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# Introduction

The described training effectiveness process is performed in accordance with the Office of Radiological Security (ORS) international response force engagement curriculum, International Response Training (IRT). This evaluation is part of an ongoing effort to objectively measure the effectiveness of the IRT course. The evaluation will enable ORS to determine if the target audience is applying course objectives and practices, and if there are identifiable positive resulting impacts to their organization.

# Levels of Evaluation

The over-arching goal is to determine the effectiveness of the IRT and if improvements should, or can, be made based on a progressive evaluation approach. The Levels represent the extent of exploration into the results of classroom training. Questions and criteria should always point back to the learning objectives, to measure the success of the course goals. Measuring knowledge transfer in the classroom is important, but you also want to know how well it has propagated in the field and whether there is overall and downstream value from the effort.

This plan will consist of both formative and summative evaluations using the four levels of evaluation. Levels 1 and 2, or the formative phases, are conducted during and at the completion of the IRT event.

All levels of evaluation are important to understanding the successes of the training and should be applied according to commitment and feasibility toward a more effective program. Higher level indicators will be discovered in the higher-level evaluations, pointing to specific improvements for course consideration. Levels 1 – 3 focus at the individual level while Level 4 evaluation focuses programmatically.

## LEVEL 1: Reaction.

 The extent to which participants find the IRT favorable, engaging, and relevant to their jobs. This will evaluate how workshop participants react to the workshop by asking questions that capture the trainees’ thoughts. The questions determine if the participants enjoyed the experience and if they found the material in the program useful for their work. This information will be gathered by verbal questions and answers between workshop facilitators and participants and in written form using an ORS standardized workshop evaluation survey.

Three discussion areas:

* Satisfaction. The extent that participants are satisfied with the training.
* Engagement. The extent that participants are actively involved in and contributing to the learning experience.
* Relevance. The extent that participants *believe* they will have the opportunity to use and apply the information they learned on the job.

## **LEVEL 2: Learning.**

 The extent to which participants demonstrate they have acquired the intended knowledge, skills, attitude, confidence, and commitment based on their participation in the IRT. Knowledge checks should directly test and reinforce learning objectives.

This evaluation is designed to gauge the level of expertise, knowledge, or mindset that participants have developed. For the international response engagement, the Level 2 evaluations can be applied during the event through the following:

* Observations by instructors during performance-based exercises
* Knowledge checkpoints throughout presentations and facilitated discussions

Performing knowledge checks at the time of engagement allows the opportunity to discover weaknesses and reinforce concepts while participants are still present.

Levels 3 and 4, the summative phases, will be conducted after the workshop has been completed. Level 3 and 4 evaluations will require an additional engagement visit to the country at a suggested timeframe of three to six months after the course is delivered.

## LEVEL 3: Behavior.

 This level evaluation is intended to check field implementation and behavioral changes as a result of the course. Looking back to the course objectives for assessment criteria, it will investigate whether evidence of the course objectives can be found in the field. Did you achieve in class what you hoped would be carried back to the job? This evaluation will examine how well participants are *applying* the information received in the IRT (e.g., plans, procedures, checklists, good practices, etc.) and will be conducted during periodic assurance visits to the sites through:

* Tabletop exercise
* Post exercise discussion
* Interviews

Because post-engagement evaluations are conducted well after the engagement, results should point to opportunities for improvement to the existing course and/or possible reinforcement of learning objectives in a strategy related to “after-care.”

## LEVEL 4: Results.

 This level analyzes the IRT workshop’s impact at the participants’ programmatic or community level. Level 4 evaluations should be conducted in person and considered as an ongoing process, allowing enough time to measure and evaluate results. Again, looking back to the course objectives for evaluation criteria, Level 4 evaluations will be conducted during periodic assurance visits to the sites using the following methodology:

* Observations
* Interviews

Two categories of measurement should be implemented: performance and effectiveness.

