

2

1993
Executive Research Project
BE1

AD-A276 928



Training Air National Guard Contract Security Personnel: How Much Is Enough?

Lieutenant Colonel
Jan C. Hoffmaster
Air National Guard

DTIC
ELECTE
MAR 14 1994
S E D

Faculty Research Advisor
Colonel Gary Leeling, USA



The Industrial College of the Armed Forces
National Defense University
Fort McNair, Washington, D.C. 20319-6000

Approved for public release
Distribution unlimited

94 3 10 019

508194-07881

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

1a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified		1b. RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS	
2a. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY N/A		3. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF REPORT Distribution Statement A: Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.	
2b. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE N/A		5. MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S) Same	
4. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S) NDU-ICAF-93-BE1		7a. NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION National Defense University	
6a. NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION Industrial College of the Armed Forces	6b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable) ICAF-FAP	7b. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) Fort Lesley J. McNair Washington, D.C. 20319-6000	
6c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) Fort Lesley J. McNair Washington, D.C. 20319-6000		9. PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER	
8a. NAME OF FUNDING/SPONSORING ORGANIZATION	8b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable)	10. SOURCE OF FUNDING NUMBERS	
8c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code)		PROGRAM ELEMENT NO.	PROJECT NO.
		TASK NO.	WORK UNIT ACCESSION NO.
11. TITLE (Include Security Classification) Training Air National Guard Contract Security Personnel: How much is Enough?			
12. PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) Jan C. Hoffmaster			
13a. TYPE OF REPORT Research	13b. TIME COVERED FROM Aug 92 TO Apr 93	14. DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day) April 1993	15. PAGE COUNT 53
16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION			
17. COSATI CODES		18. SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)	
FIELD	GROUP	SUB-GROUP	
19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) SEE ATTACHED			
20. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT ☒ UNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED ☒ SAME AS RPT. ☐ DTIC USERS		21. ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified	
22a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL Judy Clark		22b. TELEPHONE (Include Area Code) (202) 475-1889	22c. OFFICE SYMBOL ICAF-FAP

**1993
Executive Research Project
BE1**

Training Air National Guard Contract Security Personnel: How Much Is Enough?

**Lieutenant Colonel
Jan C. Hoffmaster
Air National Guard**

Faculty Research Advisor
Colonel Gary Leeling, USA



**The Industrial College of the Armed Forces
National Defense University
Fort McNair, Washington, D.C. 20319-6000**

Accession For	
NTIS	CRA&I ☒
DTIC	TAB ☐
Unannounced ☐	
Justification	
By	
Distribution /	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A-1	

DISCLAIMER

This research report represents the views of the author and does not necessarily reflect the official opinion of the Industrial College of the Armed Forces, the National Defense University, or the Department of Defense.

This document is the property of the United States Government and is not to be reproduced in whole or in part for distribution outside the federal executive branch without permission of the Director of Research and Publications, Industrial College of the Armed Forces, Fort Lesley J. McNair, Washington, D.C. 20319-6000.

ABSTRACT

The Air National Guard has military installations located across 54 states and territories--from Alaska to the Virgin Islands and from Maine to Guam. Occupying these installations are aerospace weapon systems and resources which are tasked by the Department of Defense for both peacetime and wartime missions. The day-to-day security of these installations is provided by a variety of security forces ranging from military security police to contracted security guards. The training of these contract security guards varies between installations and between states. This research considers whether or not a training program should be standardized for all Air National Guard contract security personnel.

The results of this research suggest that the Air National Guard *should* prescribe a required standard of entry level training for all *contract* security guards. Furthermore, the research suggests that a security Code of Ethics should be prepared for *all* Air National Guard security force personnel.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	ii
CHAPTER I	1
SECURITY OF AIR NATIONAL GUARD INSTALLATIONS	1
Introduction	1
Contract Security Concept	2
Security Force Composition	4
Contract Security Perspective	5
CHAPTER II	8
TRAINING CONTRACT SECURITY FORCES	8
The Individual	8
Private Sector Standards	8
Air National Guard Standards	10
Vicarious Liability	12
Training Summary	13
CHAPTER III	14
SECURITY CODE OF ETHICS	14
Ethics and Morality	14
Ethical Standards	15
Code Content	16
CHAPTER IV	20
ANG CONTRACT SECURITY IN OPERATION	20
Introduction	20
California	21
Connecticut	23
Massachusetts	25
Minnesota	26
New York	28
Pennsylvania	30
Rhode Island	31
South Dakota	32

Summary	34
CHAPTER V	35
CONCLUSIONS	35
Summary of Findings	35
Policy Implications	36
APPENDIX A	38
The Cooperative Security Funding Agreement	38
BIBLIOGRAPHY	40
ENDNOTES	42

CHAPTER I

SECURITY OF AIR NATIONAL GUARD INSTALLATIONS

Introduction

The Air National Guard presently consists of 92 flying units located across 54 states and territories. In addition to these units, the Air Guard also maintains approximately 540 mission support units (MSU) such as Tactical Control Squadrons, Combat Communications Squadrons, and civil engineering units. Assigned to all of these Air National Guard units are approximately 118,000 personnel as well as 1500 wartime tasked aircraft (Fact and Figures, 1991). The people and equipment of the Air National Guard must be provided a safe and secure environment in which to conduct routine, peacetime operations.

The day-to-day peacetime security of Air National Guard personnel, equipment, installations and information is provided by a security force assigned to, or hired by, the individual Guard installation. The employment status of the members of this security force includes full-time Air National Guard Security Police personnel, state employed security guards, Title V Department of the Air Force civilian guards, private contract security, or

local law enforcement agency peace officers. This diversity in security personnel is the result of the latitude available at the local level in the selection and hiring of a peacetime security force to provide local resource protection. However, oversight and funding responsibility for all security forces within the Air National Guard rests with the Security Police Directorate at the Air National Guard Readiness Center (ANGRC/SP), Andrews Air Force Base, Maryland.

