



Regional School of Public Administration (Phase 1)

A Joint Initiative of the European Union
and the OECD, principally financed by the EU



ReSPA/SC(2008)2/002

DRAFT TRAINING EVALUATION GUIDELINES

At the 6th Meeting of the Steering Committee, the Chair invited the representative of Serbia, supported by the representatives of Croatia and of Montenegro, to prepare a training evaluation guideline for discussion and approval at this Steering Committee session. The representative of Serbia prepared the document in consultation with the representatives of Croatia and Montenegro and the ReSPA team at the OECD

The Steering Committee is invited to:

- **Approve** the Draft ReSPA Training Evaluation Guidelines.

DRAFT GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATION OF RESPA SEMINARS

CONTENT	page
SHORT INTRODUCTION	4
THE GENERAL OBJECTIVE OF EVALUATION	4
SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE OF EVALUATION	4
INSTRUMENTS OF EVALUATION	4
<i>discussion</i>	4
<i>written questionnaire</i>	4
<i>questionnaire for participants</i>	5
Organization	5
Lecture	5
Lecturing.	5
Workshop	5
Applicability	5
Indicators for future programs	5
Target group	5
Demographic variables	5
<i>questionnaire for lecturers</i>	6
<i>Explanatory note</i>	
EVALUATION OF THE EFFECTS	6
ANNEX	7
<i>SEIO Evaluation questionnaire for participants</i>	7
<i>InWent evaluation questionnaire</i>	9
<i>SEIO questionnaire for lecturers</i>	11

SHORT INTRODUCTION

According to Webster International Dictionary evaluation means “to find the value of something”. It is a tool for perpetual improvement of processes.

Evaluation of a training can have several general objectives: evaluation of a training strategy, a programme, a practice and the effects.

THE GENERAL OBJECTIVE

The general objective of these evaluation guidelines is to evaluate the practical realization of specific seminar, workshop or other form of training.

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE

Specific objectives of the evaluation are to assess the different aspects of: organization, lecturers, lecturing, workshop, applicability, target group.

INSTRUMENTS OF EVALUATION

Instruments of evaluation are a discussion and an anonymous questionnaire at the end of the training; additional information we get through a questionnaire for the lecturers.

The discussion can be more or less structuralized and it takes place at the very end of the seminar. It is a good opportunity to pick up fresh impressions and to **discuss** them immediately. It can reveal more or less similar attitudes of participants in relation to the same issues concerning organization, quality and usefulness of the training.

But for deeper analysis we need **written questionnaire** with structured questions suitable for the evaluation analysis. The anonymity of the questionnaire assures the more objective and the more valid information, and avoid socially acceptable answers.

The questionnaire shouldn't comprise more than 10 questions, otherwise it would be an extra burden for participants, which are already reluctant to fill-in the evaluation questionnaires. The questions should be clear and short, combining multiple-choice answers, grading of marks and open answers in order to be dynamic and interesting.

There are two questionnaires. First questionnaire is filled-in by participants, the second by lecturers.

The **questionnaire** intended **for participants** relates to different aspects of the training:

1) **Organization**

- to found out an opinion about the organization of the seminar/lecture and reasons for this opinion. What was good, what was bad , and why. Reasons are very important for the general objective of evaluation, giving us the direction what should be altered in the future in order to achieve better quality.

2) **Lecture**

– to assess satisfaction with the quality of the lectures. We look at the content of the lecture, the structure of the lecture, the adequacy of the information...

3) **Lecturing**

– to evaluate the methodology of presentation and performance of the lecturers.

4) **Workshop**

- we evaluate the same indicators as under 1), 2) and 3), but if the seminar is combined of academic and interactive part we can evaluate both parts separately and their connection.

5) **Applicability**

– to find out if the training is, at this moment, useful for participants for everyday work (in their opinion). Applicability depends on many different variables and because of that only mark is not enough to create an objective assessment. The question **Why** enables us to get more complete information of the circumstances in which participants work.

6) **Indicators for future programs**

- assessment of additional needs for specialization, specifying topics of interest. This is an input for TNA.

7) **Target group**

– recommendations who else should be included in the same training next time.

8) **Demographic variables**

– it is useful to introduce some of demographic variables into the questionnaire, like age and gender, in case that we want to analyze later the correlation of replays and these factors.

The **questionnaire** intended **for lecturers**: organization of the seminar, logistics, communication with the organizers, target group participation, and the like. This kind of information reflects the perception from “the other side of the table”, giving highly useful data for the organizers and only for them. Some seminars are organized only with one lecturer, so because of that this instrument can not be anonymous and it is why its objectivity might be reduced. There is no imperative need to distribute the questionnaire for lecturers (such is for the questionnaire for participants), but it can be useful associated part of evaluation which is completing the picture of the event. It is direction for improving organizational aspects (which is, as material substance, more or less suitable for changes) and especially communicational aspect (which is, as psychological substance, very handy for positive changes).

Explanatory note

EVALUATION OF THE EFFECTS

For the **evaluation of the effects** of the training, or if the training has fulfilled the needs we have to be aware that this assessment depend on many parameters which are difficult to know, for example, the motivation of participants, its intellectual capabilities, HR management in her/his institution, selection procedure. Apart from that, we should know what was the situation before we have introduced the change, in this case that would be the training, than we need objective evaluator, an entity outside the framework of RESPA who can on the ground of impartial criteria carry out the evaluation process.

Having in mind that RESPA is a regional project the most convenient method for this activity would be an on-line IT evaluation that would address all participants. It is very important to pay attention to time dimension and to sequence evaluation of the effects in regular periods.

