

EVALUATOR GUIDELINES



Society of Professional Rope Access Technicians

Society of Professional Rope Access Technicians

994 Old Eagle School Road, Suite 1019

Wayne, PA 19087 USA

www.sprat.org

info@sprat.org

Revision History:

Version 19A Board Approved January 3rd 2019, effective April 1st 2019

Table of Contents:

1. Purpose and Scope3

2. The Evaluations Committee3

3. The Role of the Evaluator3

4. The Evaluator Appointment.....4

5. Documentation Used in the Evaluation Process.....5

6. Administering an Evaluation Session6

7. Submitting Session Information.....9

8. Evaluator Infractions.....10

9. Complaints12

10. Assessment of Evaluator Candidates.....12

11. Evaluator Workshops.....13

1. Purpose and Scope

1.1. Purpose

- 1.1.1. The purpose of this document is to provide Evaluators with the information required to provide consistent, objective, fair, accurate, and efficient evaluation sessions.
- 1.1.2. This document provides information required for Evaluators to fulfill their responsibilities as listed in Section 2.3 of SPRAT's *Evaluation Guidelines*.

1.2. Scope

- 1.2.1. This document serves as a supplement to the *Evaluations Guidelines* document by providing:
 - 1.2.1.1. The role of the Evaluations Committee.
 - 1.2.1.2. The role of the Evaluator.
 - 1.2.1.3. Details of maintaining and renewing and Evaluator appointment.
 - 1.2.1.4. Details of administrative information for correct completion of evaluation session paperwork.
 - 1.2.1.5. Detailed responsibilities for an Evaluator through the entire evaluation session.
 - 1.2.1.6. A framework for disciplinary action for violations by Evaluators.
 - 1.2.1.7. Details for assessing Evaluator candidates.

2. The Evaluations Committee

- 2.1. The Evaluations Committee is responsible for administering the rope access technician certification program according to SPRAT's *Certification Requirements for Rope Access Work*.
- 2.2. The Evaluations Committee is responsible for:
 - 2.2.1. Maintaining documentation required for the rope access technician certification program, including but not limited to the *Evaluation Guidelines*, *Evaluator Guidelines*, and SPRAT's *Process to Become an Evaluator*.
 - 2.2.2. Maintaining Evaluator requirements.
 - 2.2.3. Managing appointments and reappointments of Evaluators.
 - 2.2.4. Making recommendations for suspension or revocation of Evaluator appointments.
 - 2.2.5. Managing the facilitation of Evaluator Workshops.
 - 2.2.6. Reviewing and approving Direct Entry and Conversion applicants.
 - 2.2.7. Making recommendations to the Certification Requirements Committee to ensure consistency and efficiency throughout the certification program.
 - 2.2.8. Reviewing and considering appeals resulting from evaluation sessions or Evaluator activity.
- 2.3. Any Evaluator affected by the decisions of the Evaluations Committee may choose to appeal the decision to the Board of Directors.
- 2.4. A ruling on an appeal by the Board of Directors is considered final.

3. The Role of the Evaluator

- 3.1. An Evaluator's primary role is to administer a fair, impartial, and consistent evaluation session that objectively tests the knowledge and skills of each candidate as specified by the *Certification Requirements for Rope Access Work*.
 - 3.1.1. The evaluation session does not provide assurance beyond a candidate's ability to meet these criteria on the day of the session.
 - 3.1.2. As many factors may influence a candidate's performance, an Evaluator shall neither provide training to a candidate nor pass judgment regarding a candidate's need for more training during an evaluation session.
- 3.2. An Evaluator shall act in accordance with SPRAT's programs, policies, and documentation.
 - 3.2.1. An Evaluator shall ensure independence from all Level II and Level III candidates.

