

Evaluating the training

This exercise gives an example of outcome evaluation, namely on the CoPack training course itself, or part of it. As a training course is different from a collaborative process, it deals with different questions than were suggested in handout 5.1.

Evaluation is done by lessons, each comprising one or several handouts and exercises and excluding the Evaluation module itself. Lessons are rated using a simple cumulative voting method which is suited to groups of 5 to 30 participants.

Requirements

- A whiteboard or blackboard.
- Magnetic stickers, whiteboard pencils or chalk. According to the criteria listed on the evaluation sheet, you may use different colours, such as **red** (novelty value), **green** (understandability), **black** (controversiality) and **blue** (practical relevance), but one colour will do as well.

Provided that there are n participants, search for the number nearest to 30 that can be divided by n . We will call this number k . It is the number of stickers of each colour you will need if you use stickers.

Schedule

1. Hand out evaluation sheets (see below) or use the exercise slide to project the criteria on a canvas.
2. Make a copy of the table on the evaluation sheet on your blackboard or whiteboard.
3. Hand out k/n stickers of each colour to every participant.
4. Let every student distribute their red stickers (or coloured dots, when using pencils or chalk) freely among lessons, according to which lessons they rate best with regard to novelty value. Proceed that way with the other criteria. The rating may be prepared on the Evaluation sheet, using pencils, and then transferred to the blackboard.
5. As a result, in each category, some 30 dots or stickers scattered across lessons will indicate which lessons were rated best by a majority. If the total number is significantly less than 30, it means that the whole course was not rated very good.
6. Take a photograph of the resulting image.

Training evaluation

- **Novelty value:** Did the lecture convey new knowledge and give you fresh insights? (Opposite: was it rather commonplace and didn't teach you anything you didn't already know?)
- **Understandability:** Was the matter explained in a way that matched your vocabulary and made it easy to understand? (Opposite: was it too complicated, perhaps using devious terms or too intricate a language?)
- **Controversiality:** Did the content of the lecture cause debate among the group, or had it the potential to do so? (Opposite: did everybody feel the same about it, according to your impression?)
- **Practical relevance:** Do you think that what you've learnt may change the way you work? (Opposite: was it highly theoretical and rather detracting from the usual subjects of your work?)

| Lesson ... was | novel | under-standable | contro-versial | practically relevant |
|---|-------|-----------------|----------------|----------------------|
| 1.1 Basic concepts | | | | |
| 1.2 Criticism of collaborative planning | | | | |
| 2.1 Roles and attitudes | | | | |
| 2.2 Conflict management | | | | |
| 2.3 Media and communication | | | | |
| 3.1 Programme-based planning | | | | |
| 3.2 Method descriptions and case study | | | | |
| 4.1 Documenting events | | | | |
| 4.2 Meeting minutes | | | | |
| 4.3 Data management | | | | |