

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

sprat.org

info@sprat.org

Registry Number:
EC-02

Revision History:
Version 25A Board Approved January 2025

Table of Contents:

1. Purpose and Scope	3
2. Role of the Evaluator	3
3. Evaluator Appointment	4
4. Administering an Evaluation.....	5
5. Submitting Evaluation Information	7
6. Evaluator Infractions	8
7. Complaints.....	9
8. Assessment of Evaluator Candidates.....	10
9. Evaluator Workshops	10

Notes for Usage:

Use of the word ‘shall’ denotes a mandatory requirement.

Use of the word ‘should’ denotes a recommendation. The word ‘should’ does not connote indifference or ambivalence regarding a statement.

Visit <https://sprat.org> for the most recent [standards versions](#), [supporting documentation](#), and [news](#).



1. Purpose and Scope

1.1. Purpose

1.1.1. The purpose of this document is to provide evaluators with the information required to administer objective, impartial, and consistent evaluations as part of SPRAT's certification programs.

1.1.2. This document provides information required for evaluators to fulfill their responsibilities as listed in SPRAT's *Rope Access Evaluation Guidelines* and *Work-at-Height Evaluation Guidelines*.

1.2. Scope

1.2.1. This document provides:

1.2.1.1. Evaluator appointment details.

1.2.1.2. Evaluator policies.

1.2.1.3. Details of administrative information for correct completion of evaluation paperwork.

1.2.1.4. Detailed responsibilities for an evaluator through the entire evaluation.

1.2.1.5. A framework for disciplinary action for violations of SPRAT policies by evaluators.

1.2.1.6. Details for assessing evaluator candidates.

2. Role of the Evaluator

2.1. General

2.1.1. An evaluator shall fulfill their responsibilities as stated in *Rope Access Evaluation Guidelines* and *Work-at-Height Evaluation Guidelines* in accordance with applicable SPRAT policies and procedures.

2.1.2. An evaluator shall provide candidates with the opportunity to demonstrate their competence in a positive evaluation environment.

2.1.3. An evaluator shall represent SPRAT in a positive, professional manner.

2.1.4. An evaluator shall respect and follow any decisions made by SPRAT's Evaluations Committee and Board of Directors.

2.1.5. An evaluator shall remain current on relevant equipment, standards, and regulations related to rope access and work at height.

2.2. Impartiality

2.2.1. An evaluator shall fulfill their responsibilities in an objective and impartial manner.

2.2.2. An evaluator shall notify the SPRAT Office of potential conflicts of interest or other factors that may threaten an evaluator's ability to fulfill their responsibilities, or that may make their impartiality suspect.

2.2.3. An evaluator shall ensure independence from all candidates in rope access evaluations.

2.3. Evaluation Session Host and Candidate Interaction

2.3.1. An evaluator shall not provide training to a candidate during an evaluation.

2.3.2. An evaluator shall not make recommendations regarding a candidate's need for more training during an evaluation.

2.3.2.1. An evaluation can only provide assurance of a candidate's ability to complete certification requirements on the day of an evaluation.

2.3.3. Evaluators shall not approach Evaluation Session Hosts, training staff, candidates, or potential clients for the purposes of recruitment or future business opportunities.

2.3.4. Evaluators shall not disclose any confidential or proprietary information acquired during an evaluation unless the information pertains to practices that are clearly inconsistent with SPRAT standards or is required within Evaluations Committee or Board of Directors discussions.

2.4. SPRAT Promotion

- 2.4.1. An evaluator may actively promote the growth of SPRAT certification programs, including evaluator services.
- 2.4.2. Promotion of SPRAT certification programs and evaluator services shall not provide information that may be perceived to provide any assurance of a certification result or threaten the impartiality of the evaluation process. Examples include, but are not limited to:
 - 2.4.2.1. Pass rate information.
 - 2.4.2.2. Unsolicited fee structures.
- 2.4.3. An evaluator may engage with organizations that may be interested in becoming SPRAT members and Evaluation Session Hosts.
- 2.4.4. An evaluator may periodically provide notification of availability that may be of legitimate interest to Evaluation Session Hosts publicly listed on SPRAT's online [Evaluation Session Host list](#).

3. Evaluator Appointment

3.1. Appointment Term

- 3.1.1. An evaluator's appointment is aligned with the expiration date of their Level 3 Technician certification.
- 3.1.2. An evaluator's appointment may be revoked at any time by a minimum 2/3 vote of the Board of Directors.
 - 3.1.2.1. If an evaluator's appointment is revoked, the Board of Directors shall determine eligibility to regain an evaluator appointment.

