Class Integrity Rating Form
FAST PROJECT
VAMC San Diego, CA

Class Leaders' ID's 1)_____ 2)_____ Location #_____ Session#_____ Date_____

Directions: For each item assess the leaders on a scale from 0 to 6, and record the rating on the line next to the item number. Descriptions are provided for even-numbered scale points to assist you in the rating. If you believe the leaders fall between two of the descriptions, select the intermediate number. If the descriptions for a given item occasionally do not seem to apply to the session you are rating, feel free to disregard them and use the more general scale below:

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Poor	Barely Adequate	Mediocre	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent

Please do not leave any item blank. For all items, focus on the skill of the class leaders, taking into account how difficult the class participants seem to be.

_____1. Agenda
- 0   Leaders did not set up an agenda.
- 2   Leaders set agenda that was vague or incomplete.
- 4   Leaders recited a clear agenda but neglected to state the session number or class topic.
- 6   Leaders recited a clear agenda, stated the session number and topic. They then established and followed the agenda.

_____2. Class Review
- 0   Leaders did not spend time reviewing material learned in the previous class.
- 2   Leaders discussed class materials casually without a focus on objectives learned.
- 4   Leaders covered class materials, but spent only a little time reviewing it.
- 5   Leaders spent allotted time reviewing previous class materials, focusing on main objectives and skills learned.

_____3. Mini-lectures
- 0   Material for class topic was not covered and without reasonable justification.
- 2   Material was covered but poorly organized.
- 4   Material was well-organized, but leaders made little attempt to integrate the information to issues relevant to the group.
- 6   Material was well-organized, and applied to class problems and issues.

_____4. Time scheduling
- 0   Poor
- 2   Classes had some direction, but the leaders had significant problems with structuring or pacing (e.g. too little structure, inflexible about structure, too slowly paced, too rapidly paced, etc.)
- 4   Leaders were reasonably successful at using time efficiently. Leaders maintained appropriate control over flow of discussion and pacing.
- 6   Leaders used time very efficiently by tactfully limiting peripheral and unproductive discussion and by pacing the session as rapidly as was appropriate for the participants.

_____5. Organization of workshop time
- 0   Leaders ignored participants or spent time with one person.
- 2   Leaders spent time with most participants, but failed to focus on relevant class topics.
- 4   Leaders focused on relevant topics, but did not cover materials with all participants.
- 6   Leaders provided helpful assistance to all participants, working with materials to be covered for homework assignment.

_____6. Feedback
- 0   Leaders did not ask for feedback to determine the participants' understanding of, or response to the session.
- 2   Leaders elicited some feedback from the participants, but did not ask enough questions to be sure the participants understood the leaders' line of reasoning during the session, or to ascertain whether the participants were satisfied with the material presented.
- 4   Leaders asked enough questions to be sure that the participants understood the leaders' line of reasoning throughout the session and to determine the participants' reactions to the session. The leader's adjusted their behavior in response to the feedback where appropriate.
- 6   Leaders were especially adept at eliciting and responding to verbal and nonverbal feedback throughout the session (e.g. elicited reactions to sessions presentation, regularly checked for understanding, helped summarize main points at the end of session).

_____7. Understanding
- 0   Leaders repeatedly failed to understand what the participant explicitly said and thus consistently missed the point.
- 2   Leaders were usually able to reflect or rephrase what the participant said, but failed to respond to more subtle communication. Limited ability to listen and empathize.
- 4   leaders grasped participants' "internal reality" as reflected by both what the participant said and what the participant communicated in more subtle ways. Good ability to listen and empathize.
- 6   Leaders understood participants, and were able to communicate this understanding through appropriate responses.

_____8. Interpersonal effectiveness
- 0   Leaders had poor interpersonal skills. They seemed hostile, demeaning, or in some other way destructive to participants.
- 2   Leaders did not seem destructive but had significant interpersonal problems. At times leaders appeared impatient, aloof, or generally had difficulty conveying confidence or competence.
- 4   Leaders displayed a satisfactory degree of warmth, concern, confidence, geniuses, and were highly professional.
- 6   Leaders displayed optimal levels of warmth, concern, confidence, genuineness, and professionalism appropriate for this particular class setting.

_____9. Modeling of skills
- 0   Leaders did not model skills taught in class. Leaders failed to provide demonstration of class objectives to be learned.
- 2   Leaders provided some modeling of skills, however the leaders failed to provide adequate explanation of the functional relevance or practical application of the demonstration in relation to class material.
- 4   Leaders were able to effectively model skills, providing good explanation of the association between the demonstration and class objectives in a way that was likely to be comprehended by the participants.
- 6   Leaders were very effective at modeling important skills taught in class in a manner that was likely to significantly increase the participants understanding, while enabling them to easily apply the techniques.

_____10. Addressing problem behavior
- 0   Leaders ignored, minimized, failed to address, or otherwise unskillfully exacerbated behavior that was disruptive in a manner that severely threatened the integrity of the class or significantly compromised the leaders' ability to accomplish class objectives.
- 2   Leaders attempted to address problem behavior but did so in a manner that was unlikely to exact a solution or in a way that seem to lack the skills necessary to effectively resolve the situation.
- 4   Leaders were able to address problem behavior in a manner that effected an immediate solution but did so by either unconventional, non-collaborative, undiplomatic, or haphazard means.
- 6   Leaders addressed problem behaviors effectively, providing a skillful intervention that resulted in the maintenance of the most optimal learning environment while securing group process dynamics.