



STATEWIDE TRAINING AND EDUCATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

July 17, 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.	Erickson, Brandon	OSFM - State Fire Training	Course Scheduling	X		
2.	Garcia, Mike	OSFM - State Fire Training	Deputy State Fire Marshal	X		
3.	Hamilton, Alicia	OSFM - State Fire Training	Training Specialist	X		
4.	Hoover, Tonya	OSFM	Acting State Fire Marshal	X		
5.	Miller, Monica	OSFM - State Fire Training	Office Technician	X		
6.	Owen, Christy	OSFM - State Fire Training	Staff Services Manager		X	
7.	Richwine, Mike	OSFM - State Fire Training	Chief	X		
8.	Rodriguez, Ramiro	OSFM - State Fire Training	Deputy State Fire Marshal		X	
9.	Slaughter, Rodney	OSFM - State Fire Training	Deputy State Fire Marshal	X		
10.	Vandevort, Bill	OSFM - State Fire Training	Retired Annuitant	X		
11.	Vollenweider, Ken	OSFM - State Fire Training	Deputy State Fire Marshal		X	

	Guests	Department	Representing			
1.	Bailey, Wayne		IFSAC			
2.	Bennett, Rick	Clovis FD	RIC Work Group			
3.	Martin, Ron	Contra Costa County FPD				
4.	Moorman, Clayton		IFSAC			
5.	Pelk, Jake	Central County FD	RIC Work Group			
6.	Tollefson, Tennis		Sierra College			
7.	VonAppen, Mark	PAF	RIC Work Group			
8.	White, Kevin		CFFJAC			

I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. by Vice Chair, Ken Wagner.

II. Introductions and Welcome

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

III. Agenda Review

Issue: Approval of the Agenda

Discussion: Several changes had been made to the agenda. The discussion of the item concerning Training Instructor Enrollment Caps would be conducted via conference call with Natalie Hannum, who originated the letter within the handouts requesting reconsideration. The Rapid Intervention Crew (RIC) Tactics curriculum updates would be addressed by Chief Rick Bennett rather than Jon Woody, who was unable to attend; the Concepts for Fire Officer/Chief Officer Certification topic was determined to be an action item, and the Proposed Fire Apparatus Driver Operator 1C Course discussion was tabled until the October meeting, to allow representatives from L.A. County Fire Department to be in attendance.

MOTION: *Mary Jennings made the motion to approve the agenda and subsequent changes. D. Senior seconded the motion.*

Action: The motion carried unanimously.

IV. Approval of Minutes

Issue: Approval of the April 10, 2009 minutes.

Discussion: None

MOTION: *D. Childress moved to approve. R. Thomas seconded the motion.*

Action: The motion carried unanimously.

V. Old Business

1. International Fire Service Accreditation Congress (IFSAC) Presentation

Issue: National Accreditation for State Fire Training

Discussion: K. Wagner introduced Clayton Moorman, an IFSAC manager, and Wayne Bailey, a certification specialist for the North Carolina State Fire Marshal's Office and IFSAC member, who both came to speak on the IFSAC accreditation process. C. Moorman provided the committee members handouts pertaining to IFSAC's function accompanied by notes to supplement their presentation. W. Bailey began by giving a brief history of IFSAC, noting that all the information they were sharing could be found on IFSAC's website at www.ifsac.org

C. Moorman defined accreditation, as it applies to IFSAC, which is a status granted to a certifying agency or a degree granting institution that has been found to meet or exceed stated criteria of educational quality.

Through their Certificate Assembly, IFSAC accredits fire service programs that certify the competency of individuals who pass examinations and, like the ProBoard, they only accredit a single entity. Under that entity, individuals could then be certified. In this case, the entity would be the state of California. They do not consider the training but rather, assess the testing along with the policies and procedures in place to ensure security. They also have a system for higher education fire-related degree programs for colleges, universities, and two-year programs seeking accreditation through their Degree Assembly. IFSAC's administrative branch handles all business processes; coordination, record keeping, maintaining the budget, etc., and the membership sets the policy that they follow.

IFSAC is a member-based, peer-driven, self-governing, accreditation organization and therefore, elects members to serve 3-year terms on their board. As a democratic organization, each entity is given a vote in the policy-making process and is allowed to be as active as they so choose. The Certificate Assembly is comprised of 65 members, 50 of which are accredited, while the Degree Assembly is made up of 33 members with 17 being accredited. C. Moorman clarified that often, those members who are not accredited are usually in the process of becoming accredited. They also have corresponding members who, for a small fee, can be active; attending meetings and receiving updates to become familiar with the system, which is more common with academic institutions going through the Degree Assembly and might be several years away from receiving their accreditation.

W. Bailey expressed that they had a chance to look over State Fire Training's (SFT) goals, as laid out in Blueprint 2020, and were interested in SFT's desire to participate in a national accreditation program as well as to pursue partnerships with other states. He explained that the most significant aspect of IFSAC accreditation is the ability to network, not just nationally, but internationally as well. Even countries such as South Africa and Kuwait are represented and can be consulted on curriculum and standards.

C. Moorman noted that one of the main questions they receive about IFSAC accreditation concerns membership fees. There is a Membership Application Fee associated with IFSAC accreditation which generally runs \$2000 and includes 2000 seals for certificates. He pointed out that this was a correction from the handouts, which states only 1000 seals are included in the price. Additional seals run \$1 each. He discussed alternative solutions for managing these costs and mentioned that he had spoken with the IFSAC representative from Texas and she had indicated her willingness to share their approach to deferring seal, program, and administrative costs through testing fees. This, he illustrated, is the benefit of networking with other states. He added that there are also costs associated with site visits, which includes three peers from other states or provinces evaluating the certification/testing system in place. This cost

varies as there is a \$500 fee up front in addition to the cost of the three evaluating members' travel, hotel, and per diem. A table of fees was included in the handouts for reference along with the accreditation procedures and bylaws.

W. Bailey opened the floor for questions from the members to clarify any of the information that had been presented. B. Martin questioned if IFSAC assesses testing relative to the NFPA standard. W. Bailey confirmed that IFSAC does use NFPA standards but they also entertain alternative standards by reviewed of their Alternative Standards Committee for validation. C. Knapp asked whether IFSAC brings in an exam proctor from outside of the organization or if they allow for the instructor and proctor to be the same person. W. Bailey confirmed that the instructor can proctor exams if there are policies and procedures in place for audits, in order to safeguard the integrity of the testing. The question of statutory authority came up in regard to how the situation of multiple entities from a single state seeking IFSAC accreditation would be addressed. G. Moorman explained that in California's case, the State has statutory authority, so they would be given the decision to participate or not. Should the State decline, they could delegate the authority over to another entity for any length of time, although the vote stays with the entity having jurisdiction. If the State eventually decides to take certification back up, having statutory authority allows them to pull the "trump card," reverting the certifying authority back into their power. The final question revolved around examinations and how IFSAC qualifies the testing. W. Bailey explained that IFSAC does not certify nor do they write the tests. They want to make sure that every point within the standard is covered by validating the test bank, because if the tests are valid, then it is up to the certifying entity to ensure that the training students receive will help them pass the tests. C. Moorman also indicated that skills testing is considered as well as didactic testing.

MOTION: *None*

Action: *Information only*

2. Training Instructor Enrollment Cap

Issue: **Request for Reconsideration**

Discussion: Natalie Hannum joined the meeting via conference call to address her written request asking STEAC to reconsider the Enrollment Cap on Training Instructor classes. K. Wagner reminded the committee that action had been taken on this item back at the January STEAC meeting where it was accepted unanimously that policy for student/instructor ratios would be retained and evaluated over the course of a year with a final report compiled and brought back for the membership's review in order to analyze and determine the effectiveness. Reporting responsibilities had been given to the Fire Technology Directors. R. Martin shared that one of his main concerns was the additional cost. In her letter, N. Hannum listed

