Appalachian Search and Rescue Conference Board of Directors Meeting
1/13/07
Meeting Notes
Keith Conover, M.D., FACEP
Andrew Hower, AMRG

Called to order by Chair at 1030 hours

Approval of minutes:

As amended with addendum dated Dec 13, 2006 VAO6076 including results of conference call, two motions, first thanking TSAR for prompt response to the 'declaration of reprimand' from VDEM, and thanking them for their response. Second that the ASRC Chair draft a letter of apology to VDEM. Both passed by phone vote.
Moved by Keith Conover, seconded by Bob Allam, to accept; all in favor except Chair abstained.

Chair's Report:

There have been some changes in group class status for 2007. The Chair recommended the following for classification of each Group classification for 2007.
 (last year > this year based on rosters)
AMRG B > B
BRMRG A > A
MARG A > B
MSAR A > A
PSAR B > A
PVRG B > B
SMRG A > A
SWVMRG A > B
TSAR A > A

MARG and SWVMRG loose one rep each for dropping classification. PSAR gains a rep for achieving a new classification. Current information should be posted on the ASRC website for reference.

Moved by Conover, seconded by Theresa Crossland, to accept. All in favor except Chair abstained. Motion passed with a reconfigured board with one less member.

As of 1/13/2007 there were 475 ASRC members in total.

Strategic Review:

Postponed in view of operations.

Operational Review:

Bob Allam had three others step up and help work on the 36-month group review process: Andrew Biggers, Keith Crabtree, and William Dixon

See attached handouts *BOD Deck.ppt* and *Recert Proposal.doc*. In summary: the new process is to test **operational** readiness rather than simple administrative compliance. Current group review checks that groups are conducting training, maintain a current roster, and conduct equipment checks.

The ops group thought this process should include operational benefits as well as components to implement the ops manual through training, bylaws, etc.

The above documents are being presented as a basic proposal on what the right direction is for group recertification. By covering a basic set of right steps for future development of standards, in ensures that current and future ASRC groups are clear in their mission and operational readiness.

The evaluation process will be every 36 months, staggered amongst the ASRC member teams. Two concurrent groups will be evaluated annually on a rolling schedule, thus covering everyone in the ASRC over the course of a three year rotational period.

The rolling evaluation process will take into account the following seven topics:

- Training
- Operational Standards
- Equipment
- Feedback from three (3) Local RAs
- Group Response to Missions
- Successful Completion of a Mission Exercise
- Adherence to ASRC By-laws and Administrative Procedures

As part of the evaluation process, a written ASRC test is proposed to be administered to 25% of the members based on current member classification (FTM/FTL) to hit at least one member at each operational level. This test, based on the operations manual, will be given to these randomly selected individuals and they will have 30 days to complete the exam, using the operations manual as reference.

Keith Conover:
1. Instead of selecting a random member for a **written** test how about a **practical** test? Discussion of this, not much support. But Keith then suggested the idea of a multiple-choice test, with an extensive scenario before the question, focusing on real-life type examples. These could be at the CQ, FTM and FTL level, with different levels of question. Testing like this would:
   a. maybe involve multiple principles and multiple parts of the Ops manual and some common sense in a single question.
   b. this would prompt members who've taken the test (or heard about it) to review similar scenarios and debate how to deal with these scenarios (could post some as part of the online versions of the Ops manual, etc.)
   c. we are really more interested in whether people handle scenarios
2. Keith suggested that we consider this as a CQI tool. Quoting from his email: *The idea that continuous certification is a better idea, in that it tends to avoid "cramming" and that it is essence, an implementation of CQI - Continuous Quality Improvement - is attractive. For example, for me, I have to take a "LLSA" (life-long self-assessment) test every year. It is an open-book online test, and they encourage you to take it with others, discussing each question before you answer it. The goal for ABEM/ABMS is not to fail anyone, but to motivate people to keep up their learning on a continuous basis. They do this by picking twenty articles from the medical literature each year and then you have to take the open book test based on these articles. Every 10 years you have to take a test, but compared to the previous 2-day written and oral extravaganza, the 10- year test is a simple 92-question multiple-choice test (although very, very tough multiple choice, based on some complex medical scenarios.) The point being that even these large, well-funded national organizations that are testing and certifying in a domain similar to SAR are moving away from massive infrequent tests to frequent tests to keep people up to date, as it works better, AND there is pressure from government agencies and nongovernmental*