Non-military members of these security forces are governed by a variety of labor and arbitration agreements which represent their respective employment statuses (i.e. state employee, private contract, police agency). This variation has caused some apprehension among oversight personnel because it precludes a standardized and institutionalized approach to security. The full-time military personnel, notwithstanding their location, derive their source of authority from federal statute. Their training and ability to carry firearms is contained within Air Force and Air National Guard directives. They are covered under the Federal Torts Claims Act. Their pay, grade structure, and schedule of benefits are contained within a standardized and programmatic manpower package. Many of these conditions do not exist for the non-military security guards on an Air National Guard installation.

Contract Security Concept

Of the 92 Air National Guard flying units, eleven are located on active duty Air Force installations and therefore, the responsibility for security falls to the host active duty

forces. The remaining 81 units must be protected by some form of proprietary security. Historically, a peacetime security force was only allocated to Air National Guard flying unit locations. The units not collocated with a flying unit, known as Geographically Separated Units (GSUs), had to use a "lock-it and leave-it" policy and an arrangement with a local law enforcement agency to monitor the property. However, at the time of this writing, in addition to the 81 flying unit locations there are 23 GSUs which are using proprietary security.

Funding designated to hire these contract security forces is provided to the installations via an Operations and Maintenance "Cooperative Security Funding Agreement" (O&M Agreement). The Agreement is drawn between the United States Property and Fiscal Officer (USP&FO), acting as the money recipient on behalf of each state with it's respective installations, and the Security Police Directorate, acting as the provider on behalf of the National Guard Bureau. One standardized agreement is utilized for all of the 54 states and territories. The Agreement is an 11-page, single-spaced, typewritten document the majority of which is the usual contracting legalese. Section 9 of the agreement--"Facilities and Services"--contains the sum and substance of what security service is to be provided at the installation level. (Section 9 has been reproduced in Appendix One of this paper.)

In 1992, the total funding line for the Cooperative Security Funding Agreement was \$35M. The individual installation dollar figure is determined by ANGRC/SP and is based upon a very subjective but historical trend of "what was allocated to the installation in the

past and what are the requirements for this year." The total of these figures is measured against the total available funding line in this year's O&M security budget. Once the money has been dispersed to the installation, it is within an installation's authority to determine the most cost effective method which meets the security requirements of the installation. As indicated above, the discretionary latitude of this system has led to a qualitatively diverse group of field security forces ranging from minimum wage "door rattlers" to security guards who possess state powers of arrest.

Security Force Composition

A security force at a typical Air National Guard flying installation consists of 18 O&M contract security guards. This number translates into a one-person, 24-hour post for each of the following: the main gate, a resource protection patrol, and a flightline patrol. At the majority of Air National Guard installations, the contract security forces are the only forces immediately available to perform the routine duties and responsibilities normally associated with a law enforcement agency.

Due to the fact that the security forces are *contract forces*, their ability to answer the operational needs of the installation commander is sometimes questionable. For example: some labor agreements do not permit schedule changes without 48-hour pre-notification, nor do they permit the installation commander to establish grooming or physical fitness standards.

Although overtime pay is sometimes required for contract security forces, ANGRC/SP has denied requests to dedicate O&M security agreement dollars to compensate for overtime pay. (This decision was made due to the inability of ANGRC/SP to control overtime hours at the unit level.) Additionally, some contract guards are limited from carrying the weapon which is available in the Guard inventory.

In 1989, ANGRC/SP initiated a program, utilizing full-time Air National Guard military personnel, to provide a level of security for ANG wartime tasked aircraft commensurate with similar aircraft assigned to the active duty forces. At the request of ANGRC/SP, a Manpower Engineering Study was conducted to determine the number of military security police positions required to accomplish this task. The study concluded that approximately 300 additional full-time military personnel positions are required to provide this commensurate security. Although a Program Objective Memorandum (POM) initiative has been submitted in an attempt to add the military security police personnel, contract security will continue to be required for entry control, resource protection, and, until other military manpower is obtained, for aircraft security.

Contract Security Perspective

From the perspective of the individual unit, the O&M Agreement allows the installation commander to determine his security needs and utilize the provided money

accordingly. Some units utilize private security firms, some contract with local law enforcement agencies and some use state-employed security guards. Under the Resource Management System, any of the O&M Cooperative Security Funding Agreement monies which are allocated to an installation but not utilized for security purposes can be reallocated for other uses on base. This is accomplished via a Standard Form 30 which permits a modification to the Agreement and thereby allows the installation commander to budget his installation's total allocation of O&M dollars in a manner he deems appropriate to properly manage the base. Some units set a high priority on security and feel that the O&M agreement does not provide sufficient funds to fulfill their needs while other units set a low priority on security and have excess O&M funds which are utilized elsewhere. These differences in priority may be due to differences in local threat analysis or may be due to differences in security consciousness.

From the ANGRC/SP corporate perspective, the Cooperative Security Funding Agreement ensures an equitable distribution of available funds to provide a safe and secure environment for the personnel and property on an Air National Guard installation. But it is not the intent of the Agreement to permit one unit to hire quasi-law enforcement officers while another unit hires less than proficient, semi-skilled security guards. In addition, the Agreement does not provide an "across-the-board" institutionalized approach for contract security personnel.

Two significant factors which are missing from this present form of contract security,

which are present in security forces of the private sector, are a standardized training program and a Code of Ethics for security personnel (National Advisory Committee on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, 1976). The following chapters in this report are designed to explore logically the following questions: Does the present form of contractual security at Air National Guard installations provide an adequate level of security when considering both the unit level perspective and the Air National Guard corporate perspective? And in either case, should more across-the-board standardization be required in the form of training and/or a code of ethics?

