Rochester Area Training Consortium for Security Personnel

Michael E. McCarthy
St. John Fisher College

Follow this and additional works at: https://fisherpub.sjfc.edu/education_ETD_masters

Part of the Education Commons

How has open access to Fisher Digital Publications benefited you?

Recommended Citation

Please note that the Recommended Citation provides general citation information and may not be appropriate for your discipline. To receive help in creating a citation based on your discipline, please visit http://libguides.sjfc.edu/citations.

This document is posted at https://fisherpub.sjfc.edu/education_ETD_masters/146 and is brought to you for free and open access by Fisher Digital Publications at St. John Fisher College. For more information, please contact fisherpub@sjfc.edu.
Rochester Area Training Consortium for Security Personnel

Abstract
The purpose of this study is to investigate the feasibility and effectiveness of a training consortium of area colleges and university security departments. This cooperative training effort will develop and train experienced security officers. The area security directors decided to attempt this consortium and initiated seven pilot training programs since June 2001. The seventh pilot program, the "Active Shooter," was evaluated for effectiveness and learning. The results of the survey showed a high degree of satisfaction in the distribution of responses. The respondents to the survey also described self-reported learning. Some respondents reported transferring concepts from the "Active Shooter" program into his or her every day security function. The literature review showed that various businesses use collaborative efforts with other business entities, colleges, and governmental agencies. Even though other security consortiums were not identified, other business models showed that organizational goals could be met with innovated thinking and collaborative efforts. The results of this study show that the consortium has high degree of satisfaction and that some security directors are willing to pursue this endeavor. A needs assessment was conducted with the security directors, which resulted in a list of 27 topics for training. The attendance also shows that some of the reluctant colleges will participate depending the training subject.

Document Type
Thesis

Degree Name
MS in Human Resource Development

Department
Education

First Supervisor
Barbara Francis

Second Supervisor
Seth Silver

Third Supervisor
Marilynn Butler

Subject Categories
Education

This thesis is available at Fisher Digital Publications: https://fisherpub.sjfc.edu/education_ETD_masters/146
Rochester Area Training Consortium for Security Personnel

Michael E. McCarthy

GHRD - 590

St. John Fisher College

Rochester, New York
We approve this paper of Michael McCarthy.

Barbara Francis, Ed.D
Associate Professor of Education
St. John Fisher College

Seth Silver, Ph.D.
Adjunct Assistant Professor of Human Resource Development
St. John Fisher College

Marilynn N. Butler, Ph.D.
Advisor
Assistant Professor of Human Resource Development
Director/Chair MSHRD
St. John Fisher College
Abstract

The purpose of this study is to investigate the feasibility and effectiveness of a training consortium of area colleges and university security departments. This cooperative training effort will develop and train experienced security officers.

The area security directors decided to attempt this consortium and initiated seven pilot training programs since June 2001. The seventh pilot program, the "Active Shooter," was evaluated for effectiveness and learning.

The results of the survey showed a high degree of satisfaction in the distribution of responses. The respondents to the survey also described self-reported learning. Some respondents reported transferring concepts from the "Active Shooter" program into his or her every day security function.

The literature review showed that various businesses use collaborative efforts with other business entities, colleges, and governmental agencies. Even though other security consortiums were not identified, other business models showed that organizational goals could be met with innovated thinking and collaborative efforts.

The results of this study show that the consortium has high degree of satisfaction and that some security directors are willing to pursue this endeavor. A needs assessment was conducted with the security directors, which resulted in a list of 27 topics for training. The attendance also shows that some of the reluctant colleges will participate depending the training subject.
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Chapter 1: The Rochester Consortium

Introduction

This study examines how the Rochester and Western New York area college security departments pool their resources and expertise for training purposes. Financial resources and lack of broad-based, in-house experts and instructors restrict available training for small colleges.

This chapter introduces the purpose of this study to evaluate the problem of broad based training issues for small college security departments. Here, the solution proposed to address this problem through a collaborative effect by pooling resources and sharing in-house experts for training purposes is presented. Numerous colleges in the Rochester and Western New York area have expressed a willingness to participate in this training consortium. The interested colleges are addressing a universal concern of broad training initiatives for their respective departments. Pilot programs for the consortium have been conducted but not yet evaluated. This study has financial, retention and career development significance and implications. Additionally this chapter traces the historical aspect of security from the days of the medieval watchman to today’s college security.

Therefore, the purpose of this study is to investigate the feasibility and effectiveness of a consortium of area college and university security departments. This cooperative training effort is designed to develop and train experienced security officers. In this examination, effectiveness is based on levels of satisfaction and self-reported levels of skill and transfer of learning.
The idea of a training consortium was birthed at St. John Fisher College through an examination of a career development program that would enhance the skill level of security officers and market the St. John Fisher Safety and Security Department as a model department with high degree of training and expertise. However the financial resources prohibit bringing in numerous instructors, purchasing training aids and overtime for staff to attend training. Additionally, work shifts must be covered while officers attend training, which adds to the cost of training. The sum total of these costs is a financial strain for a small department. Therefore, the idea of sharing resources and instructors emerged as a cost saving measure and at the same time utilize the strengths and expertise within the various colleges in the area. The area college security directors met in April 2001 at a regularly scheduled bi-monthly meeting and the idea was presented to the group. The directors from the smaller colleges agreed with the potential training value and committed to experimenting with this idea with some of the larger universities not wanting to participate initially. However, subsequent training sessions, the larger colleges and universities have shown an interest in specific topics such as the “Active Shooter” program.

Likewise to having financial implications, this training consortium has retention implications. The literature shows that increased training improves job satisfaction and heightens morale (Olesen, 1999). The New York State Police conducted a survey of potential candidates considering joining the State Police. Their survey found that a key factor among women is the opportunities for job enrichment to develop new skills, and the intellectual stimulation, (LENS, 2000). Additionally, a better-trained employee with
high morale is more likely to stay with the employer than leave for other employment. An employee will remain loyal to the employer who invests in them and their careers (HR Focus, 2000). Thirdly, with increased training, the employee gains career development through increased skill and knowledge (DeCenzo & Robbins, 1999).

Therefore, this training consortium is designed to use the expertise within each participating security department and also host training sessions. The purpose of this consortium is to enhance skills, knowledge, or abilities of security officers beyond the basic training completed at the time of hiring or through other annual training initiatives. In this proposed system, the training responsibility will rotate to a different college each month that will serve as the host facility. Pilot training sessions have occurred indicating that some security organizations are in favor of continuing this project.

Organization of the Paper

This paper is divided into five chapters. Chapter 1 gives the background of training problems faced by security departments in small and mid-size colleges. In this examination, the hiring requirements as well as the state training requirements of security officers is presented. A proposed solution to the problem is offered through a collaborative effort of area college security departments to create a training consortium, in which seven pilot programs have been conducted. This chapter also takes a historical look at college security and its development into a hybrid setting from the watchman, police and sheriff concepts. Also, this hybrid environment differs from traditional industrial security and has evolved into today’s campus security officer.
Chapter 2 examines the literature of collaborative efforts, strategic alliances, and partnerships as an approach to attain organizational goals, which in this case are training goals. This review also examines emergency response and links emotional intelligence with crisis response procedures, which are grounded in pre-event training. The literature also examines the benefits of training for retention and morale, which is interlinked with leadership and ethics. However, such training comes at a cost and this chapter looks at training as a business. The final section of Chapter 2 specifically looks at the Rochester security consortium and its progression through the development stages.

Chapter 3 details the methodology employed to conduct this investigation. Chapter 4 presents the findings. Finally, Chapter 5 offers a synthesis of the findings and recommends further research into the levels of learning and competencies for the attendees of the training sessions.

Background

St. John Fisher College (SJFC) Safety and Security Department, located in Rochester, New York is hosting this project. The additional participating colleges are within the Western New York area, which range from small colleges to mid-size universities.

The Problem

Small colleges have limited resources. The enrollment of students is less than larger universities and, therefore, the security departments have smaller budgets, less staff and fewer employees to draw expert knowledge in all functions. The level of expertise needs to be present regardless of whether the campus is large with many thousands of
students or small with one or two thousand students. The security needs are the same. The problem is supplying adequate training to the staff drawing from limited in-house experts and having the financial resources to hire outside trainers to instruct the multifaceted programs.

Frequent turnover of security employees aggravates training or career development programs because training issues must be recycled as turnover occurs. Additionally, research shows that competency development and career development are important retention strategies (Kaye & Jordan-Evans, 2000).

Hiring Requirements

The hiring requirements vary from college to college, yet most hiring managers look for experience, maturity, and good people skills, which includes effective interpersonal communications. Other important qualities are writing skills, some computer competency, and/or the ability to be assertive. Each new employee possesses strengths in one or more areas but rarely do newly hired employees have full competency in all areas. Once the employee is hired, initial training is centered on orientation to the organization and the organization’s stylistic approach to patrol, report writing, investigations, and interviewing. This stylistic training orients the security officer to the acceptable methods and limitations as applied to their current employer rather than an in-depth look at investigations or the intricacies of an effective interview as examples. The reason for this short-cut version is to progress the employees to their assigned duties because open positions create gaps in security coverage as well as overall training time
and limited expertise. The goal of this training consortium is to fill those competency gaps.

Educational requirements for entering this field are a minimum of a high school diploma, although some college education is preferred. Additionally, a diverse blend of gender and ethnical backgrounds is helpful to maintain a healthy rapport with a diverse student population.

State Requirements

Since 1991, New York State requires all security guards to be licensed and receive a minimal level of training: 8 hours of pre-employment training; 16 hours of training within 90 days of hire and 8 hours of training annually. This state law also prescribes the training content. All areas are basic level topics, which include patrol responsibilities, report writing and ethics. These general training requirements are the same for industrial, corporate, or college security. The problem is not fulfilling these state-mandated courses, as they are universal to all security functions across the state, but acquiring the added skills necessary in a college environment. For example, an experienced security officer from an industrial setting is lacking in these broad range skills.

