

General Time & Evaluation Sheet for All Participants

of PandORa MC Command Post Operations on (circle):

Nov 1

Nov 2

Participant Name:

ICS Functional Area (circle):

Command Pub. Info Liaison Safety Operations Planning Logistics Finance/Administration

Incident Command System (ICS) Position:

Normal Organization:

Normal Position:

Hours of Preparation for and Participation in PandORa (fill-in and total hours that apply to you)

Event	Date/ Place	Scheduled Hours	Please insert hours and total that applies to you
Incident Commander Objectives Meeting/Workshop	9/13 OEMBA	2.0	
Command and General Staff Meeting/ Workshop	9/15 McCoy10	1.0	
Tactics Meeting	9/21 McCoy 10	2.0	
Logistics Section Workshop	10/16 McCoy8B	2.0	
Operations Section Workshop	10/12 McCoy8B	2.0	
Planning Section Workshop	10/19 Lincoln	4.0	
Strategic Nat'l Stockpile Ordering Drill	10/18 McCoy10	3.0	
Supply Unit Training	10/22 McCoy8A	1.5	
Other Unit or Team Level Preparation; name of event:		??	
Personal Study, Coordination, or Leadership as Part of Work Day		??	
Personal Study or Preparation not Charged to Workday (e.g. reading ICS references while commuting)		??	
		Your Total:	

OVER for General Evaluation:

PandORa Evaluation (continued) Please Staple to Your Main Evaluation

Instructions: For each statement or question, please assign a rating from 1-5 using the following criteria:

- 1 – Not applicable, not an issue for me.
- 2 – Generally no to extent that it adversely affected performance.
- 3 – Satisfactory, work done reasonably well.
- 4 – Generally yes, problems/issues readily solved, I felt good about it.
- 5 – Yes, very good relations, process, results under emergency conditions.

For comments, please recommend improvements and share any accolades.

1. **Did I know what was expected of me?** #____
Comments:
2. **Did I have the materials, equipment, staff to do my work right?** #____
Comments:
3. **Did I have the opportunity to apply my normal skills and expertise?** #____
Comments:
4. **Did I receive recognition or praise for doing good work?** #____
Comments:
5. **Did my supervisor seem to care about me as a person?** #____
Comments:
6. **Did my supervisor coach my development in my ICS position?** #____
Comments:
7. **Did my opinions seem to count?** #____
Comments:
8. **Did the mission and my role make me feel that my job was important?** #____
Comments:
9. **Were my coworkers in team or unit committed to doing quality work?** #____
Comments:

Please also fill out ICS ‘function specific’ evaluations as follows:

1. Every participant, evaluate your assigned function (e.g. PIO, Safety, Logistics, etc);
2. Every participant, please evaluate other functions that you worked with (optional but recommended);
3. Incident Commanders, Command and General Staff, and Evaluators, please evaluate all functions to the degree that your knowledge and working relationships allow.

A. Command Function:

For Agency Executives, Incident Commander, and Command and General Staff (optional for others)

Objectives. Clear, doable objectives for current Operational Period. Objectives for next Operational Period were timely, tailored to priority issues of the scenario, and quickly made SMART (Specific, Measurable, Assignable, Reasonable, Time-related) by Command and General Staff.

Circle appropriate evaluation: 1 (not done) 2 3 (adequate) 4 5 (superb)

Comments:

Leadership of Command and General Staff. IC led Command and General Staff, set clear expectations (tied to objectives), and monitored performance.

Circle appropriate evaluation: 1 (not done) 2 3 (adequate) 4 5 (superb)

Comments:

Collaboration with Agency Executive, EOCs, and Response Partners. IC is responsive to executive leadership, support and contributing partners, and the community.

Circle appropriate evaluation: 1 (not done) 2 3 (adequate) 4 5 (superb)

Comments:

Overall ICS Application. The Incident Command System was satisfactorily applied? E.g. response organization tailored to objectives; the Planning Cycle sufficiently aligned objectives, strategies, and resources; the Incident Action Plan sufficiently guided activities for the next Operational Period, ICS functions were performed in a collaborative manner, and a General Plan guided what had to be done in future periods.

Circle appropriate evaluation: 1 (not done) 2 3 (adequate) 4 5 (superb)

Comments:

B. Information Officer:

For Incident Commander, Command and General Staff, PIO staff

(optional for others)

Targeting the Message(s). Target audiences were identified and categorized. The message was well crafted to meet incident objectives and properly channeled to those audiences.

Circle appropriate evaluation: 1 (not done) 2 3 (adequate) 4 5 (superb)

Comments:

Public Information System – Quality of Coordination, Discipline, Division of Responsibility. All information functions within response organizations were formed into a collaborative Public Information System that agreed on high quality, consistent messages and a message ‘discipline’ (of which organizations released what kinds of information).

Circle appropriate evaluation: 1 (not done) 2 3 (adequate) 4 5 (superb)

Comments:

Leadership, Resources, Collaboration. Appropriately staffed the function, set clear expectations (tied to objectives and priorities), monitored performance, and ensured appropriate collaboration with other functions.

Circle appropriate evaluation: 1 (not done) 2 3 (adequate) 4 5 (superb)

Comments:

C. Safety Officer:

**For Incident Commander, Command and General Staff, and SO staff
(optional for others)**

Prevent Accidents. A methodical process was applied to identifying key hazards, implementing safe practices and protection, and ensuring a safety ethic in the organization.

Circle appropriate evaluation: 1 (not done) 2 3 (adequate) 4 5 (superb)

Comments:

Leadership, Resources, Collaboration. Appropriately staffed the function, set clear expectations (tied to objectives and priorities), monitored performance, and ensured appropriate collaboration with other functions.

Circle appropriate evaluation: 1 (not done) 2 3 (adequate) 4 5 (superb)

Comments:

D. Liaison Officer:

For IC, Command and General Staff, LO staff (optional for others)

Connect to Partners. Agency Representatives (able to make decisions and commit organization) were arranged (their ARs to our organization and our ARs to other lead response organizations (including key EOCs). Agency Representative contact information is documented and organized for easy handoff. Timely communications with ARs is schedules and executed.

Circle appropriate evaluation: 1 (not done) 2 3 (adequate) 4 5 (superb)

Comments:

Leadership, Resources, Collaboration. Appropriately staffed the function, set clear expectations (tied to objectives and priorities), monitored performance, and ensured appropriate collaboration with other functions.

Circle appropriate evaluation: 1 (not done) 2 3 (adequate) 4 5 (superb)

Comments:

E. Operations Section:

For IC, Command and General Staff, Ops leaders and staff (optional for others)

Plan Operations. The OSC contributed to the Planning Cycle process of designing an operations organization and strategies to successfully accomplish objectives?

Circle appropriate evaluation: 1 (not done) 2 3 (adequate) 4 5 (superb)

Comments:

Lead Operations. The OSC successfully monitored, led, and adjusted current Operational Period operations to attain or exceed objectives?

Circle appropriate evaluation: 1 (not done) 2 3 (adequate) 4 5 (superb)

Comments:

Leadership, Resources, Collaboration. Appropriately staffed the function, set clear expectations (tied to objectives and priorities), monitored performance, and ensured appropriate collaboration with other functions.

Circle appropriate evaluation: 1 (not done) 2 3 (adequate) 4 5 (superb)

Comments:

F. Planning Section:

For IC, Command and General Staff, Planning leaders and staff (optional for others)

Conduct the Planning Cycle. The PSC successfully conducted Planning Cycle, e.g.: ensured suitable overall goals: SMART operational period objectives: schedule of meetings and events for the Planning Cycle known and prepared for; efficient meetings attained needed outcomes; smooth Incident Action Plan that Operations Section leaders could confidently execute; and advance planning created long term General Plan that anticipated, prioritized, and planned operations beyond the next operational period.

Circle appropriate evaluation: 1 (not done) 2 3 (adequate) 4 5 (superb)

Comments:

Situation Status. The situation was accurately displayed in a manner that made it indispensable to command post briefings and decision-making. If separate Situation and Epidemiological Units are established, there was clear collaboration and coordination between them.

Circle appropriate evaluation: 1 (not done) 2 3 (adequate) 4 5 (superb)

Comments:

Resource Status. The resource tracking and management process (including Check-in and, if appropriate, Demob) was implemented, resource status displays were accurately and were indispensable to command post briefings and decision-making.

Circle appropriate evaluation: 1 (not done) 2 3 (adequate) 4 5 (superb)

Comments:

Documentation. A system to that ensured adequate incident and response documentation was created and executed throughout the response organization?

Circle appropriate evaluation: 1 (not done) 2 3 (adequate) 4 5 (superb)

Comments:

Technical Specialists. Technical Specialists clearly accountable to the response organization. They adequately and efficiently contributed to the decisions and processes required to support operations (e.g. designed clinic processes, conducted training, established case definitions)?

Circle appropriate evaluation: 1 (not done) 2 3 (adequate) 4 5 (superb)

Comments:

Leadership, Resources, Collaboration. Appropriately staffed the function, set clear expectations (tied to objectives and priorities), monitored performance, and ensured appropriate collaboration with other functions.

Circle appropriate evaluation: 1 (not done) 2 3 (adequate) 4 5 (superb)

Comments:

G. Logistics Section:

For IC, Command and General Staff, Logistics leaders and staff (optional for others)

Communications. The response organization is supported by adequate communications equipment, systems, and protocols [including equipment support, radio networks, fax, email, land and cell phones, and well known communication plans].

Circle appropriate evaluation: 1 (not done) 2 3 (adequate) 4 5 (superb)

Comments:

Ordering. An ordering process is efficient, well known by users, and well integrated with the objectives and the planning process. Ordering point(s) are established. ICS resource ordering protocols are established. Special ordering information and procedures that may be required by some ordering points are integrated into the system.

Circle appropriate evaluation: 1 (not done) 2 3 (adequate) 4 5 (superb)

Comments:

Facilities, Transportation, Medical, and Other Support/Services. Sufficient facilities are designated, equipped, signed, and supported? Essential support and services are anticipated and met (e.g. food, transport, rest rooms, supplies, and security and safety of the response organization and its resources).

Circle appropriate evaluation: 1 (not done) 2 3 (adequate) 4 5 (superb)

Comments:

Leadership, Resources, Collaboration. Appropriately staffed the function, set clear expectations (tied to objectives and priorities), monitored performance, and ensured appropriate collaboration with other functions.

Circle appropriate evaluation: 1 (not done) 2 3 (adequate) 4 5 (superb)

Comments:

H. Finance and Administration Section:

For IC, Command and General Staff, F/A leaders and staff (optional for others)

Financial Ceilings. Funding support is arranged through the IC and Agency Executive. Funding ceiling(s), financial report deadlines, and mechanisms for seeking increased support as funding ceilings may be exceeded are in place.

Circle appropriate evaluation: 1 (not done) 2 3 (adequate) 4 5 (superb)

Comments:

Time and Cost Tracking. A time and cost tracking system allows for accurate and timely tracking (at least daily) and forecasting of costs? The system is enforced and is well known to those contributing to it.

Circle appropriate evaluation: 1 (not done) 2 3 (adequate) 4 5 (superb)

Comments:

Procurement. Rapid emergency contracting was done in a timely, cost effective manner.

Circle appropriate evaluation: 1 (not done) 2 3 (adequate) 4 5 (superb)

Comments:

Leadership, Resources, Collaboration. Appropriately staffed the function, set clear expectations (tied to objectives and priorities), monitored performance, and ensured proper collaboration with other functions.

Circle appropriate evaluation: 1 (not done) 2 3 (adequate) 4 5 (superb)

Comments: