

Private Security Officer Selection and Training

G U I D E L I N E

ASIS INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON GUIDELINES

The Commission on Guidelines was established in early 2001 by ASIS International (ASIS) in response to a concerted need for guidelines regarding security issues in the United States. As the preeminent organization for security professionals worldwide, ASIS has an important role to play in helping the private sector secure its business and critical infrastructure, whether from natural disaster, accidents, or planned actions, such as terrorist attacks, vandalism, etc. ASIS had previously chosen not to promulgate guidelines and standards, but world events have brought to the forefront the need for a professional security organization to spearhead an initiative to create security advisory provisions. By addressing specific concerns and issues inherent to the security industry, security guidelines will better serve the needs of security professionals by increasing the effectiveness and productivity of security practices and solutions, as well as enhancing the professionalism of the industry.

Mission Statement

To advance the practice of security through the development of risk mitigation guidelines within a voluntary, non-proprietary, and consensus-based process utilizing to the fullest extent possible the knowledge, experience, and expertise of ASIS membership and the security industry.

Goals and Objectives

- Assemble and categorize a database of existing security-related guidelines
- Develop methodology for identifying new guideline development projects
- Involve/organize ASIS Councils to support guideline development
- Identify and develop methodology for development, documentation, and acceptance of guidelines
- Develop and sustain alliances with related organizations to benchmark, participate, and support ASIS guideline development
- Produce national consensus-based guidelines in cooperation with other industries and the Security Industry Standards Council

Functions

- Establish guideline project
- Determine guidelines for development and assign scope
- Assign participating Council(s), where appropriate
- Approve membership on guideline committee
- Act as a governing body to manage and integrate guidelines from various Councils and security disciplines
- Review and monitor projects and guideline development
- Approve Final Draft Guideline and Final Guideline
- Select guidelines for submission to the Security Industry Standards Council and the American National Standards Institute (ANSI)



PRIVATE SECURITY OFFICER SELECTION AND TRAINING GUIDELINE

Private Security Officer (PSO) Selection and Training Guideline

Copyright © 2004 by ASIS International

ISBN 1-887056-57-2

ASIS International (ASIS) disclaims liability for any personal injury, property, or other damages of any nature whatsoever, whether special, indirect, consequential, or compensatory, directly or indirectly resulting from the publication, use of, or reliance on this document. In issuing and making this document available, ASIS is not undertaking to render professional or other services for or on behalf of any person or entity. Nor is ASIS undertaking to perform any duty owed by any person or entity to someone else. Anyone using this document should rely on his or her own independent judgment or, as appropriate, seek the advice of a competent professional in determining the exercise of reasonable care in any given circumstance.

All rights reserved. Permission is hereby granted to individual users to download this document for their own personal use, with acknowledgment of ASIS International as the source. However, this document may not be downloaded for further copying or reproduction nor may it be sold, offered for sale, or otherwise used commercially.

Printed in the United States of America

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1



Private Security Officer (PSO) Selection and Training Guideline

1.0	Title	5
2.0	Revision History	5
3.0	Commission Members	5
4.0	Review Committee Members	5
5.0	Key Words	6
6.0	Guidelines Designation	6
7.0	Scope	6
8.0	Summary of Guideline	9
9.0	Purpose	9
10.0	Terminology	9
11.0	Recommended Practice Advisory	11
11.1	Regulation of Private Security	11
11.2	Selection: Employment Screening Criteria	13
11.3	Training Criteria	15
12.0	References/Bibliography	19
13.0	Appendix A: Adjudication Scoring Considerations for Education Verification, Employment Verification, Social Security Number Traces, and Motor Vehicle Registration Verification	21

This page intentionally left blank.

1.0 TITLE

The title of this document is the Private Security Officer (PSO) Selection and Training Guideline.

2.0 REVISION HISTORY

Baseline document.

3.0 COMMISSION MEMBERS

Sean Ahrens, CPP, Schirmer Engineering
Norman D. Bates, Esq., Liability Consultants, Inc.
Regis W. Becker, CPP, PPG Industries
Jerry J. Brennan, Security Management Resources, Inc.
Chad Callaghan, CPP, Marriott International, Inc.
Pamela A. Collins, Ed.D., CFE, Eastern Kentucky University
Michael A. Crane, CPP, IPC International Corporation
Edward J. Flynn, CFE, Protiviti, Inc.
F. Mark Geraci, CPP, Bristol-Myers Squibb Co.
L. E. Mattice, Boston Scientific Corp.
Basil J. Steele, CPP, Sandia National Laboratories
Don W. Walker, CPP, Securitas Security Services USA, Inc.

