

**WO, Fire and Aviation Management
 USDA Forest Service
 National ICT3 Assessment Summary & Feedback
 Compiled by Vi Hillman (Acting Branch Chief of Fire Training)
 July 23, 2004**

1. How long have you been certified as an ICT3?

<u>0-1 Year (s)</u>	<u>1-2 Years</u>	<u>2-5 Years</u>	<u>5-10 Years</u>	<u>Over 10 Years</u>
47 Answers	33 Answers	130 Answers	166 Answers	138 Answers
9.14%	6.42%	25.29%	32.30%	26.85%

2. What other Incident Command System fireline positions do you currently hold?

<u>Single Resource Boss</u>	<u>TFLD</u>	<u>Strike Team Leader</u>	<u>DIVS</u>	<u>OSC2 & Higher</u>
195 Answers	192 Answers	224 Answers	416 Answers	141 Answers

3. How long have you worked in the Wildland Fire Service?

<u>0-2 Years</u>	<u>3-5 Years</u>	<u>5-10 Years</u>	<u>10-20 Years</u>	<u>Over 20 Years</u>
0 Answers	0 Answers	4 Answers	142 Answers	336 Answers
0%	0%	.83%	29.46%	69.71%

Please rate using 1 to 5 where 1 is “strongly disagree”; 2 is “disagree”; 3 is “somewhat agree”; 4 is “agree”; 5 is “strongly agree”

4. This simulation involved a realistic scenario.

<u>1 - Strongly Disagree</u>	<u>2 - Disagree</u>	<u>3 - Somewhat Agree</u>	<u>4 - Agree</u>	<u>5 - Strongly Agree</u>
6 Answers	10 Answers	62 Answers	253 Answers	179 Answers
1.18%	1.96%	12.16%	49.61%	35.10%

5. This simulation accurately reflected the actions expected of an ICT3.

<u>1 - Strongly Disagree</u>	<u>2 - Disagree</u>	<u>3 - Somewhat Agree</u>	<u>4 - Agree</u>	<u>5 - Strongly Agree</u>
5 Answers	5 Answers	48 Answers	250 Answers	193 Answers
1.00%	1.00%	9.58%	49.90%	38.52%

6. The pre-study resource for this simulation helped me prepare to succeed.

<u>1 - Strongly Disagree</u>	<u>2 - Disagree</u>	<u>3 - Somewhat Agree</u>	<u>4 - Agree</u>	<u>5 - Strongly Agree</u>
82 Answers 15.38%	59 Answers 11.07%	159 Answers 29.83%	210 Answers 39.4%	82 Answers 15.38%

7. This simulation helped me improve as an ICT3 by reinforcing my training and agency Expectations for the position.

<u>1 - Strongly Disagree</u>	<u>2 - Disagree</u>	<u>3 - Somewhat Agree</u>	<u>4 - Agree</u>	<u>5 - Strongly Agree</u>
4 Answers 0.78%	23 Answers 4.49%	79 Answers 15.43%	223 Answers 43.55%	183 Answers 35.74%

8. Simulations should be required annually of all ICT3s to reinforce the leadership and decision making skills required of the positions.

<u>1 - Strongly Disagree</u>	<u>2 - Disagree</u>	<u>3 - Somewhat Agree</u>	<u>4 - Agree</u>	<u>5 - Strongly Agree</u>
82 Answers 15.89%	109 Answers 21.12%	108 Answers 20.93%	121 Answers 23.45%	96 Answers 18.60%

9. Simulations should be used in the certification of ICT3s because it permits error to be made, identified, without creating the safety problems possible in real life.

