

## 2006 INSTRUCTOR REFRESHER WORKSHOP EVALUATION FOLLOW-UP

### BRC Flexibility (David Smith)

| Excellent | Good | Average | Needs Help |
|-----------|------|---------|------------|
| 66        | 42   | 3       | 1          |

#### Comments:

##### Excellent

- Good to hear from someone in the program from a different state. A great sense of humor.
- New ideas, I liked it and I'll try some.
- I want to know more stuff like this, about how the BRC was designed and why.
- Knowledgeable and lucid.
- Very Well done.
- Great info!
- Great review of adult learning principals. He needed more time to speak.
- This break-out needed to be mandatory for all. Nice to hear what the intent was.
- Very informative.
- Dave is very good. Liked this very much.
- Smooth, moved along very well.
- Bring him back next year.
- Connected the dots on the sequence of range exercises.
- Very good, we need more of this.
- Great session, we need more of this.
- Excellent, explained the concepts that were NOT formerly outlined or clearly presented in former IRW's.
- Great explanations. Wish he had more time to speak.
- Very well done. Great direction.
- Very good class.
- Good to get clarification from an MSF person.
- Very clear, very informative.
- We need more of this type of information.
- Great presentation.
- Well done, very nice to have a copy of the slides for notes, etc. The breakout helped explained many of the principals.
- Got a lot of great ideas that I will use in class.
- Clear expectations. FINALLY.
- Clarification!!!
- This class should be part of the IP.

- This guy really knows his stuff and did a nice job. Some good, new insights were given.
- Dave really knows his stuff. Good session.
- Came away with some good ideas. Liked the explanations on why things are done the way they are.
- Talked way too fast.
- Interesting to hear comments from the national perspective.
- Very clear!

**Good**

- The class seemed to be in opposition to the IRW update but overall very good. It made me ask 'why' before choosing flexibility.
- Being able to tailor to students.
- Would like the sessions to be longer to get a little more detail.
- Slow in giving information and repeated a lot of the same items.
- Excellent presentation by the instructor.
- Very Good presentation.
- Good to know the 'why's'.
- Would be interesting to know MORE of the reasons for the way we are explained to do things in the BRC.
- Not enough depth and not enough time to cover all the material.
- Good. Interesting comments.
- Flexibility and IRW Update needs to be coordinated.
- Handout very helpful.
- An excellent speaker with an uninteresting (to me) subject.
- Presented a clear explanation of "appropriate" flexibility.

**Average**

- Expected a session addressing where and how we can or cannot be/show flexibility in instruction.

**Needs Help**

- Talks too fast and kept relating to the RSS when the majority of classes use the BRC. Also presented without any conclusions being addressed...  
'What is the answer? I don't know.'

## ABCSS of Trauma (Fred/Jeri Thomas)

| Excellent | Good | Average | Needs Help |
|-----------|------|---------|------------|
| 26        | 8    | 2       | 0          |

### Comments:

#### Excellent

- Would like to see this break-out expanded.
- Every motorcyclist should take this course.
- This is something that all instructors should know about. This should be a mandatory class.
- Fantastic.
- Very good, informative and very professional.
- Excellent presentation and materials.
- Good info: Jaw thrust.
- Learned about 'Jaw Thrust' for the first time.
- Need to offer the complete course.
- Helmet removal was an excellent... practical information.

#### Good

- Good info, especially regarding full face helmets.
- Some 'hands-on' would have been nice.
- Good information, but it could have gone deeper or have been shorter.
- It would have been nice to have this course come to Dayton.
- Photos a little gruesome.
- Very good.
- Good presentation but the information was not new to me. More outlined information would have been better for me to decide before taking the break-out.

## BRC Classroom (Dan Petterson)

| Excellent | Good | Average | Needs Help |
|-----------|------|---------|------------|
| 14        | 20   | 8       | 1          |

### Comments:

#### Excellent

- Gave us ways to apply ideas to the BRC classroom.
- Would like copies of outlines on overhead.
- Extremely helpful in understanding the philosophy of the BRC and it's development.
- I would like copies of the slides and index cards. Would like more time to hear other instructor's 'ideas're: different opinions for classroom.
- Nice ideas and a great facilitator have us doing his theories.
- Good ideas about presenting the classroom portion.
- Would like to have real hand-outs. Please send the hand-outs to all the IRW attendees.

#### Good

- This subject has been discussed before, so no new information was offered.
- Does not consider time constraints.
- Many concepts of adult learning, but no actual experience on how much time they actually take to implement.
- Good review of the BRC / adult learning principals.
- Spend more time on classroom ideas.
- Very helpful, might be good to have a mock classroom, Dan as the instructor, instructors as students, to demo these ideas.
- Not sure how we could use this due to the time constraints. But there were some great ideas to try.
- Helped me expand on things I could improve on.
- Provided some good strategies to promote adult learning.
- Helpful.

#### Average

- Needed more time.
- Not a 'hot topic'.
- 1<sup>st</sup> half could have been shortened. 2<sup>nd</sup> half excellent content.
- Too confusing.
- More of the same!

#### Needs Help

- Good ideas but did not address time constraints.

## IRW-Update (Chiefs Dan/Art)

| Excellent | Good | Average | Needs Help |
|-----------|------|---------|------------|
| 59        | 76   | 11      | 3          |

### Comments:

#### Excellent

- Cleared up a few grey areas.
- Clear and concise (Art).
- Art was awesome!
- Art's the best!
- Need to know.
- Need more time to hit and discuss the material more.
- Great, but then I heard that different chiefs taught the same class.
- Good to go over HOW it is to be done (Dan).
- Answered a lot of information and how there should be no questions when you leave the break-out.
- Needed more time, some areas are still unsolved (Art). *NC*
- Needs to speak a little louder and have better control over his class so we can hear him speak. The material was excellent (Art).
- Good material, great answers.
- Much better than last years and well organized (Art).
- Art is awesome as always.
- Went two times.
- Always good (Art).
- Needs to watch time.
- Got more clarification on range exercises.
- I liked this year's format of the update and the questions/comments section.
- Art presented his update clearly.
- A lot of good information and clarification of range procedures.
- Nice job Art.
- Thanks for keeping the bitching of the instructors in check (Art).
- Good job (Dan).
- Session had a lot of changes. Interesting.
- Art was excellent. Perhaps a use of an overhead projector and a laser pointer for visual learners.
- Yea Art!
- Very informative.

#### Good

- A quicker pace would have been better so all the material could be covered.
- Needed.

- I strongly disagree with removing counter-weighting from Ex. 10 demo/instruction!
- Some of what was told us (i.e. No throttle roll on Ex. 4) was not in the handout. Consistency? Peer Observation?
- Too many instructors interrupting the chiefs (Dan).
- Helpful information could have been more 'directive' and 'suggestive'.
- A lot of open ended answers (Dan).
- Art needs clock management!
- Left breakout not confident that I got everything clear.
- Needed more time to cover all the material (Art).
- We got conflicting messages on a couple of issues (from the morning IRW class vs. the afternoon IRW class). Conflicting information on whether we MUST demo each reversal. And conflicting information on if it's an option to begin Ex. 4 at the stopping point of Ex. 3.
- Some of the answers were ambiguous or conflicting with other information given. Beyond that, the information was useful.
- Many things were left up to the instructors and instructors must have a meeting prior to class.
- Needed to be faster.
- Good to address specific RE (Art).
- The format was significantly better than last year (Dan).
- Some review of what was said and a refresher or summation at the end of the breakout. It's nice to try and have everyone on the same page.
- Needed more time.
- Lost in minute details.
- Not enough time and the answers were not direct enough.
- Good content, great presentation skills. Need more time management skills (Art).
- Good at what's new and getting range questions answered.
- Putting things in writing was great.
- We often get contradicting information.
- Easily diverted from the main topic.
- It's about time we were told how it should be done.
- Good directives and clarification of why we need to do things a certain way.
- Need more direct answers to questions.
- Keep better track of time.
- Ran short of time. Art did a good job of passing on the new range card info.
- Thank you for standardizing and re-enforcing what is in the range cards.
- Needs to be more organized. The breakout got out of hand.
- Not enough time for questions.
- Covered material but the room was too loud with table talk (Art).
- Too much discussion in Art's breakout.

- Allowed too much dissent (Art).

