

STATE 9-1-1 COMMITTEE
Dispatcher Training Subcommittee
February 13, 2013
Meeting Minutes

A. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Jeff Troyer.

B. Roll Call

Voting Members Present:

Mr. Jeff Troyer (Chair)
Mr. David Ackley
Ms. Christine Collom
Mr. Vic Martin
Mr. Tim McKee
Ms. Terry Strother-Dixon
Mr. Stephen Todd
Mr. Brian McEachern
Ms. Kelly Page

Representing:

Calhoun County Consolidated Dispatch
Genesee County Central Dispatch
Clinton County Central Dispatch
Lapeer County Central Dispatch
Chippewa County 9-1-1
Detroit Police Department
City of Flint 9-1-1
Negaunee Regional Communication Center
Troy Police/Fire Department

Non-Voting Members Present:

Ms. Juanita Sarles Michigan Department of Treasury
Ms. Theresa Hart Michigan State Police
Ms. Stacie Hansel Michigan State Police

Absent:

Ms. Cherie Bartram SERESA
Ms. Karen Chadwick Grand Rapids Police Department
Mr. Andy Goldberger Retired
Sheriff Dale Gribler Van Buren County Sheriff's Office
Chief Paul Trinko Adrian Fire Department

C. Meeting Minutes Approval

A **MOTION** was made by Mr. Dave Ackley to approve the meeting minutes of November 26, 2012. Supported by Mr. Vic Martin, the **MOTION** carried.

D. Old Business

1. Training Standards Tracking Database

a. Status of Program in MiCJIN Portal:

Ms. Hart stated DTMB moved the Dispatcher Training Database program to the portal. It is currently empty, and Ms. Hart will work with Ms. Gina Saucedo to enter courses, etc. DTMB is receiving a few error messages, and are working those out, but at least it is on the portal now. Mr. Troyer stated there were a few subcommittee members who were part of the group who tested the database originally and it may be a good idea to schedule a date for that same group to review the database again. He asked if our DTMB contact could be included, also Ms. Gina Saucedo, if possible.

b. Application for Portal Access:

Ms. Hart stated the MiCJIN unit requires agencies complete an application to get access to programs on the portal. She will forward the application to the PSAPs and MiCJIN will determine whether they have portal access, can get portal access or if they will need to use a Secure ID token. If PSAPs need to use the token, they will need to complete the Memo of Understanding (MOU), which was provided to the Committee for review. Ms. Hart suggested Mr. Hal Martin also review the MOU for legal purposes. Mr. Stephen Todd suggested if there are any amendments, to make those changes before sending the MOU to Mr. Hal Martin.

Mr. Troyer stated he felt there were very few PSAPs who will have to use the token system. Discovering LG connectivity would grant access, he believes took care of the majority of the initial concerns. There were no amendments to the MOU discussed.

A **MOTION** was made by Mr. Vic Martin to approve the Memo of Understanding between the State Police and the State 911 Office for the AG's office to review. Supported by Mr. Stephen Todd, the **MOTION** carried.

E. New Business

1. Dispatcher Training Fund Audits

Ms. Hart conducted the audits for the dispatcher training funds. She had both Otsego County and MSP-Gaylord send in all their documentation they claimed on the 510 from 2007 to 2011.

a. Otsego County:

There were only two training courses in the specified time period. They provided all the receipts and were able to back up the charges they claimed. In reviewing, Ms. Hart noticed they had 2007 money, which she invoiced and they paid back. They did apply for 2013 money.

b. MSP – Gaylord:

Ms. Hart stated there were some discrepancies between the receipts and the 510. She met with Ms. Cindy Homant to review the information and she was able to provide additional receipts. Ms. Hart included her report in the packets passed out at the beginning of the subcommittee meeting. Since taking the position, Ms. Homant has set up a new record keeping process.

The members thanked Ms. Hart for the information. In the past, they have not received the training fund portion of the report from the certification subcommittee. Mr. Troyer stated there is no action needed from this subcommittee.