3.2. Appointment Maintenance

- 3.2.1. An evaluator shall submit a completed contract to the SPRAT Office prior to conducting an evaluation each calendar year.
 - 3.2.1.1. An annual fee of \$100 is assessed with the submission of the contract.
- 3.2.2. An evaluator shall maintain their certification as a Level 3 Technician.
- 3.2.3. An evaluator shall maintain their contact information, including their geographic residence, accurately within SPRAT's online system.
- 3.2.4. An evaluator shall maintain a SPRAT voting membership.
- 3.2.5. An evaluator shall vote on all membership ballots.
- 3.2.6. An evaluator should participate in SPRAT committees.
- 3.2.7. An evaluator shall ensure access to current versions of and maintain familiarity with SPRAT standards and supplements applicable to the evaluation they are conducting.
 - 3.2.7.1. Current standards and supplements are maintained on SPRAT's public documents page.
 - 3.2.7.2. The SPRAT Office provides update summaries, which are also present as an Appendix in SPRAT's [Document Registry](#).
 - 3.2.7.3. Preparation forms with a list of these documents are maintained for candidates, Evaluation Session Hosts, and evaluators.
- 3.2.8. An evaluator shall attend at least one virtual or in-person SPRAT Evaluations Committee sanctioned workshop or webinar on an annual basis.
 - 3.2.8.1. An evaluator shall attend at least one in-person Evaluations Committee sanctioned workshop per appointment term.
- 3.2.9. An evaluator shall administer sufficient evaluations to maintain their abilities to fulfill their responsibilities.
 - 3.2.9.1. An evaluator should administer a minimum of two evaluations per year and a minimum of eight evaluations during their appointment.

3.3. Reappointment Requirements

- 3.3.1. The reappointment process begins automatically unless an evaluator provides notice to the SPRAT Office.
 - 3.3.2. The SPRAT Office will provide access to an online, open-book written test approximately three months prior to the current appointment expiration date.
 - 3.3.2.1. The evaluator has 60 days to complete the written test.
 - 3.3.2.2. A score of 80% or better constitutes a passing score for the written test.
 - 3.3.2.3. An evaluator has two attempts to successfully complete the written test.
 - 3.3.3. 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:
 - 3.3.3.1. Maintenance of evaluator appointment.
 - 3.3.3.2. Administrative responsibilities.
 - 3.3.3.3. Evaluation feedback from candidates and Evaluation Session Hosts.
 - 3.3.3.4. SPRAT participation.
 - 3.3.3.5. Infractions incurred during most recent and previous appointments.
 - 3.3.3.6. Evaluator written test result(s).
 - 3.3.4. Following this review, the Evaluations Committee may vote by simple majority for:
 - 3.3.4.1. Approval for reappointment.
 - 3.3.4.2. Approval for probationary extension of appointment of 6 months.
 - 3.3.4.3. Denial of reappointment.
 - 3.3.5. The Evaluations Committee will review the evaluator's performance in the same manner at the conclusion of the probationary extension.
 - 3.3.6. A vote for denying a reappointment will be sent with recommendations of eligibility and/or requirements for reappointment to the Board of Directors.
 - 3.3.6.1. Possible requirements for reinstatement may include, but are not limited to:
 - 3.3.6.1.1. Attendance of an Evaluator Workshop.
 - 3.3.6.1.2. Completing an evaluation while being assessed by an evaluator meeting the requirements stated in Section 8.
 - 3.3.7. The new appointment expiration date is aligned with the evaluator's certification as a Level 3 Technician.
- ### 3.4. Appointment Expiration
- 3.4.1. If an individual's evaluator appointment is expired by less than one year, the individual shall attend an Evaluator Workshop and shall complete an evaluation while being assessed by an evaluator meeting the requirements stated in Section 8 of this document to be considered for reappointment.
 - 3.4.2. Once an individual's evaluator appointment has been expired for a year or more, the individual must restart the current evaluator process.

4. Administering an Evaluation

- 4.1. Coordinating with an Evaluation Session Host
 - 4.1.1. When scheduling an evaluation, the evaluator should:
 - 4.1.1.1. Ensure the Evaluation Session Host has established a record in SPRAT's online system and assigned the evaluation to the evaluator.
 - 4.1.1.2. Ensure the Evaluation Session Host has approved insurance documentation within SPRAT's online system.
 - 4.1.1.2.1. An evaluation date appears orange in SPRAT's online system if insurance for the evaluation date has not been approved by the SPRAT Office.

