**Common Vocational Training
to Master in the Baltic Sea Re-
gion (Master BSR)**

Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

Product 3

Evaluation concepts

A1 Evaluation concept for the Train the Trainer course

A2 Evaluation concept for the Master craftsman training

Partner involved in the work

Gdansk University of Technology, Poland

Authors

Dr Marzena Grzesiak

Dr Magdalena Olczyk

Dr Marzena Starnawska

Gdansk, October 2016

Concept of the Train the Trainer and Master training evaluations

Authors:

Marzena Grzesiak
Magdalena Olczyk
Marzena Starnawska

Concept of the Train the Trainer and Master training evaluations

Marzena Grzesiak

Magdalena Olczyk

Marzena Starnawska

Publication Date: 31.10.2016

Contents

1. Introduction

Evaluation of training concerning both quality and knowledge increase.

The generic goal of most evaluations is to provide "useful feedback" to a variety of audiences including sponsors, donors, client-groups, administrators, staff, and other relevant constituencies. Most often, feedback is perceived as "useful" if it aids in decision-making. But the relationship between an evaluation and its impact is not a simple one - studies that seem critical sometimes fail to influence short-term decisions, and studies that initially seem to have no influence can have a delayed impact when more congenial conditions arise. Despite this, there is broad consensus that the major goal of evaluation should be to influence decision-making or policy formulation through the provision of empirically-driven feedback.

2. Types of Evaluation

There are many different types of evaluations depending on the object being evaluated and the purpose of the evaluation. Perhaps the most important basic distinction in evaluation types is that between *formative* and *summative* evaluation. Formative evaluations strengthen or improve the object being evaluated -- they help form it by examining the delivery of the program or technology, the quality of its implementation, and the assessment of the organizational context, personnel, procedures, inputs, and so on. Summative evaluations, in contrast, examine the effects or outcomes of some object -- they summarize it by describing what happens subsequent to delivery of the program or technology; assessing whether the object can be said to have caused the outcome; determining the overall impact of the causal factor beyond only the immediate target outcomes; and, estimating the relative costs associated with the object.

Formative evaluation includes several evaluation types:

- *needs assessment* determines who needs the program, how great the need is, and what might work to meet the need
- *evaluability assessment* determines whether an evaluation is feasible and how stakeholders can help shape its usefulness
- *structured conceptualization* helps stakeholders define the program or technology, the target population, and the possible outcomes
- *implementation evaluation* monitors the fidelity of the program or technology delivery
- *process evaluation* investigates the process of delivering the program or technology, including alternative delivery procedures

Summative evaluation can also be subdivided:

- *outcome evaluations investigate whether the program or technology caused demonstrable effects on specifically defined target outcomes*
- *impact evaluation is broader and assesses the overall or net effects -- intended or unintended -- of the program or technology as a whole*
- *cost-effectiveness and cost-benefit analysis address questions of efficiency by standardizing outcomes in terms of their dollar costs and values*

- *secondary analysis reexamines existing data to address new questions or use methods not previously employed*
- *meta-analysis integrates the outcome estimates from multiple studies to arrive at an overall or summary judgement on an evaluation question*

Evaluators ask many different kinds of questions and use a variety of methods to address them. These are considered within the framework of formative and summative evaluation as presented above.

In formative research the major questions and methodologies are:

What is the definition and scope of the problem or issue, or what's the question?

Formulating and conceptualizing methods might be used including brainstorming, focus groups, nominal group techniques, Delphi methods, brainwriting, stakeholder analysis, synectics, lateral thinking, input-output analysis, and concept mapping.

Where is the problem and how big or serious is it?

The most common method used here is "needs assessment" which can include: analysis of existing data sources, and the use of sample surveys, interviews of constituent populations, qualitative research, expert testimony, and focus groups.

How should the program or technology be delivered to address the problem?

Some of the methods already listed apply here, as do detailing methodologies like simulation techniques, or multivariate methods like multiattribute utility theory or exploratory causal modeling; decision-making methods; and project planning and implementation methods like flow charting, PERT/CPM, and project scheduling.

How well is the program or technology delivered?

Qualitative and quantitative monitoring techniques, the use of management information systems, and implementation assessment would be appropriate methodologies here.

