



STATEWIDE TRAINING AND EDUCATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

July 19, 2013 – Sacramento, California

Members Present:

Taral Brideau, California Fire Fighter Joint Apprenticeship Committee (alternate)
Ron Coleman, STEAC Chair
Randy Collins, California Fire Technology Directors Assn. (North) (alternate)
Natalie Hannum, California Fire Technology Directors Assn. (South)
Mary Jennings, California Fire Fighter Joint Apprenticeship Committee
Ken Kehmna, Fire District Association of California
Ron Myers, League of California Cities
Kay Price, CAL FIRE Academy
Daniel Stefano, California State Firefighters' Association
Rich Thomas, California Professional Firefighters (alternate)
Nathan Trauernicht, California Fire Chiefs Association
Ken Wagner, California Fire Chiefs Association
Kim Zagaris, California Office of Emergency Services

Members Absent:

Roxanne Bercik, Metro Chiefs
Robert Briare, California Professional Firefighters
Dennis Childress, SoCal Training Officers Assn. (South)
Jim Connors, California Fire Technology Directors Assn. (North)
Bret Davidson, Southern California Training Officers
Sam Hoffman, California State Firefighters' Association (alternate)
Larry Savage, Nor Cal Training Officers (alternate)
Jim Skinner, League of California Cities (alternate)
Tom Turner, California Fire Technology Directors Assn. (South) (alternate)
John Wagner, Nor Cal Training Officers

State Fire Training Staff:

Kevin Brame, Fire Service Training Specialist III
Kevin Conant, Fire Service Training Specialist III
Tonya Hoover, State Fire Marshal
Mike Richwine, Assistant State Fire Marshal, Division Chief
Ramiro Rodriguez, Deputy State Fire Marshal III Specialist
Mark Romer, Fire Service Training Specialist III
Rodney Slaughter, Deputy State Fire Marshal III Specialist
William Vandevort, Fire Service Training Specialist III

Guests:

Scott Vail, California Office of Emergency Services
Lorenzo Gigliotti, California Office of Emergency Services
Anthony Mecham, CAL FIRE /Riverside
Michael Ramirez, CAL FIRE Academy
Jon Black, Santa Clara County Fire Department

I. Introductions and Welcome

Meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. by Committee Chair Chief Coleman.

A. Roll Call/Quorum Established

Rodney Slaughter conducted the roll call to identify attendees for voting purposes. It was established that there were 10 members present for a quorum. Attendees and guests introduced themselves.

II. Agenda Review

Chief Richwine presented the items for review on the agenda as information only; however, he mentioned that the staff report stated "Review Staff Recommendations to approve the 2013 California Incident Command Certification (CICCS) Qualifications Guide", but this item is listed on the agenda as "information only". Chief Richwine asked Scott Vail whether there should be a motion presented. S. Vail mentioned that approval will be needed as this item is on the agenda at the August 23 State Board of Fire Services (SBFS) meeting. Because this presentation was posted on the agenda as information only, we will have violated the procedures if we move forward with a motion. Chief Coleman suggested carrying out the information as identified on the agenda, but establish an approval process in the form of a teleconference prior to the August 23 SBFS meeting.

Chief Coleman recognized the presence of the State Fire Marshal Tonya Hoover, and stated that she would remain in the meeting until 10:00 am. Chief Hoover stated that she appreciates how well STEAC is doing. In addition, Chief Hoover shared information from the Summer International Fire Service Training Association (IFSTA) Validation Conference in Tulsa, Oklahoma. She stated that the committees at the conference are working on safety officer, construction, and code enforcement inspections. They expect to have some books available on the various inspections in the next cycle. In January 2014, should expect Fire Alarms-Essential 6. There are some new applications coming, most of the products are online and downloadable, including support documents for instructors. There will possibly be another call for membership to the validation committees in January 2014 to get involved. She stated that she would like a California contingency to actively participate and help spread the word to the rest of the country.

III. Approval of the April 19, 2013 Minutes

Motion: *Dan Stefano moved to accept the minutes from the April 19, 2013 meeting and Ken Kehmna seconded the motion.*
Action: *All members voted unanimously.*

IV. State Board of Fire Services (SBFS) Update

Chief Richwine provided an update from the last SBFS meeting. The meeting was held in May, and SBFS approved the action items from STEAC: the new Rope Rescue FSTEP course, the new AAIM FSTEP course, and the new accredited academy at Imperial Valley. STEAC

notified the SBFS that we are moving forward with our efforts for the International Association of Fire Fighters (IAFF) State Fire Training and Fire Fighter Safety and Survival reciprocity. Staff is continuing to work with IAFF's delegation and Sonoma County Fire on this issue.