the cost per Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) but STEAC was hoping to see this information applied to calculate how much the program is actually going to cost and how much the college brings in for the FTEs over the long-term. N. Hannum explained that she purposely left that information out because she ran into the situation at her college, where the apportionment that she would be getting back from the State is actually reduced because of the mandated lecture and lab components, which drops the unit value of the course and directly impacts the FTE. D. Senior commended her analysis but reiterated that the missing information concerning how much the college was receiving back from the State was necessary to evaluate whether this ratio is cost effective or if it will be too expensive to maintain. N. Hannum said she would follow up on the apportionment issue, but pointed out that when she compared the new Training Instructor 1A curriculum to the old curriculum, she found that it would be much easier to deliver and it demands far less of the instructor, so it seems reasonable that, with an extra lab, there would be plenty of hours to accommodate 32 students. K. Zagaris admitted that he favored the previous motion because STEAC needed to be able to make an informed decision with as much information as possible over an extended period of time. In the meantime, N. Hannum could gather that additional information on the FTEs to present at a later date. A. Hamilton suggested that it would help to define what should be included in the final report, such as identification of the colleges offering the courses and whether the numbers represent actual course deliveries. K. Wagner asked D. Senior if he would take lead on working with State Fire Training to survey and gather community college data, specifically determining which campuses have delivered and having them provide actual data on FTE costs, processes and related items. In addition, he should also contact those community colleges with Fire Technology programs that have not yet delivered the new courses to ascertain whether there were problems with the curriculum, if it didn't make sense economically, or whatever reason has prevented them from delivering the new material. He was asked to provide this information when the item comes back for review in January by the committee. D. Senior indicated that he would follow-up with N. Hannum by phone or email shortly.

MOTION: *D. Senior made the motion to reconsider previous action taken at the January meeting.*

C. Knapp seconded the motion.

Action: The motion for reconsideration failed. Without a new motion, the previous motion from the January meeting stands, requesting that the Fire Technology Directors come back in approximately 12 months with a final report detailing how the Enrollment Cap is affecting Community Colleges.

3. Instructor Requirements: Level 2 Instructor (Master Instructor)

Issue: Update & Action

Discussion: R. Martin began by reminding the committee that at the April STEAC meeting the committee had expressed concern as to whether Master Instructor status was needed to teach the Level 2 classes under the Training Instructor Series, consisting of Group Dynamics, Advanced Audio/Visual, and Test Writing (Training Instructor 2A, 2B, and 2C). He was asked to go back and survey the subject matter experts as well as to speak with the individuals that created the Master Instructor Curriculum Evaluation (MICE). After surveying the subject matter experts, they are still of the opinion that it is not necessary to be a Master Instructor for the Level 2 Training Instructor courses. Those courses are stand alone courses and if it were to become mandatory that Master Instructor registration were needed to instruct them, then that umbrella would have to be looked at for all Level 2 courses, if the concern is the instructor's teaching caliber. B. Martin offered that he could endorse it, as it makes sense pragmatically. The more instructor qualifications are expanded, the more limits it places on those who want to instruct.

MOTION: *B. Martin made the motion to accept the recommendation from the Master Instructor sub-committee that Master Instructor status is not required to teach courses within Level 2 of the Training Instructor Series. D. Childress seconded the motion.*

Action: *The motion carried unanimously.*

4. Capstone Testing Process: Training Instructor

Issue: **Task book Submissions, Testing Sites, & Procedures**

Discussion: A. Hamilton informed the group that Training Instructor was the first Capstone Testing process from Blueprint 2020. Several meetings ago, STEAC was presented several options of how to proceed, including teaching demonstrations and a written test following the completion of all requirements. She was now presenting the process the Training Instructor cadre had developed in the form of a flowchart and sample task book. Students will be required to meet all the prerequisites, take the Training Instructor 1A, 1B, and 1C courses, and complete the task book, which will be made available on the SFT website. The task book will include an area for the applicant to list all of their teaching experience including the subjects and dates taught and requiring everything be signed off either by the fire chief, an authorized representative or the community college coordinator. At this time, the candidate will be able to register to take the Capstone Test, which will be delivered by a Regional Accredited Academy with local processing. An SFT representative will be present to evaluate the task book and assist with the test delivery and processing, limiting it to a one-day event. A. Hamilton described that she envisioned a morning and afternoon session with grading times established after each session, so that the candidates can find out whether they pass or fail shortly after testing. Those who pass the test with at least an 80% will have their information taken back to State Fire Training, where a