CHAPTER II

TRAINING CONTRACT SECURITY FORCES

The Individual

The typical private guard is an aging white male who is poorly educated and poorly paid. Depending upon where in the country he works and on his type of employer...he has the following characteristics: His average age is between 40 and 55; he has little education beyond the ninth grade; he has had a few years of experience in private security; he earns a marginal wage...he receives few fringe benefits. (Kakalik and Wildhorn, 1972).

To prevent and avoid this stereotype of a "rent-a-cop" as promulgated by this Rand Corporation report of 1972, the Air National Guard must ensure that its contracted security forces are a well trained and responsible force. This chapter will compare the training standards of Air National Guard contract security forces, in accordance with the existing directives, with the generally acceptable training standards for security guards in the private sector.

Private Sector Standards

The formal training of any security force is provided for a variety of reasons. The

most salient of these reasons is to ensure that the force will accomplish the duties and responsibilities for which it was constituted. Shearing and Stenning (1980) speculate that the most important objective of security guard agencies in training their personnel is "to ensure that guards know what they are to do when they get to the job and further that they know how to provide a written report on what they have done." The Private Security Task Force (PSTF) recommends that every contract security guard receive a least an 8-hour block of training prior to employment and another 32-hour block of training within 3 months after assignment. The minimum pre-employment training as prescribed by the PSTF is as follows.

Section I-Orientation (2 hours)	Minutes
What is security?	15
Public Relations	15
Department	15
Appearance	10
Maintenance and safeguarding of uniforms and/or equipment	20
Note taking/Reporting	15
Role of public law enforcement	10
Section II-Legal Powers & Limitations (2 hours)	
Prevention versus apprehension	40
Use of force	25
Search and seizure	15
Arrest powers	20
Section III-Handling Emergencies (2 hours)	
Procedures for bomb threats	40
Procedures during fires, explosions, floods, riots, and so forth	60
Section IV-General Duties (2 hours)	
Patrol	40
Fire prevention and control	30
Safety	30
TOTAL 8 HOURS	

Air National Guard Standards

The Air National Guard Cooperative Security Funding Agreement does not specify a requirement for pre-employment training.¹ As previously indicated, there are Guard installations in 54 states and territories, but according to a survey by Moore and Spain (1989), only 28% of the states impose some type of pre-employment training requirement for private and contract security employees.

STATE-IMPOSED TRAINING REQUIREMENTS									
AL	N	ID	N	MI	Y	NY	N	TN	N
AK	Y	IL	Y	MN	N	NC	*	TX	Y
AZ	Y	IN	N	MS	N	ND	N	UT	Y
CA	Y	IA	*	MO	N	OH	N	VT	*
CO	N	KS	*	MT	Y	OK	N	VA	Y
CT	*	KY	N	NE	N	OR	N	WA	N
DE	N	LA	Y	NV	*	PA	*	WV	**
FL	*	ME	N	NH	*	RI	**	WI	Y
GA	Y	MD	N	NJ	N	SC	Y	WY	N
HI	N	MA	N	NM	N	SD	N	AR	Y
Y=Yes N=No *If firearms are carried **Not in private security status									
Source: Moore and Spain, July 1989									

The only area of the Cooperative Security Funding Agreement which addresses training is Section 9a(2). This training would be "after assignment" to an ANG contract security force.

Section 9a(2) states that the individual Guard installation will provide...

Training for personnel employed specifically for ANG security duty in accordance with Department of Defense, Air Force, and Air National Guard security standards. This training will be accomplished by or planned by the assigned unit security officer. This provision is not intended to circumvent or avoid any stated requirements for training, which may be imposed in addition to those required for this purpose.

National Guard Regulation NGR (AF) 125-037 DRAFT dated 26 February 1993, states...

Chapter 18. (Added). ANG State Contract (O&M) Guards: The National Guard Bureau (NGB), in an agreement with State USPFs, is assigned funds to provide security protection for ANG resources and assets. State contract guards (O&M) or bona fide security agency is [sic] hired to provide this type of service. The commander with the advise [sic] of the BSEC [Base Security Executive Council] will determine job description, training, arming in accordance with applicable regulations and uniform requirements.

Therefore, since there are no specific training standards within ANG regulations for contract security guards, the generalized language of the Agreement gives considerable latitude to the "assigned unit security officer" in setting a training agenda for the contract security guards at his location. This leads to the question, "Does the language of the Air National Guard Cooperative Security Funding Agreement allow too much latitude in training standards? Is it possible that some ANG installations rely on a contract security force that has not received sufficient quality training to accomplish Air National Guard security tasks?" An attempt will be made to answer this question in a subsequent chapter; for now, let us consider another salient reason for providing training--to reduce vicarious liability.

Vicarious Liability

An employer may be held liable for the actions of its employees which are carried out within the scope of their employment. In addition, the employee is also liable for his actions and it is no defense for him to say that he was representing his employer at the time of the action. (*United States vs. Wise*, 1962) "Depending upon contract terms and the degree of authority and direction exercised as the contracting entity, organizations could also be held liable for the actions of contract security services and products used by them." (Cunningham and Taylor, 1985, p.40) In any litigation involving the actions of an O&M contract security guard, the "employer" (i.e. the unit, the state, or NGB) would have to be identified by the court; however, the very fact that vicarious liability exists points to the need for adequate training of contract security guards.

