



STATEWIDE TRAINING AND EDUCATION  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES  
April 21, 2017 – Sacramento, California

**Members Present:**

Timothy Adams, So Cal Training Officers (alternate)  
Bradley Arganbright, Nor Cal Training Officers  
David Barnett, FIRESCOPE (alternate)  
John Binaski, League of California Cities  
Taral Brideau, California Fire Fighter Joint Apprenticeship Committee  
Ron Coleman, STEAC Chair  
Randy Collins, California Fire Technology Directors Association (North)  
Bret Davidson, So Cal Training Officers  
Lorenzo Gigliotti, California Governor's Office of Emergency Services (alternate)  
Jeremy Lawson, CAL FIRE Academy  
Gaudenz Panholzer, California Fire Chiefs Association  
Richard Rideout, California Metropolitan Fire Chiefs Inc.  
Brent Stangeland, CAL FIRE  
Daniel Stefano, California State Firefighters' Association  
Rich Thomas, California Professional Fire Fighters (alternate)

**Members Absent:**

Tony Bowden, Fire District Association of California (alternate)  
Robert Briare, California Professional Firefighters  
Gary Dominguez, California Fire Technology Directors Association (South)  
Gareth Harris, Fire District Association of California  
Sam Hoffman, California State Firefighters Association (Alternate)  
Matthew Jewett, California Fire Technology Directors Association (North) (alternate)  
Steve Knuckles, League of California Cities (Alternate)  
Michael Lozano, FIRESCOPE  
Steve Shull, California Fire Technology Directors Association (South) (alternate)  
John Walsh, Nor Cal Training Officers (alternate)  
Kim Zagaris, California Governor's Office of Emergency Services (Cal OES)

**State Fire Training Staff:**

Joe Bunn, Fire Service Training Specialist III  
Wendy Collins, Assistant Deputy Director  
Jim Eastman, Fire Service Training Specialist III  
Brandon Erickson, Staff Services Analyst  
Lynne Gibboney, Associate Government Program Analyst  
Andrew Henning, Acting SFT Division Chief  
Dennis Mathisen, State Fire Marshal  
Diane Radford, Division Support  
Mike Richwine, Assistant State Fire Marshal  
Dawn Robinson, Deputy State Fire Marshal III  
Kris Rose, Staff Services Manager I

**Guests:**

Natalie Hannum, Los Medanos College  
Brian Preciado, Solano Community College  
Bob Buell, California Fire Technology Directors Association (CFTDA)  
Abe Roman, Berkeley Fire Department  
David Sprague, Berkeley Fire Department  
Dana Lipps, Sacramento Metro Fire Department  
Jeff Seaton, San Jose Fire Department  
Rich Payan, City of Sacramento Fire Department  
Mark Reagan, Sacramento Fire Department  
De Felkins, Sacramento Fire Department

## I. Introductions and Welcome

The meeting was called to order at 9:03 A.M. by Chief Ron Coleman, Committee Chairman.

### A. Roll Call/Quorum Established

A quorum was established during introductions.

### B. Member Appointment/Re-Appointment

1. Steve Knuckles-Alternate-League of California Cities-not present
2. Mike Lozano-Member Re-appointment-FIRESCOPE
3. David Barnett-Alternate- FIRESCOPE

Chief Mathisen indicated that an official letter of appointment was sent to each of the members and alternates acknowledging their appointment or re-appointment to the Statewide Education and Advisory Committee (STEAC).

### C. Past Member Recognition

1. Ken Wagner-Member-California Fire Chief's Association not present
2. Pete Jankowski-Alternate-FIRESCOPE not present

Chief Mathisen stated that he made some recent staffing changes to State Fire Training (SFT). Chief Mathisen recognized Ken Wagner and Mark Romer for their significant contributions to SFT and to STEAC. Their work has been greatly appreciated. The message that Chief Mathisen wanted to give is that we will continue moving forward with curriculum development and supporting the continued work pursuing National Accreditations and Fire Fighter I. In essence there are no changes to the processes currently under way. Randy Collins said they both were important to the alignment process. They are both very professional and he offered that we could not have done what we have thus far without their contributions. Bret Davidson stated that the Training Officer's (TO'S) agreed they were hard workers and will be greatly missed. Natalie Hannum asked if there were to be any re-alignments with Sacramento State College. Chief Mathisen responded that there are some stop gap reassignments being worked on and we are looking at other ways to partner with

Sacramento State College. N. Hannum said we have enough people across the state to ramp up and assist and she offered to continue a conversation offline regarding this.