**Average**

- Got bogged down with trivial debates.
- Then give us new/updated range cards.
- When presenting specific information it should not be a discussion. Poor time management (Art).
- Important information, but a 'dry' topic had to be done (Dan).
- Seems to waffle on what instructors are supposed to do year from year.

**Needs Help**

- Answer questions with a question.

## Remediation/Dismissal (Karen Kadar)

|                  |             |                |                   |
|------------------|-------------|----------------|-------------------|
| <b>Excellent</b> | <b>Good</b> | <b>Average</b> | <b>Needs Help</b> |
| 13               | 28          | 13             | 2                 |

### Comments:

#### No Grade

- Needed to be offered more than once.

#### Excellent

- Not enough time and a bigger room would have been useful.
- Much needed subject.
- We had such a good time discussing such a serious matter.
- Very needed.
- We need more breakouts like this. Training in how to handle the stress on both sides or how to approach the issues with no stress.
- Tough subject, good to make people think.
- Handout was good.
- Good information.
- We did not cover remediation only dismissal, but it was very good and will be helpful in the dismissal of the students.
- Very good facilitator, GREAT SUBJECT with helpful take-away information.
- Perhaps 5-10 simulations from real class scenarios.
- Tough subject, good to make people think.

#### Good

- Needed more 'concrete' suggestions in session, not simply a handout. I did like the discussion in small groups.
- Discussion was OK BUT M.O. needs to publish GUIDELINES regarding dismissal.
- I wish it could have been more defined.
- Good and thought provoking.
- Difficult topic that was done pretty well. Much needed guidance.
- Karen was good, but the class size was too big.
- Karen needs to watch her spelling and grammar in her handouts.
- Room was too crowded and the noise level interfered with the sharing of information.
- Could have been better with 'mock' scenarios.
- More time needed.
- This class was fun (as in funny).
- Too loud.
- Class discussion of non-relevant material and the class got out of hand.

#### Average

- Needed more time as this was a 'problem topic'.
- Needed more time from Karen and more input from the instructors.
- Expected to receive M.O. Policy and Guidelines.
- Some good ideas.

- Somewhat disorganized and needed to be clearer cut.
- O.K.
- Needed more structure to define policies.
- Needed to quite people down.
- Good topic, too many in the room.

**Needs Help**

- Was not in control of the class but the content was good. Participants were very receptive.
- In several topics there were not many enlightening ideas shared by instructors, and Karen should have exercised more direction.

## Motorcycle Maintenance (Tosh/Dave)

| Excellent | Good | Average | Needs Help |
|-----------|------|---------|------------|
| 21        | 17   | 5       | 0          |

### Comments:

#### No Grade

- Needed more depth.
- Needed to be offered more than once.

#### Excellent

- Good insight and means o repair and replace the bikes.
- Informative.
- Dave was great, Tosh was quiet.
- Good information not known to me.
- Presented lots of new and useful information.

#### Good

- More how-to specifics (step by step instruction and adjustments).
- Nice to find out that our forms go nowhere, and that we need to call Pete or email Pete.
- Could have been more structured.
- Dave did a good job explaining his role in keeping the bikes running. He also gave up some tips for us to be able to the same thing locally.
- Dave gave good tips. He needed a better way to give MO paperwork as repairs are needed to bikes.
- Very good information and a nice job by Tosh (bring him back).

#### Average

- A bit dry. They should have thrown in some worse care scenarios to lighten things up.
- Fun topic. A more structured approach and some sample parts would have improved this.

### Mobile Program (Pete Cline)

| Excellent | Good | Average | Needs Help |
|-----------|------|---------|------------|
| 11        | 10   | 5       | 0          |

**Comments:**

**No Grade**

- Sorry I missed it.

**Excellent**

- Very good! Clear, good understanding, keep up the great work Pete!
- Good insight into the administrative part of the program.
- Very useful, good information.
- Got more clarification, good information and well presented.
- Need to watch time management and practice (just a suggestion Pete) the PowerPoint slide show.
- Honest, well thought out, informative.
- Good information. Answered all the questions well.

**Good**

- Very good info. Great class.
- Didn't have all the answers, but he did give quite a bit of good information.
- Helpful in what to expect thus year.
- Good overview of the problems and what's new for 2006.

