



ETITO

ETITO CONSULTATION

Security Industry

**Certificate of Approval and ETITO
Qualifications**

December 2007

Report Purpose

This report summarises information gathered during Security Industry consultation in August/September 2007 and is intended to inform the development of a Security Industry strategic training plan and provide detail to support qualification development. Security companies were consulted [see Appendix 1 for consultation process], but as yet training provider viewpoints have not been formally included [to be included in 2008]. Further consultation will occur for both the Strategic Training Plan and specific qualification development. Strategic Training Plan consultation will occur again in 2008 and thereafter annually. Notification of qualification development/reviews is placed on the ETITO website 6 weeks before this work is to occur in addition to direct notification to the Advisory Group Chairman. ETITO welcomes your views at these times.

Rationale for this consultation

Following on from the 2005 ETITO research project, in early 2007 the Security Industry Research Group on Improving Educational Products presented a submission to ETITO management team listing a number of prioritised recommendations for improvements to the suite of educational products on offer.

ETITO management team accepted the submission and agreed to investigate some of the recommendations in 2007. Consultation occurred in August/September 2007 and questions were designed to meet the needs of these investigations, and to also support the development of a draft strategic training plan for the industry.

The highest priority research group recommendation for both Electronic Security and Staff Services was to consult the security industry regarding entry criteria into programmes. The following is an excerpt from that submission:

The research group discussions had centred on making a Certificate of Approval mandatory for entry to all security qualifications, although this was then modified to a police check on criminal records. There was support for the idea, but also concern regarding how long these processes take and that for some areas of security currently there is no requirement for a Certificate of Approval.

Anecdotal evidence is of people participating in security training while having personal histories that mean a Certificate of Approval is very unlikely to be granted. This was seen as devaluing the qualification and creating a problem for the industry and possibly wasting time and resources for the trainee. If this issue could be resolved, it was seen as the highest priority in resolving issues to do with the credibility and consistency of educational products.

To explore this further the following question was included in the survey:
What are your thoughts regarding a person needing to have a Certificate of Approval before entering the security/electronic security qualifications?

Results

- Most respondents were very supportive of Certificate of Approval [COA] being necessary for entry into the qualification as there seems very little point in training people who are unable to legally work in the industry.
Comments for a COA included:
 - We don't employ people without applying for this – Why should we train people who we have no knowledge of their background in areas that may provide them an insight into procedures that could potentially assist them if they are criminals?
 - To refrain from this criteria will be to the detriment of the security industry country wide.
- Comments against a COA included:
 - Someone beginning a course may not be qualified to get a COA – the process of doing the course helps them become able to get one.
- The compromise would be to make COA a requirement for award of the qualification rather than entry.
 - No support for entry, but yes for award of Level 3 [not level 2].
 - As an entry criteria it wouldn't work – but for award of the level 3 qualification it wouldn't be a barrier. But not for award of level 2.

Other points raised that would need to be considered at review/revision:

- Wording on the Special Note in the qualification document will need to be carefully considered to suit court security where legislation that is different to the rest of the security industry applies, and COA is not the term used.
 - What about courts security – no COA – would have to fit wording to suit that context too and what about new legislation – better to wait and tie all together then.
 - Who pays though? It introduces more administration for PTEs and the current system works fine
- Making COA [or its courts equivalent] a requirement for award of the Level 3/4 qualification rather than entry is a compromise that would seem to meet many of the issues raised. It addresses the concerns raised in the original research group submission as the qualification would only be awarded to those with a COA, maintaining the value and credibility of the Level 3/4 qualification. It also allows room for a trainee to grow through training to become able to get a COA.

Summary

- There is wide industry support for requiring a COA [or its court equivalent] before the award of the National Certificate in Security with strands at level 3 or 4
- A COA would seem to address the issues raised by the research group for Improving Educational Products regarding consistency and credibility of the qualification.

Comments about the content of this report are welcome. Please email any comments to: jeremytu@etito.co.nz

APPENDIX 1 – Consultation Process

A similar set of questions were put to both electronic security and security staff services companies/workers. This was in response to comments from both sectors on the fact that they are one industry. The research questions were formulated to provide both qualitative and quantitative data.

To source respondents the following organisations were asked to suggest contacts: NZSA, ASIS International New Zealand Chapter, Service and Food Workers Union, Public Service Association, Security Officers Association, Unite, the SITAB Expert Working Group team leaders for projects covered by the research, and Aviation, Tourism & Travel Training Organisation.

Other respondents were sourced from the Yellow Pages and from the ETITO database. The aim was to ensure representation for companies ranging in size, from the length and breadth of the country and from the varying sectors of the industry, as well as ensuring representation of individual security officers, particularly those who could be termed senior officers/team leaders.

Potential respondents were initially contacted by phone and could either complete the questionnaire in person, by phone or by email. Most contacted chose email because of time and logistical concerns, these concerns also saw a low response rate from those who agreed to complete the survey.

For Security Staff Services, total of 63 companies or organisations were contacted, 38 surveys were sent out and 16 were received completed.

For Electronic Security, total of 33 companies or organisations were contacted, 28 surveys were sent out and 10 were received completed.