> *organizations to use this kind of "continuous certification" as there is evidence it works better to protect the public.* Keith also suggested that we should consider the saying "Knowledge is knowing the rules, understanding is knowing how to break the rules, and wisdom is knowing **when** to break the rules" and the operations research/systems theory.
>
> 3. Discussed customer service aspects of testing. Customers: members, RAs, government bodies, potential new teams, subjects. Want to keep our profession restricted and high-quality.

Discussion ensued about making a test have interpretable answers which could be argued multiple ways. This needed more specific addressing by the Ops Section.

Also – a discussion about having a large question pool similar to the amateur radio exam from the FCC and then selecting random questions for the test administration. This has a benefit where you can't study for a given question, however would be very time consuming to compose.

Questions would be pooled from all ASRC member teams to utilize concepts from the ASRC Ops Manual, however will be answers which you will need to use practical experiences and thought process to answer. The answers will be based on the operational concepts, but will exhibit unique circumstances and real life events over time to make the test-taker use practical skills in synthesizing information to answer questions.

Discussed having the Group Chair simply sign that the Group has all of its equipment rather than actually having an independent evaluator check the equipment. Consensus in favor. Discussed the idea of requiring the Chair sign an actual full inventory, and could develop a guide for this inventory, including such things as

- Expiration date
- Condition: good, marginal, "replace within next year," "replace now"
- A signed statement that this meets the minimum ASRC requirements.
- If a Group depends on some members' personal gear to meet ASRC requirements, the Group might include a signed agreement from the member that the equipment.

Discussed the idea that, instead of asking RAs to fill out a survey (in MD, only 2 RAs and neither knows much about SAR; most RAs not interested in filling out surveys and probably won't do), we could check off that someone from outside the Group has contacted local RAs and other SAR Groups to provide constructive feedback.

Observations:
1. this done on a regular basis as part of mission follow-up; can simply check off that this has been done for a Group at the time of review.
2. Dave Carter when Chair used to have a form that he gave to the RA at the end of the mission to get feedback. Could have FTMs fill out a form for feedback to FTLs, too.

What about missions? Kevin Brewer: ASRC called to fewer and fewer searches in Virginia each year, will affect ability to attend missions as part of the requirements.

Simulations: would need different simulations to address different tasks (semitech, setting up base, etc.): individualized to Group's capabilities. CQI again: Need to consider that this simulation would be as much a training exercise as a test. May want to combine the two groups being evaluated for the mission. Will help develop interoperability. Doug: should we specify how many should show up at the sim? Bob: haven't addressed this yet. Keith: maybe we can offer "double credit" for individual members who attend. Will have many evaluators from other groups, each of which also gets credit for a simulation. Members of other Groups can show up and participate and also get credit.

Additional looks at how ASRC teams are doing outreach to RAs was discussed as part of the group recertification process. It will evaluate how individual local groups have reached out to RAs and worked with them to provide services. Hopefully groups will distribute surveys to their RAs

following actual missions as part of a normal formal evaluation process.   The ASRC can then potentially do follow-up phone calls to these RAs as part of the evaluation process.

The other component to the evaluation process is mission response.

The ASRC will look at missions in a 120 mile radius and see the number of missions the group teams are responding to. The evaluation process will expect teams to respond to at least 1/3 of all missions in the service radius. There was discussion about the student teams responding to missions during key times of the year (summer, finals, spring break) as well as discussion from multiple teams regarding ASRC missions vs. Non-ASRC activations. Other discussion looked at the types of response, from rescue, semi-tech, technical, management, outreach, or dispatch and how these could potentially count for missions.

