## NSP Quality Assurance – Course/Event Evaluation

Program/Course/Event/Clinic			Location		Region			Date	
Instructor of Record – print name		NSP ID #		QA	QA Auditor- print name			NSP ID#	
Number of No of Support No of Examiners Staff Candidates	1	 Number of Pass/Fail			C	Signature			
Examiners Stair Candidates	Pass Fail								
Quality Assurance Overall Assessment – check box									
Course met National Standard	Course needs improvements				Course Failed to meet National Standard				
(+) (=) (=) (=)				n dord w	(-) L				
Information below to be used by IT to determine how well the standard was met  NAME OF COURSE HERE									
				Strong	ly Disagree	Neutral		ngly Agree	
The scenarios provided the candidates a fair opportunity to display leadership, problem management, and decision making skills.				□ (1)	□ (2)	□ (3)	□ (4)	□ (5)	
The candidate was evaluated as lead on one scenario with multiple patients and one scenario where the single patient had multiple injuries.				□ (1) es.	□ (2)	□ (3)	□ (4)	□ (5)	
The scenarios portrayed true-to-life incidents.				□ (1)	□ (2)	□ (3)	□ (4)	□ (5)	
The patient/s portrayed accurate behavior for the scenarios.			□ (1)	□ (2)	□ (3)	□ (4)	□ (5)		
The patient/s behavior was consistent throughout the day.				□ (1)	□ (2)	□ (3)	□ (4)	□ (5)	
The moulages were properly applied for each scenario.				□ (1	) 🗆 (2)	□ (3)	□ (4)	□ (5)	
The moulages were reapplied as needed.			□ <b>(1</b> )	□ (2)	□ (3)	□ (4)	□ (5)		
The scenario helpers were correctly coached.			□ (1	) 🗆 (2)	□ (3)	□ (4)	□ (5)		
The scenario helpers acted consistently throughout the day.			day.	□ <b>(1</b> )	□ (2)	□ (3)	□ (4)	□ (5)	
Recording on checksheets was accurate.				□ <b>(1</b> )	□ (2)	□ (3)	□ (4)	□ (5)	
Radio communication simulation was realistic.				□ (1)	□ (2)	□ (3)	□ (4)	□ (5)	
		Total	Points (out of	55)	%		(80% is	s passing)	
Better conformance to the national standard for this course/event may be achieved by:									
Additional comments for quality improvement:									