

BASIC EVALUATION DOCUMENT

I. EVALUATION OF PROGRAMMES

1. Delimitation of the concept of evaluation of programmes

In order to start examining the reason or justification for the need to evaluate programmes, in our case practical work, in higher education, we believe it is necessary to establish conceptual delimitations, expressed by the majority of writers, reflect upon, characteristics, advantages and disadvantages of this evaluation, describe some of the most used models and consider the methodological focus of our research work.

When tackling the defining of the concept of evaluation of programmes, we come across the fact that as Municio, P. (1992:375) says “the majority of conceptual conflicts are derived from different parts of analysis during the process of evaluation” and we also find a series of concepts to which it is necessary to refer, such as scientific research, evaluation and evaluative research.

In his doctorate thesis, Pérez Carbonell, A. (1998), sums up after a review of authors such as Kerlinger, F.N. (1975), Burck, H.D. and Peterson, G.W. (1975), Worthen and Sanders, J.R. (1973), Patton (1990), etc., the differences between Research and Evaluative Research, setting them out in this table.

RESEARCH	EVALUATIVE RESEARCH
Value judgements are limited to those implied in the selection of the problem and the responsibility of the researcher themselves.	Value judgements are extended, also, to the development and application of the study procedures. The responsibility is shared between the evaluator and instances of the programme.
Hypotheses are made which are based on theories or intuition of observations or knowledge.	It is difficult or even on occasions inappropriate to formulate hypotheses
Replication is possible.	Replication is not possible.
Data collection is determined by the problem and the hypotheses.	Data collection is carried out in terms of viability to the process. Differences are noted between the accessible data and that desired by the evaluator and persons responsible for the programme.
The researcher can manipulate or control variables at the same time as eliminating systematic effects or others.	Control or manipulation is only achieved in a superficial way and the control of the systemised variance is very difficult.
The acceptance or rejection of the hypothesis is the responsibility of the researcher	The decision about continuation, modification, application or substitution of the programme corresponds to the institution administering the programme or the audience to whom the report is directed.
The report is adapted to the norms of the scientific community	The report is adapted to the demands of the person who takes the decisions about the programme.

Table 1. Differences between Research and Evaluative Research, Pérez Carbonell, A. (1998).

Tejedor, F.J. and others (1994), also talk about these differences summed up in the following table:

TOPICS	RESEARCH	EVALUATIVE RESEARCH
Purpose	Increase knowledge, draw conclusions	Modify reality. Take decisions.
Generalization of results	To other spheres (external validity).	Limited to reference group.
Value judgements	Objective knowledge (the truth).	Assign value criteria
Role of researcher	Autonomous	Depending on the manager
Themes	Personal and /or y/o scientific interest.	Interest of manager.
Methodology	Basically quantitative.	Diverse.
Design	Pre-established.	Pre-established, but flexible.
Hypothesis	Explicit.	Non-explicit.
Replication	Demandable.	Not demandable
Data	Based on the problem	Based on viability.
Control and Manipulation	Desirable (demandable in the basic form)	Desirable, but very difficult.
Randomisation	Basic.	Not applicable.
Criteria of validity	Internal, external and construct.	Utility, credibility.
Interpretation of data	According to the rules defined.	Consideration by those responsible for the programme.
Report	Adapted to the scientific community	Adapted to the user and managers.

Table 2. Difference of topics between Research and Qualitative Research, Tejedor, F.J. and others (1994).

We see therefore that research in its general sense contributes a more generalised and theoretical knowledge than evaluation and that the latter is centred more in the particular and specific factors of a case.

We are now going to focus more on evaluative research, since in our work we are going to develop aspects related with the evaluation of programmes. We have collected a series of definitions from different authors with the aim of understanding the essence of its meaning.

Following the proposal of Fernández Ballesteros, R.(1996), whose option is to firstly clarify what *evaluation* is, in order to then define the evaluation of *programmes*. We propose a series of definitions of evaluation, as follows:

“*The estimation of merit of an object*” Scriven (1967).

“*The examination of the effects, results or outputs of a programme*” Levine (1975)

“The systematic investigation of the value or merits of some object” Evaluation Standards Committee(1983-1994).

