

Material has been reviewed by the Walter Reed Army Institute of Research. There is no objection to its presentation and/or publication. The opinions or assertions contained herein are the private views of the author, and are not to be construed as official, or as reflecting true views of the Department of the Army or the Department of Defense. The investigators have adhered to the policies for protection of human subjects as prescribed in AR 70–25.

FY20 Ready and Resilient Quality Control (R2 QC) Evaluation Technical Report

Prepared by:

Susannah Knust, Ph.D. ([Susannah.k.knust.civ@health.mil](mailto:Susannah.k.knust.civ@health.mil))

Walter Reed Army Institute of Research

Coleen Crouch, Ph.D.

Walter Reed Army Institute of Research

Kelly Toner, M.A.

Walter Reed Army Institute of Research

Richard Gonzales, B.S.

Walter Reed Army Institute of Research

Antonio Best, Ed.S.

Walter Reed Army Institute of Research

Laurel Booth, M.P.H.

Walter Reed Army Institute of Research

Gery Denniswara, B.A.

Walter Reed Army Institute of Research

Evaluation funded by:

The Army Resilience Directorate

## Table of Contents

Table of Tables.....	3
Table of Appendices.....	4
Acknowledgments.....	5
Summary.....	6
Introduction.....	7
Details of the Evaluation.....	7
Methods.....	9
Results.....	9
Discussion.....	10
Recommendations.....	11
Limitations.....	13
Conclusions.....	13
Acronyms.....	14
References.....	15

**Table of Tables**

Table 1. Resilience Training (Developed by WRAIR) in Initial Entry Training and Professional  
Military Education..... 16

Table 2. Suicide Prevention Training in Initial Entry Training..... 16

## **Table of Appendices**

Appendix A. Training Development Capabilities (TDC).....	17
Appendix B. Fidelity Checklist.....	19
Appendix C. Course Evaluation.....	20
Appendix D. Interview Guide.....	22
Appendix E. Survey Responses for the Basic Leader Course.....	24
Appendix F. Survey Responses for Direct Commissioning Course.....	25

## **Acknowledgements**

The research team would like to thank Ms. Casey Olson and Mr. Rivera for their support of this evaluation. In addition, the team is grateful to Dr. Madhavi Reddy for her feedback on the report.

## **Summary**

The Research Transition Office (RTO) at the Walter Reed Army Institute of Research (WRAIR) conducted the Fiscal Year 2020 (FY20) Ready and Resilient Quality Control (R2 QC) evaluation on behalf of the Army Resilience Directorate (ARD; Headquarters of the Army [HQDA], G-1). ARD is the Army's proponent for resilience training and suicide prevention training, part of the Ready and Resilient (R2) training portfolio (see tables 1 and 2 for portfolio details). RTO personnel observed nine courses total (i.e. one for enlisted, four for officers, three for warrant officers, one pre-command course for officers and enlisted) in FY20. Of these nine courses, only two courses used the current lesson plans approved by ARD. For these two courses, Soldiers reported favorable ratings of both the curriculum and instructors. Of the remaining seven courses, instructors used incorrect, outdated material, unit resilience training material, their own material, or a combination of these unapproved sources. Many instructors did not know how to obtain the current lesson plan or that one even existed. Recommendations are provided for ARD, as the proponent for R2 training to address these implementation issues.

## **Introduction**

The purpose of R2 training is to strengthen personal readiness and resilience. R2 training is delivered in Initial Entry Training (IET) and Professional Military Education (PME) throughout a Soldier's career (U.S. Army, 2017; U.S. Army, 2014). For IET, ARD has Program of Instruction (POI) time for officer, warrant officer, and enlisted ranks. ARD lost POI time for resilience training in PME schoolhouses in 2018 (Lundy, 2017) with the exception of six hours in the Basic Leader Course (i.e. preparing specialists and corporals to become sergeants) and seven days in the Sergeant Major Course (i.e. preparing master sergeants and first sergeants to become sergeants major) (see Table 1 for more details about resilience training in IET and PME). ARD currently has POI time for suicide prevention training in IET courses (see Table 2 for more details about suicide prevention training in IET). For each resilience or suicide prevention course, ARD is required to upload the lesson plan and associated documents into the Training Development Capability (TDC) database so instructors across the Army have access to the most current curriculum. The Army uses TDC to create, edit, and manage learning products (U.S. Army, 2021) (for more information about the purpose, requirements, and product reviews of TDC, see Appendix A).

