officer as a retired law-enforcement officer hired on a part-time basis by the local law-enforcement agency to provide law-enforcement and security services to Virginia public elementary and secondary schools. The substitute bill also requires the Department of Criminal Justice Services (DCJS) to establish compulsory minimum training standards for all persons employed as school protection officers. However, it provides that such training may be provided by the employing law-enforcement agency and shall be graduated and based on the type of duties to be performed.

**6. Budget Amendment Necessary:** Yes, Item 392.

**7. Fiscal Impact Estimates:** Preliminary (see Item 8 below).

**8. Fiscal Implications:** The proposed legislation creates a new type of school safety position, and requires compulsory minimum training standards for all persons employed in this position, to be established by DCJS.

DCJS reports that the proposed legislation would require a job task analysis (JTA) in order to assess the relevant job responsibilities and tasks for a school protection officer, and the knowledge and skills required to successfully perform the job. According to DCJS, the JTA provides the basis for establishing the compulsory minimum training standards. DCJS also states that this process entails consulting subject matter experts and in the case of the proposed legislation, it will also require the integration of diverse modes of training provided by local law-enforcement throughout the Commonwealth.

The legislation permits local law-enforcement agencies employing school protection officers to provide training for such positions. Accordingly, it is not certain how many school protection officers would need training through DCJS. DCJS anticipates the proposed legislation to have a one-time fiscal impact of \$142,500. This figure would include: (i) \$24,000 to secure legal services to research and identify the liability and risks associated with school protection officer positions and the limited duties such persons would be responsible for performing as well as the security that would be provided; (ii) \$43,500 for a part-time position to develop the necessary training standards; at least \$75,000 to secure the services of a vendor to complete a JTA for the school protection officer position. DCJS provides this

figure as an estimate, based on a recent JTA created for an existing position, and notes that a JTA for a new position is likely to be more costly.

To the extent local entities elect to provide the training there could be a fiscal impact, which cannot be determined at this time.

**9. Specific Agency or Political Subdivisions Affected:** Department of Criminal Justice Services; Local law enforcement; Schools divisions.

**10. Technical Amendment Necessary:** No

**11. Other Comments:** This bill is identical to SB1207S1.