

<b>NSP PROPOSAL FORM</b> <i>Revised 01/97</i> Do Not Use Previous Versions		Proposal Number: F09 P001
		Assigned Committee:
The proposal maker(s) submit this proposal for consideration by the NSP Board of Directors in accordance with the NSP Policies & Procedures. This proposal has been researched, is submitted in final wording with all applicable boxes completed and information provided. I (We) have contacted and discussed this proposal with the appropriate National Program Director or other staff and/or NSP Department Director prior to submitting the proposal to the national office. I (We) have indicated how I (we) believe this proposal will impact the budget, both long- and short-term. <b><i>I (we) understand that incomplete proposal forms will be returned to the maker(s).</i></b>		
Proposed by: Darcy Hanley	Position: Senior Program Supervisor	Date: March 31, 2009
I (we) have consulted the following people in drafting this proposal: <input type="checkbox"/> Staff comments (if any) attached <input type="checkbox"/> Nat. Pgm. Director: <input type="checkbox"/> Nat. Office Staff: <input type="checkbox"/> National Staff: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Others: Central Division Staff ADD		
The following references are relevant to this proposal: <input type="checkbox"/> NSP Bylaws: <input type="checkbox"/> NSP Strategic Plan: <input type="checkbox"/> CD Senior Manual:		
I (We) anticipate the following expenses, and have attached budget details and an explanation (as necessary) <input type="checkbox"/> Short-Term (this fiscal year): <input type="checkbox"/> Long-Term (sustained expenses):		
The Executive Director: <input type="checkbox"/> agrees with proposal expense estimate, <b>OR</b> <input type="checkbox"/> anticipates the following expenses: <input type="checkbox"/> Short-Term (this fiscal year): <input type="checkbox"/> Long-Term (sustained expenses):		
Proposal Text (attach additional pages as necessary; for bylaw, P&P, or other amendments of existing provisions, show changes with added words underlined, and deleted words with a line through them):  page 5 of the Senior Evaluation Program Manual <u><b>Senior Evaluation Quality Assurance Program</b></u> The Central Division Senior program is a result of the concerted effort between the regions and division training staff. It is critical to maintain the standards established by those involved in the program development. An important consideration of the Central Division Senior Program is ensuring the evaluation is consistent from year to year and from region to region. The division has a team of individuals who are versed in the senior program and are they are powerful resources to utilize as both "information gathers" and "information providers". These individuals will travel to each of the evaluations with a clear picture of how the senior evaluation should operate. They will act as observers and will only intervene in the event something should occur (or not occur) that steps well outside the guidelines of the program. Immediately following the evaluation the division QA staff member will meet with the region staff to review the completed QA form and, if needed, provide any additional suggestions to improve the event. Once the paperwork is completed a copy will be sent to the Region Senior Program Administrator, the Division Senior Program Supervisor and the Region Director. This step in the process is not just an "evaluation of the evaluation" but is a means to give positive feedback toward improving the evaluation. The final result of the QA process will generate an outstanding program for the participants, including both candidates and administrators.		
Proposal Explanation and Justification (attach additional pages as necessary): <b>QA Development of Division QA Staff Member</b> The objective of the QA mentoring program is to develop the cadre of Division QA staff to QA all region senior alpine evaluations. See Attachment		
Committee Revision of Proposal (if any):		
Committee Action: <input type="checkbox"/> Accepted as Drafted <input type="checkbox"/> Accepted as Revised <input type="checkbox"/> Rejected <input type="checkbox"/> Withdrawn		
Committee Chairman Explanation and Votes:		
Final Board Action: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adopted as Reported <input type="checkbox"/> Adopted as Amended <input type="checkbox"/> Defeated		
Vote on Final Consideration (if vote count taken): For - 8 Against - 0 Abstain -0		

## Senior Evaluation Quality Assurance Program

The Central Division Senior program is a result of the concerted effort between the regions and division training staff. It is critical to maintain the standards established by those involved in the program development. An important consideration of the Central Division Senior Program is to ensure that the evaluation is consistent from year to year and from region to region. The division has a team of individuals who are versed in the senior program and are powerful resources to utilize as both “information gatherers” and “information providers”. These individuals will travel to each of the evaluations with a clear picture of how the senior evaluation should operate. They will act as observers and will only intervene in the event that something should occur (or not occur) that falls well outside the guidelines of the program. Immediately following the evaluation the division QA staff member will meet with the region evaluation staff to review the completed QA form and, if needed, provide any additional suggestions to improve the event. Once the paperwork is completed a copy will be sent to the Region Senior Program Administrator, the Division Senior Program Supervisor and the Region Director. This step in the process is not just an “evaluation of the evaluation” but is a means to give positive feedback toward improving the evaluation. The final result of the QA process will generate an outstanding program for the participants, including both candidates and administrators. In addition, regions will be given the opportunity to evaluate the QA process in writing. This will be sent to the Region Sr. Program administrator or Region Director. This information will be directed to the Division Senior Program Supervisor who will in turn share that information with the QA staff.

### Qualifications and Development of Division QA Staff Member

The QA staff member should be an experienced senior examiner in the respective discipline and an IT in any discipline. Experience in the evaluation and administration of the program is important for an understanding of the flow and procedure of the presentation of the program. The QA staff member must have a good view of “The Big Picture”. A critical trait of the QA staff member is the ability to communicate, both by listening and providing feedback. The individual must be confident without being confrontational. Anyone interested in becoming a QA staff member must complete the division staff application and be recommended by their Region Director and a current QA staff member. The development of the new QA staff member will require shadowing an experienced QA staff member at a minimum of 2 different region evaluations. This can include an evaluation in their own region plus 1 other. Mentoring candidates are required to attend a Division STW. The candidates should be familiar with the Division QA staff and be a participant in the Senior module at the STW. The candidate must be familiar with the Senior manual and the evaluation criteria. The intent of the QA program is for the division staff member to provide support to the region administrator during the evaluation.

### QA Staff Interaction During the Evaluation

The intent of the QA program is for the division staff member to provide support to the region administration during the evaluation. There may be occasions during the evaluation when the QA staff member may have to intervene. Any immediate intervention by the QA staff member must be done discretely and with the concern of the candidates in mind. The intervention must be done between the QA staff, region director and the evaluation administrator. The QA candidate should brainstorm situations where an intervention may be necessary. These situations should include but not be limited to those that occur during an evaluation of the senior event. Situations that may need immediate intervention during a senior evaluation are:

1. evaluation is not meeting the standard
2. critical performance objectives are not being met
3. issues of safety

If immediate intervention is necessary the QA must be discreet and involve the senior evaluation advisor and Region Director.

### Responsibility of QA

The QA is required to provide the mentoring candidate with the QA form found in the senior manual. The QA should include the mentoring candidate in all email, conferences and/or other forms of communication prior to the evaluation date. The QA should confirm evaluation date, location and time of arrival with the mentoring candidate. The QA should include in the final report the mentoring candidate's name, date and location. The mentoring candidate should provide a final QA report. The mentoring candidate provides supporting details to the QA that should be included in the QA report. If remediation is necessary the QA and mentee should provide feedback as a team. The mentoring candidate should collaborate in two evaluations (one outside their home region).