## **Details of the evaluation**

For each R2 QC Quality Improvement Evaluation data collection, RTO personnel used a three-pronged approach to thoroughly assess the state of R2 training in each course. First, a research team member observed the training using a fidelity checklist to report the content taught and rate participant engagement (see Appendix B for the fidelity checklist). Second, after the training concluded, Soldiers took a brief survey to share their opinions about the training and the instructor (see Appendix C for the course evaluation). Third, the research team member interviewed the instructor to learn about their preparation for and perceptions of the training (see Appendix D for the interview guide).

Upon receiving WRAIR's Human Subject Protection Board approval for the evaluation protocol, two RTO Training Specialists (i.e. retired non-commissioned officers [NCOs]) began coordinating enlisted, officer, and warrant officer IET and PME data collections. Data collection for IET and PME involved coordination through the Center for Initial Military Training (CIMT) for Basic Combat Training (BCT) / One Station Unit Training (OSUT) and through the Sergeants Major Academy, NCO Leadership Center of Excellence (NCOLCoE) for the Basic Leader Course (BLC) observations. Efforts to observe in-person BCT/OSUT training for FY20 were denied due to new COVID-19 restrictions and risk mitigation protocols that were implemented by all Army training institutions world-wide. Since BCT/OSUT can neither be conducted nor observed virtually, these observations were postponed in FY20. However, BLC training was conducted using other various instructional formats including in-person, virtual, and hybrid. Coordination with the NCOLCoE for a list of Non-Commissioned Officer Academies conducting virtual and hybrid instruction and direct coordination with the NCO Academy yielded one BLC observation for FY20.

Coordination of data collections for officer and warrant officer courses, including Basic Officer Leader Course-Basic (BOLC-B), Warrant Officer Candidate School, Officer Candidate School, Direct Commissioning Course (DCC), Reserve Officers Training Corps (ROTC), and Company Commander/First Sergeant Pre-Command Course (CCFSPCC) was achieved by accessing the Army Training Requirements and Resources System<sup>1</sup> (ATRRS) to conduct a search for classes and dates that occurred during FY20. For Army institutions, the point of entry was generally the organization's Operations Section; however, ROTC and CCFSPCC required alternate access. In some cases, the ATRRS course administrative information included points of contact which were used to initiate the data collection coordination with schoolhouses. In cases where contact information was out of date, the institutions' websites were searched to

---

<sup>1</sup> ATRRS is a part of an online system managed by the U.S. Army that tracks military training records, course participation, class schedule management, class quota specification, or class seat reservations.

obtain current information for points of contact. Since ATRRS is not used for ROTC, coordination efforts were done by accessing college and university ROTC websites and calling the administrative specialist to arrange a call with a Professor of Military Science. Follow-up emails and calls were generally noncommittal or ignored; therefore, no ROTC observations were completed. For the CCFSPCC, there were additional challenges since the course ownership varied by installation (i.e. garrison, corps, division commands).

## **Methods**

Observations, surveys, and interviews were completed for nine courses at seven installations during FY20. Six observations were virtual due to COVID and three were in-person. During the observation, the researcher noted if the training was approved or unapproved on a fidelity checklist. The research team collected five-minute surveys from participants in classes that used the approved R2 curriculum. Survey data analysis included descriptive statistics to describe the participants' perceptions of the usefulness, relevance, and helpfulness of the curriculum and materials as well as satisfaction with the instructor. Additionally, a Training Specialist or a Research Psychologist conducted each of the 11 instructor interviews about R2 curriculum. Research Associates or Research Assistants transcribed the interview as it occurred. The interview data were then parsed by class type and mined for comments and trends, such as instructor demographics, training logistics, timing of the content relative to the rank of the Soldier students, and recommendations for curriculum changes or sustains.

## **Results**

Of the nine courses observed, two instructors (BLC and DCC) used the current lesson plans for R2 training. In their interviews, the reasons the instructors cited for using outdated or incorrect lesson plans included: 1) using the curriculum that was provided to them by the curriculum manager or equivalent (63%), 2) lack of awareness of an authorized lesson plan to use (27%), and 3) adding supplemental material because of personal interest (10%). Two hundred twenty-four Soldiers were surveyed because they received the approved curriculum.

