State of California – Department of Justice

TRAINING EVALUATION – COURSE & INSTRUCTOR ASSESSMENT

POST 2-341 (Revised 04/21)

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

PRESENTATION INFORMATION					
Course title	Control no	umber		Date	
				to	
POST Regional Consultant		Email address			
Instructor		Evaluator			
Agency/presenter		City		Zip	
Number of students	Maximum number of students allowed				
Course coordinator	Em	ail		Phone	
Instructor number of for this cours	for this course				
REQUIRED POST DOCUMENTATION					
☐ Expanded Course Outline		Y	es No	o N/A	
Resumes		Safety Briefing Performed [
☐ Hourly Distribution	urly Distribution				
☐ Budget		Instructor/Student Ratio [
Notes:					

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	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	Instructor used student backgrounds and experiences in facilitating class dialogue. Posed questions back to the class when able. Encouraged all students to participate	
engagement. Comments:			own learning. Used lecture as appropriate.	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:					
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	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 did not appear to be prepared for training, was dressed inappropriately given the environment, used profanity when unnecessary or not part of the curriculum.	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.	
Comments:					
Learning Resource Management: The use of technology and other instructional resources (PPT, web- based 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:					

DIMENSION	UNACCEPTABLE	NEEDS IMPROVEMENT	MEETS STANDARD	ABOVE STANDARD	N/A
Classroom Management: The instructor was flexible and responsive to student learning needs.	Inflexible and unresponsive to student learning needs. Unable to resolve interruptions, distractions, and/or disruptive students in class.	Recognized student learning needs but struggles with flexible delivery. Somewhat resolved interruptions, distractions, and/or disruptive students in class.	Maintained empathy with students, identified emergent learning needs, and 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.	Promoted a student-centered learning environment to guide learning process while 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.	
Comments:					
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:					
Learner Validation: Student learning was measured or demonstrated.	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.	
Comments:					

Additional Comments.	
Additional Comments:	

Additional Comments:	