

## Professionalizing security training

**Dr. Roy Jensen**

*Some security companies provide in-house training to their security professionals. Former employees have varying opinions on these courses. An extreme example is a client who wanted all security professionals to have a communication course. The company gave each security professional a completion certificate for the course, and told them to take the course when they had time. **This is not in anyone's interest!***

### Executive summary

Across Canada, security professionals are increasingly assigned to high-risk roles that were historically the responsibility of the police. Current training does not prepare security professionals for the increasingly challenging, dangerous, and litigious situations they are expected to engage in. This is exemplified by the sudden increase in on-duty deaths: one from 2000 to 2019, and seven from 2020 to 2025. (CA\*SP is currently collecting data on injuries.)

In-house training by security employers is hindered by competing interests: quality training vs low-cost security services. To be viable, the priority must be low-cost security services, resulting in short, superficial, and/or outdated courses. Substandard training gives clients a false sense of protection, and results in security professionals' getting injured and killed. Legally, providing substandard training may constitute negligence and fraud. Security companies also strive to keep their courses private, preventing independent review of the content and instructional strategies.

CA\*SP is an independent organization focused on professionalizing the security industry. CA\*SP is positioned to bring together the security industry, security trainers, and curriculum developers to develop training and accreditation standards to professionalize the security industry for the betterment of everyone involved.

---

### The current security industry

In most Canadian jurisdictions, security professionals require a one-time 32 to 54 hour basic security training (BST) course to obtain a security license. This BST course is completely conceptual. In other jurisdictions, *zero* training is required.

Since approximately 2020, security professionals are being assigned to increasingly dangerous posts — posts that were once the responsibility of the police: patrolling high-risk areas, walking beats, enforcing bylaws, issuing parking and transit tickets, trespassing individuals, responding to

alarms, etc. Additionally, there is greater overt hostility and more brazen and violent criminals. Despite this, many security professionals receive *zero* additional training, yet they are expected to engage in these increasingly challenging, dangerous, and litigious situations.

From 2000 to 2019, *one* security professional was killed while on duty. From 2020 to 2025, *seven* security professionals have been killed. **CA\*SP** is currently collecting data on security professional injuries — preliminary findings indicate a similar increase in workplace injuries.

Clients are increasingly expressing frustration with the status quo. Clients want security professionals who can safely and effectively engage in situations on behalf of the client. Stop assaults. Stop thefts. Stop vandalism. Protect people. Arrest perpetrators. Current training fails to prepare security professionals for the challenging, dangerous, and litigious situations they are expected to engage in.

To address the lack of training, some security companies developed in-house training programs. This is excellent in spirit, but several issues have arisen:

- there is little to no transparency on the instructional material
- there is no independent quality control on the instructional material
- there is no independent quality control on the instructional strategies
- there is potential to falsify training records

### **Conflicting interests**

The introduction to this document exemplifies the last bullet in the previous list: a security professional reported to **CA\*SP** that they were given a certificate for the in-house communication course, were told to take the course on their own, and were told to tell the client that they have a certificate in effective communications (technically true). Nothing about this is honest or ethical. This is an extreme story **CA\*SP** has heard, but not the only one that describes questionable training.

A security company that also provides training has conflicting interests: quality training vs low-cost security services. As contracts usually go to the lowest bidder, even respectable security companies must sacrifice training to survive. Training is treated as a cost that must be minimized, instead of an investment in quality services and safety. Minimizing cost takes several forms:

- short and superficial courses
- outdated courses
- low assessment standards

Substandard training gives clients a false sense of protection, and results in security professionals getting injured and killed. Legally, providing substandard training may constitute negligence and fraud.

Security companies also protect their courses behind firewalls, limited release of course material, and have learners sign confidentiality agreements. Ostensibly, this is to protect their intellectual property. It also prevents independent review of the course material and instructional practices.

## Professionalizing the security industry

*Advanced quality training is the core of professionalizing the security industry.*

*Advanced quality training is critical for security professionals to be safe and effective in their post.*

In established professions, education and training are governed by independent oversight bodies of members, instead of employers. The government mandates membership and continuing education, and the professional body sets training standards, accredits trainers and training, and often organizes training. Some examples are listed below.

- law societies oversee training, licensing, and professional development
- engineering associations oversee training, licensing, and professional development
- teachers ... accountants ... physicians and surgeons ... police ... all have similar professional bodies where experienced members manage and oversee training

Empowering an independent body to organize and manage security training addresses the issues identified above. This would allow for

- national training and accreditation standards developed with stakeholder input
- curriculum and instructional transparency
- regular review and revision
- accreditation of training providers
- independent verification of a specific learner's training
- labor mobility across jurisdictions

*If the security industry is to professionalize, training must be standardized and managed by an oversight body.*

CA\*SP is an independent organization, established with the mandate to professionalize the security industry through training and advocacy.

Regarding training, CA\*SP brings together subject matter experts and curriculum design experts to create interesting, engaging, and learner-centered courses. CA\*SP also provides a venue for third-party trainers to promote their training.

Relevant to this discussion, CA\*SP has published documents proposing a national basic security training standards, and proposing the development of accreditation standards for security training. Dr. Jensen has published documents on *Efficacy of instructional modalities*, and *Best practices in course development*.

*Effective training provides knowledge and/or skill so that a security professional is more capable in their post, making them safer and more effective. This benefits everyone.*

*CA\*SP supports a training system that prioritizes safety, competence, and accountability.*