

AFTER ACTION REPORT

TO: Patrick Lawton

FROM: KBEs; TNCPE key writers

DATE: 10/08/12

RE: After Action Report on TNCPE Site Visit

Purpose

-What did we set out to do?

To host a successful site visit including meeting with the TNCPE examiner team assigned to evaluate Germantown's Level 4 submission, provide supporting documentation to information discussed in the application and to provide quality experience and activities for examiners during their time at the City.

-What was supposed to happen?

- Verify/clarify/validate documentation in the application
- Compile teams including KBEs and key writing staff to meet with examiners during category sessions and have additional staff available to answer examiner questions both formally/informally
- Provide a quality experience for the TNCPE examiners

-Is there a process or procedure in place for this activity?

No. However, much of the visit is dictated by the TNCPE examiner team.

Executive Summary

-What actually happened?

Examiners showed up on time with an agenda already in place. Adjustments were made to the agenda/schedule as necessary to accomplish all tasks as time constraints became present. City staff (to the best of their ability) produced and organized documents requested by examiners in the site visit issue list received prior to the visit. Every document had an associated site visit issue number assigned to it. City staff including, key writers and KBEs, responded to examiner questions as appropriate.

-What worked well that needs to be sustained?

Examiners were provided a quality experience including a separate location within the City (the Blue Room in Economic Community Development building) with controlled access and

hospitality by the City including lunch and snacks as well as tours of City events and programs. National Night Out events, Farm Park and Fire Station #4 tours, Municipal complex tour showed linkage between key concepts (e.g. sustainability) in the application. Documentation requested by examiners was compiled and organized effectively and appropriately.

Communications to staff in preparation for the site visit including emails and meetings helped demonstrate the importance of the site visit and prepared staff for site visit week. Staff flexibility in participating in sessions ensured appropriate people answered examiner questions. Engaging and recruiting boards and commission members helped tell the customer side of our application.

Physical preparation of the city including fresh flowers, trimmed trees, re-stripping parking lot, thorough cleanings helped the City look great while the examiners were here.

-What did not work well and needs to be changed?

The schedule was difficult to maintain. Tours of the municipal complex as well as off-site functions ran behind. Some category sessions required longer discussion time with the examiners than anticipated.

Some staff did not understand the criteria and the associated questions asked by examiners. This led to people not always answering the examiner questions appropriately. Some meetings had too many people in attendance; some staff never spoke.

The prep meeting held to review and address site visit issues prior to examiner visit ran long despite being scheduled for 1 1/2 hours. This led to staff fatigue and key people unable to participate due to prior commitments. Staff who did not participate in writing or preparation sessions was in attendance for examiner meetings. Debriefing meetings held during the site visit did not address the objectives of what questions and answers were stated; little time was dedicated to preparing for the next day's group.

Lessons Learned

-What can we do better next time?

In-house examiners should help prepare other staff for application writing and site visit meetings. Preparation should include addressing key concepts (e.g. ADLI) and gathering relevant supporting documentation and information for site visit. At least one in-house examiner should be present during site visit meetings. If staff does not understand questions, ask examiner for clarification. Staff should write down examiner questions and staff responses to review at debriefing meetings. Follow up communication with all Germantown staff during and after site visit is needed in order to update on the application process.

Each department head should identify mission critical processes within their department and create a process flow chart for each one.

From the criteria perspective, improvements need to be made for the next application. Some issues include:

- Incorporating criteria in business plans and focus area cabinet reports
- Produce/refine targets, goals, projections, customer satisfaction and engagement(including common definition for all terms)
- Policy for developing goals
- Evaluation tools for listening methods
- How things become best practices
- Use of the AAR
- Review/revision of managed competition
- Identify mission critical processes in each department and create a process flow chart for each

Action Items

The following action items have been identified and assigned to specific individuals to recruit and lead a cross functional team by December 1, 2012:

- Use of the AAR (Reynold Douglas and Lisa Piefer)
- Policy for developing goals (Phil Rogers)
- Evaluation tools for listening methods (George Brogdon and Stacey Ewell)
- How things become best practices (Administration staff)

In addition, each KBE should identify mission critical processes within their departments and create a process flow chart for each process. These flow charts will be reviewed with the city administrator during business plan reviews.