



STATEWIDE TRAINING AND EDUCATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

April 10, 2009 Sacramento, California

	Member	Department	Representing	Present	Absent	Term Exp
1.	Boomgaarden, Marc	Yuba City FD	League of California Cities	X		12/31/10
2.	Childress, Dennis	Orange County FA	SoCal Training Officers	X		12/31/10
3.	Coffman, Dan	CSU Los Angeles	CA Fire Tech Directors	X		12/31/09
4.	Coleman, Ronny	Retired Fire Marshal	Chair	X		---
5.	Jennings, Mary		CFFJAC		X	12/31/10
6.	Martin, Bruce	Fremont FD	CFCA		X	12/31/10
7.	Olson, Kevin	CAL FIRE	CDF		X	12/31/09
8.	Rayon, Howard	Santee FD	CSFA		X	12/31/09
9.	Romer, Mark	Roseville FD	NorCal Training Officers	X		12/31/09
10.	Rooney, Hal	Santa Clara County FD	FDAC		X	12/31/09
11.	Senior, David	Allan Hancock College	CA Fire Tech Directors	X		12/31/10
12.	Thomas, Rich	Newport Beach FD	CPF	X		12/31/10
13.	Wagner, Ken	Roseville FD	CFCA and Vice-chair	X		12/31/09
14.	Zagaris, Kim	OES	OES Fire and Rescue		X	12/31/09
	Alternate	Department	Representing	Present	Absent	Term
1.	Amaral, Brad		NorCal Training Officers		X	12/31/09
2.	Connors, Jim		CA Fire Tech Directors	X		12/31/10
3.	Jennings, Mike	Murrieta FD	SoCal Training Officers	X		12/31/10
4.	Knapp, Chuck		CSFA	X		12/31/09
5.	McCormick, Ron	Fremont FD	NorCal Training Officers		X	12/31/09
6.	Myers, Ron	North Co. Fire Authority	League of California Cities		X	12/31/10
7.	Rickman, Tracy		CA Fire Tech Directors		X	12/31/09
	Staff	Department	Position			
1.	Hamilton, Alicia	OSFM - State Fire Training	Training Specialist	X		
2.	Hoover, Tonya	OSFM	Assitant State Fire Marshal		X	
3.	Miller, Monica	OSFM - State Fire Training	Office Technician	X		
4.	Owen, Christy	OSFM - State Fire Training	Staff Services Manager	X		
5.	Richwine, Mike	OSFM - State Fire Training	Chief	X		
6.	Rodriguez, Ramiro	OSFM - State Fire Training	Deputy State Fire Marshal		X	
7.	Slaughter, Rodney	OSFM - State Fire Training	Deputy State Fire Marshal	X		
8.	Vollenweider, Ken	OSFM - State Fire Training	Deputy State Fire Marshal		X	
	Guests	Department	Representing			
1.	Hudson, Jim	Higgins FPD	RIC Work Group			
2.	Martin, Ron	Contra Costa County FPD				
3.	Mathias, Jim	Placer County Fire	CAL FIRE / RIC Group			

4.	Tollefson, Tennis		Sierra College			
5.	Woody, Jon		CAL FIRE / RIC Group			

I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 9:00a.m. by Chair, Ronny Coleman.

II. Introductions and Welcome

Chair welcomed members and guests, and a quorum was established.

III. Approval of Minutes

Issue: Approval of the January 15, 2009 minutes.