## II. Agenda Review

**Presenter: Chief Coleman**

Chief Coleman asked if anyone had any items to discuss that are not on the agenda. Andrew Henning advised he would like to remove two items from the agenda. The first is to remove Item VI.B.1. from the agenda. This is the Animal Technical Rescue item and the removal request is due to editorial changes not yet finalized. The second item is to delete item VI.B.2 from the agenda regarding the Incident Management of High Rise Fires. The FIRESCOPE task force asked for the removal so their board of directors could have some additional time to review information and move this for a final motion at the July 2017 STEAC meeting.

## III. Approval of the January 13, 2017 Minutes

**Motion:** *Randy Collins moved to accept the STEAC minutes from January 13, 2017.*

*Mike Lozano seconded the motion.*

**Action:** *All members voted unanimously.*

## IV. State Board of Fire Services (SBFS) Update

**Presenter: Chief Dennis Mathisen**

Chief Mathisen advised that the State Board of Fire Services (SBFS) met February 23, 2017 with two accreditation items on the agenda. Santa Ana College was re-accredited as an Accredited Regional Training Program (ARTP) and the Hayward Fire Department was accredited as an Accredited Local Academy (ALA). The Fire Investigator 2017 curriculum implementation plan was approved also. The Fire Service Labor/Management Relations curriculum was also approved. Chief Mathisen stated that the SBFS has requested additional time to review curriculum for approval. There is a need for SBFS to have additional time to share with the groups they represent. A change is being made in what goes forward to SBFS. An item reviewed as information only this month at STEAC will be information only at the next SBFS meeting. Once reviewed by SBFS it will then be brought to the next STEAC meeting for approval and then brought forward to the next SBFS for approval. This allows extra time for notice process and handouts.

Chief Mathisen also indicated that at the State board level, the process of interaction from the Office of the State Fire Marshal (OSFM) office and the board members is one of staff providing reports. Chief Mathisen began a discussion at the last meeting and asked how to get the board members engaged in discussions of involvement at the project level. A list of issues was put together and the State board will get this list at the next meeting for what to work on for the next fiscal year. The consensus should be on

answering fire service issues and staying engaged on resolving these. Bret Davidson said the minutes at the January meeting indicate that it was brought up with Chief Wagner in the staff report on putting together a presentation for STEAC on how to better represent these issues. He offered that there needs to be a plan to reach outside of California more. Chief Mathisen said that this will not slip through the cracks.

Chief Coleman spoke about STEAC's responsibility to SBFS. Chief Coleman indicated that STEAC was originally created as a mechanism for doing the heavy lifting for SBFS. STEAC representation around this room is critical. SBFS must rely on STEAC to ask the hard questions and the validity of things before moving forward. We represent the users of the system. Members of STEAC must also transmit information in good time to each of your areas of responsibility.

## V. Consent Items

### A. Seeking approval for reaccreditation of two Accredited Regional Training programs/Accredited Local Academies: Rio Hondo College and College of the Desert

**Presenter: Dawn Robinson  
(Attachment 1)**

Dawn Robinson reported that the reaccreditation site visits went well. There were no questions asked.

***Motion:*** *Gaudenz Panholzer moved to accept the reaccreditation of Rio Hondo College and the College of the Desert.  
Dan Stefano seconded the motion.*

***Action:*** *All members voted unanimously.*

## VI. Mission Alignment Objectives

### A. Achieving National Recognition

#### 1. Sacramento City Fire Department

**Presenter: Jim Eastman  
(Attachment 2)**

Jim Eastman filled in for Rodney Slaughter. J. Eastman participated in the site visit. There were some modifications identified by the site group. Other participants included Chief Mathisen, Andrew Murtaugh from the San Francisco Fire Department, staff from the Stockton Fire Department, and the CALFIRE academy. Sacramento City Fire Department Director of Training, Rich Payan advised that the accreditation process was already moving forward when he came on board. R. Payan said his staff was instrumental in getting things in place. He praised several of the site participants as assisting with the process going smoothly. He offered that their doors are always open to anyone who wants to see what they have

accomplished and expressed sincere appreciation for the consideration for achieving accreditation.