Most of these Soldiers (95%) agreed that the training was useful and relevant, would help them personally (84%) and professionally (95%), and that the instructor was effective in delivering the material (97%) (see Appendices E and F to review the survey results for the BLC and DCC course, respectively).

## **Discussion**

Overall, Soldiers who received the approved and up-to-date training valued the classes. As the proponent, ARD should continue to communicate the existence of and to reinforce the use of these approved lesson plans. When the approved materials are taught, Soldiers are ensured a baseline of foundational information in IET and more nuanced and targeted leader training in PME. With Soldiers in only two of nine courses receiving approved lessons, ARD should continue efforts to ensure training compliance and accountability to ensure Soldiers receive the appropriate information and skills.

Instructor interviews indicate that they want to provide meaningful R2 training but may not know there is approved or updated curriculum, or they may believe that they have more relevant content to provide based on their personal interest or experience. The R2 QC team can effectively address these challenges by first providing assistance visits for instructors, curriculum managers, commanders/commandants, and schools who want to ensure their students get the most current content and instruction but are not sure how to get to it, and secondly, acting as a mechanism of quality control for those who do not to comply with HQDA mandatory R2 proponent developed training.

While ARD does have proponent oversight of several HQDA mandatory training requirements for units and institutional environments as identified in Tables F-1 and F-2 of AR 350-1 (2017), their institutional oversight has not been systematic. ARD is a non-traditional training and education proponent that has no schools in IET and PME—only lessons.

## Recommendations

- ARD establishes (internally or outsourced) two traditional training and education proponent support functions:
  - (1) Training Developer support for United States Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) learning products and TDC database management
  - (2) Quality Assurance (QA) Program element support for TRADOC and other learning products
- ARD establishes the Training Developer support for TRADOC learning products and TDC database management.
- ARD implements QA Program element support for TRADOC and other learning products.
- ARD continues conducting the R2 QC evaluation to assist with and confirm schoolhouse compliance<sup>2</sup>.
- If outdated or unauthorized lesson plans are still being used, the instructor, curriculum manager (or equivalent), Commander/Commandant, and ARD are outbriefed on the coordinated expectation and results of the observation.
- Broad and ongoing R2 QC observations becomes a schoolhouse expectation from the proponent even when broad compliance has been reached to continue to inform lesson revisions, maintain relevance, and meet the sequential and progressive curriculum intent.

---

• <sup>2</sup> When coordinating an observation and data collection, the R2 representative should communicate to the schoolhouse POC the current lesson plan number, lesson title, approval date, and the course that is expected to be observed to ensure TDY funds will not be wasted observing incorrect material.

- ARD training developers for TDC reviews the content in the TDC database to verify that the correct lesson plans are available and remove (i.e. obsolete) or replace (i.e. supersede) unauthorized or old lesson plans.
- ARD training developers maintains an expert level of fluency in TDC product and task development to ensure the TDC database remains current with only approved training products.
- The Common Faculty Development-Instructor Course and Common Faculty Development-Developers Course adds the following information to their respective curriculum:
  - Hands-on instruction of the local processes used by instructors and faculty to search for and obtain the most current training materials
  - The role of their curriculum manager (or equivalent)
  - A brief overview of the TDC database and its purpose
- Provide instructors access to an Army Training Network or ARD portal so they can download the approved lesson plans. A footnote and QR code should be included with the curriculum directing trainers to a portal with the approved curriculum.
- In order to keep proponent schools current on curriculum updates and training materials, ARD should regularly participate in relevant CIMT and PME POI and/or curriculum working group meetings and reviews addressing R2 training content (e.g., BCT POI reviews, Drill Sergeant Academy POI reviews, BOLC-B/Warrant Office Basic Course Common Core Task List reviews, Combined Arms Center [CAC] Training Managers and Developers forums, CAC Mid-grade Leaders Continuum telecons).
- Regular engagement with the NCOLCoE leadership and training development team to stay in the loop on Army NCO leadership initiatives and focus areas to ensure they are supported or reinforced within R2 training products.

