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# **Course staff/observer feedback form**

Provider and course director: Individual concerned:

Scheme and course: Date observed:

*As part of the ‘Course director training scheme’ Mountain Training England welcome feedback from course directors to support trainee development. Please use this form to provide feedback on the individual concerned. Depending on the role some sections will be more relevant than others, an overall opinion is valued. On completion, submit directly to* *mark@mountain-training.org*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | High standard | satisfactory | Less than satisfactory | Unsatisfactory |
| **Course preparation**How well prepared was the individual?  | [ ]  Exceptionally well prepared. | [ ]  Well prepared  | [ ]  Preparation weak in some areas. | [ ]  Poorly prepared. |
| **Comments** |
| **Mountain Training knowledge**Does the individual have a broad understanding of Mountain Training and its work? | [ ]  Exceptionally thorough knowledge and understanding. | [ ]  Good knowledge but lacks complete understanding. | [ ]  Lack of knowledge and limited understanding. | [ ]  Inadequate knowledge and poor understanding. |
| **Comments** |
| **Syllabus knowledge**Does the individual have good knowledge and understanding of the relevant syllabus? | [ ]  Exceptionally thorough knowledge and understanding. | [ ]  Good knowledge but lacks complete understanding. | [ ]  Lack of knowledge and limited understanding. | [ ]  Inadequate knowledge and poor understanding. |
| **Comments** |
| **Communication**Was the individual clear and concise when communicating with candidates?  | [ ]  Crystal clear communication throughout. Excellent contextual examples are used to highlight key concepts. | [ ]  Communication is clear and concise. Contextually appropriate examples are occasionally used.  | [ ]  Communication lacks clarity. Some candidates are left confused. Examples used are contextually inappropriate. | [ ]  Communication is incoherent and laboured. Examples are lacking throughout. |
| **Comments** |
| **Attitude**Was the individual able to inspire, enable and develop others? | [ ]  Inspirational and enabling throughout. Able to tailor approach to develop all. | [ ]  Inspirational and enabling in the main. Created opportunities to support dev. | [ ]  Inspirational and enabling on occasion. Development opportunities missed. | [ ]  Un-inspirational and showed little engagement. |
| **Comments** |
| **Opportunities for practice**Did the individual create opportunities and tasks to practice skills taught? | [ ]  Numerous opportunities integrated well into delivery. | [ ]  Occasional opportunities presented.  | [ ]  Limited opportunities presented. | [ ]  Very limited/no opportunities presented. |
| **Comments** |
| **Review**Do any summaries and conclusions relate to the task given? | [ ]  Regular reviews are strongly related to task, clearly evidenced and linked to the syllabus. | [ ]  Occasional reviews are weakly related to task, evidenced and linked to the syllabus. | [ ]  Few reviews throughout, barely related to task and poorly evidenced. | [ ]  Very limited/no effective reviewing undertaken. |
| **Comments** |
| **Safety awareness**Does the individual manage risk effectively for themselves and the candidates.  | [ ]  Extremely aware of hazards and manages risk effectively. Informs others well. | [ ]  Aware of common hazards and manages associated risk. | [ ]  Moderately aware of hazards but unable to manage risk effectively.  | [ ]  Unaware of hazards. Unable to manage risk. |
| **Comments** |
| **Overall comments** |
| **Feedback given to individual** |