CATALOGUE VARIANT T / FACILITATOR GUIDE

TalkToTrain Scenario Workshop

Catalogue variant with a training partner

Design three realistic training scenarios with observable assessment criteria, feedback and a transfer task.

Duration

4 hours including a 15-minute break as a planning assumption. The catalogue does not set duration or price.

Participants

Training partner, subject-matter owners, team lead and future learners. Planning assumption: 4 to 8 people.

Outputs

- Three subject-matter-reviewed scenario cards.
- A shared rubric with observable evidence.
- Feedback and repeat-practice process.
- Transfer plan with an accountable trainer and debrief.

Format and learning evidence

A pilot concept with a training partner. This workshop creates reviewable scenarios and does not replace professional qualification or actual instruction.

Prerequisites

• A training partner confirms the learning goal and boundaries.

• Approved subject-matter sources and a bounded learning goal are available.

• Learners understand the purpose and use of feedback.

• Prepare suitable speech, text or assisted participation and competent observation. Role briefs contain all governing exercise facts; do not improvise missing facts.

Observable completion criteria

• Each case has separate learner, counterpart and observer information, fixed facts, conditional replies, boundaries and a changed second variant. A trial works without invented domain facts.

• Two observers initially assess the same trial independently using case-specific C1-C3 anchors and exact evidence. Record differences. If disagreement remains about a critical error, withhold approval and recheck the anchor and case.

• For the fictional patterns, 0 means not demonstrated or incorrect, 1 correct with help, 2 correct without help. Leave unobserved items blank. Independent in that exercise requires C1=C2=C3=2 with no unresolved critical error; this is not professional or operational qualification.

• Each person has a learner attempt and targeted repeat or new variant with separate evidence. Record chosen mode, help and pending system evidence explicitly.

• A changed case tests application rather than wording. Agree a transfer date, subject-matter support and next review.

Three parts of the kit

This guide contains the agenda, facilitation instructions, exercise debrief, sources and slide notes. Slides support the group session. Print the separate worksheets or use the editable HTML workbook.

Preparation

Before the session

• Bring three difficult real conversation situations in anonymised form.

• The trainer identifies observable behaviour and facts that must not be invented.

• Prepare three roles and an alternative exercise without Voice access.

• Prepare separate role sheets before practice. Use real client cases only after subject-matter approval. For four or eight learners use groups of four; for six, two triads; for seven, a group of four and a triad; for five, a triad plus a pair observed by the trainer. Everyone receives a personal learner attempt.

Materials and access

• Worksheets T.1 to T.6 and slides.

• Three scenario patterns and scoring anchors in the guide.

• Approved test access, or a three-person role play.

• Facilitator library in Material/T_Rollenkarten_EN.html. Select the case, attempt and role. Distribute only the saved individual card to a digital participant, or print the selected card.

Agenda and materials

Time	Block	Sheet	Slides
00:00-00:20	Learning goal and frame (20 min)	T.1	2-3
00:20-00:55	Choose three situations (35 min)	T.2	4
00:55-01:40	Build scenarios and roles (45 min)	T.2	5-6
01:40-02:15	Calibrate assessment anchors (35 min)	T.3	7
02:15-02:30	Break (15 min)		
02:30-03:20	Practise, receive feedback and repeat (50 min)	T.4	8-9
03:20-03:45	Transfer into work (25 min)	T.5	10-11
03:45-04:00	Approval and next test (15 min)	T.6	12

Times are elapsed from the start of each session and include scheduled breaks. A practice or testing phase between sessions is additional.

Facilitation script

01 Learning goal and frame / 20 min

Goal

Agree an observable goal.

Method

The trainer names a task. Learners describe the difficult moment. Agree boundaries and the purpose of feedback.

Facilitator prompt

What should become easier after practice?

Debrief

What would we observe?

Output

Learning goal and safeguards.

Materials: sheet T.1; slides 2-3

02 Choose three situations / 35 min

Goal

Cover different demands.

Method

Collect cases silently, then select for relevance and learning need: one normal case, exception and handover.

Facilitator prompt

Where does a meaningful distinction matter?

Debrief

Do we need new facts or a better question?

Output

Three prioritised scenarios.

Materials: sheet T.2; slides 4

03 Build scenarios and roles / 45 min

Goal

Create playable cases.

Method

Review T-A for 10 min, design three cases for 25 min and exchange individual briefs for 10 min. The facilitator distributes one role card per attempt. For T-C2 the learner receives W-18 and the provisional ID. The counterpart alone gives the later correction.

Facilitator prompt

Which fact does the other role reveal only when asked?

Debrief

Can we play the case without inventing technical claims?

Output

Three complete scenario cards.

Materials: sheet T.2; slides 5-6

04 Calibrate assessment anchors / 35 min

Goal

Judge using evidence.

Method

Clarify criteria and critical errors for 5 min, show the same short trial for 5 min, score independently for 7 min, compare evidence and differences for 8 min, refine one unclear anchor for 5 min, check a further short trial for 5 min. Unresolved critical disagreement remains pending rather than averaged. Both observers save their own A or B card before comparing ratings. Record the first response and any correction after a cue separately.

Facilitator prompt

Which action supports your assessment?

Debrief

Is the anchor explicit or merely an impression?

Output

Shared rubric.

Materials: sheet T.3; slides 7

05 Break / 15 min

Goal

Rest.

Method

Keep exercise data in the agreed area.

Facilitator prompt

We return to rotating practice roles.

Debrief

No work product required.

Output

Break.

Materials: sheet ; slides

06 Practise, receive feedback and repeat / 50 min

Goal

Enable a better second attempt.

Method

Use up to four 10-min rounds: 5 min personal learner attempt, 3 min feedback, 2 min targeted repeat; then 10 min shared debrief. Groups of four use four roles including second observer and four rounds; triads use three rounds plus evidence comparison; the trainer observes a pair. Combine groups for four to eight learners as planned so everyone acts as learner. Text and assisted modes use the same criteria.

Facilitator prompt

What single change will you try now?

Debrief

Did the second attempt meet the goal better?

Output

Observed evidence and a revised attempt.

Materials: sheet T.4; slides 8-9

07 Transfer into work / 25 min

Goal

Test learning on a related task.

Method

Introduce a changed condition from T-A2, T-B2 or T-C2 for 5 min, observe the changed decision without coaching for 10 min, compare criteria with attempt 1 for 5 min, plan transfer date and support for 5 min. If observation capacity cannot cover everyone, keep personal evidence pending with a completion date.

Facilitator prompt

When would your previous answer be unsuitable?

Debrief

What needs direct practice and what requires supervision?

Output

Transfer card.

Materials: sheet T.5; slides 10-11

08 Approval and next test / 15 min

Goal

Assign open issues.

Method

Review scenarios using T.6. Proceed with training or explain required changes.

Facilitator prompt

Which assumption needs resolving before the pilot?

Debrief

Who reviews the next version and by when?

Output

Approval and change list.

Materials: sheet T.6; slides 12

Close and follow-up

Next steps

• The training partner approves scenarios and rubric.

• Pilot with a small voluntary learner group and review clarity and fairness.

• Run a new variant after an agreed period and review transfer with learners.

• At transfer review, inspect separate first/second attempts and pending observations. A successful practice dialogue does not prove a technical connection. Learners and training partner agree the next suitable task; results and maintenance effort can be reviewed in format 12.

Pitfalls

• Use no real health, customer or personnel data in exercises.

• Fluency, accent or age do not demonstrate subject-matter competence.

• AI feedback does not replace accountable professional assessment.

Terms

Transfer

Handle a related new task and explain the decision.

Assessment anchor

An observable description of a performance level rather than a general impression.

Worksheet debrief

T.1 Learning goal and frame

Complete for each case. Observe before assessing.

Illustrative example

Fictional T-A: ask about one-off need before proposing; an unauthorised discount promise is critical.

Review criterion

Agree target action, case boundary, critical error and permitted feedback use before testing.

T.2 Scenario and role card

Prepare separate learner, counterpart and observer briefs. Write fixed facts, conditional replies and unknowns explicitly. T-A to T-C are complete examples; use permitted facts only.

Illustrative example

Fictional T-A: counterpart knows the one-off introduction for four people and comparison with a video, revealed only after relevant questions.

Review criterion

All three roles contain fixed facts, conditional replies and stops; the trial needs no improvised domain facts.

T.3 Assessment rubric

Complete for each case. Observe before assessing.

Illustrative example

Fictional T-A/C1: 0 assumed need, 1 asked after coaching, 2 asked openly before proposing. Record exact question and help.

Review criterion

Each C1-C3 criterion has case-specific 0/1/2 anchors. Independent scores, evidence and resolved or pending differences are documented.

T.4 Observation and next attempt

Use a separate copy for each attempt. In the digital library select the case, attempt and observer A or B. Record first action and support for each criterion. Save before comparing judgements. As an alternative, export the workbook to a separate file after each attempt.

Illustrative example

T-B1: “I confirm the refund”, C3=0. Promise retracted only after a cue, C3=1 for the correction. Start a fresh card for T-B2.

Review criterion

Record first attempt, help, feedback and new attempt separately; later success does not overwrite the first error.

T.5 Transfer to a new task

Complete for each case. Observe before assessing.

Illustrative example

Fictional T-C2: K-17 is corrected to K-71. The person confirms the new identifier and keeps review pending instead of repeating old wording.

Review criterion

A genuinely changed condition requires a reasoned new action. Unobserved performance receives support and a completion date.

T.6 Scenario approval and maintenance

Complete for each case. Observe before assessing.

Illustrative example

Fictional: two observers disagree about a promise. The critical criterion stays pending; check wording, refine the anchor and retry.

Review criterion

Facts, role briefs and anchors are checked; unresolved critical differences prevent approval. Ownership and next review are fixed.

Practice cases and debrief

T-A Clarify need before solution and price

Situation

Fictional exercise at MusterService. A customer says the proposed learning package is too expensive. The learner may clarify need and comparison and arrange a meeting with the proposal owner, but may not change price, discount or scope.

Content

Learner brief: Your role: first contact. Known: the fictional proposal covers ongoing training support; the proposal owner approves price and scope. Goal: understand the actual need and basis of comparison without assuming a solution. Counterpart opens: This is too expensive. Permitted close: with agreement, earmark a clarification meeting with the proposal owner and summarise open questions. You have no discount, price or outcome authority. No names or real contact details are needed.

Hidden counterpart brief: Counterpart only. Attempt 1: you actually need a one-off introduction for four new colleagues, not ongoing support. The comparison is a 15-minute self-study video without personal support. Do not reveal these facts at the start. For an open needs question say: We only need a one-off introduction for four new people. For a comparison question say: The other offer is just a short video. For a discount-only question say: I care more about whether the scope fits. Confirm a summary only if it correctly includes one-off and comparison without support. If promised a price, ask: Are you authorised to promise that? No additional facts exist; for anything outside the card say it is unknown in this exercise.

Observer brief: Observe three criteria only: C1 an open question clarifies actual need before suggesting a solution; C2 comparison checks scope and support and is summarised correctly; C3 the next action stays with the authorised proposal owner without discount, price or outcome promises. Record exact evidence, help and 0/1/2 per criterion. An unauthorised commitment is critical: retract it in the debrief rather than offset it with other good scores.

Source

Exercise source Q-A, version 1: ongoing support is the known proposal scope; only the proposal owner changes scope or price. Invent no prices or savings. Customer need and comparison are hidden role facts, not evidenced Overmind features. Stop if real data, a real purchase or new service promises are requested.

Evidence

Attempt 1: one-off introduction for four people; comparison is a short video without personal support. Attempt 2: ongoing support for two teams; comparison includes one meeting only. Learner changes neither price nor scope.

Exercise content

Second attempt with changed facts: Attempt 2 is a new variant rather than memorised repetition. New opening: We do need ongoing support, but the other offer looks cheaper. Hidden facts now: two teams need ongoing support; the comparison includes one meeting only. Reveal two teams for an open needs question and the single meeting for a comparison question. Earlier one-off/four-new-people facts explicitly no longer apply. Expect new clarification, distinction between scopes and a clarification meeting only.

Expected response

C1: 0 assumed need; 1 asked after a prompt; 2 asked openly before proposing. C2: 0 treated unlike offers as equal; 1 refined comparison after prompting; 2 independently clarified scope/support and summarised correctly. C3: 0 unauthorised promise or no sound next action; 1 corrected boundary/handover with help; 2 independently stated own limit and owned next clarification. Leave unobserved criteria blank. Independent for this exercise only when all three criteria are 2 and no critical error remains open.

role rounds

1 / The proposed training package is too expensive. / You handle first contact. The proposal covers ongoing training support. The proposal owner decides price and scope. Clarify the need and comparison, summarise open questions and, with agreement, arrange clarification. You have no authority to promise a price, discount or outcome. / Counterpart only. Attempt 1: you actually need a one-off introduction for four new colleagues, not ongoing support. The comparison is a 15-minute self-study video without personal support. Do not reveal these facts at the start. For an open needs question say: We only need a one-off introduction for four new people. For a comparison question say: The other offer is just a short video. For a discount-only question say: I care more about whether the scope fits. Confirm a summary only if it correctly includes one-off and comparison without support. If promised a price, ask: Are you authorised to promise that? No additional facts exist; for anything outside the card say it is unknown in this exercise. / One-off introduction for four new people, compared with a 15-minute self-study video with no personal support. Only the proposal owner can change price or scope.

2 / We do need ongoing support, but the other offer looks cheaper. / You handle first contact. The proposal covers ongoing training support. The proposal owner decides price and scope. Clarify the need and comparison, summarise open questions and, with agreement, arrange clarification. You have no authority to promise a price, discount or outcome. / Reveal the two teams and their ongoing need for an open needs question. Reveal the single meeting for a comparison question. Confirm only an accurate summary. If a price is promised, ask about authority. / Two teams need ongoing support. The comparison covers one meeting only. A clarification meeting with the proposal owner is permitted.

T-B Hand over a refund request as a draft

Situation

Fictional service exercise. A person demands an immediate refund for a damaged writing folder. The exercise policy allows fact-finding and a labelled draft for service review only, not a refund promise or actual submission.

Content

Learner brief: Exercise source Q-B, version 1: a review draft needs order ID, item, observed defect and evidence status. Missing details stay open. Only service review decides refunds. Invent no legal entitlement, deadline, amount or likelihood of success. Permitted result: accurately summarise a simulated draft, name missing evidence and assign service review as the next role. Do not say refunded, submitted or completed.

Hidden counterpart brief: Counterpart only. Opening: I want the refund immediately. Attempt-1 facts: fictional order R-24; item writing folder; observed defect open seam; exercise photo P1 exists. Reveal only the information asked for. If asked about a confirmed cause, say you only know the seam is open. Confirm an accurate summary. If promised a refund, ask whether it is already decided. Add no real customer data or further facts; unknowns stay unknown.

Observer brief: C1: independently obtain all four required draft details or make their absence explicit. C2: accurately summarise observation versus cause and present versus missing evidence without invention. C3: separate draft from review decision and name service review and the next open task. Record exact evidence and help. A refund promise or claimed actual submission is critical; pause and correct the state during debrief.

Source

Fixed facts: R-24, writing folder, open seam, photo P1. There is no documented cause, confirmed entitlement, decision or actual system transmission. No real legal or service deadlines apply in this exercise. For questions outside Q-B the counterpart refers to service review. Stop for real personal data or actual orders.

Evidence

Attempt 1: R-24, writing folder, open seam, photo P1 present. Attempt 2: R-25, same item/defect, both photo and purchase evidence missing. Cause, entitlement, decision and actual submission are unconfirmed in both attempts.

Exercise content

Second attempt with changed facts: New variant R-25: same item and observed defect; both photo and purchase evidence are missing. Opening: Can you at least confirm now that the money will arrive? Reveal missing evidence only if asked. Expect explicit pending evidence, no carry-over of R-24 facts and no refund confirmation. Close with a simulated review draft, missing evidence and owned follow-up.

Expected response

C1: 0 missed a required detail; 1 completed after a prompt; 2 independently clarified all four details or their absence. C2: 0 invented cause/evidence; 1 corrected unclear summary with help; 2 precisely restated observation and evidence state. C3: 0 claimed refund or submission; 1 corrected state with help; 2 independently distinguished simulated draft, open task and service review. Leave unobserved criteria blank; independent only for three scores of 2 with no unresolved critical error.

role rounds

1 / I want a refund immediately. / Exercise source Q-B, version 1: a review draft needs order ID, item, observed defect and evidence status. Missing details stay open. Only service review decides refunds. Invent no legal entitlement, deadline, amount or likelihood of success. Permitted result: accurately summarise a simulated draft, name missing evidence and assign service review as the next role. Do not say refunded, submitted or completed. / Counterpart only. Opening: I want the refund immediately. Attempt-1 facts: fictional order R-24; item writing folder; observed defect open seam; exercise photo P1 exists. Reveal only the information asked for. If asked about a confirmed cause, say you only know the seam is open. Confirm an accurate summary. If promised a refund, ask whether it is already decided. Add no real customer data or further facts; unknowns stay unknown. / R-24, writing folder, open seam, exercise photo P1 present. Cause, entitlement and decision remain open. The only output is a fictional draft for service review.

2 / Can you at least confirm that the money will arrive? / Exercise source Q-B, version 1: a review draft needs order ID, item, observed defect and evidence status. Missing details stay open. Only service review decides refunds. Invent no legal entitlement, deadline, amount or likelihood of success. Permitted result: accurately summarise a simulated draft, name missing evidence and assign service review as the next role. Do not say refunded, submitted or completed. / When asked, give R-25, the writing folder or the observed open seam. When asked about a photo or proof of purchase, say each is missing. Cause unknown. If a refund is promised, ask whether a decision has already been made. / R-25, writing folder, open seam. Both photo and

proof of purchase are missing. Cause, entitlement, decision and actual submission are unconfirmed.

T-C Preserve pending review in a handover

Situation

Fictional handover exercise without technical operating instructions. A replacement is documented as performed; its check remains pending. The learner prepares the handover only and grants no safety or operational approval.

Content

Learner brief: Exercise source Q-C, version 1: case W-17; identifier K-17; replacement performed; check pending; next responsible role Review P. Handover needs identifier, performed step, pending check and responsible role. A pending check must not become passed or ready for operation. Invent no missing results and instruct no physical work on equipment. Permitted result: clear handover with confirmed identifier and pending review step.

Hidden counterpart brief: Counterpart only. Opening: The replacement at K-17 is done; please pass it on. Asked about the check, say it is pending and Review P owns it. Asked about cause, say it is unknown in this exercise. Confirm an accurate summary: replacement performed, check pending, Review P. If the learner equates done/checked/operational, ask whether they mean the replacement or the check too. Invent no further equipment, personal or safety data.

Observer brief: C1: clarify the valid identifier and replace it consistently after correction. C2: record performed replacement separately from pending review. C3: hand over the open next step and Review P without technical or operational approval. Record identifier and state verbatim. An invented passed check or operational approval is critical; stop and correct during debrief.

Source

Q-C is the entire exercise basis. There is no confirmed technical cause or check result. Review P is a fictional functional role. The task ends with information handover. No real equipment, order or actual check belongs in this role-play.

Evidence

Attempt 1: W-17/K-17, replacement performed, check pending, Review P. Attempt 2: new case W-18, provisional K-17 then explicit correction to K-71. Performed and reviewed remain separate.

Exercise content

Second attempt with changed facts: New variant W-18. Opening again names K-17. As soon as the learner summarises the identifier, correct it to K-71. Replacement remains performed, review pending and Review P responsible. Expect confirmation of K-71 and explicit replacement of the old identifier, without creating a conflicting second handover or changing pending review. Before starting, give the learner a card updated to case W-18; K-17 remains provisional. Only the counterpart knows the later K-71 correction.

Expected response

C1: 0 wrong/conflicting identifier remains; 1 corrected after a prompt; 2 independently confirmed and consistently replaced. C2: 0 conflated performed/reviewed; 1 separated with help; 2 independently distinguished. C3: 0 invented review/operational readiness or missing ownership; 1 corrected with help; 2 independently named pending review, Review P and boundary. Leave unobserved criteria blank; independent only for three scores of 2 with no unresolved critical error.

role rounds

1 / The replacement at K-17 is done. Please pass it on. / Exercise source Q-C, version 1: case W-17; identifier K-17; replacement performed; check pending; next responsible role Review P. Handover needs identifier, performed step, pending check and responsible role. A pending check must not become passed or ready for operation. Invent no missing results and instruct no physical work on equipment. Permitted result: clear handover with confirmed identifier and pending review step. / Counterpart only. Opening: The replacement at K-17 is done; please pass it on. Asked about the check, say it is pending and Review P owns it. Asked about cause, say it is unknown in this exercise. Confirm an accurate summary: replacement performed, check pending, Review P. If the learner equates done/checked/operational, ask whether they mean the replacement or the check too. Invent no further equipment, personal or safety data. / W-17, K-17. Replacement performed, check pending. Review P owns the check. No operational approval.

2 / The replacement at K-17 is done. Please pass it on. / Case W-18. Provisional ID K-17, replacement performed. The check is pending and Review P is responsible. Clarify the valid ID during the conversation and hand over the evidenced status. / As soon as the learner repeats the provisional identifier, explicitly correct it to K-71. Confirm the new ID when asked. If asked about status, state that replacement is complete, review pending and Review P responsible. Cause unknown. / W-18. K-17 is provisional. The counterpart corrects it to K-71 when the learner repeats the ID. The single current handover uses the confirmed ID. Replacement performed, check pending, Review P.

Annotated first and second attempt T-A

Situation

ANNOTATED FICTIONAL EXAMPLE T-A. Exercise data only, not Overmind prices or service promises. Attempt 1, variant A1. Counterpart: The proposed learning package is too expensive. Learner: Then you probably only need a video; I can give you a discount. Annotation: need and comparison were assumed. The discount promise exceeds authority. Counterpart: Are you authorised to promise that? The observer stops the attempt. Learner corrects: No. I retract the discount promise; the proposal owner would have to review it. Observation before help: C1=0 because there was no open needs question; C2=0 because comparison was not checked; C3=0 with a critical error for the discount promise. Record the guided correction additionally as C3=1, keeping the original error visible in attempt 1. Retraction removes the false statement but does not make the original attempt independent. During feedback the learner identifies the premature assumption. Agreed change: ask about need and comparison first, summarise, and offer only the permitted next step. Attempt-2 setup: use new variant A2. The learner receives only the new opening; the counterpart receives changed facts. Give no coaching cues during the assessed second attempt.
Counterpart: We do need ongoing support, but the other offer looks cheaper. Learner: What support do you need during everyday work? Counterpart: Two teams need ongoing support. Learner: What does the comparison include, especially support? Counterpart: One meeting only. Learner: So you need ongoing support for two teams, whereas the comparison covers one meeting. Have I understood correctly? Counterpart: Yes. Learner: I cannot change price or scope. With your agreement, I can earmark a clarification meeting with the proposal owner to review your need and the different scopes. I promise no discount or outcome today. Counterpart: Agreed.
Attempt-2 observation: C1=2 for an open needs question before proposing; C2=2 for specific comparison and confirmed summary; C3=2 for explicit authority boundary and permitted next action. Result: A2 learning goal demonstrated independently in this exercise. This does not establish general sales competence or technical Voice operation. Debrief: what would need fresh clarification for a third competing offer? Record transfer date and support in T.5.
Raters compare initially independent judgements using the quoted evidence. If interpretation still differs, revise the relevant anchor and play another case; an average does not resolve a critical error.

Expected response

Assess the attempts separately. Attempt 2 has changed facts; success does not overwrite the first error.

Slide facilitation notes

01 TalkToTrain Scenario Workshop

The training partner leads the debrief and requests concrete evidence.

02 Outcome and agenda

The training partner leads the debrief and requests concrete evidence.

03 An observable learning goal

The training partner leads the debrief and requests concrete evidence.

04 Three different demands

The training partner leads the debrief and requests concrete evidence.

05 The role card

Open a saved card and check its role and case. In T-C2 the corrected ID stays hidden until the learner mentions the provisional one.

06 A new condition

The training partner leads the debrief and requests concrete evidence.

07 Evidence for assessment

Use case-specific C1-C3 anchors on the briefs. 0 incorrect/not demonstrated, 1 with help, 2 correct without help; leave unobserved blank. Averages cannot offset critical errors. Record independent scores first, resolve disagreement and retest. Save the two individual observer cards before comparing. Keep a separate evidence entry for a correction during feedback.

08 Role rotation with a personal attempt

Up to four rounds and ten minutes debrief. For five people, use a triad and a trainer-observed pair; nobody only watches. Fixed facts determine responses, not counterpart improvisation.

09 Useful feedback

T-A includes a fully annotated example with a critical first error and changed second case. Score attempts separately; correction does not retrospectively pass the first attempt.

10 Transfer beyond wording

The training partner leads the debrief and requests concrete evidence.

11 Subject-matter approval

The training partner leads the debrief and requests concrete evidence.

12 Next trial and maintenance

The training partner leads the debrief and requests concrete evidence.

Sources and revision status

Materials for 2027, reviewed on 17 November 2026. Exercises and proposed criteria are newly authored facilitation materials. They do not establish technical availability or client approval.

Teaching revision: personal, task-specific learning evidence and equivalent participation modes; new fictional role cases are labelled exercises. Existing product, pricing and approval boundaries remain authoritative.

TalkToTrain One-Pager DE v1

https://overmind.one/wp-content/uploads/2026/10/TalkToTrain_OnePager_DE.pdf

Three client scenarios, feedback and repeat practice as a pilot concept.

Knowledge transfer between experienced staff and learners

https://overmind.one/en/silver-agers-why-companies-should-arrange-knowledge-transfer-early

Supervised transfer and mutual learning.

Local baseline

The inventory review used the October 2026 catalogues and kits 1 to 10. Current materials are in DE and EN. Product lists and interface terminology differ between the former catalogues, strategy and scoping. The review records these differences; the updated catalogue guides selection by task.

Before a client session

The facilitator checks current access, confirmed scope, language, sources, roles and approvals. Test demo limits and interfaces in the actual setting. Exact pricing and outcome commitments follow the approved quotation.