## Sexual Harassment (Steve Gall)

|                  |             |                |                   |
|------------------|-------------|----------------|-------------------|
| <b>Excellent</b> | <b>Good</b> | <b>Average</b> | <b>Needs Help</b> |
| 62               | 56          | 9              | 2                 |

### **Comments:**

#### **No Grade**

- It's pronounced DUH. Could be more "learned-centered".

#### **Excellent**

- Had a little information but good to know more.
- Very informative.
- Very necessary info nowadays.
- Great topic, especially in today's world.
- Expert. Very helpful.
- Good presentation.
- I would have liked more feedback and talk.
- Very informative.
- Way to go Steve.
- Nice job.
- Very good.
- Right on target! Super!
- Good information, great presentation!
- Good overall concept and review of the laws that apply to all areas of the course.
- Great definitions and the way they relate to our everyday lives.
- Very clear information, excellent delivery on a difficult topic.
- Has MO ever considered all classes to combine one man and one woman coach?
- Well done.
- Liked the outline so we could print out areas of concern, and reinforcing the fact that we as rider-coaches have 'liability' for our conduct.
- Vary informative and not too long.
- It's always good to rehash this topic.
- Very serious topic and well presented.
- Excellent speaker, valuable topic.
- Very useful information.
- Good!

#### **Good**

- You should already know this! You're in a profession, keep it professional!
- Informative and myth defying.
- Should have been more concise. Very broad.
- Too long. Use the handout and hit the highlights.
- DO MORE PEER EVALS!
- Steve presented material well. I get this information consistently at my job.

- Good outline was handed out.
- Informative.
- Good common sense suggestions.
- Could have been streamlined.
- Good perspective, old subject, AGAIN.
- Good information, thanks.
- Appreciate this coming from a fellow instructor.
- Good session, but not necessary every year.
- Good job, very well spoken.
- Good information.
- Nothing was gained by the talk that was not covered in the handout.
- Room was cooler, could hear with the microphone well, topic is not really a major issue (I feel anyhow).
- No real surprises here, but good information that everyone should know and review occasionally.
- Not as specific as other break outs, but adequate.

**Average**

- Too long, too much common sense, even for those who struggle with common sense.
- Reminder that we must be 'professional'.
- Dry, too long, but perhaps necessary in today's world.
- Needed to be more structured toward the audience. 99% of the information presented was not specific to teaching in class.
- More common examples. You should have told them 'do not do this', or you could receive this punitive action.

### Awards Banquet:

| Excellent | Good | Average | Needs Help |
|-----------|------|---------|------------|
| 60        | 42   | 9       | 3          |

#### Comments:

#### No Grade

- Do not issue pens, the crowd has ADHD.
- As usual Bob and Melissa and all the rest did a great job with such an undertaking.
- The food was not very good to at least not as good as last year.
- Excellent. Makes me feel supported and taken care of.
- For \$18 I would expect a better lunch.
- We need more breakouts so we have a chance to go to more sessions. I really, REALLY wanted to go to Dave/Tosh's break-out.
- Good show. The food could be better.
- Spend a few more dollars on the food.
- The four 45 minute sessions would have been nice to attend as I couldn't attend three of them. Lunch was poor.
- Imre was great! What a well spoken individual with NO NOTES! Outstanding job. The food was great, as was the organization and handouts! Thanks for a great job!
- Rooms were a bit warm and small. I did not care for the lunch food. I liked the location being off a major freeway (315), with free and easy parking. In general the conference was very organized!

#### Excellent

- Lunch was a little weak-sorry to complain.
- Good job guys.
- Good content, fun, good food.
- Keep doing it!
- Great opportunity to recognize achievement. Overall the IRW was very, very good. Excellent job MO!
- Very nice.
- More chairs in each session, with bigger rooms. This was awesome!
- Overall excellent, but we needed larger break-out rooms.
- Good time, very informative.
- This event was very well organized and orderly. Thank you!
- Very good.
- Thanks for lunch!
- Wish I could attend all the sessions.
- Great job Bob, Missy. Thanks.
- Very enlightening.
- Very good meeting this year. Many questions were answered.