Discussion: None

MOTION: *D. Coffman moved to approve. K. Wagner seconded the motion.*

Action: *The motion carried unanimously.*

IV. Consent Calendar

1. Letter to Cal Chiefs Regarding STEAC Membership

Issue: Request for Additional seat on STEAC

Discussion: R. Coleman received a letter that he wanted to address before the committee, so that he could draft a response and also have STEAC members take the message back to their subgroups. The letter was from the Cal Chief's Mechanics group requesting another seat on STEAC. R. Coleman discussed the matter with Cal Chief's Executive President, Sheldon Gilbert, and concluded that his position is that STEAC is a policy committee created as a Cal Chiefs/State Fire Marshal combined effort to provide advice to the State Board of Fire Services. Therefore, a limit needs to be enforced on how many participate, otherwise, there is no end to how many seats can be added. Every member currently on the board is there because they were intended to be, upon the committee's inception, and it should not become a practice to keep adding subgroups, which could end indefinitely. R. Coleman provided STEAC members the letter he meant to forward to the Cal Chiefs informing them of his decision and indicated it has been agendaized for future discussion. M. Richwine added that STEAC will continue to reach out to those sections when issues arise that specifically affect them or are of any significant interest to them, including inviting them to the meetings for input.

MOTION: *None*

Action: *Information Only.*

2. Eastern Kentucky University Upper Division Fire Science Program

Issue: Program-Adopted Texts

Discussion: R. Coleman shared that he had recently had the opportunity to be on the curriculum advisory committee for Eastern Kentucky University. He provided STEAC members a list of the textbooks recently adopted for the various classes within their fire science program for reference.

MOTION: *None*

Action: *Information Only.*

V. Old Business

1. Rapid Intervention Crew (RIC) Tactics Workgroup Update

Issue: **Update on Curriculum Rewrite**

Discussion: J. Woody, a member of the RIC Curriculum revision workgroup, began by introducing Chief Jim Mathias and Jim Hudson. He provided the committee a summary on the status of the curriculum development with insight as to where they were headed next. K. Wagner described conversations held with Chief Rick Bennett, also on the workgroup, sharing information with him regarding communication between Firescope and the International Association of Fire Chiefs on terminology. The term “Mayday,” according to Firescope documentation, is not the language that has been carried over into ICS documents. J. Woody confirmed that they were in fact changing the Command and Control portion to reflect the terminology used in ICS 910 Emergency Traffic. When asked about an estimated completion date, he indicated that they anticipate having a finished product available by November. The work group hoped to have the Command and Control portion ready to submit to A. Hamilton within the next couple of months. K. Wagner commended the work group on their involvement in the development of curriculum for this topic and for their effort to make it a contemporary program, which is being embraced by developers and personnel alike. M. Richwine also expressed his commendations and advised that the group needs to begin identifying prop or cache needs, as well as instructor packet and rollout requirements. He requested that C. Owen provide them with a copy of timeframes and the matrix developed for rollouts because there will be concurrent classes in progress when the transition is being made. R. Coleman asked if the 16 Strategic Initiatives for Firefighter Safety, as laid out by the National Fallen Firefighters Foundation, were going to be considered as part of the baseline and incorporated into the teaching initiatives. J. Hudson responded that the RIC Ops portion would include a large appendix on case studies and resources on firefighter fatalities and near-misses, many of which are from the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health. R. Coleman insisted that The 16 Strategic Initiative also be looked at for inclusion, even as just an informational item. For a lead on current and comprehensive bibliographies, D. Coffman recommended 2 FESHE safety classes that can be found on the FESHE website under course outlines for the Associates Degree. J. Woody asked the committee as a whole if they had any problems with the instructor-to student-ratios, which mirror the LARRO requirements. A. Hamilton inquired about the Command and Control portion only having 25 students maximum while the other classes max at 30, which could potentially leave students out. J. Woody explained that they wanted a 1:10 ratio to ensure

plenty of supervision and thorough critiques during simulations. M. Romer pointed out that there may be a problem with Academies, which would most likely require 2 sessions in order to conduct such large classes, if more than 2 instructors were required. D. Senior added that the classes could, theoretically, be as large as 40 or more students with a 1:10 requirement, as long as the intent is met, which means there needs to be an identified cap on class size as well. M. Richwine requested that any meeting minutes and documentation of discussions between the workgroup members be provided to SFT as a package, upon presentation of the final curriculum, for historical reference on the evolution of this class.