<u>1 - Strongly Disagree</u>	<u>2 - Disagree</u>	<u>3 - Somewhat Agree</u>	<u>4 - Agree</u>	<u>5 - Strongly Agree</u>
21 Answers 4.15%	19 Answers 3.75%	71 Answers 14.03%	199 Answers 39.33%	196 Answers 38.74%

10. Simulations should be used to teach policy and procedures changes for ICT3s as appropriate.

<u>1 - Strongly Disagree</u>	<u>2 - Disagree</u>	<u>3 - Somewhat Agree</u>	<u>4 - Agree</u>	<u>5 - Strongly Agree</u>
13 Answers 2.55%	35 Answers 6.88%	125 Answers 25.56%	221 Answers 43.42%	115 Answers 22.59%

11. Simulations should be incorporated into ICT3 training to give students practice leadership and decision making.

<u>1 - Strongly Disagree</u>	<u>2 - Disagree</u>	<u>3 - Somewhat Agree</u>	<u>4 - Agree</u>	<u>5 - Strongly Agree</u>
5 Answers 0.98%	7 Answers 1.37%	33 Answers 6.45%	185 Answers 36.13%	282 Answers 55.08%

12. All line positions from Single Resource Boss to Division Supervisor should be assessed by simulation prior to being Red Carded or Certified.

<u>1 - Strongly Disagree</u>	<u>2 - Disagree</u>	<u>3 - Somewhat Agree</u>	<u>4 - Agree</u>	<u>5 - Strongly Agree</u>
49 Answers 9.51%	54 Answers 10.49%	136 Answers 26.41%	153 Answers 29.71%	123 Answers 23.88%

Comments were typed the way they were received:

Simulations should be used for practice (simulators); task books are for certification.

Simulations are a good training tool. With my limited experience with simulations, I'm not sure of their value as a certification tool. The task book process is probably better for certification. The scenario was good, but for me seeing flames and smoke is different.

Simulations should be used as proficiency and intended to sharpen skills not as a test.

Simulations should be learning and teaching tools and should not be the basis for certification. Certification should remain as it is now, by doing the job and evaluated through the task book system.

Private industry and armed forces use simulations as training tools. Certification is a cop out. 30 Mile/Cramer can be directly attributed to administrative oversight. Administrators are not being "certified". Secondly, there is no incentive to be an ICT3 if you keep getting left holding the bag.

Start bringing simulations into training before changing our use of the position task book to replace their use as the certifying elements required in 5109.17 and 310-1.

Good training tool should not be used for certification.

The criterion used for rating the individuals was quite easy. Each individual received about 23 points for just showing up and you only had to get a 48 to pass the simulation evaluation. The bar could be raised to make it more challenging and truly an evaluation.

This simulation is an excellent tool and training aid. The simulation definitely has its place in s-courses and as refresher training. I would like to see the simulation used for the benefit of everyone from the single resource boss on up the chain of command. I don't want to see this as an annual re-certification tool required for a select few. I believe all like operations personnel could and should benefit from

using the simulation as a training tool. Don't keep it secret and only available to ICT3 as a mandatory annual certification.

This was a good scenario to go through (pass or fail) to heighten my awareness of how quickly things can change during an incident. The scenario does put a lot of pressure on an individual but so do real life situations. I feel that this should be replayed for ICT3, 4, 5s as well. I am not sure it would be necessary for all overhead but it is well planned for those who want to do the position at IC at any level.

Great exercise. Very realistic and a great learning experience. I am a real believer in this tool as a way to find out if a person is qualified under "stress".

I think this was a good exercise for what it was intended for. I hope other agencies follow suit. I hope this and other simulations will be used as a training tool prior to certification. This is a time consuming process, especially during the spring burning season and all the other training taking place this time of year. I still feel the best tool is experience and good supervision. I would hate to see Red Card quals pulled from experienced hands due to a computer simulation exercise. I know of much safety conscious qualified ICT3s not in the fire organization that are going to let this qual drop because of the simulation. We are becoming shorthanded as it is and can't afford to lose these people. That's why I hope simulations stay in the training world and not drive people away from their qualifications.

All in all I think it was well worth the time to do. Coming in I wasn't sure and thought it was going to be a waste of time. Make part of course to sit through the next person's simulation is good extra training.

