

IAFF Snapshot:

DOE TRAINING:
Principal Investigator:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Patrick Morrison
Evaluator(s):
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dr. Harold Stolovitch has aided in establishing and reviewing the evaluation protocol Dr. Alex Cohen, Evaluation Expert, performed analysis in 2005 Third Party Evaluation Report from Bruce Lippy
Grant Number:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> U45ES09759
Goal(s) of Evaluation:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Determine student experience in practicing a drill or mock scenario Obtain structured feedback for instructors Determine whether IAFF training is having a positive impact on the students trained Measure the correlation of behavior before training and subsequent changes in behavior leading to increased safety
Evaluation tools:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pre-/post- test (First Responder Operations (FRO) exam evaluates factual recall of course units) were administered. Trainee follow-up examines how the students behavior has changed after the class. Student evaluations and peer evaluations/observations of instructors. In 2008 the IAFF conducted Level II evaluations through the assistance of Dr. Harold Stolovitch. Review of the HazMat/WMD training program by an outside consultant (the Lippy Group, LLC) was conducted September 2006 through March 2007 (note: Appendix C from 2007 report is a copy of the final Lippy report). A Registration and Survey form consisting of 83 multiple choice questions was used to gather demographic information on each student, the course taken, and feedback about the instructor (note: more info and the scantron answer sheet found in Appendix B of 2006 report). Quality Assurance Program (QAP) – consists of a Quality Assurance Checklist (addressing issues of program quality prior to, during, and after training events), the Internal Quality Assurance Report (ensures that planning, logistics, registration, and reporting functions are completed properly), and the External Quality Assurance Report (distributes a review of pre- and post- test scores, etc) – (Note: found in Appendix G for 2006 report).
Population Served:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emergency responders (predominantly male, having at least a high school education, and serving as firefighters)
Types of Courses/ Training Curricula Offered:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Technician (Tech)</i> and <i>Confined Space Rescue (CSR)</i> training programs
Trainers:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IAFF instructors assigned as subject matter experts from different regions and department sizes Training provided for mentor observers Each year the IAFF conducts and Instructor Development Conference (IDC) to provide program policy and curriculum updates to IAFF instructors who are independent consultants
Proof of effectiveness/value?

- IAFF exceeding its training goal by 136% for classes conducted in 2011.
- 93% of students responded as “strongly agree or agree” that they will practice and use the skills from this workshop on the job in 2011.
- 92% of students responded as “strongly agree or agree” that the workshop covered the skills most Emergency Responders need in 2011.
- In 2010 IAFF collected data showing a 33.5% gain from pre-test to post-test.

Most beneficial aspects/well received methods:

- Participants cited the experience of instructors and their ability to explain in practical terms, safety as the primary goal of all concepts, and hands on activities as the best features of their courses.

HDPT TRAINING:

Principal Investigator:

- Patrick Morrison

Evaluator(s):

- Third Party Evaluation Report from Bruce Lippy
- Dr. Harold Stolovitch conducted evaluations

Grant Number:

- U45ES06167

Goal(s) of Evaluation:

- Evaluate the quality and integrity of the program and the knowledge and teaching ability of the instructors
- Measure knowledge gained by each student
- Determine if and how students have applied what they have learned
- To determine the effectiveness of the instructor, the quality of the material, and the suitability of the facilities

Evaluation tools:

- Pre- and post-test are conducted.
- Comprehensive survey given at the completion of class (including a brief survey of the training, self-assessment of the skills of the instructor, and overall assessment of course).
- Registration and Survey form used to capture specific data.
- Mentor observation program to evaluate the IAFF instructor cadre’s training techniques and procedures using grant funding.
- Peer evaluations/observations of its mater instructor cadre.
- Students were asked to determine the value of the activities in some programs compared to their time.
- Level III Evaluation used in FY 2008.
- In trainee follow-up, each student will be required to demonstrate specific first responder actions with their peers in a small-group format.

- Quality Assurance Program (QAP) – consists of a Quality Assurance Checklist (addressing issues of program quality prior to, during, and after training events), the Internal Quality Assurance Report (ensures that planning, logistics, registration, and reporting functions are completed properly), and the External Quality Assurance Report (distributes a review of pre- and post- test scores, etc).