Hopefully the evaluation process is strictly a CQI move – where the evaluation will not be as much of Pass/Fail criteria, however a QI feedback thing where the ASRC can assure that their teams are meeting a standard of excellence in order with the mission of the ASRC, and discussion to make its member teams better both administratively and operationally.   If a member team 'fails', the operations section will have appropriate action, which hasn't been clearly defined yet, however will most likely result in a committee to discuss process.

It is the hope of the ASRC to then incorporate its lessons learned through "Lessons Learned Information Sharing" (LLIS.gov) for a best practices in the Search and Rescue community.

Brief discussion of NIMS compliance: no consensus, still need to get some groups to get more members to document compliance.

Bob will have 1-2 phone conferences with the Group Ops officers, and some email work, and will have a formal complete proposal for an up or down vote at the next BOD, with plans for implementation in the fall.

Training, William Dixon

Alex McClellan received favorable vote of ICs for IC-1/ACA by the ICs, sponsored by IC-1 Bob Allam and approved by Conference Training Officer William Dixon via phone call, and unanimous vote in favor.

Chair: suggested that the ASRC $500/course for up to two ASRC-centric PSO course taught by Dave Carter. Noted that we have $1500 set aside for PSO and such IS/IC Discussion: would it be better to just give $50/ASRC member for taking? Better just to have ASRC "sponsor" the course in terms of relationship with other SAR Groups? Motion reimburse ASRC members $50 for taking an ASRC-sponsored PSO course in calendar 2007. Passed with two abstentions.

William announced his resignation as the Conference Training Officer and will serve until the position is filled. Current the ASRC CTO and the Webmaster are open positions which need filled.

Discussed the fact that Delmarva has standards that meet the ASRC standards but are above them. Discussed the fact that the ASRC Bylaws require that members can transfer between groups; Delmarva now has an ASRC member from another Group joining and will accept this member's prior ASRC certifications.

Admin Report, Steve Weiss
Met with Mark Eggeman in November. "No groups will be self-certified." What about CQs? Maybe have an expiration date on CQ membership. What about certification? Says that you've passed certain tests, and met other requirements, and you have been accredited by an

authorizing agency, which issues the credentials. Steve: want to see ASRC accrediting Groups to be able to test individuals to the standards. ASRC Groups then issue credentials to individuals. Need to revamp our language (even though our *process* is basically OK) to be more overtly NIMS compliant. NIMS: "We're either going to get out in front or get run over."

Will be reviewing the draft MOU that Mark Eggeman suggested as a model for new MOUs with VDEM. It lists the kind of services that an organization can provide under the state's auspices. Might this be seen as limiting what SAR teams can do at the scene? No, this just limits what they can do *as a state resource with state workers' compensation and liability coverage*. If we have responded as a VDEM state resource, and the RA asks to use one of our resources outside of what can reasonably come under the MOU with the state, we need to provide that resource quickly, efficiently and cheerfully, but have the RA sign that he understands that this resource is now no longer covered under the state MOU and will be covered by the RA's liability and workers' comp.

Kudos to Roger Miller and several people in BRMRG: team effort to get us a new OMD, got ASRC ALS license renewed for 2 years. New VA OMD is Dr. George Lindbeck, head of Thomas Jefferson EMS region in Virginia.

Do we want to get ASRC licensed as an EMS agency in other states?

West Virginia requires a $1,000,000 liability coverage by the ASRC as addressed as an issue from MARG.

AMRG is currently pursing a license as a QRS (Quick Response Service) in Pennsylvania, do we want to ask AMRG to consider doing this as the ASRC as opposed to just the AMRG? Consensus yes, whenever possible do this so the whole ASRC is covered. Keith will forward to AMRG.

Finance, Jen Clifton:
See attached. We have about $2500 with $1500 allocated for PSO training an' 'at. Just got a donation from a SAR team that has now disbanded. Projected dues receipts, about $8000, with projected expenses of about $7000, including insurance.

Discussion from Chair to propose an increase for Web expenses to an even $400 for updates for the secure section fees for the website in addition to an upgrade to $250 for achievement pins.