At least one study considering the impact of training on company liability found that only when security companies, or companies with their own guards, find liability verdicts exceed the cost of training will they be concerned with training (Moore, 1990). A survey of the participants at the International Security Conference in August 1989 illustrated their concern regarding security training by their answer to the following: "What, in your opinion, is the biggest challenge facing private security?" The most frequent response was "lack of security training." (Cunningham, Strauchs and Van Meter, 1990)

Training Summary

In this chapter we have seen the extreme importance of the proper training of contract security forces. This training accomplishes several tasks, none the least of which is: to accomplish the duties and responsibilities of the force, ensure guards know what they are supposed to do and when to do it, and reduce the vicarious liability risks of the guard's employer.

We have also noted in this chapter the latitude afforded to the Air National Guard installation "assigned security officer" in setting their own training agenda. In a later chapter (Chapter IV) we will look at a sample of individual guard units to determine if proper training is being provided or should a training agenda be regulated upon the unit commanders by the O&M Cooperative Security Funding Agreement.

CHAPTER III

SECURITY CODE OF ETHICS

Ethics and Morality

"The term "ethics" is defined as the discipline dealing with what is right and with moral duty and obligation; as a set of moral values; or as the principles of conduct governing an individual or group" (Cunningham et al. 1990, p. 47). Runkle (1982) stated that ethics offer guidance when we are in a quandary and want to know where our moral duty lies. This chapter will examine ethical standards, what they are, and how they may apply to persons involved in the security profession. Specifically, in lieu of a standardized training regime for Air National Guard contract security forces, would a security Code of Ethics provide a semblance of standardization for all ANG contract security?

Considered in this chapter will be the contract security guards at Air National Guard installations. Also included in this chapter are some proposed topic areas which should be incorporated into a code of ethics for security personnel. The chapter concludes with two examples of security codes of ethics—one dated 1972 and the one dated 1990—which could be

adapted for a code within the Cooperative Security Funding Agreement.

Ethical and moral standards vary among individuals. Whether or not a particular issue is ethically or morally correct transcends that individual's own cultural, legal, religious and political beliefs. According to Karp and Abramms (1992) there are divergent views of the term "ethics." At one end of the spectrum ethics are viewed as a "set of high moral principles" while at the other end they are a "set of specific behaviors whose only function is to keep a person out of the slammer" (p. 37). This divergence strikes at the very heart of the problem when dealing with or contemplating the necessity and/or preparation of a code of ethics for an organization. There is not a generally agreed upon conceptual framework outlining what constitutes "ethics." Who's morality should be used when measuring the baseline for a code of ethical behavior?

Ethical Standards

In the early 1970's the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) under the United States Department of Justice had, as one of his sub-committees, the Private Security Advisory Council. One of the products of this council was the publication of the Code of Ethics for Private Security Management and Private Security Employees. This report emphasized "the need for ethical conduct and performance on the part of all segments of private security" (p. 1).

The Council noted that the members of a security force are entrusted with the safety and protection of the people of the client organization; therefore, the security guards are constantly dealing with the human frailties and the moral weaknesses of others which lead to violations of the law. The most significant element is that private security has emerged as a significant part of crime prevention and this dictates that its role, as well as the conduct and performance expected of its members, be properly defined (President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, 1976).

Codes of ethics are not regulations or statutory laws. "A Code of Ethics prescribes the moral duties and obligations, based upon ethical philosophies and principles, that form a model of "right" action" (President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, 1976, p.1). Accordingly, the Council agreed that every security force should be governed by a code of ethics. Most of the 300 respondents to a survey about ethics mailed to various types of businesses indicated that a majority of companies feel that a code of ethics makes their employees aware of ethical considerations when dealing with company matters; however, some still believe that a code of ethics will not deter a wrongdoer (Berenheim, 1988).

Code Content

The Private Security Advisory Council proposed that a code of ethics for a private or

contract security firm cover certain topic areas within the code. Some of these topic areas should pertain to the security force *employees*, some should pertain to security *management*, and some topic areas should pertain to *both*. The following are the topic areas, as proposed by the Council, which should be considered in a security code of ethics.

<u>Topic Areas</u>	<u>Management</u>	<u>Employee</u>
Recognition of Law	X	X
Honor, Justice, Morality	X	X
Quality of Service/Improvement of Skills	X	
Observance of the Law	X	X
Fairness of Objectivity		X
Employment Policy	X	
Cooperation with Public Authority	X	X
Confidentiality	X	X
Non-Salary Compensation		X
Disclosure of Criminal/Unethical Conduct	X	X
Professional Conduct	X	X
Education and Training	X	X

From these topic areas, the Private Security Advisory Council suggested that the following Code of Ethics be considered for adoption by all groups within private security (President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, 1976).

In recognition of the significant contribution of private security to crime prevention and reduction, as a private security employee, I pledge:

I

To accept the responsibilities and fulfill the obligations of my role: protecting life and property; preventing and reducing crimes against my employer's business, or other organizations and institutions to which I am assigned; upholding the law; and respecting the constitutional rights of all persons.

II

To conduct myself with honesty and integrity and to adhere to the highest moral principles in the performance of my security duties.

III

To be faithful, diligent, and dependable in discharging my duties, and to uphold at all time the laws, policies, and procedures that protect the rights of others.

IV

To observe the precepts of truth, accuracy and prudence, without allowing personal feelings, prejudices, animosities or friendships to influence my judgments.

V

To report to my superiors, without hesitation, any violation of the law or of my employer's or client's regulations.

VI

To respect and protect the confidential and privileged information of my employer or client beyond the term of my employment, except where their interests are contrary to law or to this Code of Ethics.

The reason for contemplating a code of ethics for Air National Guard contract security forces would be an attempt to standardize a system which has not been institutionalized by the present form of O&M contract security. "Ethics form the structure that converts values into action" (Karp and Abramms, 1992, p. 39).

The American Society for Industrial Security has adopted the following as their Code of Ethics (American Society for Industrial Security, 1992).