MOTION: *None*

Action: *Information only*

2. Fire-Arson Investigator Certification Training Standards (CTS) Final Draft

Issue: Presentation of Final Draft & Action

Discussion: A. Hamilton explained that she had been under the impression that STEAC had previously voted to approve the original CTS for Fire-Arson Investigator but upon closer inspection, she discovered that although presented to STEAC previously by Joe Konefal, a motion had never been made to adopt. She was now bringing it back, having updated it to the 2009 NFPA Standards, to finally get the document formalized in order to move forward with additional updates. She went on to remind the committee that Fire Investigator 1 & 2 would change to Fire Investigator for the first level and Fire-Arson Investigator for the second level. M. Romer questioned whether this change would have any effect on the Fire Officer Certification Track. A. Hamilton replied that it would not, as the Investigation 1A that they came up with would be the one used for Fire Officer; those standards had already been worked into the Fire Officer CTS. Once the CTS go to the State Board of Fire Services for approval, they will be posted to the website for download.

MOTION: *K. Wagner made the motion to approve the final draft of the Fire-Arson Investigator CTS. R. Thomas seconded the motion.*

Action: *The motion carried unanimously.*

Ron Martin of Contra Costa County Fire arrived at 9:15 a.m.

3. Fire Instructor 3 – Course Information and Required Materials Manual (CIRM) Final Drafts

Issue: Update & Action

Discussion: A. Hamilton started by providing some background of the Fire Instructor III Certification Track. The Fire Instructor 3 class, also known as Master Instructor, currently fits into the Fire Instructor III series as an additional class required to become a Master Instructor within California, so anyone

wanting to teach Training Instructor 1A and 1B must successfully complete it. Over the course of presenting the Master Instructor update class, they were able to include over 120 of the 150 currently registered Master Instructors. During the class, the instructors were polled to determine if the Fire Instructor 3 class was still needed to teach Level I Instructor courses, which will essentially be phased out once the Level III curriculum and syllabuses are ready for delivery. A strong majority responded that, indeed, it was still needed to hone the teaching skills of interested instructors. This resulted in SFT looking at developing a stand-alone course, much like the Regional Instructor Orientation and EMT Instructor Orientation, to become a Master Instructor. A course outline and requirements have been drafted and the course is now ready to be implemented, replacing the current Fire Instructor 3. R. Martin added that in order to create a course outline, they had sought subject matter experts throughout the state who taught Fire Instructor 3 classes the most and ended up with a well-versed team of individuals, which included Bill Melendez, Jim Eastman, Bill Vandevort, Alicia Hamilton, and himself. He admitted that he wrestled with the question of whether this course was necessary and concluded, based on all the input from other instructors as to why it was so crucial, that it would be important to look at a Master Instructor Competency Evaluation. The course outline itself is a departure from just teaching Training 1A and 1B and has moved to a domain of actually honing an instructor skill set, teaching to keep an adult learner engaged and instructing at an adult-learner's level of competency. D. Coffman questioned why this course is only policy to instruct within Level I and not Level II. A Hamilton replied that it has actually been proposed and encouraged for some time, but it had never been put on the table for requirement and, in fact, this course outline is focused specifically toward teaching Training Instructor 1A, 1B, and 1C. R. Coleman requested a motion be made to continue the discussion.

MOTION 1: M. Romer made the motion to adopt the final draft of the Fire Instructor 3: Master Instructor Competency Evaluation CIRM page. D. Senior seconded the motion.

Action 1: The motion carried unanimously.

