

Chapter 7: Post-Workshop Action Items

1. Post-Workshop Outputs

This chapter provides the details of how to develop each post-workshop output. Following the completion of the PAWSA workshop, the facilitation team should begin working on the following action items. Each item should be completed as soon as possible after the workshop ends while memories are still fresh. Action items include:

- Perform a quality assurance check on *Books 2, 3, and 4*
- Analyze the workshop's quantitative results
- Complete the final Attendee Contact List
- Perform the workshop critique analysis
- Prepare the *PAWSA Workshop Report*

2. Quality Assurance Check

The quality assurance (QA) process ensures that all results from *Books 2, 3, and 4* are accurate. The Day One QA check for *Book 1* should already have been conducted, but if not, perform the QA check at this time. This task requires two people – usually the data entry person and another member of the facilitation team. Ideally, since the data entry person originally entered the numbers into the PAWSA software, the alternate person should check the entries while the data entry person verbally reads the numbers from the books. Obviously all keypunching errors must be corrected. This cross-check ensures that the final results are 100% accurate.

3. Quantitative Results Analysis

The Excel™ workbook that is used for the PAWSA process includes spreadsheets that are used to capture the participants' quantitative evaluations, analyze that data, and display results. This section details information available from those spreadsheets that should be reviewed after the workshop concludes. While the most critical results are displayed during the PAWSA workshop, the additional information in the *All Books (waterway name)* workbook will give the sponsor a fuller sense of those results, important to judging the strength of feeling in various areas.

Using *Book 1: Baseline Risk Levels* the PAWSA participants decide which of four qualitative descriptors for each risk factor best fits the waterway being studied. While strong consensus in those decisions is expected, particularly for risk factors that can be directly quantified (e.g., Wind Conditions), sometimes that does not occur. Cells V4:V27 in the *Bk 1 Calcs* spreadsheet presents the standard deviation in the scores that were entered into the *Bk 1 Input* spreadsheet. Red highlights in that column denote a standard deviation greater than 1.0, warranting a close inspection of the raw inputs to determine which teams see the waterway's risks radically differently than the other teams. Knowing who holds that different perspective can be very enlightening.

The *Bk 2 Rslts* spreadsheet is used to analyze the *Book 2: Team Expertise Cross-Assessment* evaluations. Results to note are displayed in cells B4:D11 of that spreadsheet. Blocks highlighted in yellow indicate that between $\frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{2}{3}$ of the teams placed themselves in that block. This typically

happens in the six “Top 1/3” blocks (B4:B9) due to the fact that participants are invited to PAWSA workshops because of their acknowledged expertise. Consequently, they tend to evaluate their expertise pretty highly. However, pay close attention to any of those cells that are highlighted in red – denoting that $\frac{2}{3}$ or more of the teams placed everyone in a particular block. Given that all blocks ideally will be exactly 33%, red highlights could denote both an unwillingness of participants to judge the other teams and an imbalance in workshop expertise. That imbalance sometimes also is manifested by critique comments indicating that key interest groups were NOT adequately represented in the workshop. Taken together, these indicate possible bias in the overall workshop results.

In like manner, cells D4:D27 in the *Bk 3 Rslts* spreadsheet gives the standard deviation for the *Bk 3 Scores* inputs from the *Book 3: Mitigation Effectiveness* evaluations. Not as much consensus is expected in those scores because the 1 to 9 scale used for that evaluation is only loosely anchored. Therefore, standard deviations between 1.0 and 2.0 are highlighted yellow and shouldn't be cause for much concern. However, cells highlighted red (standard deviation greater than 2.0) should be investigated to see which teams see the effectiveness of existing risk mitigations radically differently than the other teams. Again, knowing who holds that different perspective can be enlightening.

Cells R29:AG31 in the *Bk 3 Y-N* spreadsheet summarize how each team voted with respect to whether existing mitigations are well balanced with the risks for all 24 risk factors in the Waterway Risk Model. Line 32 in that spreadsheet shows a yellow highlight if a team's number of Yes votes is more than one standard deviation from the average number of Yes votes for all teams. Again, knowing which teams see things much differently than the others can provide important insight into the workshop dynamics and the issues that were raised during the sessions.

Yellow Caution flags that appear on the *Bk 4 Disp* spreadsheet should be investigated by examining cells A1:H27 in the *Bk 4 Rslts* spreadsheet. If desired, even more detail can be gleaned from columns U:V in the *Bk 4 Calcs* spreadsheet. As explained in Chapter 6, those yellow caution flags occur when the most selected intervention category is different from the most effective intervention category AND (first case) either less than 50% of the participant teams chose the most selected category OR (second case) more than 50% of the participant teams chose the most effective category. The first case is an indicator that the participants are undecided as to the best course of action with respect to further reducing risks for that factor. The second case shows that there are two strong risk mitigation approaches which should be considered.