One time decision training with simulation then required every other year. See the need for tactical decision-making training program for new/younger employees.

Simulation is a good tool for training but cannot take the place of actual assignments on the line. If a person is routinely doing this position, it may not be necessary to do an annual simulation review. Maybe something of every two to three years. The question is how much proof is needed to know a person can handle the assignment.

This evaluation should be used as the last ticket punched for single resource boss. Division Supervisors ICT3s and ATGS' should have to do this simulation prior to certification.

ICT3 should not be evaluated if they are going on assignments. Only if they don't go on an assignment that particular year then I would make them go through this evaluation. It is not realistic to put single resource boss through this simulation every year, unless it is completed at the local level.

Overall good exercises and worthwhile. I think face-to-face briefings should be included in the simulation. I would add more stress for the person in the hot seat. This evaluation reinforced my training and agency expectations.

My personal thanks to the cadre for making me feel comfortable and facilitating the simulation. I was impressed by their sincerity and professionalism. I'd like to have scored everything a "5" below, but feel that better identification of the Type III problem, would result in better solutions leading to a more professional Type III cadre. ICT3's should never be encouraged to accept a fire under conditions depicted unless he/she felt absolutely necessary to protect life or very high resources. I think we have to

be careful not to send the wrong message. From discussion, with the cadre, it sounds like the simulation process is yielding desirable results. I believe, however, that this solution should be only part of a comprehensive evaluation at how we select, train, qualify and evaluate Type III IC's. While this type solution may be an okay interim step, and a very desirable part of training protocols for Type III IC's, I believe that in the future, Type III IC's deserve to be evaluated similarly to Type I & II Incident Commanders. To single them out in the future, I'm afraid, sends a powerful negative message that detracts from the professional development of this resource. We've obviously let some unqualified individuals into the Type III ranks. Now that we have used the simulation to weed out the obvious, I believe it's imperative to have review teams and individuals constantly review all our Incident Commanders in the field. This will further to the professionalism of the Type III cadre, and weed out where necessary those who passed the simulation but can't perform safely and effectively in the field. Also, I believe we should revamp the entire process for selecting and training IC candidates. As the requirements and demands on Type III ICs grow ever more complex, our selecting process must grow with the job. I recommend something similar to S-420, but scaled to S-320 needs. Thanks for the opportunity to comment.

This was a good simulation. I believe that all IC's should be brought up through a progression of simulations that coincide with training and are pertinent to the employee's current level. Throwing someone into a sink or swim scenario doesn't work.

All teams Type I & II should also be assessed bi-annually at least. The land management agencies are the only entities I know of where the Type I (highest) team only get together for the "Big Game" –where are the drills, simulations and training exercises? I have been on a Type I Team for six years as an ATGS and only saw the team start to gel one year. Not that they performed badly, the rest of the time, but the big game should not be the place where the "feeling things out" takes place. The agency is on the right track with this simulation process for recertification. Too bad we are doing it as knee jerk reaction manner after fatalities and not as a planned, thought out event. The people tasked with completing these evaluations are doing a fantastic job of picking up the ball.

It worked pretty good considering how quickly everything had to be pulled together. Could be expanded on at a later date and made a little harder at least for those that are ready for it. Needs audio effects to be more effective also to add the normal distractions you have to filter through. I think a desertification of every three years would suffice.

Only negative here the way it was setup, students didn't usually key to the screen, but waited for verbal keys or their experienced based timing. Would have been much better to be in training room as described in Don's presentation.

Have to say this is a great tool and I can see it having a much broader application at many different qualification levels. I thought it was much better than the sand table. Role players are not qualified at the ICT3 level have the opportunity to learn by watching higher qualified individuals perform. Looking forward to implementing this across the agency.

I've been doing this for many years and never reached the level of radio traffic and information requests that I found during this simulation. It was more condensed than what you encounter in real life.

Additional real life would include 2 radios and having to monitor CMD and TAC frequency.