“The appraisal, based on criteria and pre-specified references, of technically designed and systematically collated information, on how many relevant factors make up the educative processes in order to facilitate improvement decision making.” Pérez Juste, R. (1995).

“The process of identification, collection and treatment of data in order to obtain information that justifies a determined decision. It should serve not only for analysing a determined programme, but also to help us to understand the learning process.” García Llamas, J.L (1996: 46).

Thus there are four main contents of evaluation: the contents to evaluate, the information to collect, the consideration of the information and the finality or functions.

In methodological terms, a programme can be interpreted as an intervention or treatment, that is to say, “as a set of manipulations that have been programmed to be implanted in a determinate socio-environmental reality” Fdez-Ballesteros, R, (1996: 28).

Defined in a broader way, Bartolomé Pina, M. (1990:39) understands programmes as being “a set of strategies and elements geared to the achievement of determinate goals and objectives.”

That is to say, using the theory of the UTOS of Cronbach, J. L.(1982),as support, in which he talks about the components of the evaluation of programmes, we underline the fact that said programmes are applied to certain “units” or population, in which there has been previous observation of a series of “operations” and which is developed in determinate context”. From which we can deduce, the transcendence that the said components have when it comes to being able to generalise the evaluation of a concrete programme to another of different characteristics.

Other definitions of programme:

“A systematic plan of intervention, designed and drawn up intentionally for the achievement of objectives for improvement,” Pérez Juste, R. (1992: 46).

“The systematic efforts carried out in order to achieve pre-planned objectives with the aim of improving health, knowledge, attitudes and practice,” Fink (1993:2).

Thus when talking about a *programme* we refer to a structuring and organisation of a series of resources both of materials and human capital, placed at the service of a population with a specific need (training, social, health, etc)

Neither is there just one unique concept when it comes to the evaluation of programmes. We find with different authors that they not only differ in their point of view as to the definition of the same, but also on the procedures for development of a programme.

One of the best characterizations on what can be understood as being evaluation of programmes, from an experimental perspective, we owe to Weiss, C.H. (1983: 31):

“Research in evaluation is a rational task, which examined the effects of policies and the programmes of its populations – object, in terms of the ends it tries to reach. For objective and systematic methods, evaluation measures the extension with which the said ends are reached and observes the factors associated with the success or failure of its results. It is supposed that by contributing “facts”, evaluation helps decision taking for intelligent choice between courses of action. Precise and not oblique data on consequences of the programmes will improve the said decision making.”

In the following definitions we can see that conceptual evolution to which Worthen and Sanders (1988) referred from the proposal of Tyler, R. to the current day.

“The process for determining in what measure educative objectives have been reached via curricular and education programmes” Tyler, R. (1950:69).

“It is the process of identifying, obtaining and proportioning useful and descriptive information on the value and merits of the goals, planning, the realisation and impact of a determinate object, with the aim of acting as a guide for decision taking, solving problems of responsibility and promoting the comprehension of the phenomena implied.” Stufflebeam, D.L. (1989).

“A process of determination of areas of decision on matters of interest via the selection of appropriate and analysed information in order to produce a report with useful data for those who make decisions.” Alkin, M.C., 1990.

“The systematic application of the procedures of social investigation in appraising the conceptualisation and design of a programme, and the implementation and usefulness of social intervention programmes” Rossi y Freeman (1991).

“Systematic process designed intentionally and technically, of rigorous data collection – valuable, valid and reliable- geared to appraising the quality of a programme, as the base for the later improvement decision making both of the programme and the personnel implied, and in an indirect way, of the social body in which it was immersed.” Pérez Juste, R. (1992)

“The evaluation of programmes is the systematic research through scientific methods of the effects, results and objectives of a programme with the aim of taking decisions on it” Fernández Ballesteros, R. (1996:23).

From the analysis of these definitions, we deduce that the evaluation of programmes becomes a fundamental component of education developed in parallel with the rest of educative activities. And that it is not easy to find a total agreement between the differences on the evaluation of programmes. According to Talmage (1982), the majority of them are work definitions and cannot appreciate a high consensus with respect to the objectives of the same evaluation.

