

## Training Workgroup Breakout

March 24, 2017

### *Minutes*

Present: Faye Guertin, Rob Krombeen, Greg Demerritt, Sean Gibbs

The Workgroup reviewed a list of suggested topics related to training. (See worksheet for Training Workgroup for 3.24.17 meeting)

The Workgroup also discussed the Security Assessment checklist.

As to the Checklist, the Workgroup suggested that there be some sort of training, perhaps a short webinar, on how to conduct the Security Assessment and how to develop a written report based on the Checklist. It was discussed that many courts do not have court security personnel or other personnel that are familiar with security concepts and as such they may not fully comprehend not only how to conduct the assessment, but what the assessment means, what certain concepts in the assessment mean and how they relate to the recently adopted Court Security Standards.

The Workgroup discussed Standards 23, 24, and 25 with an eye toward thoughts on what might be included in training developed under those standards and thoughts on what might be beyond the ability to achieve under those standards.

**Standard 23, New Hire Training:** It was suggested that there might be a universal training developed by the JEC that would meet a general need and that universal training would be followed by local training that provided specific hands on training related to security requirements and measures of a particular location. For example the local training might involve a walk through on evacuation routes, lock-down and shelter in place locations for the new employee in relation to their new office space, how and to whom to report an security concern or incident, or personal security tips, etc.

The discussion related to the universal/general New Employee Orientation training on security involved the creation of web-based training modules that new employees would be required to compete within a specified number days of their start date.

For new judicial officers it was suggested that perhaps the local training would be a one on one meeting with the new judicial officer that covers courtroom security, personal safety, or how to summons security or assistance if a situation arises in the courtroom.

**Standard 24, Annual Security Training:** (training beyond new hire training) The group discussed how it may be important to create a system that will maximize time for providing training with limited trainings.

Another suggestion was that local trainers might review the results of the security assessments to determine what types of local training might be needed. Either because items in the checklist are the result of employees not knowing policy and procedures related to certain security measures, or because

new security measures are implemented as a result of the security assessment and implementation of the standards that require training of employees.

As there is a focus on localizing training to a significant degree, it was suggested that discussion occur as to how best to expand the types of trainings that would be granted COJET credit. The Workgroup suggested that ideally courts can do local training drills and walk through training that is somewhat hands on that will qualify for COJET.

**Standard 25: Annual Training for Security Officers:** The Workgroup discussed the number of items listed in the standard and the time training on each one of those would take if every security officer had to complete them all annually.

Discussion included the minimum time allowed for a training to qualify for COJET and the question arose as to whether there could be a way to group some of the trainings that may only require 15 minutes each to allow for training to be efficient, to take into account for the relatedness of various items in the list of required training components and to ensure that security officers could receive all the training required while not detracting from the time they are needed to perform their duties.

One suggestion was that there be a monthly training that was short in duration that was in-service training, and that if regularly scheduled and cycled, could be a way of getting the trainings accomplished with minimum interruptions to work assignments.

Another ideas discussed was to have a system of training modules that were web-based and that would automatically record completion to allow officers to complete training around their work schedules.

The Workgroup also noted that for some types of skills there was a difference between being required to be proficient (firearms for example) versus have a refresher on operation or knowledge-based content.

The Workgroup also thought it was reasonable that if it was determined certain types of training covered by Standard 25 were better suited for training in different increments, for example, every two years versus annually, that should be considered for adoption as the training programs are developed.