



## American Board of Cardiovascular Perfusion

2903 Arlington Loop  
Hattiesburg, MS 39401  
(601) 268-2221  
Fax: (601) 268-2229  
Email: abcp@abcp.org

### Simulation Center Case Verification and Evaluation Form

#### Participant's Information

Participant's Name and ABCP #:

Date of Simulation Exercise:

Simulation Instructor's Name:

Facilitator's ABCP #:

Facilitator's Work Email Address:

ABCP-Recognized Center where activity occurred:

The University of Pittsburg Medical Center (UPMC)/Procirca Simulation Center

The Biomed Simulation Training and Education Center

Other

If you checked "Other," please list center where activity occurred:

#### Simulation Information

Simulation course:

Location:

Type of simulator used:

Simulated scenario(s):  Disaster Management  Product Evaluation  
(Select all that apply.)  Clinical Education  Clinical Competency  
 Skill Enhancement  Other

Simulation date and simulation start/end time:

#### CCP Simulation Facilitator Effectiveness

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. Pre-simulation instructions were clear and to the point.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. CCP Simulation Facilitator demonstrated mastery of simulation scenarios.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. CCP Simulation Facilitator debriefed participant at end of simulation.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. CCP Simulation Facilitator was responsive to participant's concerns.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Scenario and mechanics of simulation were based on a realistic patient model and/or perfusion model.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

# Simulation Center Case Verification and Evaluation Form

## Simulation Instructional Methods

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. The simulation instructional material was well organized.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Pre-simulation lecture was relevant to the simulation exercise	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. The instructional methods simulated the concepts well.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Simulator equipment realistically mimicked a "life-like" setting.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Achievement of simulation objectives were met.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

## Achievement of Objectives

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
1. Overall impression of simulation exercise	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Overall impression of simulation equipment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Overall impression of simulation facility	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Overall impression of facilitator/instructor	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

## Comments