In the evaluation of programmes we can identify two key components: conceptual and n methodological, both with an open and flexible character. Although the choice of a determinate theoretical and methodological focus decides the possible evaluative model to follow in practice.

That is to say, “An evaluative process cannot be conceived as a basically technical and neutral activity. Of mere application of scientific procedures, but more as a successive process of coherent decision making, which are started with the definition of the theoretical model from which they stem, the choice of the type of evaluation to follow, the role of the evaluator, ends, etc, until it ends in the collection of more particular data and the elaboration of the evaluative report” Colás, P. y Rebollo, M^a.A. (1993).

1.1 Characteristics of the Evaluation of Programmes

Colás, P. Y Rebollo, M^a. A. (1993), compile eight of the key aspects to consider in the development of whatever modality of programme evaluation.

1. It is a process with a dynamic character
2. Scientific procedures are applied, including design strategies, collection and analysis of rigorous and systemised information.
3. The aim is to obtain valid and reliable information

4. It should have decision making as a projected end
5. It is conditioned by the circumstances and has to adjust itself to the real conditions in which the programme to be evaluated is applied
6. It will go in reference to a programme. And can have a restricted or very wide scope of application
7. It has an ideological and political function
8. It supposes the emission of a judgement or consideration of something or other

For Álvarez Rojo, V. (1994), there are four common characteristics in the evaluation of programmes.

- 1) Systematic process
The evaluation is carried out continually and sequentially, via indicators, criteria and variables that have been agreed upon and applied: before, during and after the valuation.
- 2) Planned collection of data
Action which leads to the elaboration of value judgements on the praxis of the programme during its development (formative evaluation) and offers a valuation of the results obtained for some subjects in a determinate context (summative evaluation).
- 3) The evaluation is aimed at all elements of the programme.
According to this author there are two types of elements, the primary (objectives, contents activities, methodology, instructional units, organization, materials and results expectable) and the secondary (target public, managers and contexts of application and development of the programme).
- 4) The principal objective of the evaluation of programmes is the obtaining of data on the same, and its development in natural contexts that make decision making possible.

In short, the evaluation of programmes is a process that is not uniform in terms of models and methodology, with a dynamic character, in which rigorous and systematic scientific procedures are applied, which include a series of strategies of design, collection and analysis of information, in order to obtain valid and reliable information, with which decisions can be taken attending the contextualisation and real conditions in which the programme is applied.

1.2 Functions of the Evaluation of Programmes

Within the generic proposal in which we understand that the prime objective of the evaluation of programmes is to take decisions around a determinate intervention, there are different proposals as to the functions that this evaluation has to adopt.

We would like to highlight some of the more important ones due to the transcendence and close relation that they have, along with the definition of evaluation, the evaluative model and the methodological processes to follow.

Colás, P. y Rebollo, M^a.P. (1993).present us a double perspective of the said functions, one is the external perspective put forward by Gross and Humphreys (1985:3) the other perspective an internal one proposed by Sanz Oro, R. (1990: 59)....

Functions from an external and/or political perspective (Gross and Humphreys):

- Provide information and comprehension about the programme

- Help the development and expansion of the programme
- Help to establish policies, seeing that the results of an evaluation help to determine the future direction of the programmes
- Defend and support initiatives
- Help to identify the good virtues or successes of the innovations
- Help to propagate programmes
- Help the educative community to be better informed
- Provide a base for the decision making as to the distribution of resources or the possibility to extend, eliminate, institutionalise and replicate the programme or one of its parts
- Help to demonstrate the worthwhile quality of the programme to the external public

Functions from an internal perspective, in relation with the programme itself (Sanz Oro, R.):

- Check if the programme is responding to and satisfying the needs for which it was planned.
- Serves as a basis for continual improvement.
- Offer rigorous information on the progress of the programme.
- Receive constant feedback on the effectiveness of the programme.
- Choose and use the intervention techniques on the basis of its usefulness, Understand a programme, identify its possibilities and limitations, the dimensions it does and does not cover
- Make possible a critical reflection on a determinate situation

In the evaluation of programmes the determination of the functions of the evaluation, is going to condition the following decisions, that is to say, it is going to influence the kind of objectives, contents, methodology etc. And the functions in turn, are going to depend on the entity, person or institution from which the initiative of evaluating has stemmed. If these are the persons directly responsible for the programme who are to evaluate the functions will be different from if they are external agents to the same.

1.3 Types of Evaluation of Programmes

In terms of the above, the majority of Spanish authors such as Sanz Oro, R. (1990), Alvira Martín, F. (1991), Colás, P. and Rebollo, M^a.A (1993), Rodríguez Espinar, S. and others (1993), Fdez.-Ballesteros, R. (1989), talk of four types of evaluation that interact with each other:

- Evaluation of the context and needs
 - Evaluation of the design and planning of the programme.
 - Evaluation of the process.
 - Evaluation of the product or results.
- ❖ The evaluation of the **context** according to Stufflebeam, D. y Shinkfield, A. (1987:11):“has as its function to define the institutional context, identify the target population of the study and to value its needs, diagnose the problems that underlie the needs and to judge if the objectives proposed are sufficiently coherent with the needs valued.”

Put in the words of Sanz Oro, R (1990), it is a question of once we have defined the framework of application of the programmes, identifying the failings, gaps and needs of the users, in order to solve them.

According to Colas, P. y Rebollo, M^a. A (1993),. at this point of the evaluation we can pose the following questions:

- What are the characteristics of the context and the specific situation of the programme?

- Who is participating in the programme?
- What conditioning factors exist in carrying out the programme?
- What resources are necessary and what do we have?
- What are the key needs that programme must comply with?
- What time availability and human resources do we have?
- What are the expectations that the receivers of the programme have?

❖ Evaluation of the **design**, according to Stufflebeam, D. and Shinkfield, A. (1987:11): “centres its proposals in identifying and appraising the strategies of the programmes and the planning of its procedures at the same time that it “satisfies a double aim , identifying and valuing the strategies of the programme and planning the application procedures”

That is to say the aim is to know if the programme is evaluable or not, if it responds to the needs for which it was designed. Which also tends to be referred to as knowledge of the “evaluability” of a programme according to Hernández Fdez., J. and Martínez Clares, P.(1996), who in turn base their argument in using the said term on authors such as Horst, Scanlon and Wholey (1977).

In this evaluation of the design of the programme we can consider the following questions, Colás, P. y Rebollo, M^a.A. (1993):

- Are the objectives of the programme well defined?
- Is the sequence of activities expressed with sufficient clarity for its immediate set up?
- Does the planning of the programmes respond to the situation of the context where it will be implemented?
- Is time adjusted to the activities to be carried out?

As far as the most used work techniques in this evaluation are concerned, Rodríguez Espinar, S. and others (1993), highlight the following: the search for specialised information, summaries of the literature consulted, recording and knowledge of information programmes of recognised worth, inventory and analysis of human and material resources available, discussion in small groups of the personnel responsible for the programme and means with which to involve the direct users of the programme.

❖ Evaluation of the **process**, also known as follow-up or “formative” by Scriven, M (1967) “ is that carried out during the application of the programme and has as its essential objective the improvement and perfection of the same” And termed as “implementation” by Alvira Martín, F. (1991).

It aims to discover the defects of the planning that have been produced in the implementation of the programme, both in the procedures as well as in the activities, during the application process, with the aim to favour improvements in the same.

The questions posed by Colás, P. y Rebollo, M^a.A. (1993) in this evaluation are:

- What is the perception of those involved on the execution of the programme?
- Are activities being carried out in accordance with the proposed plan?
- What are the most important difficulties and achievements detected?
- How do the groups work?
- What is the level of participation of those involved?
- What is the real development of the programme: developed activities, attendance, and performance of the users?

According to Rodríguez Espinar, S. and others (1994), the most utilised techniques in this evaluation are: anecdotic recordings, the descriptions of the changes in the original plan, standardised reports on

limits and achievements, minutes from meetings with the persons responsible for the programme, balance of costs of the programme, opinion surveys on the progress of the programme and interviews with the representatives of the different groups involved.