Population Served:

- Emergency response personnel across the country (including fire fighters, tribal communities, law enforcement, public works, industry workers, and ambulance/pre-hospital service personnel)
- Trainees predominantly male, Caucasian, well educated with at least a high school education, and primarily paramedics and firefighters

Types of Courses/ Training Curricula Offered:

- Include Frontline Safety Course, HazMat First Responder Operations (FRO), First Responder Awareness, WMD Awareness, HazMat Technician, Confined Space Operations, WMD Operations, Confined Space Rescue, Incident Command, Emergency Medical Services, HazMat Specialist

Trainers:

- An annual Instructor Development Conference (IDC) is held to convey course updates, administrative changes, and new training technologies to instructors
- Master instructors in their respective fields

Proof of effectiveness/value?

- Some of the comments from students in 2012 HDPT courses: “boosted morale”.... “instructors gave 110% to class”... “encouragement through examples”.... “course challenges you to change.”
- In 2012, 96% of respondents responded “strongly agree or agree” that the training will be valuable in helping them do their job in a safer and strategic manner and that they will practice and use the skills from the workshop on the job.
- Comment from a letter received by the IAFF: “The students from this program have personally attested to the quality of instruction provided. We were originally concerned that the amount of material necessary for delivery of this program would be too great with the contact hours set at 8-hours for students to comprehend and retain. These instructors were able to meet, if not exceed this task.”
- Comment from 2007 review by the Lippy Group finds the program to be “a very mature, efficiently run, creative and important effort that is universally well-regarded by key stakeholders. Viewed solely as an independent effort, the IAFF training program has archived an excellent record of reaching a critical population in a consistently cost-effective manner.”

Most beneficial aspects/well received methods:

- Near miss reporting system
- Appropriate mix of classroom, demonstration, and hands-on training (according to 2007 report from Lippy Group)
- Trainers exchange program (mentioned in 2006 progress report)

HWWT TRAINING:

Principal Investigator:

- Patrick Morrison

Evaluator(s):

- Third Party Evaluation Report from Bruce Lippy
- Dr. Harold Stolovitch conducted evaluations

Grant Number:

- U45ES06167

Goal(s) of Evaluation:

- Evaluate the quality and integrity of the program and the knowledge and teaching ability of the instructors
- Measure knowledge gained by students
- Measure the correlation of behavior before training and subsequent changes in behavior leading to incidents
- Determine if students are transferring the knowledge and skills acquired during the IAFF's training to their jobs as fire fighters (goal of Level III evaluation through Dr. Harold Stolovitch)

Evaluation tools:

- Use of pre-/post-tests.
- Comprehensive survey following training, which includes a brief survey of the training self-assessment of the skills of the instructor(s) and overall assessment of the course.
- Registration and Survey form captures specific data on students.
- Trainees follow up 6-12 months post-course, focusing on behaviors that demonstrate students have applied key concepts. Intended to generate case studies and anecdotes.
- Mentor observer program to evaluate IAFF instructor's training techniques and procedures using grant funds.
- In follow up, each student is required to demonstrate specific first responder actions with their peers in a small-group format.
- Quality Assurance Program (QAP) – consists of a Quality Assurance Checklist (addressing issues of program quality prior to, during, and after training events), the Internal Quality Assurance Report (ensures that planning, logistics, registration, and reporting functions are completed properly), and the External Quality Assurance Report (distributes a review of pre- and post- test scores, etc).

Population Served:

- Emergency response personnel across the country, primarily those in the fire service, but also including tribal communities, law enforcement, public works, industry, and ambulance/pre-hospital service personnel
- Trainees predominantly male, Caucasian, well educated with at least a high school education

Types of Courses/ Training Curricula Offered:

- Confined Space Rescue and Operations, HazMat Technician, First Responder Awareness, WMD Awareness and Operations, Emergency Medical Services, Hazmat Instructor, Incident Command

Trainers:

- An annual Instructor Development Conference (IDC) is held to convey course updates, administrative changes, and new training technologies to instructors
- Master instructors in their respective fields

Proof of effectiveness/value?

- Some comments from students of HWWT-sponsored classes in 2012: “Instructors actually had real life experience” ... “instructors did not depend on PowerPoint” ... “team atmosphere” ... “the hands on exercises were great.”
- 99% of respondents from 2012 trainings responded as “strongly agree or agree’ that they will practice and use the skills from this workshop on the job, and 98% that the quality of instruction was good.

Most beneficial aspects/well received methods:

- Annual Instructor Development Conferences help to keep instructors up to date
- An appropriate mix of classroom, demonstration, and hands-on training