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SENATE VOTE: 38-0

SUBJECT: School safety: school security officers and security guards

SUMMARY: Requires all security guards working on the property of a California Community College (CCC) district to complete the latest training developed by the Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA) and requires districts to provide the training to all security guards during their regular work hours. Specifically, this bill:

1) Deletes the requirement, as of July 1, 2021, that only security guards working more than 20 hours per week must complete the specified training developed by the Bureau of Security and Investigative Services (BSIS) of the DCA, and instead requires all security guards working on the property of a CCC district to complete the training.

2) Requires a CCC district to provide the required training to all school security officers who are employees of the school district, and requires that the training be provided during the employee’s regular work hours, unless otherwise negotiated and mutually agreed upon with the employee’s exclusive representative.

3) States that a CCC district is not required to provide training to security guards who are not employees of the school district, but who work on district property pursuant to a contract with a private licensed security agency.

EXISTING LAW:

1) Authorizes the governing board of a community college district may establish a community college police department under the supervision of a community college chief of police and, as specified, may employ personnel as necessary to enforce the law on or near the campus of the community college and on or near other grounds or properties owned, operated, controlled, or administered by the community college or by the state acting on behalf of the community college. Each campus of a multi-campus community college district may designate a chief of police. (Education Code (EDC) Section 72330)

2) Requires that, after July 1, 2000, every school security officer employed by a community college district who works more than 20 hours a week as a school security officer shall complete a course of training developed no later than July 1, 1999, by the BSIS of the DCA in consultation with the Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST). If any community college security officer subject to the requirements of this subdivision is required to carry a firearm while employed, that security officer shall additionally satisfy the training requirements of Section 832 of the Penal Code. Further stipulates that every security officer employed by a community college district prior to July 1, 2000, who works more than 20 hours a week as a school security officer shall meet the requirements above by July 1, 2002, unless he or she has completed an equivalent course of instruction pursuant to Section 832.2 of the Penal Code. (EDC Section 72330.5)
3) Provides that any peace officer employed by a K-12 public school district who has completed training as prescribed shall be designated a school police officer. (Penal Code (PEN) 830.32)

**FISCAL EFFECT:** According to the Senate Appropriations Committee, the bill’s requirement for school districts and community colleges to provide the required training could result in local costs in the low millions of dollars over time. This assumes there are between 7,000 and 10,000 security guards working in K-12 and community college districts statewide earning between $15 and $20 per hour, and that the training takes 24 hours to complete at a cost of $90 each. The estimate could be higher or lower depending on the exact number of security guards as well as the wages they are earning. Further, because the bill requires security guards to complete the latest training developed, additional ongoing training would be required (as updates from the DCA become available) rather than just completing it once.

**COMMENTS:** *Double-referral.* SB 390 was double-referred to the Assembly Education Committee, where it passed on June 19, 2019 with a 7-0 vote.

*Need for the bill.* According to the author, “Today’s students are faced with increasingly complex stressors including bullying, gun violence, gangs, social media, and drug abuse. An estimated half of the state’s school security employees are part-time and limiting the training to those with more than 20 hours leaves many employees without the skills necessary to perform their jobs. California should demonstrate its commitment to student safety by training all security personnel, regardless of whether they are full or part-time. The best way to create a safe school atmosphere involves using a school security team that is up to date, and well trained in all aspects of the law and the evolving needs of the student population.”

*School security guard training requirement.* All security guards or school security officers employed by a district for more than 20 hours per week must complete a training course developed by the BSIS in consultation with the Commission on POST. This requirement first took effect July 1, 2000, and affects only guards employed pursuant to a contract between a K-12 school district or California community college district and a private patrol operator.

The course is a total of 24 hours, consisting of the following components:

1) Role and Responsibility of School Security Officer (4 hours).
2) Laws and Liability (8 hours).
3) Security Awareness in the Educational Environment (3 hours).
4) Mediation/Conflict Resolution (4 hours).
5) Disasters and Emergencies (1 hour).
6) Dynamics of Student Behavior (3 hours).
7) Examination (1 hour).
Alternative approaches to preventing school violence. Following the deadly shootings at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Florida, a group of over 200 universities, national education and mental health groups, school districts and more than 2,300 individual experts signed on to “A Call for Action to Prevent Gun Violence in the United States of America.” This document suggests that rather than having armed officers, metal detectors, or locked doors in schools, the focus should be on prevention by improving the social and emotional health of the students. Their eight point plan includes the following elements:

1) A national requirement for all schools to assess school climate and maintain physically and emotionally safe conditions and positive school environments that protect all students and adults from bullying, discrimination, harassment, and assault.

2) A ban on assault-style weapons, high-capacity ammunition magazines, and products that modify semi-automatic firearms to enable them to function like automatic firearms.

3) Adequate staffing (such as counselors, psychiatrists, psychologists, and social workers) of coordinated school- and community-based mental health services for individuals with risk factors for violence, recognizing that violence is not intrinsically a product of mental illness.

4) Reform of school discipline to reduce exclusionary practices and foster positive social, behavioral, emotional, and academic success for students.

5) Universal background checks to screen out violent offenders, persons who have been hospitalized for violence towards self or others, and persons on no-fly, terrorist watch lists.

6) A national program to train and maintain school- and community-based threat assessment teams that include mental health and law enforcement partners. Threat assessment programs should include practical channels of communication for persons to report potential threats as well as interventions to resolve conflicts and assist troubled individuals.

7) Removal of legal barriers to sharing safety-related information among educational, mental health, and law enforcement agencies in cases where a person has threatened violence.

8) Laws establishing Gun Violence Protection Orders that allow courts to issue time-limited restraining orders requiring that firearms be recovered by law enforcement when there is evidence that an individual is planning to carry out acts against others or against themselves.

This document lays out a more comprehensive approach to preventing school violence but, among other things, requires significant investments in pupil support services.

Arguments in support. The California Teachers Association writes that “…SB 390 requires school security officers and security guards to complete a course of training during regular work hours developed by the BSIS of the DCA in consultation with the Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training regardless of the number of hours worked per week and to compete the training course annually. It is imperative schools do all within their power to guarantee students and employees are safe both at school and off-site school sponsored activities. Training will benefit not only the security officers and guards but will ensure a safe environment for students and staff. Consistent and professional training linked to state standards is necessary given recent events.”
REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:

Support

California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO
California School Employees Association
California State PTA
California Teachers Association

Opposition

None of file.
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