The Proposed Solution

The Rochester area and Western New York college security directors have discussed this problem and have agreed, in concept, to share their expertise and facilities to increase the competencies of the area security staffs. Preliminary pilot training programs have been presented this past year but the programs have not yet been
evaluated. The purpose of this study is to investigate the feasibility and effectiveness of a consortium of area colleges and university security departments through a cooperative training effort to further develop and educate experienced security officers.

The goal of this consortium is to tap the extensive and collective experience of security officers and supervisors currently working in the security field in the Rochester area. At each campus security personnel have different strengths. For example, personnel from Nazareth College offer supervisory development, Hobart and William Smith College has environmental safety strengths, Rochester Institute of Technology has Critical Incident Management expertise, and St. John Fisher College has police investigative experience. Each campus can benefit in the development of their respective staffs by sharing these strengths with the others. For most topics, the costs are minimal to develop the program or travel to a nearby campus. The bulk of the expense would be any overtime pay to send officers or provide coverage while other officers are attending a training session.

Pilot Programs

Seven pilot programs have been conducted since June 2001 (see Exhibit 1). These training sessions were open and available to all college and university security departments in the Western New York area. This study will also examine the effectiveness and satisfaction of a recent training session, the “Active Shooter, conducted in January. The “Active Shooter” program consisted of lecture presentations in the morning, which covered emergency planning, unarmed response to an active shooter and an overview of response techniques consistent with Critical Incident Management
protocol. The afternoon session was a demonstration by the Monroe County Sheriff's Department's Special Weapons and Tactics Team (SWAT) with their response procedures for an active shooter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Host Facility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 7, 2001</td>
<td>&quot;Managing Criminal Investigations&quot;</td>
<td>St. John Fisher College (SJFC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 19, 2001</td>
<td>&quot;Effective Patrol Techniques&quot;</td>
<td>Nazareth College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2, 2001</td>
<td>&quot;Interview and Interrogation&quot;</td>
<td>SUNY Genesee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2, 2001</td>
<td>&quot;Workplace Violence&quot;</td>
<td>Finger Lakes Comm. College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 30, 2001</td>
<td>&quot;Bomb threats and Assessment&quot;</td>
<td>Nazareth College / SJFC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 9, 2002</td>
<td>&quot;Active Shooter&quot;</td>
<td>Nazareth College / SJFC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 14-18, 2002</td>
<td>&quot;Critical Incident Management&quot;</td>
<td>Monroe Community College</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Surveys were sent to all attendees of the “Active Shooter” program 30 days after the program in order to measure their self-reported learning and overall satisfaction. Area security directors were also sent a needs assessment survey to determine their individual training needs and willingness to host a training session.

**Historical perspective**

The history of security and its close association with law enforcement has an important progression. The evolution of college security is a hybrid of these two foundations. Current practices show that some colleges have sworn police officers with arrest powers and others are private, propriety security. The difference is college police officers are armed and have arrest powers. This historical review will show the link between today’s college security and the early watchman and the law enforcement progression.

Earliest indication of a designated security person was in medieval times where the watchman served as the official who was responsible for castle security. This position
was part of the skilled labor force and a member of the Guild system of apprenticeship to
master process (Hull, 1997). The watchman concept continued and they eventually
became known as constables after the feudal system was nationalized. However, the
constables and the watchmen had few resources and consequently, were not able to
control the crime within their area especially the cities (Bloy, 1997). Military troops were
commonly used to restore and maintain order. During this period of medieval Briton, the
landowners assigned a Reeve, an appointed judicial officer, to administer the judicial
system and enforce the King’s writs. The Reeves had control of the King’s area of
influence, which was divided into small kingdoms known as shires. These shires
eventually became counties within England. The Reeves were referred to as Shire-Reeves
and later shortened to the modern term of sheriff.

In 1829, Sir Robert Peel was able to have the English Parliament pass the
Metropolitan Police Act creating a new police force in London. This new force was to
concentrate on crime detection and prevention with well-trained, unarmed uniform police
officers. These officers are still known today as “Bobbies” nicknamed after Peel. Peel’s
police reformation served as a model for all modern police departments. This new law
required the police to be patient, professional and work cooperatively with the citizens
(Bloy, 1997).

Peel’s system of policing continued through the British and American law
enforcement systems using the localized precinct idea. The policeman walked the beat
and he knew everyone who lived in his neighborhood, which gave the interaction
between the police officers and the community that Peel envisioned. However, the
policeman on the beat became less effective with the introduction of vehicles as society became more mobile. Law enforcement decided to centralize their operations through larger mobile patrol units (Repetto, 1978) and centralized detective bureaus. The precinct concept was abandoned for this more efficient organizational structure. In the early 1990's, police officials across the United States realized their efficient departments were unskilled in addressing crime and neighborhood concerns. The community-based concept was born adding a new synthesis of Peel's precinct concept through community oriented policing. Rohe, Adams, Arcury (2001) report that community policing has a multi-layered approach including shared responsibility for community safety, an expectation of getting to know the community and its problems, the return of the foot patrol and the effective and efficient bike patrol.

This history is important to understand because college security is a hybrid of the traditional security and police function. The duties of the "watchmen," as an unarmed police force serves cooperatively with the "citizens" of the college. Likewise, the security officer carries out the rules of the organization, reporting directly to the college administration, such as the Shire-Reeves. College security traditionally has encompassed the community policing concept where students and security accept the role of community safety with a collaborative approach.

_Industrial vs. College Security_

College security has varying duties that cross from a traditional industrial watchman function to a professional response dealing with medical, criminal and civil aspects. Security officers in a college setting must maintain community stability on a
twenty-four hour basis from a largely 18 to 22 year-old group. This young group is still defining its maturity. The students are testing their personal and peer limits with alcohol, drugs, sexuality and behavioral activity. Long after faculty, staff and administrators of the college leave for the day, the security staff is the sole adult presence that represents order and college influence.

Meanwhile, the industrial security officer’s main duty is to protect a facility from unauthorized persons from entering for the purpose of industrial espionage, internal theft or trespassers. An employee badging system is the upfront preventative strategy for this industry. The training requirements for college security verses an industrial application are vastly different. An experienced security officer from an industrial location hired into a college setting requires significant upgrading of skills, knowledge and ability.

The training obligation for these varied duties require significant expertise because the duties require a broad range of knowledge, skill and ability. Also, the students, staff, faculty and parents expect a professionally trained adult to maintain a secure facility in which the student can learn and live safely.

*Today’s Security Officer*

Today’s effective security officer must have a mature and ethical foundation. Additionally, the officer needs to develop excellent people skills, ability to recognize alcohol issues, medical concerns, fire safety, mental health problems, crime prevention, investigative skills and hazardous chemical matters. Hiring managers look for these strengths in prospective candidates or the ability to learn and develop these skills.
The motivation to enter the security profession is varied. Some people enter this field as a stepping stone to a public law enforcement appointment, some enter waiting for a better offer to come along, others enter for the benefits such as St. John Fisher College’s tuition remission program, and still others enter because they see a long term commitment to the security field. Regardless of the motivation, the expectations, competencies and commitment are necessary of all officers. Each person brings different experiences and abilities. Some officers are retired police officers with a wealth of experience in people skills, enforcement knowledge and are comfortable dealing with crisis situations. However, these officers need training in a college-centered environment, fire safety and other environmental issues. Other officers, who are new to this field, need a basic introduction and expanded training to the various job requirements. Therefore, the importance of this study is to fill the gaps of knowledge, skills and ability for all security officers regardless of their past experience.

In the next chapter, current literature is reviewed on the topic of shared learning, consortiums, and other collaborative efforts. Chapter 2 will also explore the relationship between training and retention, leadership, and emotional awareness strategies. Chapter 3 will describe the methodology used to evaluate the “Active Shooter” pilot program that has been presented. Chapter 4 will show the findings of the research were significantly successful for the training consortium and describe the future needs as identified by area security directors. Finally, Chapter 5 will summarize this study and state the conclusions. Also this closing chapter will list recommendations for future study in this area.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

The purpose of this study is to investigate the feasibility and effectiveness of a consortium of area colleges and university security departments, by means of a cooperative training effort to develop and train experienced security officers. The importance of this study is that it will act as a key determinant as to whether to continue this project or abandon the consortium. A definition of a consortium is a group formed to undertake an enterprise beyond the resources of any one member (Merriam-Webster, 1993). In this case, any one of the small college security departments do not have the financial resources or the personnel to adequately handle all the varied training obligations for their staff. This chapter reviews the literature about organizations that have used consortium models and partnerships for the purpose of training or other applicable and successful programs.

This first section of the chapter examines groups who historically have banded together in a collaborative effort for a common purpose or goal. Next, various groups have formed strategic alliances to achieve a goal that otherwise would not be possible or practical. The third section focuses on collaboration for training, initially, from a historical perspective, then secondly, examples of modern applications. The next section links emergency response and emotional intelligence awareness for security officers. After that, the benefits of training for retention and morale are discussed as well as the connection to good leadership and ethical decisions. These training issues have a cost to the organization; therefore, the next section considers the business of training. Finally,
the last section brings in the Rochester security consortium model and assesses its progression.

_Collaborative Thinking_

_Historical View_

The idea of bonding together for a common purpose is as old as civilization. The survival of humans has been based on community thinking, learning from one another and sharing methods that make life easier and more efficient. From early history, through the development of ancient Greece, Rome and Egyptian cultures, people have passed knowledge and skills down through generations and across disciplines. Homer’s _Iliad_ and _Odyssey_ are timeless examples of the human condition encompassing relationships, adversity, values, ethics, communications, loyalty and strategy, all elements that can be applied to today’s corporate world. These stories and lessons have been passed through generations. For example, Cahill (1995) compared Dale Carnegie to Cicero suggesting that every word and gesture is related to win and influence, whether for the modern salesperson or ancient politician. These communications are shared experiences handed down for those who follow so they need not go blindly nor fall to the dangers.

Early Egyptians also taught their youth ethics, values and survival principles to further their concept of an organized society. Like most cultures, the Egyptian men taught the boys and the Egyptian women taught the girls (Egypt State Information Service, 2002). As adults, they learned and shared the common acceptable culture, which was then passed on to their children. These life strategies were eventually written down, published and continuously passed on through the generations. Likewise, Eastern cultures passed
life strategies through the generations but used a more philosophical approach. The next section will examine one of these approaches and show the significant differences to Western culture.

