

2024 Exercises

- [Jonesboro Fire Department Response Exercise](#)
- [2024 Fall Fire Drills AAR-IP](#)
- [Lab Sciences Fire TTX AAR-IP](#)
- [2024 Spring Fire Drills AAR-IP](#)

Jonesboro Fire Department Response Exercise

To view the formatted PDF, click here: [Jonesboro Fire Department Response Exercise AAR-IP.pdf](#)

Jonesboro Fire Department Response Functional Exercise

After-Action Report/Improvement Plan

December 6, 2024

This After-Action Report/Improvement Plan (AAR/IP) aligns exercise objectives with preparedness doctrine and related frameworks and guidance. This AAR meets Homeland Security Exercise and Evaluation Program (HSEEP) guidelines. Exercise information required for preparedness reporting and trend analysis is included.

Exercise Overview

Exercise Name	Jonesboro Fire Department Response Functional Exercise
Exercise Date	November 12-14, 2024
Planning Date	October 31, 2024
Hotwash Date	November 12-14, 2024 (After Each Day)
Scope	This exercise is functional, and evaluated fire response capabilities to a fire situation in various locations at Arkansas State University. The scope was limited to response planning, responding, and on-scene staging. Participants utilized radio communications for reporting based on an Incident Radio Communications Plan (ICS 205).
Focus Areas ^[1]	Response

Exercise Name	Jonesboro Fire Department Response Functional Exercise
Capabilities[2]	• Planning • Operational Coordination • On-Scene Security, Protection, and Law Enforcement
Objectives	§ Identify locations on campus on initial callouts; § Identify the best route to respond/stage at a given campus location; § Coordinate with other responding units to determine staging locations/routes; § Identify capabilities, target capabilities, and gaps.
Hazard	Various; Fire Department Response Needed
Scenario	A call for service originating from Arkansas State University's Campus, either from notification of a fire alarm or a reported working structure fire. Injects are not cumulative, but rather are different incidents at different times to reflect various possibilities of the overall scenario
Sponsor	Arkansas State University
Participating Organizations	Office of Emergency Management (Wyatt Reed, Exercise Director & Ronnie Gilley); Jonesboro Fire Department (Ricky Howton, Lead Controller & E1/E3/E6/T1/B1 All Shifts),
Point of Contact	Wyatt Reed, Emergency Operations and Occupational Safety Specialist Office of Emergency Management Arkansas State University WReed@AState.edu or (870) 972-3352

Analysis of Capabilities

Table 1 includes the exercise objectives, aligned capabilities, and performance ratings for each capability as observed during the exercise and determined by the evaluation team.

Objective	Capability[3]	Performed without Challenges (P)	Performed with Some Challenges (S)	Performed with Major Challenges (M)	Unable to be Performed (U)
Identify locations on campus on initial callouts	Planning		X		

Objective	Capability [3]	Performed without Challenges (P)	Performed with Some Challenges (S)	Performed with Major Challenges (M)	Unable to be Performed (U)
Operational Coordination	X				
Identify the best route to respond/stage at a given campus location.	Planning		X		
	Operational Coordination	X			
Coordinate with other responding units to determine staging locations/routes.	Planning	X			
	Operational Coordination	X			
Identify capabilities, target capabilities, and gaps.	Planning	X			
	Operational Coordination	X			
	On-Scene Security, Protection and Law Enforcement				X

Table 1. Summary of Core Capability Performance

Rating Definitions:

Performed without Challenges (P): The targets and critical tasks associated with the capability were completed in a manner that achieved the objective(s) and did not negatively impact the performance of other activities. The performance of this activity did not contribute to additional health and/or safety risks for the public or for emergency workers, and it was conducted in accordance with applicable plans, policies, procedures, regulations, and laws.

Performed with Some Challenges (S): The targets and critical tasks associated with the capability were completed in a manner that achieved the objective(s) and did not negatively impact the performance of other activities. The performance of this activity did not contribute to additional health and/or safety risks for the public or for emergency workers, and it was conducted in accordance with applicable plans, policies, procedures, regulations, and laws. However, opportunities to enhance effectiveness and/or efficiency were identified.

Performed with Major Challenges (M): The targets and critical tasks associated with the capability were completed in a manner that achieved the objective(s), but some or all of the following were observed: demonstrated performance had a negative impact on the performance of other activities; contributed to additional health and/or safety risks for the public or for emergency workers; and/or was not conducted in accordance with applicable plans, policies, procedures, regulations, and laws.

Unable to be Performed (U): The targets and critical tasks associated with the capability were not performed in a manner that achieved the objective(s).

The following sections provide an overview of the performance related to each exercise objective and associated capability, highlighting strengths and areas for improvement.

Capability Definitions:

Planning: Conduct a systematic process engaging the whole community as appropriate in the development of executable strategic, operational, and/or tactical-level approaches to meet defined objectives.

Operational Coordination: Establish and maintain a unified and coordinated operational structure and process that appropriately integrates all critical stakeholders and supports the execution of core capabilities.

On-Scene Security, Protection, and Law Enforcement: Ensure a safe and secure environment through law enforcement and related security and protection operations for people and communities located within affected areas and also for response personnel engaged in lifesaving and life-sustaining operations.

Exercise Setup

Initial Training

The initial training portion of this event included a guided tour of campus along four legs (see map in Appendix A). This training allowed players to familiarize themselves with the response routes that may be used both in the exercise and in everyday responses. Additionally, the Exercise Director evaluated the ability of emergency vehicles and personnel to navigate these routes to identify areas of vulnerability or needed correction.

Units remained in service for calls while the training took place, and little impact was noted. Adequate command staff were present to assist A-State in performing the training and exercise in a effective manner. After the initial training portion of the event, all units broke for a lunch sponsored by the A-State Office of Emergency Management.

Issues Identified:

- Truck companies will be unable to utilize sidewalk access in the Northpark Quads due to inadequate space to swing into the turn.
- Engine companies struggle to utilize sidewalk access in the Northpark Quads. Handicap spots prevent an adequate amount of space to swing.
- Sorority houses present a challenge to both engine and truck companies due to the concrete median and bollards that are present.
- A fire zone on the east side of Aggie Way needs to be established – the loading zone currently there could block a potential response.
- Parking spaces near the curve on the east side of HPESS would prevent the ability of companies to negotiate the curve if a vehicle(s) are parked there.
- Trees near the sculpture at the northwest corner of Lab Science West need to be trimmed to ensure access continuity.
- Additional signage that is easily readable should be added across campus.
- Maps need to be updated and divided by vehicle classification, not usage (e.g. truck company, engine company, ambulance, etc. versus a broadly encompassing map).
- Additional information integration into FirstDue is needed, such as farm gate code.

Successes Identified:

- Companies are able to navigate the entirety of Quapaw Way, including the sculpture at Lab Science West.
- Engine companies are able to drive the entirety of the sidewalk in front of the Dean B. Ellis Library.
- Positive feedback was given by JFD members as to the helpfulness and effectiveness of the training.

Inject 1

Companies were initially dispatched to Lab Science West for a fire alarm.

Noted Results:

- Quapaw Street, which is no longer accessible from University Loop, shows as accessible on JFD's Geospatial Information System (GIS) routing tool.

- Although Lab Science is one building and address, it is referred to by the wings of the building (east and west). This caused understandable confusion among some responders.
- Engine companies were able to navigate through the curve of Quapaw Way and exit via the south end of the library, which was not previously thought to be possible.

Inject 2

A single engine company was dispatched to a possible field fire. Once on scene, confirmed a working fire and initiated a full alarm assignment.

Noted Results:

- Companies were able to navigate to the correct area with ease.
- Only one shift identified the nearest hydrant and staged.

Inject 3

Inject 3 was not performed in order to preserve time.

Inject 4

Full alarm dispatch to the Dean B. Ellis Library for a fire alarm.