I would look at doing this evaluation every two years. Don't know about this—the simulation can be more stressful than an actual incident—it should not be rushed into—let this one run for a while, get the plus and minus before looking to put it everywhere.

The experience mostly helped me. The study guide was not helpful as a tool in itself. If people use it that way, I think it will mess them up as they will look at it as a test. Instructors' saying that this is real is an excellent way of instructing, for people (IC's). Must feel they can do their job whatever the role that may be.

Should have more realistic sound effects and orbiting aircraft to aid and assist the incident commander. Helps to prompt conversation and engagement of air attack and incident commander.

The technology is available to present good simulations. We should do it more. The simulation was too time compassed. Did not have enough time to talk and do my documentation.

Need to develop more scenarios.

This is a valuable tool. Uniformed roll players and radios will make the scenario even more realistic.

Do not agree to requiring simulations for all positions. We already have refresher trainings to heighten our skills and awareness. Current view of the IC needs to be changed so IC can see changes in fire behavior more rapidly.

This is a great simulation to learn from. It should be utilized as a continuing training aid...not a test.

This should not by any means replace or reduce on the ground training.

Only for training and final certification.

With initial training.

Simulations, I think, would be good for refresher type training. I don't believe re-certing annually would be a great idea. This could be a good tool for a lot of levels as refresher.

Help develop better leaders, not just to certify positions.

Task book?? Use this as a teaching tool.

I am not sure simulation should be considered the "test". There are too many other options- written test, field exercises, trainee on fires, evaluations on controlled burns- that I believe, for some positions, are better for evaluating a person than a simulation.

I think simulations should be included in S & I courses. Hands on trainee assignments are still best. Not sure if we have resources to complete all these sims and get our other work done.

Use simulations during classroom training for these positions.

Definitely for ICT4. I believe that the qualifications for ICT3 should be changed so that you have to be division qualified to be an ICT3.

I agree with the concept and would plug it into sim for certifying, however support for that type of change needs to occur with scripts, sand tables and computer sims.

I don't think that annual re-certification should be required. This is good training, but it is already a big time impact on the trainers.

It would be nice to have my own ability to do it (? handwriting) - should have lots of practice sims.

Prior to first training assignment.

This kind of training should be utilized for other operations positions. Easily accessible with the ability to change situations up.

I recommend this for ICT4, 5 to become part of their annual training as well. This tool should become the standard for all levels of fire training.

Simulation is good and should be incorporated into S-300. I don't think annual simulations are needed. Maybe informational sessions or packages to provide updates. More time needed for proper documentation.

However, annual simulations as practice should be required.

Can't assess without knowing what you'd be testing. If have currency, don't evaluations serve this check?

Excellent simulation. It should be used to initially certify ICT3s. I agree that simulations should be required to maintain currency of qualifications.

Sim needed larger view, sand tables give you that.

Although you go in thinking you have a game plan it all goes out the window once the sim starts. Puts you under instant stress and in a reactive mode. A good measure of how someone should perform in these situations.

Line Officer role could be improved (complexity)

Could be improved.

Didn't look at them.

Should not need...

Reference materials good.

Pre-study is good but short of having the script, or if you know what you're doing you'll do fine. If you don't I don't think pre-study helps much either way.

Pre-study was okay it was a little short on info and how grading would take place. I wouldn't change anything with the pre-study. If you gave more info I don't think you would get the student thinking.

What pre study?

It was good to be evaluated by the pros.

More often is better.

Helped me relearn use of incident objectives and find weaknesses.

The simulation was a good opportunity to improve on my abilities to manage an incident that has a dynamic scenario.

Extremely so (good review)

Not annually.

Every three years will do.

Every five years like other positions.

Not every year, maybe every three.

More simulations, not just once a year.

The cost is prohibitive?

Maybe every two years?

One is enough.

Should be used after completion of task book and often with certification of home unit red card committee. Commitment of resources would be a killer.

Biannually too much time.

Yes but logistically possible?

NO- maybe ties to length of time between assignments over 3 years.