*Eastern Thought*

Eastern cultures embrace an understanding of their world through a concept of Tao. Tao is a philosophical method to view problems, not by logical examination of past experience but through a deeper understanding of a current problem (Smullyan, 1977). Tao requires meditation and a level of serenity through acceptance of the way things are. "How to..." books are not available in Tao thinking, for each problem has its own uniqueness and the person asking the question is expected to think through an answer. Tao philosophy would have difficulty as a corporate strategy in the fast-paced Western culture. Less "how to" training would be needed if security personnel thought in Tao, Zen-like fashion and if faculty, staff and students were willing to let this contemplative process occur. Although Taoists do not, generally, band together for group problem solving, this philosophical view is presented in this study as an example of Eastern thinking. The next section returns to Western thinking and will show how groups have banned for a common purpose.

*Great Groups*

Today's Western thinking - the social, political, and corporate worlds - still share past experiences to better prepare themselves for future events through the links of mass communication and the mobility of people. Bennis (1997) took the adage of "none of us are as smart as all of us" and applied it to what he called "Great Groups." Bennis felt that
ordinary people in the right group and with the right jobs could create extraordinary results. He cited the birth of Apple computers, Disney’s production of *The Lion King* and the development of fighter jets through Skunk Works, a division of Lockheed Aircraft, as examples. These Great Groups want to go to the next level of their ability rather than repeat what has already been accomplished even though achieving greatness was not the intended goal (Bennis, 1997). The message Bennis was sending is about collaboration with others.

Similar to collaborative models, strategic alliances bring people together for the greater good. The next portion of this chapter examines strategic alliances as a model to bring together similar thinking people to attack a problem. These alliances can be from the same industry, suppliers, higher education or even competitors.

*Strategic Alliances*

This section examines model alliances applied by various groups such as neighborhood organizations, university settings, and the airlines industry. Alliances are formed out of an identified need between two or more groups that cannot be serviced by anyone of the groups. These strategic alliances or collaborations with other organizations can be considered an advanced yet complicated way of achieving the strategic goals of the organization (Lorange & Roos, 1992). Here, the alliance is a means to an end. However, unintended outcomes may surface with an elevated evolution toward a larger goal (Lorange, & Roos, 1992). That goal depends on the group and the purpose of the group. The outcomes may be a better or quicker product development, ability to reach a more global market, or better long-term relations. However, Lorange and Roos warn that
other negative outcomes, for example competition and other trust issues may arise. Case in point, Perlik (1999) describes a group of fire alarm executives who joined together to create a learning environment designed so they could gain knowledge from each other. This group gathers and shares data that would help them create better fire detection systems. By design, they feel no competitive threat from each other. In comparison, members of the Rochester security consortium are not in competition with each other, even though their larger organizations may compete for students.

At the security department level, the stated missions of crime prevention and apprehension, personal safety awareness, and service to their community are usually similar. Unexpected outcomes from a training alliance may be hard to predict, but enhanced communications between organizations is a likely outcome. For example, if one college is experiencing a rash of thefts, communicating that information through a formal or informal network of known associates is a helpful tool in combating crime.

Strategic alliances or partnerships are excellent for building networks, identifying best practice methods and collaborating on common obstacles. To bring more focus to this discussion, specific examples of alliances are provided.

*Neighborhood Alliance*

The Weed and Seed program in Indianapolis is a partnership designed to address a high crime neighborhood and troubled teenagers (Allender & DePew, 1999). The objective is to reduce drug trafficking, violence, and other crimes through a cooperative assemblage of law enforcement, business leaders, government, and community associations. This model is used to strengthen businesses in the neighborhood, maximize
community policing and prevent crime. The ultimate goal is to revitalize the neighborhood as a viable living and working area through this integrated approach. This program had a shaky start not because of competing interests, but a lack of trust between police officials and the neighborhood community. The police wanted to address drug dealing and violent crimes. In contrast, the community people wanted quality of life concerns such as littering and nuisance issues to be addressed. After discussing these points, both sides realized that quality of life issues cannot be separated from other major criminal activity (Allender & DePew, 1999). The connection between the security consortium and the Weed and Seed program is the process of reaching outside the self-concept and thinking collaboratively.

University Alliance

The idea of training partnerships in a business setting is not new. Many colleges and universities have partnered with business organizations. For example, Rochester Institute of Technology (RIT) has a partnership with the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA). The CIA provides adjunct professors to their Imaging Science program and RIT conducts research for the intelligence agency. The CIA then recruits graduates of RIT (Daneman & Mullins, 2002). This arrangement satisfies needs for both organizations. At one point, one organization is the supplier and the other is the customer; the process is then reversed. In the security consortium, the partners share knowledge similar to the supplier/customer relationship between RIT and the CIA; however, at a later training date, the process is reversed. The difference between the RIT/CIA model and the security consortium is that the partnership is not exclusive to two organizations.
Libraries Alliances

Cutright (2000) describes a consortium with a library system that serves 2,200 islands in Micronesia covering 3.2 million square miles. Their focus was to improve library service from widely dispersed, loosely knit groups throughout these islands. The library group used the Internet and large-scale computerized technical processing for training, inter-library loan and networked operations. The applicable concept to the security group is communications. The security groups are not looking to conduct on-line training at this time; however, the coordination of training programs, announcements, reservations, feedback and interpersonal networking can all occur on-line.

Airlines Alliances

In order to attract a dwindling pool of pilots, the Peachtree Flight Center in Atlanta, Georgia formed two strong alliances with Atlantic Southeast Airlines and Georgia State University. The flight training school entered into this consortium to fast-track pilots through their flight training. The Peachtree Company saw this opportunity as a method to stay ahead of the competition and remain a viable business, which proved to be a successful venture (Lewis, 2001).

Air Transport World (2001), an airlines industry journal, reports the Mesa Air Group, in collaboration with the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), provides airline security training for numerous airlines. Effective security is now becoming part of the airline’s organizational goals. Recent research found that 90% of polled passengers would prefer trained security personnel on the aircraft (Air Transport World, 2001). These collaborative and strategic alliances combine mission, training and bottom-line
organizational goals. College administrators must recognize student safety as the bottom-line organizational goal (DeBecker, 1999).

These partnerships or alliances have come together to meet strategic organizational goals and have found a collaborative method to meet those needs. The basic goals in the security field are safety and security for the community they serve. Those goals start with the officer in the field and therein lay the importance of proper security training, for example, emergency response, patrol techniques, and crime prevention. This security consortium is looking for a collaborative training effort to enhance its safety and security goals.

Collaboration and Training

Collaboration within training has been used throughout history. In medieval times, the Guild system, a mentoring process, was developed for skilled laborers and artisans. The young apprentice tutored under the master but the goal was to gain lifelong working skills (Hull, 1997). Even though the apprentice was cheap labor for the master, the system was advantageous for both parties, i.e. the master had an assistant for menial tasks and the apprentice learned a trade. The apprentice went on the road to become a journeyman and continued to learn from other masters he or she met along their travels. Eventually the trainee mastered their trade and settled within a community. Like Bennis’ Great Groups, some of the world’s great Renaissance artisans came out of this mentoring system. Using Bennis’s idea about group thought, the consortium is designed to bring together security personnel from different campuses to blend best practices training as developed through multiple exposures to various methods and experiences.
Group Training

The Guild system still exists in contemporary form within the skilled labor organizations such as plumbers and bricklayers. However, the progression of the watchman concept has been dropped from the modern Guild system. The modern watchmen are no longer taken through the process of apprenticeship and journeyman to a master level. The contemporary security watchmen have followed the path of the castle watchmen where the modern duties are generally access control into an industrial setting. Conversely, college security officers have followed both the castle watchmen and the modern police model established through the reforms of Sir Robert Peel thereby creating a hybrid of the two historical paths.

Peel’s Reform

Sir Robert Peel in 1829, spearheaded a significant reform for protecting the people that started the London’s modern Metropolitan Police Department. Peel’s reform linked community goals for safety with the function of the police, such as crime prevention (Bloy, 1997). For college security, Peel’s view of the police function and the watchmen concept of castle protection come together in the campus setting. The skills that college security need are similar to Peel’s concept of unarmed community based police. Campus security offers a twenty-four hour watch of the facility and its officers work closely with faculty, staff and students in the prevention of crime. Through these varying functions, the campus officer needs to build multiple skills. As a rule, campus security departments have employees that have mastered their proficiency in one or more related fields and can apply their skills to job-related functions. Therefore, goal of the
Rochester Security Consortium is to use the expertise within the existing group, unlike the one-on-one the Guild system, to build career-enhancing skills. The consortium training is designed to be a classroom setting rather than an on-the-job training.

*On-the-job vs. Off-the-job Training*

Similar to the Guild system, on-the-job training is gathering a renewed interest rather than the past practice of off-the-job training (Rothwell 1996). Rothwell sees the advantage of real-time interaction between the employee and supervisors and other co-workers. Therefore on-the-job is training is designed for one-on-one training. The drawback for the consortium to on-the-job training is the impractical nature of one-on-one training versus a group setting from multiple agencies. Conversely, law enforcement personnel combine the Guild system the off-the-job academy instruction with a mentoring field training system for a new police recruit. Upon successful completion of the academy, the recruit enters his or her field training process, which consists of an assignment to an experienced Field Training Officer (FTO) for an additional 14 weeks (Brosnan, personal communication, January 29, 2002). The recruit learns to transform the classroom education into the practical street application during this time. The recruit goes through a constant evaluation process for adjustment and adaptability to the police environment. This mentoring process occurs internal to the organization and not through a multi-organizational collaboration. However, if an organization cannot support all the training pieces either through time, finances, or expertise, then a multi-organization alliance could be a viable alternative.
Collaborative Training

Michael S. Karnes (personal communication, February 27, 2002), Dean of Monroe Community College’s Public Safety Training Facility (PSTF) describes his facility as a partnership of Monroe Community College (MCC), the County of Monroe and the City of Rochester for the purpose of training all emergency responders in the county. This partnership includes police agencies, fire departments, emergency medical technicians (EMT), and civil defense personnel through the Office of Emergency Preparedness. In addition, this facility has expanded its capabilities for training fire fighters from the Northeast area of the United States in aircraft rescue and plane crash management. The faculty of the PSTF is assigned from the various agencies that use the facility including the Rochester Police and Fire Departments, Monroe County Sheriff’s Office and MCC instructor staff. This PSTF training model draws on large-member organizations to staff their training needs. They also maintain a full time facility that conducts training continuously (Karnes, personal communication, February 27, 2002). This model of a full time facility is not feasible for this training project, although the concept of drawing on the member organizations’ expert trainers is the application the security group would like to duplicate.

Bates College in Lewiston, Maine offers a weeklong campus security officer academy during June of each year that focuses on universal topics, which apply to all colleges and universities (Johnson, 2002). The Bates model uses their existing college staff to manage the academy and instruct the topics, which include patrol techniques, report writing, ethics, fire safety, crime prevention and other specific investigative
procedures (NECSOTA, 2002). This academy also charges a registration and housing fee. The proposed Rochester model consists of a less than one day training, on one topic, which is within a short driving distance and free to participating colleges. Moreover, like the Bates model, it uses in-house instructors to teach the curriculum.

Thus far, this study has examined the value of using collaboration and alliances to improve the skills of the officers in performing the task at hand. The next section will look at the Community Policing model. This model is used in police departments as an organizational approach to service the community it protects. This approach is based an assumption of an alliance with the community and law enforcement personnel to address neighborhood problems.

Community Policing Concept

Security or any aspect of law enforcement cannot work in a vacuum; a collaborative element needs to exist. Chicago Mayor Richard Daley (1993) states that everyone - all city agencies and community members - must share the responsibility for the safety and well being of that community. The police, or in our case security personnel, can be the catalyst for forging and developing this collaboration (Rodriguez, 1993) between the citizens of the community and security officers for building a safe environment. For example, Security (2000) highlights a school safety model using a consortium in Pennsylvania between the school, a security vender, and a consultant company. The focus of this consortium is to identify the best practice for safeguarding students through an assessment process, developing a plan, training the right people, securing the environment, influencing behavior, and crisis management. McShane (1999)
describes a second example. Here, an internal partnership in the hotel business where all staff, including housekeeping and maintenance personnel, are trained in security prevention and awareness. If any staff person is alerted to suspicious activity, that person has been trained in how to report, observe or respond to the incident.

The charge from Sir Robert Peel’s innovations in 1829 where the police must seek the consent and co-operation of the citizenry (Bloy, 1997) is restored in the community policing concept. Many security departments in a college setting have used the community policing process whether knowingly or unwittingly as a collaborative effort for residence hall safety, campus lighting, or security escorts.

The next section looks beyond traditional training topics and examine the emotional aspect of emergency responders and the need to explore the impact of crisis incidents on security officers.

*Emergency Response and Emotional Intelligence*

*Emergency Response*

Security personnel have always recognized their role in the event of a disaster or some other crisis, whether natural or human initiated. Emergency plans have been developed and training has occurred around those plans. However, the events of September 11, 2001 have changed many aspects of American life. The security field is no exception. Organizations are looking at their emergency plans and their ability to handle a major crisis from a new perspective of unpredictability. Many employees are involved in the execution of those plans and in particular, security officers, are directly involved in
the immediate response and the initiation of these plans. Training is paramount for success and creating the optimum circumstances for safe response for all involved.

Research shows that reports of violence are increasing in the workplace and employers are responding with added security measures and preventative training (HR Focus, 2000). School violence has also increased, demonstrated by the much-publicized shootings at Littleton, Colorado; Jonesboro, Arkansas; and Springfield Oregon. Recommendations for multifaceted approaches include trained security personnel to assist in monitoring student behavior and activities (IACP, 1999).

This level of response requires preparation and training along with a well-defined crisis plan, which are the keys to a professional response. Security officers cannot be surprised by an intense critical incident, which would paralyze the unprepared officer. Schmitz (2002) states that during an emergency, whether large or small, the weakest links are personnel and equipment. Schmitz (2002) further states that personnel are the most vulnerable link to success, but if they suffer from emotional or physical effects, they cannot be repaired as easily as machines. Thus, the implications for enhanced emotional intelligence becomes paramount.

Emotional Intelligence

Emergency planning includes preparing the security officers to respond in a dependable, predictable and coordinated manner. The officers have to be prepared for operating in confusion, panic and disastrous surroundings. Each officer needs to be aware of his or her own emotion composition and limits. Daniel Goleman (1995) advocates developing your emotional response to stressful situations long before the incident occurs
whether a major catastrophe or an every day stressful situation. He further adds that the employee must be committed to personal growth in his field of employment. An officer who deals with an intoxicated student at two o’clock in the morning needs to learn about his or her stress level and ability to channel insults. Goleman, (1995) in his book, *Emotional Intelligence*, referred to developing the working memory to control the instantaneous clash of feelings, emotions and intellectual effort, which are paramount to the security officer’s credibility and survival. The effective use of the emotional intelligence concept adds to the professional stature of security officers. The officer must know the mission and values of the department and must react to these intense incidents according to training received. The line of sight to the organizational values and goals must be continuously present (Lindahl, 2001); but likewise, the administrator’s line of sight to the officer dealing with these stressful encounters must be equally clear.

Training in conflict management, crisis management, and emotional intelligence are strategic elements in a highly effective security organization. The integration of the policies and procedures with the appropriate emotional response need to be realistic and applicable to the task at hand. DePree (1989) indicates that leaders owe a covenant to the institution and a commitment to the people of the organization. Clear expectations, appropriate training, and well defined policies and procedures are part of that covenant balanced with the reality of getting the job done. The value of this training in a consortium setting is that the group can share concerns, fears and common problems that may not explored in other settings.
The stated goal of this consortium is to develop security officers with enhanced skills, knowledge and abilities. The logical extension of building these skills is improved morale among officers who, therefore, want to continue in this field and within their organization. Training’s contribution to employee retention and leadership development has been the focus of numerous studies. Using training as a retention tool should be examined.

The Benefits of Training

Training and Retention

The purpose of this research is to develop a cooperative training effort with local colleges and universities. The value of this training is to field a better-qualified security officer and retain officers as long as possible. Training plays a role in retention by keeping basic skills current within the field, encouraging enrichment by enhancing skills, and including cross training. Therefore, professional development also becomes key around the retention issue.

Employers from across the many disciplines are linking the importance of continuing training as a method to retain employees. Thomas Mahan, vice president and senior consultant with Saratoga Institute found that loyalty is linked to the workers confidence in maintaining their job performance into the future (Olesen, 1999). He ties training, education, personal development, mentoring and growth opportunities to recruitment, job satisfaction and retention (Olesen, 1999).

Results from a survey by Interim Services (Dobbs, 1999) illustrate that “60 percent of employees include training as a top priority in their careers, and if training
isn’t offered in one company, then employees will leave for one that does offer it” (p. 54). The New York State Police conducted a survey of potential candidates considering joining the State Police. Their survey found that a key factor among women was the opportunity for job enrichment to develop new skills, and the intellectual stimulation, (LENS, 2000).

Vellani (2001) states that his Security Consultant Group (SCG) receives adequate on-the-job training, which improves morale, self-worth, experiential foundation, as well as their abilities. Vellani (2001) continues to say that he, also, provides off-site training and encourages staff to pursue their own educational training programs. Likewise, Lenahan (2000) states that the key to both officer retention and improved performance is gaining the mastery of advanced skills. Kroth and Boverie (2000) noted that the stronger and more focused a person’s life mission, the stronger and more focused the learner’s self-direction.

Retention of employees does relate to training; however, the manager has to identify and link the different aspects of the organizational goals and objectives. Van Adelsberg and Trolley (1999) said that the training has to be purposeful and linked to the business strategy. Such training includes trouble-shooting training, workplace needs assessment training, or overall job enhancement training. The employee also must be committed to personal growth in his or her field of employment. The success of this growth is determined by the employee’s need to grow, his or her self-concept, experiences, readiness to learn, orientation to learning and motivation to learn (Knowles, Holton & Swanson, 1998). However, training for employee retention may not directly
involve the employee, but may be supervisory-focused within leadership, interpersonal communications or management identification strategies training.

*The Leadership Aspect*

Effective leadership is important to this study because the leader defines the mission, goals, objectives, and values of the department. The leader links the goals and objectives through training to effectively accomplish the mission. Conversely, lack of training fails to give the direction of the department and each member then defines their own goals and direction. Such a state of affairs leads to disharmony, lack of direction and poor morale (Baker, 2000). With effective training, every member is working in the same direction for the same common goal.

Business is results-driven; colleges and security are no exception to being held accountable for positive results that affect the bottom line. Routine damage to the physical plant of the campus from drunken behavior or unchecked theft of valuable resources such as computers or office equipment can cost the college thousands of dollars. Effective security measures produce results through education, prevention or apprehension of violators. Zenger, Ulrich, Smallwood (2000) feel that leadership should be measured by such results. This concept, places the burden on the leader to achieve results. A security department has an obligation to use all possible methods to address criminal or risk behavior. The leader has to instill aggressive approaches to identify and prevent crime patterns. Monitoring by the leader includes overseeing staff that are empowered to problem-solve, make decisions and resolve conflicts in carrying out the
goals of the department. Kayser (1995) states the “facilitator is the key to unlocking the gold mine of wisdom and knowledge buried in the heads of your people” (p. 34).

DePree (1987) states that organizations need to understand the complexity in the diversity of people’s gifts, talents and skills. Such awareness enables leaders to utilize the strengths of each employee effectively. This appreciation also instills meaning, fulfillment and purpose, a similar belief held by Weisbord (1987), who believed workers require dignity, meaning and community in their workplace in order to feel like fulfilled, productive employees. Wagner and Hollenbeck (1998) refer to the socialization process where new employees learn behavioral norms from current employees. The security manager can utilize this process and build this community through a field training program, which is common in the police and security field. The new officer is assigned to a Field Training Officer (FTO) who mentors the trainee for a designated training cycle of two or three weeks or more, depending on the complexity of the job and availability of officer(s). The trainee receives a working knowledge of organization, the geographical layout of the college, as well as forming a bond with current officers during this field training process. The officer coaches the trainee’s progress and introduces him or her to the organization’s expectations, purpose and mission.