certificate will be issued via mail. If they fail, the candidate can retake the test after 30 days at the same testing site or another testing site, depending on what is convenient for them, and the testing site will be invoiced for each person. Mary Jennings asked if there was a maximum timeframe, after they finish the course, to complete the task book. A. Hamilton pointed out that the task book states that it is valid as long as the certification requirements do not change, and generally, the guides stay the same for years, but if changes were being made to the requirements, State Fire Training gives a 6-month to 1-year notice that changes are being implemented and to finish up any mandatory requirements before they go into effect.

The question was posed as to how it would be verified that a candidate has actually taught the courses they list in the task book. A. Hamilton explained that in the section where the candidate lists their teaching experience, it is required to be accompanied by a signature from their Fire Chief or authorized representative. R. Martin added that it is expected that a Fire Chief ask for validation and/or supporting evidence before signing off on anything. B. Martin suggested that it may be prudent to do some strategic communication to the Fire Chiefs, and get it circulating throughout the fire service, that this requirement is coming. A. Hamilton agreed and pointed out the goal was to get the Fire Chief's more involved and with these new task books, it will be necessary for them to do research to be aware of what they are signing off. M. Richwine assured that an announcement would be placed in the SFT Fireline newsletter in addition to being sent out to multiple organizations requesting distribution.

MOTION: *None*

Action: *Information Only*

5. Course Retake Eligibility

Issue: **Policy for Retaking Summative Exams**

Discussion: M. Richwine recalled that this item had been touched on during the July meeting while discussing the pass/fail summative tests and it was suggested that it be brought back for further discussion. The issue stems from a conflict in policy between State Fire Training and the community colleges concerning what constitutes a passing grade. This resulted in students failing the summative exam by SFM standards but receiving passing credit on their transcripts by the community colleges. Subsequently, the issue came up of students being unable to retake the class if it had already been passed, but it was discovered this policy could be overridden depending on how the class is set up.

A. Hamilton explained that the primary reason for bringing this issue to the floor is that it had already come up in several instances, and with State Fire Training's intent of moving all SFM courses towards Capstone Testing, these will not just be isolated incidents but rather, something that

needs to be addressed more broadly. Her suggestion was to make community colleges aware of the Capstone Testing using Instructor-developed summative tests, so that they can add that language to their approval process. She offered that she would send a memo to all Master Instructors informing them that students must pass the summative exam with at least an 80% and that there is a potential conflict with community colleges. State Fire Training will leave it at the instructor's discretion whether to offer a retake to their students, as long as it is accomplished within the 15-day period of the class materials needing to be returned to the SFT bookstore, as per their agreement. R. Martin added that the letter going out to instructors will remind them that they need to make it clear to their students that if they do not pass the summative exam for Training Instructor 1A, they will not be approved to take 1B. A. Hamilton acknowledged that it will be necessary to continue working with all the different community colleges to ensure students are meeting SFM standards and it's up to the instructors to remain cognizant of any issues that arise so that they can be worked out and SFM courses can continue being offered through community colleges.

MOTION: *None*

Action: *Information Only*

6. Revised Agreement for On-line Hybrid Course Delivery

Issue: **Presentation of Revised Draft**

Discussion: M. Richwine presented the committee a revised version of the written agreement for any Accredited Regional Training Programs (ARTPs) that wants to deliver Fire Officer courses in an online hybrid format. The agreement was being brought back with the changes that had been suggested during the April meeting and with new language added. He shared that there are several colleges that want to begin delivering classes in the online format this Fall, so the agreements need to start getting distributed so that the interested colleges and ARTPs can complete and submit them to State Fire Training as a condition of their course approval. K. Wagner offered one suggestion for the new language underlined; that the statement "for the sake of exam security" be omitted as platform choice does more than just provide exam security.