- 3.2.2. An Evaluator shall Inform the SPRAT Office and Evaluations Committee of relations or commercial interests which may make an Evaluator's impartiality suspect, or of any other potential conflicts of interest.
- 3.3. An Evaluator should remain current on equipment specifications, standards, and regulations related to rope access.
- 3.4. As the majority of rope access technicians will only ever interact with SPRAT through an Evaluator at an evaluation session, an Evaluator shall act as a positive representative of the organization.
 - 3.4.1. Evaluators shall not participate in any form of blind solicitation promoting Evaluator services and/or Evaluator fee structures.
 - 3.4.2. Evaluators shall not approach Evaluation Session Hosts, training staff, candidates, or potential clients for the purposes of recruitment or future business opportunities.
 - 3.4.3. Evaluators shall not disclose any confidential or proprietary information acquired during the course of an evaluation session unless the information pertains to practices that are clearly inconsistent with SPRAT standards and is required within Evaluations Committee or Board of Directors discussions.

4. The Evaluator Appointment

- 4.1. Term of Evaluator Appointment
 - 4.1.1. An Evaluator's appointment is valid for a maximum of three years, with an expiration date aligned with that of their Level III Technician certification.
 - 4.1.2. An Evaluator's appointment may be revoked at any time by a 2/3 vote of the Board of Directors.
 - 4.1.2.1. If an Evaluator's appointment is revoked, the Board of Directors shall determine a minimum period of time before an individual may attempt to regain appointment following SPRAT's *Process to Become an Evaluator*.
 - 4.1.3. To conduct evaluation sessions, an Evaluator shall maintain currency during their appointment.
- 4.2. Evaluator Currency
 - 4.2.1. An Evaluator shall submit a completed Evaluator Contract to the SPRAT Office prior to conducting an evaluation session for each calendar year.
 - 4.2.1.1. An annual fee of \$100 is assessed with the submission of the Evaluator Contract.
 - 4.2.2. An Evaluator shall maintain their status as a Level III Technician.
 - 4.2.3. An Evaluator shall participate in the organization.
 - 4.2.3.1. An Evaluator shall maintain a SPRAT voting membership.
 - 4.2.3.2. An Evaluator shall vote on all membership ballots.
 - 4.2.3.3. An Evaluator shall respond to any requests from the Evaluations Committee, the Board of Directors, or the SPRAT Office.
 - 4.2.3.3.1. The Evaluator is responsible for communication between the SPRAT Office and the Evaluation Session Host on any discrepancies relating to paperwork or administrative issues that have been identified from an evaluation session.
 - 4.2.3.4. An Evaluator should participate in SPRAT committees.
 - 4.2.4. An Evaluator should administer a minimum of two evaluation sessions per year and a minimum of eight evaluations during their appointment.
 - 4.2.5. Evaluators shall attend an Evaluator's Workshop bi-annually.
 - 4.2.5.1.1. Evaluators should attend an Evaluator Workshop annually.
- 4.3. Reappointment
 - 4.3.1. Unless an Evaluator provides notice to the SPRAT Office, the Evaluations Committee will automatically process an Evaluator's reappointment.

- 4.3.2. An Evaluator’s performance shall be reviewed in the following categories by the Evaluations Committee no less than two months prior to the appointment expiration date:
 - 4.3.2.1. Maintenance of Evaluator currency
 - 4.3.2.2. Administrative responsibilities
 - 4.3.2.3. Feedback from evaluation sessions
 - 4.3.2.4. SPRAT participation
 - 4.3.2.5. Infractions incurred during most recent appointment period
- 4.3.3. After review, the Evaluations Committee may vote by simple majority in the following manner:
 - 4.3.3.1. Approval for renewal with no conditions
 - 4.3.3.2. Approval for probationary extension of appointment of 6 months
 - 4.3.3.3. Denial of reappointment
- 4.3.4. The Evaluations Committee will review the Evaluator’s performance in the same manner at the conclusion of the probationary extension.
- 4.3.5. A vote for denying a re-appointment will be sent with recommendations of requirements for reinstatement to the Board of Directors.
 - 4.3.5.1. Possible requirements may include, but are not limited to, attendance of an Evaluator workshop and/or completing an evaluation session while being assessed by an Evaluator meeting the requirements stated in Section 10 of this document for reinstatement.
- 4.3.6. Once a reappointment is approved, the Evaluator’s previous record of infractions is cleared, unless the Evaluator is under probation following a suspension.
- 4.3.7. The new appointment expiration date will be realigned when the Evaluator recertifies as a Level III Technician.
- 4.4. Appointment Expiration
 - 4.4.1. If an Evaluator’s appointment is expired by less than one year, the Evaluator must attend an Evaluator’s workshop and must complete an evaluation session while being assessed by an Evaluator meeting the requirements stated in Section 10 of this document for reinstatement.
 - 4.4.2. If an Evaluator’s appointment has expired for a year or more, the applicant must restart the current Evaluator process.