## **Limitations**

This evaluation has an extremely small sample size in the context of the Army education system. COVID mitigation protocols limited in-person training observation, if these were even allowed, while other schoolhouses were quickly shifting to online learning, when appropriate. However, results highlight several issues that can be addressed by ARD in order to improve implementation of R2 training in IET and PME. Another limitation was that surveys were only conducted directly after training so the research team is unable to determine if there were changes in knowledge, attitudes, or behaviors due to the training.

## **Conclusions**

With this limited snapshot of R2 training observations, surveys, and interviews, the initial trends indicate that the current lesson plans are not being taught by many instructors. When using the approved material, Soldiers indicated the concepts and skills were relevant and useful, and could be applied in professional and personal settings. The Soldiers recognized that instructors were knowledgeable and did well teaching the class. It is important for the instructors to be aware of and teach the current lesson plans for the benefit of Soldiers, units, the Force, and the Soldiers' Families.

## Acronyms

ATRRS	Army Training Requirements and Resources System
ARD	Army Resilience Directorate
BCT	Basic Combat Training
BLC	Basic Leader Course
BOLC-B	Basic Officer Leader Course-Basic
CAC	Combined Arms Center
CIMT	Center for Initial Military Training
CCFSPCC	Company Commander/First Sergeant Pre-Command Course
DCC	Direct Commissioning Course
FY20	Fiscal Year 2020
HQDA	Headquarters Department of the Army
IET	Initial Entry Training
NCOLCoE	NCO Leadership Center of Excellence
NCO	non-commissioned officer
OSUT	One Station Unit Training
PME	Professional Military Education
POI	Program of Instruction
R2	Ready and Resilient
R2 QC	Ready and Resilient Quality Control
ROTC	Reserve Officers Training Corps
RTO	Research Transition Office
TRADOC	United States Army Training and Doctrine Command
TDC	Training Development Capability
WRAIR	Walter Reed Army Institute of Research

## References

Lundy, M. D. (2017). *AR 350-1 Guidance Regarding Professional Military Education (PME)*.

[Memorandum]

U.S. Army. (2014). *Comprehensive Soldier and Family Fitness* [AR 350-53]. Retrieved from

[https://armypubs.army.mil/epubs/DR\\_pubs/DR\\_a/pdf/web/r350\\_53.pdf](https://armypubs.army.mil/epubs/DR_pubs/DR_a/pdf/web/r350_53.pdf)

U.S. Army. (2017). *Army Training and Leader Development* [AR 350-1]. Retrieved from

[https://armypubs.army.mil/epubs/DR\\_pubs/DR\\_a/pdf/web/ARN18487\\_R350\\_1\\_Admin\\_FINAL.pdf](https://armypubs.army.mil/epubs/DR_pubs/DR_a/pdf/web/ARN18487_R350_1_Admin_FINAL.pdf)

U.S. Army. (2021). *Training and Educational Development in Support of the Institutional Domain*

[TP 350-70-14]. Retrieved from

<https://adminpubs.tradoc.army.mil/pamphlets/TP350-70-14.pdf>

**Table 1**

*Resilience Training (Developed by WRAIR) in Initial Entry Training and Professional Military Education*

Institutional Resilience Training (IMT/PME)				
Course Name	Course Abbreviation	Lesson Length (min)	Last Updated	Stage of Career
Basic Combat Training	BCT	120 (+ three optional 20 minute lessons)	5/21/2021	New Soldiers
Basic Leader Course	BLC	360	11/3/2017	Pre-SGT
Officer Candidate School	OCS	120	11/6/2017	Pre-Commission
Reserve Officers Training Course	ROTC	120	102L10 3/31/2021 * 401L26 3/31/2021 *	Pre-Commission
Direct Commission Course	DCC	120	Using OCS	Pre-Commission
Basic Officers Leader Course	BOLC-B	360	5/13/2021	LTs
Warrant Officer Candidate School	WOCS	240	2/25/2021	Pre-Commission
Company Commander/First Sergeant Pre-Command Course	CCFSPCC	120	3/27/2019	CPTs & 1SGs