- 4.1.1.3. Ensure that the Evaluation Session Host is familiar with the site and equipment requirements for the rope access or work-at-height evaluation.
 - 4.1.1.4. Ensure that the Evaluation Session Host is familiar with candidate eligibility requirements.
 - 4.1.1.5. Ensure that any Direct Entry applications have been submitted to the SPRAT Office.
 - 4.1.1.6. Ensure the number of candidates are within allowed evaluation limits.
 - 4.1.1.6.1. An evaluator may administer up to two work-at-height evaluations or one work-at-height evaluation and one rope access evaluation in one day.
 - 4.1.1.6.2. Each evaluation may have up to eight candidates.
 - 4.1.1.7. Enquire if specific personal equipment is needed to access the site and/or administer the evaluation.
 - 4.1.1.8. Coordinate evaluation fee(s), travel, and accommodation with the Evaluation Session Host.
- 4.2. Initial Introduction
- 4.2.1. The initial introduction to the candidates should provide an overview of the evaluation process.
 - 4.2.2. When introducing an evaluation, the evaluator should:
 - 4.2.2.1. Thank the Evaluation Session Host.
 - 4.2.2.2. Provide a brief introduction of SPRAT.
 - 4.2.2.3. Provide a brief personal introduction.
 - 4.2.2.4. Explain the role of the evaluator.
 - 4.2.2.5. Remind the candidates that the evaluation is performance-based.
 - 4.2.2.6. Provide a brief overview of the plan of the day.
 - 4.2.2.7. Encourage candidates to ask questions.
 - 4.2.3. Prior to making observations of candidates in the evaluation, the evaluator shall:
 - 4.2.3.1. Verify a candidate's identity.
 - 4.2.3.2. Ensure a candidate's personal and testing information is accurate within SPRAT's online system.
 - 4.2.3.3. Verify a candidate's eligibility to test at their selected level.
 - 4.2.3.4. Ensure that all candidates have completed SPRAT's *Candidate Affidavit*.
 - 4.2.3.5. Complete SPRAT's site safety checklist.
- 4.3. Introducing the Evaluation
- 4.3.1. Prior to beginning the evaluation, the evaluator should:
 - 4.3.1.1. Ensure that candidates are aware of requirements for their selected testing level.
 - 4.3.1.2. Review performance principles and grading of *Rope Access Certification Requirements*.
 - 4.3.1.3. Inform candidates that they may be issued discrepancies and failures during the entire evaluation.
 - 4.3.1.4. Provide common examples of discrepancies and fails.
 - 4.3.1.5. Remind candidates that completion of requirements is done by each candidate individually unless directed otherwise by the evaluator.
 - 4.3.1.6. Inform candidates that if asked to stop they shall do so immediately and wait for specific instructions.
- 4.4. Administering the Evaluation
- 4.4.1. Evaluators may allow candidates to decide the order of completing requirements or may assign candidates a series of skills.
 - 4.4.2. If multiple requirements are combined into one exercise, evaluators should ensure that candidates understand and are comfortable with the request.
 - 4.4.3. The number of ongoing exercises may be limited by the number and testing levels of candidates as well as the site layout.

4.5. Issuing Discrepancies and Fails

- 4.5.1. An evaluator issues a discrepancy or fail based on observations of a candidate's adherence to the Performance Principles of *Rope Access Certification Requirements* and *Work-at-Height Certification Requirements*.
- 4.5.2. An evaluator should not impede upon a candidate's actions during an evaluation.
- 4.5.3. An evaluator should issue a discrepancy or fail only after a candidate has committed an error.
 - 4.5.3.1. Unless a candidate's action would present an immediate risk to the safety of the candidate or others, an evaluator should not issue a discrepancy or fail based on the possibility of that action.
 - 4.5.3.2. The evaluator is not responsible for the overall safety of an evaluation.
- 4.5.4. A fail may be issued the moment it occurs.
- 4.5.5. An evaluator should look for a convenient stopping point to issue a discrepancy to avoid interrupting a candidate's actions and affecting their performance.
 - 4.5.5.1. An evaluator may take photos of a candidate's actions to facilitate discussion.
 - 4.5.5.1.1. Evaluators should obtain permission from the Evaluation Session Host and candidates to take photos and shall delete photos upon request.
- 4.5.6. An evaluator shall provide a candidate with the rationale of an issued discrepancy or fail.
 - 4.5.6.1. A candidate's understanding of why they are being issued a discrepancy or fail fosters a constructive evaluation and may preempt complaints or appeals regarding the evaluation results.
- 4.5.7. An evaluator shall not issue a discrepancy or fail for an exercise after the candidate has begun a separate exercise.