Noted Results:

- Companies overall navigated to the area well and communicated.
- One engine company took an unapproved path to obtain access to the area. The confusion seemed to stem from a communication breakdown in training. The driver believed that all double sidewalks on campus were approved emergency routes.
- One engine company attempted to exit through the entrance gate in front of the Neil Griffin College of Business in wrong-way traffic.
- A food delivery robot delayed the response of one engine company due to its inability to recognize the emergency response vehicle.

Exercise Director Notes

Overall Evaluation

The exercise overall appeared to be a success. The exercise was built on a mastery learning philosophy where players had to demonstrate skill and knowledge to achieve exercise objectives. Safety was ensured at all times through proper controls and public information campaigns. Because Arkansas State is essentially a community within a community, more frequent events and collaboration needs to occur to build on the success of the exercise. These opportunities include public engagement, professional development, and special operations such as hosting specialized training (high angle, confined space, etc.).

Response times seemed to be realistic and achievable, especially given the fact that companies were not running a full response. Additional data evaluation will be available in this report.

Player Feedback

Overall Evaluation

Overall, participants gave positive feedback on the ability to participate in this training and exercise. Many players highlighted the importance of performing both elements of the event during normal operational hours while campus was actively in session to provide a realistic training ground. More failueres and points-of-emphasis were able to be identified than would be possible in an empty-campus setting.

Participants did request for ongoing engagement from Arkansas State and the Office of Emergency Management in continuing to collaborate and train with each other.

Exercise Time Results

Day 1 (Tuesday) Results

Inject 1	
Company	Response Time (in minutes)
Engine 1	4:00
Engine 3	3:00
Engine 6	7:00
Truck 1	4:00
Average Response Time	4:30

Inject 2	
Company	Response Time (in minutes)
Engine 1	5:00
Engine 3	6:00
Engine 6	5:00
Truck 1	5:00

Average Response Time	5:15
------------------------------	-------------

Inject 4	
Company	Response Time (in minutes)
Engine 1	3:00
Engine 3	3:00
Engine 6	3:00
Truck 1	3:00
Average Response Time	3:00

Exercise Day Overall Times	
Source	Response Time (in minutes)
From CSA1	4:00
From CSA2	5:00
From CSA3	3:40
Engine 1	4:00
Engine 3	4:00
Engine 6	5:00
Truck 1	4:00

Day 2 (Wednesday) Results

Inject 1	
Company	Response Time (in minutes)
Engine 1	4:00
Engine 3	3:00
Engine 6	5:00
Truck 1	4:00
Average Response Time	4:00

Inject 2	
Company	Response Time (in minutes)
Engine 1	3:00
Engine 3	N/A
Engine 6	4:00
Truck 1	3:00
Average Response Time	3:20

Inject 4	
Company	Response Time (in minutes)
Engine 1	4:00
Engine 3	N/A
Engine 6	4:00
Truck 1	4:00
Average Response Time	4:00

Exercise Day Overall Times	
Source	Response Time (in minutes)
From CSA1	4:00
From CSA2	3:45
From CSA3	3:30
Engine 1	3:40
Engine 3	3:00
Engine 6	4:20
Truck 1	3:40

Day 3 (Thursday) Results

Inject 1

Company	Response Time (in minutes)
Engine 1	5:00
Engine 3	2:00
Engine 6	5:00
Truck 1	4:00
Average Response Time	4:00

Inject 2	
Company	Response Time (in minutes)
Engine 1	3:00
Engine 3	6:00
Engine 6	3:00
Truck 1	3:00
Average Response Time	3:45

Inject 4	
Company	Response Time (in minutes)
Engine 1	5:00
Engine 3	3:00
Engine 6	8:00
Truck 1	5:00
Average Response Time	5:15

Exercise Day Overall Times	
Source	Response Time (in minutes)
From CSA1	5:00
From CSA2	4:45
From CSA3	2:40
Engine 1	4:20
Engine 3	3:40

Engine 6	5:20
Truck 1	4:00

Aggregated Time Results

Exercise Mean Times	
Source	Response Time (in minutes)
From CSA1	4:20
From CSA2	4:30
From CSA3	4:16
To Inject 1	4:08
To Inject 2	4:13
To Inject 4	4:05
Overall Response	4:09
Engine 1	4:00
Engine 3	3:43
Engine 6	4:54
Truck 1	3:54

Time Results Summary

A review of the time results leads to the conclusion that mean response time of less than 5 minutes (of which all mean times exemplified) suggest exercise suggest and that response timing is able to achieve and exceed the target capability of response within five minutes. While the exercise pre-staged on the outskirts of campus areas, apparatus were not permitted to run a full emergency response with excess speeds, sirens, etc. due to safety concerns. Given this, the times are fairly accurate to what true responses would be from farther distances but quicker speeds.

Areas of Strength

Strength 1 (Planning)

One of the strengths identified by the exercise director and controller was the overall success and likelihood of effective response due to planning. The Office of Emergency Management and Jonesboro Fire Department maintain a close working relationship for effective interoperability.

(Capability: Planning, Operational Coordination)

Strength 2 (Stakeholder Engagement)

Another identified strength is the engagement of key stakeholders in the process. The majority of campus stakeholders came together to welcome this training and help support it. This is a crucial component of an effective exercise program. **(Capability: Operational Coordination)**

Strength 3 (Resources)

Players appreciated the resources that the Office of Emergency Management was able to provide, such as subject matter expertise and planning documentation. Players now have a contact for additional aid and resources if the need arises in a planning or response cycle. **(Capability: Planning)**

Areas for Improvement

Improvement Area 1 (Database Integration)

As management information systems (MISs) are becoming increasingly complex and more common, additional care needs to be put in to ensuring these databases and their information are appropriately shared and integrated. This may require a capabilities meeting to determine what capabilities exist between stakeholders MISs and how that data may be useful to the other party. **(Capability: Planning)**

Improvement Area 2 (Training and Decision Support)

Additional revisions need to be made to the response and training plan as it relates to emergency response to the A-State campus. Maps and other resources need to be revised and simplified where possible to maximize the effectiveness of their information. Collaboration needs to be more frequent between A-State and response partners to ensure a more seamless interoperability and to provide decision support in pre-incident planning periods as well as in response. **(Capability: Planning, Operational Coordination)**

Improvement Area 3 (Infrastructure)

While adequate infrastructure exists to enact an effective response, the ability to identify and access this infrastructure is difficult at certain parts of campus. For example, players reported being unable to distinguish emergency sidewalk routes from non-emergency routes as well as

having difficulty identifying the routes exist at certain portions of campus. Additionally, buildings and address markers are difficult to identify in many places. Certain portions of campus, such as the North Caraway division point in front of Eugene Smith, are difficult and/or impossible to access and present a vulnerability. **(Capability: Planning)**

Appendix A: Training Route

Appendix B.1: Exercise Day 1 Communications Plan (ICS 205)

Appendix B.2: Exercise Day 2 Communications Plan (ICS 205)

Appendix B.3: Exercise Day 3 Communications Plan (ICS 205)

Appendix C: Improvement Plan

This IP is developed specifically for Arkansas State University as a result of the JFD Response FE conducted in November of 2024:

Area for Improvement	Corrective Item	Implementation Plan	Primary Responsible Organization	Organization POC
Database Integration	Identification of Capabilities	Work with stakeholders to identify what MIS systems and other databases are being used to determine if internal data could support the database or if the stakeholder database could support internal plans/operations.	Emergency Management (Primary)	Emergency Management: Wyatt Reed or Ronnie Gilley