DePree (1987) compares the organization with the human body by saying that the “measurement of leadership is not the quality of the head but the tone of the body (p. 10).” Here, DePree asserts that success is not isolated to leadership alone, but embracing of all workers and that success is accomplished by first recognizing and utilizing the full potential of all employees. Lindeman (1989) makes a key point stating that meaning must
reside in the things for which people strive, their goals which they set for themselves, their wants, needs, desires and wishes. Wagner and Hollenbeck (1998) state that “any job, in which planning, judgment, and memory are used in day-to-day performance, individuals high in general cognitive ability will generally outperform those who are low in this ability” (p. 32).

Mary Parker Follett (1987) also believed the leader should have a spirit of adventure, as a pioneer blazing new trails. This organizational entrepreneurial spirit gives life to the creativity of the work force to define its course within the mission of the organization. Many improvements and product developments are the result of employee-driven ideas. Covey (1992) argues that leaders must manage from the left side of their brain and lead from the right. He states that managers draw from the left side for verbal, logical and analytical work; however, leaders draw intuitive, emotional or creative work from the right brain. The effective leader can draw from both sides. Follett (1987) considered it essential that the leaders have a grasp of the total situation, which includes the direction of the organization through its mission and purpose. She felt that “out of the welter of facts, experience, desires, aims, the leader must find the unifying thread” of the organization. Through this view of the situation, the leader “must see the whole, not a mere kaleidoscope of pieces” (1987, p. 51). This observation is a result of thorough knowledge and the ability to relate facts to the total picture. Weisbord (1987) believes a workplace that draws on workers’ enthusiasm, knowledge, and personal effort to create an atmosphere of common understanding and direction adds meaning to the employees work, dignity to their contribution and a sense of community within the organization.
Motivated officers present an air of professionalism and a teamwork ethic, which are intangible assets essential to protecting a facility (Minion, 2000). The training of these concepts is also an investment into the employee and employer partnership. The employer must provide training and communicate those aspects, which are linked to job performance and effectiveness.

These theorists argue that every employee needs to know the mission, scope, goals and objectives of the organization. With that knowledge, the employee can actively work to achieve the business results as expressed by the Zinger group. For security operations, this means crime prevention, asset protection, and aggressive enforcement. A training consortium can train to effective patrol, crime prevention, investigative techniques, and base line mission and ethics. However, each organization must follow up with specific training to it’s own mission, policies, procedures, and strategic planning. Zenger et al. (2000) further argues that leaders must keep the big picture perspective, including the interests of stockholders, customers, employees, and the public. Consequently, new leadership development needs to prepare people for the pressure of the business world. Those interests take time, resources and training. Even though security is not seen on the competitive side of the business, security effectiveness influences the bottom line.

Ethics, similar to leadership, is an integral part of the success of the departmental and organizational goals. There is little latitude for ethical breaches in the security function because of the nature of the trust placed by the organization on the security staff. Baker (2000) argues that ethics should be integrated into every training curriculum
because of the value choices in nearly all aspects of the job. The significance of placing an ethical component with each training program is that officers learn the skills as well as the limitations and ramifications of their discretion. For example, report writing could be a straightforward training program however; opinions, rumors, gossip, accuracy and confidential information are all ethical issues in reporting an incident.

*Ethics*

Security officers are given a position of trust by the organization. They maintain a twenty-four hour watch on the physical layout of the organization with keys to every room, nook and cranny in case of fire, mechanical breakdown or other potential disaster. This watch includes times of isolation when the challenges for a violation of trust can occur. Also in a college setting, young students live on campus and have an expectation of privacy. The potential to abuse this trust can occur in various ways each day in the form of theft, false reporting, invasion of privacy, willful negligence or other breaches of confidence. Therefore, the security officer must possess a solid foundation of principles and values. The expectations and ethical standards of the organization and manager should be very clear. Such standards must be relayed to staff members. Ethics based training, as Baker (2000) implied, defines the organizational values and opens for discussion and clarification any related ethical dilemma.

However when it comes to ethics, the Stevens study (1999) showed employees primarily learn about organizational ethics through their orientation training program. After that initial training, ethical discussions are more likely to occur between employees to work out dilemmas rather than discussing with their supervisors. Her study showed
that participants discussed ethical issues with family and friends rather than supervisors and co-workers. However if they did discuss ethics within the organization, the next source of ethical decisions came from fellow employees. Her study also indicated that ethical decisions are not second nature based on intuition.

Such ethical issues and questions can be problematic in the security field. This Rochester area training consortium can share common ethical dilemmas in a group setting, similar to the emotional training described previously and develop values-based strategies that blend peer input and supervisory expectations.

The next section will examine training from a business perspective. Even though this consortium is designed as a free service to all security departments in the Western New York area, the alternative is to find a professional trainer who has a proven record of results and effectiveness. However, consultants sell their knowledge for a fee.

The Business of Training

Today, successful business strategies are treated as commodities, which are bought and sold through books, training seminars or multimedia venues. Peter Block (2000) describes how a consultant enters an organization and sells knowledge or a process. However, Block’s consultant, like a trainer, points the way for a better and more efficient business practice. For such services, Block outlines how to negotiate a fee; a business mercenary in Homer’s society. Knowledge capital is sold rather than shared at a group forum in the community center. However, cost effective training is difficult with a small department and a small budget. Mahoney (2000) agrees that one of the most important challenges for law enforcement is low-cost instruction programs.
Training is also a business venture. The problem is not the availability of training, but the cost of training. An individual training session usually is affordable, but to continuously train staff on the many layers of competencies is expensive. The problem is exaggerated by frequent turnover in this field when each new employee must be brought up to the standard level of competencies. Many agencies place a higher priority on the immediate needs of salaries, overtime costs, patrol vehicles, and fixed operating expenses. Training ends up at a second or third level priority (Mahoney, 2000). This training consortium is attempting to provide quality training from experts in the field for a nominal cost.

The concluding component of Chapter 2 narrows this literature review to the consortium model that the Rochester area security directors are hoping to accomplish. This section will bring learning, collaboration and change forces together into focusing on the Rochester consortium. Also this section will introduce a partnership model to track the consortium’s progress and determine its future direction.

The Rochester Consortium Model

The Rochester consortium is thinking forward to address the industry direction to a smaller, leaner department, yet still fill the educational needs. Willmore (1999) states that in the future, everyone is linked for learning and networking for common needs through technology. Organizations that are fluid and highly adaptive are more likely to change in size, composition, location, and focus. This organizational direction has already started. Companies are downsizing to better fit their needs. Also, companies are
relocating to other countries for better access to labor market, resources, tax relief, or
market share. Through these leaner structures, new innovative models are necessary.

McLagan (1999) describes a change in paradigm with the movement from a
mechanical-factory based world through informational technology to a new knowledge-
based world. McLagan states that a knowledge-based business requires an integrated
people-based systems design, participative processes, and change facilitation. This new
focus means developing a partnership mindset within all levels of the organization
internally and externally to the organization. The security professionals in the Rochester
area are poised to become the leaders to serve the changing paradigm.

Dent (1999) gives a process for formulating business alliances that will enhance
products, services and overall performance. His partnership development describes the
process of (a) assessing, (b) exploring, (c) initiating and (d) committing. The first stage,
assessing, is determining what you expect to obtain from the partnership as well as your
readiness to engage in the process. Stage two, exploring, is the process of collaborating
with the potential partners to determine the areas of common interest and mutual benefit.
The third stage, initiating, is the process of agreeing to initial activities and taking the
first steps. Finally, the fourth stage in the development process is committing to the
partnership (Dent, 1999).

Dent’s process was employed to develop the Rochester Consortium. In March
2001, the Rochester area security directors group was approached about the idea of
engaging in this consortium. After going through stage one and two, assessing and
exploring, some directors decided not to participate. At this point, about half of the
directors decided not to participate. The remaining half were willing to move forward into stages three and four, initiating and committing. In June 2001, the first pilot training program was initiated at St. John Fisher College. To date, six additional training programs have been presented through this consortium. Therefore, this security collaboration has completed Dent's four stages of partnership development.

Upon completion of Dent's four-phase partnership development model, success measure became the focus. Dent (1999) warns that the success of a partnership is measured on the accomplishments, not on the stated intention. He recommends utilizing the Plan-Do-Check-Act cycle, introduced by Walter Stewhart. This cycle should be used to evaluate the consortium's progress and determine if continued collaboration is viable. The first step, plan the action, was utilized by the Rochester Consortium by meeting with the area security directors and deciding to try this collaborative effort. The second step, do the activity, was accomplished by initiating the pilot programs. The third step, check the accomplishment in meeting the goal, is the focus of this study. The fourth step is to act on the results. This fourth step is to decide whether to abandon the project or to move on and progress to the planning stage for further project development (Dent, 1999).

The Rochester Consortium model has completed the first two steps of this cycle - the "planning" and "doing" steps. The purpose of this study is to "check," as described in Stewhart's third step, and decide the feasibility of pursuing this partnership, as described in Stewhart's fourth step of "acting" through abandoning the project or moving to the next step of further planning.
In the following chapter, Chapter 3, the methodology employed to conduct this examination is described.
Chapter 3: Methodology

The purpose of this study is to investigate the feasibility and effectiveness of a training consortium of area colleges and university security departments. This cooperative training effort will develop and train experienced security officers. Chapter 3 describes the methodology employed in this study. The design of this study was to collect data from two sources: (a) a needs assessment from area college security directors -- Part One; and (b) experienced security personnel who attended the “Active Shooter” program -- Part Two.

Part One of this chapter describes a needs assessment from the area security directors for training topics necessary for staff development. In addition, the directors were polled for their willingness to host one or more training sessions. Part two of this chapter describes the method used to evaluate the “Active Shooter” program, which was presented on January 9, 2002.