2. Audit of Dispatcher Training Courses

Mr. Troyer stated this item arose from the subcommittee within the DTS. They are beginning to receive courses coming in for approval, which may or may not meet the requirements due to the course content. The review team of the subcommittee had a conference call and discussed options. There may be a need to remind agencies, directors, or PSAP administrators the committee reserves the right to review and sit in on any class that is SNC approved. If a PSAP has dispatchers attend a course and the content is not relevant to dispatchers, that information should be reported to the dispatcher training subcommittee, which is kept confidential. Then, the subcommittee could ask for a volunteer to sit in on the next class to review. The training provider cannot charge the individual sitting in, but there may be other costs incurred, such as hotel, etc. Mr. Troyer will discuss this issue with Ms. Miller-Brown. Mr. Troyer will draft a letter, to be reviewed at the next meeting, for distribution to all the PSAPs as a reminder that the option of reporting back is available.

Mr. Tim McKee asked Mr. Troyer if everyone understands how the courses are identified, Tier I, Tier II, Tier II(a), and Tier II(b). Mr. Troyer stated there were letters that went out to the providers and PSAPs. The training course listing on the Web site now includes an endorsement section. He stated the key is to get people to understand that just because a class does not have the endorsement, does not mean it does not meet the requirements of the standards. If there is a class which does not have the endorsement, it is up to the PSAP administrator to contact the training provider and ask for a syllabus to review the content to make sure it meets the requirements.

Ms. Kelly Page asked if the Module II endorsement is an "easy look" and not an "end all be all." Mr. Troyer stated Module II is more difficult as it can be taken as a 40 hour class. If an endorsement is requested as a 40 hour class and it meets the requirement, it either receives or does not receive the full Module II endorsement. If there is something that states Module II and

nothing else, it is approved for the entire Module; if it says 2a, 2b, etc. that is specific to the A, B, C, etc. listing in the training standards for that eight hours.

Mr. Stephen Todd suggested the subcommittee members take one or two days a year to audit a class. It is good to review the courses dispatchers are attending, and also good for the vendors to see they are being reviewed. Mr. Troyer stated once the application process is over, it would be good to begin auditing classes, evaluating the content against what was approved, and ensuring that the instructors teaching the class were the instructors who were approved.

Mr. Todd asked if the subcommittee had ever drafted a statement to the providers explaining reasonable standards for anyone using public funds, a standard for training meeting guidelines. For example, the statement would avoid a situation where the subcommittee would hold someone accountable and they state that standard was never set for them. Mr. Troyer thought there was something in the past. Mr. Todd suggested it be something to ask legal to advise on. Mr. Vic Martin stated something else to add in that statement would be regarding the provider wanting payment from the individual auditing the class. That individual would not be receiving a certification or credit for the class, it is only an audit. Mr. Troyer stated that in addition to the letter to the PSAPs reminding them to report on class content issues, a letter also be sent to the providers reminding them their course may be audited at any time.

Mr. McKee asked whether any issues would arise from someone receiving certification from a course, which later is removed from the approved listing. Mr. Troyer stated it will be only going forward. If at the time the class was taken it was on the approved list, it would count. Ms. Strother-Dixon stated the subcommittee would have to be diligent about removing the specific course from the approved listing if it no longer meets the criteria. Mr. Troyer asked Ms. Hart if MCOLES has any type of process, to which she stated she believes they audit courses also by just showing up and she does not know if they have had any issues doing so. Ms. Hart will look into what they do for online training.

Mr. Troyer asked Ms. Hart to draft a letter for the providers and one for the PSAP administrators to have available for review at the next meeting.

a. Priority Dispatch Training Courses

Mr. Troyer stated the recertification for all priority dispatch EMD and the CDE quizzes are currently approved for eight hours each, and action is required. The quizzes are ten question quizzes that take maybe two minutes to complete, and the recertification is more filling out paperwork than anything else. Mr. Troyer is not suggesting disapproval, but reevaluating the hours going forward to possibly one hour.

A **MOTION** was made by Mr. Dave Ackley for the CDE quizzes and the priority dispatch EMD, EFD, and EPD recertification, to reduce those each from eight hours to one hour. Supported by Ms. Christine Collom, Mr. Troyer opened the motion for discussion.

Mr. Vic Martin voiced his concerns about giving people an hour, when he would be surprised if the quizzes take that long. Ms. Strother-Dixon stated she does not believe time approved should be less than one hour. Mr. Ackley asked if the recertification could be approved for one hour and the quizzes in-house. Mr. Troyer stated he is in favor of the recertification being one hour. There is a cost to submit the quizzes and he believes that is what the subcommittee is trying to cover under training funds. The courses would have to be reissued new numbers in the approved course listing for the database to recognize the new numbers going forward are only for one hour and not eight as is currently.

After discussion, Mr. Troyer asked for a vote on the **MOTION**. Mr. Stephen Todd opposed, the rest of the subcommittee approved. The **MOTION** carried.

3. Dispatcher Training Program Manual

Mr. Troyer stated the manual was drafted originally between 2006 and 2007 by the Dispatcher Training Workgroup. Soon after the training standards were approved, questions began coming in. This was the only document drafted to address general questions. Ms. Hart went through the document to update dates, etc. Mr. Troyer stated the document does a fairly good job of explaining what happens in a leave of absence, or what happens if a dispatcher becomes delinquent, etc.

There were some suggestions that internal training should come before the subcommittee for approval. Even though the subcommittee is not approving training fund use, it can still be counted for continuing education hours. Mr. Troyer stated there were too many other courses coming in for approval as it is and is not in favor of reviewing internal training; that was not the intent. A very broad statement regarding internal training was added on page five, number two. Mr. Troyer stated the paragraph asks that the content for the eight hours of in-house training be directly related to the essential job tasks listed for an emergency dispatcher.

Mr. Ackley gave an example of an employee who had ten years of experience, left for approximately seven months and a week later was a dispatcher in another state. When she returned, she started over as a new employee. In that scenario, Mr. Ackley stated the program manual was conflicting. On page five, under existing telecommunicators, his employee would be a designated telecommunicator by that definition. On page seven, section C, it is pretty vague. He does not know if he would be able to find her certification for completion for a basic 40. He states there needs to be a process in place for employees in this situation. Mr. Troyer stated the only thing to go by is exactly what is approved by the Public Service Commission.

Mr. Ackley commented that MCOLES has a process in place where an employee can be gone from employment for two years before losing certification. Mr. Troyer stated the training standards, as approved, read, "A telecommunicator employed by a primary PSAP for a minimum of 12 months before the effective date of these rules is exempt from the training requirement module." The interpretation of the standards, does not say continuous. Mr. Troyer stated the State 911 Office has said it needs to be continuous, but that is not stated anywhere. Mr. Ackley wanted to bring the situation up to the subcommittee because MCOLES has specific wording in the standards of when you lose your certification and what you must do to regain it. Mr. Troyer stated the exemption is only for grandfathering employees and moving forward is black and white. Mr. Todd stated he believes in creating the program manual, there was much discussion about leaving the statements broad to allow for the PSAP directors to use their own discretion. Mr. Troyer stated the only thing moving forward is the standards, which are cut and dry. It is the employees who would be exempt from the modules at December 13, 2012, and whether or not that employee is grandfathered. That is the question that needs to be answered.

The program manual was edited by Ms. Hart to match the training standards. The manual was drafted as the basis of the initial standards, which the Public Service Commission helped draft. There is nothing in the manual which contradicts what the training standards are. Mr. Troyer stated the State 911 Committee is tasked with the administrative rules portion so the State 911 Office can administer the standards.

Mr. Todd asked if the subcommittee could have the time between now and the next meeting, February 26, to evaluate, review, and send Ms. Hart any changes in order to finalize the manual for SNC approval. Mr. Troyer suggested the subcommittee also review the training standards while reviewing the manual since it cannot veer from the standards.

One change is on page five, letter F, "...December 13, 2011..." should be, "...December 13, 2012..."

4. Review of Dispatcher Training Fund Applications

The review of the training fund applications began.

Mr. Troyer stated there were 1,435 FTEs pending approval and a total of 245 FTEs recommended for denial. A **MOTION** was made by Mr. Vic Martin to recommend approval of the 1,435 FTE's and denial of the 245 FTEs to the State 911 Committee. Supported by Mr. Brian McEachern, the **MOTION** carried.

F. Public Comment

None

G. Next Meeting

Tuesday, February 26, 2013, 9 a.m.

H. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned.