

| | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| N/A Use X to demonstrate it is N/A for this item | Score: 0 Possible: 249 Percentage: 0.00 Stars: 0.0 | | |
| Instructor skills | | Criteria | |
| 21. Timing – 0/5 = 35 | | 35 | |
| Instructor started on time | | The class was addressed at the time class was advertised to start. Content doesn't need to be delivered, but the class needs to be acknowledged. | |
| Breaks were as long as advertised | | Breaks only go as long as they were indicated - 10 minutes was actually 10 minutes. | |
| Class restarts on time | | The class was addressed at the designated time stated at the beginning of the break. | |
| Topics were covered in the time described | | All topics were covered according to the agenda and within the time allocated. | |
| Class ended on time | | Class ends at the time indicated at the beginning of class. | |
| Class did not run out of time | | Instructor covered all of the agenda items for the day in the time announced. | |
| Class didn't end too early | | Class does not end earlier than 15 minutes before the stated time. | |
| 22. Interaction with participants – 0/3 = 24 | | 24 | |
| Target audience appropriate | | 0 The instructor tailored participant interaction based on the participant's expertise and prior experience? | |
| Learned names of participants (can be N/A if class is too large or virtual) | 0 | An effort was made to learn names of the participants in the time allocated for the class. | |
| Treated each participant with kindness | | Empathy, patience, and effort in understanding each participant and addressing their needs or concerns was evident. | |
| Demonstrated patience with slower participants | | Slower participants were given the time and opportunity to improve and catch up, either directly by the instructor or by the instructor pairing them with more capable participants. | |
| Answered all questions with seriousness | | All questions were addressed professionally and with detail, with a follow-up for the asker. | |
| Kept instructor/participant interaction professional | | No flirting, sarcasm, innuendo, or other unprofessional interactions were experienced for any participant. | |
| Demonstrated respect for participants | | All participants were treated equally, with empathy, and professionally, demonstrating respect for person, background, and culture. | |
| Created a safe place to fail | | Participants felt safe to make mistakes and were not villified, harassed, mocked, or demeaned by making mistakes or not being as skilled as others. | |
| 23. Scenario management (waive if N/A) – 0/5 = 55 | | 55 | |
| x = No scenarios. Do not x out any of the other parts. | 0 | 0 | |
| Scenarios had appropriate number of personnel | 0 | Participants did not have to backfill missing personnel, instructor ratios were sufficient, and every scenario position was staffed adequately. | |
| Equipment was maintained separately | 0 | Equipment to be used in the scenario was kept separate or in a safe place where participants would not misuse or handle them. | |
| Participants were briefed without giving away execution | 0 | A pre-briefing was provided that setup the situation, but did not provide any clues or hints at how to perform. | |
| Instructor allowed scenario to unfold | 0 | Instructor did not interfere with the organic development of the scenario unless there was a safety issue or the scenario was going out of parameters. | |
| Scenarios were kept within a set time limit | 0 | Scenarios were not allowed to languish and run longer than was necessary. Instructors would stop scenarios if it was clear the participant was struggling. | |
| Class was pre-briefed on purpose, goals, boundaries, and safety | 0 | A scenario briefing was provided establishing safe words, safety concerns, personnel introductions, and other details without divulging the scenario details. | |
| Debriefed roleplayers | 0 | Roleplayers were debriefed after each iteration for their insights and experiences, away from the participants and before the participants were debriefed | |
| Debriefed participants privately and directly | 0 | Participants were debriefed away from other participants. | |
| Participant provides experience first | 0 | The instructor asks what the participant experienced, listens, asks probing and leading questions, before providing feedback | |
| Instructor feedback reflects performance | 0 | Instructor provides detailed feedback of both good and poor performance, with empathy and encouragement | |
| Debriefed class | 0 | The class was given a debrief and allowed to ask questions and provide commentary about their experience. | |
| 24. Safety (autofail if an instructor is unsafe) | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Safety Failure (If there is a safety failure, checking the box eliminates the score for auto fail) | | Safety was maintained and managed. If there were incidents, appropriate action was taken quickly, according to the pre-brief. | |