5. Documentation Used in the Evaluation Process

- 5.1. Evaluators shall be familiar with and maintain current copies of the following reference documentation:
 - 5.1.1. *Safe Practices or Rope Access Work*
 - 5.1.2. *Certification Requirements for Rope Access Work*
 - 5.1.3. *Evaluation Guidelines*
 - 5.1.4. *Evaluator Consensus Matrix*
 - 5.1.4.1. SPRAT’s *Evaluator Consensus Matrix* was established by the Evaluations Committee as a reference to assist in the consistent grading of evaluation sessions.
 - 5.1.4.2. As stated in the *Evaluator Consensus Matrix* and *Evaluation Guidelines*, there may be aggravating or mitigating circumstances that cause an Evaluator to make a decision that differs from the matrix.
 - 5.1.4.3. Matrix codes allow for the collection, processing, and analysis of data regarding the occurrences of discrepancies and fails by the SPRAT Office.
 - 5.1.5. *Process to Become an Evaluator*
- 5.2. Evaluators are responsible for providing and ensuring the completion off the following administrative documentation for an evaluation session:
 - 5.2.1. Evaluation Record

- 5.2.1.1. The Evaluation Record provides a summary of results of an evaluation session.
- 5.2.1.2. An Evaluator shall provide the codes corresponding to candidate errors from the *Evaluator Consensus Matrix* on the Evaluation Record.
- 5.2.1.3. Any issued discrepancy or fail that does not correspond to a specific line item listed in the *Evaluator Consensus Matrix* is coded as X.D or X.F, respectively.
 - 5.2.1.3.1. A written explanation for the rationale of these issued grades shall be provided on the Evaluation Record.
 - 5.2.1.3.2. These codes are used to assist in the development of future line items for the *Evaluator Consensus Matrix*.
- 5.2.1.4. Any other additional concerns or circumstances from an evaluation session should also be provided.
- 5.2.1.5. An Evaluator's signature verifies the information provided as well as an Evaluator's independence from upper level candidates.

5.2.2. Site Safety Checklist

- 5.2.2.1. The site safety checklist confirms that an Evaluation Session Host has complied with all SPRAT evaluation session policies and provided for a safe environment to conduct the evaluation session.

5.2.3. Technician Evaluation Form

- 5.2.3.1. Technician Evaluation Forms are mailed with serial numbers assigned to each Evaluator.
- 5.2.3.2. Ensure extra copies of all blank forms.
- 5.2.3.3. If errors are made on a Technician Evaluation Form and it is not used, write "VOID" lengthwise on the document and keep with the rest of the paperwork to be sent in to the SPRAT Office
- 5.2.3.4. It is the responsibility of the Evaluator to inform the SPRAT Office when new forms are required.
- 5.2.3.5. Forms will be sent ground, unless expedited service is requested and paid for by the Evaluator.

5.2.4. Candidate Affidavit

5.2.5. Written Tests, Answer Sheets, and Keys

- 5.2.5.1. Written tests are currently available in English, French, and Spanish
- 5.2.5.2. The Evaluator shall maintain the confidentiality of testing materials.