4.0 REVIEW COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Kerstin Bagus, ChoicePoint, Inc.
Mark H. Beaudry, CPP, IBM
Steven K. Bucklin, Glenbrook Security Services, Inc.
Pamela A. Collins, Ed.D., CFE, Eastern Kentucky University
Sandra M. Cowie, CPP, Principal Financial Group
Richard L. Daniels, CPP, POLINT
Kort L. Dickson, Kraft Foods
David L. Foley, Security Forces/SFI Electronics
Arik S. Garber, CPP, Initial Security Services
Michael E. Goodboe, Ed.D., CPP, The Wackenhut Corporation.
Bernard D. Greenawalt, CPP, Securitas Security Services USA, Inc.
Kenneth R. Grover, Ph.D., Darden Restaurants, Inc.
Steve Hess, Government of British Columbia
Charles McCarthy, CPP, Fox Protective Services, Inc.
Richard H. McClintock, Dartmouth-Hitchcock Medical Center
Bonnie S. Michelman, CPP, Massachusetts General Hospital
Kelvin M. Ng, CPP, Yaletown Technology Group, Inc.
Kathryn E. Scarborough, Ph.D., Eastern Kentucky University
David G. Schott, Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts
Gail Simonton, National Association of Security Companies (NASCO)

5.0 KEY WORDS

Private Security Officer, State Regulation of Private Security, Selection: Employment Screening Criteria, Training Criteria.

6.0 GUIDELINES DESIGNATION

This guideline is designated as ASIS GDL PSO 11 2004.

7.0 SCOPE

The Private Security Officer (PSO) Selection and Training Guideline has been written for both proprietary and contract security but is not intended to cover all aspects of selection and training criteria for private security officers. It is intended to set forth minimum criteria that regulating bodies and companies in the United States can use to assist in recommending legislation and policies for the selection and training of private security officers.

ASIS International has long been a proponent of professional standards for private security officers, including participation in the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration National Advisory Committee on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals in 1976.

The PSO Selection and Training Guideline was identified by the ASIS Commission on Guidelines as a critical need for the security industry and was selected for development in 2001. A comprehensive review of existing guidelines, reports, and other significant “milestone” documents was undertaken in the fall of 2001. Research and development continued and culminated in October 2003, when the guideline was placed on the ASIS International Web site for public review and comment.

Private security officer selection and training has been a topic of interest and much debate over the last 25 years. Various studies and research efforts have been undertaken to better define the role of a private security officer and also provide agencies with information needed to adequately select and train such officers. One of the earlier studies of interest on this subject was the 1972 work by Kakalik and Wildhorn entitled “Rand Corporation, Private Police in the United States.” This report provided one of the first descriptions of private security in this country and continues to be referred to as the baseline research on this subject.

The following sources were identified and reviewed as part of the background research prior to developing this guideline. All documents were reviewed by various members of the ASIS Commission on Guidelines.

- Anderson, Teresa. “Affairs of State.” *Security Management*. May 2001, pp. 83–84.
- Canadian National Standards Board. *Security Guards and Security Guard Supervisors*. CAN/CGB-133.1.99. Canadian General Standards Board, Standards Council of Canada. Ottawa, Canada K1A 1G6, November 1999.
- Castle, Reed A. *A Study of the Security Officer*. Commonwealth of Virginia, Department of Criminal Justice Services: Schroeder Measurement Technologies, Inc., April 2002.

- Conn. Gen. Stat. § 29-534 (2001). Private Detectives, Guard Services and Security Personnel. Web site: <http://www.cga.state.ct.us/2001/pub/Chap534.htm>
- Cunningham, William C., Taylor, Todd H. *Private Security and Police in America: The Hallcrest Report I*. Portland, OR: Chancellor Press, 1985.
- Cunningham, William C., John S. Strauchs, and Clifford W. Van Meter. *Private Security Trends 1970–2000: The Hallcrest Report II*. Boston, MA: Butterworth-Heinemann, 1990.
- Goodboe, Michael E. “The Development of an Entry-Level Model Curriculum, Optimum Training Methodology, and Implementation and Evaluation Plans for Unarmed Contract Security Officers.” Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Nova Southeastern University, 1966.
- Johnston, Les. “Regulating Private Security.” *International Journal of the Sociology of Law*, Academic Press Limited. 1992, 20, pp. 1–16.
- National Advisory Committee on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals. *Private Security: Report of the Task Force on Private Security*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA), 1976.
- National Association of Security and Investigative Regulators. *Model State Statute for the Regulation of Private Security Officers and Their Employers*. Waterloo, IA: National Association of Security and Investigative Regulators, 2001. <http://www.iasir.org/pdf/NASIRGuardlawamended.pdf>
- Pinkerton’s Center for Professional Development. *Advanced Certification Training (ACT), Volumes 1, 2, and 3*. Arlington, VA: Pinkerton, Inc., 1997–2002.
- Private-Sector Liaison Committee of the International Association of Chiefs of Police. *Private Security Officer Selection, Training and Licensing Guidelines*. Alexandria, VA: International Association of Chiefs of Police, 1998. <http://www.theiacp.org/documents/pdfs/Publications/privatesecurityofficer.pdf>
- Private Security Advisory Council to the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA). *Model Security Guard Training Curricula*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, 1978.
- “Private Security Officer Quality Assurance Act of 1997.” HR 103 EH, 105th Congress, First Session. 1997.
- “Private Security Officer Quality Assurance Act of 1999.” HR 60 IH, 106th Congress, First Session. 1999.
- Spaninks, L., Quinn, L., & Byrne, J. in close co-operation with members of CoESS/UNI-Europa. Final Report European Vocational Training Manual for Basic Guarding. Funded by the European Commission: DG Education and Culture + DG Employment and Social Affairs. Lyon, France: CoESS/UNI Europa, 2001. [http://www.union-network.org/uniproperty.nsf/0/5c819184fa80aefac1256b45003f4505/\\$FILE/Training%20Manual.pdf](http://www.union-network.org/uniproperty.nsf/0/5c819184fa80aefac1256b45003f4505/$FILE/Training%20Manual.pdf)
- Vocational-Technical Education Consortium of States. *A Catalog of Performance Objectives and Performance Guides For Security Guard*. Detroit, MI: Wayne State University College of Education and Michigan Department of Education Vocational-Technical Education Service, 1978.

- Weber, Tina, comp. A Comparative Overview of Legislation Governing the Private Security Industry in the European Union. Final Report of a project for CoESS/ UNI-Europa funded by the European Commission, Version 31/01/2002. Dr. Tina Weber, ECOTEC Research and Consulting Ltd., Birmingham, UK: Priestly House, 2002. [http://www.union-network.org/uniproperty.nsf/0/6878ecb710bd395bc1256bc3004318b0/\\$FILE/legislations%20analysis%20-%20final%20report.pdf](http://www.union-network.org/uniproperty.nsf/0/6878ecb710bd395bc1256bc3004318b0/$FILE/legislations%20analysis%20-%20final%20report.pdf)

In addition to the works listed above, legislation regarding selection and training requirements for private security officers was analyzed from the following states: Arizona, California, Florida, New York, Oregon, Utah, Virginia, and North Dakota. These states were selected using ratings provided by the Services Employees International Union (SEIU). The Pinkerton's Internal Analysis of all State Regulations for Private Security Officers and Westcott Communications, Inc.'s Private Security Television Network (PSTN) Catalog of Security Officer Training Programs were also reviewed.

Finally, feedback on various drafts of the guideline were solicited from the following groups prior to the release of the Private Security Officer Selection and Training Draft Guideline for public review and comment: the National Association of Security Companies (NASCO), the International Association of Security and Investigative Regulators (IASIR), The Wackenhut Corporation, Barton Protective Services, Securitas Security Services USA, Inc., and Guardsmark.

NASCO, founded in 1972, focuses on setting meaningful standards for the private security industry. NASCO also monitors proposed state and federal legislation and regulations that might affect the quality and/or effectiveness of private security services. IASIR, founded in 1993, is a North America-wide membership association made up of state and provincial government regulators, private industry, law enforcement, and other interested individuals with the goal of promoting professionalism in the private security industry through effective regulation. The Wackenhut Corporation is the U.S.-based division of Group 4, the world's second largest provider of security services. Wackenhut is a leading provider of contract services to major corporations, government agencies, and a wide range of industrial and commercial customers. The company's security-related services include uniformed security officers, investigations, background checks, emergency protection, and security audits and assessments. Barton Protective Services is a contract security provider that recently merged with Allied Security, one of the largest U.S.-owned security services companies in the U.S. Securitas Security Services USA, Inc., is the largest security services company in the U.S., providing uniformed security officers, investigations, consulting, electronic systems integration and specialized vertical market security services. Guardsmark is another provider of security services, including uniformed officers and individualized protection of client assets.

After the review by these groups, ASIS sought public review and comment of the draft guideline for a period of 60 days, which ended December 10, 2003. To evaluate all the comments and suggested revisions, the ASIS Commission on Guidelines established a Review Committee that began work on finalizing the PSO Selection and Training Guideline.

The Review Committee, made up of security professionals from a wide variety of disciplines, spent several months revising the guideline based on both the submissions

received and the professional expertise of the Committee members. After the creation of a revised draft guideline, ASIS established an additional public review and comment period of 30 days, which ended September 3, 2004. The research, the reviews, and the public comments have been invaluable in the creation of this guideline setting forth the minimum criteria recommended for states and organizations to use in crafting legislation and policies for the selection and training of private security officers.

8.0 SUMMARY OF GUIDELINE

The Private Security Officer (PSO) Selection and Training Guideline offers minimum criteria for the selection and training of all private security officers and includes definitions of terms and references/bibliography.

9.0 PURPOSE

The purpose of the PSO Selection and Training Guideline is to provide regulating bodies in the United States with consistent minimum qualifications in order to improve the performance of private security officers and the quality of security services.

10.0 TERMINOLOGY

Armed – As used in this guideline, armed refers to a private security officer who is equipped with a weapon (firearm), such as a pistol or rifle, from which a shot is discharged.