The questions and methods addressed under summative evaluation include:

What type of evaluation is feasible?

Evaluability assessment can be used here, as well as standard approaches for selecting an appropriate evaluation design.

What was the effectiveness of the program or technology?

One would choose from observational and correlational methods for demonstrating whether desired effects occurred, and quasi-experimental and experimental designs for determining whether observed effects can reasonably be attributed to the intervention and not to other sources.

What is the net impact of the program?

Econometric methods for assessing cost effectiveness and cost/benefits would apply here, along with qualitative methods that enable us to summarize the full range of intended and unintended impacts.

3. Evaluation dimensions

Evaluation literature refers to the "dimensions of evaluation" as process, outcome and impact. These concepts are fundamental and we will return to them in other contexts more fully.

- Process evaluations

Process Evaluations describe and assess programme materials and activities. Establishing the extent and nature of programme implementation is an important first step in studying programme outcomes; that is, it describes the interventions to which any findings about outcomes may be attributed. Outcome evaluation assesses programme achievements and effects.

- Outcome evaluations (see also 8.ii.f and g)

Outcome Evaluations study the immediate or direct effects of the programme on participants. The scope of an outcome evaluation can extend beyond knowledge or attitudes, however, to examine the immediate behavioural effects of programmes.

- Impact evaluations

Impact Evaluations look beyond the immediate results of policies, instruction, or services to identify longer-term as well as unintended programme effects. Very useful reports on this subject have notably been made by the Center for Global Development[1], and by Deloitte Insight Economics.[2]

4. An example of evaluation model - Donald Kirkpatrick's 4 levels[3]

Kirkpatrick described 4 levels of training evaluation: reaction, learning, behaviour and results. He identified the four levels as:

- Reaction – a measure of satisfaction (what the trainees/fellows thought and felt about the training); evaluation here focuses on the reaction of individuals to the training or other improvement intervention:
- Learning – a measure of learning (the resulting increase in knowledge or capability); evaluation here assesses what has been learned as measured with end of course tests;
- Behaviour – a measure of behaviour change (extent of behaviour and capability improvement and implementation/application); evaluation here measures the transfer of what has been learned back to the workplace;
- Results – a measure of results (the effects on the institutional environment resulting from the fellows' performance); evaluation here measures (at least tries to) the impact of the training on overall organizational results (in the private sector on business results).

---

[1] See "When Will We Ever Learn: Improving Lives through Impact Evaluation", May 2006 publication by the Center for Global Development.

[2] See "Impact Monitoring and Evaluation Framework", June 2007 report at www.crcwood.unimelb.edu.au/docs/CRCA_Framework_Background.pdf. [9] See inter alia www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/intreval.htm. above.

[3] See notably 1998 edition of his book "Evaluating Training Programs: The Four Levels".

Level	Measurement focus	Questions addressed
1 - Reaction	Trainees's perceptions	What did trainees think of this training?
2 - Learning	Knowledge/skills gained	Was there an increase in knowledge or skill level?
3 - Behaviour	Worksite implementation	Is new knowledge/skill being used on the job?
4 - Results	Impact on organization	What effect did the training have on the organization?

5. The concept of train the trainers evaluation

5.1. The aim of train the trainers evaluation

The aim of the train the trainers evaluation is to improve training design, content and delivery.

5.2. Methodology

First, we want to evaluate the trainees and their reaction during training delivery. In particularly we aim to answer the following questions: Did the trainees appear involved and interested?, Did the trainees ask questions?, Did the trainees help solve problems and issues as they arose during the training? Did the training location appear to be suitable? Was the right number of trainees involved? Was the training session the right length?

Second, the trainer work will be evaluated. We want assess: What worked well? Why? What didn't work well? Why?, Were the training aims and objectives met? Does trainees activity in the workplace support this? Was the information presented during the training appropriate and adequate? Was the information provided in an interesting and engaging manner? Was there any additional content or resources that would have assisted the training? Were the resources used to support the training appropriate? Do the trainees have any further training requirements? Have the administrative and record-keeping requirements been met?