4.6. Finalizing Evaluation Results

- 4.6.1. An evaluator may conduct a debrief with candidates as a group or individually.
 - 4.6.1.1. The evaluator should not provide unsolicited opinions of a candidate beyond the observed and recorded results.
- 4.6.2. Evaluators should:
 - 4.6.2.1. Ensure that candidates understand their written test and evaluation results.
 - 4.6.2.1. Update the certification section of successful candidates' logbooks.
 - 4.6.2.2. Reference SPRAT's website and user accounts for provisional certification information.
 - 4.6.2.2.1. Provisional certification information is valid for 60 days.
 - 4.6.2.2.2. If information is not directly submitted within the Evaluator App, evaluators should inform candidates that provisional information is typically available on SPRAT's online system within 72 hours.
 - 4.6.2.3. Inform that SPRAT certification cards and logbooks take four to six weeks for delivery.
 - 4.6.2.4. Inform unsuccessful candidates of options for retesting.

5. Submitting Evaluation Information

- 5.1. Evaluation information should be submitted to SPRAT's system or the SPRAT Office within 72 hours of the evaluation.
 - 5.1.1. Processing of certifications will not begin until all information has been received by the SPRAT Office.
 - 5.1.2. If an evaluator is not able to submit information within this time frame, they shall contact the SPRAT Office to provide the reason behind any delays and an estimated submission date.
- 5.2. Preferred Submission
 - 5.2.1. The Evaluator app should be used to submit all evaluation information.
 - 5.2.1.1. Written tests should be taken online.
 - 5.2.2. Candidate and Evaluation Session Host feedback should be submitted using SPRAT's online forms.

5.3. Alternative Submission

5.3.1. Administrative documentation is maintained in case evaluators are unable to complete portions of the evaluation with the Evaluator App.

5.3.1.1. Evaluators should ensure access to current versions of administrative documentation applicable to the evaluation they are conducting.

5.3.1.2. Forms must be completed, including signatures, to be considered valid for an evaluation.

5.3.2. Evaluation Record

5.3.2.1. The Evaluation Record, available for each evaluation type, provides the overall results, grades, written test results, result signatures, and assigned codes for an evaluation.

5.3.2.2. A completed Evaluation Record should be retained as a backup to Evaluator App Data.

5.3.3. Site Safety Checklist

5.3.3.1. The site safety checklist verifies that an evaluation site meets the requirements to conduct and evaluation.

5.3.4. Candidate Affidavit

5.3.4.1. Completed candidate affidavits are required for all candidates prior to their participation in an evaluation.

5.3.4.2. One candidate affidavit may serve for rope access and work-at-height evaluations completed on the same record in SPRAT's system.

5.3.5. Written Tests and Proctor Forms

5.3.5.1. A completed proctor form must only be completed for paper-based written tests.

5.3.5.1.1. Online written tests are currently available in English, French, and German.

5.3.5.1.2. Paper-based written tests are currently available in English, French, German, and Spanish.

5.3.5.2. Evaluators shall maintain the confidentiality of testing materials.

5.3.5.3. As written test results are provided in the Evaluation Record, answer sheets do not need to be submitted to the SPRAT Office.

5.3.6. Candidate Photographs

5.3.6.1. If candidate information is not submitted within the SPRAT system, photographs shall be emailed as attachments to certification@sprat.org or submitted via other arrangement with the SPRAT Office.

5.3.6.2. File names shall include a candidate's full name.

5.3.6.3. Photographs embedded within an email are not accepted.

5.3.7. Candidate Personal Information

5.3.7.1. If the candidate roster information is not present in the SPRAT system, this form must be submitted to ensure correct personal information for all candidates.

5.3.8. If evaluation documentation is submitted outside of SPRAT's online system, the evaluator shall retain this information for at least one year from the date of the evaluation unless receipt is verified by the SPRAT Office.

6. Evaluator Infractions

6.1. The Evaluations Committee uses an infraction system when considering evaluator actions that are inconsistent with SPRAT policies, evaluator responsibilities, or the best interest of the organization.

6.2. The SPRAT Office shall inform the Evaluations Committee of evaluator administrative concerns.

6.2.1. Documented infractions are kept on file by the SPRAT Office for a minimum of three years.

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

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

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

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

6.5.1. An evaluator infraction from personal conduct may range from a minor breach to gross misconduct based on its severity.

6.6. The following is a scale of infractions, associated repercussions, and non-exhaustive list of examples.

Infraction Levels	
1	<p>Minor breach of evaluation policies</p> <p>Repercussion: Written request from SPRAT Office</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Repeated incomplete submission of evaluation information. - Unexcused delay of evaluation information >72 hours.
2	<p>Major breach of evaluator responsibilities</p> <p>Repercussion: Written warning from Evaluations Committee</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Conducting evaluation without Evaluation Session Host insurance on file with SPRAT Office. - Multiple unexcused delays of evaluation information >72 hours.
3	<p>Misconduct unbecoming of an evaluator</p> <p>Repercussion: Evaluations Committee recommendation to Board of Directors of suspension of appointment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Conducting evaluation without Evaluation Session Host insurance in place. - Evaluation of more candidates than permissible. - Evaluation of a Direct Entry candidate without approval. - Falsifying information. - Conducting rope access evaluation when not independent. - Conducting evaluation when personal certifications are expired. - Conducting evaluations without sufficient appointment maintenance.
4	<p>Gross misconduct unbecoming of an evaluator</p> <p>Repercussion: Evaluations Committee recommendation to Board of Directors of revocation of appointment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Evaluation conducted while suspended. - Level 3 infraction while on probation.

7. Complaints

7.1. When a complaint is lodged against an evaluator, the SPRAT Office shall anonymize the complaint and supporting documentation.

7.2. The anonymized information shall be sent to the evaluator.

7.3. The evaluator shall have 14 days to review the complaint and provide a response.

7.4. After all relevant information has been received, the SPRAT Office shall anonymize and submit all information to the Evaluations Committee.

7.5. The Evaluations Committee shall review the provided information to determine if the complaint is persuasive.

7.6. Following review of the information, the Evaluations Committee may determine a potential infraction level.

7.7. A Level 1 or 2 infraction may be determined by a simple majority of the Evaluations Committee.

7.8. Prior to determining 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.

7.8.1. There shall be no financial, close personal relationship, or known or expressed issued between the accused evaluator and any member of the investigation team.

7.8.2. The complaining party and evaluator shall be contacted by the investigation team.

7.8.2.1. The complaining party must be willing to follow through with any reasonable request made by the investigation team.

7.8.3. The investigation team shall submit a report for review by the Evaluations Committee.

7.8.4. The Evaluations Committee shall review the report and determine an action.

7.8.5. For Level 3 or 4 infractions, the Evaluations Committee shall present a recommended action to the Board of Directors.

- 7.8.6. Any evaluator with a second complaint from a separate evaluation that requires investigation by the Evaluations Committee while another investigation is ongoing or within the 90 days of its completion shall be temporarily suspended as an evaluator until the complaints have been fully investigated.

8. Assessment of Evaluator Candidates

- 8.1. SPRAT's *Evaluator Induction Process* details the development and approval of new evaluators, including eligibility requirements for evaluators to assess evaluator candidates.
- 8.2. Evaluators should contact the SPRAT Office for further details prior to conducting the final assessment of an evaluator candidate.

9. Evaluator Workshops

- 9.1. Evaluator Workshops are established to:
 - 9.1.1. Maintain consistency of evaluation.
 - 9.1.2. Review updates to SPRAT standards and supplements as they relate to evaluation sessions.
 - 9.1.3. Discuss new observations of candidate techniques and mistakes.
 - 9.1.4. Explore approaches to efficiently administer evaluation.
- 9.2. Prior to any Evaluator Workshop, the SPRAT Office will contact all evaluators for recommendations of discussion topics.
- 9.3. 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.
 - 9.3.1. To qualify to supervise a workshop, an evaluator shall:
 - 9.3.1.1. Meet all evaluator currency requirements.
 - 9.3.1.2. Have no current, unaddressed infractions on their record.
 - 9.3.2. An evaluator shall submit the request to the SPRAT Office.
 - 9.3.2.1. The Evaluations Committee shall review and may choose to approve or deny the request.
 - 9.3.3. 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.
 - 9.3.4. If an evaluator has never supervised an Evaluator Workshop, the Evaluations Committee may assign an approved evaluator to support administering the workshop.