Moved by Theresa, seconded by Keith, to accept the projected budget. Passed; all in favor except Chair abstained.

Operations, Bob Allam:
Delmarva SAR proposed for full ASRC membership. Moved that we recommend to the membership for the April General membership meeting, second and approved, all in favor except Chair abstained. Need to have 1/3 of the members represented in person or by proxy at the ASRC General Membership Meeting so Groups are directed to *start collecting proxies now!*

Discussed the need to demonstrate solvency; as this was right after a case of identity theft against one of the Delmarva members, they provided a redacted bank statement, with the numbers, individual entries, and other potentially compromising material blacked out, but with enough information to demonstrate solvency.

A note was made to add to the ops manual to blank numbers and remote personally identifiable information as a potential solution and recommended procedure.

ASRC General Membership Meeting April
Will be hosted by Delmarva SAR in NE Maryland, at Boy Scout Camp Rodney, near the town of North East (yes that's the town name).

PFD Discussions – Personal Flotation Devices (PFDs) were discussed including what Types and numbers for each of the teams – more discussion will be needed to determine what requirements must be met. Due to recent events, PFDs will most likely end up as an equipment requirement.

Operational Review
VA-067-06
First person one scene arrived expecting to be FTL, had her dog in the car (nobody to watch at home), RA found the dog was available and certified (though not in VA) as a trailing dog, RA was told that if he wanted to use the dog it would NOT be covered as a Virginia resource; RA understood and wanted to use the trailing dog anyway. At the RA's discretion, the trailing dog was dispatched, while another airscenting dog was held back; but this reportedly was because the task was appropriate for trailing but not airscenting. This apparently caused a complaint by the other dog handler, from a VA certified airscent dog, that resulted in a formal complaint and reprimand from the Virginia SAR Coordinator. However, this handler's SAR team has expressed its support for the ASRC and appreciation for its work on this mission. The two issues for which the member was disciplined as far as we are concerned were (1) not signing out appropriately (even though she verbalized she was doing this) and (2) did not take off or reverse her TSAR shirt.

VDEM does not dispatch or authorize non-certified resources. For instance, if someone calls the state for a bloodhound, which is not listed or certified as a state resource, the state does not alert the bloodhound association, they act as a conduit to pass on the number for the bloodhound association.

As far as VDEM is concerned, this issue is reportedly closed.

We still need to formalize the process of "sign out as ASRC/VDEM, sign in as non-VDEM resource." Will discuss by email on the BOD list after the VSARCO meeting in a week.

Some discussion of insurance; no specific conclusions.

Are 332 pages sent to the ASRC website logged? Yes. Some of these are 30' callouts, and nobody is every notified. Can have it sent from the website to the ASRC records and to the Operations Officer.

Attachments:
Recert Proposal.doc
BOD Deck.ppt
Treasurer's report.

Appalachian Search & Rescue Conference
2007 Projected Budget
Jen Clifton, Treasurer

Projected Income

Dues:	8125.00

Total: **8125.00**

Projected Expenses

Insurance	6426.00	
5 Year Pins	243.35	
Metrocall	285.00	23.75/month
Dispatching	600.00	
Misc. Supplies	100.00	
Incorporation Fee	25.00	
Web Expenses	332.40	

Total: **8011.75**

Net Income:	**113.25**
Current Balance:	2625.49
Projected Ending Balance:	**2738.74**
Earmarked funds:	1500.00
Projected Usable Funds:	**1238.74**

ASRC Group Accreditation Proposal

Committee members: Bob Allam, Andrew Bickers, Keith Crabtree, William Dixon

Date: January 13, 2007

The Current Process Is Primarily Administrative

The process verifies that the Group:

- Has the required equipment.
- Maintains a roster.
- Conducts training.

This Process Should Focus On Operational Capability

- For the subject's benefit.
- For compliance with the:
  - Operations Manual.
  - Training Standards.
  - Bylaws and Administrative Manual.

- Purpose is to make sure the groups and the ASRC are viable SAR groups.

Stagger the Evaluation

Ease the administrative burden by:

- Using a rolling schedule.