We will use the four sequential levels of evaluation were originally proposed by Donald L. Kirkpatrick. In our evaluation concept will focus on two selected levels of Kirkpatrick' method i.e. on level 1 (how do participants react to the training program) and on level 3 (how has the behavior of participants changed after the training program).The main method of train the trainers is the post-training survey, which will be conducted after the TTT course. It is recommended to set aside enough time to fill in the questionnaire forms as a scheduled session before the end of the program. Post-training survey should measure the learning as a result of the course experience, to analyze the appropriateness of the learning objectives, to

recognize trainees who need additional help, to target any instructional needs to improve the course. We will also use the observations sheets to evaluate the train the trainers. This observation sheet has to be filled by evaluator for each session

5.3.   Questionnaires

According to the methodology three questionaries' were prepared:
-    for trainees (annex 1)
-    for trainers (annex 2)
-    observation sheet (annex 3)

6. The concept of master training evaluation

6.1.   The aim of master training evaluation

Master training evaluation is an objective summary of quantitative and qualitative data gathered about the effectiveness of training. The primary purpose of evaluation is to make good decisions about use of organizational resources. Training evaluation data helps the organization to determine whether training and subsequent reinforcement is accomplishing its goals. It also helps to decide how to adjust the training and other interventions for greater effectiveness. Evaluation data enable judgments about the following questions: • How well did the training meet the development needs identified? • How well did the learners master the training content? • How well did the learning transfer to the work setting? • How well did the training contribute to the achievement of the organization's mission?

6.2.   Methodology

To evaluate a master training we propose using a multi-level evaluation methodology based on Kirkpatrick's four-level evaluation schema. While Kirkpatrick includes only four levels (Satisfaction/Opinion, Knowledge, Behavior, and Outcomes), we added two additional evaluation levels (Tracking and Formative). These six evaluation levels help build a chain of evidence about master training effectiveness.

Level 1: Tracking

ASSESSMENT: Who is attending the training? What experience/background do they bring that may affect the way the training is perceived?

EVALUATION TOOL: Questionnaire. The first level of evaluation tracks participants who attend training. Information collected at this level is mainly demographic data such as level of education, years of experience, race/ethnicity, gender, primary language. Complied together, this data provides a snapshot of the demographics of trainees and a lens for understanding other levels of training evaluation data. In addition, demographic information is used to determine if the training is working equally well for all participants or is biased towards a particular sub-category of trainees.

Level 2: Formative

Assessment: Is the curriculum valid? Does it teach to the Core Competency?

EVALUATION TOOL: Delta-Plus. Level two is a formative evaluation that assesses if the curriculum content is valid and teaches to the identified competencies and objectives. Since effectiveness of training depends on both the content and the structure/delivery of the training, we actually employ two systems when conducting formative evaluation. First, at each training session, program staff use a Trainer Observation Form or a Delta Plus Tool to take notes on the training content and delivery. At the end of the training series, program staff meet to discuss the curriculum and propose any changes needed. Second, we have a trainer development process in place to enhance our trainers' ability to deliver the curriculum. Staff observe each trainer at regularly scheduled intervals and provide feedback and update each trainer's personal development plan as needed.

Level 3: Satisfaction/ Opinion

Assessment: What is the trainee's opinion/satisfaction of the training received? What is the trainer's opinion/satisfaction with the training delivered?

EVALUATION TOOL: Satisfaction Survey. Level three evaluation measures a trainee's self-perceived change in attitude or values, increase in competence, and enhanced level of comfort with the content of a specific training. Data collected at this level helps to evaluate the training environment, the planned application of knowledge, values, and skills, and the overall participant satisfaction and reaction the training itself. Results are used to identify areas where the curriculum appears to be successful in transferring knowledge and skills and those portions of the training that may need changing. To further assist with refinement of training

delivery, we ask our trainers for feedback on their satisfaction with the training delivery and pre-training planning. The results

of our level three evaluation are used in concert with other levels of evaluation to help refine the content and delivery of each training.

Level 4: Knowledge/ Skill Acquisition

Assessment: Is there any change in the trainee's knowledge, attitudes, and skills? Can the trainee adequately perform the skill taught? Has the trainee's self-perceived knowledge, skills, comfort with the area of training changed?

EVALUATION TOOL: Pre/Post Test Embedded Evaluation.