Chief Coleman reminded the members that the STEAC agenda centers on the mission alignment objectives. It is important that you listen to the mission objectives and take the information back to your organizations, as this is our communication process to gain consensus or be informed of any issues.

I. Mission Alignment

A. Achieving National Recognition

1. Voluntary vs. Mandatory Capstone Testing and IFSAC/Pro Board Certification Presenter: Ken Wagner (Attachment 1)

Chief Coleman met with Ken Wagner and Chief Richwine on this issue. Chief Coleman opened the presentation as an "information only" discussion. Chief Richwine added that the primary goal is to pursue national accreditation, and our applications have been submitted to both IFSAC and Pro Board for our Fire Fighter I program. We also have a subcommittee established to develop our self-assessment instrument that will be submitted. There are various requirements for accreditation and capstone testing and we want to discuss with STEAC members in order to gain their consideration to determine whether all Fire Fighters will be required to pursue accreditation, or should we make it an application process. There will be some impact to the system and business processes in SFT. Members will need to speak up to represent their stakeholders and take the information back to discuss with those individuals.

During a previous staff meeting, our team identified that there are 5 issues that have huge paradigm shifts involved for SFT. It is critical that communication takes place and that we receive input. Ron Myers offered comments about getting the minutes up sooner so that the stakeholders can have enough time to review the information. Chief Coleman stated that the STEAC minutes reflect the collective action of this committee, and is important to review quickly. Chief Richwine stated that we are getting the minutes out two weeks before the next meeting. R. Myers stated that the internal process needs to move a little quicker in order to receive the input that is needed from many individuals. SFT will make this a higher priority, as communication is critical.

K. Wagner addressed the items in Attachment 1. The document was previously distributed to the National Recognition Self Study Team. The report is broken down into two separate components: capstone testing and whether IFSAC or Pro Board certification should be conferred in a voluntary or mandatory certification in addition to California certification.

K. Wagner explained in detail the background on the process: After July 1, 2012, SFT discontinued maintaining course certification exams, STEAC approved the action.

Instructors are now required to prepare and administer their own summative exams when delivering a class. The instructor notifies SFT of the exam results. Any material created by the instructor must be maintained for four (4) years for audit purposes (exam, planning sheet, et al). On July 22, 2011, STEAC approved the implementation of a performance-based task book process to evaluate and validate the candidate's qualifications for certifications. At any level, students would be required to take the various course summative exams and when completed, the student would be issued a task book. Upon completion of the task book and the signing off of the task book by the fire chief, the candidate would have completed all Job Performance Requirements (JPR) and obtained the occupational experience required for the position. This process would eliminate requiring the fire chief to prepare a formal letter.

The change to summative tests and capstone task books was taking place before the decision to move forward with national recognition. Once Mission Alignment was underway, discussions revolved around the concept of National Recognition, BluePrint 2020 discussed National Recognition, and presentations were made by Pro Board and IFSAC representatives present at previous STEAC meetings. It wasn't until the beginning of the Mission Alignment process that we felt the need to move forward on this initiative. Prior to this we also did not take the time to review the requirements from IFSAC and Pro Board to determine what would be needed to participate in their certification programs. After further review, the requirement from Pro Board and IFSAC is that we must administer a certification-level capstone test for each level of certification that we wish to have accredited. IFSAC and Pro Board do not utilize a task book, because the process does not fit the confines and definition of their program. However, they use a portfolio-type process (more akin to our Fire Chief certification process), not a task book sign-off. There are other states, e.g., Montana, which uses a capstone testing process, in addition to using a task book. California needs to develop capstone testing, written and skills-based (if skills are associated with that position). Therefore, our first mission is to complete the Fire Fighter I curriculum to meet the 2013 NFPA standards. This is a cornerstone to the process with IFSAC and Pro Board as we seek accreditation.

Based on discussions with the staff and with our Self Study Team, a determination was made that those individuals coming into the fire service at the Fire Fighter I level and starting at the academy level are not prepared to make a decision on whether to go for a California certification, Pro Board certification, or IFSAC certification. These concerns are coming from the academy staff and students. We have been working the idea that at the end of the academy process, those candidates in the local and accredited regional academies, would go through a written and skills-based capstone test, then move on to the task book concept, and then certification would be issued. Capstone testing at the written and skills level has not been specifically required in our Fire Fighter program in the past, so this proposal strengthens our program. We have the Fire Fighter captive at that time, therefore making it far more practical to conduct capstone testing.

In regard to other levels of certification, since it will be required by IFSAC and Pro Board, a written and skills based capstone test should be offered, depending on what the position requires. These tests should be available to administer to a candidate when the coursework is completed for each individual level of certification. If we use a

third-party administrator, the task book would be given and the person would move forward towards the certification process. SFT has concerns that when a candidate goes through the process, they may choose poorly initially, but later (6 months, 1 year, etc.) they will ask for the IFSAC and Pro Board certification. SFT would then have to run through a rigorous process to get this individual through the accreditation requirements, e.g., do we have a test available, are we using a different edition, etc. From a processing and practical perspective at the staff level, capstone testing would be required, and then the task book would be issued after coursework is completed. Other staff would prefer the test be offered at the very end of the complete process.

The cadre groups are prepared to validate capstone testing at the written and skills level. K. Wagner has also spoken with representatives from other states and found that these groups work in the same type of system. The state fire training function delivers the testing to various locations. We continue to work with our partners in the Accredited Regional Training Programs to help us identify how to make the process work.

We originally made the decision to rely on the position task book to be the capstone document for SFT. But as we move forward with national accreditation, IFSAC and Pro Board require capstone testing. The recommendation from staff on “marrying” the task book with capstone testing would strengthen our system, satisfy the requirements from IFSAC and Pro Board, and deliver the certification system on a very level playing field and solid platform which would be open to less interpretation and confusion by the applicants. The first part is making the change from relying solely on the position task book to inserting written and skills capstone testing that is being developed by the cadre groups. Security will be maintained through SFT, working with our regional delivery groups to help us administer that testing.

Chief Coleman asked the members for comments, using a roll call input process. This discussion is for information only, with no motions to be made, but to have each member provide his or her perspective on what direction should we be moving, and what problems can occur. Chief Coleman has met with K. Wagner on this subject, and believes this is a paradigm shift, as we have to deal with economical, philosophical, and professional perspectives.

Nathan Trauernicht stated that this process is about staying current in the fire service and professionalism. It has worked in other states where the certifications required are IFSAC, Pro Board, or both. The proposal is not unusual, the challenges are not insurmountable. Chief Coleman stated that one of the reasons people look to the California fire service is because we have continuously been leaders. The testing process will allow us to catch up, where we have fallen behind, and will add another level of credibility and rigor to the program that most people will welcome. Chief Coleman asked K. Wagner if the processes are in the drafting stage, and K. Wagner confirmed by saying “yes”. N. Trauernicht did not have any specific questions, but stated that it was almost unusual coming to a place where capstone testing was not required while it was in other states where he has been employed. K. Price offered no comments or had no questions. R. Myers asked for understanding on making sure that the capstone testing process would be carried through all certifications, as he was

hearing that capstone testing “twice”. K. Wagner explained that instructors would continue to provide formative and summative tests for that individual course. If there were three courses that applied to a level of certification, the capstone test would be inclusive of the information in all courses. R. Myers asked about the next level of capstone testing, and whether it would be going towards the other certifications. Chief Richwine and Chief Coleman asked to limit this discussion to Fire Fighter I certification.

R. Myers asked for more understanding of the capstone process and how often it will be used with the Fire Fighter I process, and if there is some other certification testing involved. K. Wagner explained that an individual would still need to finish the task book and occupational experience as required by the position. The cadre teams will develop the tests. Chief Coleman asked if there is some schematic or demonstration that could be developed that shows the process, because we will have a number of individuals who will complete the academy, and may never get employed, and may never get certified. K. Wagner stated that the task book is to be completed once they are employed, and that there is a matrix that explains how folks getting training in some venue other than an academy can complete training and testing. They can do weekly drills, et al, and we are continuing to talk with the training programs to have them involved in offering the capstone written/skills test to individuals who have received that base training in a format that is not being offered in an accredited training program.

N. Trauernicht provided information related to his experience with IFSAC and Pro Board. He stated that he has received various certificates issued by state fire training in Oklahoma. At the end of the program, all students took the certification test, but once you were eligible you submitted information that you passed the capstone test; this avoided a gap on when a student completed training from when they found employment. N. Trauernicht also talked about submitting documentation to the state in order to receive the capstone test. The capstone was universal, state-wide. The program can work. M. Jennings asked for clarity on the California Fire Fighter I certification on whether there will be a written and skills exam that is administered by the state. K. Wagner also confirmed that we will have a written and skills exam. We envision that a senior evaluator (a registered instructor through SFT) and a crew of skilled evaluators working for them will proctor the testing. There will be an internal policy controlling this. M. Jennings asked for clarification on approving skills evaluators and test proctors and whether the process would be as handled as it is now-----does not mean anything for JAC because certification is voluntary. Capstone is only done if they want Fire Fighter I certification from the state. It is the training standards themselves within the JAC standards that make a difference to JAC. The additional requirements for certification are different; but don't see that the testing process for certification necessarily impacts JAC as there are already various testing processes available through the department. D. Stefano mentioned that capstone testing is needed. His question is on the timeline on the capstone test: is there a 1, 2, 3, or 4 year to get to the test and the next phase whether an individual is working with a department or not? K. Wagner mentioned that the premise we are working under is that an individual would be issued the task book but no time limit to complete that. SFT will have a registry of when the task book would be issued, what edition of the standard is being used and when started. If changes occurred that would affect the task book, SFT would notify the candidates to