- ❖ The evaluation of the **product** or the results, is also called evaluation of impact or “summative” by Scriven, M. (1967) “ is that which is carried out once the programme has finished, its aim being to value, interpret and judge the positive and negative results of a programme, and to offer sufficient information to take decisions over the prolongation, repetition, widening or cancellation of a programmes to other contexts or spheres, Martínez Clares, P. (1996).

Again Colás, P. y Rebollo, M^a.A. (1993) pose the following questions on this type of evaluation:

- What are the achievements obtained?
- What has the programme contributed to the educative community?
- Has there been a change of attitude of the participants towards the programme?
- In what sense?

1.4 Criteria and norms for the evaluation of programmes

There is no doubt about the influence of the valuation of programmes in education over the last decades- and if this influence has been seen thanks to the setting up of ethical-scientific norms for regulating the work of the evaluators.

One of the most important contributions introduced in the evaluation of programmes, down to Tyler, has been the explicit consideration of criteria of evaluation. Suchman (1967) when proposing his scientific evaluation, puts forward five categories of criteria: effort (quantity and quality of the activities of the programme), efficiency (he separates the results of the effort, from its efforts, impact (idealness of the result in terms of the satisfied needs) cost- efficiency and processes, naming these last categories as “clarifying” ones.

It is not possible to establish criteria from a general consideration, according to Fernández Raigoso, M. y Arias Blanco (199-) we cannot state from the beginning and without reference of context, of the person responsible for the programme, the evaluator, that there are criteria that are better or worse than others for a determinate programme.

The same is considered by García Ramos, J.M. (1992), “every evaluative research, in accordance with its epistemological proposals and the methodological resources its uses, must define with the greatest precision possible its criteria when designing the evaluation of the programme.”

Brunet, L (1987) highlights the four main aspects that have to be controlled in order to make the measurement of criteria as valid as possible:

1. If the criteria that we wish to measure includes all the desired objectives of the programme.
2. Certain elements that are external to the programme that can affect the results
3. Alterations caused by the characteristics of the group, which are produced when the participants already possess the characteristics measured by the criteria.
4. The pluridimensionality of the criteria, which calls for the need to evaluate the criteria with multiple forms of measurement.

Gairín, (1993), widely lays out some of the criteria to be considered in evaluation, which we summarise in the following table:

CRITERIA	CONCEPTUAL DEFINITION
EFFECTIVENESS	Relation between what is assigned and what is achieved.
EFFICIENCY	Relation between that achieved and the means applied
UNDERSTANDABILITY	Relation between obtained gains and the affected population Relation between what is desired and what exists Relation between what is assigned and the detected needs.
SATISFACTORINESS	Appropriateness to the established ends.
SUFFICIENCY	Degree of consistency of a proposal or an activity Appropriateness to scientific laws and principles. Degree in which it can be applied
PERTINENCY	Capacity of solving concrete situations.
COHERENCE	Importance for covering individual and social needs.
OBJECTIVITY	Relation between the effective properties and those previewed.
UTILITY	
APLICABILITY	
RELEVANCE	
PROGRESS	
ACTION	

The Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation devoted in 1981 part of its efforts to the identification of the said criteria or norms of quality, born from the associations of professionals involved in the evaluation of educative programmes, integrated in the Joint Committee.

This committee, which started its activity in 1975, currently represents 15 professional American and Canadian organisations in the sphere of educative evaluation (Sanders, J.R., 1994). These norms have a dynamic character and the intention of being periodically revised. Its basic objective is to create the need for evaluations to be serious, of quality and useful.

The four main categories in which they classify the said norms can be summarised as follows:

1. *Norms of Utility.* They have to provide for a better knowledge of the characteristics of the teaching on the part of the audiences and for the consequent adoption of solidly based decisions of perfection.

They imply:

- Identification of the audience
- Credibility of the evaluator
- Selection and range of the information
- Identification of values.
- Clarity of the report.
- Diffusion of the report.
- Idealness of the report
- Importance of the evaluation

2. *Norms of de Viability.* Have to be carried out without great difficulties, with easily applied procedures. That is to it has to be a realistic, prudent, diplomatic and frugal evaluation.