- Evaluating 2 Groups concurrently.

- Conducting 2 evaluations annually.

Evaluate 7 Key Areas

- Knowledge of operational standards.
- The Group's training program.
- Possession and maintenance of required equipment.
- Feedback from 3 local RAs.
- Group response to missions.
- Successful completion of a mission simulation.
- Adherence to ASRC Bylaws and Administrative SOP.

Knowledge of Operational Standards

- Evaluate using a test administered to 25% of the Group's members, randomly selected based on the current roster submitted to the ASRC Secretary.

- The test will be administered to at least 1 member at each training level.

- Members have 30 days to complete the test.

- Members can refer to the Operations Manual while taking the test.

- 80% of those tested must achieve at least an 80% score.

Review of Group Training Program

Evaluate 15 criteria concerning:

- Training advancement by members.

- Use of current training materials.

- Documentation.

- Training execution.

- Recertification program.

Possession and Maintenance of Required Equipment

- Evaluate based on Annex A of the Operations Manual.
- Utilize a signed statement by the Group Chair rather than requiring a third party inventory.

Feedback From 3 Local RAs

- Completion of an RA Satisfaction Survey by 3 local agencies.

- Addresses:
  - Formal support agreements.
  - Knowledge of how to engage the Group.
  - Mission response by the Group.
  - Knowledge of resource types available in the Group.
  - Any issues with the Group and how they were resolved.
  - Awareness of the ASRC.
  - Awareness of VDEM and how to request additional resources.

Group Response to Missions

- Evaluate mission response using ASRC Dispatch records:
  - Group Dispatch was opened for at least 75% of ASRC missions that met certain criteria.
  - At least 5% of members responded to 75% of ASRC missions that met certain criteria.

- Group membership is based on the roster used for dues purposes for the year in which each mission occurred.

Completion of a Mission Simulation

- The true test of operational capability.
- Develop scenarios for:
    - Field team operations.
    - Search management operations.
    - Semi-tech rescue operations.
- Includes deployment and utilization of Group equipment.

Adherence to ASRC Bylaws and Admin

The Bylaws define other administrative requirements including:

- Sufficient membership for Class A or Class B membership.
- Maintain standards and requirements as defined in ASRC documents.
- Financial solvency.
- Group Training Officer (GTO) has been appointed.
- Active in ASRC affairs – We define this as ASRC BOD attendance and participation as evaluators in the reaccreditation process.
- Current Group Bylaws have been provided to ASRC Secretary.

The Group Chair will submit a self-assessment of the Group's FEMA Wilderness SAR Typing category.

What Happens if the Group Fails?

- The ASRC Operations Officer will report the evaluation . results to the BOD. If the Group failed the BOD will determine what action is appropriate.

- The Group remains decertified until it successfully completes the failed portion(s).

- The BOD will determine the consequences of two consecutive failures including the Group's future in the ASRC.

Implementation Suggestion

- Since this is a significant change we propose:
  - Asking each Group to conduct and submit a self-assessment.
  - Treating these requirements as 'goals' for the initial evaluation of each Group.
- This will help the Groups get familiar with the expectations and let us modify the requirements as appropriate.
- This approach sets expectations for ASRC groups and can assist them in improving if appropriate.
- This will put us in a better position if VDEM/VASARCO adopts a group accreditation process.
- This could also be shared with VDEM/VASARCO once it's been refined.

Next Steps

- Gain BOD agreement to develop the rest of the details.

- Distribute to Operations list for group review in preparation for several review conference calls with the Group Operations Officers.

- Request each Group conduct a self-assessment by March 30.

- At the next BOD meeting reassess the proposed process based on Group feedback and self-assessments.

ASRC Group Reaccreditation Process

Similar to the rigors imposed on a new group desiring to become a Certified Group of the ASRC, it is equally important for Certified Groups to demonstrate their continued readiness on a recurring basis.