let them know of other JPRs to complete. M. Jennings asked if a person has testing at the end of the academy, but obtains no job for 6-7 years--am I still good to go. K. Wagner, in response, said "yes", as there is only so much the process can do. Chief Coleman mentioned it would be in the interest of the Fire Fighter to get affiliated with a fire department and get the task book immediately. M. Jennings mentioned that having a task book expire would not be a motivating factor over getting a paycheck. K. Wagner stated that it would be fine at this point. Chief Coleman stated that we are making sure that we protect this—do not want to have a young Fire Fighter spend half of his life trying to get hired. D. Stefano asked if there is a tie-in for the continuing education to fill the gap. M. Jennings stated there would be issues around getting continuing education, but you need to have a job to become certified. K. Wagner said some Fire Fighters are not keeping up on their basic skills; not working on EMS continuing education; some of this will separate the weak candidates from the strong candidates. D. Stefano believes the process needs to be mandatory.

Chief Coleman set a ground rule for this discussion, if a question is asked by another member, the opportunity will be made to provide comments. R. Thomas said he had no comments. R. Collins stated he gets phone calls about Fire Fighters not wanting to go to the fire academy, because they come from another state, and they are frustrated with the training received (reciprocity). It is high and necessary, and would agree with K. Wagner's perspective that this program becomes mandatory. K. Zagaris stated that his issue is the letter (Attachment 1). We are almost back to having continuous issues, we have many individuals that eventually leave to go out of state. CAL EMA has been working on things. We don't have the largest labor group but it is more about the next steps. Chief Coleman mentioned that a significant amount of our candidates are going out of state for job. K. Zagaris talked about the 19 Fire Fighters that died in AZ; 5 came out of the California programs. As we look at this program and how we move forward, we have 30,000+ that were present; need to work out this "flag" internally as we move forward. N. Hannum stated that semantics do matter, that when we talk about capstone testing, we talk about it as a program. We need to get programs identified as capstone testing, but not as SFT training course (FSTEP) when a student registers with IFSAC will they have a number to use for tracking data? For colleges we have the opportunity to provide an accredited regional training program, we have some ARTPs that are on staff, if we can get duplicity of testing. K. Wagner stated that in regards to the testing, Mark Romer will address this. We are looking to build this into the Fire Fighter I curriculum. In regards to data management, we are required to report on to IFSAC and Pro Board on who we issue their certifications to. They have a discreet participation number system; SFT has an ID number, and we are trying to work with them to mesh our systems. The new computer system at SFT will help alleviate this issue. Ken Kehnma stated that he believes that the decisions will help us in the long run. Make sure that the process can accommodate, especially for Company Officer. K. Wagner stated that we have the players in the room who are responsible for the curriculum development. In the future when we look at Fire Fighter I, the way Fire Fighter I is delivered, there are so many training mechanisms in place. Once we can get these figured out, the systems are transferrable. Chief Coleman stated we want building blocks that fit together. R. Myers is looking at numbers in regards to task books and was wondering if that will overwhelm SFT in regards to the numbers or prospective academy graduates. K. Wagner stated that the task book can be started in the academy; many of the JPRS can

be addressed at the academy, and others can be addressed at the department where the person is employed. There will be some challenges, but we have to qualify the evaluators at some levels. IFSAC and Pro Board states that one who trains in that skills cannot proctor that skills test. R. Myers asked if we should provide what the Fire Fighter should be doing once they exit the academy, if they are not already working on skills. Chief Coleman mentioned professional development and career development that you have to counsel individuals early on in their career. R. Collins mentions to individuals on orientation day to get involved early. R. Myers said that what is being asked is what you have done; it needs to provide information on what should be told beforehand. Chief Coleman is currently working with many volunteer fire departments. N. Hannum stated that as a component to Fire Fighter I we should put a professional development module in place. It is the Fire Fighter's responsibility to step forward.