Part One: Needs Assessment

Population

The group of Rochester area college and university security directors consists of 19 participating members. This group exists to share security related information that occurs on or effects their campuses and has been active for the past four years. Through this group the training consortium has evolved. Therefore, the security directors were asked through an electronic mailing to identify future training needs that could be presented as a consortium topic. This Needs Assessment was sent to all 19 directors on February 15, 2002.
Data Collection

The entire population was surveyed.

Instrument. The Needs Assessment contained a cover letter (see attachment A) explaining the purpose of this study and instructions to complete the Needs Assessment. Attached to this letter was a one-page survey asking the directors to identify seven training topics. Also, the directors were asked to list any training topic they would be willing to host at their campus.

Administration. Survey responses were returned through electronic mail to mccarthy@sjfc.edu (Attachment B).

Data Analysis

The Needs Assessment responses were evaluated through content analysis. Here, frequency responses of the training topics formed a list. In addition, willingness to host training sessions were observed and noted.

Confidentiality

Confidentiality was not required for the needs assessment from the security directors as open discussion of the various needs and the priority of the training issues ought to be openly discussed.

Part Two: The “Active Shooter”

The “Active Shooter” training was designed to prepare a security officer for their role in responding to a critical incident that involved a shooter who was actively shooting a firearm on their campus. This program, presented to the Rochester area security
officers, consisted of lecture presentations in the morning session, which covered emergency planning, unarmed response to an active shooter and an overview of response techniques consistent with Critical Incident Management protocol. The afternoon session was a demonstration by the Monroe County Sheriff's Department's Special Weapons and Tactics Team (SWAT) with their response procedures for an active shooter.

Population

Thirty security personnel attended the training on January 9 representing Rochester Institute of Technology, University of Rochester, Hobart-William Smith College, Nazareth College and St. John Fisher College. The method used to gather these data consisted of a questionnaire sent to security personnel who attended the "Active Shooter" program. The purpose of the survey was to measure self-reported satisfaction levels with regards to learning and improvement of behavior on the job as described in Kirkpatrick's 4 levels of evaluation (Noe, 1999).

Data Collection

The entire population was surveyed.

Instrument. Thirty days after the training program, on February 18, 2002, surveys were sent to each of the attending security officers. Enclosed with each survey was a stamped return envelop.

This survey was designed to measure the effectiveness of the "Active Shooter" training session. The first section of the survey, Section A, solicited demographic information from each respondent such as gender, race, and years of service, and whether
a public or private college or university. The second section employed a five point Likert scale (Huck & Cormier, 1996) for response to statements.

Section B is comprised of 7 survey questions rating the effectiveness of the training. Each respondent anonymously rated the training based on a five-step Likert-type scale (Huck & Cormier, 1996) ranging from “Strongly agree” to “Strongly disagree.” An eighth question was included for a descriptive answer on the specific job related knowledge, skills or ability that the respondent has applied, changed or remember from the training. Additional space was provided for additional comments if the respondent desired.

Administration. This survey was mailed to each participant of the training session, which was conducted on January 9, 2002. Each attendee of this session received a letter (Attachment C) printed with instructions for the process to complete the survey (attachment D) and return-using postage paid return envelope.

Data Analysis

The evaluation survey was designed to measure satisfaction and increased learning following the “Active Shooter” training session. All data were aggregated, then analyzed using quantitative and qualitative data analysis techniques. Content analysis was employed on the answers to the open-ended questions.

Confidentiality

Responses from the security personnel attending the “Active Shooter” Program will be kept confidential. The surveys included demographic information, which could be the only source of identification. The survey did not ask for personal identification. Any
identifying information included on a survey by a participant was removed. Information received will be kept confidential including any information linked to any individual respondent and reported only in aggregate to preserve the anonymity of the participants. The only person with access to the data is the researcher and the information will be kept secure by the researcher.

Chapter 3 explained the method used to conduct a needs assessment from the area security directors to determine future training needs as well as those colleges willing to host training seminars. This chapter also described the methods used to sample and analyze the effectiveness of the “Active Shooter” program. The next chapter describes the findings from these effectiveness surveys and the needs assessment.
Chapter 4: Findings

The purpose of this study is to investigate the feasibility and effectiveness of a training consortium of area colleges and university security departments. This cooperative training effort will develop and train experienced security officers. This chapter presents the findings of the two surveys used in this study; Part 1: A needs assessment by the security directors; and Part 2: an effectiveness survey from the participants of the “Active Shooter” program.

Part 1: Needs Assessment Results

A needs assessment was sent to all college and university security directors in the Rochester / Western New York area to determine the training needs for their security officers. An electronic mail message with a cover letter (attachment A) was sent to nineteen security directors (attachment B) that was returnable by e-mail. Six responses were received.

Training Topics

This survey identified 36 responses that were collapsed into 27 topic areas. The most frequent topic mentioned was report writing (3). Patrol techniques, safety training, interviewing, diversity issues, critical incident management and the investigative process were each identified by at least two of the responding directors. The remaining 19 topics include criminal procedure laws, specific criminal investigations includes sexual assault, drugs and hate crimes, interpersonal communications, fire safety and alcohol issues, for example (see Exhibit 2).
### Exhibit 2. Training Topics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training topics</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patrol Techniques</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Training</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defensive Techniques</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Writing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewing skills</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proper arrest techniques</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYS Penal / V&amp;T CPL Laws</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Incident Management</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigative Process</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Divisional Relations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Related Issues</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Harassment Inv.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Control Techniques</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Resolution</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Communications</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Service</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Speaking</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Issues in Public Safety</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Assault Investigation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hate Crime Investigations and Laws</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Aid</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AED Use and Protocol</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire extinguisher use</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Safety</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug recognition and Investigation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Host Facilities**

The directors responded on the needs assessment which topics they would be willing to host at their campus. Exhibit 3 shows that five of the six colleges were willing
to host a training segment with St. John Fisher volunteering to host 3 topic areas and Nazareth College willing to host two topics.

**Exhibit 3. Participating colleges and topics willing to present**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Host Facility</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genesee Community College</td>
<td>Any topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niagara University</td>
<td>Critical Incident Mngt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keuka College</td>
<td>None stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester Institute of Technology</td>
<td>Critical Incident Mngt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nazareth College</td>
<td>Quality Customer Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nazareth College</td>
<td>AED Use &amp; Protocal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. John Fisher College</td>
<td>Investigative Techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. John Fisher College</td>
<td>Alcohol Laws &amp; Investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. John Fisher College</td>
<td>Sexual Assault Investigation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part 2: The "Active Shooter" Results

The "Active Shooter" training was designed to prepare a security officer for their role in responding to a critical incident that involved a shooter who was actively shooting a firearm on their campus. Twenty-one of the thirty surveys were returned for a response rate of 70%.

**Demographics**

The first section of the survey canvassed demographic detail from the respondents requesting gender, years of service in the security field, whether their school was public or private and whether their race was Caucasian, African-American or Hispanic.

The response rate was 70% (21). By gender, there were 19 males, 1 female with one gender response recorded as missing data. The average years of service was 12.63
years with all attendees employed at private colleges. By race, 14 officers were from Caucasian; six were African-American and one was a Hispanic officer (see Exhibit 4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Average Years of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* missing data - 1 by gender

**Program Effectiveness**

This survey was designed to determine if the “Active Shooter” training was effective in preparing security officers for their role in responding to a critical incident that involved a shooter who was actively shooting a firearm on their campus. The results shown in Exhibit 5 indicate that the participants showed a high degree of satisfaction in the distribution of responses.

**Exhibit 5. Survey responses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Satisfied with training</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Satisfied with instructors</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Satisfied with time spent</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Improved skills</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Applied to job</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Feel better equipped</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. More effective leader **</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** data missing from two surveys
Agreement statement results. The following information shows the results of the eight agreement statements from the security officer's surveys.

Statement 1 - I was satisfied with the training I received during the "Active Shooter" presentation. The first statement on the survey asked if the attendee was satisfied with the training received. Twenty responses indicated they agreed with this statement, while one strongly agreed. The comment area for this question consisted of responses ranging from "Very informative" to "Could have been better organized." Other themes included three comments that the SWAT Team could have done a better job explaining and demonstrating their role.

Statement 2 - I was satisfied with the quality of the instructors who presented in the "Active Shooter" training. The second statement asked the attendees if they were satisfied with the instructors. Twelve responses agreed with this statement, while eight responses strongly agreed and there was one neutral response. Comments for this question indicated that it was well organized, professional, highly informative, and the training made the respondent more aware of potential problems.

Statement 3 - I was satisfied with the amount of time spent on the "Active Shooter" training. The third statement asked if the attendee was satisfied with the time spent on the "Active Shooter" program. Eleven responses agreed with this statement, while six strongly agreed. Two responses disagreed with the statement and two remained neutral. Comments included that it could have been shorter and that it could have been more concise. Conversely, other comments were that it was well organized and that the training had no gaps of time.
Statement 4 – I have improved my skills as a result of this training. The fourth statement asked if the attendee had improved his or her skills as a result of this training. Eleven agreed that their skills improved, while six responses strongly agreed. Four responses remained neutral. Comments included they improved knowledge rather than skills. Another stated that they had already received this training. Other comments were the training provided the basis for further discussion and reading about the topic. One respondent linked September 11 events to the training stating they had become more aware of the total aspect of security after 9/11.

Statement 5 – I have applied some of the training ideas presented from the training in my job. The fifth statement asked if the attendee had applied any training ideas to their job. Eleven stated they agreed with this statement, four strongly agreed, while one disagreed and five gave neutral responses. Comments for this question included that the training made them more aware of small detail; there has been no situation where this training would apply. Other comments stated the respondent was more observant and had more confidence on my response in a potential emergency. Another stated, “I have begun to develop ideas and strategies for ‘just in case’.”