5.3. Evaluators may assist Evaluation Session Hosts in the submission of evaluation session feedback.

5.4. The SPRAT Office will communicate any updates regarding documentation used in the evaluation process.

6. Administering an Evaluation Session

6.1. Pre-Session Responsibilities

6.1.1. Prior to scheduling an evaluation session, the Evaluator shall:

- 6.1.1.1. Ensure the Evaluation Session Host has provided the SPRAT Office an Evaluation Session Host Agreement for the current year and notice of the upcoming evaluation session.
- 6.1.1.2. Ensure the Evaluation Session Host has provided the SPRAT Office with documentation in accordance with SPRAT's approved [Evaluation Session Insurance Policy](#).
- 6.1.1.3. Ensure that the Evaluation Session Host is familiar with the site and equipment requirements provided in Section 4 of the *Evaluation Guidelines*.
 - 6.1.1.3.1. The Evaluator should enquire if they need to provide any specific personal equipment.
- 6.1.1.4. Ensure that there are no more than eight candidates per evaluation session.
 - 6.1.1.4.1. There shall only be one evaluation session per day per Evaluator.
- 6.1.1.5. Ensure that any Direct Entry and Conversion applications have been submitted to the SPRAT Office.

- 6.1.1.6. Ensure that the Evaluation Session Host is aware of a candidate’s responsibility to provide experience documentation at the beginning of the evaluation session as stated in the *Certification Requirements for Rope Access Work* and *Evaluation Guidelines*.
 - 6.1.1.7. Establish a fee directly with the Evaluation Session Host.
 - 6.1.1.8. Coordinate travel and accommodation arrangements with the Evaluation Session Host.
- 6.2. Introducing Candidates to the Evaluation Session
- 6.2.1. The initial introduction to the candidates should provide an overview of the evaluation process, while setting a professional, cordial, and relaxed tone for the evaluation session.
 - 6.2.2. The Evaluator should:
 - 6.2.2.1. Thank the Evaluation Session Host for supporting SPRAT.
 - 6.2.2.2. Provide a brief personal introduction and background of experience.
 - 6.2.2.3. Provide a brief introduction of SPRAT.
 - 6.2.2.3.1. SPRAT is an international, member driven organization, comprised of both individuals and companies.
 - 6.2.2.3.2. SPRAT creates rope access industry standards, and works with regulatory authorities to reflect the needs of the rope access industry.
 - 6.2.2.4. Explain the role of the Evaluator.
 - 6.2.2.4.1. The Evaluator’s primary role is to observe candidates demonstrating the requirements as stated in *Certification Requirements for Rope Access Work*.
 - 6.2.2.4.2. Evaluators are not at the evaluation to trick or provide instruction to candidates.
 - 6.2.2.5. Provide a brief overview of the plan of the day.
 - 6.2.2.5.1. Details for the written, field oral, and field practical portions of the evaluation session should be provided prior to beginning each portion.
 - 6.2.2.5.2. Candidates should be provided with an estimate for how long the evaluation session may take, as well as the plan for breaks.
 - 6.2.2.6. Remind the candidates that no resources may be consulted during the evaluation process.
 - 6.2.2.7. Remind the candidates that the evaluation is a performance-based test.
 - 6.2.2.8. Encourage candidates to ask questions.
- 6.3. Administering the Written Test
- 6.3.1. Information for administering the written test is provided in the *Evaluation Guidelines*.
 - 6.3.2. Written tests shall be taken with any field evaluation session.
- 6.4. Initiating the Field Evaluation
- 6.4.1. In order to make observations of candidates in the field evaluation, the Evaluator shall:
 - 6.4.1.1. Complete a [site safety checklist](#).
 - 6.4.1.2. Ensure that all candidates have completed SPRAT’s Candidate Affidavit.
 - 6.4.1.3. Verify a candidate’s identity and collect required candidate personal information.
 - 6.4.1.4. Verify a candidate’s eligibility with supporting documentation, such as current certification, experience documentation, and notice of Direct Entry or Conversion approval, as applicable, to test at their desired level.
- 6.5. Introducing the Field Evaluation
- 6.5.1. The Evaluator should encourage questions at any time.
 - 6.5.2. An Evaluator should provide the following information regarding grading of the evaluation session:

- 6.5.2.1. Candidates will be tested on all skills for their desired level of certification as listed in the *Certification Requirements for Rope Access Work*.
- 6.5.2.2. Increased levels of proficiency and efficiency are expected at higher levels of certification.
- 6.5.2.3. Grading of each requirement consists of either a pass, discrepancy or fail for each skill.
- 6.5.2.4. There are 3 ways to fail the field evaluation:
 - 6.5.2.4.1. Inability to complete a skill
 - 6.5.2.4.2. Automatically failing from committing a serious safety issue
 - 6.5.2.4.3. Committing minor safety issues resulting in three discrepancies
- 6.5.3. Examples of discrepancies and failures should be provided during the field oral portion and prior to beginning the field practical portion of the evaluation.
- 6.6. Administering the Field Oral Evaluation
 - 6.6.1. The *Evaluation Guidelines* establishes criteria for the oral evaluation based on a candidate's desired level of certification.
 - 6.6.1.1. The field oral evaluation should be used as a time to discuss expectations of the field practical skills portion by eliciting examples of common discrepancies and fails.
 - 6.6.1.2. The field oral evaluation is not a time for an Evaluator to seek information that is unobtainable from manufacturer's specifications or SPRAT documentation.
 - 6.6.1.3. The Evaluator may ask guided questions, but shall not provide information beyond the aforementioned documents.
 - 6.6.1.4. If a candidate fails to provide the required information, a discrepancy shall be issued.
 - 6.6.2. The Evaluator may provide other common examples of discrepancies or fails for a piece of equipment.
- 6.7. Administering the Field Practical Evaluation
 - 6.7.1. Prior to beginning the field practical portion of the evaluation, the Evaluator should:
 - 6.7.1.1. Reemphasize that candidates are encouraged to ask questions throughout the evaluation session.
 - 6.7.1.2. Inform candidates, that for the purposes of the evaluation, a candidate is expected to have an effective backup system any time they are on-rope.
 - 6.7.1.3. Encourage candidates not to rush through skills and that any swing is considered unsafe.
 - 6.7.1.4. Inform candidates that if asked to stop they shall do so immediately and wait for specific instructions.
 - 6.7.1.4.1. While being asked to stop may indicate a safety concern, an Evaluator may simply need to better view what is happening or need to address another issue in the evaluation session.
 - 6.7.1.5. Remind candidates that rescues are considered individual maneuvers.
 - 6.7.1.5.1. Casualty management is considered a part of rescue skills.
 - 6.7.1.5.2. Both the rescuer and casualty must maintain two connection points at all times.
 - 6.7.1.5.3. If during a rescue any coaching is observed, a discrepancy will be issued to both the casualty and the rescuer.
 - 6.7.1.6. Provide common examples of discrepancies and fail that are not elicited during the field oral portion of the evaluation.
 - 6.7.1.7. Inform candidates that they are subject to being issued discrepancies and failures during the entire evaluation session.
 - 6.7.1.7.1. Even if a candidate has completed all requirements, the session is not considered complete until the candidate and the Evaluator have signed the Technician Evaluation Form.
 - 6.7.2. Evaluators may allow candidates to decide the order of completing requirements or may assign candidates a series of skills.

6.7.2.1. If multiple requirements are combined into one exercise, Evaluators should ensure that candidates understand and are comfortable with the request.

6.7.2.2. The number of ongoing exercises should be adjusted based on the site layout and the desired level of candidates.

6.8. Issuing Discrepancies and Fails

6.8.1. An Evaluator issues a discrepancy or fail based on observations of the actions of the candidates.

6.8.2. The Evaluator is not responsible for the overall safety of the session.

6.8.3. An Evaluator should not impede upon a candidate's actions during a session.

6.8.4. In the absence of any aggravating circumstance, an Evaluator should issue a discrepancy or fail only after a candidate has committed an error.