Chief Coleman closed the discussion on this capstone testing. K. Wagner has defined the next steps: there appears to be a consensus that continuing on with the capstone testing is an acceptable approach. He will work on the details and come back at the next STEAC meeting with items to present for approval which will include implementing a written and skills test done under the auspices of the State. Chief Coleman is asking members to discuss with stakeholders.

K. Wagner proceeded with the voluntary vs. mandatory testing portion of the staff report. He has discussed with various over states on how to proceed. Other states do not administer a state certification and IFSAC/Pro Board certification. It is basically IFSAC and Pro Board only. California has this certification system and need to come to grips with how we issue the California certifications along with IFSAC and Pro Board. In regards to mission alignment, it was going to be voluntary, as discussed a year ago when we began the process. As we have had discussions with other states, attendance at the Pro Board conference, meetings with colleges, et al questions keep coming up with consistency. The applicants that are in the process need to understand where they are going. There are too many options, leading to confusion. If we do not make IFSAC and Pro Board mandatory, weeks later we may have a Fire Fighter comeback asking for this certification. California will be forced to engineer systems to take care of some issues that we could have resolved had we made IFSAC and Pro Board mandatory at the time a Fire Fighter went for California certification.

We are looking at the current processes and fees that are being charged. Fees and time associated with cadres to come together, forwarding documents to students, and various testing that is involved. We can amortize these costs over a larger population, but on the average we have been issuing about 1500 certifications a year over the past 5 years. K. Wagner discussed the pros/cons to the process: some participants are not interested, or become interested later; Fire Fighters don't like change. Running a strong and consistent program requires that Fire Fighters be issues IFSAC and Pro Board in addition to California certification. K. Wagner made reference to the letter from the CPF.

Chief Coleman asked for comments from the members on K. Wagner's staff report. K. Wagner stated that when professional certifications were issued, they were done from the beginning of the process. Chief Coleman asked when certification process began;

was in 1973 per M. Jennings. California was on the leading edge of certification before other states were doing it. However, California skipped over some processes.

N. Hannum asked what the costs are. K. Wagner mentioned that the current fee is \$40 for Fire Fighter I certification. If there was a process where everyone had to do this it would be between \$60-\$70, or if not required, it would be \$70-\$80. N. Hannum mentioned that it becomes a positive marketing tool, and to look for employment outside of California. Chief Coleman stated this is the process of business, but once it becomes mandatory it has a tendency to become institutionalized and become a part of the process.

K. Wagner stated that what we are saying is if a candidate applies for certification, they would get California certification, IFSAC and Pro Board. K. Zagaris stated that this can be a great marketing tool for the community colleges, but wants the focus to be on in-state participants. If we go for a higher cost, it can become a positive or a negative. Chief Coleman stated that of the 1500 certifications, what percentages are employed vs. those who do not have a job. K. Wagner stated that they cannot obtain the Fire Fighter I until they are employed. The fees are an individual expense. K. Zagaris stated that he knows of some departments that do pay for their staff. R. Collins stated that there will be a financial impact similar to the EMT and Registry issues. R. Thomas stated that CPF is opposed based on the fees; what is the benefit to our members? We have some global concerns regarding testing processes and applicants coming in from out of state. Currently we have the SFT accredited academies--does this apply only to them? K. Wagner stated that this would apply to anyone seeking the certification regardless of how they received their training; this applies to the candidate seeking a particular level of certification. R. Thomas asked what is the overall benefit to the fire service today? K. Wagner stated that we made the decision in the Blueprint 2020 and felt there was value to participate in the national certification mechanism for interoperability and professionalism. Chief Coleman mentioned that in other states this certification was opposed by labor. We are facing the proverbial crossroad, we evolve, and there is a reason for mission alignment; it involves the overall process in California and how does it apply to "me." R. Myers asked what we have learned a few years ago; to what we are learning now has many concerns. Chief Richwine stated we are raising the bar on the overall system, by linking to national accreditation, a goal of blueprint 2020; it enhances the professionalism of the training and education system. We then become in alignment with other states; an upgrade. N. Hannum stated that sometimes we feed others outside our state. Chief Richwine stated this streamlines the process for interstate and intrastate Fire Fighter.

D. Stefano mentioned the presentation on mission alignment and the system being broken. We need to listen and move forward. M. Jennings stated that certification is voluntary and should remain that way. She does not believe we have that many Fire Fighters that want to go elsewhere; therefore, they should not all be subjected to this change. She believes that certification should stay voluntary; those that participate in the programs should pay for it. R. Myers stated that we are not changing what we teach or what we do; we are saying that we can be more professional by having a national certification.