MOTION: *None*

Action: *Information only*

7. Rapid Intervention Crew (RIC) Tactics Curriculum Revision Updates

Issue: **Status Report, Presentation of RIC Course Outlines, & Action**

Discussion: R. Bennett started by introducing himself and informing the committee that he would be presenting on behalf of J. Woody. He reminded the committee that the goal of the RIC curriculum rewrite was to take the

current 16-hour RIC course and develop it into three courses; a 16-hour *Firefighter Survival* course for the Firefighter I level, a 16-hour *RIC Operations* course for the Firefighter II level, and an 8-hour *Command and Control of the RIC Deployment* course for the Command level. He was providing the committee all three draft course outlines for input and approval. B. Martin asked if R. Bennett could provide the current status of the term “Mayday” as there had been previous discussions of its usage in RIC, and what Firescope accepts, last time a status report was given to STEAC. R. Bennett confirmed that there had been objection to its use in the *Command and Control* course, but in evaluating its use in *RIC Deployment*, the rewrite committee looked at ICS 910, which includes very specific information about “Mayday” and about procedures developed for Emergency Traffic, so the cadre plugged that particular information into the course to avoid any controversy. As for the Command level, they are trying to employ Emergency Traffic terms and references to control the radio environment. K. Wagner assured that he had been in close contact with R. Bennett regarding the Firescope dialog, providing him more information on the topic, and was confident the rewrite cadre has been taking it all into consideration. D. Senior questioned the absence of course objectives in the *RIC Operations* outline provided and how they proposed to develop content without established objectives. R. Bennett explained that the objectives had in fact been written but must not have made it into the draft outline before being dispersed.

R. Bennett also briefly went over RIC Instructor Qualifications as laid out in another document he provided the members. Quality control was key in the examination of instructor qualifications, so they began with State Fire Marshal requirements as a foundation, then provided more detailed experience and training requirements for each of the three courses. He admitted that already there is some dissension with the proposed requirements in terms of how much burden should be placed on existing instructors, so they should be viewed as a “work in progress.” It is the hopes of the cadre to present a substantial number of Train-the-Trainer update courses in 2010 to acquire as many instructors as quickly as possible and they are proposing a 5-year currency requirement for all instructors.

R. Bennett offered that the cadre was working to have established drafts of all three curriculum submitted to A. Hamilton by mid-September for refinement and formatting, after which, they will go out for peer review in October and November. Final edits will be made to complete the final draft so that it can be presented to STEAC for final approval at the January meeting and from there it can go to the State Board of Fire Services for adoption. M. Richwine reminded R. Bennett that State Fire Training still needs the cadre to submit a work plan and budget to plug into projections for the coming fiscal year, in order to help incur some of the costs.

MOTION: *Mary Jennings made the motion to approve all three course outlines with the understanding that the objectives for RIC Operations have been*

developed and will be included in the next iteration. B. Martin seconded the motion.

Action: The motion carried unanimously.

The committee took a 15-minute break at 10:45 a.m.

8. Curriculum Development and Approval Process Flow Chart

Issue: Procedures & Guidelines for Curriculum Development, Approval, and Implementation through State Fire Training

Discussion: A. Hamilton presented the committee a revised flowchart that originally came out of State Fire Training's Curriculum Development Guidelines, which she and R. Coleman had developed in the early 90s. She had been updating it over the years, as the process had been refined, and was now bringing it to the committee as a refresher and to clearly define at what point STEAC and the State Board of Fire Services (SBFS) becomes involved in the approval process and the development of curriculum.