Aware that the quality of professional security activity ultimately depends upon the willingness of practitioners to observe special standards of conduct and to manifest good faith in professional relationships, the American Society for Industrial Security adopts the following Code of Ethics and mandates its conscientious

observance as a binding condition of membership in or affiliation with the Society:

- I. A member shall perform professional duties in accordance with the law and the highest moral principles.
- II. A member shall observe the precepts of truthfulness, honesty and integrity.
- III. A member shall be faithful and diligent in discharging professional responsibilities.
- IV. A member shall be competent in discharging professional responsibilities.
- V. A member shall safeguard confidential information and exercise due care to prevent its improper disclosure.
- VI. A member shall not maliciously injure the professional reputation or practice of colleagues, clients or employer.

Karp and Abramms (1992) believe that a viable code of ethics is essential, not only for conducting business in a safe and professional manner, but for improving the quality of people's work lives by providing the framework for ethical (value driven) work decisions.

CHAPTER IV

ANG CONTRACT SECURITY IN OPERATION

Introduction

A survey of each Air National Guard installation which possesses some form of contract security is not within the purview of this research paper. However, it is necessary to provide some practical examples of how the Cooperative Security Funding Agreement is put into operation so the reader might draw a conclusion as to the possible need for a Code of Ethics and/or a system of standardized training. Therefore, telephone interviews were conducted with responsible persons at the unit or state headquarters level who administer some portion of the security program. The different locations were purposefully selected to present a representative sample of the various ways in which Air National Guard units have elected to provide day-to-day peacetime security.

The following information was obtained through interviews with unit security officers or resource managers at the state headquarters. As noted in a previous section of this paper, the Cooperative Security Funding Agreement specifies the "unit security officer" will

administer the program for contract security personnel. The "unit security officer" is usually a Senior Master Sergeant member of the installation's Security Police Squadron. The resource managers at state headquarters are usually Lieutenant Colonels or GS-13/14 federal civil service employees. The resource managers manage the programming and budgeting contract security program for the entire state. Names of interviewees have not been included in this report since the names do not contribute to the validity of information. Several people preferred to maintain their anonymity for various reasons.

The telephone interviews were "open-ended" but guided by the following questions: 1) Is a copy of the O&M Agreement sent down to your organizational level, 2) How have you elected to utilize the O&M Agreement funds, 3) Do you become involved in the selection process of security guards, 4) How is general training handled and specifically firearms training, 5) Should the O&M Agreement contain language for standardized training, and 6) Should the O&M Agreement contain a Code of Ethics. There were no questions asked about the Active Guard and Reserve (AGR) members of the installation's security force because their training and education is set within federal, U.S. Air Force, and Air National Guard directives.

California

California has four flying units and nine Geographically Separated Units (GSU).

Three flying units (the fourth is located on March AFB) and one GSU maintains a peacetime security force. A telephone interview was conducted with an individual at state headquarters who monitors the programming and budgeting of the state's Air National Guard security forces. The following information concerning California was obtained from the interview.

The State of California utilizes three types of security personnel--Active Guard and Reserve (AGR), private security firms, and state Active Duty personnel. As far as could be determined, California is the only state to utilize state active duty status for its security force personnel.

The state places the federal funding dollars from the Cooperative Security Funding Agreement into the state coffers and then uses these funds to place "traditional" Guard personnel (weekenders) on state active duty. People on state active duty receive the same pay and benefits from the State of California, as military members receive from the federal government. However, since they are not full-time military, the state has to pay workmen's compensation and a private Health Maintenance Organization (HMO) for health, vision and dental benefits. Some of the advantages of this program are that the members receive a variable housing allowance (which helps defray some of California's high costs of living areas), and, since people are already members of a California Air National Guard unit, their training, education, uniforms and security clearances are accomplished via ANG directives and regulations.

California also uses the O&M Agreement monies to contract with private security firms. For example, a contract for private security is used at one of California's GSUs. At this location the private security guards are responsible for entry control and plant protection. The state writes the contract specification as to the duties and responsibilities for the security of a Geographically Separated Unit (i.e. entry control and resource protection) and the training is then the responsibility of the security firm. The private firm employees wear the distinctive uniform of their employer and the individual pay and benefits are handled directly by the security firm. This system for GSU security is reported to work quite well for California's needs.

The person interviewed from California believes that the present form of O&M Agreement meets their needs and does not see a need for standardized training or a Code of Ethics. Both of them would be difficult to apply to California's way of managing its security forces because the private security firm provides its own Code of Ethics and the state active duty personnel utilize existing Air National Guard directives.

Connecticut

Connecticut has one flying unit and one GSU. Both units maintain a peacetime security force. A telephone interview was conducted with the unit security officer at the flying unit. The following information was obtained from the interview. Due to the size of

the state of Connecticut, the officer was equally familiar with the security at the state's one GSU.

The Connecticut flying unit has a combination of AGR, and O&M state employed security guards. Until approximately one year ago the unit had a combination of all three types of security guards on one installation--AGRs, O&Ms, and a private contract security. The AGRs answered to military direction, the private firm answered to the prevailing contract, and the O&M guards were perceived as answering to the labor union which represents the state employees. Budget cuts forced the unit to drop its contract with the private firm although they would have preferred to eliminate the union represented state employees.

In Connecticut, the unit security officer becomes directly involved in the selection process for new O&M security guards. When there is an O&M guard position vacancy, the unit security officer notifies state headquarters which forwards a list of available candidates to the unit. The unit then selects from the list and notifies state headquarters of the choice. Since the state requires firearms training for employees of private security firms, but not for proprietary security guards, the flying unit administers its O&M guard program as though they were proprietary guards. In this manner the unit can provide weapons training in accordance with Air Force and Air National Guard regulations.