Area for Improvement	Corrective Item	Implementation Plan	Primary Responsible Organization	Organization POC
Systematic Review	Create guidelines internally to review databases and MIS systems, both internally and with external stakeholders, to ensure information is accurate and systems functional to inform planning.	Emergency Management (Primary)	Emergency Management Wyatt Reed or Ronnie Gilley	
Training and Decision Support	Training Schedule	Work to create a more uniform training schedule with JFD over a variety of subjects to maintain knowledge and working relationship.	Emergency Management (Primary) Jonesboro Fire Department (Secondary)	Emergency Management Wyatt Reed or Ronnie Gilley Jonesboro Fire Department Division Chief Rickey Howton
	Decision Support Resource Maintenance	Evaluate the resources currently in place for decision support to ensure they have been shared and are accurate. Create additional maintenance plans for periodic reviews to ensure they still provide accurate decision support.	Emergency Management (Primary)	Emergency Management (Primary) Wyatt Reed or Ronnie Gilley
Infrastructure	Identification Markers	The Office of Emergency Management will work with Facilities Management and other university departments to evaluate options for updating markers of emergency routes and sidewalks for clearer communication.	Emergency Management (Primary)	Emergency Management: Wyatt Reed or Ronnie Gilley

Area for Improvement	Corrective Item	Implementation Plan	Primary Responsible Organization	Organization POC
Existing Infrastructure Overhaul	Work with Facilities Management and Parking Services to determine if overhauls of existing access infrastructure and designs need to be performed, such as in front of Eugene Smith or in parking areas across campus.	Emergency Management (Primary)	Emergency Management: Wyatt Reed or Ronnie Gilley	

[\[1\]](#) Selected from National Preparedness Goal's Five Mission Areas (DHS, 2015)

[\[2\]](#) Selected from National Preparedness Goal List of Core Capabilities (DHS, 2015)

[\[3\]](#) Selected from National Preparedness Goal List of Core Capabilities (DHS, 2015)

2024 Fall Fire Drills AAR-IP

To view the formatted PDF, click here: [Fall 2024 Fire Drills AAR-IP.pdf](#)

Fall 2024 Fire Drills

After-Action Report/Improvement Plan

November 4, 2024

This After-Action Report/Improvement Plan (AAR/IP) aligns exercise objectives with preparedness doctrine and related frameworks and guidance. This AAR meets Homeland Security Exercise and Evaluation Program (HSEEP) guidelines. Exercise information required for preparedness reporting and trend analysis is included.

Exercise Overview

Exercise Name	Fall 2024 Fire Drills
Exercise Dates	September 23 & 24, 2024
Planning Date	August 15, 2024
Hotwash Date	October 11, 2024
Scope	This exercise is a drill, planned for approximately 5 minutes at each residence hall. Exercise play is limited to activating the fire notification system in each building, monitoring the receipt and response by occupants, examining the notification system for any failures, and documenting all observations.
Focus Areas ^[1]	Protection, Mitigation, Response
Capabilities ^[2]	§ Community Resilience § Infrastructure Systems § Operational Coordination § Planning § Public Information and Warning

Exercise Name	Fall 2024 Fire Drills
Objectives	§ Determine the operational status of fire notification systems § Examine the ability of occupants to recognize hazard communication messaging § Examine the occupant's response to hazard communication messaging § Examine the ability of staff to encourage and guide evacuation efforts § Evaluate the effectiveness of previous public information programs § Examine for hazards that may compound fire risk/consequence
Hazard	Uncontained Fire
Scenario	Fire alarm activation signals the potential for a fire in the respective residence hall or living quarters.
Sponsor	Arkansas State University
Participating Organizations	Office of Emergency Management, University Housing, University Police Department Dispatch
Point of Contact	Wyatt Reed , Emergency Operations and Occupational Safety Specialist Office of Emergency Management Arkansas State University WReed@AState.edu or (870) 972-3352

Analysis of Capabilities

Table 1 includes the exercise objectives, aligned capabilities, and performance ratings for each capability as observed during the exercise and determined by the evaluation team.

Objective	Capability [3]	Performed without Challenges (P)	Performed with Some Challenges (S)	Performed with Major Challenges (M)	Unable to be Performed (U)
Determine the operational status of fire notification systems	Community Resilience	X			
	Infrastructure Systems		X		
	Public Information and Warning	X			
Examine the ability of occupants to recognize hazard communication messaging	Community Resilience	X			
	Infrastructure Systems	X			

Objective	Capability [3]	Performed without Challenges (P)	Performed with Some Challenges (S)	Performed with Major Challenges (M)	Unable to be Performed (U)
Planning	X				
Public Information and Warning	X				
Examine the occupant's response to hazard communication messaging	Community Resilience	X			
	Planning	X			
Examine the ability of staff to encourage and guide evacuation efforts	Community Resilience	X			
	Operational Coordination	X			
	Planning	X			
Evaluate the effectiveness of previous public information programs	Community Resilience	X			
	Planning	X			
	Operational Coordination	X			
Examine for hazards that may compound fire risk/consequence	Community Resilience	X			

Table 1. Summary of Core Capability Performance

Rating Definitions:

Performed without Challenges (P): The targets and critical tasks associated with the capability were completed in a manner that achieved the objective(s) and did not negatively impact the performance of other activities. The performance of this activity did not contribute to additional health and/or safety risks for the public or for emergency workers, and it was conducted in accordance with applicable plans, policies, procedures, regulations, and laws.

Performed with Some Challenges (S): The targets and critical tasks associated with the capability were completed in a manner that achieved the objective(s) and did not negatively impact the performance of other activities. The performance of this activity did not contribute to additional health and/or safety risks for the public or for emergency workers, and it was conducted in accordance with applicable plans, policies, procedures, regulations, and laws. However,

opportunities to enhance effectiveness and/or efficiency were identified.

Performed with Major Challenges (M): The targets and critical tasks associated with the capability were completed in a manner that achieved the objective(s), but some or all of the following were observed: demonstrated performance had a negative impact on the performance of other activities; contributed to additional health and/or safety risks for the public or for emergency workers; and/or was not conducted in accordance with applicable plans, policies, procedures, regulations, and laws.

Unable to be Performed (U): The targets and critical tasks associated with the capability were not performed in a manner that achieved the objective(s).

The following sections provide an overview of the performance related to each exercise objective and associated capability, highlighting strengths and areas for improvement.

Capability Definitions:

Community Resilience: Enable the recognition, understanding, communication of, and planning for risk and empower individuals and communities to make informed risk management decisions necessary to adapt to, withstand, and quickly recover from future incidents.

Infrastructure Systems: Stabilize critical infrastructure functions, minimize health and safety threats, and efficiently restore and revitalize systems and services to support a viable, resilient community.

Operational Coordination: Establish and maintain a unified and coordinated operational structure and process that appropriately integrates all critical stakeholders and supports the execution of core capabilities.

Planning: Conduct a systematic process engaging the whole community as appropriate in the development of executable strategic, operational, and/or tactical-level approaches to meet defined objectives.

Public Information and Warning: Deliver coordinated, prompt, reliable, and actionable information to the whole community through the use of clear, consistent, accessible, and culturally and linguistically appropriate methods to effectively relay information regarding any threat or hazard, as well as the actions being taken and the assistance being made available, as appropriate.

Residence Hall Breakdowns:

This area will identify the strengths and weaknesses of each residence hall as it relates to exercise objectives and core capabilities.

Living-Learning Communities (LLCs)

Living-Learning Community (LLC) #1

Time: 3:20 | **Number Evacuated:** 24

- **Observations:** Exercise excelled all requirements.

Living-Learning Community (LLC) #2

Time: 2:37 | **Number Evacuated:** 16

- **Observations:** Exercise excelled all requirements.

Living-Learning Community (LLC) #3

Time: 3:12 | **Number Evacuated:** 21

- **Observations:** Exercise excelled all requirements.

Living-Learning Community (LLC) #4

Time: 2:15 | **Number Evacuated:** 26

- **Observations:** The assembly area was not well utilized.

Living-Learning Community (LLC) #5

Time: 3:52 | **Number Evacuated:** 19

- **Observations:** Exercise excelled all requirements.

Living-Learning Community (LLC) #6

Time: 3:32 | **Number Evacuated:** 22

- **Observations:** Exercise excelled all requirements.