| 25. Questions – 0/5 = 35 | | 35 | |
| Time for questions at end of course | | Time was provided at the end of the course for participants to ask questions. | |
| Time for questions at end of blocks | | Each block of training provided opportunities for questions and discussion. | |
| Time made during delivery for questions | | Participants felt safe and encouraged to ask questions during the instruction period, without designated question time. | |
| Intentional discussion questions | | Discussion questions were designed into the course to encourage debate and conversation (more than “any questions?”) | |
| Debate is allowed/encouraged in class | | Participants felt safe to discuss, debate, and disagree with the content and with each other. | |
| Structured questions after demonstrations | | Discussion questions were provided for activities, videos, or presentations as part of debriefing and to encourage conversation | |
| Socratic method used correctly and efficiently | | Participants were asked leading questions to help them arrive at predetermined objectives and information, as part of developing critical thinking. | |
| 26. Appropriateness, unless it is relevant to the course. – 0/4 = 28 | | 28 | |
| No inflammatory language (racist, sexist, etc.) was used | | Inflammatory language is any language that is not necessary for the delivery of the course or relevant to the content of the course. | |
| No political commentary | | Unless relevant to the course, political commentary was avoided and instructor neutrality was evident while instructing. | |
| Limited obscenities were used | | The use of obscenities was limited to relevant use in scenarios, course content, or other material necessary for the delivery of the course. | |

| | | |
|-----|--|---|
| | No sexual innuendo with participants | No sexual innuendo or advances were made by the instructor towards any participant in the class. |
| | No shaming or belittling of participants | Participants were not shamed, mocked, or belittled in class unless it was specifically a part of the content or a scenario. |
| | No criticism of other instructors | The instructor showed professionalism by refraining from making statements about other instructors or administrators during class time. |
| | No criticism of agencies | No criticism of other agencies or agency personnel was made during class time. |
| | 27. Knowledge – 0/5= 40 | 40 |
| | Covered content in materials (IG, PG, or slides) | All content indicated by a participant guide or an agenda was covered sufficiently. |
| | Added context to content delivered | The instructor was able to add context and background for the content as was necessary to develop participant understanding. |
| | Used figures of speech to illustrate the content | Metaphors, similes, and anecdotes were used appropriately to explain content and concepts. |
| | Demonstrated depth of knowledge | Provided details and additional information to illustrate content and further develop understanding. |
| | Was able to support content with research, statistics, and detailed background | The instructor was able to reference third-party materials or provide guidance for further study by participants. |
| | Allowed debate and answered challenges to the content respectfully | Allowed participants to disagree and was respectful during the debate about content. |
| | Was able to argue counter-points for both sides of the discussion | The instructor's knowledge of the content was sufficient that they were able to argue both sides of an issue or question. |
| | Three Why's answered and addressed | The instructor didn't have to resort to "because I said so" statements. Mindset and "whys" were clearly stated and addressed. Able to answer "why" questions with detail, reason, and evidence. |
| | 28. Demonstration – 0/4 = 32 | 32 |
| | Explains the expected task performance | An explanation was provided as a demonstration occurs. |
| | Demonstrates all of the expected task | The task was fully demonstrated from beginning to end, to include any subtext or secondary effects. |
| | Task is broken into steps | |
| | Each step is demonstrated separately | |
| | Participants are walked through steps as they perform | |
| | Instructor works with each participant as they work through the steps | |
| | Instructor demonstrates tasks in total at end | |
| | Participants debriefed after performance | |
| | 29. Caselaw in practice | Percentage of total |
| 0.5 | Spell v. McDaniel: use and custom | Instructor does not introduce content that is not in the material or provides commentary contrary to the material |
| 0.5 | City of Canton v. Harris: reflect job tasks | Job tasks are as stated in material and are tied to job tasks |