**Motion:** *Randy Collins moved to accept the accreditation of the Sacramento City Fire Department.  
Brad Arganbright seconded the motion.*

**Action:** *All members voted unanimously.*

## **B. Curriculum Development & Delivery**

### **1. Animal Technical Rescue**

**Presenter: Andrew Henning  
(Attachment 3)**

This item was removed from the agenda and will be re-scheduled.

### **2. Incident Management of High Rise Fires**

**Presenter: Kevin Conant  
(Attachment 4)**

This item was removed from the agenda and will be re-scheduled.

### **3. AH-330 Strike Team/Task Force Leader Curriculum**

**Presenter: Andrew Henning  
(Attachment 5)**

Andrew Henning advised there are two versions of the AH- 330 curriculum. There is the regular Strike Team Task Force curriculum version and there is the All Risk version. This is a revised curriculum for all hazards. State Fire Training (SFT) is committed to working with FIRESCOPE on the terminal learning objectives and enabling learning objectives in order to match the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) preference. There were no questions regarding this information only item.

However a question from Bret Davidson was asked about whether the All Hazard Safety Officer curriculum was to be re-worked also. B. Davidson indicated that there has always been some controversy between the SFT curriculum and the FIRESCOPE curriculum. B. Davidson advised that SFT has the Safety Officer curriculum but it does not cover all hazards, all risks. The students are typically looking for the all risk course. Lorenzo Gigliotti said we need to work on getting the elements from FIRESCOPE to SFT, just as was

done with the AH-330 curriculum. Andrew Henning offered to work with FIRESCOPE on a resolution to this.

#### **4. Company Officer Standards & Curriculum Update**

**Presenter: Joe Bunn  
(Attachment 6)**

Joe Bunn stated we had the legacy curriculum for a long time. We then transitioned to the new process we use now. This is the first update with the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) being the bloodline of our curriculum. J. Bunn indicates that in 2014, Bill Vandervort updated the NFPA 1021 side but the NFPA 1051 Wildland portion was in between updates. It has now been updated and published. In reviewing the job performance requirements (JPR'S), there were no new JPR'S. There were several editorial changes, and new Course Information Requirements (CIRMS) were completed in about 6 hours. The plan worked seamlessly and is a good indication of how quickly SFT can make changes with a good working plan going forward. This is positive for the instructors across the state and the entire fire service community.

Chief Richwine commented that he appreciates the paradigm here. In order to update curriculum in the past it would have been several years before the courses were available for use in training. Chief Richwine stated this is an amazing process and he is appreciative that the system is working as planned.

#### **5. NFPA Curriculum Updates**

**Presenter: Andrew Henning**

Andrew Henning stated SFT is in the process of updating several of our certification tracks. This includes the Fire Fighter I, where we need to add the new addition of the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) 1051 Wild land Fire Fighter release. We also need to update the Chief Fire Officer for the NFPA 1051 Wild land portion. He also stated that we need to update the Fire Inspector I and II curriculum with the NFPA 1031 standard, as well as the Community Risk Educator based on the NFPA 1035 standard. We are only seeing editorial changes to the Job Performance Requirements (JPR'S). SFT staff would like to move forward with these, indicating that the JPR'S are not changing, the Course Information Requirements (CIRM'S) and course plans are to be updated just for reference to the NFPA standard and the task books. A. Henning asked what format the STEAC would like to see if this is considered only an editorial item. The options are in the form of a staff report and errata sheet, which can be an excel sheet with JPR'S listed side by side. The other option is in a track changes format to visualize what was struck out or underlined. A. Henning advised he will bring both options to the next STEAC meeting so a determination can be made

