

STATE 911 COMMITTEE
Dispatcher Training Subcommittee
May 23, 2013
NENA Conference
Lexington Hotel, Lansing

A. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Jeff Troyer.

B. Roll Call

Voting Members Present:

Mr. Jeff Troyer (Chair)
Ms. Karen Chadwick
Ms. Christine Collom
Mr. Andrew Goldberger
Mr. Vic Martin
Mr. Stephen Todd
Chief Paul Trinko
Ms. Cherie Bartram
Ms. Kelly Page

Representing:

Calhoun County Consolidated Dispatch
Grand Rapids Police Department
Clinton County Central Dispatch
Retired
Lapeer County Central Dispatch
City of Flint 911
Adrian Fire Department
SERESA
Troy Police/Fire Department

Non-Voting Members Present:

Ms. Harriet Miller-Brown
Ms. Theresa Hart
Ms. Stacie Hansel

Michigan State Police
Michigan State Police
Michigan State Police

Absent:

Mr. Brian McEachern
Mr. David Ackley
Sheriff Dale Gribler
Mr. Tim McKee
Ms. Terry Strother-Dixon

Negaunee Regional Communication Center
Genesee County Central Dispatch
Van Buren County Sheriff's Office
Chippewa County 911
Detroit Police Department

C. Approval of Agenda

Mr. Troyer added "agenda approval" and then made a change to the agenda. Item 3c under New Business will be moved to 3a. A **MOTION** was made by Mr. Andrew Goldberger to approve the revised agenda and supported by Mr. Vic Martin. Discussion followed.

Ms. Bartram asked if online training had been discussed previously and where the subcommittee was with that discussion. Mr. Troyer stated all training, regardless of the method, needs to meet all the requirements set in the guidelines. Online providers would need to find a way to validate a specific dispatcher actually took the course. Mr. Troyer stated the review team reserves the right to contact the online provider and ask for documentation of who registered and who actually took the course, same as a signature page in a typical classroom course.

After discussion, the **MOTION** carried.

D. Meeting Minutes Approval – February 26, 2013 and March 5, 2013

A **MOTION** was made by Mr. Vic Martin to approve both sets of meeting minutes and supported by Ms. Kelly Page. Mr. Goldberger abstained from the February 26, 2013, vote as he was not at that meeting. The **MOTION** carried.

E. Old Business

Training Standards Tracking Program/Application

Ms. Theresa Hart stated the implementation date is May 31, and she and Mr. Troyer will be giving a live demonstration of the program during the NENA conference and MCDA new director's school. The application was e-mailed to all PSAPs for portal access and if they do not have access, a token will be provided to them. MiCJIN will receive the applications; determine if there is a way to gain access

without a token, and then issue tokens as needed. Ms. Hart will be contacting each PSAP to let them know about their connectivity options. MiCJIN is processing applications as they come in. Even though the portal icon might appear for PSAPs, no one will have access until the May 31 deadline. She is also looking for feedback from PSAPs regarding any issues or if there are things missing that people feel should be included. Mr. Troyer experienced issues with having access to the portal on the dispatch computers, but not the office computers. Access to the program is specific to a desktop IP address and it needs to be the person who will be entering information into the database.

Ms. Collom asked about a new employee who came from another PSAP and if their training records need to be reentered under her PSAP. Ms. Hart stated if people let her know, she will transfer the employee from one PSAP to another, so there is no need to reenter all the training information. Each employee has a unique identifier and all records should stay with the employee rather than entering the same person multiple times.

F. New Business

1. Draft Form for Audit of Dispatcher Training Courses

Mr. Troyer stated with the training standards in place, more approval requests from training providers are being received. A form was created to standardize the audit process when concerns are brought up regarding either the training material or instructor. When conducting an audit, the subcommittee members should contact Ms. Hart, who will contact the providers no more than 24 hours in advance of the audit. Ms. Hart would in turn send the auditor what is on file (the outline, the biography of the instructor, and the course syllabus, which is what the course is approved from), along with the audit form. The form asks for comments instead of a rating system in order to document specific examples, with an overall rating at the bottom.

Chief Trinka asked why the provider would receive any notice prior to the audit. As the subcommittee reserves the right to audit any course, no notice needs to be given. The auditor would need to introduce themselves privately to the instructor upon arrival and let them know the course is being audited. Mr. Troyer stated when talking to the dispatchers, let them know the subcommittee wants to hear their feedback also. Ms. Miller-Brown stated it is important, with the training standards now in place, to maintain integrity from the beginning.