Maybe every 3 years. Depending how active you have been as an ICT3. If people have been active as an IC, could use the evals from fires.

Tie it to qual currency or if inactive do yearly.

Every 2-3 years.

Should have frequent practice sims not a test once a year.

Also ICT4 and ICT5.

Needs to be a part of a refresher requirement yearly. (To get buffed up and ready).

Annually for new ICT3s and first 5 years. After that maybe every 2 or 3 years.

Good before a season!

Recert every three years.

Recert 2-3 years

However certification should not be based on these

Maybe every 2 –3 years

Not annually

It will help keep everyone up to snuff.

Use as part of ICT3 training course.

Strongly agree! It would be a good final exam.

Different scenarios could be completed

Not just ICT3's

Need to understand how this type of simulation fits with training and performance,, if qualified after receiving training and performance (taskbook),,,, What's re-cert?

It depends on what the policy change is.

Depends on how it is organized.

After working for another agency it provided good insight into the standards and protocols that the Forest Service has developed over the last 2 years.

Yes, not just ICT3, TFLD, DIVS, Ops...

It will be very helpful.

Yes, keep is program going.

There should be policy for all training on the job.

You should be expected to be evaluated every year if you don't do an assignment for that year.

This evaluation should not be used every year for single resource boss level.

Simulations are an excellent training tool.

You should be evaluated upon completion of your task book for ICT3.

This evaluation should be used as a training and development tool.

Consider doing workshops to develop folks.

Observer roll is a huge benefit.

Thanks. Good job.

This evaluation should not be used annually, but every couple of years.

This evaluation should be used after the task book has been completed.

It is a great tool to use.

Thanks for your time. It was a good learning tool for me in areas that I need to improve on.

I would use L-381 Incident Leadership to train folks. This was more of an evaluation than a training.

If documentation is critical factor in the simulation, allow more time.

STEX is a great learning tool.

If you look at doing this evaluation annually I would use it as a refresher on the local unit.

There is nothing like a real assessment used in annual refresher trainings.

Conducting this evaluation at the single resource boss would be a nightmare unless it is done at the local unit.

This evaluation should only be required every two years and when a person doesn't have a chance to do a real assignment from the previous season.

The evaluation did reinforce agency expectations.

These evaluations should be conducted at the local level.

I would require this evaluation bi-annually.

Overall, I really liked this simulation. Fix some problems with computers which sounds like it will happen. Continue to get feedback on how we can improve simulation experience. Make sure people are consistent if not we are opening ourselves up to problems when someone challenges a decision. Continue to train people in this so it is used as a tool not just a game. Continue to make sure everyone is getting the same information.

Use simulations as training qualification and refresher. Is a great tool for all aspects of the firefighting mission?

Didn't like sitting for 5 hours to wait for simulation.

Cadre did an excellent job. The simulation is fast paced and realistic. I feel a simulation for those who do the job annually is over kill but every third year would be good. For ICT3s who do not do it on a regular basis maybe annually is a good idea.

Have time slots for people and appointments.

Why do we have task books?

Simulation was very good. Did reinforce past training.

That's what fire assignments are for.

I would look at doing this evaluation every 2 or 3 years.

Need to use this as a training before the start of each fire season.

Emphasis should be more on training verses pass/fail.

Simulations should be used to teach and refine skills, not to certify. The simulation crashes many events into the short simulation time, yet many were ok. Some of the test items were a bit vague or I received conflicting information—actual fire behavior reported from the line was considerably less than what I expected based on BI and Pocket Cards. That often happens, and I want actual weather reading to be Behave Calculations so I can get rate of spread and flame length for my fire. Good critique at the end by the director and evaluator. Again simulations should be use to train and polish, but never to certify.

Rather than requiring a simulation every year I believe the recurrency for all fireline positions should go to 3 years instead of 5.

Good simulation. The smoke and clouds could be more realistic, I judge many things from watching them.

Good refresher.

Specify actual simulation time.