Discussion: A. Hamilton continued that because this course has been specifically designed to target the delivery of Training Instructor 1A, 1B, and 1C, there wouldn't be any relevancy having someone who wants to teach the Level II courses take Master Instructor. It would just be another hoop to jump through and in the interest of saving training money and time, it would be best kept at Level I. Instructor II classes currently consist of Test Development, Group Dynamics, and Advanced Audio/Visual. The new classes will merge Test Development and Group Dynamics into a single class, Advanced Audio/Visual will be the second class, and Course Development will be the newly introduced class where students work with

course outlines and develop entire courses rather than just individual lesson plans. M. Romer and M. Boomgaarden both felt as though these classes build on the Level I classes and it would be reasonable that if they are going to be a Training Instructor II, that they have the value of having their competencies honed or evaluated through this class to teach the higher level teachers. R. Martin contended that one could then make the argument that if it is going to be applied to the Level II Instructor Series, it could also be considered at the Level II of other courses such as Command, since they are teaching to Chief Officers. He made the distinction that the Level II courses teach the academics of group dynamics, course development and so forth. He thought it would be advantageous to go back and discuss the matter with J. Eastman, B. Vandevort, and B. Melendez, as well as share it with the 120+ Registered Master Instructors initially surveyed, otherwise it might appear as another hoop to jump through to the limited cadre of instructors available to teach Level II courses. M. Romer wondered what the effect would be if the subject matter experts came back wanting Master Instructor required for Level II also. D. Coffman thought it would involve a rewrite of the Level 2 classes and A. Hamilton added that it would impact the Procedures Manual as well. R. Coleman declared that another motion would be needed to request staff to take these comments into consideration.

MOTION 2: M. Romer amended his original motion to have the staff and chair go back to the team, as well as the Master Instructors, to ascertain whether or not Master Instructor certification should be required for Level II Instructor Series classes also. Recommendations will be brought back before STEAC when the committee convenes in July.

Action 2: The motion carried unanimously.

4. Hired Equipment Course Outline

Issue: Presentation of Course Outline & Action

Discussion: A. Hamilton provided a quick background about the proposed course that was a collaborated effort between CAL FIRE and United States Forest Service (USFS) to offer an 8-hour program each year for hired equipment operators. They came to M. Richwine requesting that it be taken over by State Fire Training and made into an FSTEP class to meet the Injury and Illness Prevention Plan (IIPP) requirements for Hired Equipment, to give their operators a basic awareness of the risks to which they may be exposed. They provided draft curriculum but otherwise, none of the materials from which they previously taught, except antiquated 4300 handbook lesson plan excerpts. SFT is now trying to pare down the information and numerous videos to develop an actual course that can be delivered. A. Hamilton was presenting the latest draft of course outline for the committee's review. One issue of concern is the maximum class size. Currently, the classes are being delivered to anywhere between 200-400 students in a single class, with thousands of people needing to take it every

Spring, before the fire season. Her concern was how the course would work under such a process. K. Wagner shared that he had heard concerns that the course was not quite ready for delivery yet. He also questioned if the statute regarding the training program intended that its resources be utilized to train private contractors, who are not fire fighting or law enforcement personnel. He wasn't disputing that the behavioral objectives are essential for the contractors, but didn't necessarily see the point of entertaining it as an FSTEP course if it is not going to be used by firefighters. R. Coleman felt that this raises the question of whether this course offering is appropriate under SFT's statutory responsibilities and procedures. D. Childress made the argument that this was not much different from teaching volunteer firefighters, as these people are volunteering their work on the fireline, much like volunteers or hand crews. R. Coleman asked for a policy choice to be made in the form of a motion. K. Wagner wanted it to be specific so that staff knows that STEAC took action to reject it as it currently stands, rather than just providing a recommendation. M. Richwine appreciated K. Wagner's position and explained that when he made the decision to take this on, it was because they were type-hired resources; they are emergency response personnel and equipment when they sign up, and he felt that would fit into the statutes. It was SFT's intent to create an FSTEP course, and if a CAL FIRE unit, the Bureau of Land Management, or USFS wanted to offer this, it would be available with established instructor criteria, within the suite of courses SFT offers. He wanted those agencies that originally requested SFT to develop the course, to understand that the project is now at risk of being aborted unless they step up and provide everything needed to sufficiently develop it, including all of the requirements and help with standardization throughout the state, which is especially notable with USFS now deciding to pull out of the effort. D. Senior wanted to have it also looked at from a financial aspect and whether the impact would be positive, neutral, or a loss to SFT. M. Richwine felt it would be a positive financial impact because there would be no alteration to the course calendar and there is an annual demand, but he also wanted to be clear that it was not money that was driving this course but rather, a need to standardize. D. Coffman expressed that he understood K. Wagner's point concerning the mandate, but truly believes that it is in the best interest of fire service personnel that SFT develops the curriculum and oversees this course, as the contractors' actions on the fireground affects the firefighters. Safety practices need to be pushed more in these classes, so everyone is on the same page. M. Richwine agreed and felt that if the class is picked up, its emphasis will become more safety oriented, rather than how to handle the contracts, shift tickets and other paperwork. The paperwork component would then have to be acquired at the local unit, where their equipment is located. K. Wagner wanted to clarify that he didn't think the curriculum was a bad idea, but the issue runs along the same lines as that of private fire investigators and it had previously been determined that it is not in SFT's best interest to allow them to be certified

under the State Fire Marshal's system after the statute had been consulted to interpret the mandate's intent for such an instance.

MOTION: *K. Wagner made the motion to reject the program in its current form, to have staff go back to the proponents of this curriculum to iron out any questions from staff, then have them evaluate this program in the context of FSTEP delivery and determine whether or not it meets our statutory mandate. C. Knapp seconded the motion.*

Action: The motion carried unanimously.

The committee took a 15-minute break at 10:08 a.m.

5. On-line Hybrid Course Delivery Implementation Plan

Issue: Delivery Requirements and Draft Agreement

Discussion: C. Owen reminded the committee that the final report for on-line hybrid delivery was accepted by STEAC at the previous meeting and it had been noted that in order to move forward, there were some administrative aspects that needed to be resolved. These issues included the instructor registration environment, changes to the Course Information and Required Materials Manual, and changes to the SFT Procedures Manual. The hybrid beta test subcommittee met to discuss some of the issues at hand and determined that it was going to be too labor intensive for SFT staff to go through a separate registration process for online instructors; it would be better handled by having the Accredited Regional Training Programs (ARTP) maintain documentation for Instructors and ensure that all the requirements in the CIRM and Procedures Manual are being met. The records would then be available for review upon request by State Fire Training. C. Owen will be working closely with R. Slaughter to have the Procedures Manual and CIRM changes in the next regulatory package. She provided the committee members a draft agreement that was still being fine tuned, for the ARTPs to complete, sign and have approved by SFT in order to deliver the class. It listed all the requirements the ARTPs would have to be willing to abide by in order to conduct an online course, including instructors with experience teaching the specific course at least once in the classroom format prior to teaching in the online format, providing those instructors with training in whichever particular platform the class is delivered through, and allowing SFT access to review or monitor as they deem appropriate. Also, student evaluations will include the online portion of the class and will be returned to SFT upon the class's completion, the delivery platform must be able to track and provide reporting for web statistics upon request by SFT, and ARTPs and community colleges will be required to disclose to students, prior to course registration, that SFT will have access to their grades, information, and class work. J. Connors questioned whether teaching the course in the classroom format once was sufficient experience to merit online

instructing status. D. Coffman assured that this requirement provides the community college or ARTP discretion in determining experience qualifications, taking the burden off of State Fire Training. He explained that the provision just states that you have to “demonstrate,” and if a community college deems that this is accomplished after teaching the subject three times, it is entirely their decision. A. Hamilton felt that a statement should be added suggesting that the ARTPs can impose more stringent policy. D. Senior thought it was important to include that SFT should be able to log on at any time, into any class, for reasons of quality control. C. Owen mentioned that any other suggestions can be forwarded to her for considered of incorporation. SFT is aiming for a Fall delivery of courses. D. Senior indicated that the Fire Tech Directors were meeting on May 7th and would discuss the matter further.