\* Pending Implementation

**Table 2**

*Suicide Prevention Training in Initial Entry Training*

Institutional Suicide Prevention Training (IET/PME)				
Course Name	Course Abbreviation	Lesson Length (min)	Last Updated	Stage of Career
Basic Combat Training – Suicide Prevention	BCT – suicide prevention	60	09/28/2015	New Enlisted Soldiers
Officer Initial Entry Training (OCS/WOCS) – Suicide Prevention	Officer Accession – suicide prevention	60	9/18/2019	Pre-Commission
Reserve Officers Training Course – Suicide Prevention	ROTC – suicide prevention	60	03/29/2021 *	Pre-Commission
The United States Military Academy (USMA) – Suicide Prevention	USMA – suicide prevention	60	09/23/2019	Cadet/Pre-Commission
Basic Officer Leader Course –B / Warrant Officer Basic Course – Suicide Prevention	BOLC-B/WOBC – suicide prevention	60	09/23/2019	LTs/Pre-WO1
Company Commander and First Sergeant Pre-Command Course	CCFSPCC	60		CPTs & 1SGs

\* Pending Implementation

## **Appendix A**

### *Training Development Capabilities (TDC)*

#### **Purpose**

- TDC is used to develop, store, and manage learning products for all training domains. It is the primary automated tool used by Army (TRADOC and non-TRADOC) schools and centers to create, edit, and manage all training and education products that support both the institutional and operational forces. It also informs Army electronic repositories and other automated development tools with learning content and resource requirements.

#### **Requirements**

- Formalized training is required to access and develop products in TDC. In order to begin product development in TDC, the Training Developer will need a number of items from the subject matter experts, including all resourcing requirements for input into fillable screens within the system. Items required include: instructional content, instructor notes, terminal learning objective, enabling learning objectives, instructor actions tests and assessments, checks on learning, presentations (PowerPoints), instructor requirements, instructor and student handouts, instructor to student ratios, video links/files, references, supported tasks, facilities, equipment, and personnel required, content distribution restrictions, time requirements, module groupings, targeted Learning Levels and Domains; Training Aids, Devices, Simulators, and Simulations; Graphic Training Aids; course supplies; administrative data; etc.

#### **Reviews and Updates**

- TDC products have several reviewer points. Input begins at the Pre-Development stage, then moves on to the Development, next it's routed to the training developer's Manager Review, afterwards products are routed to CAC/ArmyU for external (TRADOC level) review, upon return, products are returned to the training developer Manager for action

or forwarding to the Approver. Systematic product revisions and reviews are conducted about every three years or sooner depending on triggering circumstances. Centers of Excellence/schools and institutions must also maintain strict version and edition control of learning products contained in TDC, pursuant to established policy in order to maintain the quality of this database.

## Appendix B

WRAIR #2743  
v.1, 9Mar20

### R2 QC Fidelity Checklist

Location/Installation:	Observer:																																		
Course:	Course version & publication date:																																		
Date:	Start time:                      End time:																																		
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Instruction</b></p> <p>Instructor Rank/Grade: _____</p> <p>Instructor was knowledgeable about the material:</p> <table style="width: 100%; text-align: center;"> <tr> <td>Very Good</td> <td>Good</td> <td>Fair</td> <td>Poor</td> <td>Very Poor</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="radio"/></td> <td><input type="radio"/></td> <td><input type="radio"/></td> <td><input type="radio"/></td> <td><input type="radio"/></td> </tr> </table> <p>Instructor facilitated vignettes:</p> <table style="width: 100%; text-align: center;"> <tr> <td>All of them</td> <td>Most of them</td> <td>About half of them</td> <td>A few of them</td> <td>None of them</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="radio"/></td> <td><input type="radio"/></td> <td><input type="radio"/></td> <td><input type="radio"/></td> <td><input type="radio"/></td> <td><input type="radio"/></td> </tr> </table> <p>Instructor facilitated discussion:</p> <table style="width: 100%; text-align: center;"> <tr> <td>Almost always</td> <td>Often</td> <td>Sometimes</td> <td>Seldom</td> <td>Never</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="radio"/></td> <td><input type="radio"/></td> <td><input type="radio"/></td> <td><input type="radio"/></td> <td><input type="radio"/></td> <td><input type="radio"/></td> </tr> </table>	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	All of them	Most of them	About half of them	A few of them	None of them	N/A	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Almost always	Often	Sometimes	Seldom	Never	N/A	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Content</b></p> <p>TLO: <input type="radio"/> Achieved <input type="radio"/> Not achieved</p> <p>If not achieved, please elaborate:</p>
Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor																															
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>																															
All of them	Most of them	About half of them	A few of them	None of them	N/A																														
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>																														
Almost always	Often	Sometimes	Seldom	Never	N/A																														
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>																														
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Engagement</b></p> <p>Students were engaged:</p> <table style="width: 100%; text-align: center;"> <tr> <td>Almost always</td> <td>Often</td> <td>Sometimes</td> <td>Seldom</td> <td>Never</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="radio"/></td> <td><input type="radio"/></td> <td><input type="radio"/></td> <td><input type="radio"/></td> <td><input type="radio"/></td> </tr> </table> <p>Students participated in group discussion:</p> <table style="width: 100%; text-align: center;"> <tr> <td>All of them</td> <td>Most of them</td> <td>About half of them</td> <td>A few of them</td> <td>None of them</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="radio"/></td> <td><input type="radio"/></td> <td><input type="radio"/></td> <td><input type="radio"/></td> <td><input type="radio"/></td> <td><input type="radio"/></td> </tr> </table> <p>Students participated in role-plays:</p> <table style="width: 100%; text-align: center;"> <tr> <td>All of them</td> <td>Most of them</td> <td>About half of them</td> <td>A few of them</td> <td>None of them</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="radio"/></td> <td><input type="radio"/></td> <td><input type="radio"/></td> <td><input type="radio"/></td> <td><input type="radio"/></td> <td><input type="radio"/></td> </tr> </table> <p>Student questions:</p>	Almost always	Often	Sometimes	Seldom	Never	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	All of them	Most of them	About half of them	A few of them	None of them	N/A	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	All of them	Most of them	About half of them	A few of them	None of them	N/A	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>General Notes</b></p>
Almost always	Often	Sometimes	Seldom	Never																															
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>																															
All of them	Most of them	About half of them	A few of them	None of them	N/A																														
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>																														
All of them	Most of them	About half of them	A few of them	None of them	N/A																														
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>																														