Miscellaneous Residence Halls

Arkansas Hall

Time: 5:15 | **Number Evacuated:** 56

- **Observations:** Additional staff would be beneficial. Some residents struggled to use the identified assembly area.
- **Response:** Reinforcement of the correct assembly area in post-drill communications should occur. Staffing needs will be better planned for in the exercise design phase.

Kays Hall

Time: 6:45 | **Number Evacuated:** 76

- **Observations:** Exercise excelled all requirements. RAs did an outstanding job!

University Hall

Time: 4:45 | **Number Evacuated:** 80

- **Observations:** One resident entered after the drill commenced.
- **Response:** Residents should not reenter the building for any reason. Identify appropriate messaging to residents to reinforce this.

Northpark Quads

Northpark Quad #1

Time: 4:31 | **Number Evacuated:** 61

- **Observations:** Exercise excelled all requirements.

Northpark Quad #2

Time: 5:18 | **Number Evacuated:** 76

- **Observations:** Exercise excelled all requirements.

Northpark Quad #3

Time: 3:47 | **Number Evacuated:** 57

- **Observations:** Exercise excelled all requirements.

Northpark Quad #4

Time: 4:53 | **Number Evacuated:** 53

- **Observations:** Exercise excelled all requirements.

Northpark Quad #5

Time: 5:35 | **Number Evacuated:** 65

- **Observations:** A resident entered the building after the drill commenced to check on a relative. Additionally, UPD Dispatch reported challenges with receiving the alarm from this building.
- **Response:** Residents should not reenter the building for any reason. Identify appropriate messaging to residents to reinforce this. Resets were done on the building and UPD software and a test alarm was eventually received. Should follow up with Life Safety to verify all issues are corrected. Use as an example in future training sessions as a reason to have redundant alarming (caller + FA panel).

Pack Place

Pack Place #1

Time: 4:30 | **Number Evacuated:** 37

- **Observations:** Evacuation assembly areas are not fully utilized.
- **Response:** Continue to educate on the importance of utilizing the nearest exits in conjunction with assembly areas.

Pack Place #2

Time: 5:20 | **Number Evacuated:** 53

- **Observations:** Evacuation assembly areas are not fully utilized.
- **Response:** Continue to educate on the importance of utilizing the nearest exits in conjunction with assembly areas.

Red Wolf Den

Red Wolf Den #1

Time: 2:47 | **Number Evacuated:** 20

- **Observations:** Exercise excelled all requirements.

Red Wolf Den #2

Time: 1:51 | **Number Evacuated:** 10

- **Observations:** Exercise excelled all requirements. Some residents reported challenges hearing alarm systems.
- **Response:** An issue with the fire alarm system has been identified and reported to Life Safety for repair.

Red Wolf Den #3

Time: 2:58 | **Number Evacuated:** 10

- **Observations:** Exercise excelled all requirements.

Sorority Houses

Zeta Tau Alpha

Time: 2:35 | **Number Evacuated:** 8

- **Observations:** A resident reentered the building and then evacuated again.

- **Response:** Residents should not reenter the building for any reason. Identify appropriate messaging to residents to reinforce this.

Alpha Gamma Delta

Time: 1:31 | **Number Evacuated:** 3

- **Observations:** Exercise excelled all requirements.

Alpha Omicron Pi

Time: 2:15 | **Number Evacuated:** 14

- **Observations:** Exercise excelled all requirements.

Chi Omega

Time: 1:39 | **Number Evacuated:** 6

- **Observations:** Exercise excelled all requirements.

Delta Zeta

Time: 0:43 | **Number Evacuated:** 7

- **Observations:** Exercise excelled all requirements.

The Circle:

The Circle Building #1

Time: 6:43 | **Number Evacuated:** 10

- **Observations:** Exercise evacuation timing is slow for this building.
- **Response:** Identify ways to encourage quick evacuation of buildings.

The Circle Building #2

Time: 3:23 | **Number Evacuated:** 3

- **Observations:** Exercise excelled all requirements.

The Circle Building #3

Time: 2:38 | **Number Evacuated:** 3

- **Observations:** Exercise excelled all requirements.

The Circle Building #4

Observations: Exercise excelled all requirements.

Strengths

Strength 1 (Staff Leadership): Overall, leadership by Housing staff has improved concerning this exercise. It is noted that RAs are continually growing in their confidence in the appropriate action to take and the correct procedure to follow. Additional growth opportunities are available and will be explored, but overall this is a strength. **(Capability: Community Resilience, Operational Coordination, Planning)**

Strength 2 (Knowledge Of and Adherence to Procedures): Fewer issues are noted of failure to comply with established procedures and increased usage of assembly areas. No student conduct referrals were needed in this exercise. Staff were receptive and engaged in fulfilling exercise needs and requirements. **(Capability: Community Resilience, Planning)**

Areas for Improvement

Area for Improvement 1 (Re-Entry): One issue noted numerous times was residents re-entering the building. It should be communicated to residents the expectation for them to evacuate the building promptly and remain evacuated until cleared by appropriate response personnel. **(Capabilities: Community Resilience, Public Information and Warning)**

Area for Improvement 2 (Fire Safety Systems): While fire safety systems in residential areas are generally well-maintained and invested in, vulnerabilities in monitoring systems have been noted during this drill. Relevant stakeholders should work to review the effectiveness of monitoring systems, while the importance of notifying a public safety answering point or the on-campus dispatch center should continue to be stressed among residents and resident staff. **(Capabilities: Planning, Public Information and Warning)**

Area for Improvement 3 (Messaging): While public awareness campaigns in general have increased on campus, continuing to communicate not only response information but also policy expectations as well as good fire safety prevention habits should continue. **(Capability: Planning, Community Resilience, Public Information and Warning)**

Appendix A: Improvement Plan

This IP is developed specifically for Arkansas State University as a result of the Fall 2024 drills conducted in September of 2024:

Area for Improvement	Corrective Item	Implementation Plan	Primary Responsible Organization	Organization POC
----------------------	-----------------	---------------------	----------------------------------	------------------

Re-Entry	Communication of Expectations	Communication with residents about expectations regarding appropriate procedures should be communicated during initial resident meetings and followed up with reminders throughout the year.	University Housing (Primary) Emergency Management (Secondary)	University Housing: Natalie Eskew or Jenny Keller Emergency Management: Wyatt Reed or Ronnie Gilley
Fire Safety Systems	Inspection, Testing, & Maintenance Plan	Evaluate plans and programs for the inspection and maintenance of fire alarm systems; specifically, evaluate testing plans of monitoring capabilities.	Emergency Management (Primary)	Emergency Management: Wyatt Reed or Ronnie Gilley
	Fire Safety Training	Continue explaining the importance of notifying UPD by phone of fire alarms to RAs and other University Housing staff.	Emergency Management (Primary)	Emergency Management: Wyatt Reed or Ronnie Gilley
Messaging	Safety Messaging	Safety messaging and information campaigns should increase, both proactively and reactively. This includes sending a consistent stream of preparedness and preventative information to residents as well as corrective information and guidance as needed.	University Housing (Primary) Emergency Management (Secondary)	University Housing: Natalie Eskew or Jenny Keller Emergency Management: Wyatt Reed or Ronnie Gilley

[\[1\]](#) Selected from National Preparedness Goal's Five Mission Areas (DHS, 2015)

[\[2\]](#) Selected from National Preparedness Goal List of Core Capabilities (DHS, 2015)

[\[3\]](#) Selected from National Preparedness Goal List of Core Capabilities (DHS, 2015)

Lab Sciences Fire TTX AAR-IP

To view the formatted PDF, click here: [Lab Sciences Fire TTX AAR-IP.pdf](#)

Lab Sciences Fire TTX

After-Action Report/Improvement Plan

December 2, 2024

This After-Action Report/Improvement Plan (AAR/IP) aligns exercise objectives with preparedness doctrine and related frameworks and guidance. This AAR meets Homeland Security Exercise and Evaluation Program (HSEEP) guidelines. Exercise information required for preparedness reporting and trend analysis is included.