6.8.4.1. Provided the candidate's action will not present an immediate risk to the safety of either the candidate or anyone else, an Evaluator should not issue a discrepancy or fail based on the possibility of an eventual occurrence.

6.8.5. Typically, a fail can be issued at the moment it occurs.

6.8.6. As interrupting a candidate's actions can affect their performance, an Evaluator should look for a convenient stopping point to issue the discrepancy, or take a photo to document the error to aid in issuing the discrepancy at a later time.

6.8.7. At no point shall an Evaluator issue a discrepancy or fail after the candidate has begun a separate exercise.

6.8.8. An Evaluator should provide a candidate with the rationale for why they issue a discrepancy or fail.

6.8.9. A candidate's understanding of why they are being issued a discrepancy or fail is a part of fostering a safe work environment and may preempt complaints or appeals regarding the session results.

6.9. Issuing Session Results

6.9.1. An Evaluator may conduct a debrief with candidates as a group or individually.

6.9.2. The Evaluator should not provide unsolicited opinions on the performance of a candidate.

6.9.3. Evaluators should:

6.9.3.1. Ensure that Technician Evaluation Forms are filled out completely.

6.9.3.1.1. Discrepancy and Fail notes should be listed in Comments box.

6.9.3.1.2. Evaluation result and corresponding level shall be marked on form.

6.9.3.1.3. Candidate signatures shall be obtained.

6.9.3.1.4. Evaluator has signed the form.

6.9.3.2. Ensure that candidates have reviewed questions missed on their written tests.

6.9.3.3. Provide provisional certifications to successful candidates.

6.9.3.3.1. This provisional certification is valid for 60 days

6.9.3.4. Update the certification section of logbooks for successful candidates.

6.9.3.5. Inform successful candidates that SPRAT certification cards, certificates, and logbooks usually take 4 to 6 weeks for delivery.

6.9.3.6. Ensure unsuccessful candidates understand their responsibilities for retaking the written or field portions of the evaluation.

7. Submitting Session Information

7.1. An Evaluator shall submit the following information to the SPRAT Office within 15 days of an evaluation session:

7.1.1. Evaluation Record

7.1.2. Site Safety Checklist

7.1.3. Proctor Affidavit (if needed)

7.1.4. Candidate Information:

7.1.4.1. Technician Evaluation Form with written test result for all candidates

7.1.4.2. Candidate Affidavits for all candidates

7.1.4.3. Photographs of successful candidates.

7.1.4.3.1. Photographs shall be passport style headshots.

7.1.4.3.2. Photographs shall be taken with a white or neutral background.

7.1.4.3.3. Candidates shall not wear hats or sunglasses.

7.2. App-based submission of information

7.2.1. The evaluation session app collects and submits all required session information.

7.2.2. Once data is submitted, the evaluation session is closed from further editing.

7.2.3. The app syncs at regular intervals with SPRAT's database if data services are available during the evaluation session.

7.2.4. The evaluation session app will also retain all information locally until data services are available to submit the information.

7.2.4.1. If data services are not available, a hardcopy Evaluation Record with overall results should be completed and retained until evaluation information is submitted via the app.

7.3. Hardcopy-based submission of information

7.3.1. The Evaluator can arrange for the Evaluation Session Host to send in session information to SPRAT; however, the Evaluator remains the responsible party for any missing or altered materials.

7.3.2. If evaluation session documentation is submitted electronically, the Evaluator shall retain all originals for one year from the date of the evaluation session.

7.3.2.1. All documentation shall be submitted as one file in order according to Section 7.1.

7.3.2.2. If Evaluators assist in submitting evaluation session feedback, it shall be sent as a separate file.

7.3.3. If documentation is mailed in hardcopy, copies of information not already in duplicate form, such as the Evaluation Record, should be made before the originals are placed in the mail.

7.3.3.1. Shipping delivery tracking information should be provided.

7.3.4. Digital Photographs of Candidates

7.3.4.1. Photographs shall be emailed as attachments to certification@sprat.org or submitted via other arrangement with the SPRAT Office.

7.3.4.1.1. Photographs embedded within an email shall not be accepted.

7.3.4.1.2. File names shall include a candidate's full name as well as corresponding candidate number on the Evaluation Record.

7.3.4.1.3. Photographs should include an additional means of identification, such as a Technician Evaluation Form.

7.3.4.2. A copy of all photographs shall be retained for one year from the date of the evaluation session.

7.3.5. If Evaluators assist in submitting evaluation session feedback, it shall be a separate file.

7.4. Processing of certifications will not begin until all information has been received by the SPRAT Office.

8. Evaluator Infractions

8.1. The Evaluations Committee has developed an infraction system to review Evaluator actions that are inconsistent with SPRAT policies, Evaluator responsibilities, or the best interest of the organization.

8.1.1. The SPRAT Office shall inform the Evaluations Committee of Evaluator administrative concerns.

8.1.2. Documented infractions are kept on file by the SPRAT Office for three years.

8.2. The Evaluations Committee has the authority to determine the level of any infraction.

8.3. Any action that leads to all certifications issued at a session to become invalid will be considered, at a minimum, a level 3 infraction.

8.4. Suspensions may be issued for a maximum of 12 months.

8.4.1. Following any suspension, a probationary period of 1 year shall be enforced

8.5. The following is a scale of infractions, associated repercussions, and possible examples.

8.5.1. Examples provided are non-exhaustive.

Infraction Levels	
<p>1 Minor breach of Evaluator responsibilities <i>Equivalence: N/A</i> Repercussion: Written request from SPRAT Office Examples: - Not using issued Technician Evaluation Forms - Incomplete paperwork - Delay paperwork >15 days</p>	
<p>2 Major breach of Evaluator responsibilities <i>Equivalence: Multiple Level 1 infractions</i> Repercussion: Written warning from Evaluations Committee Examples: - Conducting evaluation session without Evaluation Session Host insurance on file with SPRAT Office - Delay paperwork >30 days</p>	
<p>3 Misconduct unbecoming of an Evaluator <i>Equivalence: Multiple Level 2 infractions</i> Repercussion: Evaluations Committee Recommendation to Board of Directors of suspension of appointment Examples: - Conducting evaluation session without Evaluation Session Host insurance in place - Evaluation of >8 candidates - Evaluation of DE candidate without approval - Falsifying information - Conducting evaluation session when not independent of candidate/employer, etc. - Conducting evaluation session when personal certifications are expired - Conducting evaluations when not current</p>	
<p>4 Gross misconduct unbecoming of an Evaluator <i>Equivalence: Multiple Level 3 and 2 infractions</i> Repercussion: Evaluations Committee Recommendation to Board of Directors of revocation of appointment Examples: - Evaluation session conducted while suspended - Level 3 infraction while on probation</p>	

9. Complaints

9.1. Initial Complaint Review

- 9.1.1. If a complaint is lodged against an Evaluator, the SPRAT Office shall anonymize the complaint and supporting documentation, as appropriate, and provide the redacted information to the Evaluations Committee.
- 9.1.2. The Evaluations Committee shall review the provided information to determine if the complaint is persuasive.
 - 9.1.2.1. If the complaint is found to be persuasive by a simple majority, the Chair of the Evaluations Committee shall notify the Evaluator.
 - 9.1.2.2. The Evaluator may review the complaint and should provide a detailed response to the Evaluations Committee.
- 9.1.3. Once an Evaluator's response is considered, the Evaluations Committee shall determine any appropriate infraction level.