Statement 6 – I feel better equipped to approach my job as a result of this training. The sixth statement asked if the respondent felt better equipped to approach their job as a result of this training. Nine responses indicated they agreed with this statement; eight strongly agreed; one disagreed and one strongly disagreed. Two responses were neutral. Comments included that they now know what is expected of us. Another response indicated they were continuing to learn and have benefited from this
program and another stated that it was inspirational to see how the process works in real
time circumstances.

Statement 7 – I feel I can take a more effective leadership role during a critical incident as a result of this training. The seventh statement asked if the respondents felt they could take a more leadership role during a critical incident as a result of this training. Ten responses stated they agreed they could be better leaders. Eight responses strongly agreed with this statement and one remained neutral. Two respondents did not answer this question. Comments for this leadership question stated they had the ability to see things in advance and not take anything for granted. Other comments included they learned how SWAT operates-designates buildings, how perimeters are established, danger zones defined, resources and capabilities; we are expected to observe, report, and do as directed, nothing more; I have felt more confident since participating in this program; I have gained a tremendous sense of what to do and my role in getting it done through leadership.

Statement 8 – Specifically what job related knowledge, skills or ability have you applied, changed or remember from the training that you received. This last portion on this survey asked each respondent to specifically list the job related knowledge, skills or ability they have applied, changed or remembered from the training. The responses to this open question were listed out and separated into four themes (see Exhibit 6). The first theme consisted of comments made directly relating to the Crisis Response / Active Shooter. Such comments included how to establish an inner perimeter and greater understanding of what the police want or need when they arrive at the scene. The second
theme reflected comments that relayed back to their role as a security professional. These comments included that attendees were more observant of their surroundings and they make mental notes when arriving at the scene of any incident. Another comment in this theme stated that he/she sees a larger picture rather just running into a situation. The third theme focused on learning the duties of the SWAT Team. These comments stated the attendee learned the tactical maneuvers of SWAT and internal numbering system used for identifying locations. The fourth theme was for other comments, which consisted of two comments that the attendee did not learn anything new and the other stated it was the best training ever attended.

The following list shows the summary list of comments that were categorized into themes generated from the responses from this open question.

Exhibit 6. Comments on Statement 8

Crisis Response / Active Shooter
- Inner perimeter establishment;
- Understand what the police want;
- Responding police have control;
- The overall Critical Incident Management system keeps everyone safe;
- I am more knowledgeable after working hand-in-hand with the SWAT Team;
- There should be a county-wide training facility that provides this type of learning opportunity and stimulate professional development of security personnel;

Security Function
- I try to observe my surroundings and make mental notes upon arriving at any scene;
- Applied my prior police skills;
- As a supervisor, I can better handle and instruct officers on like situations;
- I have re-evaluated my thinking as a first responder;
- I look at a larger picture instead of just running into something;
- More observant of people and situations, rehearsing imaginary scenarios and responses, focusing on potential locations for active shooters on campus,
Listening and considering the incidents of violence in campus communities since receiving this training, having greater confidence in off-campus people and resources for support in emergency situations;
- I see the campus through a strategic point of view; I address issues of safety and security in a more responsible manner.
- I have increased my staff's awareness of expecting the unexpected

**SWAT Duties**
- Tactical maneuvers and strategy utilized;
- Numbering system;
- Information related to SWAT tactics specifically setting up and maintaining a perimeter;

**Other comments**
- I didn't learn anything knew - just a refresher;
- This was the best training / interaction I was ever introduced to

Complete synopsis of all comments made on the surveys to each question is listed in Appendix E.

**Summary**

This chapter showed the findings of the surveys used in this study. The findings include 27 topics being identified as training needs by the security directors. The most frequently identified topic was report writing. All but one of the six responding directors offered to host a future training segment at their campus.

As for the security officers, 70% of the attendees at the “Active Shooter” program presented on January 9, 2002 responded to the survey with an average rating of four on a five point Likert scale (Huck & Cormier, 1996). Most security officers indicated they were able to apply the learning directly to similar active shooter scenario or link the learning to other job functions.
Following in Chapter 5, the meaning of these findings and the conclusions of this study are summarized. Based on these finding and conclusions, recommendations will be made for future training or identify further study needs.
Chapter 5: Synthesis of the Findings, Recommendations for Further Study and Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to investigate the feasibility and effectiveness of a training consortium of area colleges and university security departments. This cooperative training effort will develop and train experienced security officers. This chapter provides a synthesis of the findings, conclusions from those findings as well as recommendations for the future study. Additionally, this chapter discusses the perceived effectiveness and learning based on the self-reported levels of skill improvement and transfer of training surveys conducted after the “Active Shooter” training. The future of this consortium is dependant on the success and effectiveness as determined by the surveys as well as the willingness of the security directors to support and sponsor training initiatives.

The Rochester consortium has progressed through the first two steps of Shewhart’s Plan-Do-Check-Act cycle (Dent, 1999). These two steps - the planning and doing steps were completed in early 2001 by the security directors agreeing to try this consortium concept and initiating the pilot programs. The purpose of this study is to check the effectiveness of this consortium, as described in Shewhart’s third step, and decide the feasibility of pursuing this partnership. The results will progress to the fourth step of acting, which is continuing the project, or if determined by this study this consortium is not feasible, abandon the idea. Therefore, the importance of this fifth chapter is to synthesize the results of this study to help determine the decision of continuing the project or abandoning the consortium.
Synthesis of the Findings

The results of the survey from the security officers showed a high level of satisfaction with the training, along with a self-reported change in behavior as a result of this training. This level of satisfaction shows the value of the training consortium for the officer in the field, which is important for the success of the program. Furthermore, high satisfaction from the officers leads to an appreciation for the training and ideally increased morale. Vellani (2001) states that adequate training improves morale, self-worth, experiential foundation and abilities. Likewise, the officers who attended the “Active Shooter” reported increased confidence. They noted the training defined their responsibilities thus giving them better confidence in knowing their role in such an incident. Such confidence adds to retaining personnel as well as improved performance (Lenahan, 2001). The flip side of the issue, according to Dobbs (1999), is that people will leave their employment if the company does not offer such pertinent training.

Further, the issue of retention has organizational implications as well. The “Active Shooter” training is important for officers because the content defined their responsibilities in a critical incident. However, such training is not easy to frequently assemble. The logistics of commandeering a building for a day’s training and bringing in specialized units like the Sheriff’s Department’s SWAT Team is difficult. Therefore, frequent employee turnover creates a loss of this experiential training. A trained officer is a significant investment in time and money. Therefore the issue of retention has further ramifications in frequency of training and financial implications as well as maintaining a level of expertise.
Although, the likelihood of experiencing an active shooter during one’s career is low, preparation for such an extreme, life-threatening scenario is critical for an unarmed security officer. Security officers are expected to conduct various duties at such an incident until the arrival of armed law enforcement officers. This training was designed to inform officers of those responsibilities. The high level of satisfaction indicates that officers did value the training. The results were important for the security directors, as well. If the officers reported dissatisfaction with the training based on their expected responsibilities, security directors could expect poor performance during such a crisis, which would be problematic. Therefore the “Active Shooter” training was important for both the security officers and the security directors in understanding congruent expectations.

The “Active Shooter” training was an unusual theme for training. However, the principles for retention, career development and skill building are the same regardless of the training topic. For example, the security directors identified report writing as a training need. The ability of writing a clear, understandable report potentially increases confidence and job satisfaction, thus building morale and retention. However, the ideal goal of training is to go beyond satisfaction to the levels of increased learning, changed behavior and ultimately show performance results as described by Kirkpatrick (Noe, 1999). Therefore, the next step for this consortium is to outline the future learning goals and objectives.
Recommendations for Further Research

The “Active Shooter” survey identified self-reported change in behavior but actual learning and demonstrated change in behavior was not measured. In moving beyond Kirkpatrick’s first level of satisfaction, the next step is to measure learning, change in behavior and results. Therefore, future recommendations for this training consortium are to test Kirkpatrick’s levels of evaluation, i.e. second level - measure learning; third level – behavior change; and fourth level - increased results (Noe, 1999).

The “Active Shooter” would be difficult to measure because of the unusual nature and infrequent occurrences of these incidents, however report writing may be a more suitable topic for future measurement. Therefore, the method to evaluate report writing through Rothwell and Sredl’s (2000) application of Kirkpatrick’s four levels of evaluation is recommended and shown.

Exhibit 7 presents the action plan for mapping a report writing evaluation. The first level determines the participant’s reaction to the training, whether or not he or she was satisfied and happy with the training. The second level measures learning through a pre-test and a post-test procedure. The third level, change in behavior, is measured by tracking the participant’s reports over time to determine if an improvement occurs. The fourth level is tangible results for the organization such as better crime analysis thus a reduced crime rate or improved outcomes from student disciplinary hearings.
### Exhibit 7. Kirkpatrick’s Hierarchy of Evaluation for Report Writing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hierarchy</th>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>Performance Results</td>
<td>Experimental research</td>
<td>Research crime rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Research outcomes of student disciplinary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>hearings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>Changed Behavior</td>
<td>On-the-job</td>
<td>Review, monitor and track daily reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>demonstration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>Test prior to training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>Test following training containing course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Reaction to Training</td>
<td>Self-reported</td>
<td>Satisfaction survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>satisfaction</td>
<td>Immediately following training</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rothwell & Sredl (2000)

This study did not identify the competencies for a college security officer. Therefore, further study is necessary to identify the competencies for today’s security officer in a college setting. This research may be necessary on a campus-by-campus level, if not already completed by individual security departments. After those competencies are identified, then, assessment activities can help to determine the competence level of each officer and identify performance gaps. These activities could become the driving forces to determine follow up training needs.

Likewise, the security directors have identified 27 training needs thereby showing their interest in continuing this consortium project. This response indicates that report writing is the primary concern for security directors that responded to the needs assessment. Also, future Rochester Consortium training initiatives should contain a report-writing curriculum. Other topics, such as Patrol Techniques, Safety Training,
Interviewing, Diversity, Critical Incident Management, Customer Service and the investigative Process, received two responses and therefore should be addressed in a short term and long term planning for the consortium. The remaining 19 topics are also long term items to be considered in planning.