MOTION: *None*

Action: *Information only*

VI. New Business

1. ICS 100/200 Online Course Hours

Issue: Online Course Equivalencies & Action

Discussion: M. Richwine provided handouts to the members regarding an I-200 class. He shared that it had just come to the attention of State Fire Training that the National Fire Academy (NFA) now had an online I-200 class, after a certificate had been received from a student who was a participant. He immediately contacted the NFA inquiring about equivalencies, and they stated that it is, in fact, equivalent to the NWCG I-200, however there are no minimum hours. M. Romer added that it also does not require any course application, as a large portion of the class consists of reviewing Powerpoint slides. M. Richwine explained that his purpose for bringing the issue forward to STEAC is to make the committee aware and get their opinion on SFT accepting this course as an equivalency or continuing with the classroom based I-200 for prerequisite and instructor requirements. D. Childress noted that the same discussion had been held previously concerning I-300 and I-400 and STEAC ultimately rejected them based on their format. M. Romer agreed this class should be viewed similarly as it is vital to the preparation of perspective Company Officers. K. Wagner pointed out that the course seems to be developed more with the city or municipal government public works employee that might have some role in emergency management/preparedness, in mind. It doesn't necessarily provide a clear understanding of the Incident Command System, which is fundamental for someone who is a daily practitioner of this methodology. D. Senior suggested that if the curriculum was not comprehensive enough and inappropriate for frontline firefighters, that STEAC reject it as an equivalency. R. Coleman stated that it will now be the committee's obligation to notify the Training Officers and State Board of Fire Services (SBFS) to relay word to all students that passing 1-200 online will not

suffice. He also proposed that STEAC communicate to NWCG that this decision was made after a careful review of the course revealed it was not appropriate for the purposes of the fire service. C. Owen added that an online certificate would also not be accepted for Instructor registration; to teach I-200. D. Childress asked if Firescope should be included. R. Coleman stated he would take it into advisement and indicated that he knows Warren Campbell, from FEMA, and would speak with him concerning the decision.

MOTION: *D. Senior made the motion to reject the National Fire Academy online ICS-200 course as an equivalency. K. Wagner seconded the motion.*

Action: The motion carried unanimously.

2. Where Public Safety Policy Meets Higher Education

Issue: Feedback on Article in Firehouse Magazine

Discussion: M. Richwine began by recalling a presentation at the August 2008 STEAC meeting, by Cogswell Polytechnical College President, Chester Haskell, and Professor Younes Mourchid, on their Long Distance Learning Program. Prof. Mourchid recently had an article published in Fire House Magazine entitled *Where Public Safety Policy Meets Higher Education*, which highlights the state's adoption of the FESHE model and its move forward in a new direction as part of the Blueprint 2020 Strategic Plan. He was sharing it with members in hopes of wider distribution but also to attain feedback for Prof. Mourchid on the appropriateness of the article. M. Richwine indicated that the article could be found on the SFT website and comments could be sent directly to Prof. Mourchid, who is collecting the feedback to determine whether he needs to follow-up on the article with any further clarification. R. Coleman stated that based on his request, he would draft a letter for Prof. Mourchid on behalf of STEAC letting him know that the article has been reviewed as an agenda item; generally acknowledging that his article has been received favorably by the committee. M. Richwine volunteered, instead, to draft the letter since he had held several conversations already with Prof. Mourchid.

MOTION: *None*

Action: M. Richwine is to draft a letter to Prof. Mourchid, on behalf of STEAC, indicating the committee's favorable position concerning his article.

VII. Announcements

California State Fire Association (CSFA) in Sacramento

R. Coleman reminded the committee that CSFA would be in town the following week. He shared that he has been working with the volunteer committee to implement their strategic plan and it is starting to materialize into a program that looks very promising with some documentation coming out of it that will be a great resource for Volunteer Departments to utilize.

Fire Department Instructor Conference (FDIC) in Indianapolis, Indiana

R. Coleman asked if anyone else was attending FDIC in Indianapolis, Indiana between April 20-25, 2009. He explained that currently, there is a lot going on, in terms of information exchange, which would be of interest to the committee. He indicated that he would be present for two days during the conference proceedings and would bring back some of the materials he collects for future STEAC discussions.

NWCG Certification Issues

D. Childress wanted to present an issue on behalf of the Southern California Training Officers concerning new roadblocks they are facing with NWCG certification. The issue lies with having member agency status as described by their requirements which state that “educational institutions contract, or associations and non-member agencies may issue a NWCG course certificate if their lead instructor is an authorized representative of an NWCG member agency if they have a formal agreement established with a NWCG member agency.” M. Richwine confirmed that CAL FIRE is a member agency and has passed the authority over to SFT, but he was unsure whether the instructor needed to be approved by State Fire Training or CAL FIRE. It is possible that SFT would need to enter into agreements with all of their outside entities, such as Accredited Regional Training Programs, in order for them to deliver training through SFT and issue NWCG certificates. M. Richwine indicated that he would be discussing the issue with Kevin Olson of CAL FIRE, who is now a member of the training working team for NWCG, for clarification, as well as take the discussion back to CICCIS for further input. R. Coleman felt this is a topic that should be brought back as a future agenda item.

Upcoming Fire and Emergency Services Higher Education (FESHE) Conference

D. Coffman reminded everyone that the FESHE conference was coming up, beginning May 30, 2009.

VIII. Roundtable

M. Richwine

He attended a California Fire Mechanics Academy (CFMA) banquet on April 9th and learned they will be celebrating their 40th anniversary next year. He also became aware of a CFMA class that teaches firefighters basic mechanical aptitude, which he thought would make a great addition to the FSTEP program, especially for the new generation of firefighters entering the workforce.

He also notified the committee that the 2-year plan, for 2009/2010, has been completed and is available for review on the website. Copies of State Fire Training’s portion will be distributed to all members at the July meeting. He noted that all of the objectives come straight off of Blueprint 2020, excluding budget issues and related matters.

Next, he provided an update on the Quality Improvement (QI) Program, which had been temporarily set aside due to other projects, but was set to get back on track. He acknowledged Jeff Meston’s help in the creation of the documents and hoped to get back together with him soon to have a final product ready for July’s meeting.

His last item concerned a TRADE Region Meeting he had recently attended. He had an opportunity to speak with many of the publishers there and was encourage to hear that they have already held conversations with the community college Fire Tech Directors and are aware of California's plans to publish curriculum and utilize the standards and course outlines. Some of the publishers, like Jones and Bartlett, have very comprehensive online resources that they are providing to support the curriculum, such as records management systems, instructional online support, and a warehouse for training records. He indicated that the publishers are recognizing that online delivery is the wave of the future and they are responding by infusing considerably more of it into their delivery as well.

C. Owen

C. Owen presented the committee a memo from the EMT commission regarding two issues surrounding SFT's EMT program. The first issue discussed in the memo stems from a challenge from the San Joaquin County EMS to the EMS Authority (EMSA). It resulted in the EMSA going back to their legal council for an opinion on code and will ultimately impact SFT's EMT Training Program. Currently, SFT trains fire service individuals and others alike, but only certifies fire service personnel. The changes laid out by EMSA would no longer allow SFT to train non-fire service personnel. The biggest impact would be to the Basics Training program, which is typically delivered at community colleges and fire academies. An analysis is being prepared to present a thorough briefing to Chief Dargan due to the obvious potential fiscal impact it will have on SFT. The second issue that arose concerns who has the authority to approve SFT's program. Presently, EMSA has always approved SFT's program, as they have every other state public safety agency. EMSA's proposed implementation date for program changes is July 1, 2009. D. Coffman requested clarification about whether students could attend an SFM course then go to the county for their certificate. C. Owen explained that they can go to the county EMS, but whoever operates the training class would have to have dual approval through the State Fire Marshal and at the local level. In such case, the student would receive a certificate with a local seal versus a State Fire Marshal seal. K. Wagner suggested that with the conflicting views of code, it might be worthwhile to take the issue to the Attorney General for an opinion. M. Richwine agreed that would be one of the options laid out in their staff report to Chief Dargan. He also mentioned that the State Fire Marshal's Office could attempt to fight it legislatively.

A. Hamilton

Quite a few of the new Training Instructor 1A and 1B classes have now been delivered and A. Hamilton had a few items she wanted to emphasize, especially for the community colleges and the accredited academies. First, she wanted to remind everyone that successful completion of the course is 80%. Second, the curriculum committee never put in writing what the retake process would be and differing opinions have been expressed by several instructors delivering the course as to what they think should happen, so they were going to develop a procedure in a document they will present to SFT. Her concern was that these classes are the basis for Fire Officer certification and although SFT is trying to move away from the certification exams, it is apparent people are doing poorly on their final exam and this could be a result of instructors creating exams that are either too difficult or, on the other hand, creating exams that are overly easy in order to pass students just to see them get through it. Therefore, the curriculum committee is looking at

allowing a retake of the summative test as long as it is within the 15-day period from when the class needs to be finished and returned to SFT.

A. Hamilton's third issue concerned students successfully passing Training Instructor 1A with a C grade at community college, but then failing the summative test and, consequently, not receiving the course completion certificate from SFT. She receives copies of the roster and has noticed students who have failed 1A, attending the 1B class a couple weeks later, essentially receiving credit for a passing grade at community college without meeting the prerequisite for successfully passing the SFT course or having that certificate needed to move forward. D. Senior recommended A. Hamilton bring this to the July meeting as an agenda item, because he shares her concerns, especially if the students cannot retake the class because they had a passing grade as established by the community college, but still failed by State Fire Training's standards. He felt like Training Instructor needed to be modeled like Firefighter I certification, where they have to pass all aspects of the class; not cumulatively passing by doing well on different assignments while having an unacceptable demonstration.

Her next item was that there has been an influx of students attending the Regional Instructor Orientation (RIO) with very little understanding of why they are there, many of whom should not even be there, either because they're not in the fire service and cannot become instructors, or they simply are not ready to attend. She advised STEAC members that when they are working with people, to carefully go over instructor requirements with them to make sure they are at the right point in the Instructor track to attend the RIO class, because they have one year from the completion of that course to become an instructor. The sentiment was shared by several STEAC members who are instructors for Ethical Leadership as well.

Finally, A. Hamilton wanted STEAC members to encourage their people to visit the SFT website, where an announcement for all the Driver/Operator Instructors has just been posted. Also, corrected pages for Prevention Instructors can be downloaded for their guides accompanied by a memo notifying them that the corrected certification exams will start being used and that a CD-ROM will be distributed with the recently corrected bridge program.

D. Senior

D. Senior shared an issue that had recently arose in one of his classes after it had been discovered that a Northern California fire department's training officer has posted all of the EMT exams from the IFSTA Brady book online. Suddenly all of his students were passing book quizzes with perfect scores. They ultimately contacted Brady who, in turn, contacted the department's Fire Chief, and he arranged to have them immediately removed from the web.

His other item was that the Chancellor's Office Public Safety and Advisory Committee changed the way they distribute grants. It is now back to competitive needs, which opens up the grant money to any community college that wants to apply for it. He suggested that SFT may still be able to apply for monies that can offset the cost in becoming ProBoard or IFSAC certified and aid in any related projects that the organizations deem necessary for national certification that would have an effect statewide.

IX. Future Meeting Date

Friday, July 17, 2009

Office of the State Fire Marshal
Sacramento
1131 S Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

X. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 12:10p.m. by Chair, Ronny Coleman.