Exercise Overview

Exercise Name	Lab Sciences Fire TTX
Exercise Date	July 17, 2024
Planning Date	N/A
Hotwash Date	July 17, 2024
Scope	This exercise is a tabletop, designed to evaluate internal response capabilities only. Exercise play is limited to general administrative incident management, although certain on-scene incident management strategies were evaluated.
Focus Areas ^[1]	Response, Recovery
Capabilities ^[2]	§ Planning § Operational Coordination § Fatality Management § Environmental Response § Situational Assessment

Exercise Name	Lab Sciences Fire TTX
Objectives	§ Feel comfortable with incident management processes and structure; § Understand how to apply incident management processes and plans to a scenario; § Consider how similar events might impact standard daily operations; § Identify capabilities, target capabilities, and gaps.
Hazard	Uncontained Fire, Hazardous Materials Release
Scenario	A fire alarm reported in the Lab Sciences building, compounded by following injects of a working structure fire, hazardous materials release, and likely mass casualty incident.
Sponsor	Arkansas State University
Participating Organizations	Office of Emergency Management (Wyatt Reed, Facilitator & Ronnie Gilley), Disaster Preparedness & Emergency Management Program (Jon Carvell, Evaluator), Environmental Health & Safety (Melissa Dooley), Facilities Management (Brian Lasey & Petree Buford), Risk Management (Sandra Bramblett), Student Affairs (Dr. Martha Spack), University Communications (Todd Clark), University Police Department (Randy Martin & Billy Branch)
Point of Contact	Wyatt Reed , Emergency Operations and Occupational Safety Specialist Office of Emergency Management Arkansas State University WReed@AState.edu or (870) 972-3352

Analysis of Capabilities

Table 1 includes the exercise objectives, aligned capabilities, and performance ratings for each capability as observed during the exercise and determined by the evaluation team.

Objective	Capability [3]	Performed without Challenges (P)	Performed with Some Challenges (S)	Performed with Major Challenges (M)	Unable to be Performed (U)
Feel comfortable with incident management processes and structure	Planning	X			
	Operational Coordination	X			
	Situational Assessment	X			

Objective	Capability [3]	Performed without Challenges (P)	Performed with Some Challenges (S)	Performed with Major Challenges (M)	Unable to be Performed (U)
Understand how to apply incident management processes and plans to a scenario	Planning	X			
	Operational Coordination	X			
	Situational Assessment	X			
Consider how similar events might impact standard daily operations	Planning	X			
	Environmental Response	X			
Identify capabilities, target capabilities, and gaps	Planning	X			
	Fatality Management	X			

Table 1. Summary of Core Capability Performance

Rating Definitions:

Performed without Challenges (P): The targets and critical tasks associated with the capability were completed in a manner that achieved the objective(s) and did not negatively impact the performance of other activities. The performance of this activity did not contribute to additional health and/or safety risks for the public or for emergency workers, and it was conducted in accordance with applicable plans, policies, procedures, regulations, and laws.

Performed with Some Challenges (S): The targets and critical tasks associated with the capability were completed in a manner that achieved the objective(s) and did not negatively impact the performance of other activities. The performance of this activity did not contribute to additional health and/or safety risks for the public or for emergency workers, and it was conducted in accordance with applicable plans, policies, procedures, regulations, and laws. However, opportunities to enhance effectiveness and/or efficiency were identified.

Performed with Major Challenges (M): The targets and critical tasks associated with the capability were completed in a manner that achieved the objective(s), but some or all of the following were observed: demonstrated performance had a negative impact on the performance of other activities; contributed to additional health and/or safety risks for the public or for emergency workers; and/or was not conducted in accordance with applicable plans, policies, procedures,

regulations, and laws.

Unable to be Performed (U): The targets and critical tasks associated with the capability were not performed in a manner that achieved the objective(s).

The following sections provide an overview of the performance related to each exercise objective and associated capability, highlighting strengths and areas for improvement.

Capability Definitions:

Planning: Conduct a systematic process engaging the whole community as appropriate in the development of executable strategic, operational, and/or tactical-level approaches to meet defined objectives.

Operational Coordination: Establish and maintain a unified and coordinated operational structure and process that appropriately integrates all critical stakeholders and supports the execution of core capabilities.

Fatality Management: Provide fatality management services, including decedent remains recovery and victim identification, working with local authorities to provide temporary storage and sharing information with mass care services for the purpose of reunifying family members and caregivers with missing persons/remains, and providing counseling to the bereaved.

Environmental Response: Conduct appropriate measures to ensure the protection of the health and safety of the public and workers, as well as the environment, from all-hazards in support of responder operations and the affected communities.

Situational Assessment: Provide all decision-makers with decision-relevant information regarding the nature and extent of the hazard, any cascading effects, and the status of the response.

Evaluator Notes

Initial Scenario

Initial evacuations and alarm confirmations are likely to go smoother in the busier hours of the day than less busy. Reports of fire and/or a fire alarm may go to various places, such as the University Police's dispatch center, administrative staff, the Facilities Management Work Order Center, etc. It is important to not only direct people to notify University Police, but also to anticipate these other entities that may receive reports and direct them to notify University Police as well.

To mitigate initial impacts, proper response protocols (including evacuation procedures) must be accessible both before and during the incident. This may include tools from marketing campaigns to signage.

Inject 1

Short of physically being present, confirming a fire can be difficult. Cameras may be used, but in this particular building, the infrastructure is likely not present for real-time confirmation. Discussed ways to add credibility to threat, including volume/specificity of reports.

Inject 2

Appropriate campus stakeholders such as Environmental Health and Safety did well to identify initial areas of concern. Additional access to these databases likely needs to be expanded, including CampusOptics' Hazardous Materials portal. After confirmation of the threat, UPD appropriately highlighted the importance of triggering the campus emergency notification system as well as notifying the chain of command. Adding cameras to buildings for real-time confirmation of threats and hazards in addition to general surveillance would be beneficial.

Inject 3

Highlighted the question of integrating Jonesboro E911 into aiding campus dispatch. Likely, E911 will already be getting numerous calls since cellular 911 calls from campus are routed to their center. Consider who should be notified and at what level: this could include building-level staff, such as safety committees. Emergency Operations Center needs to be prepared for activation as well as the campus incident management team. The university likely needs to evaluate readiness for promptly establishing an EOC and activating a campus IMT. At this stage, prompt public information activities should be started.

Inject 4

Constant evaluation of stakeholders and incident objectives needs to occur as the scene unfolds. Consider rescheduling classes or canceling – a discussed advantage of canceling would be

prompting a voluntary evacuation, much in the way that inclement weather closures prompt this, without having to publicize it as such. Notifying area hospitals and the Craighead County Office of Emergency Management is necessary to ensure operational coordination remains in place and a common operating picture exists. Utilize MoU with St. Bernard's for counseling services and evaluate if this capability meets target capabilities. Fill gaps with campus resources and potentially outside consultants. Start the recovery process with the insurance company through the Office of Risk Management to preserve scene integrity. Evaluate plans to move communications from UPD to the Division of Communications, as well as a devolution plan in accordance with notification policies.

Inject 5

Fatality management may present challenges due to the infrequency of handling this on campus. However, in general, follow Student Affairs protocols for a death on campus. University Police can assist in notifications to next-of-kin. Mortuary assistance can be utilized through ADEM but is likely not needed for a localized incident such as this. The Chancellor and President should be made aware of fatalities. An identified challenge is the delay in reporting fatalities until a NOK and university officials are notified. Work with media to release information but respect the privacy and integrity of the investigation.