Since it is usual to outsource a specialized organization to carry out this task it wouldn't be appropriate to develop the methodology of evaluation on their behalf..

ANNEX

In the annex are examples of SEIO and InWent evaluation questionnaires.



ВЛАДА РЕПУБЛИКЕ СРБИЈЕ
КАНЦЕЛАРИЈА ЗА ПРИДРУЖИВАЊЕ
ЕВРОПСКОЈ УНИЈИ

**“Laws and Procedures of the EU“
Ministry of Diaspora, Vase Carapica 20
4. May 2006.**

QUESTIONER FOR SEMINAR EVALUATION

This is the questioner for the evaluation of the seminar that you have participated in. We are kindly asking you to answer these questions sincerely in order for us to evaluate adequately the seminar and design the ones. This questioner is anonymous.

1. Gender (circle): F M

2. Age (circle the category):

- a. under 25 years old
- б. from 26 to 35
- ц. from 36 to 45
- д. from 46 to 55
- е. from 56 to 65
- ф. more than 65

3. What is your opinion about the organization of the seminar/lectures?

a) bad b) average c) good

Why? _____

4. Evaluate the quality of the lectures?

(circle one of the offered possibilities)

- a) not satisfactory
- b) partly satisfactory
- c) completely satisfactory

Questions about the lectures:

5. Evaluate the lecturer by circling the mark from 1 to 5, where 1 represents the lowest, and 5 the highest mark.

Lecturer 1	1	2	3	4	5
Lecturer 2	1	2	3	4	5

Questions about the workshop

6. What is your evaluation about the connection between the workshop and introduction lecture?

a) harmonized

б) not harmonized

7. Evaluate the workshop by circling the mark from 1 to 5, where 1 represents the lowest, and 5 the highest mark.

1 2 3 4 5

8. Evaluate the applicability of the seminar for your everyday work?

(circle one of the offered possibilities)

- 1. not applicable
- 2. little applicable
- 3. fairly applicable
- 4. quite applicable
- 5. very applicable

Why?

9. Do you need additional professional specialization, seminars, lectures?

- a) Yes б) No

If you circled Yes, in which areas?

10. Who do you think should be involved in similar seminars?

Please, comment whatever you consider that we have missed to ask about professional specialization.

Thank you!

Serbia and the Stabilization and Association Agreement with the EU Negotiation and Implementation Training

Workshop 2 The Chapter on Free Movement of Goods Belgrade, 13/14 December 2005

EVALUATION

1. What is your overall assessment of the programme? I am ...

- very content
- content
- more or less content
- discontented

Please give reasons for your choice:

2. What is your impression of the organization of the programme? I am ...

- very content
- content
- more or less content
- discontented

Please give reasons for your choice:

3. With the moderation and supervision of the workshop I was all in all ...

- very content
- content
- more or less content
- discontented

Please give reasons for your choice:

4. With the information distributed (hand-outs, publications, floppy disk etc.) I am ...

- very content
- content
- more or less content

- discontented

Please give reasons for your choice:

5. What would you consider your personal benefit after having participated in this seminar?

6. Please try to assess the performance of the lecturers in the workshop with the help of the scale mentioned below.

(1- very good; 2 - good; 3 - satisfying; 4 - with deficiencies; 5 - poor)

Name: Mark: reasons:

7. What did you like most during the workshop? What didn't you like at all?

8. Here is some space for further comments, criticism, approval or proposals concerning the workshop:

Thank you very much!



QUESTIONNAIRE ON SEMINAR ORGANISATION AND COOPERATION WITH SEIO (for lecturer)

This is a questionnaire designed for evaluation of cooperation with SEIO and organization of seminars that You participated in as a lecturer. Since we are of the opinion that a quality training requires more than a feedback from the seminar participants, we would highly welcome Your opinions on previous experiences and in particular Your suggestions. Please provide as straightforward answers to the questions below in order for us to enhance and promote our future trainings and cooperation.

Title of the seminar:

Seminar date: _____ Seminar venue _____

Full names of SEIO staff that You cooperated with 1. _____
in relation to this seminar: 2. _____

1. Gender (encircle): F M

2. Age (encircle the category):

- a. up to 25
- b. from 26 to 35
- c. from 36 to 45
- d. from 46 to 55
- e. from 56 to 65
- f. over 65

Questions on organization

3. In Your opinion, what was the quality of the seminar/lecture oorganization?
(encircle one option)

- a) poor b) average c) good

Why? _____

4. Evaluate the following organizational aspects by encircling numbers from 1 to 5, 1 being the lowest and 5 the highest mark.

- classroom/premises	1	2	3	4	5
- available equipment/technical appliances	1	2	3	4	5
- appropriate level of participant group	1	2	3	4	5
- capacity of SEIO members					
for resolution of possible outstanding issues	1	2	3	4	5

Why? _____

Questions related to cooperation

5. In Your opinion, what was the quality of cooperation with SEIO in relation to the seminar/lecture (professionalism, technical support, fairness of contact persons in communication...)?

- a) poor b) average c) good

Why? _____

6. Did the contact person inform You duly on all relevant issues related to the seminar?

- a) Yes b) No

8. How would You estimate the application of Your suggestions in relation to the better quality of the seminars (topic, organization etc.)?

- a) insufficient
- b) sufficient
- c) adequate
- d) very good
- e) excellent

9. How would You estimate Your promotion through cooperation with SEIO?

10. Judging by Your experience, what would improve the quality of the seminars?

If we happened to overlook something in relation to organization and cooperation, You are more than welcome to add any additional comments.

We sincerely thank You for Your cooperation!

Signature