The unit security officer receives a copy of the O&M Agreement and sets a training

schedule according to his perception of the needs and requirements of his O&M guard force. Because Connecticut has AGR security policeman who provide security for the unit's wartime tasked aircraft, the O&M guards are only assigned to installation entry control and base resource protection. Currently, the unit security officer establishes a training record for each of his state employed O&M guards similar to the training record he uses for the AGRs. He uses a post certification process to ensure the guards can accomplish the various post requirements.

The unit security officer interviewed in this state is of the opinion that the O&M Agreement should set the training standards. If the standards were outlined in the Agreement, he feels the labor unions would have less complaints when he establishes the training agenda. Furthermore, he does not see how a security Code of Ethics would help him accomplish his job of securing the installation.

Massachusetts

Massachusetts has one flying unit and six GSUs. The flying unit and two of the GSUs maintain a peacetime security force. A telephone interview was conducted with a unit security officer at the flying unit level and the following information was obtained from that interview.

The Massachusetts flying unit is the host on a base which contains several other reserve and active duty units. Because the Guard unit is the host, it maintains a security force of approximately 40 Department of the Air Force Title V security guards (DoD guards) as well as 15 contract security guards. [Since there are only four Air National Guard units that utilize DoD security guards, they will not be addressed in this paper.] The contract security guards are paid through the state, but they are not hired as part of the state's civil service system. The unit security officer hires each individual separately.

Massachusetts O&M guards are not represented by a union and therefore the base security officer has considerable autonomy in establishing training standards. However, since about half of his 15 O&M guards are also members of the Air National Guard, he is not concerned about their training standards. For the remaining half (civilians) he establishes a training agenda to duplicate the training agenda for the guardsman. This unit security officer believes that a training standard should be included within the O&M Agreement; however, he feels that the present system has been in existence too long and inculcated within the various state personnel systems that it is too late to change. Also, he does not see how a Code of Ethics would help at the unit level.

Minnesota

Minnesota has two flying units and three GSUs. Only the flying units have a

peacetime security force. A telephone interview was conducted with a unit security officer at the flying unit level and the following information was obtained from that interview.

The unit utilizes state employed security guards which are 100% federally funded via the O&M Agreement. There are no AGRs and no private security forces. Like many other states, Minnesota had at one time, made membership in the Minnesota Air National Guard one of the prerequisites for employment as a contract guard. In addition, the applicant had to be assigned to the security police squadron within the Guard unit. However, the union which represents the state employed security guard began to question military membership as a prerequisite for employment. Therefore, in 1987, the prerequisite requirements were relaxed to merely membership in the Air National Guard regardless of career field. Then, in 1990, with further union pressure, the requirement for Guard membership was eliminated altogether. In its present form, an applicant for a contract security position in Minnesota must be a graduate of the U.S. Air Force Security Police Academy.

The unit security officer has set up his own training records based upon military standards and uses a post certification system to determine what training is required for what employee (i.e. aircraft security, base patrol or main gate duty). Since the O&M guards are state employees, the security officer uses state police officers as trainers for subject matters which the unit deems appropriate for the contract guards. For example, in Minnesota the O&M guards are issued pepper mace and therefore they have to receive the proper training from the state patrol.

The contract guards are hired through the Minnesota Department of Military Affairs. When there is a vacancy at the base, the security officer notifies the Department of Military Affairs and requests a list of qualified applicants. The unit security officer interviews the applicants and then notifies the Department of Military Affairs as to his choice. Only once in the past several years has the department disagreed with the choice of applicants. (The state had not met its minority quotas and therefore the base security officer had to change his choice of selectees.)

The unit security officer interviewed at this Minnesota location believes that the O&M Agreement should contain the training standards. Based on his experience, eliminating the training standards from the O&M Agreement results in less ability to control the training agenda of contracted employees.

New York

New York has five flying units and four GSUs all of which receive funding for contract security. A telephone interview was conducted with a resource manager at the state headquarters level and the following information was obtained. The State of New York uses AGRs, O&M contracted state employee security guards, and private security firms. An interesting point is that the state has elected to give their O&M

state employed security guards "peace officer" status and calls them New York State Air Base Security Guards. Section 2.10 of the New York Criminal Procedures Law indicates who will be considered as peace officers.

§2.10 Peace Officer Designation.

48. New York state air base security guards when they are designated as peace officer under military regulations promulgated by the chief of staff to the governor and when performing their duties as air base security guards pursuant to orders issued by appropriate military authority; provided, however, that nothing in this subdivision shall be deemed to authorize such guards to carry, possess, repair or dispose of a firearm unless the appropriate license therefor has been issued pursuant to section 400.00 of the penal law.

49. Members of the army national guard military police and air national guard security personnel belonging to the organized militia of the state of New York when they are designated as peace officers under military regulations promulgated by the adjutant general and when performing their duties as military policemen or air security personnel pursuant to orders issued by appropriate military authority; provided, however, that nothing in this subdivision shall be deemed to authorize such military police or air security personnel to carry, possess, repair or dispose of a firearm unless the appropriate license therefor has been issued pursuant to section 400.00 of the penal law.

These Air Base Security Guards are used at all of the flying unit locations in addition to the military AGRs. The training requirements of these Air Base Security Guards, while similar to the military training standards, are nonetheless set by the state. Each of these O&M security guards had to complete a two week state certified course prior to receiving the peace officer designation. This training is a standard course for all New York state peace officers and subsequent military training must be provided at the unit level. At one time these state employed O&M guards had to be members of the National Guard with a compatible career

specialty code. However, as a result of the union which represents the security guards, that requirement has been relaxed and now a member of the security guard force may leave the Guard after a ten year period.