They imply:

- Practical procedures.
- Political viability
- Cost-product relation

3. *Norms of legitimacy.* They should respect the rights of those involved via the carrying out and compliance with explicit agreement. They must be honourable and ethical in the presentation of the results showing the reality of the object of evaluation with its virtues and defects.

They imply:

- Formal obligation
- Conflict of interests
- Total and frank exposition.
- Right to public information
- Subject rights
- Human interaction
- Balance of the report
- Responsibility

4. *Norms of Precision.* The evaluation has to be seen to be free of influences, offering valid and bona fide conclusions, as to the features of the object of study.

They imply:

- Identification of the object
- Analysis of the context
- Described proposals and procedures
- Sources of trustworthy information
- Valid and trustworthy measurement
- Systematic data control
- Analysis of the quantitative information
- Analysis of the qualitative information
- Founded conclusions
- Objective report

Fixing these evaluation criteria also represents an arduous task, which Van de Ven and Ferry (1980) make easier by proposing a six-point guide to be carried out:

- 1) Choose criteria that have grading so that they can be discriminative.
- 2) Research those criteria that explain or are related to the number of variables.
- 3) Look for those criteria that are less difficult to measure.
- 4) Determine whether the criterion is associated with a dependent, independent or modulating variable.
- 5) Classify the criteria by levels of analysis.
- 6) Reach a consensus between users and evaluators on the most appropriate criteria.

Many authors highlight and explain the need and importance of criteria and norms of evaluation. Sanders, J. R. (1985); De la Orden, A. et al (1992); Villa Sánchez, A. et al (1996); Escudero Escorza, T. (1996); etc.

The two reasons that Sanders, J.R. (1985) gives to justify the need for these norms of evaluation are:

1. The literature on evaluation of programmes has increased substantially since 1985 and it is difficult to cover individually; therefore it is necessary to collect and analyse the point of view contained in a field that is so widespread.
2. What has increased is the need for evaluation in the field of education. As a consequence, it makes it necessary to transmit suggestions and warnings for the practice of educative evaluation.

2. Methodology of the Evaluation of programmes

Centring our interest on the methodology of the evaluation of programmes, basing our attention on theoretical suppositions previously mentioned and on the definition of the evaluation of programmes. We consider the stages, dimensions and objectives of the evaluation of programmes, which according to the cited author the evaluator has to follow when it comes to tackling an evaluation of this kind. He sets his ideas out in the following table and we will develop the ideas afterwards:

STAGES	DIMENSIONS	OBJECT
The Programme Itself	Intrinsic Quality of the Programme.	Content of the Programme. Technical Quality. Evaluability.
	Appropriateness to the Context	Necesidades y carencias. Needs and failings Prioritisation.
	Appropriateness to Starting Situation	Viability.
The programme in terms of its development		Sequences. Timing. Framework Flexibility.
The programme in terms of its results.		Affirmation. Contrast. Critical analysis. Appraisal. Incorporation of improvements.

Stages, dimensions and object of the evaluation of programmes. Pérez Juste, R. (1995 y 1995 a)

Thus, **the first stage** in the evaluation of programmes is, the evaluation of the programme itself. This entails the analysis of :

1. *The intrinsic quality of the programme*; with the objective being to set the programme in motion in favourable conditions and to facilitate the later diagnostic analyses and the decisions for improvement. In specific terms, the criteria and methodology with which we are to attend to the objects of analysis are the following:

A) The content of the programme.

Fundamental Criteria : Coherence of the programme with its theoretical fundaments.

Methodology: Critical analysis, by experts, of the content of the programme in relation to the fundamental base.

B) Technical quality of the programme.

Criteria: Design of the programme in conformity with technical demands. Plan, system, order, appropriateness, and coherence.

Methodology: Critical analysis, by experts, of the content of the programme

B) Evaluability of the programme

Criteria: provision of sufficient, appropriate and relevant information, in order to appraise both the

quality as well as the efficiency in efficient frameworks

Methodology: critical analysis, by experts in evaluation, of the content, language, and methodology included in the programme.

1. *Appropriateness to context*; with the object being to detect whether the programme responds to the necessities/ failings of the subjects, seeking the maximum level of adjustment and to determine whether this is done after appropriate prioritisation.

Criteria: coherence between the programme and necessities.

Methodology:

- Observation of the reality: detection of failings, conflicts, and dysfunctionalities.
- Consulting personnel: formal and informal techniques.
- Analysis of documents
- Prospective analysis
- Deduction starting from the theory.

3. *Appropriateness to the starting point*; with the objective being to appraise the viability of the programme and promote the motivation and involvement of the users and the rest of the personnel.

Criteria:

- Realism in the previsions of means, resources, time, and personnel.
- Participation, involvement, and degree of consensus of the community in the implantation, design and incardination of the programme.

Methodology: contrast between an inventory of resources available and those demanded by the programme.

The **second stage** in the evaluation of programmes is the evaluation of the programme in terms of its development. We break down this process in the following points:

1. *Objectives*

Facilitate the timely taking of immediate improvement decisions (in programmes already validated)

Accumulate information for later decisions, once the programme has been validated (first evaluations of a programme).

2. *Object of the evaluation.*

Sequences

Timing

Framework of the programme

Ease for adaptation

3. *Criteria*

Conformity with the planning

Existence of irregularity/maladjustments

Appearance of non-programmed effects

Appropriate behaviour of personnel (attendance, participation, "morale" ...)

Satisfaction of personnel

Effective incardination in the Centre's Plan

4. *Methodology.*

Observation of the processes
 Dialogue with the personnel
 Formal interviews with all the members of the community
 Formal information collection techniques
 Triangulation

And the **third stage** in the evaluation of programmes is the evaluation of the programme in terms of its results. The methodological approach of this is as follows:

1. *Objectives.*

Determine the efficiency of the programme as it was effectively developed.
 Decide about the maintenance, suppression or modification of the programme, after the analysis and consideration of the corresponding achievements.
 Systemize information in relation to decisions of improvement for the programme.

2. *Object of evaluation.*

The achievements of the programme without cutbacks in: contents, techniques and sources of data.

3. *Criteria.*

- Preset levels
- Levels of other programmes
- Levels of programme in other applications
- Price/success relation
- Circumstances.

4. *Methodology.*

- Different designs, from the purely experimental, be they from groups or where n=1, to the co-relational elements, and moving on to those with a quasi-experimental nature.
- Measurement of the effects

In other words, what the evaluator of educative programmes does, is to ask questions about the quality of the same, trying to respond to them via a process of research.

Joining and giving shape to all the questions that the evaluator poses, we get to see the framework and the orientation of each one of the evaluative investigations; that is to say, as Escudero Escorza, T (1996: 291) states “the content of the evaluative research is shaped and in short we define its meaning.”

To sum up

Evaluation is currently considered as a fundamental component of the way systems and institutions function, as stated by Medina Rivilla, A. y Villar Angulo, L.M. (1995:25), “The aim is to control the quality of its processes and products in order to attend to the inexcusable challenge of permanent improvement.”

Thus we are dealing with a transcendental fact for educative quality, and the evaluation of programmes presents itself as being “an unavoidable demand” in this continual and permanent search for improvement of Education.

II. GUIDELINES FOR THE EVALUATION OF PROGRAMMES

In the following text we will find a series of **indicators** (aspects on which to focus representing signs of the variables to be valued) to which the appropriate **criteria** should be applied. The elements making up each guideline are in the form of questions to which answers should be given.