K. Wagner stated we want our training standards to match the NFPA standards, but that they still need to be part of the California state system. We are taking on the major undertaking to update our curriculum, what the instructors get, and what will be delivered to students. We are proposing to strengthen our system by providing a capstone test to demonstrate competency in a specific skill. With this new process in place, we will have a more defined system that was better than before. R. Myers asked are we missing the boat on the certification piece, what is the value of that? If the labor groups didn't have such an issue with this, maybe we are moving too fast, or missing some piece. N. Hannum stated as a state fire training delivery system, I see this as a mechanism to open the system and be a state of opportunity instead of a state of exclusion.

Chief Coleman will bring a 20-minute presentation on values to the next STEAC meeting. Labor has concerns, but the system is for everybody but not those who are just employed--those who are employable. R. Myers stated that this new process creeps into the other certifications; we may need to slow down to see how CPF will be affected. R. Collins asked Rich Thomas whether the information in the letter will heavily impact his stakeholders. R. Thomas responded on voluntary vs. mandatory, the position is based on who they are representing. Chief Coleman stated that it is a difficult question to answer for the entire labor group. What we lack here is an adequate amount of information--California Fire Fighters are seeking employment in other states.

Chief Coleman mentioned the lack of reciprocity. N. Trauernicht believes that there is not only an information gap, but a fundamental communication gap. There is a difference because if a person chooses to get certified, it would be considered value-added. Students at UC Davis go through the programs to get certified, but are coming from out of state, getting training and moving back to their home state. There is an issue on the mentoring and coaching piece, which is vital. We have some responsibility to point students in the right direction and to give them their best opportunity of success.

Chief Richwine has spoken to President Paulson and is still working to get through the issues. Chief Coleman stated that the Fire Fighter has one chance, and if you refuse that chance, don't come back asking for another chance. A waiver could be put in place to say that these are your options. Chief Richwine stated that is a two tier system. K. Wagner stated we are talking about a waiver decision, where we are moving away from processes. K. Price stated asked whether the decision would come from the student or the academy. K. Wagner stated that it only changes what happens when the package is submitted to SFT. N. Hannum asked how we deal with students coming from out of state? This is a concern that the same testing centers would have to deal with these anomalies. K. Wagner stated we are trying to solve the problem right now.

Chief Richwine appreciated the comments and feedback. We will refine the proposal and discuss whether progress can be made between SFT and labor. We will come back at the October STEAC meeting with two separate actions items: capstone testing and certification. The first item that needs to be done is to work with CPF/JAC to come to some agreement, if we do not achieve this, we cannot bring it to the next STEAC meeting for action. K. Wagner stated the system of bringing items to STEAC for discussion is working right now, whether we agree or not on the outcome.

B. Curriculum Development & Delivery

1. Discussion: Curriculum Development Task Force Update

**Presenter: Bill Vandevort
(Attachment 2)**

Bill Vandevort provided information on the curriculum update. There are 6 active cadre teams working on projects, in addition to the Fire Fighter I group. We have another 4 projects going on with editors working on formatting. Executive Chief Officer, Company Officer, Instructor Officer Cadre groups will be meeting in the coming weeks. It is encouraging that the Fire Fighter I & II training standards, course plans are in draft form already. B. Vandevort opened up his presentation with questions/concerns. Chief Coleman stated that we are working to stay on schedule. Bill mentioned that we expect to complete projects by end of 2013. The curriculum and validation cadres are working and putting in suggestions, once done, it will be forwarded to STEAC and eventually SBFS, and the SFM. Once all approved, there will be a transition period, about 1.5 years to put all in place. Please share this information with the constituents. We will need to tread carefully with labor contracts and various discussions. It is critical to share with labor stakeholders; they also need to know there may be some changes in semantics. Nathan Trauernicht asked whether this is for certification, not individual certification. What we are looking for in the competencies, is that the student be able to do the task that the certification requires.

2. Discussion: Update Regarding Fire Fighter I and II Curriculum

**Presenters: Mark Romer
(Attachment 3)**

Mark Romer provided feedback on the Fire Fighter I & II status and the new curriculum. He provided the prospective changes. He identified the cadres, editor, and cadre team members for development team, and the group for the validation teams. The members of the cadre teams are the "end user". M. Romer identified the "declaration of independence" date for the Fire Fighter curriculum as January 1, 2013 (cadre leader/editor). The cadre has addressed multiple standards, 1001, 1051, and 472 FRO. This information has been added to the current documents. The bulk of the work has been done at the workshops and many hours have been used to write the various documents. After the development team formed the documents, the validation team came in place to review documents. M. Romer re-iterated for the STEAC members to take this information to the various stakeholders. The approval entities are the SFT, STEAC, SBFS, and OSFM.