Level four evaluation focuses on actual changes in the knowledge, skills, or values of the participant as a result of the training. Data are used to measure the effectiveness of the training, assess if the competencies and learning objectives were met, and to provide guidance as to where changes to the curriculum should occur. To measure knowledge acquisition, a pre/post-test model is typically used with multiple-choice questions mapped to the learning objectives of the training. To measure skill acquisition, an embedded evaluation is used – frequently in the form of a vignette that requires application of key skills. Trainee responses are recorded for evaluation purposes, and vignette exercises are frequently debriefed in class to further trainee learning

Level 5: Transfer

ASSESSMENT:

Is the trainee able to transfer knowledge, values, and skills taught in the classroom and apply them at work? What effect did the training have on the trainee's ability to utilize the information?

EVALUATION TOOL: Follow-up Surveys Skill Assessments

Level five evaluation focuses on a trainee's ability to transfer the knowledge, skills, and values discussed in training and apply them in the workplace. Evaluation at this level attempts to assess the relevancy of training and measure the effect training had on a trainee's ability to utilize the information. To measure a participant's transfer of learning, follow-up surveys are

typically conducted asking trainees to describe how they have utilized the knowledge, skills, and values presented at the training. A more rigorous way to evaluate transfer of learning is to conduct a follow-up skill evaluation or pull case files to determine any differences in practice.

Level 6: Outcomes

ASSESSMENT: Has the training affected client outcomes?
EVALUATION TOOL: Follow-up Surveys Pre/Post Case and Review Change in Outcome Trends. Level six evaluation looks at the impact of training on client outcomes. For training evaluation purposes, we typically use follow-up surveys which ask participants to provide examples of how the training impacted positive outcomes for any of their cases. More rigorous measures would include case/control studies or review of case files pre- and post-training.

6.3. Questionnaires for the master training evaluation

According to the methodology three questionaries' were prepared:
-   for trainees (annex 4)
-   for trainers (annex 5)
-   observation sheet (annex 6)
Moreover short face-to-face interviews should be done. (annex 7)
In the interview are used a standardized questionnaire and we ask "open questions" in a consistent format.
Advantages of a face to face interview: Interviewer can help the participant to understand the question. Longer interviews are tolerated, higher reluctance to quit convenient for the respondent Additional questions can be used to collect detailed information, body language and reaction can guide the interviewer .

Annex 1

Train the training evaluation sheet

*(This sheet has to be completed by evaluator from every trainee)

Country of the participant………………………………………………………….

1. Training information

Training name	Train the trainers
Date and location	
Organize by	
Module name	

2. Training organization

Please rate on a scale 1 (very bad) - 5 (very good) the following element of training' organization.

	1	2	3	4	5
The location of the training venue was suitable					
The training venue was comfortable and conducive to the learning process					
Duration of the training was sufficient					
The quantity of training materials support implementation of planned material					
The quality of training materials support implementation of planned material					

What do you like about the training?

………………………………..…………………………………………………………………

………………………………..…………………………………………………………………

What are the areas for improvement?

………………………………..…………………………………………………………………

………………………………..…………………………………………………………………

3. Training programme and methods

Please indicate in the scale of 1 (strongly disagree) - 5 (strongly agree) do you agree with the following statements.

	1	2	3	4	5
I received new knowledge and skills that will allow me to develop MASTER BSR project tasks					
Training methods, rhythm and teaching tools helped to achieve the training' aim					
There was appropriate amount of theory					
There was appropriate amount of practice					
The aim of training was achieved					

What do you like about the training?

…………………………………..…………………………………………………………………

…………………………………..…………………………………………………………………

What are the areas for improvement?

…………………………………..…………………………………………………………………

…………………………………..…………………………………………………………………

Overall grade of training (please mark).

1	2	3	4	5
poor	satisfactory	good	very good	excellent

4. Trainers
Please indicate in the scale of 1 (strongly disagree) - 5 (strongly agree) do you agree with the following statements.

	1	2	3	4	5
Experience the coach was relevant to the subject of training					
The attitude of the coach was friendly, professional and committed					
The way the discussion was organized helped to achieve the aim of the training					
The way of the knowledge presentation helped to achieve the aim of the training					

What do you like about the training?