The goal of the Group Reaccreditation Process is for each Group to demonstrate the operational readiness of the Group and its individual members in support of providing the best outcome for our missing subjects and the law enforcement agencies who request our assistance. This is accomplished by evaluating compliance with the requirements defined in the:
- ASRC Operations Manual for mission readiness.
- ASRC Training Standards for certification of members.
- ASRC Administrative Manual for group administration.

On missions the responding ASRC Group members must be able to work together as search management and team leaders/members in conjunction with other SAR resources to competently execute the search mission. Knowledge and demonstration of the ASRC standards is critical to facilitate the interoperability necessary on missions in order to best utilize the available resources.

The reaccreditation process will be conducted every 3 years:
- Using a rolling schedule.
- Two groups concurrently.
- Two evaluations annually.

Due to the significant process change being proposed, we should consider asking each Group to conduct and submit a self-assessment. For the initial evaluation of each Group we may opt to treat these requirements as goals rather than risk having a number of groups decertified. This would also enable us to modify the requirements as appropriate.

The ASRC Operations Officer will compile a packet for each evaluated Group for presentation to the ASRC BOD. The packet will include all pertinent documentation from the evaluation.

The Group Reaccreditation Process includes:
- Knowledge of the ASRC operational standards as defined in the ASRC Operations manual and any subsequent BOD minutes that have not yet been incorporated. The knowledge will be validated by:
  - A test maintained by the Conference Training Officer will be administered to 25% of each Group's members for each training certification level including CQ.
    - The ASRC Operations Officer will randomly select members to be tested based on each Group's current roster filed with the ASRC Secretary. The group can identify additional members to take the test.

ASRC Group Reaccreditation Process

- - The Conference Training Officer will distribute the test to the designated members and score the results.
  - Those designated to take the test will receive it via mail, email, or access it on the ASRC website.
  - Passing this part of the reaccreditation requires 80% of those taking the test to score at least 80% on the test. Failure to submit a completed test within the designated time period is considered a failure by that member.
  - The test will be taken individually with no assistance from anyone and completed within 30 calendar days of distribution. The ASRC Operations Manual may be used for reference during the test. Clarification about questions will be directed to the ASRC Operations Officer. Test results will be treated confidentially with only the member, the Group Operations Officer, the Conference Training Officer, and the ASRC Operations Officer having access to an individual's score. An anonymized report will be provided to each Group. The ASRC BOD will only receive a pass/fail indication for the Group for this part of the reaccreditation process.
  - o A review of the Group training program against the ASRC Training Program Accreditation Criteria will be conducted by the Conference Training Officer. The criteria will be attached as an appendix. This will focus on individual recertification management.
- Possession and maintenance of the required Group equipment in accordance with Annex A of the ASRC Operations Manual. This will be accomplished by the Group Chair submitting a signed form with an attached equipment checklist to the ASRC Operations Officer.
- Awareness of and satisfaction with the Group by local Responsible Agents based on a survey of 3 agencies within at least a 50 mile radius of the Group as requested by the ASRC Operations Officer. The Group Chair will provide the contact information.
- Documented Group response to missions
  - o During the reporting period at least 5% of Group members have responded to 75% of ASRC missions lasting at least 8 hours within a 120 mile radius of the Group. Response includes members enroute at the time the mission is closed or suspended. The Group membership will be determined based on the Active Group membership at the time the dues were assessed for the year in which each mission occurred.
  - o During the review period the Group opened Dispatch and reported availabilities to ASRC Dispatch for 75% of the ASRC missions involving that group.
  - o The ASRC Dispatch records will be the source.
- Successful completion of a mission simulation that includes scenarios for field, management, and semi-technical rescue. This includes deployment and utilization of Group equipment. Checklists will be used for evaluating each scenario category.