Beginning with CFSTES Level 1, the process always begins with a Training Need which gets linked to the Certification Training Standards. At this point, the Curriculum Development Team is assembled because at Level 1, there is a desire to retain standardization throughout the curriculum. The team develops the Course Information and Required Materials document, which has taken the place of the course outline, providing more relevant and detailed information such as prerequisites, student/instructor ratio, and required materials. They will also provide a Calendar of Events, identify additional Instructor Qualifications, as far as experience goes; then, if any texts are getting published, they should make them available to STEAC/SBFS for Provisional Approval. Community Colleges would then start taking these materials through their Curriculum Approval Process. When they have successfully been adopted, the Curriculum Committee would develop all required materials such as student activities, lesson plans, evaluation tools, audiovisual support, and instructor guides and finally, announce a course release date.

CFSTES Levels 2 and 3 processes have been much less defined in the past and A. Hamilton was hoping to finally get an approval on some concrete procedures. State Fire Training has begun using the proposed courses developed by the Education Resources Roundtable, where SFT curriculum is obsolete and no longer utilized and instead, are moving into Instructor-developed summative testing. The discussion for years has been to treat Level 2 differently than Level 1, that is, to identify a Training Need, link it to Certification Training Standards, develop the CIRM document, identify textbooks, and determine Instructor Qualifications; thereby completing the extent of SFT's involvement in the development of the course. SFT would no longer be involved with lesson plans or student manual development.

Finally, the process for FSTEP courses would remain very similar to what the Curriculum Development Guidelines already has in place. The revised flowchart just reiterated that the Northern and Southern Training Officers were the authority determining whether a course be brought to State Fire Training for statewide delivery or if it is more specific to a local (regional) interest, not requiring adaptation by SFT.

MOTION: *M. Romer made the motion to adopt the process as presented to the committee. C. Knapp seconded the motion.*

Action: *The motion carried unanimously.*

9. Concepts for Fire Officer/Chief Officer Certification

Issue: Update & Action

Discussion: Bill Vandevort, chair of the Fire Officer Review Project cadre, introduced himself and explained that he had furnished the members a fairly comprehensive report on the cadre's status. He noted that at the end of the report, the cadre had listed four items needing approval, for which he would provide more detail with his presentation. He presented some background on the project and the direction the cadre received from SFT. The cadre had been tasked with reviewing the CTS to ensure that the course outline is reflective of the knowledge and skill requirements within. In addition, they were directed to exclude Fire Prevention 1A and 1B from the Fire Officer curriculum, since those courses are designed for fire prevention personnel.

First, he discussed the cadre selection and the criteria established for choosing members. SFT posted an announcement on the web requesting resumes from those interested in participating on the project. Thirty-four resumes were received but in the interest of scale and manageability, only ten were selected. They looked at everything from rank and education, to job experience and participation with State Fire Training. It was important that both Northern and Southern California were represented on the cadre as well as providing a mix of more experienced cadre participants with those who are new to working on curriculum projects, to infuse the system with "new blood." B. Vandevort was impressed with the final selection and felt that the cross-section of participants should result in a very successful outcome.

The task of reviewing the CTS documents, to determine what needs to be revisited, posed more challenges than the cadre initially anticipated as the Fire Officer and Chief Officer certification tracks have not been examined in their entirety since their inception over 25 years ago, nor have they been assessed in a manner where one level builds upon the other. Also a new edition of NFPA 1021 was published since the Fire Officer and Chief Officer CTS was created, requiring updates be made to both CTS documents to reconcile the changes. Those documents would be making their way to STEAC for review shortly.

It was during the review of the Fire Officer CTS that the cadre identified their first item for approval; **to change the Fire Officer Certification level to “Company Officer”** in order to make the title more descriptive of the duty. Among the most compelling recommendations made for change within the Fire Officer Certification Level, the cadre advocated a complete overhaul of Command 1A and 1B, re-titling both to best reflect the new course content; a reorganization of the course outline for Fire Command 1C to fall in line with 1A and 1B, while leaving the content untouched; reworking the content for Management 1 and re-titling it, and adding a new course entitled Leadership 1, which provides the leadership component that STEAC previously advised for inclusion. Several other recommendations for consideration were listed within their handouts.

While further delving into the review process, it was determined by the cadre that it would better serve the certification system if **the Chief Officer CTS were split into two levels: Chief Fire Officer and Executive Fire Officer**, which was another recommendation offered for approval. Chief Fire Officer would require less training and would comprise of Program Managers, Training Officers and EMS Managers where Executive Fire Officer would require more training and would consist of Deputy Chief’s Assistants or those managing Human Resources or Finance areas. Again, there were complete course overhauls, including Fire Command 2A and 2E, course elimination of Fire Command 2B, 2C, and 2D along with Management 2A, 2B, 2C, 2D, and 2E, (the content would be reworked back into other courses, some for other levels of certification). They also advised the addition of a re-worked Fire Command 2B, Management 2A and 2B and a completely new courses such as Leadership 2. With the proposal of these changes, the final items the cadre was seeking STEAC to approve was **the number of courses and tentative course titles indentified in both the Company Officer and Chief Fire Officer levels of certification.**

MOTION: *B. Martin made the motion to accept this proposal in concept and recommended that the presentation be made to the State Board of Fire Services to get their early review of the sweeping changes embodied within. D. Childress seconded the motion.*

Action: *The motion carried unanimously.*

VI. New Business

1. Proposed Fire Apparatus Driver Operator 1C Course

Issue: **Item Tabled Until October Meeting.**

Discussion: None

MOTION: *None*

Action: *None*

2. Clarification to Educational Requirements (Associates Degree or Equivalent)

Issue: Changes in Regulations Concerning Language

Discussion: M. Richwine explained that for years, in order to be certified as a Fire Officer, it has been required that one possess, at minimum, an Associates degree, in any major, or an equivalent degree from an Accredited Post-Secondary Institution. Some confusion has arisen concerning what qualifies as an equivalent, resulting in several inquiries from new applicants. He was bringing the issue to STEAC because State Fire Training was recommending that a change be made to the language clarifying the requirement as possessing an Associates Degree, in any major, or *higher* from an Accredited Post Secondary Institution. He turned the issue over to the committee members for their opinion as to whether there was a need for the language “or equivalent.” There was general agreement from the members that the language was not necessary since there really is no equivalent to an Associates Degree. With that, M. Richwine offered that State Fire Training would go ahead and make this language change in regulations and move forward.

MOTION: *None*

Action: *Information only*

3. Student ID Cards

Issue: Implementation of Fire ID Numbers to Replace Social Security Numbers

Discussion: M. Richwine announced that State Fire Training has finally reached the point of implementation for the new Fire ID Cards. Currently, State Fire Training utilizes Social Security Numbers (SSN) for data system entry and retrieval. For security purposes, the decision was made to transition away from the use of SSNs and move towards the use of unique Fire Identification numbers, which students will be issued with completion of their initial course through State Fire Training. He passed around an example of the paper version of the ID card that will later be replaced by a lightweight plastic card, which would become available within the next year. If a student does not have an ID number, for whatever reason, when they attend a class, they will still be able to provide their SSN, but they will be required to provide at least one of these two options to have their new records entered into the database. Beginning in the Fall, the letters with the attached ID Cards will start going out to students as they complete classes. Complete SSNs will still need to be provided upon initial application, in order for Student ID numbers to be assigned, but with receipt of their Fire ID cards, either number can be utilized for identification.