…………………………………..…………………………………………………………………

…………………………………..…………………………………………………………………

What are the areas for improvement?

…………………………………..…………………………………………………………………

…………………………………..…………………………………………………………………

5. Open questions

Which issues discussed at the training should be developed more?

…………………………………..…………………………………………………………………

…………………………………..…………………………………………………………………

…………………………………..…………………………………………………………………

…………………………………..…………………………………………………………………

Which issues discussed during the training were in your opinion not necessary? (You would not use them in the implementation of project tasks)

………………………………..…………………………………………………………………

………………………………..…………………………………………………………………

………………………………..…………………………………………………………………

………………………………..…………………………………………………………………

What issues should appear in the training, but they were not there?

………………………………..…………………………………………………………………

………………………………..…………………………………………………………………

………………………………..…………………………………………………………………

………………………………..…………………………………………………………………

Thank you for fulfilling the evaluation sheet. It will be helpful to improve the training.

Annex 2

*(This sheet has to be completed by evaluator from every trainer)

1. Training information

Training name	Train the trainers
Date and location	
Organize by	

Name of trainer ……………………………………………………………………………………

Was there sufficient time for the training planned? Yes/no? Can you please give any constructive and helpful comments to make improvements?

………

………

………

………

How do you evaluate the trainees' learning, activity, participation?

………

………

………

………

Is there anything else you would like to suggest?

………

………

………

………

Other remarks

………

………

………

………

Thank you for fulfilling the evaluation sheet. It will be helpful to improve the training.

Annex 3

Train the training observation sheet

*(This observation sheet has to be filled by evaluator for every session)

6. Training information

Training name	Train the trainers
Date and location	
Organize by	

7. <u>Training observation</u>

Name of trainer

………………………………………………………………………….

Did the trainer comply with the training topics?

………………………………………..………………………………………………………

………………………………………..………………………………………………………

………………………………………..………………………………………………………

………………………………………..………………………………………………………

Did the trainer adhere to the schedule?

………………………………………..………………………………………………………

………………………………………..………………………………………………………

………………………………………..………………………………………………………

………………………………………..………………………………………………………

The variety of the used tools by the trainer? (Power Point/ or other application presentation, work-sheet, videos etc.)

………………………………………..………………………………………………………

………………………………………..………………………………………………………

………………………………………..………………………………………………………

………………………………………..………………………………………………………

How did the trainer activate the participants?

………………………………………..………………………………………………………

………………………………………..………………………………………………………

………………………………………..………………………………………………………

………………………………………..………………………………………………………

Were the trainees active?

…………………………………..…………………………………………………………………

…………………………………..…………………………………………………………………

…………………………………..…………………………………………………………………

…………………………………..…………………………………………………………………

Other remarks

…………………………………..…………………………………………………………………

…………………………………..…………………………………………………………………

………………………………..…………………………………………………………………

…………………………………..…………………………………………………………………

Overall grade of session

1	2	3	4	5
poor	satisfactory	good	very good	excellent

Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

ANNEX 4

Master training evaluation sheet for trainees

*(This sheet has to be completed by every trainee)

1. **Training information**

Date and place……………………….…..……………………………………………………………

Your position in the organization, where you work

…………………………….…………………………………………………………………

2. Information about the participant
A.

Sex			Age			
Women	□	Men	□	18-25	□	Older than 25	□

B. Have you received a vocational education and training so far?

1. No □

What is your educational background so far?

………

2. Yes □

 Please give a few details (duration, field, degree/target degree)

…………………………………………………………………………………………………...…

……………………………………………………………………………………………………

 C. Do you have any work experience?

1. No □

2. Yes □

Please give a few details about your work experience in the past and now (your field of activity,

sector, and duration)

……………………………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………………………

Master
BSR
Common
Vocational
Training

Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

3. Training venue/organisation

Please rate on a scale: **6 (I agree very much)** *to* **1 (I strongly disagree)** *the following aspects of the training:*	6 +++	5 ++	4 +	3 -	2 - -	1 - - -
The location of the training venue was suitable.						
The training venue was comfortable and conducive to the learning process.						
The duration of the training was sufficient.						
The catering for the training was adequate (if applicable)						
I received relevant training materials on time (if applicable)						

What did you like about the training venue?