ASRC Group Reaccreditation Process

- Continue to satisfy the other Certified Group requirements defined in Article III, Sections 3.2 and 3.3 of the ASRC Bylaws, as:

  - 3.2.2.1 - A Class A Certified Group will have a GTO, at least 6 FTLs or higher and 10 FTMs or higher and will be entitled to two voting members on the Board of Directors elected in accordance with Article I, 2.7.3
  - 3.2.2.1 - A Class B Certified Group will have a GTO, at least 10 FTMS and will be entitled to one voting member on the Board of Directors elected in accordance with Article I, 2.7.3.
  - 3.2.3 - Be of good standing in terms of meeting the ASRC Operational and Administrative Requirements, which is interpreted as 3.1.3 that says 'maintain the standards and requirements of an ASRC Group as specified in the Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws, Training Standards, Operations Manual and Administration Manual'.
  - Chair submitting a signed form stating that the current Group Constitution and Bylaws have been reviewed during this review process and found to be not in conflict with ASRC Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws.
  - Chair submitting a signed form stating that the Group adheres to the procedures in the ASRC Administrative Manual, particularly that the group's procedures for handling charges against its members is consistent with Section 6 - Due Process
  - 3.2.4 - Be financially solvent and be able to certify that the Group meets the requirements of non-profit exempt status as defined by the IRS.
  - 3.3.3 - Select a Group Training Officer of FTL or higher status.
  - 3.3.4 - Play an active role in ASRC affairs, as measured by ASRC BOD representatives attending at least 3 out of 12 (one per year) BOD meetings and members of the Group participating as evaluators for previous 36 month review simulations.
  - 3.3.6 - Maintain a current version of the Group's Bylaws with the ASRC Secretary.
- The group Chair will submit to the ASRC Operations Officer a self-assessment of the Group's FEMA Wilderness SAR Typing category.

Failure to meet the reaccreditation standards
- In situations where a Group failed to achieve the reaccreditation standards, the ASRC Operations Officer will report the results to the BOD who will determine what action is appropriate.
- If decertified, the Group will remain in that status until it successfully completes the failed portion(s).
- If a Group fails the reaccreditation process two consecutive times, the ASRC BOD will determine the consequences including the Group's future in the conference.
- Consideration should be given to requiring the Group to pay a fee to be retained by the ASRC in the event the Group fails the reaccreditation process.

ASRC Group Reaccreditation Process

Attachments:
- Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ)
- Draft operational standards test
- Draft Training Program Accreditation Criteria
- Draft RA satisfaction survey
- Draft form to be submitted by Group Chair to ASRC Operations Officer
- Draft form to be submitted by ASRC Operations Officer to ASRC Chair

ASRC Group Reaccreditation Process

Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ)

- Overall:
    - The evaluation areas are:
        - Operations test
        - Group training program
        - Group equipment
        - Agency survey
        - Mission response
        - Mission simulation
        - Other Certified group requirements defined in Bylaws and Administrative Manual
    - Is each evaluation area equally weighted? Yes – pass/fail
    - How determine pass/fail? TBD
    - Should there be a capability rating of 1-5? No
- If the group fails:
What must be done to return to Certified status? Successfully complete failed area(s)
    - Can the Group respond to missions while in Probationary status? Yes if the Group is covered under the ASRC MOU
    - Does VDEM have to be informed if a Group goes from Certified to Probationary? No
    - Can a decertified Group retake the failed portion(s) as soon as ready? Yes
    - Does the decertified Group go through the entire evaluation again or only the portion(s) failed? Only the failed portion(s)
    - Would a mentor Group be assigned to help the decertified Group?
    - Should a monetary penalty be incurred if the Group fails?
    - Would the Group lose their BOD vote(s) until Certified status is achieved? Yes
- Is the scope of the test on the ASRC operational standards? Yes
- Will there be only 1 test regardless of training certification level? Yes but the test will contain sections only required to be answered by members at specific training levels (CQ, FTM, FTL, IS, IC)