According to the resource manager the New York Air National Guard GSUs utilize private security contract forces. Since many of the GSUs are only comprised of one or two buildings, the security guards are trained in local plant protection and entry control. Many of them are unarmed. In addition, the manager believes that New York, with its system of Air Base Security Guards, does not need any training standards included in the O&M Agreement. Accordingly, state ethics codes are appropriate for state employees and a security code of ethics in the O&M Agreement would be redundant and probably not applicable.

Pennsylvania

Pennsylvania has three flying units and twelve GSUs. Only the flying units receive O&M money for peacetime security forces. A telephone interview was conducted with a unit security officer at one of the flying units and the following information was obtained.

At this particular Pennsylvania unit they utilize AGRs for flightline (aircraft) security and a private security firm to provide resource protection and base entry control. Pennsylvania has a state certified Lethal Weapons Training Act so all private security guard

personnel are state certified with a firearm prior to coming to the Guard unit. However, the state training is not an annual requirement and thereafter the Guard unit conducts annual qualification via the Air Force Qualification Course (AFQC) and the Security Police Course (SPC). In addition to this training, the unit security officer uses a post certification method to provide in-house training for the various posts assignments. He uses an Air Force form to log training for the private security guards.

The Pennsylvania unit security officer believes that standards should be articulated in the O&M Agreement to permit easier administration of private security guards. He felt that a Code of Ethics in the O&M Agreement would not affect the private firm employees who would probably be dedicated to their firm's code of ethics.

Rhode Island

Rhode Island has one flying unit and three GSUs. The flying unit and one of the GSUs receives funding for contract security. A telephone interview was conducted with a unit security officer at the flying unit and the following information was obtained.

Rhode Island uses only state employed O&M contract security guards to provide peacetime protection and, from a unit level perspective, there appears to be considerable problems with the present system. The most significant problem is that the unit security

officer does not have an input in the decision-making process of hiring security guards. If an opening become available for a contract guard, the base contacts the state Adjutant General's office and within a day or two a new employee will appear at the base. The new employee could have been a house painter or a "hamburger flipper" the day before, and today he is a security guard.

In Rhode Island there is no pre-selection training required and no state certified firearms training requirement. The unit security officer has put together a one week training course which contains a combination of classroom and on-the-job training; however, "If I am short-handed, I put him right out on the road with one of the other guards and strictly use OJT!" Firearms training is conducted for the O&M guards in accordance with Guard regulations.

The Rhode Island unit security officer strongly supported a standardized training program in the O&M Agreement. Although he sees little necessity for a Code of Ethics, he stated that he would "vote for a Code of Ethics if it will help maintain more control over the system."

South Dakota

South Dakota has one flying unit and no GSUs. A telephone interview was conducted

with the unit security officer at the flying unit, and like several other states, another unique situation was discovered. The following information was obtained from the interview.

The local county sheriff's department provides all of the security services--including entry control and base patrol--for the flying unit. The unit utilizes the O&M Agreement money to contract with the Sheriff's Department for security services required at the Air National Guard base. The program has been so successful that the Sheriff's Department established its own Air National Guard Division which is comprised of the deputies which provided the security services at the base. The deputies within the Air Guard Division are dedicated to provide service only the South Dakota Air National Guard and only in an extreme emergency would they be used for other law enforcement services within the County.

The deputies are sworn law enforcement officers and as such have received the state certified police officer's training. They receive post certification training from the unit security manager at the flying unit level. According to the security officer interviewed, this system provides all of the needs of the South Dakota Air National Guard and they do not see a need for a change in the O&M Agreement other than to increase the funding. It seems that the deputies assigned to the Air National Guard Division receive less pay than comparable deputies within other divisions on the Sheriff's Department. The salaries of the Guard deputies are restricted by the monies provided by the O&M Agreement.

Summary

Each of these interviews suggest that a unique situation exists in each state and in each Guard installation. It appears that the variation in standards which currently exists is the result of the influence of state laws, labor arbitration agreements, and unit security requirements.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

Summary of Findings

This paper attempted to answer the question, "Should the Air National Guard include a standardized training agenda within the Cooperative Security Funding Agreement in order to have an institutionalized approach to training for peacetime contract security guards. If not, then should a Code of Ethics be included (and therefore mandated) for all contract security guards?"

Chapters I and II highlighted the importance of a comprehensive training program for all contract security guards--both military and in the private sector. The training elevates the quality of service which is provided by the guards, it ensures they will know what to do and when to do it. In addition, comprehensive training reduces the vicarious liability of the Air National Guard.

Chapter III noted the significance of helping individuals determine the "right" and moral thing to do in a given situation. It was also noted that a code of ethics is essential not only for conducting business in a safe and professional manner, but for providing an important foundation for improving the quality of people's work lives.

Chapter V noted input from a limited number of Air National Guard units concerning training and ethics. These limited inputs provided a generalization of how the O&M Agreement is utilized within the states and among the units.

Policy Implications

The results of this research suggest that a variety of training standards *do* exist among the 103 Air National Guard installations which utilize some form of proprietary security. These variations are due primarily to the manner in which the individual installation has elected to secure the base. The training standards of these local security organizations are influenced by state laws, labor agreements, and other local conditions. As a result of this diversity, the research suggests that, at a minimum, a list of required subject-matter training areas should be included in the Cooperative Security Funding Agreement.

This "across-the-board" approach to security training will accomplish two significant objectives for the Air National Guard. First, it will provide the installation's assigned unit

security officer the needed guidance to establish his entry level training program. Second, it will certify that every contract security guard employed by the Air National Guard has received a minimum level of training thereby ensuring the guards know what they are to do, and when they are to do it.

Similarly, the research suggests that a security Code of Ethics should be prepared for all Air National Guard security force personnel. This code will further enhance the job performance of the contract security guards by prescribing their moral duties and obligations based upon the philosophies and principles of the Air National Guard security program.

Therefore, it would appear that the National Guard Bureau, and specifically the Security Police Directorate at the Air National Guard Readiness Center, should initiate a study project to inquire into the establishment of an entry level security training standard for all Air National Guard *contract* security personnel and prepare an Air National Guard Security Code of Ethics for *all* security force personnel.

APPENDIX A

The Cooperative Security Funding Agreement

9. Facilities and Services

a. The types of services to be provided under this agreement are as follows:

(1) Security and resource protection for all ANG facilities and equipment in accordance with applicable Department of Defense, Air Force, and Air National Guard directives or until the unit is mobilized under Federal Law.

(2) Training for personnel employed specifically for ANG security duty in accordance with Department of Defense, Air Force, and Air National Guard security standards. This training will be accomplished by or planned by the assigned unit security officer. This provision is not intended to circumvent or avoid any stated requirements for training, which may be imposed in addition to those required for this purpose.

(3) If duty position requires access to classified information and/or unescorted entry into a restricted area, the individual must be able to obtain a personnel security clearance eligibility or a favorable investigation determination IAW AFR 205-32/NGB(AF)205-032.

(4) Provide personnel dedicated to resource protection and/or aerospace security duty, as applicable under para b below.

(5) All personnel will function under the general management of the ANG security officer.

b. The Base Security Council (BSC)/Resource Protection Executive Committee (RPEC) will prioritize the security needs for the installation. Examples of specific services to be accomplished by employed individuals:

(1) Conduct random patrol of all facilities and equipment with emphasis on weapon systems, firearms, munitions, and explosive storage areas. Also, respond to alarms, make random checks of area fencing, enforce entry control to the base and flight line, and provide an armed response capability in accordance with the Air Force and Air National Guard standards and directives.

(2) Accomplish administrative duties as required in support of installation security and resource protection programs.

c. The following specific directives apply: AFR 205-1, NGR(AF)205-1, AFR 205-32, NGR(AF)205-032, AFR 125-26, NGR(AF) 125-026, AFR 125-37, NGR(AF) 125-037.

d. Guardsmen employed as State O&M Guards will abide with training IAW applicable regulations.

The State Shall:

a. Submit to the Government for review and approval, in writing, plans, and cost estimates for security services.

b. Contract and/or provide all work, material, and/or services required to carry out this Agreement in accordance with the laws of the State of _____ and under those regulations which are applicable to federally assisted programs. To the maximum extent possible, such contracts, any change orders and contract modifications, thereunder shall be subject to prior approval by the Government.

c. Shall cause work on any project undertaken under this agreement to be commenced within a reasonable time after receipt of written notification from the Government and will insure that the project will be completed with reasonable diligence.

d. Supervise and make inspections of the type and quality of services being provided under this agreement as may be deemed necessary by the government, and to permit inspections by a representative of the government.

e. Furnish certificates and/or invoices, satisfactory to the government for the Government's cost of the services set forth in this Agreement.

f. Shall insure that its employees are prohibited from using their positions for a purpose that is or gives the appearance of being motivated by a desire for private gain for themselves or others.

g. Shall afford any authorized representative of NGB, Department of Defense, or the Comptroller General access to and the right to examine all records, books, papers, and documents that are within the State's custody or control and that relate to its performance under this Agreement.

h. NGB may, in addition to any financial or other reports required by the terms of this Agreement, require the state to prepare reports or provide information relating to this Agreement. The State agrees to provide such reports within a reasonable time of request and in such detail as may be required.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- American Society for Industrial Security. American Society for Industrial Security. 1992. ASIS: Arlington, VA.
- Berenbeim, Ronald E. 1988. "Defining Corporate Ethics." Security Management. (September): 24-34.
- Berenbeim, Ronald E. 1988. "Ethics Codes and Educational Programs." Security Management. (October): 91-97.
- Bilek, Arthur J., John C. Klotter and R. Keegan Federal. 1980. Legal Aspects of Private Security. Louisville: Anderson Publishing Company.
- Cunningham, William C., John J. Strauchs and Clifford W. Van Meter. 1990. Private Security Trends: The Hallcrest Report II. Boston: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Cunningham, William C., and Todd H. Taylor. 1985. The Hallcrest Report I: Private Security and Police in America. Boston: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Facts and Figures. 1991. National Guard Bureau: Washington, D.C.
- How To Keep Out of Trouble. 1989. Washington, D.C.: Office of Government Ethics.
- Kakalik, James S., and Sorrel Wildhorn. 1972. The Private Police Industry: Its Nature and Extent. Santa Monica: The Rand Corporation.
- Karp, H.B., and Bob Abramms. 1992. "Doing the Right Thing." Training and Development. 46:36-41.
- Moore, Richter, and Norman Spain. 1989. "No Joke: Training Cuts Liability." Security (July): 31.
- National Advisory Committee on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals. 1976. Report of the Task Force on Private Security. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- New York State Criminal Procedure Law Supplement. 1992. Flushing: Looseleaf Law Publications.

President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. 1976. Code of Ethics for Private Security Management and Private Security Employees. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Russell, Bebecca. 1990. "Officer Training: Identify Your Options." Security (May): 40-43.

Shearing, Clifford D., Margaret B. Farnell and Phillip C. Stenning. 1980. Contracting Security in Ontario. Toronto: University of Toronto.

United States v. Wise, 370 U.S. 405 (1962).

ENDNOTES

1. No DoD regulations were found which dictate a training agenda for contracted security guards at an Air National Guard installations during non-mobilized conditions. There are regulations as to what security duties must be accomplished. There are also regulations concerning the use of deadly force and weapons proficiency demonstration course of fire, but no regulations as to what subject matter areas are mandatory.