of what will work better and STEAC can decide the best practice. If the option becomes more than editorial changes, it can be pulled and come back to STEAC for the next meeting as an item for motion. Bret Davidson asked about the effects of this on the Fire Fighter I, with International Fire Service Accreditation Congress (IFSAC) and The National Board on Fire Service (PROBOARD). A. Henning responded that because the Fire Fighter I is accredited through IFSAC and PROBOARD we are required through the accreditation process to submit any changes to them within a two year period. The changes to a textbook typically take one year for the changes to get rolled out, which puts us in a narrow one year window to revalidate the course plan and test banks. Joe Bunn offered that working with an editor and cadre leader allows for these changes to be done quickly. Chief Richwine added that all JPR'S and all programs are available in the database. Jim Eastman said this is currently in an excel format. A. Henning will add to consent items agenda.

Henning asked how STEAC wants to handle a minor change. This would be more than an editorial change, but not a whole class overhaul. There are 3 different ways NFPA standards can change. One option is editorial in nature. Another is minor such as the addition of a sentence and the addition of one new JPR. And lastly the NFPA standard had a major overhaul and is brought to you as if it is brand new curriculum. Natalie Hannum suggested that a litmus test might have fiscal impact and that would make a difference between being just a consent item. 99.9% of the time it would not have any fiscal impact. B. Davidson said change the JPR and add time to the class. Dan Stefano stated that if you have to ask the question if this is a minor tweak, you already answered the question. A. Henning stated this is a learning curve and that staff can adjust and adapt if it does not meet STEAC needs.

## **6. FSTEP Instructor Curriculum**

**Presenter: Jim Eastman  
(Attachment 7)**

Jim Eastman indicated that many STEAC members worked on this curriculum. They took the old curriculum and updated the content and have created new FSTEP courses. The new FSTEP curriculum is Techniques of Evaluation (previously Fire Instructor 2A), Group Dynamics and Problem Solving (previously Fire Instructor 2B) and Employing Visual Aids (previously Fire Instructor 2C). Randy Collins asked whether the class hours were the same as they were in the CFSTES system. J. Eastman stated that the old Fire Instructor 2A course was a 40-hour course and is now a 32 hour course. The Fire Instructor 2b course was 40 hours and is now 32 hours and the old Fire Instructor 2C course was originally 40 hours and is now adjusted to 39 hours.

## **7. Certified Instructor Experience Requirement**

**Presenter: Jim Eastman  
(Attachment 8)**

Jim Eastman stated that we are looking at the difference between Instructor Certification and Registered Instructor. Originally in the process to get certified as an Instructor 1, we required an applicant to complete 80 hours of classroom instructional experience. For the Instructor II certification, we required completion of another 80 hours of classroom instructional experience. Now we are asking to move the requirement down to 40 hours of instructional experience for each level of certification. This marries the old requirement of Registered Instructor, wherein Certified Instructor I and II would now complete a total of 80 hours rather than 160 hours. Chief Coleman stated this is streamlining the objective. A conversation took place surrounding this presentation and the benefits. Participants included Bret Davidson, Jim Eastman, Randy Collins, Chief Coleman, Natalie Hannum, Jeff Seaton and Joe Bunn. The consensus is that this is a positive move. J. Eastman said this helps with future instructors being groomed with the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) standards. B. Davidson also stated this is also a better requirement for Instructor II because they can take then take the Ethics course and Regional Instructor Orientation (RIO) and then can teach California Fire Service Training and Education System (CFSTES) classes and Fire Service Training Education Program (FSTEP) classes. J. Eastman offered that Andrew Henning will be following up with the 80 candidates who currently have been issued task books under the current requirements. Jeff Seaton asked whether reciprocity was built into the implementation of this. J. Eastman stated that it is not, as management needs to work with the Fire Fighter I and II first.

A further discussion took place regarding building a work force in California and including this in reciprocity. The discussion included looking at the Department of Defense (DOD) so they can take courses locally and assist us. Chief Richwine stated that he put out documentation to the Fire Chief's on the DD214 and hiring process. He stated that reciprocity would be a couple of years out. J. Seaton talked about a delay of recruitment outside the state. He also advised that this is not part of accreditation but it needs to be and reciprocity needs to be part of the implementation plan. Andrew Henning said that Ken Wagner advised that the Fire Fighter reciprocity certification is such a big piece with the International Fire Service Accreditation Congress (IFSAC) and The National Board on Fire Service



(PROBOARD), there is discussion of breaking this into three different certifications.