Draft Operational Standards Test

Being drafted

ASRC Group Reaccreditation Process

Draft Training Program Accreditation Criteria

Minimum Criteria for Group Training Program Accreditation for 36 month review

Criterion	Description	Yes/No/Weak	Comme
1	Group has a GTO that is certified as an ASRC FTL or higher		
2	Group certifies CQ, FTM, FTL based on latest version of ASRC training standards, and accepts certifications by other ASRC groups.		
3	Have conducted at least one of their own classroom or field training in search or rescue techniques at least once per quarter		
4	Have conducted at least one of their own training in patient medical care at least once per quarter		
5	Have progressed at least one CQ member up to FTM each year		
6	Have progressed at least one FTM member up to FTL each year		
7	Group has recognized group instructors for FTM and FTL training levels		
8	Group is using the latest training materials available		
9	Printed manuals are available for all students		
10	FTM certifications use the latest ASRC FTM written & practical test as a baseline		
11	FTL certifications use the latest ASRC FTL written & practical test as a baseline		
12	Written documentation of passing test scores, dates and instructors, and curriculum are maintained by the Group for the duration of the member's operational activity with the Group.		
13	Identification of training level and either date certified or expiration date of training level for each member is listed on the current roster		
14	Members training levels are reviewed at least once each year against recertification requirements. Downgrade of training level is done when member does not meet recertification requirements		
15	Members receive written notification and certificate of training level certification by GTO, which includes the validity period.		

ASRC Group Reaccreditation Process

Draft RA Satisfaction Survey

Questions concerning the awareness of and satisfaction with the Group by local agencies

Group: _____

Feedback Area	Feedback
1. Does your Agency have a formal support arrangement such as an MOU with this Group?	
2. Does the agency know about the Group and how to engage the Group for a mission?	
3. When was your agency most recently contacted by the Group?	
4. When your agency is responsible for a missing person search do you quickly consider requesting the assistance of this Group?	
5. Does the Group promptly respond when requested in support of a mission?	
6. Does the Group appear competent in conducting search and rescue activities?	
7. Does the Group respond with the appropriate equipment to conduct search and rescue activities?	
8. Does the Group appear to be able to appropriately utilize their equipment to conduct search and rescue activities? or Did you know that the Group can provide certified ground search personnel, such as certified field team members, certified team leaders, and trackers/signcutters?	Tailor question based on group's personnel certifications
9. Did you know that the Group can provide certified search dogs, such as an air-scent dog, or a trailing dog?	
10. Did you know that the Group can provide people with advanced training in search planning, communications, and operations?	
11. Has your agency had any issues with	

Comment [w1]: Hmmm, I like #6, but I wonder if #7 and #8 are same as #6 ?

this Group within the last 3 years ? If so, were these issues addressed to the group? If so, do you feel like the Group was responsible in addressing these issues and did these issues get resolved?	
12. Did your agency know about the ASRC as a SAR organization providing services in your area through this member Group?	
13. Did you know that the VA Department of Emergency Management defines state standards for SAR training and provides state recognition and liability coverage for some SAR teams?	VA RAs only.
14. Would your agency feel comfortable requesting additional SAR teams through VA Department of Emergency Management?	VA RAs only.
15. May I pass your answers to this survey to the head of the group so they can follow up with you?	Confirm contact info.

ASRC Group Reaccreditation Process

Draft Form To Be Submitted By Group Chair

To: ASRC Operations Officer
From: (name), Chair of (group name)
Subject: ASRC Group Reaccreditation

As the Group Chair I certify that:
1. This group possesses all equipment defined in Annex A of the ASRC Operations Manual and that it is properly maintained. See attached list.
2. The Group's Bylaws were compared against the ASRC Bylaws and are not in conflict.
3. The Group adheres to the procedures defined in the ASRC Administrative Manual including the procedure for due process in Section 6.

We have also conducted a self-assessment and determined that this group meets the criteria for a FEMA SAR Wilderness Type (enter type) team.

ASRC Group Reaccreditation Process

Draft Form To Be Submitted By ASRC Operations Officer

To: ASRC Chair
From: ASRC Operations Officer
Subject: ASRC Group Reaccreditation of (group name)

(group name) was evaluated for reaccreditation on (date) and successfully met the criteria.

All pertinent documentation is attached:
1. Operational standards test results
2. Review of Group training program against the ASRC Training Program Accreditation Criteria
3. Group equipment inventory
4. Responsible Agent surveys of 3 agencies
5. Group response to missions
6. Mission simulation results
7. Group Chair letter