Conclusions

This study was successful in showing a high level of satisfaction and perceived learning outcomes from the officers who received the “Active Shooter” training. Also, the security directors also showed their willingness to pursue this project through their response to the needs assessment and identifying 27 topics for future training. Also, some directors are willing to host future training sessions. This level of interest from the security directors and the level of satisfaction from the officers indicate the project is worth continuing.

Further, the literature showed that collaborative efforts are useful in achieving organizational goals. The Rochester consortium has brought together various security officers to share in a collaborative training effort. Lorange & Roos (1992) felt that alliances, i.e. collaborations, are a means to an end. This consortium showed that training alliances are achievable in this security setting. Likewise, Allender & DePew (1999) warned through the Weed and Seed program that trust issues might block achieving mutual goals. However the Rochester consortium has shown feasible cooperative partnerships.

Therefore, this cooperative training effort should continue this consortium effort to develop and train experienced security officers. Even though early commitments
indicated the larger universities in the Rochester were not in favor of participating in this consortium project. Subsequent training including the “Active Shooter” program indicates that some topics will interest the larger colleges and universities. Even though a large number of security directors did not respond to the needs assessment, their participation in attending the training shows they will respond to individual training opportunities of their interest.

This study has used Shewhart’s Plan-Do-Check-Act cycle (Dent, 1999) to show the progression of the Rochester Consortium’s development. This evaluation process is at Shewhart’s third step of checking the plan and assessing the outcomes. The results of this study indicate the consortium’s objective of providing low-cost training within the Rochester area colleges and universities that can be shared is successful.

The fourth step in Shewhart’s cycle is to continue the action within the process. The next step is to report back to the security directors the results of this study and recommend the continuation this consortium.
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Appendix A
E-Mail Letter

To: Area College and Universities Security Directors
From: Michael McCarthy, St. John Fisher College
Date: January 21, 2002
Subject: Training Consortium

The Training Consortium of the Rochester Area College and University Security Directors is being assessed. I am a Master of Science degree candidate currently enrolled in the Graduate Human Resource Development (GHRD) program at St. John Fisher College while conducting this project.

This study is being conducted as an Applied Research course requirement. Upon completion, a report of the findings will be produced and will become part of the assessment of the Training Consortium. The focus of the study is to provide data to measure the program’s success in meeting its mission.

As a Security Director for a college that has participated in this training Consortium, please complete the enclosed Needs Assessment. This assessment will identify future training needs for the consortium. Please follow the instructions on the survey and return in the enclosed envelope.

Also, anyone who has attended the Active Shooter training on January 9, 2002 at Nazareth College are being asked to complete a satisfaction and learning survey in which they will evaluate the training and its impact on their knowledge, skills or abilities. The survey will take approximately fifteen minutes to complete. Members of your staff who attended this training will receive this study in the next couple of days.

Their identity will be kept confidential unless otherwise specified by them in writing. Your input in this study authorizes your consent. This study has been reviewed and approved by the St. John Fisher College’s Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects. If you have questions or concerns about this study, please contact Michael McCarthy at (585) 385-7315. Please respond via e-mail to mccarthy@sjfc.edu.

Michael E. McCarthy
Director of Safety and Security
St. John Fisher College
Appendix B
Needs Assessment
Campus Security Survey

Please complete the following survey with regards to the training needs of your staff. What special knowledge (knowledge the average person does not have) does your staff need to perform their job? Please list the top seven areas (ex. interviewing skills) that you feel is their most important training need to perform their job duties:

1. ____________________________
2. ____________________________
3. ____________________________
4. ____________________________
5. ____________________________
6. ____________________________
7. ____________________________

Comments:

Please list any training topic that you would like to host at your school.

1. ____________________________
2. ____________________________
3. ____________________________

This past year the Training Consortium has sponsored the following training sessions:
The MCI Process - Managing Criminal Investigations
Effective Patrol Techniques
Interviewing and Interrogations
Workplace Violence
Bomb Threats and Assessment
Expecting the Unexpected – The Active Shooter
Critical Incident Management – Initial Response

Thank you for input. This survey was designed to identify the needs you feel are important for your staff to better perform their duties. Return this form via e-mail to mccarthy@sjfc.edu.

Thank you
Appendix C

January 21, 2002

Name
Address
City, State Zip

Dear Name:

The Training Consortium of the Rochester Area College and University Security Directors is being assessed. I am a Master of Science degree candidate currently enrolled in the Graduate Human Resource Development (GHRD) program at St. John Fisher College while conducting this project.

This study is being conducted as an Applied Research course requirement. Upon completion, a report of the findings will be produced and will become part of the assessment of the Training Consortium. The focus of the study is to provide data to measure the program’s success in meeting its mission.

As someone who has attended the Active Shooter training on January 9, 2002 at Nazareth College you are asked to complete the enclosed survey in which you will evaluate the training and its impact on your knowledge, skills or abilities. The survey will take approximately fifteen minutes to complete. Please follow the instructions on the survey and return in the enclosed envelope.

Your identity will be kept confidential unless otherwise specified by you in writing. All information collected in this study will be grouped ensuring individual response anonymity. Your input in this study authorizes your consent. This study has been reviewed and approved by the St. John Fisher College’s Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects. If you have questions or concerns about this study, please contact Michael McCarthy at (585) 385-7315.

Sincerely,

Michael E. McCarthy
Director of Safety and Security
St. John Fisher College
Appendix D

Training Effectiveness Survey

Section A: Demographic data, please mark appropriate box:

Training topic: __Active Shooter____ Date of Training: __January 9, 2002.__

Gender: M or F Years of security service: ______________;

Public institution: __Y__N__; Private Institution: __Y__N__;

Race: Caucasian __; Afro-American __; Hispanic __;

Other (identify) ______________

Section B: Please rate training effectiveness: (Circle one)

1. I was satisfied with the training I received during the "Active Shooter" presentation.
   1) Strongly disagree  2) Disagree  3) Neutral  4) Agree  5) Strongly agree
   Comment: ___________________________________________________________________

   ___________________________________________________________________

2. I was satisfied with the quality of the instructors who presented in the "Active Shooter" training.
   1) Strongly disagree  2) Disagree  3) Neutral  4) Agree  5) Strongly agree
   Comment: ___________________________________________________________________

   ___________________________________________________________________
3. I was satisfied with the amount of time spent on the "Active Shooter" training.
   1) Strongly disagree  2) Disagree  3) Neutral  4) Agree  5) Strongly agree
   Comment: ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________

4. I have improved my skills as a result of this training.
   1) Strongly disagree  2) Disagree  3) Neutral  4) Agree  5) Strongly agree
   Comment: ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________

5. I have applied some of the training ideas presented from the training in my job.
   1) Strongly disagree  2) Disagree  3) Neutral  4) Agree  5) Strongly agree
   Comment: ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________

6. I feel better equipped to approach my job as a result of this training.
   1) Strongly disagree  2) Disagree  3) Neutral  4) Agree  5) Strongly agree
   Comment: ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
7. I feel I can take a more effective leadership role during a critical incident as a result of this training.

1) Strongly disagree  2) Disagree  3) Neutral  4) Agree  5) Strongly agree

Comment: ________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________

8. Specifically what job related knowledge, skills or ability have you applied, changed or remember from the training that you received?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Any further comments:
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Thank you
Appendix E

Survey Statements - List of Comments:

Question #1: I was satisfied with the training I received during the “Active Shooter” presentation.

Comments: Demonstration could been better organized; Very informative; should have told us what to do instead of making us figure it out; SWAT Team could have done a better job; post demonstration could have been better; I was made aware of the dangers of not handling a situation without training or working knowledge.

Question #2: I was satisfied with the quality of the instructors who presented in the “Active Shooter” training.

Comments: Well organized and professional; highly informative, the training made me more aware of potential problems;

Question #3: I was satisfied with the amount of time spent on the “Active Shooter” training.

Comments: Could have been shorter; could have been more concise; well organized, no gaps of time;

Question #4: I have improved my skills as a result of this training.

Comments: Improved knowledge rather than skills; I have already received this training; the training provided the basis for further discussion and reading about the topic; I have become more aware of the total aspect of security after 9/11.

Question #5: I have applied some of the training ideas presented from the training in my job.

Comments: Made me more aware of small detail; there has been no situation where this training would apply; I find that I am much more observant and have confidence on my response in a potential emergency; I have begun to develop ideas and strategies for 'just in case.'

Question #6: I feel better equipped to approach my job as a result of this training.

Comments: We now know what is expected of us; I am continuing to learn and have benefited from this program. It was inspirational to see how the process works in real time circumstances;

Question #7: I feel I can take a more effective leadership role during a critical incident as a result of this training.
Comments: Ability to see things in advance and not take anything for granted; learned - how SWAT operates-designates buildings, how perimeters are established, danger zones defined, resources and capabilities; we are expected to observe, report, and do as directed, nothing more; I have felt more confident since participating in this program; I have gained a tremendous sense of what to do and my role in getting it done through leadership.

Question #8: Specifically what job related knowledge, skills or ability have you applied, changed or remember from the training that you received?

Comments: Inner perimeter establishment; Understand what the police want; tactical maneuvers and strategy utilized; numbering system; responding police have control; I try to observe my surroundings and make mental notes upon arriving at any scene; I didn't learn anything knew - just a refresher; applied my prior police skills; I am more knowledgeable after working hand-in-hand with the SWAT Team; as a supervisor, I can better handle and instruct officers on like situations; I have re-evaluated my thinking as a first responder, I look at a larger picture instead of just running into something;
7 critical tasks are great; the overall Critical Incident Management system keeps everyone safe; information related to SWAT tactics specifically setting up and maintaining a perimeter; more observant of people and situations, rehearsing imaginary scenarios and responses, focusing on potential locations for active shooters on campus, listening and considering the incidents of violence in campus communities since receiving this training, having greater confidence in off-campus people and resources for support in emergency situations; there should be a county-wide training facility that provides this type of learning opportunity and stimulate professional development of security personnel; I see the campus through a strategic point of view, I address issues of safety and security in a more responsible manner. I have increased my staff's awareness of expecting the unexpected; this was the best training/interaction I was ever introduced to.
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