David Barnett spoke regarding instructor training and the creation of a Master Instructor Certification to entice the enrollment in the FSTEP curriculum. As a Training Chief, he stated he needs extra funds for FSTEP courses to allow the department to enroll participants. There needs to be a motivating factor to do so. J. Eastman advised the option of this as a capstone testing process could be a concept to look into.

## **VII. Reconfiguration of State Fire Training**

### **A. Future Instructor Requirements-**

**Presenter: Jim Eastman/Andrew Henning  
(Attachment 9)**

Andrew Henning advised that an Interim Procedure has been created. This process is to help eliminate confusion between the training and process needed in becoming a Certified Instructor and the training and process needed to become a Registered Instructor. The document provided outlines the Interim Procedure on one side and the course plan on the other side. For approximately two years, State Fire Training (SFT) has accepted the Regional Instructor Orientation (RIO) class if the applicant has taken it within the last two years. Previously it was required to be taken within the past twelve months. Going through this process we identified some issues with the training instructor going into the new Instructor classes.

A. Henning stated that the interim procedure outlines what the policy was and what changes are being made. Under the current policy, completing the Instructor 1 and Instructor II courses, you would not qualify to become a registered instructor. A. Henning stated that we want to codify that if you have the Instructor I and Instructor II courses you will now be able to apply to become a registered instructor.

For those legacy Instructors who have been teaching for many years and have either Fire instructor 1A, 1B or Training Instructor 1A, 1B, they now can take Instructor II in order to qualify as a registered instructor. By implementing this procedure we also needed to adjust the course plan and the Course Information Requirements Manual (CIRM).

Brett Davidson said this is very inclusive and keeps complaints from those who did not take the Training Instructor 1C course. Taral Brideau asked how long this process is to be in place. A. Henning said this Interim Procedure should be in place through December 31, 2018. At that time we will then transition from Registered Instructor to Certified Instructor.

Jim Eastman reiterated that December 31, 2018 is the date in which a person must become a Registered Instructor in order to not need to comply with the new Certification requirements to teach SFT courses.

J. Eastman reiterated that if someone is a Registered Instructor now in good standing, they are still a Registered Instructor. They can continue on with adding additional qualifications for teaching courses by submitting the Registered Instructor application, a letter of experience with the agency approved signature verifying their subject matter expertise, and the completion of a course specific task book, if applicable. There is no change to their status. This process really only applies to new folks who wish to become SFT Instructors.

For new Instructors, they will be required to complete the following: Instructor 1 course, Ethical Leadership in the Classroom course, complete a Instructor I Task Book and become certified and complete the Instructor II course and the Regional Instructor Orientation (RIO) class, complete the Instructor II Task Book and become certified and then they can be approved to teach Fire Service Training and Education Program (FSTEP) and the California Fire Service Training and Education System (CFSTES) courses as long as they qualify to teach the specific course they are requesting to teach.

J. Eastman stated this is to formalize the implementation plan on this item that was originally voted on and approved in 2015. David Barnett asked why if someone has taken Fire Instructor 1A, 1B this is only utilized for Registered Instructor and not for Certified Instructor. J. Eastman replied that those courses have been retired twice and after line by line scrutiny, they cannot marry these to the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) standards. They do not match up. D. Barnett stated that the current interim procedures indicate that they can become a Registered Instructor having taken Fire Instructor 1a, 1b and Training Instructor 1C but they cannot become a Certified Instructor. Why is there no inclusiveness with the Certified Instructor certification procedure? J. Eastman responded that the distinction between Fire Instructor 1A and Fire Instructor 1B is that this curriculum was retired in 2008/2009. The new Instructor curriculum model rolled out in 2014-current date. Kris Rose offered that the Fire Instructor curriculum was allowed to be included for Registered Instructor applicants but not for Certified Instructor applicants. If both had been retired simultaneously, there may be less confusion.

Andrew Henning commented that another issue we have with Instructor Registration is recognizing the historical process. Most of the implementation plans that have been approved by STEAC state that if you are a Registered Instructor before the course retirement date, you are eligible to become a Registered Instructor for the new courses. If you don't register for new courses before the retirement date, you must follow the Pace II process. For example, someone who taught the Fire Officer

classes for the last 10 years and those classes for certification were retired on December 31, 2016. As long as they submit their application to add the new Company Officer classes before the deadline, under the grandfather process, they will be able to teach the new Company Officer courses. A person with the same criteria, but who did not apply before the deadline is not eligible to teach the new courses. Currently Lynne Gibboney has a current backlog of 400 plus Registered Instructor applications. The Training Officer's have offered 12 people to assist over a two day period with this backlog. A. Henning stated he is very appreciative of this assistance as they are utilizing their own funds to fly to Sacramento to assist with this backlog.

Andrew Henning said his concern is if we keep this policy of implementation plans, all Instructors who register after January 1<sup>st</sup>, will have to go thru the Pace II process. This can be a 6-9 month approval process, thus creating additional backlog. He indicated he brainstormed with Chief Richwine and two other options other than PACE II came to mind. Another option is that perhaps we empower SFT staff to do an administrative review, validating their Fire Officer Certification, Chief's letter content and determine they were in the rank for X number of years without going through the Pace II process. The other option is to soften up and push back to give an additional 18 months to allow registering under the old classes. A. Henning asked STEAC for feedback. A detailed discussion took place with participants including Chief Richwine, Andrew Henning, Bret Davidson, Joe Bunn, Natalie Hannum, David Barnett, John Binaski, Kris Rose, Lynne Gibbony, Gaudenz Panholzer, Richard Rideout and Jeremy Lawson. A lengthy discussion took place where it was decided that there was no support for extending the current deadline. Additional discussion took place regarding the Pace II process, and it was determined that placing a burden on SFT staff was not effective. Kris Rose stated that this discussion is for new Registered Instructors only. Existing Instructors need to email Lynne Gibboney or Kris Rose. The option of requiring 5 years in the rank and giving SFT staff empowerment was the final consensus. It was discussed that these questions will go back to the Training Officer's regarding the cutoffs and administrative review. This should not tie up PACE. A. Henning said this is a growing pain of the old CFSTES classes. The transition of the 2014 Company Officer to the new 2017 addition won't have this growing pain. This is just a transitional process with those classes moving to National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) guidelines.

B. Davidson asked a question about being a Chief Officer and as the new curriculum rolls out, is he eligible to teach the new Company Officer courses. K. Rose advised that anyone who was on the development cadre for any new curriculum receives a course completion equivalency for those classes. For an Instructor in the system, but now they want to teach new classes, do they have to take the new courses is the question up for discussion. A. Henning said the administrative process looks like what we want to do. This issue is for CFSTES classes only. Allowing administrative review, with 2 yrs experience on top of what's in the procedure manual to allow someone to teach the new curriculum.

There was discussion about publishing this as an interim procedure with a deadline. Chief Richwine asked to hear from Lynne Gibboney as this affects her daily process.

L. Gibboney stated that there is a need for a fix to the current process, because of the amount of work she has and the length of time needed to review the applications. She also gets calls for applications from those retiring but wanting to teach, which adds to the already large volume of applicants. L. Gibboney offered that all she has to go by is reviewing the Chiefs letter. She can read through the letter and check boxes for what they're qualified for, if there is a solid process in place that she can follow. If they have the rank identified in the letter it is easier for her to qualify them for approval. A. Henning stated that the Auto Extrication and Driver Operator courses are backwards compatible. This is where the courses, even if retired, are still usable for teaching experience. All of the other CFSTES courses, once the course is retired this is also retired for registered instructor.