MOTION: *None*

Action: *Information only*

4. SFT Staffing Changes

Issue: Transition of Duties & New Hires within State Fire Training

Discussion: M. Richwine informed the committee that Christy Owen, formerly the State Fire Training Manager of Certification and Registration, had recently accepted a position as the State Fire Marshal Administrative Manager. Her replacement, Mary Wilshire, would be joining State Fire Training effective July 31, 2009. She joins State Fire Training from the California Emergency Management Agency (CalEMA) but worked previously with CAL FIRE in Grants and Contracts, possessing a great deal of knowledge in contracts and the budgeting process, which will make her a valuable addition to SFT. Sandy Margullis has been appointed as a Deputy State Fire Marshal and is now assigned to the Fire and Life Safety Division. Her position has been filled by Linda Menchaca, who has been promoted to Staff Services Analyst and will now be responsible for the EMT Program and PACE II Instructor Registration. Taking over as Course Registrar is Brandon Erickson, who has been promoted to Office Technician from his Student Assistant position in the SFT Bookstore. B. Erickson will still be handling all bookstore shipping and receiving but can be contacted with any course scheduling requests as well. Finally, Mike Garcia was introduced to the members as State Fire Training's newest Deputy State Fire Marshal, primarily assigned to Southern California. M. Garcia shared a bit of his professional background explaining that he had just come from the Department of Corrections after working with them for 13 years as a chief at two different locations. Prior to that, he was a Fire Prevention Officer with Santa Monica Fire for 8½ years while being active with the South Bay FPOs simultaneously. Currently, he is a Registered Instructor with State Fire Training and an Outreach Instructor for CSTI.

MOTION: *None*

Action: *Information only*

VII. Roundtable

K. Zagaris

The Office of Emergency Services and the Office of the State Fire Marshal collaborated to present four one-day outreach classes for CICCIS. There is still one more class to present in the North area. A lot of information exchange took place and things went very well. His impression is that one outreach class will probably be needed annually, but could most likely be accomplished in a half day format versus a full day.

D. Childress

Northern and Southern California Fire Training Officers (FTOs) convened in San Simeon for a 2-day meeting to prepare for the Symposium. Both sections have expanded to the point that some of the meeting rooms normally used for the Symposium will not be able to facilitate the increase of attendees. The FTOs are responding by bringing in more workers to accommodate the influx.

B. Martin

Cal Chiefs is holding the Executive Leadership Institute again, at the Symposium in Fresno for a week in November. There is a working group in place to keep the curriculum updated and current. This course is worthwhile for anyone aspiring for Chief Officer positions.

In Fremont, the fire department has opened their classrooms as part of their renovations through the \$51M fire bond they received. Part of the money was allocated for a Public Safety Training Center which includes an 80-person smart classroom, a 32-person smart classroom, a simulator room for EMS and Fire Command presentations, as well as some administrative offices. They are also building a tower with a separate classroom which will include Confined Space Trench Rescue props. He offered that if any organizations are looking to host courses out of the Bay Area, these new classrooms are available for use.

D. Senior

Community Colleges are looking at increasing the number of minimum students in a class. Alan Hancock College has yet to make the change, but they have begun freezing contracts with some local agencies which had created problems. He advised that if anyone was currently working with community colleges to set up classes, they do so early to avoid any issues.

K. Olson

CAL FIRE is gearing up for another training year. Budget-wise, they have begun to realize that it is much more cost-efficient to hold classes at the Academy, therefore, they have increased Academy classes by nearly 20% over the next year. They are currently looking at hiring around 160 new engineers within the year.

M. Jennings

She wanted to dispel rumors that there is no more money available in the State budget for apprenticeships. Apprenticeship did take a financial hit, but they are working to get the money back and have been successful thus far. Any questions concerning apprenticeship funds could be addressed to Kevin White, also of CFFJAC.

CFFJAC has also begun to implement their \$2.5M contract for Terrorism training, which will come out of AB587, until June of 2010. Dates for Train-the-Trainer classes can be found on their website, www.cffjac.org, and there is backfill money available for those departments sending attendees, which is \$35/hour for the 6-hour course, as long as the money lasts. CFFJAC will provide the instructor, the materials, lunch and will even reimburse mileage. The only stipulation is that it all has to be run through the departments for Fire Chief/Training Officer verifications, to set it up in a fashion where it can be audited. CFFJAC only requests that if a department receives Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) funds, they do not apply for these funds as well.

VIII. Future Meeting Date

Friday, October 16, 2009

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

IX. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 12:02 p.m. by Vice Chair, Ken Wagner.