………………………………………..……………………………………………………………………

………………………………………..……………………………………………………………………

………………………………………..……………………………………………………………………

What are the areas for improvement of the training from organizational point of view?

………………………………………..……………………………………………………………………

………………………………………..……………………………………………………………………

………………………………………..……………………………………………………………………

4. Evaluation of the trainer(-s)

Please rate the following on a scale: *from* **6 (I agree very much)** *to* **1 (I strongly disagree)**:	6 +++	5 ++	4 +	3 -	2 - -	1 - - -
The trainer(-s) was/were all in all communicative and clear.						
The trainer(-s) was/were all in all friendly and open.						
The trainer(-s) was/were all in all very keen to answer all questions, remove doubts and uncertainties.						
The trainer(-s) was/were all in all well-organized.						
The trainer(-s) had a good time management.						
The trainer(-s) was/were competent.						
I would like to have more learning experiences with this/these particular trainer(-s).						

What do you particularly appreciate about the work of the trainer(-s)?

………………………………………..……………………………………………………………………

………………………………………..……………………………………………………………………

Master
BSR
Common
Vocational
Training

Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

What would you suggest to improve in the trainings in future?

……………………………………………..…………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………..…………………………………………………………………………………

5. Evaluation of the own competence development

Please rate the following aspects on a scale: *from* **6 (I agree very much)** *to* **1 (I strongly disagree)**:	6 +++	5 ++	4 +	3 -	2 - -	1 - - -
I have developed new skills and competences for my future work and career path.						
I have gained relevant knowledge for my work and career.						
I have made new contacts for my work and career.						

What is the most important thing you take from the training/learned in the training?

………

………

What skills and competences would you like to develop more in this training?

……………………………………………..…………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………..……………………………………………………………………………

6. Evaluation of the teaching content

Please rate on a scale: *from* **6 (I agree very much)** *to* **1 (I strongly disagree)** *the following aspects:*	6 +++	5 ++	4 +	3 -	2 - -	1 - - -
There was an appropriate part of theory.						
There was an appropriate part of examples of practices/practice.						
The teaching methods were diversified						
The teaching methods were up-to-date and used sensibly.						
The quality of the training materials was good and useful in the learning process.						
The quantity of the training materials was good and useful in the learning process.						
The variety of training materials was sufficient.						

Which elements/contents of the training should be developed more?

………………………………………………..…………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………..……………………………………………………………………………………

………

Master BSR
Common Vocational Training

Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

Which elements/contents of the training were missing?

……………………………………………..…………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………..…………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………..…………………………………………………………………………

What elements were superfluous?

……………………………………………..…………………………………………………………………………

……………………………..…………………………………………………………………………………………

What is your overall assessment of the training so far? (Please tick as appropriate)

very poor	
poor	
satisfactory	
good	
very good	
excellent	

Thank you for answering the questions.
It helps to improve our work.

Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

ANNEX 5

Master training – trainer evaluation form

*(This sheet has to be completed by the IP/evaluator for every trainer)

Trainer's Name...
Date and place of the training...

Please choose the most appropriate option that describes best your experience with the trainer.

1. How was the trainer's understanding/knowledge on the subject?

a. Excellent

b. Good

c. Fair

d. Poor

2. How were the trainer's efforts to actively involve students in the lessons?

a. Excellent

b. Good

c. Fair

d. Poor

3. How was the trainer in answering questions of students?

a. Excellent

b. Good

c. Fair

d. Poor

4. Was individual help provided when needed?

a. Yes

b. Somewhat

c. Not at all

5. How was your trainer's preparation for class?

a. Excellent

b. Good

c. Fair

d. Poor

6. How was the trainer's professional appearance?

a. Excellent

b. Good

c. Fair

d. Poor

7. Did the trainer provide time for follow-ups?

a. Yes

b. Somewhat

c. No

8. How would you rate the overall skills of the trainer?

a. Excellent

b. Good

c. Fair

d. Poor

9. Place for any additional comments, suggestions, problem description, etc.

……………………………..…………………………………………………………………

……………………………..…………………………………………………………………

……………………………..…………………………………………………………………

……………………………..…………………………………………………………………

……………………………..…………………………………………………………………

……………………………..…………………………………………………………………

Thank you for answering the questions.
It helps to improve our work.

