

The SEC's Solution Innovation Partner (SIP) program evolved to help security practitioners expedite choosing a trustworthy risk mitigation vendor with confidence given the myriad of viable options in the marketplace. Proven Solution Innovation Practice Case Studies help evaluate performance claims and differentiate security solution providers for business outcomes including risk mitigation, return on investment, and security assurance. This Solution Innovation Case Study offers a proven process approach for mitigating risk(s) that could result in injury or impairment of people, assets, critical processes, products, and/or brand reputation. This proof point examines representative risk issues, mitigations, and result outcomes as validated by the Security Executive Council and the end-user.

The following case study highlights the experience of a large, physical security services organization in comparing PostHire capabilities to its current provider's results on previously screened and re-screened employees for criminal activity occurring after an employment offer. PostHire is an SEC-trusted Solution Innovation Partner by virtue of proven practice integrity assurance vetting. It does not necessarily replace an organization's need for a robust pre-hire screening program. Instead, PostHire compliments an employer's existing compliance infrastructure, alerting them in near real-time to any criminal offense activity that threatens brand reputation, stakeholders, or one's ability to complete their job responsibilities.

#### **Risk Issues and Mitigation Opportunities:**

- Conventional pre-employment background screening combined with legacy "monitoring" solutions often miss post-hire life events that can harm an organization's brand. Multiple research findings reveal that employees rarely self-report offenses likely to result in sanctions including termination for cause.
- The uniform security services employer was not confident they were receiving accurate, timely, national results.
- Fairness dictates that individual incidents must be adequately documented so that the employer can treat its workforce consistently; even though the underlying criminal violations vary in relevancy, severity, and outcome.
- Legal departments within most organizations are reluctant to operate outside of existing EEOC safe harbor guidelines. Therefore, compliance risk perceptions are heightened for organizations that value the ability to monitor public record data for criminal activity beyond pre-employment.
- Coupled with self-reporting and employee assistance programs, employers recognize that helping employees with exceptional behaviors may be a means of mitigating risk and retaining talent.
- Evolving "zero trust" and persistent assurance compliance is anticipated will likely require government-sensitive product and service supplies to explore continuous integrity assurance, sooner than later.

#### **Solution Requirements:**

- Provide a continuous and timely situational crime detection proven practice for undisclosed, need-to-know recent crimes (post-hire) and convictions for a national sensitive uniform security service organization.

## Solution Innovation Case Study: Continuous Employee Screening Assesses Insider Risk and Assures Duty of Care Expectations

- The solution must leverage national, near-real-time public record information and matching criteria to workforce identities with alerts to designated responsible individuals within the organization.
- The deployment process must be simple to implement and shall not require additional HR specialists, staff, or training. The service offering will comply with the requirements of internal legal counsel.
- The solution must optimize resources with actionable documentation insights that work to empower the organization to act confidently and expeditiously.
- The solution must be an extension of the existing pre-employment program with improved and defensible governance alerts featuring up-to-date records details including case filings, statuses, dispositions, sentencing determinations, etc.

### Delivered:

- Continually and persistently identifies prohibited offenses that occur after the employee's enrollment into the service.
- Actively monitors and reports timely case status updates, 24 hours a day, for specified employees or contractors for relevant criminal cases from inception through disposition.
- Provided 150,000+ criminal records reviews nationally per day with near real-time alerts within employer's customizable lists of prohibited offenses.

### Outcome and Benefits of Service Including ROI:

- Coverage includes 97% of the US population which is represented by 2800+ counties.
- Detected 708 undisclosed individual criminal events over a 90-day period, monitoring 50,000 identities. An increase of over 300+% of events provided by the incumbent monitoring solution, including:
  - Felony – 81
  - Fraud/Deception/Forgery – 21
  - Drugs – 42
  - Domestic Relations – 46
  - Offense against minors – 20
  - Theft/ Larceny – 36
  - Violence – 68
  - Weapons – 49
  - Criminal Other – 88
- Near real-time alerts identified numerous risk mitigation opportunities with previously unknown criminal case documentation, which can be further supported by ongoing case updates direct from court dockets.
- Up to 4% of workers were involved in previously unreported criminal activity annually.
- The total number of incidents matched to workforce identities – 967.
- Number of unique individual matches – 708 out of 50,000 identities
- No false positives or events provided failed to meet the substantive criteria as outlined by the client. Active filtering allows customers to focus only on the incidents that matter most.

**SIP Case Study Authentication Process**

This process was overseen by a Security Executive Council subject matter expert with 20+ years of experience in developing and leading people and asset protection programs as trusted security advisor for global, multinational organizations. **Client end-user authenticated May 2023.**

*Note: The Security Executive Council's Solution Innovation case study represents a snapshot in time to demonstrate a solution to a specific organization's issue. End-user diligence, trial and measurement are strongly recommended for any contemplated risk mitigation activity.*

**A General Comparison of Competition**

| Vendor Attributes                                                                                                                                 | Provider A | Provider B | POSTHIRE |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|------------|----------|
| Real-time alerting is triggered by relevant arrests, bookings, case updates, and convictions as they apply to enrollment groups                   | No         | No         | Yes      |
| Alerts are provided in real-time.                                                                                                                 | No         | No         | Yes      |
| Alerts are routinely detected even when underlying criminal offenses did NOT result in an arrest.                                                 | Yes        | No         | Yes      |
| Alerts are fueled by the largest near real-time aggregation county, state, and federal sources inclusive of sex offender registries and warrants. | No         | No         | Yes      |
| Alerts include identity-matching confirmation                                                                                                     | No         | No         | Yes      |
| Alerts always include offense descriptions.                                                                                                       | Yes        | No         | Yes      |
| Alerts designed to be EEOC/FCRA-compliant <i>without</i> requiring lengthy internal "investigation" for conviction alerts                         | Yes        | No         | Yes      |
| Unlimited Alert Filtering customized by identity, role, and responsibility of monitored employee.                                                 | No         | No         | Yes      |
| Alerts can be customized to exclude unwanted offense types, categories, and geographies.                                                          | Yes        | Yes        | Yes      |
| Alerts may include a copy of the corresponding governmental record as an option.                                                                  | Yes        | No         | Yes      |
| Enrollment and cancellation of participants via multiple methods.                                                                                 | Yes        | Yes        | Yes      |
| Enrollment does NOT require participants' prior written consent if "evergreen" background checks have been consented to in most jurisdictions.    | Yes        | Unclear    | Yes      |
| Enrollment includes an automated permissions module to maintain compliance                                                                        | No         | No         | Yes      |



SECURITY EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

A research and advisory firm

## Solution Innovation Case Study: Continuous Employee Screening Assesses Insider Risk and Assures Duty of Care Expectations

|                                                                                                                                               |     |     |     |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|
| Enrollment does NOT require additional employee consent if “evergreen” provision is met.                                                      | Yes | No  | Yes |
| National monitoring footprint includes over 97% of the US population, emanating from over 4,000 county courts and all federal district courts | No  | No  | Yes |
| Access to records and primary source information through a client portal (court, arrest, sex offender information)                            | No  | No  | All |
| Client Portal provides reminders and status of pending actions                                                                                | No  | No  | Yes |
| Monitoring performed without transmitting participants’ identifying information to a 3rd party commercial processor.                          | Yes | Yes | Yes |

See other case studies and learn more about the SIP Program here:  
<https://www.securityexecutivecouncil.com/solutions/vendor-innovations>