The teams created and validated the course plans for IFSAC, 1001, 1051, and 472 FRO. The format has significantly changed, and there were 3 binders available for members to review. M. Romer provided updates on the Fire Fighter I certification; he provided the date for the last update, and what courses were never implemented. M. Romer also provided course comparisons from the 2000 version vs. the current 2013 version. There were no prerequisites, co requisitions for I-200, Confined Space Awareness, FRO, and Emergency Care of Sick and Injured; Wildland training, which did not meet the

minimum for CICC. The recommendations for the 2013 version includes a pre-requisites for EMS (Public Safety First Aid Minimum) and co-requisites of IS-100, IS-700a, Confined Space Awareness); the new Wildland Training will meet NFPA 1051 and CICC Type 2 Fire Fighter. I-200 was removed because it is designed for single resource initial actions and is for those who have supervisory experience. This updated course will allow other instructors to provide the Wildland Training Course. Other course comparisons involve vehicle extrication, and flammable liquids/gas fire training. The updated course comparison also includes the breakdown of lecture hours skills, and testing hours. M. Romer made reference to the new manuals that will be used for the Fire Fighter I & II, and FRO. Chief Coleman asked when where those books adopted. M. Romer responded that the textbooks are in discussion with the teams, and will meet the needs across the board. To gauge our lecture time, the material provided by the textbook manufacturer was used. By using the revised curriculum, students will become proficient enough and pass the capstone test. Classes are being built with maximum attendance of 50 students.

How much time is going to be needed for capstone testing, it is based off the IFSAC and Pro Board process. Chief Coleman wanted to confirm the hours for the vehicle extrication/flammable liquids/gas. The 2013 proposed hours are 40 more than the 348 hours. Natalie Hannum identified lower hours for lecture.

M. Romer mentioned that we are now focusing on skill-based. Under the older program, there was no didactic or skills testing. It will now be using skills sheets for use utilizing capstone testing. This is tied to the correlation sheets from IFSAC and Pro Board. New skill sheets identify section for 1st and 2nd test; students have two opportunities to take the test. Ron Myers asked how many times can one re-test? Ken Wagner states that it gives students the opportunity to re-test right after the 1st one, but can re-schedule. If the student does not pass again, remediation would be required or suggested to find another career. M. Romer identified the skill testing sheet, and the five components on each test. Random selection of test questions would be done by SFT. SFT would assign the ID, and issue to the community college or other testing centers and it would be done after the testing process. Mary Jennings asked how many random questions in capstone testing. K. Wagner stated there are ten (10) skills, 5 required, and 5 at random for Fire Fighter I. M. Romer continued the discussion by stating that the skill sheets are provided by the publishers. Students will have access to the skills sheets to help them with expectations. Psychomotor skills would be signed off.

Chief Coleman asked the members for questions. M. Jennings asked why Vehicle Extrication was being taking out of Fire Fighter I, Chief Coleman and M. Romer stated that the Vehicle Extrication is going into Fire Fighter II to meet the NFPA standard. M. Romer answered R. Myers question by stating that we have standardizing our training. The costs savings would be tremendous if the training would be implemented.

N. Hannum asked where is the discussion with the fire chiefs and the labor reps for entry level exams. M. Romer stated that most are using other tests. M. Jennings stated that other fire departments in the state will have the right to choose testing of choice.

M. Romer will provide the CTS and other documentation on the SFT website. M. Jennings stated that the Fire Fighter I certification training standards should encompass all classes not one. Confined Space Awareness information needs some clarity. Chief Coleman mentioned that the verbiage on co-requisite is confusing.

Kim Zagaris added comments on CAL EMA having far more requirements. Chief Coleman stated that M. Romer needs to have some protocol to address. Randy Collins stated that he will make sure his group reviews, but I would have questions about testing and logistics. Tony Mechem stated that the NFPA detail far exceeds what we are doing in CAL FIRE Basic, S631; we covered the specific items and want to use the certifications to hire seasonal firefighters. Rich Thomas asked questions about the flammable liquids, which M. Romer responded that 2013 change identifies the course info was moved to Fire Fighter II. R. Thomas asked whether the individual departments would have the ability to make those changes, which M. Romer confirmed. R. Myers asked why not leave in Fire Fighter I. Chief Coleman stated the philosophy is based on minimum NFPA standards. Bill Vandevort stated that it was an issue on individuals coming in from another state with certificates. We are not reducing our requirements. Chief Coleman said the basic doctrine is streamlining and going to national standards. Rodney Slaughter stated that academies can make changes as appropriate. Chief Coleman stated that we are making changes now, but the impact will be profound.

3. Discussion: 2013 CICCIS Qualifications Guide

**Presenters: Scott Vail
(Attachment 4)**

Scott Vail provided information in regards to the additional NIMS courses to the CICCIS. He referred to the FEMA mandates and that go into the Type II teams. They need to make changes since there were errors in the SFT procedure manual and others. 14 months ago his team met to work on the guide. The attachments identified all the changes and added the NIMS instructor qualifications.

Chief Coleman reminded members that the changes in the attachment that S. Vail made reference to are in "yellow". He was hoping to be more consistent to what is already written. If not in matrix, it is not included in the course information anymore.

Chief Coleman asked S. Vail about the AAIM course, and Rodney Slaughter answered that the AAIM course was approved by STEAC and adopted by SBFS. Scott has completed all documents reflecting changes, and looking for concurrence from STEAC. This is a time where all members are to review documents; the intent is to get information on next SBFS agenda. Ron Myers stated that besides not having fire apparatus budgets, the CICCIS resolves the issues around the strike team leaders and keeping them current. Kim Zagaris commented on the currency issues around our strategic plan and will try to get staff through some sort of simulation. S. Vail is proposing that it be put in an appendix with suggestion to maintain the currency. He will attempt to provide the final draft by August 15; he will need this to hold the web conference. He needs concurrence from the task force; Chief Coleman is asking an approved document by August 2, with an announcement of a conference call to occur by end of the 2nd week in August.

C. Cross Generational Marketing

1. Twitter and Website Update Presenter: Rodney Slaughter

On behalf of Kris Rose, Rodney Slaughter made the presentation about the communication plan and introduced a Twitter account, and as of Monday July 22 individuals can sign into the account. We are sending out tweets, but most of the information provided will be linked back to the SFT website.

II. Announcements/Correspondence

A. UC Davis Senior Fire Leadership Program Presenter: Nathan Trauernicht

N. Trauernicht presented information about a senior fire service leadership program. 15 quarter units of academic credit is available. In alignment with the FESHI model, are looking at a February or March 2014 launch date. There may be some scholarship opportunities. A course syllabus should be available next two months. There is website and a promotional video. They are looking to model this program after the executive leadership program. Faculty will change as subjects change in the industry. There are no elective courses, but in discussion with Oklahoma State University where some of the courses could be used towards a master's program. We will be looking at other public colleges in California as an emphasis.

Natalie Hannum will partner with N. Trauernicht to provide information on the program. N. Trauernicht further spoke on the challenges about entry into fire service program. N. Trauernicht is on the NFPA committee, and the committee is recommending this program. Individuals need to have a bachelor's degree for entry. The program is 100% UCD based. N. Trauernicht added that because it is a certificate program, the focus is on current issues, challenges, and best practices.

B. Health & Safety Guidelines for Fire Fighter Safety Presenter: Ron Coleman

Chief Coleman talked about this document and stated that the information can be pulled from the internet. The guidelines about Fire Fighter Safety should be incorporated into our body of knowledge.

C. Physiological Stress Associated with Structural Fire Fighting Observed in Professional Fire Fighters Presenter: Ron Coleman

Chief Coleman stated that there is an ongoing recognition with core body temperature and issues associated with heat stress on fire fighters that need to be incorporated. It is absolute tragedy the number (approximately 10%) of fire fighters who are killed or injured during training sessions.

Both of these documents should be able to be downloaded from the internet, if you have any issues locating these documents, Chief Coleman can assist you in locating the documents.

III. Roundtable

Dan Stefano mentioned that the Fresno Symposium will be held from Nov 18-22 and the course schedule will be forwarded by end of summer.

Rodney Slaughter accepted a self-assessment report from Santa Rosa Community College for reaccreditation. He stated that he has approximately 6 site visits that need to be scheduled and he will be sending out a schedule asking for STEAC member's participation for the site team for fall dates.

Chief Richwine met with California Technology Agency and SFT is in the final stages of approval for the Feasibility Study Report and are on a path for September 1 start date with project manager and plan with the new system being in place by the end of 2017. We are not sure yet about the functionality for scheduling classes, but that will be part of the project.

Natalie Hannum has relocated back north and has taken a position with Contra Costa Community College and therefore will no longer be a member of STEAC but will attend as a non member.

Chief Coleman mentioned the passing of Moe Fitch, who was an early member of SFT, and made a significant impact with firefighters across the state.

IV. Future Meeting Dates

A. October 18, 2013; January 17, 2014; April 18, 2014; July 18, 2014

V. Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 1:00 pm by Chief Coleman.