State of California – Department of Justice

## TRAINING EVALUATION – COURSE & INSTRUCTOR ASSESSMENT

POST 2-341 (Revised 10/23)

Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (**POST**) 860 Stillwater Road, Suite 100 West Sacramento, CA 95605-1630

PRESENTATION INFORMATION							
Course title	Control number		Date				
			to				
Instructor		T	Evaluator		to		
Agency/presenter			City			Zip	
Number of students Maximum number of students allowed							
Course coordinator	Course coordinator Email Phone						
Training commander	Е	mai	il		Phone		
Instructor number of for this cours	se						
REOU	IDED DO	eT.	DOCUMENTATION				
	IKED PO	<b>3</b> 1	DOCUMENTATION				
Expanded Course Outline				Yes			
Resumes			Safety Briefing Performed				
☐ Hourly Distribution			Safety Policies Reviewed Instructor/Student Ratio				
Budget			Instructor/Student Ratio				
Notes:							
Instructional Design Recommendations:							

## **INSTRUCTION AND FACILITATION**

DIMENSION	UNACCEPTABLE	NEEDS IMPROVEMENT	MEETS STANDARD	ABOVE STANDARD	N/A
Facilitation Skills (as appropriate for the lesson):  Instructor communicated clearly, used active listening skills, engaged students with thoughtful questions, promoted student engagement.  Comments:	Instructor only lectured. Did not allow opportunity for student feedback, engagement, or participation.	Instructor missed opportunities to engage students. Did not use questioning techniques to promote student dialogue. Relied too heavily on lecture.	Instructor maintained a student-centered learning environment. Used active listening skills. Engaged students in openended questions. Promoted student participation in their own learning. Used lecture as appropriate.	Instructor used student backgrounds and experiences in facilitating class dialogue. Posed questions back to the class when able. Encouraged all students to participate in the learning.	
DIMENSION	UNACCEPTABLE	NEEDS IMPROVEMENT	MEETS STANDARD	ABOVE STANDARD	N/A
Subject Matter Expertise: Instructor was up to date, well versed in the course material, was readily able to answer questions.	Instructor did not appear to have sufficient knowledge in the topic and lacks credibility with students. Had difficulty answering student questions. Offered no evidence that he/she is keeping up with latest trends. Teaching was contradictory to the lesson. Instructor was unfamiliar with the lesson.	Instructor lacked knowledge and appeared to lack credibility with students. Had difficulty answering questions.	Instructor had sufficient knowledge of the topic. Was well versed in the course material. Instructor was up to date with current trends.	Instructor had extensive credentials and experience in the course subject material. He/she was well versed, could readily answer all student questions, served as an example of an expert in the field.	
Comments:					

DIMENSION	UNACCEPTABLE	NEEDS IMPROVEMENT	MEETS STANDARD	ABOVE STANDARD	N/A
Time Management: Satisfied the learning objectives at an acceptable pace in the time allotted.	Instructor failed to keep to a time schedule. Was rushed, unable to meet the objectives. Dismissed class early despite not covering all material.	Instructor had trouble keeping to a time schedule. Sometimes missed student breaks. Ran over the scheduled ending time or was too far under the scheduled ending time. Did not meet objectives before dismissing class.	Instructor kept to a time schedule that enabled him/her to cover all necessary information while maintaining student breaks and class dismissal times.	Instructor effectively changed or adjusted the learning environment during the course of instruction to meet student needs and learning objectives. Allowed time for students to go beyond the lesson and/or expand. Adjusted time for students to ask questions and answer their questions.	
Comments:					
DIMENSION	LINACCEDTABLE	NEEDS	MEETS STANDARD	ADOVE STANDADD	N/A
DIMENSION	UNACCEPTABLE	NEEDS IMPROVEMENT	MEETS STANDARD	ABOVE STANDARD	N/A
Professionalism: Attitude, language, conduct, and attire were appropriate.	Instructor conduct was unacceptable for a professional training environment. Used unnecessary profanity outside the scope of course material, inappropriate attire, displayed a poor attitude toward the students or the course material.		Instructor was prepared for the training, was dressed appropriately given the training environment, refrained from using profanity. Treated all students with respect. Displayed a positive attitude.	Instructor was dressed appropriately given the training environment, did not use profanity. Communicated clearly using proper grammar. Treated all students with respect. Was enthusiastic about teaching. Maintained a professional demeanor. Treated instruction and students as a priority.	N/A
Professionalism: Attitude, language, conduct, and attire	Instructor conduct was unacceptable for a professional training environment. Used unnecessary profanity outside the scope of course material, inappropriate attire, displayed a poor attitude toward the students or the course	IMPROVEMENT  Instructor did not appear to be prepared for training, was dressed inappropriately given the environment, used profanity when unnecessary or not	Instructor was prepared for the training, was dressed appropriately given the training environment, refrained from using profanity. Treated all students with respect. Displayed a positive	Instructor was dressed appropriately given the training environment, did not use profanity. Communicated clearly using proper grammar. Treated all students with respect. Was enthusiastic about teaching. Maintained a professional demeanor. Treated instruction and	