Mr. Todd asked if it would be possible to verify if a provider also has a similar MCOLES course. It looks like some providers may be making generic changes to their submissions and saying the course is also for dispatchers. Ms. Miller-Brown stated some of those courses are double certified due to police officers acting as dispatchers.

Ms. Hart will send the draft form out to the subcommittee again for any feedback or changes.

2. Dispatcher Training Standards – Grandfathering of Police Officers

Mr. Troyer stated the standards only refer to an employee being employed at a PSAP for the 12 months prior to implementation. If Detroit Police Department runs a PSAP, are all the employees grandfathered? The standards do not say anything about primary responsibilities of an individual, only being employed at the PSAP. With all the questions coming up, a decision needs to be made about this issue.

Ms. Bartram gave an example of agencies that supplement their dispatch budget with their police budget and have officers rotating in their dispatch center every night and also filling in when a dispatcher calls in. The officers are not trained as dispatchers because they are patrol officers, but the agency wants to grandfather them in. Mr. Troyer stated it is key that their primary responsibilities be some of the job duties that are listed in the back of the dispatcher training manual. Some agencies, like Detroit, have sworn officers, but their primary responsibility is the PSAP. Ms. Bartram suggested if the primary responsibility of the officer is the PSAP, employees can be grandfathered and if it is not, the employee cannot. Mr. Martin stated it could be verified by how many hours the officers are working on the road versus how many hours in dispatch. Mr. Troyer suggested reaching out to the agencies that did not submit

an employee worksheet and ask them to complete it to then use for grandfathering purposes. Ms. Miller-Brown stated even if grandfathered in, the agency needs to keep track of employee CEU's and if they do not meet the CEU requirement, they are dropped off the list next year. Secondly, it will be the agency's issue of liability when an officer is acting as a dispatcher and they are not designated under the rules.

The employee worksheet will be sent out to those who were not part of the application process to complete. There may be a way for DTMB to lock the hire date so it will not allow dates further back than 12 months in order to grandfather someone in.

A **MOTION** was made by Mr. Vic Martin to send a letter out asking for the employee worksheet to be filled out and sent back in to keep a record of the dispatch employees, supported by Chief Trinka. Discussion followed. Mr. Troyer asked Ms. Hart to draft the letter and send to the subcommittee first before being sent to all the PSAPs.

After discussion, the **MOTION** carried.

3. Dispatcher Training Fund

a. PowerPhone Request for Reconsideration in Reduction of Training Course Hours

Mr. Troyer stated the subcommittee took action regarding the recertification hours for the EMD for PowerPhone, APCO, and Priority Dispatch. PowerPhone submitted a request for reconsideration.

Ms. Tara Milardo from PowerPhone stated they received a letter regarding the reduction of hours to one for the recertification. She supplied a copy of their course, which outlines online completion time versus classroom hours. There are two parts the employee needs to complete for recertification. The first re-instills concepts regarding liability, stress, and overall fundamentals. They then take a test to move on the next portion. Each section is approximately three plus hours, rounding up to four hours classroom equivalent, eight hours total. The reduction of hours down to one is not possible and does no justice to the industry. Ms. Milardo would supply more documentation or let subcommittee members take the course to judge for themselves.

Mr. Troyer asked Ms. Milardo if both portions were two separate courses, which she answered the first one is a requirement before taking the EMD recertification course. The EMD is important, but PowerPhone wants to reinforce the other skills as well to support the EMD piece. Every two years, the employee would recertify in both the Foundation and EMD portion.

Mr. Troyer stated the Foundation portion would need to be applied for as a separate course. It was originally applied for as eight hours for EMD, without knowing that included four hours for Foundation and four hours for EMD.

A **MOTION** was made by Chief Trinka to request PowerPhone to resubmit requests for approval for the four courses in three separate four hour blocks and one three hour block. Supported by Mr. Vic Martin, the **MOTION** carried.

b. Mid-year Distribution

Mr. Troyer stated now that the training standards are in effect, if an agency misses the application deadline, there is no funding for them until the next year's distribution. Surveys were sent to agencies who did not apply for funds, asking them the reason why they did not apply. White Lake Township's response was they did turn everything in and did not know they were not approved until they received the survey. It was discovered the reason was a transposing of letters in e-mailing their application. Sheriff Dale Gribler, chair of the State 911 Committee (SNC) requested their application be reviewed again by the DTS for a second distribution. If reconsidering one application,

all should be given the same opportunity. Mr. Troyer stated a mid-year distribution has never been considered, except under the consolidation policy.

Any agency who did not apply would be able to submit an application. Timelines would be set to allow for approvals, denials, and the appeals process by the September SNC meeting. Mr. Todd asked why the process would need to be reopened to every agency who did not apply, there are two appeals being heard today. Mr. Troyer stated other agencies did not know it was an option because it has never been an option. If the DTS decides to reconsider for this year only, everyone needs to know it is an option due to training standards being implemented.

Ms. Collom brought up the point of other deadlines and how many have a mid-year reconsideration to reapply. For instance the state funds received quarterly, if the deadline is not met, it is not opened up again at a later date.

A **MOTION** was made by Mr. Andrew Goldberger to leave the policy as is for a single year review for distribution, supported by Mr. Vic Martin. Discussion followed.

Mr. Troyer stated it would not preclude recommendations for adjustments in the distribution, as long as adhered to as policies are written. Consolidations would still be allowed under the policy and anything above and beyond that would be FTE adjustments.

Mr. Troyer stated a motion had been made, which cannot be taken off the table. The motion on the floor will not allow the DTS to reconsider a mid-year application process this year. It was suggested the DTS may have issues getting a quorum for a second distribution. Mr. Troyer stated it is a lot of work, but this is also a unique year with the implementation of the training standards.

Lieutenant Kline from White Lake Township addressed the subcommittee. He e-mailed his application on January 16 to meet the deadline. Until he received the survey asking why he did not apply, he did not know his application was not received. The reason the e-mail was not received is due to a misspelling of the e-mail address, but he did not receive a rejection saying his e-mail did not go through. He supplied a copy of his original e-mailing of the application. Lieutenant Kline stated in years past they have always applied and been approved, relying heavily on the funds to train their dispatchers. They do have plans for hiring and have needs for training funds. Mr. Troyer stated it is not an appeal as the policy does not allow acceptance of mid-year applications. Mr. Martin stated White Lake Township does have over \$11,000 available this year.

Ms. Jamel Anderson from Grand Traverse County addressed the subcommittee. She also did not realize she had not applied until she received the survey. Ms. Anderson looked for her documentation and realized she did not apply. She stated they spend more money every year than they receive from the training fund because training is a priority, even beyond the standards. She appreciates the time of the subcommittee members and does not want to duplicate the process, but is looking for a result that will not penalize the dispatchers due to her error.

Ms. Collom asked for clarification on a couple of points. If voting yes on the motion, it is automatically saying no to the people filing the appeal, which was correct. Also, of the ten responses received from the survey, were the others told they could come and appeal. Mr. Troyer answered there were no notices sent out to agencies, who were denied or did not apply, that would give them reasonable expectations to think the DTS would reconsider any application.

Mr. Todd stated an objection to the idea that in order for anyone to appeal, the process needs to be reopened. Mr. Troyer stated it cannot be considered an appeal because the process does not allow it. Ms. Miller-Brown stated that what is being voted affirms what the subcommittee is currently doing, but would not preclude DTS from making a recommendation to the SNC that DTS modify the appeal process.

After discussion, a roll call vote was taken.

Name	Yes	No	Abstain
Mr. Jeff Troyer		X	
Ms. Karen Chadwick	X		
Ms. Christine Collom	X		
Mr. Andrew Goldberger	X		
Mr. Vic Martin	X		
Mr. Stephen Todd		X	
Chief Paul Trinkka		X	
Ms. Cherie Bartram		X	
Ms. Kelly Page		X	
Total	4	5	0

The **MOTION** failed.

A **MOTION** was made by Mr. Jeff Troyer that the Dispatcher Training Subcommittee consider a mid-year application process for 2013 only for the second distribution of training funds in November and opens it up to all agencies that were either denied or did not apply. Support by Mr. Stephen Todd. Discussion followed.

