|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ACL Accreditation Meeting | | | |
| **Date:** | 6 June 2017 | **Time:** | 0900 - 1200 |
| **Venue:** | Metro Area Meeting Room | | |
| **Attendees:** Steve Turek, Des Irving, Dave Stackhouse, Paul Henderson and Leannda Pine | | | |

Summary of discussion points:

***Validation Process***

* Validation process outlined as follows:
  + Submit application (yet to be developed, Ian Pickard to be involved in developing process and logistics)
  + Undertake pre-work at station (look at current local processes i.e. what’s used for SSO’s - initial assessment undertaken Regionally with an opportunity to undertake a practice scenario), use document 4 (ACL3 Command Assessment Record) as key tool
  + Go to NCC Rotorua for assessment (3 scenarios in 1 day that increase in complexity with an opportunity for reflection between each based on feedback from assessor)

*Refer Action Point 1 re scenario development*

* Use “1-Up” process as a general principle to undertake the assessments (i.e ACL4 assesses ACL3) in collaboration with a FRCA member. Assessment of the assessors needs to be undertaken also.
* For top-level assessments look at possibility of developing a multi-level group with no rank who are qualified to assess skills against the competency framework with consideration given as to how to assess the different urban and rural skill sets.
* Also raised as possible issues were neutrality of assessors, moderation to ensure consistency, SSO to SSO or union member to union member assessment scenarios
* Validation process will apply to new staff or anyone coming up for promotion, assume ACL2 can apply for full ACL3 accreditation but a process is yet to be developed for this to give staff an opportunity to undertake ACL3 assessment (possibly at the start of the year identify SSOs to be assessed for this). Also yet to develop an assessment process for SSOs to get to ACL3.
* Principle is that no-one “Acts-up” unless they’ve been assessed, consider how to tie into current “Acting-Up” policy and the re-validation required once achieved ACL3 and reverted back to normal role.

**Re-Validation Process**

* Re-validation process outlined as follows:
  + Undertake re-validation locally
  + Use document 4 (ACL3 Command Assessment Record) as a key tool
  + Use 1 scenario (practical demonstration with short interview to reinforce points and examine command presence and situational awareness)
* Undertake re-validation every two years using a mix of practical assessment and questioning for clarification. Portfolio based assessment and evidence also discussed but considered difficult to implement at this stage. Discussion raised the possibility of using 3rd alarms as a benchmark (the only current measure is alarms), also K1’s and K45’s being used as a measure of regular response with an assessor trained to examine these. Include questioning of experience such as :
  + - Working in an RCC
    - Interagency working, ie. leading or taking over an interagency incident (question complexity such as size of resources managed, plan, staff welfare, logistics)
    - Ops support of lead agency where we’re not the lead agency
    - Long duration events
* ST considered that some of these criteria need more work as K1s and attendance at incidents alone is not a measure of competency.

*Refer Action Point 2*

* Focus on developing policy for those that fail an assessment (sanctions and remedies) looking at existing policies such as those for relieving at a higher rank (i.e taken off operational duties and given opportunity to develop and demonstrate required competencies), documentation will be required to protect both individual and organization (questions around consistency and neutrality of assessors)

*Refer Action Point 3*

* Consider how to track the assessment process through a register ie SMS, station diary management

*Refer Action Point 4*

**Knowledge**

* Would want an online test of knowledge e.g. of Incident Command Manual but this would be a large project to establish so agreed to park the knowledge component for now and have as an aspiration for the future (include as a principle).

**Entry Level Criteria & RPL**

* Principle is SSO qualified, 12 months under Section 66 (criteria to sit ACL3 is by default entry level to Senior Officer Rank) questions around what does consolidation mean and what mechanism replaces Section 66.
* Agreed to consider principle around Volunteer eligibility for ACL
* Use role maps as entry level criteria (becomes RPL by default). Role maps to be defined and put forward to OLT as a recommendation for them to support to P&C *(refer action point 5)*
* Agreement needs to be reached on who assesses RPL to demonstrate equivalency to competencies – internal or external assessor? Explored examples from overseas e.g portfolio examined by an external assessor and probationary period undertaken under guidance of a mentor

*Refer Action Point 6*

* Agreed that self-assessment processes to be aligned with new competencies and work should be undertaken with training to develop RPL processes

Documents

1. Approved Command Level 3 – Practical Assessment for Validation and Revalidation
2. Outcomes of the ACL Workshop
3. Competency Assessment and ACL Accreditation
4. ALC 3 Command Assessment Record

The following document changes were made, otherwise changes noted in previous minutes were agreed.

**Document 1 - Approved Command Level 3**

* Changed protocols to policies

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 2 | Confirm that current action complies with relevant legislation and policies;  ***Confirm candidate has specific incident type knowledge with relevant legislation and policies*** |

Page 3.

* Note Des commented regarding Health & Safety component yet to be further developed

*Refer Action Point 7*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 13 | Hand over status to relevant agencies before withdrawing support from the incident. - **Breakdown wording, Health and Safety etc** |

Page 5.

* A knowledge component needs to be added (put on hold - refer discussion points )

**Document 2 – Outcomes of the ACL Workshop**

Page 1

Revise Principle Two to become more generic.

*Refer action Point 8*

Page 2

Remove Principle Four

*Refer Action Point 9*

Principle Five (revised previously as per below, additional discussion as noted below)

It is recognised that there will be times due to lack of staff turnover and other factors that opportunities for staff to progress and gain experience may be limited, therefore a structure needs to be considered to provide opportunities for progressive officers to gain Command competency and experience. It was therefore discussed and agreed in principle ***that an Officer who is qualified and demonstrate competency and consolidation at ACL2 level than can be assessed at ACL3.***

*Refer Action Point 10*

*DI Detail on consolidation to be developed, allow time to achieve this*

*Refer Action Point 11*

*ST No arbitrary timeframe, demonstrate competency not to a prescribed timeframe – not looking into detail just developing principles*

Principle Six

Revise wording as follows

***If a staff member who has held ACL but has been absent from operations for 2 years or more they are required to sit a full assessment and submit an evidence portfolio.***

*Refer Action Point 12*

*DS Raised why putting in a timeframe when talked about removing timeframes*

*ST Still need an arbitrary timeframe for re-validation, it’s about demonstrating competency not timeframes depends on the individual*

*DI How does someone fit process on return from secondment?*

*ST Do they still do re-validation process when on secondment?*

*DI Consider currency, when last did re-validation*

*ST Want to avoid someone falling through the cracks regardless if on secondment*

*Refer action point 3 regarding revision of principle 6*

**Document 4 – ACL 3 Command Assessment**

DI is yet to review document 4 *(refer action point 14)*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Summary of Action Points from meeting 6 June 17** | **Responsible** | **When** | **Status** |
| 1 | Develop scenarios of complex incidents | All | 13 June (?) | Open |
| 2 | Agree evidence criteria for future portfolio use | All | Next Meeting | Open |
| 3 | Agree policy criteria for those failing (Not Deemed Competent) and outcomes to remedy this. | All | Next Meeting | Open |
| 4 | Consider how to track the assessment process through a register in SMS station diary system. | Steve to discuss with SMS Unit/ Trg | Next meeting | Open |
| 5 | Role Map confirmation with P&C/Trg once process confirmed | Steve Turek |  | Opn |
| 6 | Agree who assesses RPL to demonstrate equivalency | All | Next meeting | Open |
| 7 | Health and Safety wording to be developed for Document 1 | Des Irving | Next  Meeting | Open |
| 8 | Revise Principle Two in Document 2 to become more generic by removing specific reference to SSO’s ACL 2 and 3 etc. | Steve Turek |  | Completed |
| 9 | Remove Principle Four in Document 2 | Steve Turek |  | Completed |
| 10 | Revise Principle Five (now Four) to include reference to qualified officers. | Steve Turek |  | Completed |
| 11 | Detail on Consolidation to be developed and discussed | All | Next meeting | Open |
| 12 | Revise wording in Principle Six (now Five) in terms of revalidation process | Steve Turek |  | Completed |
| 13 | Circulate draft OLT paper recommending support of Role Maps (FRCA AGM possibly in August) | Steve | ? | Open |
| 14 | Complete review of Document 4 – ACL 3 Command Assessment | Des (?) | 2-3 weeks | Open |