K. Rose advised that the wording on the current implementation plan will say current instructors of fire management of the specific course number, are authorized to deliver the new course. New instructors will be required to either complete the new course or apply for Pace II review of their instructor qualifications, including appropriate education and practical experience relating to the course content. A. Henning stated that SFT will follow the current procedures using Pace II until the July STEAC meeting. When the Training Officer's come to assist in June, an evaluation of the current applications will be done. This will determine how many need the Pace II process, how many are current registered instructors adding a course and how many are brand new instructors. L. Gibboney advised that another part of the backlog issue is with folks with the Accredited Local Academies (ALA'S) turning in applications. The message they seem to be getting is to also register for Lead Evaluators. In order to be a lead evaluator, they must be a Registered Instructor. Chief Richwine advised that we need to plan to fix the current backlog issue and then address the future plan to eliminate this occurring again. Chief Richwine said we currently seem to have a focus on instructors lying dormant and now the deadline has passed. How do we want to handle these applicants. John Binaski stated it does not make sense that we charge a fee for certification and everything else in SFT but you can become an instructor for free, when there is tons of work involved in evaluating and approving someone as a Registered Instructor. K. Rose advised there is a concern also of people having taken a class, so they mark the box for that class whether they intend to instruct the class or not. It would make a difference if we charge some kind of a fee to eliminate this random checking of boxes. K. Rose asked that everyone spread the word now that an applicant needs to apply only for what they want to teach now. They can add on additional classes later. A. Henning stated that he will take the direction provided and bring this back to STEAC in July. Chief Coleman advised this type of group discussion is exactly why STEAC exists.

## **B. Interim Procedures for ARTP/ALA On-Line and Hybrid Training**

**Presenter: Andrew Henning  
(Attachment 10)**

Andrew Henning stated that SFT has had several interim procedures for online and hybrid training classes. Each time we bring it back to STEAC it has evolved. SFT is requiring a college instructor to teach a class in person before they allow another

instructor to teach it online. This will assist the colleges with their current process. For the future, if for example, Miramar College teaches the course online, and develops the shell, or course guide, then develops a pilot course and then shares this with Alan Hancock College. Alan Hancock College can in turn share this with another college. This is the direction the colleges want to go. Natalie Hannum offered that this is in response to the industries online learning initiative. When they can build a shell and share with others, the colleges are looking at evaluating online learning.

Jim Eastman asked is there a limit to how many online courses can be taken to get a degree. N. Hannum said this is very college dependent, but is usually 50-50. J. Eastman asked if there was a difference between being able to take online and hybrid classes in obtaining a 2 year degree or a 4 year degree. The consensus was that this varies from one college to another. An Instructor could make the decision that a portion of the material will be in face to face rather than online. Allowing this flexibility is an individual assessment. Chief Coleman asked about the assessment process and completion rates. N. Hannum addressed this as a title 5 full assessment. Dan Stefano asked if the Fire Tech Directors are on line with this. A. Henning stated yes this was discussed as an information only item. N. Hannum said online sections cannot be offered enough and we need to think about that level of capacity when the time comes.

## **VIII. Announcements/Correspondence**

### **A. Company Officer Task Book Update**

**Presenter: Andrew Henning  
(Attachment 11)**

Andrew Henning discussed the Task Book Rank Requirements and Job Performance Requirements (JPR'S) simulations. He drafted the language discussed at the last STEAC meeting. The language proposed to be added to all current and future Task Books is "For JPR'S that are not part of a candidate's regular work assignment, the evaluator can develop a scenario which supports the required task and evaluates the candidate to the stated standard. This exception shall be utilized only under the stated circumstances and does not apply when the JPR is only infrequently encountered".

A discussion surrounding this verbiage ensued. John Binaski offered an example of a Plans Examiner review that he is working on. One of the tasks is to participate in proceedings that the testimony is accurate and the plan reviewer's demeanor is appropriate in the meetings. J. Binaski stated that he has a Fire Marshal who has done this for many years and has not ever been to an appeals court of hearing. This candidate needs to somehow be able to accomplish this required task. Andrew Henning advised that this is similar to the scenario Mark Romer discussed at the last

meeting using the fireworks stand as an example. A. Henning said the infrequently part is up to the Chief to decide. Further discussion ensued with participants including Taral Brideau, J. Binaski, A. Henning, Gaudenz Panholzer and Bret Davidson. David Barnett advised there is language that pertains to this in the National Wildlife Coordinating Group (NWCG) task book. Rich Thomas advised that his organization does not support this language, due to the lack of flexibility. He asked does a Fire Chief have the ability to determine if a certain skill is not applicable to the department. The answer was no, they must follow the NFPA guidelines. B. Davidson offered there is a work around with simulation. T. Brideau asked whether it is needed to develop a scenario or can the NWCG language be used that says Interview or simulation. D. Barnett advised that the task can be done in a rare situation, and it would need to state it is rare, and the use of simulation can be done and then sign off can be completed. B. Davidson offered a change in language for a new motion. Add the verbiage simulation or interview to the NWCG language. It will then read as follows. Rare events such as accidents, injuries, vehicle or aircraft crashes occur infrequently and opportunities to evaluate performance in a real setting are limited. The evaluator should determine, through scenario or interview, if the trainee would be able to perform the task in a real situation. Jeremy Lawson said that no documentation is required when the Chief signs off on a rare event, so if the Chief determines this, it's acceptable

The other item discussed was the change to the rank requirement in all effected task books. T. Brideau stated that at the last meeting it was stated you could be in an acting position. She asked does that mean appointed in an acting position or being an actor. It was determined either is appropriate. B. Davidson said the Chief determines if they are doing the job or not.

A. Henning advised that with these changes and with STEAC'S approval today will now be moved forward to the State Board of Fire Services (SBFS) for review and approval prior to implementation.

**Motion:** *Dan Stefano moved to accept the approval of the Company Officer Task Book Update and additional language pertaining to simulations.*

*Taral Brideau seconded the motion.*

**Action:** *All members voted unanimously.*

## IX. 2017 Meeting Dates

July 14, 2017, October 13, 2017 & January 12, 2018.

## X. Roundtable

Chief Coleman stated that since Ken Wagner was the Vice Chair for this committee and has since vacated the position, he needs someone available to take this position. According to the by-laws, Chief Coleman chooses the predecessor. Chief Coleman chose John Binaski as the Vice Chair. John Binaski accepted the position.

Dan Stefano asked that we close the meeting in honor of Chief Ray Picard. Chief Coleman told a story of Chief Picard's role in creating the State Board of Fire Services. He said next to Ed Bent he had more influence on the State Board of Fire Services. A moment of silence took place in commemoration of his dedication and service to the fire industry.

John Binaski said that Ken Wagner and he had a discussion of the influx of the Accredited Local Academies (ALA'S) and how many were becoming ALA'S and the opportunity to do so. J. Binaski said this is basically to make a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU'S), Joint Powers of Authority (JPA) with an ALA in order to serve other agencies. You could do Fire Fighter I and Fire Fighter II testing for a neighboring fire agency instead of becoming an ALA. He stated that not everyone has the best relationship with the Accredited Regional Training Programs (ARTP'S') to make this happen. He asked about the status of this since Chief Wagner was no longer with the group. Andrew Henning said he supports this and there is a need for accountability to be in place. Randy Collins asked if there was an ARTP that was close by to do this for J. Binaski.

A discussion followed regarding ARTP'S, ALA'S and the skills test process. David Barnett said if we bring other agencies students into our academy and they run a Junior Fire Academy (JFA) he can test them under the current procedures. The point is if the ALA is not available, can another ALA take the students. A further discussion of the costs for ARTP'S, and that many are trying to become ALA'S prior to the end of 2018 took place. This brought about a discussion on increased staffing needs and control issues. J. Binaski and G. Panholzer offered that if another ALA is within a certain distance, can do this only as a partnership, which only manages the problem. Randy Collins says to talk to the ARTP'S about flexibility. He went to his own county and to Mendocino County, and talked about his stand alone test for Fire Fighter I and advised on the process. He offered that he is happy to assist with testing anyone if needed.

Natalie Hannum suggested a group of 4 to look at these issues. A. Henning and N. Hannum discussed forming a team to prepare a plan of operation for the creation of sustainability.

Brett Stangeland will give instruction after the meeting for Fire Fighter folks for questions that have been circulating.

## XI. Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 12:15 p.m.