4. Attendee Contact List

After all participants and observers have provided the information requested on the Attendee Contact List, the data entry person should prepare the information electronically. During the workshop, the Attendee Contact List should be prepared, printed out, and validated by the attendees. In any event, a comprehensive review should be performed and corrections made, as necessary, upon conclusion of the workshop. A distinction should be made on the list between participants and observers to avoid confusion about that person's role when contacting him/her at a later date. The primary use of this list, however, is to obtain the correct mailing information of each person, specifically email addresses, so that workshop-related information can be promptly and efficiently disseminated. The corrected Attendee Contact List is given directly to the sponsor or sponsor's primary point of contact.

5. Workshop Critique Analysis

After gathering the completed workshop critiques, a comprehensive review and analysis of the comments should be performed. All comments, positive or constructive criticisms, are counted. Positive comments provide an insight into things that were done right during the workshop and that should not change in future versions of the process. Constructive criticisms also are a main focus because they generally offer ways to improve the overall process; these comments become especially important when planning a subsequent PAWSA workshop.

Critique comments are separated into two categories: (1) recommended changes to the process and (2) terms and concepts that were not clear. *Appendix A: Workshop Critique Analysis* provides a simple and useful format for entering the comments. While doing so, be as precise as possible, and enter the comments where they best fit based on the categories. Try to place all similar comments next to one another and then, if necessary, further classify the types of comments within natural groups. After all comments are entered, manually count similar comments to get an indication of the strength of feeling for any particular issue. Pay very close attention if more than three comments are made about any one issue. Once completed, the top five or ten comment themes are presented in descending order, and the workshop critique analysis and the original critique forms are provided to the sponsor for review.

6. PAWSA Workshop Report

The *PAWSA Workshop Report* can be an invaluable tool. Without some form of resulting documentation, there may be participants who feel as though the time spent in the PAWSA workshop was not justified. The *PAWSA Workshop Report* can provide that justification, providing each participant with a tangible item showing the results of the group's efforts over the entire two-day period. The recommended procedure is for the sponsor to disseminate the finalized report in a timely manner as an enclosure to a thank you letter. *Appendix B: Thank You Letter* and *Appendix C: PAWSA Workshop Report* provide recommended formats for both items.

The *PAWSA Workshop Report* should be finalized as soon as possible after the workshop finishes. (If contractor support is used to conduct the workshop, see Chapter 3, *Appendix A: Statement of Work* for required timelines). Typically, a draft of the *PAWSA Workshop Report* is provided to the sponsor within one week, while information is still fresh in the minds of those preparing and reviewing the document.

The purpose of the *PAWSA Workshop Report* is to provide the sponsor with an overall sense of the results stemming from the PAWSA process. The report should include an executive summary and summarize the PAWSA proceedings including specific risks identified, existing mitigations, desired new mitigations, and the results of all quantitative evaluations. Based on the sponsor's understanding of organizational responsibilities and lines of authority, the *PAWSA Workshop Report* also should provide specific mitigation intervention recommendations. The sponsor can use the report as a tool to inform other individuals / agencies / organizations about workshop results and garner support for risk mitigation actions, as well as to spark further discussion about risk reduction strategies with other stakeholders in the maritime community.

The *PAWSA Workshop Report* is a public document, available to anyone who wants a copy through the Freedom of Information Act process.

7. Sponsor Feedback to Maritime Community

Based on the content of the *PAWSA Workshop Report*, the sponsor should initiate a local proposal for the waterway and direct the feedback to the maritime community. There are a number of ways in which this may occur.

In many waterways, the most notable type of feedback involves informing the local Harbor Safety Committee, perhaps by providing each member with a copy of the *PAWSA Workshop Report* or hosting a follow-on meeting to discuss the outcomes of the PAWSA workshop. If actions are required on a regional and/or national level, arranging a comprehensive post-workshop meeting specifically for the political leaders in that maritime community is recommended. This would allow those individuals, most of whom likely did not attend the workshop, to address their concerns and provide input on the recommended actions, as well as forward them through the proper channels for further review and possible approval. The use of the media offers another method for providing feedback, not only to the maritime community, but to others who may not necessarily be waterway stakeholders, to become aware of any proposed mitigation actions.

Regardless of the methods used to provide feedback to the maritime community, there is an essential need for the sponsor to promote community involvement by addressing risk with all pertinent organizations and stakeholders within the community on a continual basis.