

Conducting Post Incident Evaluations

Fire Chief (ret.) Richard B. Gasaway, PhD, EFO, CFO, MICP

Gasaway Consulting Group

www.RichGasaway.com

RBG3100@aol.com

Copyright © 2009
Richard B. Gasaway
Gasaway Consulting Group, LLC
All Rights Reserved.

No part of this document may be reproduced or transmitted in any form by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopy, recording, or any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the author.

The contents of **Conducting Post Incident Evaluations**
is the intellectual property of
Richard B. Gasaway, Ph.D.

Gasaway Consulting Group, LLC
P.O. Box 13542
St. Paul, MN 55113-0542
Phone: 651-331-8518

If you are interested in hosting a program, please contact Dr. Gasaway at
www.RichGasaway.com or RBG3100@aol.com

The purpose of a post-incident evaluation

To understand...

What went well

&

Where we can improve.

Tips

- Avoid using the term “Critique.”
- Evaluations are learning opportunities.
- Focus on what went well, and...
- Identify your areas to improve.
- Make plans for improvements.
- Evaluate all incidents, even if you think everything went well.
- Make your evaluations non-threatening

Tips

- Use an open format
- Follow an outline
- Conducted by the person in-charge
- Start with what occurred before first arrival
- Layout the scene
- Schedule soon to avoid losing information
- Document your findings so those who could not attend the evaluation can still benefit from the lessons.

Ground Rules

- Not designed to find fault or criticize the actions of others.
- Remember, even if things did not go well... no one was messing it up on purpose.
- Provides an honest assessment of the operation
- Take notes on what went well and what can be improved.

Process

- First arriving officer describes situation and actions.
- Each successive company explains what they say and what they did.
- Keep the conversation focused on key factors.
- Relate actions to SOPs
- Capture what needs to change

Examples of things
to evaluate...

**There was one person in charge
(incident commander)
at all times during the incident.**

**Command was passed to a new
person only when necessary
and only after a briefing
(C.A.N.) report.**

The person in-charge completed a 360-degree size-up of the emergency scene.

The person in-charge, stayed
in charge, and did not do
hands-on tasks.

The person in-charge stayed far enough away from the action to ensure a big-picture view.

**The strategy for the incident
was communicated to
everyone at the scene.**

Incoming crews were given assignments and their activities were coordinated.

**Accountability of all personnel
was maintained at all times
(location, crew size and actions).**

**Communications were
clear and concise.**

**The right tactics were used
to solve the problem.**

The person in-charge was
plugged-in to everything going on
(broad perspective).

The person in-charge was able to think ahead of the incident (predict where the incident was heading).

**All the radio traffic was
disciplined and manageable.**

Someone was assigned to
monitor every radio channel
(talkgroup) in use.

**Every communication from
crews working in high-
hazard areas were heard the
first time transmitted.**

**There was adequate staffing
on-scene to carry out the
strategy safely and effectively.**

**As emergency conditions
changed, so did the
strategy and tactics.**

**Progress reports were clear,
concise, accurate, timely,
and informative.**

**There were no conflicting
orders and no
conflicting tactics.**

**The organizational culture did
not influence the strategy,
tactics or operations.**

**A safety officer was assigned
and performed the duties
appropriately.**

**There were significant resources
(apparatus, equipment, rescue
tools, water, etc.)
to accomplish the tactics.**

Personnel were adequately
trained to perform their
assignments.

**Proper SOPs/SOGs were
established, implemented,
communicated and followed.**

Questions

www.RichGasaway.com