Final Inject

The recovery process starts quickly. Not only does this building contain space, but it likely has unique assets such as chemicals and experiments that cannot be quickly replaced. Ensure the focus is not just on immediate response and the tragedy itself but also on recovery and business continuity. Players properly identified the importance of involving structural engineers, insurance adjusters, and worker's compensation providers for employees injured.

Facilitator Notes

Overall Evaluation

The exercise overall was a success in the eyes of the facilitator. Players did an exceptional job in allowing appropriate stakeholders to be responsible for answering questions within their subject matter expertise. Additional stakeholder buy-in would have likely offered additional perspectives from key decision-makers that would have guided the conversation along. The Office of Emergency Management can improve upon future exercises by continuing to expand the stakeholders involved as players. An area that needs additional evaluation in the future is the ability to quickly activate an Incident Management Team (IMT) and Emergency Operations Center (EOC). Additionally, meetings with policymakers would likely help set the vision for incident response and management. This is necessary to define who is responsible for certain aspects of the response, as well as ensuring internal agencies are aware of these policies and abiding by them.

To end on a positive note, all players integrated into an EOC-like environment and were able to effectively communicate and respond to the injects. Collectively, the group was able to answer the most challenging situations thoughtfully and effectively.

Participant Evaluation Form Results

Form Setup

The evaluation form had two parts: Part A consisted of a Likert formatted questionnaire. Part B consisted of a qualitative assessment in a short answer format to certain prompts.

Evaluation

Part A

The evaluation of Part A was determined based on selecting a level of agreement from 1-5, where 1 was strongly disagree, 3 was neutral, and 5 was strongly agree. All questions were created where a higher selection represented a more favorable view of the exercise in relation to the question being asked. The exercise would be deemed successful if the mean aggregate of all respondents' selections was greater than 3.2 on a 5.0 scale. The complete mean aggregate was 4.26, indicating a 1-point deviation positively from the success marker.

Part B

The evaluation of Part B is subjective both in terms of the respondent's answers to the prompts and the interpretation of the response by the facilitator.

Response #1: Please list 3 areas of strength from this exercise.

Respondents noted that A-State's readiness for emergency response seems to be in a good state, with key stakeholders well-trained and knowledgeable. Relationships with external partners are good, and internal partners seem to be able to collaborate on incident management objectives well. Players noted the campus emergency notification system as a key piece of infrastructure for response, and they evaluated that it would likely perform well in this scenario. Respondents appreciated the realism of the scenario and the ability to not be overwhelmed by injects. The guidebook was a good tool for players in the exercise.

Response #2: Please list 3 areas for improvement noted from this exercise.

Respondents noted the staffing for crowd control as an issue, as well as emergency access to the facility. Additionally, campus partners who would likely be part of an incident management team need additional training in preparation for an EOC activation. One respondent noted the potential benefit of having building liaisons to verify information and help in response operations. Many noted that additional departments/agencies should be involved in future exercises. Another player would like to see improvements in checking in on students/staff to verify safety. Improving communication plans to include a devolution/reconstitution plan between emergency officials and the Division of University Communications. Finally, improvements in collaboration with officials charged with response to hazardous materials incidents on campus as well as an increase in surveillance tools.

Response #3: What steps would you take to improve on issues identified in Response #2?

Respondents noted the importance of mutual aid to meet the resource needs of an incident, as well as expanding/outlining campus evacuation routes. Another recommends reviewing the incident management team at least once annually, as well as a meeting/exercise of those expected to staff the EOC. Additionally, we need to evaluate access to campus databases such as CampusOptics for emergency response personnel.

Areas of Strength

Strength 1 (Integration and Communication)

One of the strengths identified numerous times by players and the evaluator is the ability of campus leaders to quickly come together and offer their subject matter expertise in a helpful manner. Players were able to quickly integrate and effectively respond to the scenario/injects in a timely manner. **(Capability: Planning, Operational Coordination, Situational Assessment)**

Strength 2 (Emergency Notification System)

Another identified strength is the capabilities and redundancy of the campus emergency notification system, especially in its infrastructure design. The system can use numerous vehicles, both conventional and integrated, to be able to deliver a uniform message in a timely manner. **(Capability: Planning, Operational Coordination, Environmental Response, Situational Assessment)**

Strength 3 (Exercise Planning)

Respondents felt that this exercise was well planned and that the tools provided (e.g. presentation, guidebook, etc.) were helpful aids in navigating the exercise. The scenario and injects were realistic and achievable, while also stimulating thought and conversation. **(Capability: Planning)**

Areas for Improvement

Improvement Area 1 (EOC and IMT Integration Readiness)

An area that needs improvement is the maintenance of a campus Incident Management Team (IMT) as well as ongoing integration exercises and conversations surrounding an Emergency Operations Center (EOC) activation. The campus IMT needs to be identified and trained, and investments into a practical EOC need to be made. **(Capability: Planning, Operational Coordination)**

Improvement Area 2 (Communications Devolution and Reconstitution Plan)

Another area that needs improvement is crisis communications. While players were able to effectively identify the system and key stakeholders in crafting and delivering crisis communications, the university needs to evaluate at what point (if any) that communication duties transfer from the alerting authority to the Division of University Communications during incident management and then back based on incident needs and objectives. Additionally, the university must evaluate if this transition not only is needed but is feasible from an infrastructure standpoint. **(Capability: Planning, Operational Coordination, Situational Assessment)**

Improvement Area 3 (Stakeholder Communications)

An integral part of campus response and readiness is the ability of internal and external stakeholders to be equipped with the information needed to seamlessly transition into a multi-agency response. A major tool (especially for hazardous materials response) that is utilized on campus is CampusOptics. However, this database also contains sensitive information that does not need to be publicly accessible. The university needs to identify agencies and agency leaders with a need-to-know for access to this database, as well as other campus response plans. **(Capability: Planning, Situational Assessment)**

Improvement Plan

This IP is developed specifically for Arkansas State University as a result of the Lab Sciences Fire TTX conducted in July of 2024:

Area for Improvement	Corrective Item	Implementation Plan	Primary Responsible Organization	Organization POC
EOC and IMT Integration Readiness	Identification and Credentialing	Identify members of the campus IMT and work to provide credentials for these individuals. Set up a recurring process to evaluate the IMT for turnover.	Emergency Management (Primary)	Emergency Management: Wyatt Reed or Ronnie Gilley
	EOC Infrastructure	Work with ITS and Facilities Management to evaluate EOC infrastructure needs and gaps to obtaining target capability. Request funding to achieve the target capability.	Emergency Management (Primary) ITS & Facilities (Secondary)	Emergency Management Wyatt Reed or Ronnie Gilley ITS & Facilities Scott Wheat or Brian Lasey
	EOC Exercise	Once the first two corrective items are implemented, exercise to evaluate if the target capability can be met.	Emergency Management (Primary)	Emergency Management: Wyatt Reed or Ronnie Gilley
Communications Devolution and Reconstitution Plan	Evaluate Notification Infrastructure for Portability	Evaluate the campus emergency notification systems to see if the infrastructure can be moved, transferred, or operated remotely.	Emergency Management (Primary) University Police Department (Secondary)	Emergency Management Wyatt Reed or Ronnie Gilley University Police Department Randy Martin or Billy Branch

Area for Improvement	Corrective Item	Implementation Plan	Primary Responsible Organization	Organization POC
Policy Development	Evaluate the need (if any) for devolution and reconstitution of university emergency communications. If needed, draft policy and procedures into a plan.	University Communications (Primary) University Police Department (Secondary) Emergency Management (Tertiary)	University Communications Todd Clark University Police Department Randy Martin or Billy Branch Emergency Management (Tertiary) Wyatt Reed or Ronnie Gilley	
Stakeholder Communications	Data Sharing	The Office of Emergency Management will identify stakeholders that need access to internal data/databases. Access will be given after any necessary university security concerns are identified and mitigated or accepted.	Emergency Management (Primary)	Emergency Management: Wyatt Reed or Ronnie Gilley

[\[1\]](#) Selected from National Preparedness Goal's Five Mission Areas (DHS, 2015)

[\[2\]](#) Selected from National Preparedness Goal List of Core Capabilities (DHS, 2015)

[\[3\]](#) Selected from National Preparedness Goal List of Core Capabilities (DHS, 2015)

2024 Spring Fire Drills AAR-IP

To view the formatted PDF, click here: [Spring 2024 Fire Drills AAR-IP.pdf](#)

Spring 2024 Fire Drills

After-Action Report/Improvement Plan

April 17, 2024

This After-Action Report/Improvement Plan (AAR/IP) aligns exercise objectives with preparedness doctrine and related frameworks and guidance. This AAR meets Homeland Security Exercise and Evaluation Program (HSEEP) guidelines. Exercise information required for preparedness reporting and trend analysis is included.

