**Trainees evaluate trainees: by choosing 2 colleagues, which whom they would like to make a training in the future**

The trainer asks trainees in the final feedback, with whom they whom they could imagine to be a co-trainer, or on which trainer they would rely. They should choose 2 names (and/or maximum 1 trainer). This kind of evaluation/assessment of trainees (and trainers), as it is only positive, is a proper way, to evaluate the skills of the trainees (without giving notes), although they will also decide based on friendships and sympathy (the ability to cooperate and find friends is also a level in business life). The summary of our evaluation showed, that the most skilled trainees were leading the charts. With one exemption: there were 2 new trainees (all the others had already 3-4 common Units) and they got less recommendations than the well-known team-members. So we think, this evaluation is a good help/addition to a practical test, but the result should be adepted by the trainers/training centers.

**Learning Outcome:** *alternative assessment/evaluation of trainees (and/or trainers), trainees evaluate trainees without giving notes, skills, sympathy matters, cooperation*

**The results of this evaluation (names abbreviated), maximum points/% = 25p/%:**

*(practical assessment: evaluation by Trainer: 0-20p, evaluation by trainees: + 0-5p)*

*Name: points/% by trainees -> result trainer + trainee evaluation = sum*

**A, P: 5 recommendations -> 5 points 20 + 5 = 25p**

**O, S: 4 recommentdations -> 4 points 20 + 4 = 24p**

**Ro: 2 recommendations -> 2 points 20 + 2 = 22p** *(first time in STEP Unit)*

**Ra: 1 recommendations -> 1 points 19 + 1 = 20p**

**C: 0 recommendations -> 0 points 19 + 0 = 19p** *(first time in STEP Unit)*