DIMENSION	UNACCEPTABLE	NEEDS IMPROVEMENT	MEETS STANDARD	ABOVE STANDARD	N/A
Learning Resource Management:  The use of technology and other instructional resources (PPT, webbased resources, easel pads/handouts (including virtual), breakout rooms, etc. to enhance curriculum delivery. Reference material could include internet links, suggested videos, experts, or other training material.	Instructor did not use instructional resources. Did not promote engaging student learning using delivery resources. Did not provide reference material for use during or after the class.	Instructor used a minimal number of instructional resources (e.g., PowerPoint only) in delivering course material. Missed opportunities to enhance the class with engaging resources.	Instructor used a variety of methods and tools to support student-centered learning (PPT, webbased resources, easel pads/handouts including virtual), breakout rooms, etc. to enhance curriculum delivery as appropriate. Provided reference/resource material.	Instruction was entirely student-centered with a wide variety of engaging classroom activities using multiple resources. Instructor provided students with useful resources for use during and after the course with direct application to skills used on the job.	
Comments:		NEEDS			
DIMENSION	UNACCEPTABLE	IMPROVEMENT	MEETS STANDARD	ABOVE STANDARD	N/A
Classroom Management: The instructor was flexible and responsive to student learning	Inflexible and unresponsive to student learning	Recognized student learning needs but struggles with flexible delivery. Somewhat	Maintained empathy with students, identified emergent learning needs, and	Promoted a student- centered learning environment to guide learning process while	
needs.	needs. Unable to resolve interruptions, distractions, and/or disruptive students in class.	resolved interruptions, distractions, and/or disruptive students in class.	made purposeful course revisions on the fly. Identified risk management issues and resolved any potential distractions immediately to return the class to an effective learning environment.	also assuring learning outcomes were met. Took potentially disruptive situation(s) and turned it into a teachable moment while maintaining tact and an effective learning environment.	

DIMENSION	UNACCEPTABLE	NEEDS IMPROVEMENT	MEETS STANDARD	ABOVE STANDARD	N/A
Real World Application: Presentation included instruction that provided knowledge, skills, and abilities in real world application.	Instruction did not provide relevant information for application in realworld context	Instructor missed opportunities to connect curriculum with real- world application. Relied too heavily on lecture with limited opportunities for students to apply the material.	Instructor established relevance, provided instruction and curriculum that had real- world or tangible application outside the classroom.	Instructor established relevance, provided instruction and curriculum that had real-world or tangible application outside the classroom. Instructor incorporated effective learning activities that enabled students to experience hands-on application.	
Comments:					
DIMENSION	UNACCEPTABLE	NEEDS IMPROVEMENT	MEETS STANDARD	ABOVE STANDARD	N/A
Instructional Methods:  Delivery applied to a variety of learning styles (visual/auditory/tactile/kinesthetic), used activities, and learning domains (cognitive, affective, psychomotor) as appropriate.	Instructor did not address different student learning styles at all. Used delivery methods that did not allow for student centered learning.	Instructor missed opportunities to address different student learning style needs. Focused too much on one learning domain when the curriculum or topic crossed multiple domains.	Instructor used a variety of delivery methods applicable to different learning styles and learning domains as appropriate for the course.	Instructor delivered information in ways that involved all learning styles, fully utilized RIDEM principles (Relevance, Involvement, Discovery, Experience, Modeling). Incorporated learning domains as appropriate for the instruction.	
Comments:					

DIMENSION	UNACCEPTABLE	NEEDS IMPROVEMENT	MEETS STANDARD	ABOVE STANDARD	N/A
Learner Validation:					
Learner Validation: Student learning was measured or demonstrated.  Comments:	Instructor did not measure student skills or comprehension or provided answers without requiring students to demonstrate knowledge retention.	Instructor missed opportunities to validate learning, or the testing was inappropriate for the curriculum (e.g., no skills demonstrations in psychomotor skills, etc.).	Instructor utilized a form of testing to demonstrate knowledge or skills (written testing, group discussion feedback, student Q&A, application demonstration, etc.).	Instructor used multiple opportunities for students to individually demonstrate their knowledge of the course material.	

Additional Comments:	
Additional Commonts.	