9.2. Level 3 and 4 Infractions from Complaints

- 9.2.1. If the Evaluations Committee determines from initial review that the complaint may constitute a Level 3 or Level 4 infraction, an investigation team of at least two members of the Evaluations Committee shall conduct further investigation into the complaint.
 - 9.2.1.1. There shall be no financial, close personal relationship, or known or expressed issued between the accused and any member of the investigation team.
 - 9.2.1.2. The complaining party shall be contacted by the investigation team.
 - 9.2.1.2.1. The complaining party must be willing to follow through with any reasonable request (e.g. documentation, requests for phone discussions, session details) that is made by the investigation team.
 - 9.2.1.3. A documented meeting may be held by teleconference or in person between the investigation team and the accused Evaluator.
- 9.2.2. The investigation team shall submit a report for review by the Evaluations Committee.
- 9.2.3. The Evaluations Committee shall review the report and determine an action.
- 9.2.4. For Level 3 or 4 infractions, the Evaluations Committee shall present a recommended action to the Board of Directors.
- 9.2.5. Any Evaluator to have two or more complaints by separate individuals that require investigation by the Evaluations Committee within any 90-day period will be temporarily suspended as an Evaluator until the complaints have been fully investigated.

10. Assessment of Evaluator Candidates

- 10.1. As detailed in the *Process to Become an Evaluator*, Evaluators play an integral role in the development and approval of new Evaluators.
- 10.2. When assisting an Evaluator Candidate during their internship phase:
 - 10.2.1. An Evaluator that provided a letter of recommendation as part of the Evaluator candidate's application may only serve as the Evaluator for one shadow session.
 - 10.2.2. Only one shadow session may be conducted with an Evaluator that is not independent of the candidate.
 - 10.2.3. Evaluators shall provide feedback following any evaluation session with an Evaluator candidate during their internship.
 - 10.2.4. Evaluators are also encouraged to provide feedback of Evaluator candidates following Evaluator Workshops to which they were in attendance.
- 10.3. To qualify to be an Evaluator for an Evaluator Candidate's final assessment, an Evaluator shall:
 - 10.3.1. Meet all Evaluator currency requirements.

- 10.3.2. Have no current, unaddressed infractions on their record.
 - 10.3.3. Have conducted a minimum of 10 evaluation sessions during their current tenure as an appointed Evaluator.
 - 10.3.4. Not have provided a letter of recommendation as part of the Evaluator candidate's application.
 - 10.3.5. Be independent of the Evaluator candidate.
 - 10.3.6. Be independent of the upper level candidates in the session.
- 10.4. Evaluators shall confirm with the SPRAT Office that an Evaluator candidate has been approved for their final skill assessment prior to scheduling that evaluation session with an Evaluator candidate.

11. Evaluator Workshops

- 11.1. Evaluator Workshops are established to:
- 11.1.1. Maintain consistency of evaluation sessions.
 - 11.1.2. Review updates to SPRAT standards, guidelines, and policies as they relate to evaluation sessions.
 - 11.1.3. Discuss new observations of candidate techniques and mistakes.
 - 11.1.4. Explore approaches to efficiently administer evaluation sessions.
- 11.2. Prior to any Evaluator Workshop, the SPRAT Office will contact all Evaluators for recommendations of discussion topics.
- 11.3. While Evaluator Workshops are generally held in conjunction with SPRAT's Annual and Mid-Year meetings, an Evaluator may request to supervise an Evaluator Workshop at any time of the year.
- 11.3.1. To qualify to supervise a workshop, an Evaluator shall:
 - 11.3.1.1. Meet all Evaluator currency requirements.
 - 11.3.1.2. Have no current, unaddressed infractions on their record.
 - 11.3.2. An Evaluator shall submit the request to the SPRAT Office.
 - 11.3.2.1. The Evaluations Committee shall review and may choose to approve or deny the request.
 - 11.3.3. If approved, the Evaluator will be expected to interact with the SPRAT Office as well as a representative of the Evaluations Committee to ensure that all information and logistics are handled properly.
 - 11.3.4. If an Evaluator has never supervised an Evaluator Workshop, the Evaluations Committee may assign an approved Evaluator to support.