Exercise Overview

Exercise Name	Spring 2024 Fire Drills
Exercise Dates	February 26-28, March 6, 2024
Planning Date	February 23, 2024
Hotwash Date	April 16, 2024
Scope	This exercise is a drill, planned for approximately 5 minutes at each residence hall. Exercise play is limited to activating the fire notification system in each building, monitoring the receipt and response by occupants, examining the notification system for any failures, and documenting all observations.
Focus Areas ^[1]	Protection, Mitigation, Response
Capabilities ^[2]	§ Community Resilience § Infrastructure Systems § Operational Coordination § Planning § Public Information and Warning

Exercise Name	Spring 2024 Fire Drills
Objectives	§ Determine the operational status of fire notification systems § Examine the ability of occupants to recognize hazard communication messaging § Examine the occupant’s response to hazard communication messaging § Examine the ability of staff to encourage and guide evacuation efforts § Evaluate the effectiveness of previous public information programs § Examine for hazards that may compound fire risk/consequence
Hazard	Uncontained Fire
Scenario	Fire alarm activation signaling the potential for a fire in the respective residence hall or living quarter.
Sponsor	Arkansas State University
Participating Organizations	Environmental Health & Safety, Office of Emergency Management, University Housing
Point of Contact	Wyatt Reed , Emergency Operations and Occupational Safety Specialist Office of Emergency Management Arkansas State University WReed@AState.edu or (870) 972-3352

Analysis of Capabilities

Table 1 includes the exercise objectives, aligned capabilities, and performance ratings for each capability as observed during the exercise and determined by the evaluation team.

Objective	Capability ^[3]	Performed without Challenges (P)	Performed with Some Challenges (S)	Performed with Major Challenges (M)	Unable to be Performed (U)
Determine the operational status of fire notification systems	Community Resilience	X			
	Infrastructure Systems	X			
	Public Information and Warning	X			
Examine the ability of occupants to recognize hazard communication messaging	Community Resilience	X			
	Infrastructure Systems	X			

Objective	Capability [3]	Performed without Challenges (P)	Performed with Some Challenges (S)	Performed with Major Challenges (M)	Unable to be Performed (U)
Planning	X				
Public Information and Warning	X				
Examine the occupant's response to hazard communication messaging	Community Resilience	X			
	Planning	X			
Examine the ability of staff to encourage and guide evacuation efforts	Community Resilience	X			
	Operational Coordination		X		
	Planning		X		
Evaluate the effectiveness of previous public information programs	Community Resilience	X			
	Planning	X			
	Operational Coordination	X			
Examine for hazards that may compound fire risk/consequence	Community Resilience	X			

Table 1. Summary of Core Capability Performance

Rating Definitions:

Performed without Challenges (P): The targets and critical tasks associated with the capability were completed in a manner that achieved the objective(s) and did not negatively impact the performance of other activities. The performance of this activity did not contribute to additional health and/or safety risks for the public or for emergency workers, and it was conducted in accordance with applicable plans, policies, procedures, regulations, and laws.

Performed with Some Challenges (S): The targets and critical tasks associated with the capability were completed in a manner that achieved the objective(s) and did not negatively impact the performance of other activities. The performance of this activity did not contribute to additional health and/or safety risks for the public or for emergency workers, and it was conducted in accordance with applicable plans, policies, procedures, regulations, and laws. However,

opportunities to enhance effectiveness and/or efficiency were identified.

Performed with Major Challenges (M): The targets and critical tasks associated with the capability were completed in a manner that achieved the objective(s), but some or all of the following were observed: demonstrated performance had a negative impact on the performance of other activities; contributed to additional health and/or safety risks for the public or for emergency workers; and/or was not conducted in accordance with applicable plans, policies, procedures, regulations, and laws.

Unable to be Performed (U): The targets and critical tasks associated with the capability were not performed in a manner that achieved the objective(s).

The following sections provide an overview of the performance related to each exercise objective and associated capability, highlighting strengths and areas for improvement.

Capability Definitions:

Community Resilience: Enable the recognition, understanding, communication of, and planning for risk and empower individuals and communities to make informed risk management decisions necessary to adapt to, withstand, and quickly recover from future incidents.

Infrastructure Systems: Stabilize critical infrastructure functions, minimize health and safety threats, and efficiently restore and revitalize systems and services to support a viable, resilient community.

Operational Coordination: Establish and maintain a unified and coordinated operational structure and process that appropriately integrates all critical stakeholders and supports the execution of core capabilities.

Planning: Conduct a systematic process engaging the whole community as appropriate in the development of executable strategic, operational, and/or tactical-level approaches to meet defined objectives.

Public Information and Warning: Deliver coordinated, prompt, reliable, and actionable information to the whole community through the use of clear, consistent, accessible, and culturally and linguistically appropriate methods to effectively relay information regarding any threat or hazard, as well as the actions being taken and the assistance being made available, as appropriate.

Residence Hall Breakdowns:

This area will identify the strengths and weaknesses of each residence hall as it relates to exercise objectives and core capabilities.

Living-Learning Communities (LLCs)

Honors #1

Time: 3:04 | **Number Evacuated:** 8

- **Observations:** One resident did not evacuate.
- **Response:** Report will be made by University Housing to OSC.

Honors #2

Time: 3:14 | **Number Evacuated:** 10

- **Observations:** Exercise excelled all requirements.

Living-Learning Community (LLC) #3

Time: 3:32 | **Number Evacuated:** 11

- **Observations:** Exercise excelled all requirements.

Honors #4

Time: 4:05 | **Number Evacuated:** 24

- **Observations:** Assembly area was not well utilized.

ROTC/STEM

Time: 2:45 | **Number Evacuated:** 11

- **Observations:** Exercise excelled all requirements.

Griffin Business

Time: 3:01 | **Number Evacuated:** 8

- **Observations:** Exercise excelled all requirements.

Miscellaneous Residence Halls

Arkansas Hall

Time: 6:40 | **Number Evacuated:** 34

- **Observations:** The timing was better than the previous semester. Assembly area usage seems to be improving.
- **Response:** Continue to improve communication with residents, especially since this is a building with “alarm fatigue”.

Kays Hall

Time: 6:10 | **Number Evacuated:** 65

- **Observations:** Exercise excelled all requirements. RAs did an outstanding job!

University Hall

Time: 5:28 | **Number Evacuated:** 45

- **Observations:** One resident didn't evacuate.
- **Response:** Resident will be reported to OSC by University Housing.

Northpark Quads

Northpark Quad #1

Time: 5:10 | **Number Evacuated:** 50

- **Observations:** Exercise excelled all requirements.

Northpark Quad #2

Time: 5:03 | **Number Evacuated:** 31

- **Observations:** Exercise excelled all requirements.

Northpark Quad #3

Time: 4:49 | **Number Evacuated:** 40

- **Observations:** Exercise excelled all requirements.

Northpark Quad #4

Time: 5:17 | **Number Evacuated:** 47

- **Observations:** Assembly area was not well utilized by residents.
- **Response:** Expectations of assembly areas will continue to be communicated to residents and University Housing staff. Additionally, additional assembly areas/signage may be implemented in the future.

