

STATE 911 COMMITTEE
911 Training Subcommittee
 December 1, 2020
 Meeting Minutes

Voting Members Present	Representing	Attending Remotely
Chief Mark Barnes	Oshtemo Township Fire Department	Oshtemo Township
Lt. David Aungst	Lenawee County Sheriff's Office	Addison, Lenawee County
Ms. Kimberly Grafton	Calhoun Co Consolidated Dispatch	Calhoun County
Mr. Sam Kalef	Troy Police Department	Oakland County
Ms. Tammy Smith	Ottawa County Central Dispatch	Ottawa County
Mr. Jeff Troyer	Kalamazoo Co Consolidated Dispatch	Kalamazoo City
Ms. Cherie Bartram	SERESA	Richmond, Macomb County
Ms. Christine Collom	Clinton County Central Dispatch	Alma
Mr. Brian McEachern	Negaunee Regional Comm Center	Marquette County
Ms. Jennifer Robertson	Farmington Hills Police Department	Farmington Hills, Oakland Co.
Ms. Amy Thomas	Montcalm County Central Dispatch	Montcalm County
Ms. Elizabeth Bagos	Macomb County Sheriff's Office	Macomb County
Non-Voting Members Present	Representing	
Ms. Joni Harvey	State 911 Office	
Ms. Theresa Hart	State 911 Office	
Ms. Stacie Hansel	State 911 Office	
Voting Members Absent	Representing	
Ms. Melissa Harris	Ingham County 911 Central Dispatch	

A. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 10 a.m.

B. Roll Call

Roll call was taken, and a quorum was present.

C. Old Business

Instructor Approval Process

Prior to the meeting, members of the NTS sent any feedback regarding the instructor approval process to Ms. Bartram. She compiled everyone's notes into one list, including pros and cons of blanket instructor approvals, and sent it to the group for discussion. Some examples of the pros listed include speeding up the process for getting instructors approved and helping providers schedule more courses offering more availability. Some examples of cons listed include the review team not seeing each instructor profile individually and the potential of instructors who are not qualified teaching SNC-approved courses.

Ms. Hart reminded the group that the process in MiSNAP is much quicker and easier. Instead of emailing the requests, getting the review team votes, sending the provider a letter, etc., it is all done through MiSNAP. The providers are also told it can take up to six weeks to process requests. The expiration of courses should no longer be an issue as the dashboard notifies the provider up to 90 days before a course will expire.

As a reminder, this topic was brought up due to a complaint that providers are not able to get instructors approved, which in turn is prohibiting PSAP staff getting trained.

Discussion followed.

The State 911 Committee has been adamant both courses and instructors are vetted, ensuring quality training. Considering blanket instructor approval goes against everything the SNC and NTS have worked so hard for. It also goes against the allowable/disallowable use of training funds as courses and instructors have to be SNC-approved. The NTS receives more complaints on instructors than actual course content.

The NTS policy states the process may take up to six weeks for a decision. For the few that did take longer than the six weeks, it was due to the fact the information was entered incorrectly or submitted without the required documentation.

It was asked if there were time parameters or is this a blanket unlimited request. For instance, the blanket approval will be in effect for one year and will be up for discussion at that time. There was no previous discussion about time parameters. If the NTS agrees to blanket approval for instructors, that is something the group would decide.

The only item the review team had concerns about was technical issues. This is where the conversation of blanket instructor approvals began as the review team had over one hundred instructors to review. Overall, they had no issues going through the pending list. The review team is now caught up with the pending requests and find the blanket approval is no longer needed.

One of the NTS members stated as a PSAP staff, she wants to make sure someone is reviewing each individual instructor. A blanket approval goes against everything the subcommittee is for. Instead of changing the process, it was suggested adding more people to the review team to serve as backup when needed.

One provider submitted many of the requests; however, many were rejected at the State 911 Office level as they were submitted in the wrong format. The provider is going to resubmit the documentation. The provider was also informed the NTS does not need a multiple page resume, they should only focus on the individual's qualifications to teach the course. If a course expires without a renewal in process, the course and instructors need to be submitted as new. This could be the cause of why there were so many pending instructors waiting for approval.

The process works for the majority of the providers. This may be a provider issue, not a procedural issue that should be considered.

After much discussion, and in the absence of a motion, the instructor approval process will remain as is.

D. Public Comment

Ms. Caitlin Sampsell, Berrien County, asked how long the process is to approve instructors. The policy states the process can take up to six weeks. Ms. Hart also stated if Ms. Sampsell knows of any requests taking longer than the six weeks, or if she would like to check that a particular instructor has been submitted for review, to contact her and she can look into it.

The review team was thanked for all the time it takes to review the information. It usually takes less than six weeks; however, there are times when a provider does not submit the information correctly which makes the process take longer. This is through no fault of the review team or of the process in place.

E. Next Meeting

February 10, 2021 at 10 a.m.

F. Adjourn

A **MOTION** was made by Ms. Cherie Bartram, with support by Mr. Brian McEachern, to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 10:44 a.m.