Master
BSR
Common
Vocational
Training

Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

ANNEX 6

Master observation sheet

*(This observation sheet has to be filled by evaluator/IP for the <u>chosen</u> session)

Background information

Observer

_____

Date and Place of the Observation

_____

Duration of the Observation:

__ 1 hour   __ about half a day

__ 2 hours   __ a whole day

Other, please specify

_____

Total Number of Attendees

_____

Name(s) of the Trainers(s)

_____
_____
_____

 This section provides a brief overview of the session (part of master training) being observed.

I. Session Context

In a few sentences, describe the session you observed. Include: (a) whether the observation covered a partial or complete session, (b) whether there were multiple break-out sessions

………………………………..…………………………………………………………………………
………………………………..…………………………………………………………………………
………………………………..…………………………………………………………………………
………………………………..…………………………………………………………………………

II. Session Focus

Indicate the <u>major intended purpose(s)</u> of this part of master training

………………………………..…………………………………………………………………………
………………………………..…………………………………………………………………………

III. Training Session Activities
(Check all the activities— and related issues (such as resources)—you observed and describe them when relevant)

A. Indicate the <u>major instructional resource(s)</u> used in this part of master training

    ___ Print materials

    ___ Hands-on materials

    ___ Outdoor resources

    ___ Technology/audio-visual resources

    ___Other instructional resources (Please specify)
……………………………..……………………………………………………………

……………………………..……………………………………………………………

B. Indicate the <u>major way(s)</u> in which participant activities were structured

    ___ As a whole group

    ___ As small groups

    ___ As pairs

    ___ As individuals

C. Indicate the <u>major activities</u> of presenters and participants in part of master training (Check to indicate applicability)

    ___ Formal presentations by the trainer/speaker: **(describe focus)**
………………………..……………………………………………………………………
………………………..……………………………………………………………………
………………………..……………………………………………………………………
………………………..……………………………………………………………………

    ___ Formal presentations by participants: **(describe focus)**

………………………..……………………………………………………………………
………………………..……………………………………………………………………

Master
BSR
Common
Vocational
Training

Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

…………………………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………

……

___ Hands-on/investigative/research/field activities: **(describe)**

……

……

……

……

___ Problem-solving activities: **(describe)**

……

……

……

……

___ Proof and evidence: **(describe)**

……

……

……

……

___ Reading/reflection/written communication: **(describe)**

……

……

……

……

___ Explored technology use: **(describe focus)**

……

……

……

……

___ Explored assessment strategies: **(describe focus)**

…………………………………………

………

………

………

___ Assessed participants' knowledge and/or skills: **(describe approach)**

………

………

………

………

___ Other activities: **(Please specify)**

………

………

………

………

D. <u>Comments</u>: Please provide any additional information you consider necessary to capture the activities or context of this part of the master training

………

………

………

………

………

………

………

………

Master
BSR
Common
Vocational
Training

Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

ANNEX 7

Face-to-face interviews with the trainees

*(This observation sheet has to be filled by evaluator/trainer/IP when interviewing the selected trainees)

Questions:

1. What about the master training this week? Was it relevant for your work?

…………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………

2. What would you wish to change in order to make the training more useful for your work?

…………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………

3. What do you see as training's strengths?

…………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………

4. What do you see as training's weaknesses?

…………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………

5. Will you be able to apply the gained knowledge from the training lessons in practice?

…………………………………………………………………………………………………

Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

…………………………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………

……………………………….…………………………………………………………………………

6. What challenges might you face?

…………………………………….……………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………….……………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………….……………………………………………………………………

7. What resources will you need in order to implement what you learned in this master training?

………………………………….…………………………………………………………………………

………………………………….…………………………………………………………………………

……

……

………………………………….…………………………………………………………………………

8. Would any additional part of the master training be helpful?

………………………………….…………………………………………………………………………

………………………………….…………………………………………………………………………

……

………………………………….…………………………………………………………………………

……

………………………………….…………………………………………………………………………

……

………………………………….…………………………………………………………………………

Thank you for answering the questions.

It helps to improve our work.