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Incident Management Measurement Toolkit

Peer Assessor Protocol
Peer Assessor Protocol

Domain 1: Situational awareness and information-sharing

The perception and characterization of incident-related information to identify response needs

How might I observe the items related to this domain?

- **Look at and synthesize documents**: For example, ask the incident manager or a team member to show you the most recent situation updates and look at time stamps. Reflect on time stamps and, considering what you know about the incident, make a judgment about whether the documentation is appropriate for the nature and pace of the incident.

- **Discern responders’ awareness**: For example, do team members mention a large number of surprises or a lack of awareness that affects their ability to do their jobs? Conversely, are people overwhelmed with information and cannot discern what is important and actionable versus what is simply helpful to know?

1. Situation assessments are delivered frequently enough, given the incident timeline and speed, phase of the response, and structure of the public health system.
   - [ ] Strongly disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Neutral
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Strongly agree

   Explanation for rating:
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________

   Example of what this might look like in practice:
   The peer assessor asked the incident manager for the five most recent situational updates and looked at the time stamps. The time stamps show that the initial updates were regular, and, as the incident grew in intensity and size, the updates grew more frequent. Consequently, the assessor marks “Strongly Agree” and describes their process in the “Explanation for rating” section.

2. Situation assessments are delivered to the appropriate stakeholders in a timely manner.
   - [ ] Strongly disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Neutral
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Strongly agree
3. Any delays in delivering or receiving situation assessments do not cause problems (e.g., lack of guidance for decisions, coordination problems—please specify).

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree
- Not applicable

Explanation for rating:

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

**Example of what this might look like in practice:**

When talking with IM team members, the peer assessor heard references to information gaps. After probing the reason for these gaps, they learned that some SITREPS had been delayed during a key phase of the response. Consequently, the assessor responds with “Disagree,” writing in the “Explanation for rating” section that the late information caused an observable problem.
Domain 2: Incident action and implementation planning

The articulation and communication of decisions in coherent incident action plans to set up implementation of those plans

How might I observe the items related to this domain?

- **Look at and synthesize documents**: For example, ask the incident manager or a team member for a copy of documents disseminated in a recent meeting, such as a morning briefing or an operations planning meeting. Attempt to locate in these documents a clear indicator of the incident command team’s objectives for the day, for this stage of the incident or for the incident overall.

- **Discern responders’ reactions**: During conversations or team meetings, observe whether team members are confused about why certain tasks or actions have been taken.

4. Within available documents (e.g., incident action plans [IAPs], situation reports [SITREPs], incident command system forms) or discussions, incident management objectives are clear.

   - Strongly disagree
   - Disagree
   - Neutral
   - Agree
   - Strongly agree

Explanation for rating:

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

Example of what this might look like in practice:
The peer assessor was able to locate a clear and concise list of objectives in an IAP. They can understand the objectives and how the IM team’s work contributed to the IAP goals. Reviews of other recent IAPs were similar. The assessor did not hear any confusion from team members about these goals. Consequently, the assessor marks “Strongly Agree” and describes their process in the “Explanation for rating” section.
Domain 3: Resource management and mobilization

The deployment of human, physical, and other resources to match ongoing situational awareness, identification of roles, and relevant decisions

How might I observe the items related to this domain?

- **Look at and synthesize documents**: Look for information and consistency in daily reports, such as incident status summaries (such as ICS Form 209). These documents can contain information on incident resources, as well as pertinent history and data. Other regularly updated documents can be used to find this information.
- **One-on-one conversations**: Talk with incident command team members responsible for resource mobilization and demobilization to learn about resource tracking systems. Talk with the incident's safety officer about workplace safety questions or incidents.
- **Listen in**: Those working on incidents can offer valuable insight into the IM team arrival, their own mobilization experiences, and what it’s like to work on the incident.

5. Estimated time of first official report of incident (date/time/unable to judge):

_______________________________________

Example of what this might look like in practice:
The peer assessor examined the day’s Incident Status Summary and found the information. They add this information in the “Response” section.

6. Estimated time of IM stand-up (date/time/unable to judge):

_______________________________________

Example of what this might look like in practice:
The peer assessor examined the day’s Incident Status Summary and found the information. They add this information in the “Response” section.

7. The estimated time difference between first official report of the incident and stand-up of the IM system did not affect the overall incident response.

- [ ] Strongly disagree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Neutral
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Strongly agree
Example of what this might look like in practice:
The peer assessor spoke with members of the IM team that were present for the IM stand-up process. The assessor learned there was initially some delay, but the team was able to quickly get back on top of things and the response was not negatively affected. Consequently, the assessor marks “Agree” and describes their process in the “Explanation for rating” section.

8. IM team members are able to anticipate availability of resources.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree
- Unable to judge

Explanation for rating:
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

Example of what this might look like in practice:
The peer assessor listened to IM team members discuss what upcoming days will look like as new resources arrive and discovered a mix of information. Some teams had a clear grasp of what to expect, whereas others expressed frustration at not knowing when needed resources would arrive. Consequently, the assessor marks “Neutral” and describes the team’s process in the “Explanation for rating” section.

9. It is clear who is responsible for maintaining the resource tracking system (e.g., entering data, checking data, using data, and solving any resource tracking technological problems).

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree
Example of what this might look like in practice:
The peer assessor asked members of the IM team who they would ask to check on new resources. The answers they received were clear and consistent, and the people the assessor was directed to were available to check on those resources. Consequently, the assessor marks “Strongly Agree” and describes their process in the “Explanation for rating” section.

10. Appropriate staff seem to be able to use the resource tracking system without excessive effort.
    - Strongly disagree
    - Disagree
    - Neutral
    - Agree
    - Strongly agree

Explanation for rating:

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

Example of what this might look like in practice:
The peer assessor talked with the IM staff responsible for the resource tracking system. The staff described being able to easily and consistently track resources. Consequently, the assessor marks “Strongly Agree” and describes their process in the “Explanation for rating” section.

11. When asked, an appropriate team member is able to identify how many people are doing a given job.
    - Strongly disagree
    - Disagree
    - Neutral
    - Agree
    - Strongly agree
Example of what this might look like in practice:
The peer assessor asked the IM team’s operations section chief how many division leaders there are on the incident. The answer was clear and matched incident organization charts. Consequently, the assessor marks “Strongly Agree” and describes their process in the “Explanation for rating” section.

12. Issues related to safety and fatigue are rare in this response.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

Explanation for rating:

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

Example of what this might look like in practice:
The peer assessor talked to the safety officer about safety and fatigue issues. In addition, the peer assessor listened to team members’ informal conversations. Team members did not mention fatigue-related issues and were not contacted when off shift. Consequently, the assessor marks “Strongly Agree” and describes the team’s processes for managing safety and fatigue in the “Explanation for rating” section.
Domain 4: Coordination and collaboration

The processes of mutual adjustment between internal and external actors involved in IM to reach a common objective

How might I observe the items related to this domain?

- **Listen in on meetings:** Observe in-person and virtual meetings, focusing on how individuals and groups work together. Note attendance—were key groups and individuals in the room and able to give input?
- **Discern the feel in the room:** In informal settings and conversations, such as at water coolers or mealtimes, listen in to hear whether there are frustrations or irritations about communication.

13. There is clarity among IM team members on channels of communication.

- [ ] Strongly disagree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Neutral
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Strongly agree

Explanation for rating:

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

Example of what this might look like in practice:
The peer assessor noted during formal meetings that some team members seemed unsure as to who is supposed to know key pieces of information, sources providing information, and how frequently this information needs to be updated. Consequently, the assessor marks “Strongly Disagree” and describes their process in the “Explanation for rating” section.

14. The frequency of contact between the command center and responders in the field is adequate (i.e., neither too seldom nor too frequent) given the pace of the incident.

- [ ] Strongly disagree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Neutral
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Strongly agree
Example of what this might look like in practice:
The peer assessor noted in conversations with team leadership that frequency of contact was regular. But IM team leaders indicated that frequency has not changed in regularity as the tempo of the incident has changed. This has not caused problems but has necessitated more informal conversations and occasional last-minute decisionmaking, which generated stress. Consequently, the assessor marks “Neutral” and describes their process in the “Explanation for rating” section.

Domain 5: Feedback and Continuous Quality Improvement

The collection and use of information about past operational periods to identify lessons for current and future responses

How might I observe the items related to this domain?

- **Have one-on-one conversations:** Talk with leadership about previous incidents or earlier stages of the current incident and how they have shaped today’s response efforts.
- **Have one-on-one conversations:** Talk with general team members with several years’ experience with the current team to see whether incident response has changed over time. Also ask them whether there are mechanisms for giving feedback to leadership and whether they feel leadership listens to and uses that feedback to improve incident response.
- **Look at and synthesize documents:** Specifically, aim to assess whether any lessons learned, such as AARs, have been incorporated to improve the response.

15. Processes exist to build on experiences from previous phases and previous incidents.

- [ ] Strongly disagree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Neutral
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Strongly agree

Explanation for rating:

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
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Example of what this might look like in practice:
The peer assessor heard in discussions with leadership and team members that leadership used lessons learned from previous incidents to guide the current incident. Discussions with team members suggested mistakes with mandating proper use of personal protective equipment and ensuring worker safety were occurring. Consequently, the assessor marks “Neutral” and describes the different areas of response in the “Explanation for rating” section.

16. IM leadership and others can point to examples of how lessons learned from previous incidents or phases of the current response influence subsequent response activities. If applicable, list up to three.

Example 1:
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

Example 2:
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

Example 3:
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

Example of what this might look like in practice:
IM team members described how lessons identified in previous AARs, IAPs, and other continuous quality improvement mechanisms were being applied to this incident.
Final Section

17. Overall, I feel this incident was managed well (or has been managed well so far).

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

Explanation for rating:
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

18. Any other notes on how this incident was managed?
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________