* Performance – Has the following been implemented:
* Collaboration between first responders and sites
* The use of Site Response Plans, Target Folders, Critical Information cards
* Formalized and reliable alarm notification process
* Effectiveness - Can the site demonstrate the following:
* Process an alarm properly through the alarm sequence process
* Notify first responders promptly
* The ability to respond in an appropriate time to contain the attempted theft of radiological sources

These indicators will demonstrate an effective workshop by showing improvements in the protection of radiological material.

# Evaluation Process

The IRT evaluation approach should include all four levels. Section 2.0 above describes the intended investigation behind each level. In order to fully assess the effectiveness and intended outcomes of the IRT workshop, it is recommended that each of the levels be implemented to explore optimum possible improvements to engagements. The comprehensive approach to evaluation could also provide indicators that post-event training support (job aids, infographics, etc.) would further supplement classroom time for a more effective training program.

## Level 1:

Level 1 evaluations will be conducted at the conclusion of each IRT event. Prior to the event, the lead instructor will ensure the Trainee Feedback Form (see Attachments) has been translated into the appropriate language(s). The feedback forms will be distributed to the trainees at the conclusion of the course, and upon completion, the forms will be collected by the lead instructor. The lead instructor will arrange for forms and all comments to be translated to English. The lead instructor will be responsible for reviewing the feedback forms and generating a summary of the information. Each site delivering an IRT course will maintain the evaluation forms so they can be evaluated during the scheduled comprehensive review of IRT course.

## Level 2:

The Level 2 approach for IRT will include knowledge checks for participants to ensure learning objectives are retained. The course includes performance exercises that demonstrate participant knowledge and application of principles. These will be observed through a facilitated discussion using a video of attempted theft of radiological material (pre-knowledge evaluation) and a tabletop exercise involving the theft of radiological material (post-knowledge evaluation). Additionally, knowledge checkpoints will be delivered for each module of instruction that tests the knowledge of the participants.

Subtopic knowledge checks will be administered to also test transfer of knowledge.

Results of the content delivery and practice exercises through these measures will be recorded by ORS Level 2 Evaluation Form (see Attachment) and the results reviewed for necessary improvements.

The Level 3 and 4 evaluations require a field visit and should be combined to maximize efficient use of the visit. The evaluation visit should be planned for three to six months after the delivery of the IRT event and the tools for collecting evaluation data will be designed to observe (and review) both performance behavior (compared to the learning objectives) as well as programmatic and/or community impact. Review criteria will include:

## Level 3:

The Level 3 evaluation will be conducted in country during the evaluation visit. A tabletop exercise (TTX) will be conducted for the sites and first responders who previously attended the IRT. The TTX will measure how training has influenced the behavior of the participants by conducting a TTX that addresses the objectives outline in the ORS Level 3 Evaluation Form (see Attachment)

Validated Level 3 information will be incorporated into the Level 3 and 4 evaluation report.

## Level 4:

Level 4 evaluations will be conducted in country during the evaluation visit. Level 4 evaluations will involve observation and interviews from supervisors from the site, first responders, and the regulator. Observations and interviews will be based on the ORS Level 4 Observation and Interview Form (see Attachment).

Evaluators will observe objectives from the Observation and Interview Form and conduct follow-on questions based on the observation.

Validated Level 4 information will be incorporated into the Level 3 and 4 evaluation report.

# Evaluators

Individuals who should participate in the field reviews include:

* Identified Lead Evaluator
* Subject matter experts (SMEs) familiar with the IRT and its learning objectives (minimum of 2 SMEs)

Evaluators must have experience in conducting tabletop exercises for the purpose of evaluating performance based the objectives of the IRT Course.

# Reporting

## Levels 1 and 2:

Level 1 and 2 information will be summarized and maintained by the lab conducting the training. Level 1 and 2 evaluations will be reviewed during the comprehensive review of IRT course and during the regular course revision process.

## Levels 3 and 4:

Upon conclusion of the field review, a lead evaluator will assemble the feedback from each participant and develop an evaluation report. The report will describe the evaluation conducted and outline the observation results. If recommendations were made in the field by SMEs, those will also be described in the report.

Reporting will include:

1. Description of field observation
2. Observation results (include exhibits, photos, etc.)
3. Recommended actions provided in-field
4. Performance behavior and results summary
5. Instructor recommendations and survey results (pre-visit feedback)
6. Summary of evaluation
	1. Notable practices in the field (these point to course successes and objectives that are effectively implemented)
	2. Opportunities for training actions and/or

Attachments:

* ORS Level 1 Trainee Feedback Form
* ORS Level 2 Evaluation Form
* ORS Level 3 Evaluation Form
* ORS Level 4 Observation and Interview Form
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ORS Level 1 Trainee Feedback Form

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Trainee Name (optional): |  | Date:  |  |
| Contact (optional) |  |  |  |
| Job/Organization: |  |
| Location: |  | Course Title: |  |

Please use the scale on the right to rate your level of agreement with each numbered statement. Comments can be added to page 2. ***To help us improve our courses and workshops, please include explanations for any statements that you mark “Disagree” or “Strongly Disagree.”***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral  | Agree | Strongly Agree | Not Applicable |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (N/A) |
| **Training/Workshop Content:** |
| 1. I found the course material easy to understand.
 | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| 1. I was appropriately challenged by the material.
 | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| 1. The course content was relevant to my work.
 | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| 1. I was given the opportunity to ask questions.
 | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| 1. I felt that my questions were answered.
 | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| **Training/Workshop Facilitator:** |
| 1. I felt that the facilitator was knowledgeable of the content.
 | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| 1. I felt that the facilitator was organized and prepared.
 | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| 1. I learned from the experiences shared by the facilitator
 | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| **Training/Workshop Materials and Activities:** |
| 1. I understood the learning objectives.
 | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| 1. I can relate what I learned to the learning objective of this course.
 | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| 1. I was given opportunity to demonstrate my knowledge.
 | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| 1. I feel that I will be able to immediately apply what I learned in my work.
 | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Interpretation and Translation (If applicable):** |
| 1. I was able to understand the translation provided during the event.
 | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| 1. The material was translated with technical accuracy.
 | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| **Learning Environment:** |
| 1. I found the room to be comfortable.
 | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| 1. In the future, I would refer others to the event.
 | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| 1. I was comfortable with the duration of the event.
 | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| 1. I was comfortable with the pace of the event.
 | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]   | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| 1. The event provided opportunity for me to learn from others.
 | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| 1. There was sufficient time to discuss how what you learned will be applied to your job.
 | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |
| 1. It was easy for me to get actively involved during the event.
 | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  | [ ]  |

1. Which portions or activities of this training were most valuable to you and why?

1. How could this training be improved?

1. On a scale of 1 – 5, with 5 being the highest rating and 1 the lowest rating, how do you rate your overall experience of this event? Please circle your response.

**Low** 1 2 3 4 5 **High**

1. Other Comments: *(include explanations of any negative ratings here to help us improve our trainings/workshops*)



ORS Level 2 Evaluation Form

Course Name: International Response Training

Dates of Course: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Instructors:

1. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

2. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

3. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Organizations Present:

1. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

2. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

3. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

4. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

The checklist below is evaluated on a scale from 1 to 5:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 =No Knowledge | 2 =Minimal Knowledge  | 3 = Average knowledge  | 4 =Above average Knowledge  | 5 =Excellent Knowledge  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **BEFORE TRAINING** | **QUESTIONS** | **AFTER TRAINING** |
| **1 2 3 4 5** | Do sites containing radiological material know the process to notify first responders when suspicious activity occurs? | **1 2 3 4 5** |
| **1 2 3 4 5** | Do sites and first responders understand the alarm sequence? | **1 2 3 4 5** |
| **1 2 3 4 5** | Do first responders know the critical tasks necessary for establishing containment during an attempted theft of radiological material? | **1 2 3 4 5** |
| **1 2 3 4 5** | Do first responders know what additional resources to notify if there is an attempted theft of radiological material? | **1 2 3 4 5** |
| **1 2 3 4 5** | Do first responders understand the requirements for responding to an attempted theft of radiological material? | **1 2 3 4 5** |
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ORS Level 3 Evaluation Form

Target Audience: Former IRT Students

Course Name: International Response Training Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Dates of Original Course: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Instructors:

1. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

2. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

3. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Organizations Present:

1. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

2. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

3. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

4. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Objectives of the Tabletop Exercise:

1. Evaluate if the previous training provided to the attendees furnished the skills and knowledge necessary to perform their job effectively
2. Evaluate if the responses during the TTX reflect how they are supposed to perform if there is an attempted theft of radiological material.
3. Evaluate if the standards modeled in the TTX accurately reflect work standards
4. Evaluate if the IRT Training supported the target audience mission

Key Observations:

1. Were any tasks or duties associated with this training that the participants were not able to effectively perform?
2. Were any tasks or topics identified that would require more or less emphasis in future training?
3. Did participants demonstrate improved knowledge and behavior during the TTX?
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ORS Level 4 Observation and Interview Form

Target Audience: Supervisors (Facility, Response and Regulator)

Course Name: International Response Training Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Dates of Original Course: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Instructors:

1. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

2. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

3. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Organization: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Observations and Interviews:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Observation: Has the site developed Target Folders?** | Yes | No |
| [ ]  | [ ]  |
| (If no) Question: What percentage of the Target Folder has been developed? | Comments: |
| (If no) Question: When is the anticipated completion of the target folder? | Comments: |
| (If yes) Question: Has information in the Target Folder been shared with first responders? | Comments: |
| **Observation: Has the site developed Site Response Plans?** | Yes | No |
| [ ]  | [ ]  |
| (If no) Question: What percentage of the Site Response Plans has been developed? | Comments: |
| (If no) Question: When is the anticipated completion of the Site Response Plans? | Comments: |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| (If yes) Question: Has information in the Site Response Plan been shared with first responders? | Comments: |
| **Observation: Have first responders developed critical information cards?** | Yes | No |
| [ ]  | [ ]  |
| (If no) What percentage of the Critical Information Cards has been developed? | Comments: |
| (If no) When is the anticipated completion of the Critical Information Cards? | Comments: |
| (If yes) Where are the Critical Information Cards located? | Comments:  |
| (If yes) Who has access to the Critical Information Cards? | Comments: |
| **Observation: Has the central alarm integrated alarms from sites containing radioactive materials?** | Yes | No |
| [ ]  | [ ]  |
| (If no) When will the central alarm station have the ability to monitor the sites containing radioactive material? | Comments: |
| (If yes) Has the central alarm station received specialized training or instructions for sites containing radioactive materials? | Comments: |
| **Observation: Does the central alarm station have procedures for alarms received from sites that possess radioactive material?** | Yes | No |
| [ ]  | [ ]  |
| (If no) When will procedures be developed? | Comments: |
| **Observation: Can first responders arrive at locations with radioactive material in a timely manner (Driving safely with no emergency equipment engaged)?** | Yes | No |
| [ ]  | [ ]  |
| Comments: |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Observation: Do first responders know the location of the target material?** | Yes | No |
| [ ]  | [ ]  |
| Comments: |
| **Observation: Do first responders know the location of the target material?** | Yes | No |
| [ ]  | [ ]  |
| Comments: |
| **Observation: Do first responders know the location of the Critical Information Cards?** | Yes | No |
| [ ]  | [ ]  |
| Comments: |
| **Observation: Has either the site or first responders deviated from recommendations from the IRT Course?** | Yes | No |
| [ ]  | [ ]  |
| Comments: |
| **Observation: Have the site and first responders developed a working relationship?** | Yes | No |
| [ ]  | [ ]  |
| Comments: |