Northpark Quad #5

Time: 6:18 | **Number Evacuated:** 22

- **Observations:** Exercise excelled all requirements.

Pack Place

Pack Place #1

Time: 6:57 | **Number Evacuated:** 46

- **Observations:** Exercise excelled all requirements. RAs did an outstanding job!

Pack Place #2

Time: 7:24 | **Number Evacuated:** 52

- **Observations:** Timing is bordering on an unacceptable range. Some residents refused to evacuate. A few residents did not evacuate to the correct assembly area and had to be corrected by the RAs, although most were compliant after being confronted.
- **Response:** Increased outreach should be performed so that students understand where their assembly point is and the importance of being prudent in reaching it. Housing officials should send an email out to Pack Place #2 residents highlighting the appropriate evacuation procedures, the identified assembly area, and the consequences for not following procedures.

Red Wolf Den

Red Wolf Den #1

Time: 4:20 | **Number Evacuated:** 12

- **Observations:** Exercise excelled all requirements.

Red Wolf Den #2

Time: 2:37 | **Number Evacuated:** 2

- **Observations:** Exercise excelled all requirements.

Red Wolf Den #3

Time: 6:11 | **Number Evacuated:** 11

- **Observations:** Most participants excelled exercise requirements. A few did not evacuate and will be reported to OSC by University Housing.

Sorority Houses

Zeta Tau Alpha

Time: 3:10 | **Number Evacuated:** 7

- **Observations:** Exercise excelled all requirements.

Alpha Gamma Delta

Time: 1:53 | **Number Evacuated:** 8

- **Observations:** Exercise excelled all requirements.

Alpha Omicron Pi

Time: 2:17 | **Number Evacuated:** 10

- **Observations:** Exercise excelled all requirements.

Chi Omega

Time: 2:16 | **Number Evacuated:** 5

- **Observations:** Not all residents utilized the assembly area to the north of the house after evacuating.

Delta Zeta

Time: 2:20 | **Number Evacuated:** 4

- **Observations:** Exercise excelled all requirements.

The Circle:

The Circle Building #1

Time: 2:47 | **Number Evacuated:** 3

- **Observations:** Exercise excelled all requirements.

The Circle Building #2

Time: 2:53 | **Number Evacuated:** 10

- **Observations:** Exercise excelled all requirements.

The Circle Building #3

Time: 3:12 | **Number Evacuated:** 12

- **Observations:** Resident re-entered the building to retrieve her dog.
- **Response:** University Housing will refer the resident to the Office of Student Conduct for this matter to be handled internally.

The Circle Building #4

Time: 3:33 | **Number Evacuated:** 8

Observations: Exercise excelled all requirements.

Strengths

Strength 1 (Fire Notification Systems): The fire alarm systems used in residence halls are generally high-quality systems that are well-maintained. The investment made by the University in upgrading and maintaining these systems leads them to be a reliable and fully operable mitigation and response tool, which leads to overall resilience. Most are integrated into the University Police dispatch center. **(Capabilities: Community Resilience, Infrastructure Systems, Public Information and Warning)**

Strength 2 (Staff Leadership): Overall, leadership by Housing staff has improved in relation to this exercise. It is noted that RAs are continually growing in their confidence in the appropriate action to take and the correct procedure to follow. Additional growth opportunities are available and will be explored, but overall this is a strength. **(Capability: Community Resilience, Operational Coordination, Planning)**

Strength 3 (Procedural Response): Fewer issues are being noted of failure to comply with established procedures and increased usage of assembly areas **(Capability: Community Resilience, Planning)**

Areas for Improvement

Area for Improvement 1 (Fire Prevention): Many fire prevention issues are continuing to be noticed or growing, including policy and code violations. From this drill, improper use of fire doors was noted which can lead to an overall failure of that safety system. Electric devices like scooters that are prohibited were documented during this drill and ultimately created a hazard that could be mitigated. **(Capabilities: Community Resilience, Infrastructure Systems)**

Area for Improvement 2 (Assembly Area): While the implementation of an assembly area has been a much-needed improvement, additional steps can be taken to ensure residents are aware of this area and to provide ease of access. Signage at the assembly area could be a helpful reminder, and for certain buildings, two assembly areas may be beneficial to residents. **(Capabilities: Planning, Public Information and Warning)**

Area for Improvement 3 (Communication): While public information and communication capabilities and follow-through have improved, there is additional work to be done to achieve the target capability. Increasing safety messaging in pre-established communication modes is vital, as is sending targeted reminders to areas identified as problematic in the hotwash. **(Capability: Community Resilience, Operational Coordination, Public Information and Warning)**

Appendix A: Improvement Plan

This IP is developed specifically for Arkansas State University as a result of the Fall 2023 drills conducted in October of 2023:

Area for Improvement	Corrective Item	Implementation Plan	Primary Responsible Organization	Organization POC

Fire Prevention	Code Compliance Checks	Certain basic fire code standards from the Arkansas Fire Prevention Code should be identified as most critical and be monitored by Housing staff in pre-established rounds. Any compliance issues can be remediated or reported as needed.	University Housing (Primary) Emergency Management (Secondary)	University Housing: Natalie Eskew or Jenny Keller Emergency Management: Wyatt Reed or Ronnie Gilley
	Policy Compliance Enforcement	University Housing policy on the mitigation of hazards should be enforced, including the usage of cooking materials, open flames, and electric devices. Corrective actions include increasing documentation during Fire, Health, and Safety inspections as well as reporting violations to the Office of Student Conduct when appropriate.	University Housing (Primary)	University Housing: Natalie Eskew or Jenny Keller
	Fire Safety Training	Fire safety training can increase for both residents and University Housing staff, both for fire prevention and response. Emergency Management will work alongside Housing and external partners to increase these.	Emergency Management (Primary)	Emergency Management: Wyatt Reed or Ronnie Gilley

Safety Messaging	Safety messaging and information campaigns should increase, both proactively and reactively. This includes sending a consistent stream of preparedness and preventative information to residents as well as corrective information and guidance as needed.	University Housing (Primary) Emergency Management (Secondary)	University Housing: Natalie Eskew or Jenny Keller Emergency Management: Wyatt Reed or Ronnie Gilley	
Assembly Area	Additional Signage	While maps currently exist to communicate appropriate evacuation assembly areas, additional external signage would likely be beneficial. Emergency Management will coordinate with Facilities Management and Housing partners to evaluate this.	Emergency Management (Primary) University Housing (Secondary)	Emergency Management: Ronnie Gilley or Wyatt Reed University Housing: Natalie Eskew or Jenny Keller
	Evaluation of Additional Assembly Areas	Adding one additional assembly area for certain buildings would likely make evacuations simpler, safer, and more accessible. Emergency Management will coordinate with Housing to evaluate this need and add any areas necessary.	Emergency Management (Primary) University Housing (Secondary)	Emergency Management: Wyatt Reed or Ronnie Gilley University Housing: Natalie Eskew or Jenny Keller

Communication	Fire, Health, and Safety Blurbs	As identified in the previous AAR, increasing communication through the preexisting FHS emails would be helpful. Housing should coordinate with Emergency Management to determine the content of these reminders.	Emergency Management (Primary) University Housing (Secondary)	Emergency Management: Ronnie Gilley or Wyatt Reed University Housing: Natalie Eskew or Jenny Keller
	Post-Drill Communications	Areas that were identified as having significant issues (especially procedurally) in the hotwash should be sent a follow-up email from Housing communicating expectations and applicable policy/procedures.	University Housing (Secondary)	University Housing: Natalie Eskew or Jenny Keller

[\[1\]](#) Selected from National Preparedness Goal’s Five Mission Areas (DHS, 2015)

[\[2\]](#) Selected from National Preparedness Goal List of Core Capabilities (DHS, 2015)

[\[3\]](#) Selected from National Preparedness Goal List of Core Capabilities (DHS, 2015)