- Bill Carter is a great guy! Go Blue!
- Name badges very good.
- Much better facility than last year on the east side. Good lunch choice.
- Best IRW yet. Excellent speaker.
- General comment: This year was more informative than last year.
- All the rooms were too small for the number of people. Perhaps more (and smaller) classes would help.
- Nice awards! Awesome door prizes. Great job overall! Very informative and enjoyable!
- Nice job "Bob", see you next year!
- Love the IRW and banquet, but I still prefer the slower specific sessions I'm used to. Imre's update was excellent! The breaks could have been reduced so that all four breakouts could have been offered.
- Content great, the food was not so good, some of the updates were good. Best ever since 1993!
- Good information!
- The appropriate amount of time. Could the IRW be the same relative week each year, for personal planning reasons?
- Excellent timing. Imre was a nice addition.
- Very well done.
- Very pleased and an excellent workshop.
- Excellent seminar and banquet.
- Nicely done and great food. The ice cream was a nice touch. Great job all around. Thank you!

### **Good**

- Need to have smoking access inside.
- Lunch was poor.
- Would be nice to know who nominated the individuals for awards.
- My cherry pie was smaller than apple pie slices. You should have longevity and total number of classes per year and overall.
- The material was good, but it could have used some beverages.
- Move to warmer part of the year.
- Very nice. It moved right along.
- Overall it was very good. The food was OK but I would have preferred a hot meal.
- Nachos were soggy and the sandwich was OK. It was a good time and learning.
- Excellent content and length.
- Food could have been better. Classrooms need to be bigger. Classes were all offered at the 3<sup>rd</sup> breakout, so there was NO WAY to attend what you wanted.
- Need a better choice for rooms for classes and a better menu.
- Good job, the food was poor.
- Very informative and it was nice to meet with the other instructors in an informal atmosphere.

- Need more traditional food selections.

**Average**

- Food could use improvement.
- Food was below average. Same things, different year.
- Lunch= less than adequate.
- Lunch needed improvement!
- Can you imagine having bought a guest whom paid \$15 for a wrap and a piece of pie?
- 

**Needs help**

- Even though it was no cost, the food was less than desirable.
- We need awards for 1, 5, 10 year and 15 year instructors.
- Food left a lot to be desired.
- Lunch!

## **INSTRUCTOR REFRESHER WORKSHOP ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**

- Not enough situations and role-playing for instructors to apply some of the theories and techniques shown in the breakouts. There were not enough of those types of situations for instructors to respond to. For example, a student can't master or even come close to using the clutch in Ex. 2. How do you, an instructor, handle this? We need these types of questions answered.
- Everything I attended was very good, however... I would have liked to have been able to attend ALL of the breakout sessions. Later this month I'll be attending the MSF Update in East Lansing, MI. Perhaps I'll have an opportunity to get more training then. I believe the IRW-Update should be given as an entire group session rather than a break-out session. The presentation by Imre was excellent.
- While the free meal is always appreciated, I must say that this lunch could have used a little more flair. The wait staff and hotel employees were accommodating to help make the meal more enjoyable, but the service needed to be better (more coffee, more condiments).
- Overall the day was very enjoyable and productive. I liked the different sessions and presentations, and the banquet / workshops are getting better every year. This was very professional, but lunch could have been better.
- Excellent job. Thank you to all the MO staff for the great facility and having so much diversity on the topics. It took a lot of work on your part! Thanks you! The topics were very good, but one suggestion... for next year you should sign up in advance so that meetings are not overcrowded. The Food was excellent and the location nice! I would like to see more information on 'private providers' as it is happening VERY fast. I would also like the general session to be an open discussion on posted topics.
- To me, this year was much more informative than last year. Instead of 'learner-centered', this year the breakouts were more direct in approach.
- This year was very good. The sessions were very helpful and informative. Hopefully with the sessions covering the range cards will help out with 'all the instructors doing the same thing'. As a new instructor I found it frustrating to see how some fellow instructors run the range. Peer Observation should be more geared towards 'older' instructors, not just the fresh IPC grads. Also, I'd prefer the PO's not to announce their visit.
- This was not a banquet. Specifically, the food has a lot to be desired. The food and service and table set-up was horrible. Next year, call it an 'Awards Luncheon'.