Armored Car Company – A company which, for itself or under contract with another, transports currency, securities, valuables, jewelry, food stamps, or any other item that requires secured and insured delivery from one place to another with armed personnel.

Armored Car Personnel – An armed employee of an armored car company who is engaged exclusively by that company and is liable for the safe transportation, care, and custody of valuables.

Background Verification/Check – The process of checking an individual's character, general reputation, personal characteristics, or mode of living for consideration of employment, promotion, access to sensitive assets (such as national information), or for continued employment. Elements of a background verification/check can vary widely, and may include information from credit bureaus, courts records repositories, departments of motor vehicles, past or present employers and educational institutions, governmental occupational licensing or registration entities, business or personal references, and any other source required to verify information that was voluntarily supplied.

Computer Based Training – Any training that uses a computer as the focal point of instructional delivery. Training is provided through the use of computer hardware and software that guides the learner through an interactive learning program.

Contract Security Service – Protective services provided by one entity, specializing in such services, to another entity on a compensated basis.

Criteria – The individual (criterion) or collective stated qualifications (criteria) to be compared with an applicant's or employee's actual credentials, experience, or history in determining suitability for an employment decision (hiring or otherwise).

Critical Infrastructures – The sophisticated facilities, systems, and functions, which include human assets and physical and cyber systems, that work together in processes that are highly interdependent to provide the foundation for our national security, governance, economic vitality, and way of life.

Electronic Medium Based Training – Any training that uses an electronic technology as a method of effectively conveying instruction and/or information. Electronic technology includes but is not limited to video or audiocassettes and video conferencing.

Homeland Security – The federal government’s efforts, in coordination with state and local governments and the private sector, to develop, coordinate, fund and implement the programs and policies necessary to detect, prepare for, prevent, protect against, respond to, and recover from terrorist or other attacks within the United States.

Nolo Contendere – The name of a plea in a criminal action, having the same legal effect as a plea of guilty, so far as regards all proceedings on the indictment, and on which the defendant may be sentenced. (Latin for “I will not contest it.”)

Private Security – An independent or proprietary commercial organization whose activities include safeguarding the employing party’s assets, ranging from human lives to physical property (the premises and contents), responding to emergency incidents, performing employee background investigations, performing the functions of detection and investigation of crime and criminals, and apprehending offenders for consideration.

Private Security Officer – An individual, other than armored car personnel or a public employee (federal, state, or local government), employed part or full time, in uniform or plain clothes, hired to protect the employing party’s assets, ranging from human lives to physical property (the premises and contents). The definition excludes individuals who are not employed in the capacity of a private security officer.

Proprietary Security – Any organization, or department of that organization, that provides full time security officers solely for itself.

Public Safety – Support mechanisms that sustain the life and vitality of a community’s health, safety, and social stability by performing such services as law enforcement, fire prevention, personal and facility security, disaster preparedness, and emergency medical assistance. In some instances, public safety may refer to law enforcement officers, firefighters, rescue squads, and ambulance crews. In other instances, public safety properly encompasses private security officers, as well.

Regulatory Body – Any state board, commission, department, or office, except those in the legislative or judicial branches, authorized by law to conduct adjudicative proceedings, issue permits, registrations, licenses, or other forms of authorization to offer or perform private security officer services, or to control or affect the interests of identified persons.

Selection – The act or process of choosing individuals who possess certain characteristics or qualities.

Threat – An indication of something impending that could result in damage or injury.

Training – An act, method, or process of instruction; to teach so as to make fit, qualified, or proficient.

11.0 RECOMMENDED PRACTICE ADVISORY

11.1 Regulation of Private Security

Private security officer selection and training criteria vary from state to state ranging from comprehensive training requirements for every private security officer to little or no training for private security officers. One of the main goals of the Private Security Officer Selection and Training Guideline is to develop and encourage adoption of minimum national criteria for the selection and training of all private security officers, be they proprietary or contract.

The development of such minimum criteria has become essential for enabling the private security industry to meet the need of providing effective security to its clients as well as meeting the demands associated with new homeland security initiatives. Effective security today requires workers who are familiar with all aspects of a facility's security system for assessing and containing potential threats. Security officers are required to be well versed in emergency procedures and able to work with an organization to ensure that emergency procedures can be implemented successfully. They are also required to be able to work closely and effectively with public safety personnel.

The ability of U.S. companies to protect the nation's critical infrastructure and contribute to homeland security efforts depends largely on the competence of private security officers. Therefore, private security officers and applicants for private security officer positions should be thoroughly screened and trained, in accordance with these recommended criteria, at a minimum.

The tables within this document set forth the recommended steps to be taken by regulating bodies and companies in the U.S. towards the development of such guidelines, beginning with effective licensing and enforcement. Recognizing that specific details of each regulatory body's licensing laws are different, elements listed in Table 1: State Regulation of Private Security are nevertheless basic for effective private security officer legislation. It is hoped that each regulatory body will embrace the concept of greater consistency of requirements. It is additionally recognized that while state law typically pre-empts city, municipal, or county ordinances/laws, a city, municipality, or county may impose additional requirements if they do not conflict with state laws. Thus, the elements listed below should be considered by any governmental entity proposing to exercise controls over the providers of private security.