Mr. Todd asked if there were any legal hurdles. Ms. Miller-Brown said no, but was asking for administrative clarification. When saying “denied,” does it also mean those who appealed and were denied? The answer was no, but Ms. Miller-Brown stated that is what the motion states. For an example, she said if there were 111 PSAPs who receive training funds, the others, regardless of the reason, if not on the first distribution list, will qualify for the second distribution. Mr. Troyer stated they would have to apply, but would qualify for the application process. Ms. Miller-Brown then asked if it would be an adjustment to everyone else’s distribution, which could result in November’s distribution being significantly different than in May. She also asked where the cutoff date is for the spend down, which has always been December 31.

Ms. Collom stated the previous vote was to not have just a one year application. The vote was for once a year and the subcommittee said no, and now it is being discussed doing it only for 2013.

Mr. Troyer stated the current policy is still in place. The first motion voted on would have taken all consideration for any application this year, regardless of reason, off the table. Ms. Collom said when she asked for clarification before the vote, voting yes would keep the process to once a year and automatically deny the two agencies appealing today. When she voted, she voted with the thought of supporting what is currently in the policy. It got voted down and in her mind, that opens the policy which now needs to go to the SNC that the subcommittee voted for a twice a year application process. Mr. Troyer stated the vote did not rescind the policy currently in place. The two applications on the table were tied to the original motion. Other members stated when they voted no; they wanted to consider the appeals. When Ms. Collom voted yes, it was her thought it should only be a once a year application process. She didn’t vote with the consideration of opening it up. She voted yes to support the policy and move forward.

Chief Trinka asked if there was anything in the policy that stops the DTS from looking at applications where there was an error in submission. Ms. Miller-Brown stated even though it is the DTS policy right now, it does not mean they cannot go back and reconsider the policy and bring recommendations to the SNC. Chief Trinka stated there were state laws allowing individuals to go to a board of review in March, July, and December for mutual errors of fact. That would be more manageable rather than opening it up to everyone. He would recommend drafting language to that effect.

After discussion, a roll call vote was taken.

Name	Yes	No	Abstain
Mr. Jeff Troyer	X		
Ms. Karen Chadwick	X		
Ms. Christine Collom	X		
Mr. Andrew Goldberger		X	
Mr. Vic Martin		X	
Mr. Stephen Todd		X	
Chief Paul Trinka		X	
Ms. Cherie Bartram	X		
Ms. Kelly Page	X		
Total	5	4	0

The **MOTION** carried.

Ms. Miller-Brown stated since there is a mid-year application process, the DTS needs to figure out what it is in order to get it to the SNC by the June meeting. Mr. Troyer said it is simple moving forward, identify the dates of the deadline to be set and keep policies in place. For instance, spend down is spend down, nothing changes. If denied due to non-spend down, the agency will not qualify for the mid-year process. Mr. Troyer will work with Ms. Hart before the June SNC meeting to create the dates and send the information to the subcommittee. The intention is to keep the policies as is with the exception of opening up, for this year only, the mid-year application process.

Ms. Bartram asked for clarification on the reason for only opening it up this year, so next year agencies cannot say it was opened last year and why not this year. Mr. Troyer stated it is due to training standards being in place and it will need to be clearly stated in the letter going out.

c. Module I Training Course Approval Requests from PSAPs

Mr. Todd suggested this be tabled as it will be a long discussion. In summary, the review team is receiving requests on the part of training providers to make their CTO content fit into a Module I approval.

Mr. Troyer gave an example of Ms. Chadwick submitting a fantastic Module I course with the intention of opening it to outside agencies, proving it is not in-house training. What the review team bases the approval on is the syllabus, instructors, course outline, and DTS-34. On the other side, there was an agency who applied for a course, instructors were all in-house, there was no intention to open it to outside agencies, and it is done on an as-needed basis and appears to be on the job training. The application was denied and was resubmitted showing classroom style, 40 hours, meeting all requirements, and taking out all agency specific policies. It was denied again. Mr. Troyer and Ms. Hart had a conference call with the agency to tell them it was still considered on the job training.

The issue may be with the definition of in-service versus internal training. If training is not opened up to outside agencies, under the definition, it is considered to be internal training because it is PSAP specific and does not qualify.

Mr. Todd stated he is very pleased with Mr. Troyer and the review team's process in questioning some of the requests that are received and not approving everything.

G. Public Comment

Ms. Anderson and Lieutenant Kline thanked the subcommittee for listening to their requests to apply for training funds.

H. Next Meeting

TBA

I. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned.