

INTENTIONAL PERFORMANCE CERTIFICATION · EXPERT REVIEW

---

# Vetter Feedback Form

Thank you for reviewing the IPCC curriculum. Your expertise shapes the final course. Please complete this form and return to john@baker-hq.com with subject line: IPCC Vetter Feedback — [Your Name].

---

## REVIEWER INFORMATION

### Please Complete Before Returning

---

**Reviewer Name**

**Credentials / Expertise Areas**

**Institutional Affiliation (if applicable)**

**Date of Review**

## SECTION 1

## Overall Assessment

---

Please rate the curriculum on each dimension, then provide written commentary. Circle the number that best applies.

**Content Accuracy**

Do the frameworks accurately represent the source research and theory?

① ② ③ ④ ⑤ N/A

1 Weak 2 Below Average 3 Satisfactory 4 Strong 5 Exceptional

Written comments:

**Framework Fidelity**

Are ACT, SDT, MI, MBAT, and other models applied correctly and without distortion?

① ② ③ ④ ⑤ N/A

1 Weak 2 Below Average 3 Satisfactory 4 Strong 5 Exceptional

Written comments:

**Internal Coherence**

Does the curriculum build logically across six weeks? Is the progression defensible?

① ② ③ ④ ⑤ N/A

1 Weak 2 Below Average 3 Satisfactory 4 Strong 5 Exceptional

Written comments:

**Practical Applicability**

Can practitioners actually implement what is taught in real coaching contexts?

① ② ③ ④ ⑤ N/A

1 Weak 2 Below Average 3 Satisfactory 4 Strong 5 Exceptional

Written comments:

**Credential Rigor**

Does the certification standard (exam + submissions) reflect a meaningful threshold?

① ② ③ ④ ⑤ N/A

1 Weak 2 Below Average 3 Satisfactory 4 Strong 5 Exceptional

Written comments:

**Developmental Appropriateness**

Does the course correctly distinguish between youth, collegiate, and professional populations?

① ② ③ ④ ⑤ N/A

1 Weak 2 Below Average 3 Satisfactory 4 Strong 5 Exceptional

Written comments:

**Overall Written Impression**

What is your overall assessment? What works well? What concerns you?

## SECTION 2

## Week-by-Week Feedback

---

For each week, note any specific concerns about content accuracy, framework application, or gaps. Skip any week you did not review in detail.

### Week 1 — The Coach's Inner Game

Focus: ACT, MI Spirit & OARS, Values Clarification

Specific concerns, corrections, or affirmations:

*Content accuracy · framework fidelity · gaps · overclaims · what works*

### Week 2 — Motivational Architecture

Focus: SDT, MI Advanced (Reflections, Change Talk)

Specific concerns, corrections, or affirmations:

*Content accuracy · framework fidelity · gaps · overclaims · what works*

### Week 3 — Mental Skills Suite I

Focus: Gucciardi, Evans Red/Blue, PETLEP, Defusion

Specific concerns, corrections, or affirmations:

*Content accuracy · framework fidelity · gaps · overclaims · what works*

## Week 4 — Mental Skills Suite II

Focus: Nideffer, Wulf OPTIMAL, PPL, Ritual Construction

Specific concerns, corrections, or affirmations:

*Content accuracy · framework fidelity · gaps · overclaims · what works*

## Week 5 — Expanding the Frame

Focus: Teams/3Cs, Parents, Developmental Frame, Systems

Specific concerns, corrections, or affirmations:

*Content accuracy · framework fidelity · gaps · overclaims · what works*

## Week 6 — Certification

Focus: Ethics, Examination, Case Submissions, Program Design

Specific concerns, corrections, or affirmations:

*Content accuracy · framework fidelity · gaps · overclaims · what works*

## SECTION 3

## Specific Concerns

---

### Content Accuracy

**Where, if anywhere, does the curriculum misrepresent the research or theory it cites?**

Please cite specific lessons or claims if possible.

### Gaps

**What important frameworks, research, or practical knowledge is missing?**

What would you add if you were designing this curriculum?

### Overclaims

**Where, if anywhere, does the curriculum claim more than the evidence supports?**

Be specific. Overclaims in a credential course are a credibility risk.

### Scope of Practice

**Is the ethics and scope framework (performance enhancement, not psychopathology) clearly and correctly drawn?**

Any concerns about the referral protocol or the boundary between coaching and clinical work?

**The MBAT Protocol**

**Does the 28-day attentional training design accurately represent Jha's research and Nideffer's model?**

Including the week-by-week quadrant mapping (W1=Narrow External, W2=Narrow Internal, W3=Broad External, W4=Broad Internal).

## SECTION 4

## Examination Review

---

The 25-question certification examination is included in Week 6. Please review it separately and provide feedback here.

### Overall Quality of Examination Questions

Are the questions testing understanding or memorization? Are they defensible?

① ② ③ ④ ⑤ N/A

1 Weak 2 Below Average 3 Satisfactory 4 Strong 5 Exceptional

Written comments:

### Questions That Should Be Corrected, Removed, or Replaced

Question number · concern · suggested revision if applicable

### Is the 80% Pass Threshold Appropriate?

Too high / appropriate / too low — and why.

### Suggested Additional Questions (optional)

If there are critical concepts not tested, suggest questions here.

## SECTION 5

## Credential Assessment

---

Does the credential title "Intentional Performance Certified Coach" accurately represent what graduates can do?

Is the framing "Ontological Performance Coaching — Identity · Attention · Ritual" an accurate and honest description of the approach?

Would you recommend this credential to practitioners in your field? Why or why not?

What additional requirements, if any, would make this credential more rigorous or credible in your professional context?

## SECTION 6

## Final Comments

---

Anything else you want John Baker to know about this curriculum:

**RETURN INSTRUCTIONS**

Thank you. Return this completed form to [john@baker-hq.com](mailto:john@baker-hq.com) — Subject: IPCC Vetter Feedback — [Your Name]. Your feedback will be addressed before the program launches. If you'd prefer a call to discuss, reply to the email and we'll schedule time.