Table 1: State Regulation of Private Security

Subject	Recommendations — Consideration should be given to:
Regulatory Body Oversight/Enforcement	Establishing a regulatory body, operating under the direction and within the framework of a state agency.
State Fees to Support Enforcement Process	Establishing fees commensurate with the effort necessary to process applications for registration/licensure/renewal to be used by the regulatory body to manage the department and enforce the regulations. Enforcement should include inspection, administrative fines for violations of the state statute and the implementation of regulations, sanctions, and criminal violations in certain instances.
Licensee-in-Charge/Qualifying Agent Registration	Establishing requirements for licensee-in-charge/qualifying agent (e.g., education, experience, written exam).
Insurance	Establishing requirements for licensee-in-charge/qualifying agent liability insurance (e.g., minimum of \$1,000,000 per occurrence).
Individual Security Officer Registration/License	Establishing a requirement for regulatory bodies to issue private security officer registrations/licenses, which should include a photograph and other relevant identification information.
Private Security Officer Registration/License	Establishing a requirement for registration/licensure of all private security officers.
Background Investigations	Establishing a requirement that all candidates must successfully pass a background investigation prior to assignment as a security officer.
Pre-assignment, Post-assignment, and Annual Training	Establishing a requirement for private security officer training (orientation/pre-assignment; on-the-job; ongoing/refreshers/annual courses).
Armed Security Officer Training	Establishing additional training requirements for armed security officer training (classroom, range safety, course-of-fire, re-certification policy, instructor qualifications, etc.).

11.2 Selection: Employment Screening Criteria

Table 2: Selection: Employment Screening Criteria provides the necessary framework for private security officer job descriptions and minimum criteria to be utilized in the selection of private security officers. Private security officers must still comply with the applicable statutory requirements of their respective regulatory bodies as well as any established criteria of the employer, which may exceed the minimum requirements as set forth in this guideline.

Table 2: Selection: Employment Screening Criteria

Subject	Recommendations — Consideration should be given to:
General Requirements	Establishing a requirement that candidates be at least 18 years of age for unarmed security and 21 years of age for armed security, with provisions that the candidate must be able to perform the duties required of the position.
Citizenship	Establishing a requirement that candidates be a citizen or national of the United States, a lawful permanent resident, or an alien authorized to work.
Personal Information	Establishing a requirement that candidates submit their current and previous residential addresses and phone numbers for at least the last seven years. (See parenthetical remarks under Social Security Number).
Social Security Number	Establishing a requirement to verify a candidate's name and social security number. (Additionally, consideration may be given to conducting a social security number trace to determine if the number has been actively issued, is not retired, and to obtain an address history. The address history should be compared against addresses given on the application and should be used to verify criminal record checks have been conducted in all required residence addresses. See Appendix A for Adjudication Scoring Considerations for Social Security Number Trace.)
Education	Establishing a requirement that candidates possess a high school diploma, GED, or equivalent. (See Appendix A for Adjudication Scoring Considerations for Education Verifications.) Also, the applicant should demonstrate an ability to read, write, and speak English and the language(s) most appropriate to his or her assigned duties. Additionally, consideration may be given to the administration of a validated aptitude test for security officer applicants.

(continued)

Table 2: Selection: Employment Screening Criteria (continued)

Subject	Recommendations – Consideration should be given to:
Criminal History	<p>Establishing a requirement that candidates not have been convicted of or pled guilty or nolo contendere to a felony or job related crime for a minimum seven-year period immediately preceding the candidate’s date of hire. Any felony conviction discovered in the course of conducting the search should also be considered relevant to the candidate’s qualifications for the position.</p> <p>Armed security officer candidates must not have been convicted of a state or federal misdemeanor involving the use or attempted use of physical force, or the threatened use of a deadly weapon.</p>
Employment Verification	<p>Establishing a requirement to verify a candidate’s current and previous employers’ addresses and phone numbers for at least the last seven years. (See Appendix A for Adjudication Scoring Considerations for Employment Verification.) Candidates with prior military service may be required to provide form DD-214.</p>
Registrations/Licenses and Certifications¹	<p>Establishing a requirement to verify the candidate-provided license, registration, credential, or certification information against the appropriate agency. (Compare given information on licensee’s name and address, licensing board, or agency name, license type, license number, status and original issue date. If provided by the agency, note any negative license actions or sanctions.)</p>
Fingerprints	<p>Establishing a requirement that candidates submit a fingerprint card or electronic fingerprint to be processed for a criminal history check. Whenever possible, consideration should be given to the use of a national fingerprint identification database.</p>
Drug Screening	<p>Pre-Employment: Establishing a requirement that candidates undergo a drug screen test.²</p> <p>Post Employment: Random drug testing, where permitted by state law and employer policy, should be conducted by using a valid random testing methodology.</p>
Photographs	<p>Establishing a requirement that candidates submit two recent (within the past 30 days) passport size photographs for purposes of identification and registration/licensing.</p>