## Appendix C

### Resilience Training Course Evaluation

WRAIR #2743  
v. 3, 25MAY22

1. I have read the information sheet. I consent to allow my anonymous course evaluation responses to be used for potential future research purposes.
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

2. Today's date:
____ / ____ / ____ MM / DD / YYYY

3. What is your primary component?
<input type="checkbox"/> Active <input type="checkbox"/> Reserve <input type="checkbox"/> National Guard

4. How many deployments have you completed that lasted more than 30 days?
<input type="checkbox"/> 0 <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5 or more

5. What course are you currently taking?
<input type="checkbox"/> BCT <input type="checkbox"/> BLC <input type="checkbox"/> BOLC-A Direct Commissioning <input type="checkbox"/> BOLC-A OCS <input type="checkbox"/> BOLC-A ROTC Resilience <input type="checkbox"/> BOLC-A ROTC Suicide Prevention <input type="checkbox"/> BOLC-A USMA Suicide Prevention <input type="checkbox"/> BOLC-B Resilience <input type="checkbox"/> BOLC-B Suicide Prevention <input type="checkbox"/> CCFSPCC <input type="checkbox"/> WOCS <input type="checkbox"/> WOBC Resilience <input type="checkbox"/> WOBC Suicide Prevention

6. Please rate how strongly you disagree or agree with the following statements about the training.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
a. The training was useful for me.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The training was relevant for me.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. I learned skills that will help me be a better Soldier.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. I learned skills that will help me be a better leader.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. I learned skills that will help me be a better family member.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SURVEY APPROVAL AUTHORITY: US ARMY RECORDS MANAGEMENT AND DECLASSIFICATION AGENCY  
 SURVEY CONTROL NUMBER: AAHS-RMC-22-128 (EX). AGENCY IDENTIFIER: WRAIR. EXPIRATION DATE: 24MAY23

00000

7. Please rate how strongly you disagree or agree with the following statements about your instructor.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
a. The instructor was knowledgeable about the material.	^	^	^	^	^
b. The instructor explained the material clearly.	^	^	^	^	^
c. The instructor asked questions that facilitated discussions.	^	^	^	^	^
d. The instructor answered questions effectively.	^	^	^	^	^
e. The instructor presented the materials at an appropriate pace.	^	^	^	^	^
f. The instructor made connections to real-world applications of the material.	^	^	^	^	^

8. Please rate how strongly you disagree or agree with the following statements.	N/A	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
a. The handouts/worksheets were helpful.	^	^	^	^	^	^
b. The material presented in the course flowed in a logical, easy-to-follow manner.	^	^	^	^	^	^

9. For the amount of material presented, the length of the training was...	^ Too Long	^ Just Right	^ Too Short
--	------------	--------------	-------------

10. Please list one aspect of this training to sustain and why:

11. Please list one aspect of this training to improve and why:

12. What skills or topics did you find to be most helpful in becoming a better leader or Soldier?

Thank you for your participation!

0000

## Appendix D

WRAIR #2743  
v2, 29May20

### R2 QC Interview Guide

We are conducting an evaluation on behalf of the Army Resilience Directorate. The purpose of the evaluation is to collect information about the training that you've just conducted. We're looking at adherence to the curriculum and timelines, satisfaction with the curriculum, and we also want to ask for your recommendations to help shape future versions of the course.

Although we are interviewing you for this program evaluation, it is also possible that a transcript of these interviews might be used for research in the future. Have you read the information sheet and consent to allow your anonymous responses to be used for potential future research purposes?  YES  NO

\* Do not ask the questions marked with an asterisk if the wrong material was presented.

#### Demographics

Rank:

Component:

Are you an MRT?

[If yes]: When did you attend MRT?

Have you attended the Common Faculty Development Instructor Training?

[If yes]: When?

#### Training Logistics

How much time were you given to teach the module?

Is that usually the amount of time you're given?

How many times have you taught this version of the resilience material in this course?

What were your strategies to prepare to teach the material the first time?

What were your strategies to prepare to teach the material this time?

Did you use personnel at the R2 performance center to help in your preparation for this course?

\* What is your confidence in teaching this material on a scale from 1-5 (where 5 is most confident)?

How do you get your training material?

How do you know you're teaching the most current material?

How do you get your updated materials?

(Does it come through TDC (the official proponent-approved LP system))?

\* Did you use the SmartGuide for this course?

Does the R2 training content fit in the optimal place in the course lesson sequence?

Was the correct material presented?

Yes  No\*

Version #/Title of PPT:

\_\_\_\_\_

If not, how could the sequencing be improved?

**Content**

\* Is the TLO relevant for the audience at this point in their career?

[If not] What is the most important resilience takeaway at this level?

[If yes] Is the content of the lesson sufficient to achieve the training TLO?

[If content is not sufficient] How would you alter the training?

What are the most valuable topics & why?

\* Look at the list (*curated per course*). Select up to 3 skills.

What are the least valuable topics & why?

\* Look at the list (*curated per course*). Select up to 3 skills.

**Sustains & Improves**

What are aspects of this training (not content-related) to sustain?

What could be done to improve this training (i.e. videos, exercises)?

Are there other topics that should be addressed in R2 training when there is a revision?

If so, what are they?

**Integration**

Do you integrate resilience skills or concepts throughout the course (outside of the R2 classroom time)?

If yes, please describe. (e.g., where, when, which skill/concept) COVID-19

Was the format of this class changed due to COVID-19 (to online from in person)?

If yes, how much was the content revised to fit the new format?

If yes, how much input did you have about how the course was revised?

What is your preference for how this material is presented (in person, online, large group, small groups, etc)? Why?

What are the advantages and disadvantages to the format (online, in person, etc) of this class?

## Appendix E

### Survey Responses for the Basic Leader Course

#### Training

Frequency/ percent	Training Useful	Training Relevant	Skills - Soldier	Skills - Leader	Skills - Family		Frequency/ percent	Training Length
Strongly Disagree	2 / 1.3%	2 / 1.3%	2 / 1.3%	2 / 1.3%	2 / 1.4%		Too Long	14 / 9.4%
Disagree	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	1 / 0.7%		Just Right	130 / 87.2%
Neither	5 / 3.4%	5 / 3.4%	6 / 4%	5 / 3.4%	20 / 13.5%		Too Short	5 / 3.4%
Agree	71 / 47.7%	73 / 49%	64 / 43%	61 / 40.9%	65 / 43.9%			
Strongly Agree	71 / 47.7%	69 / 46.3%	77 / 51.7%	80 / 54.1%	60 / 40.5%			

#### Training

Frequency/ percent	Helpful Handouts	Logical Flow	Format Restricted Interaction	Social Distancing Restricted Interaction		Frequency/ percent	Preferred Format
Strongly Disagree	1 / 0.7%	1 / 0.7%	33 / 22.1%	35 / 23.5%		In Person	50 / 33.6%
Disagree	1 / 0.7%	2 / 1.3%	56 / 37.6%	50 / 33.6%		Online*	74 / 49.7%
Neither	30 / 20.1%	11 / 7.4%	25 / 16.8%	28 / 18.8%		Hybrid	22 / 14.8%
Agree	65 / 43.6%	77 / 51.7%	16 / 10.7%	17 / 11.4%			
Strongly Agree	40 / 26.8%	57 / 38.3%	18 / 12.1%	13 / 8.7%			
N/A	12 / 8.1%	0 / 0%	1 / 0.7%	6 / 4%			

\* Class was taught virtually and that is the students' preference.

#### Instructor

Frequency/ percent	Knowledge-able	Explained Clearly	Facilitated Discussions	Answered Questions	Appropriate Pace	Real World Connections
Strongly Disagree	1 / 0.7%	1 / 0.7%	1 / 0.7%	1 / 0.7%	1 / 0.7%	1 / 0.7%
Disagree	0 / 0%	1 / 0.7%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	2 / 1.3%	0 / 0%
Neither	3 / 2.0%	5 / 3.4%	4 / 2.7%	8 / 5.4%	4 / 2.7%	1 / 0.7%
Agree	42 / 28.2%	44 / 29.5%	38 / 25.7%	41 / 27.5%	42 / 28.2%	39 / 26.2%
Strongly Agree	103 / 69.1%	98 / 65.8%	105 / 70.9%	99 / 66.4%	100 / 67.1%	108 / 72.5%

## Appendix F

### Survey Responses for Direct Commissioning Course

#### Training

Frequency/ percent	Training Useful	Training Relevant	Skills - Soldier	Skills - Leader	Skills - Family		Frequency/ percent	Training Length
Strongly Disagree	3 / 4%	2 / 2.7%	2 / 2.7%	2 / 2.7%	3 / 4%		Too Long	23 / 30.7%
Disagree	2 / 2.7%	3 / 4%	2 / 2.7%	0 / 0%	3 / 4%		Just Right	49 / 65.3%
Neither	9 / 12%	8 / 10.7%	12 / 16%	9 / 12%	18 / 24%		Too Short	3 / 4%
Agree	48 / 64%	49 / 65.3%	37 / 49.3%	43 / 57.3%	38 / 50.7%			
Strongly Agree	13 / 17.3%	13 / 17.3%	22 / 29.3%	20 / 26.7%	13 / 17.3%			

#### Training

Frequency/ percent	Helpful Handouts	Logical Flow	Format Restricted Interaction	Social Distancing Restricted Interaction		Frequency/ percent	Preferred Format
Strongly Disagree	0 / 0%	1 / 1.3%	1 / 1.3%	1 / 1.3%		In Person*	36 / 48%
Disagree	3 / 4%	2 / 2.7%	13 / 17.3%	10 / 13.3%		Online	21 / 28%
Neither	15 / 20%	13 / 17.3%	18 / 24%	10 / 13.3%		Hybrid	18 / 24%
Agree	36 / 48%	43 / 57.3%	28 / 37%	35 / 46.7%			
Strongly Agree	9 / 12%	14 / 18.7%	28 / 37.3%	18 / 24%			
N/A	12 / 16%	2 / 2.7%	3 / 4%	1 / 1.3%			

\* Class was taught virtually, but the students prefer in person.

#### Instructor

Frequency /percent	Knowledge-able	Explained Clearly	Facilitated Discussions	Answered Questions	Appropriate Pace	Real World Connections
Strongly Disagree	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	1 / 1.4%	0 / 0%
Disagree	4 / 5.3%	5 / 6.7%	4 / 5.3%	2 / 2.7%	7 / 9.5%	2 / 2.7%
Neither	7 / 9.3%	6 / 8%	8 / 10.7%	6 / 8%	8 / 10.8%	11 / 14.9%
Agree	35 / 46.7%	35 / 46.7%	32 / 42.7%	37 / 49.3%	34 / 45.9%	36 / 48.6%
Strongly Agree	29 / 38.7%	29 / 38.7%	31 / 41.3%	29 / 38.7%	24 / 32.4%	25 / 33.8%