¹ For any private security officer with driving responsibility in a motorized vehicle (not limited to those driving company vehicles), consideration should be given to conducting an annual Motor Vehicle Registration check (also know as MVR, DMV check) to verify such things as license information (type or class of driver’s license, full name, and address at the time of last license renewal), restrictions or violations, convictions and license revocations, automobile insurance cancellations, and accidents. (See Appendix A for Adjudication Scoring Considerations for Motor Vehicle Registration Verifications.)

² A drug screen test may include on-site drug screens administered on company premises, job sites, and/or clinics.

11.3 Training Criteria

In addition to providing the framework for effectively selecting private security officers, this guideline provides an outline for the design and delivery of private security officer training by employers and other agencies. The ASIS Commission on Guidelines calls for a formal mechanism to establish minimum training requirements certified by a regulatory body in each of the 50 states. Although the regulatory bodies should mandate the minimum training requirements, there should be cooperative efforts by these bodies to mandate consistent requirements state-to-state. All entities or persons providing security officer training should also be certified by a regulatory body.

The elements listed in Table 3: Training Criteria are the proposed training topics considered essential for each regulatory body and subsequent proprietary or contract security agency to consider in the training of their private security officers. This guideline prescribes specific recommended hours of training and acknowledges different ways in which a security officer may receive this training or demonstrate proficiency to perform the duties of a private security officer. For example, training may consist of computer based training, classroom training, self-study, or other methods of delivery. Consideration should be given to providing the appropriate length and content of pre-and-post assignment training dependant upon each officer's assignment. It is further recommended that all training be accompanied by an appropriate assessment and evaluation to measure the security officer's knowledge of the training subject. Further, testing should be appropriate to subject matter, that is, written or performance.

Table 3: Training Criteria

Subject	Recommendations — Consideration should be given to:
Training	Establishing a requirement that each private security officer receive 48 hours of training within the first 100 days of employment.
Training Topics	<p>Establishing a requirement that each private security officer pass a written and/or performance examination(s) to demonstrate that he/she understands the subject matter and is qualified to perform the basic duties of a private security officer. Training should include the following Core Training Topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1.0 Nature and Role of Private Security Officers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1.1 Security Awareness <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1.1.1 Private Security Officers and the Criminal Justice System 1.1.2 Information Sharing 1.1.3 Crime and Loss Prevention 1.2 Legal Aspects of Private Security <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1.2.1 Evidence and Evidence Handling 1.2.2 Use of Force and Force Continuum 1.2.3 Court Testimony 1.2.4 Incident Scene Preservation 1.2.5 Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) and Diversity 1.2.6 State and Local Laws 1.3 Security Officer Conduct <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1.3.1 Ethics 1.3.2 Honesty 1.3.3 Professional Image 2.0 Observation and Incident Reporting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2.1 Observation Techniques 2.2 Note Taking 2.3 Report Writing 2.4 Patrol Techniques 3.0 Principles of Communications <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3.1 Interpersonal Skills 3.2 Verbal Communication Skills 3.3 Customer Service and Public Relations 4.0 Principles of Access Control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4.1 Ingress and Egress Control Procedures 4.2 Electronic Security Systems 5.0 Principles of Safeguarding Information <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5.1 Proprietary and Confidential

(continued next page)

Table 3: Training Criteria (continued)

Subject	Recommendations — Consideration should be given to:
Training Topics, cont.	<p>6.0 Emergency Response Procedures</p> <p>6.1 Critical Incident Response (e.g., natural disasters, accidents, human caused events)</p> <p>6.2 Evacuation Processes</p> <p>7.0 Life Safety Awareness</p> <p>7.1 Safety Hazards in the Workplace/Surroundings</p> <p>7.2 Emergency Equipment Placement</p> <p>7.3 Fire Prevention Skills</p> <p>7.4 Hazardous Materials</p> <p>7.5 Occupational Safety and Health Requirements (e.g., OSHA related training, bloodborne pathogens, etc.)</p> <p>8.0 Job Assignment and Post Orders</p> <p>Depending upon the requirements and specifications applicable to the assignment, consideration should be given to the following additional training topics which include but are not limited to:</p> <p>9.0 Employer Orientation And Policies</p> <p>9.1 Substance Abuse</p> <p>9.2 Communications Modes (e.g., telephones, pagers, radios, computers)</p> <p>10.0 Workplace Violence</p> <p>11.0 Conflict Resolution Awareness</p> <p>12.0 Traffic Control and Parking Lot Security</p> <p>13.0 Crowd Control</p> <p>14.0 Procedures for First Aid, Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation (CPR), and Automatic External Defibrillators (AEDs)</p> <p>15.0 Crisis Management</p> <p>16.0 Labor Relations (strikes, lockouts, etc.)</p>
Annual Training	<p>Establishing a requirement for annual training. The training may consist of on the job training, classroom training, computer based training, or other forms of electronic medium based training. The type of training should be determined by such factors as the type of facility where the security officer is assigned, the duties of the security officer, the value of the assets being protected, and the level of security risks, threats, vulnerabilities, and criticality of the assignment.</p>

(continued)

Table 3: Training Criteria *(continued)*

Subject	Recommendations — Consideration should be given to:
Pre-Assignment Firearms Training	Establishing a requirement for a minimum range and classroom course, taught and administered by a state certified firearms instructor or approved current law enforcement or military firearms certified instructor. Applicants should be required to provide any prior information regarding the suspension or revocation of any firearms certification or license they may have held.
Post-Assignment Firearms Requirements	Establishing a requirement that security officers and security agencies notify the appropriate regulatory body of any discharge of a firearm in the course of the officer’s duties. The incident report should contain an explanation describing the nature of the incident, the necessity for using the firearm, and a copy of any report prepared by a law enforcement office. Additional firearms training may be required by the state agency.
Annual Firearms Training	Establishing a requirement that state mandated annual firearms training be followed.

12.0 REFERENCES/BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, Teresa. "Affairs of State." *Security Management*. May 2001, pp. 83–84.
- ASIS International. (2002). *ASIS International Glossary of Security Terms*, [Online]. Available: <http://www.asisonline.org/library/glossary/index.xml> [2002, 2003].
- Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth edition*. St. Paul, MN: West Publishing Co., 1990.
- Buck, Kelly. *Guidelines for Improved Automated Criminal History Record Systems for Effective Screening of Personnel*. Monterey, CA: The Department of Defense Personnel Security Research Center (PERSEREC), 2002.
- Canadian National Standards Board. *Security Guards and Security Guard Supervisors*. CAN/ CGB-133.1.99. Canadian General Standards Board, Standards Council of Canada. Ottawa, Canada K1A 1G6, November 1999.
- Castle, Reed A. *A Study of the Security Officer*. Commonwealth of Virginia, Department of Criminal Justice Services: Schroeder Measurement Technologies, Inc., April 2002.
- Conn. Gen. Stat. § 29-534 (2001). Private Detectives, Guard Services and Security Personnel. Web site: <http://www.cga.state.ct.us/2001/pub/Chap534.htm>
- Cunningham, William C., Taylor, Todd H. *Private Security and Police in America: The Hallcrest Report I*. Portland, OR: Chancellor Press, 1985.
- Cunningham, William C., John S. Strauchs, and Clifford W. Van Meter. *Private Security Trends 1970–2000: The Hallcrest Report II*. Boston, MA: Butterworth-Heinemann, 1990.
- Freedonia Group, Inc. *Private Security Services to 2006*. Cleveland, OH: The Freedonia Group, Inc., 2002.
- Goodboe, Michael E. "The Development of an Entry-Level Model Curriculum, Optimum Training Methodology, and Implementation and Evaluation Plans for Unarmed Contract Security Officers." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Nova Southeastern University, 1966.
- Horton, William. *Designing Web-Based Training: How to Teach Anyone Anything Anywhere Anytime*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons, 2000.
- Johnston, Les. "Regulating Private Security." *International Journal of the Sociology of Law*, Academic Press Limited. 1992, 20, pp. 1–16.
- Kay, Beverly and Sharon Jordan-Evans. *Love 'Em or Lose 'Em: Getting Good People to Stay*. San Francisco, CA: Barrett-Koehler, 1999.
- Kirkpatrick, Donald L. *Evaluating Training Programs: The Four Levels*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, 1998.

National Advisory Committee on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals. *Private Security: Report of the Task Force on Private Security*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA), 1976.

National Association of Security and Investigative Regulators. *Model State Statute for the Regulation of Private Security Officers and Their Employers*. Waterloo, IA: National Association of Security and Investigative Regulators, 2001. <http://www.iasir.org/pdf/NASIRGuardlawamended.pdf>

Peterson, Robyn. *Training Needs Analysis In the Workplace*. San Diego, CA: Pfeiffer & Company, 1992.

Pinkerton's Center for Professional Development. *Advanced Certification Training (ACT), Volumes 1, 2, and 3*. Arlington, VA: Pinkerton, Inc., 1997–2002.

Private-Sector Liaison Committee of the International Association of Chiefs of Police. *Private Security Officer Selection, Training and Licensing Guidelines*. Alexandria, VA: International Association of Chiefs of Police, 1998. <http://www.theiacp.org/documents/pdfs/Publications/privatesecurityofficer.pdf>

Private Security Advisory Council to the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA). *Model Security Guard Training Curricula*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, 1978.

“Private Security Officer Quality Assurance Act of 1997.” HR 103 EH, 105th Congress, First Session. 1997.

“Private Security Officer Quality Assurance Act of 1999.” HR 60 IH, 106th Congress, First Session. 1999.

Rosenburg, Marc J. *E-Learning*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill, 2000.

Spaninks, L., Quinn, L., & Byrne, J. in close co-operation with members of CoESS/ UNI-Europa. Final Report European Vocational Training Manual for Basic Guarding. Funded by the European Commission: DG Education and Culture + DG Employment and Social Affairs. Lyon, France: CoESS/UNI Europa, 2001. [http://www.union-network.org/uniproperty.nsf/0/5c819184fa80aefac1256b45003f4505/\\$FILE/Training%20Manual.pdf](http://www.union-network.org/uniproperty.nsf/0/5c819184fa80aefac1256b45003f4505/$FILE/Training%20Manual.pdf)

Vocational-Technical Education Consortium of States. *A Catalog of Performance Objectives and Performance Guides For Security Guard*. Detroit, MI: Wayne State University College of Education and Michigan Department of Education Vocational-Technical Education Service, 1978.

Wackenhut Training Institute. Wackenhut Security Officer Training Materials. Palm Beach Gardens, FL: The Wackenhut Corporation, 1999, 2003.

Weber, Tina, comp. A Comparative Overview of Legislation Governing the Private Security Industry in the European Union. Final Report of a project for CoESS/UNI-Europa funded by the European Commission, Version 31/01/2002. Dr. Tina Weber, ECOTEC Research and Consulting Ltd., Birmingham, UK: Priestly House, 2002. [http://www.union-network.org/uniproperty.nsf/0/6878ecb710bd395bc1256bc3004318b0/\\$FILE/legislations%20analysis%20-%20final%20report.pdf](http://www.union-network.org/uniproperty.nsf/0/6878ecb710bd395bc1256bc3004318b0/$FILE/legislations%20analysis%20-%20final%20report.pdf)

13.0 APPENDIX A

Adjudication Scoring Considerations for Education Verification

Score as Approved if any of the following conditions exist:
All information provided by applicant is verified with no discrepancies.

Score as Pending if any of the following conditions exist:
The educational institutional was not located.
Three attempts on three days, no response was received from the educational institution.
No high school diploma/GED can be found.
Institution cannot verify applicant's attendance due to unavailable records.
Discrepancy in dates outside a 90-day window.

Score as Unacceptable if any of the following conditions exist:
Institution verifies that applicant never attended.
Discrepancy in major course of study or degree earned.

Adjudication Scoring Considerations for Employment Verification

Score as Approved if any of the following conditions exist:
All information provided by applicant is verified.
Applicant is eligible for rehire.

Score as Pending if any of the following conditions exist:
The place of employment was not located.
Three attempts on three days, no response was received from the employer.
Minor discrepancy in the position held.
Discrepancy in dates outside a 90-day window.
Not eligible for rehire.

Score as Unacceptable if any of the following conditions exist:
Applicant never worked at business indicated on the application.
Major discrepancy in the position held.
Terminated for cause.

Adjudication Scoring Considerations for Social Security Number Traces

Score as Approved if any of the following conditions exist:
Name and Social Security Number (SSN) match.

Score as Pending if any of the following conditions exist:
If the last name does not match but it is reasonable to assume it is a maiden name.
No record found.
Two or more names (other than applicant's) listed on the report.
Applicant's name appears incorrectly.

Score as Unacceptable if any of the following conditions exist:
A message reports that the SSN has not been issued.
Applicant's name does not appear on the trace.

Adjudication Scoring Considerations for Motor Vehicle Registration Verification

Score as Approved if any of the following conditions exist:
Name and license number match.
Clear record.

Score as Pending if any of the following conditions exist:
Driver not found or not a driver.
Subject has ID record only.
Current status active, but record shows suspension or revocation in the past five years.
Three or more tickets, moving violations, or accidents within the past five years.

Score as Unacceptable if any of the following conditions exist:
DUI (Driving Under the Influence)/DWI (Driving While Intoxicated) convictions in the past three years.
Expired or suspended status.
Criminal (felony) vehicular conviction within the last three years.

This page intentionally left blank.

This page intentionally left blank.



ASIS International (ASIS) is the preeminent organization for security professionals, with more than 33,000 members worldwide. Founded in 1955, ASIS is dedicated to increasing the effectiveness and productivity of security professionals by developing educational programs and materials that address broad security interests, such as the ASIS Annual Seminar and Exhibits, as well as specific security topics. ASIS also advocates the role and value of the security management profession to business, the media, governmental entities, and the public. By providing members and the security community with access to a full range of programs and services, and by publishing the industry's number one magazine — *Security Management* — ASIS leads the way for advanced and improved security performance.



Advancing Security Worldwide™

1625 Prince Street
Alexandria, VA 22314-2818 USA
703-519-6200
Fax: 703-519-6299
www.asisonline.org

ISBN 1-887056-57-2



9 781887 105657 1