In general the best quality that a data collection tool should possess is its being totally coherent with the reality being evaluated, acceptance, rejection or modification is a technical task that should be carried out by the teacher or teachers interested in this task. In this way determinate items may, in specific cases, be irrelevant; on the other hand, at times it may be necessary to pay deeper and closer attention to some of the indicators proposed here. Here are the guidelines:

<p>STARTING POINT: EVALUATION OF THE PROGRAMME ITSELF</p> <p>1. INTRINSIC QUALITY OF THE PROGRAMME</p> <p>2. APPROPRIATENESS TO THE CONTEXT</p> <p>3. APPROPRIATENESS TO THE STARTING POINT</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Have the scientific and socio-psychological fundaments of the programme been explained? 2. Is the treatment given to the themes, theories, and events appropriate/ distorted/ imbalanced? 3. Are the contents of the programme up to date or out of date? 4. Can the included contents be considered relevant from scientific, social, psychological and pedagogical (with an educational value) standpoints? 5. Does the programme include objectives, activities, resources, methodology, and evaluation systems? 6. Can we consider the objectives to be congruent with the scientific – curricular proposals, with social demands and the evolutionary characteristics of the target beneficiaries? 7. Is internal coherence given between the various elements of the programme and those in relation to the aim and goals sought in the project? 8. Is the programme designed in line with the diversity of differential characteristics: motivation, interests, capabilities, etc, of the recipient pupil body. And of the teaching staff teaching the material? 9. Is the information contained in the programme, in terms of its later evaluation, deemed to be sufficient, relevant and appropriate? <hr/> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 10. Does the programme propose democratic, cooperative and implicational operation of the centre? And does it facilitate such a function among the teaching staff? 11. Does the programme contemplate the need for the centre to cooperate with families when it is necessary for the development of the programme? 12. Have meetings been proposed with the teachers in the centres in terms of planning and implanting the new programme? 13. Is there data (reports, records, minutes, etc) in the education centres where there is a wish for the programme to be implanted, on the needs and deficiencies of the pupil body related with the thematic contents of the programme? And is there data on the training and informational needs and deficiencies of the teachers? 14. Are tools and tests of a diagnostic nature (questionnaires, interviews, etc) available in order to detect educational and informational needs and deficiencies of the target audiences involved in the programme: teachers, pupils, management teams, etc.? 15. Does the programme foresee a system of initial adjustment to the deficiencies and difficulties detected in the different target audiences, such as information days, training seminars, tutorial systems, etc.? <hr/> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 16. Does the programme answer the needs of those interested? 17. Have the necessary physical areas, calendar (dates and timetables) , human and material resources been envisaged for the implementation of the programme? 18. Are the persons responsible capable and equipped for the development of the programme? 19. Have follow-up meetings been planned with the team of teachers responsible for the development of the programme in the different education centres? 20. Will the programme be subjected to approval by the whole teaching team of the education centres? And likewise by the parents?
<p>SECOND STAGE: THE APPLICATION PROCESS OF THE PROGRAMME</p> <p>1.THE SETTING IN MOTION OF THE PROGRAMME</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 21. Is the methodology proposed in the programme considered appropriate for the development of the objectives? 22. Do the pupils show interest and motivation towards the activities of the programme? And the teachers involved? 23. Are significant advances appreciable in the achievement and sequence of the activities proposed? 24. Is it possible to detect significant gaps in the foreseen time schedule? 25. Does the planning respect the physical areas, timetables, institutional support, resources, etc.? 26. Are the partial levels of success seen to be distant from or tailored to those proposed? 27. Is a rigid or flexible approach being given to the application of the programme? <hr/> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 28. Is it possible to appreciate conflicts and tensions among the staff of the education centre that could have repercussions on the development of the programme?

<p>2. FRAMEWORK OF APPLICATION OF THE PROGRAMME</p>	<p>29. Can we categorise the relationship between teachers and pupils during the development of the activities linked to the programme as being cordial or problematic?</p> <p>30. Is it possible to detect any incompatibility or overlap between the objectives or proposals of the foreseen programme and the educational project of the centre in which the programme has been implemented?</p> <p>31. Is it possible to note harmony between the organisation and discipline in the classroom(s) in which the programme is being developed and the organisational and disciplinary system of the centre in general?</p> <p>32. Is there a sense of confidence in the use and success of the programme among the teachers? And among the pupils?</p>
<p>THIRD STAGE: FINAL EVALUATION OF THE PROGRAMME</p> <p>1. MEASUREMENT AND ACHIEVEMENTS</p> <p>2. APPRAISAL</p> <p>3. CONTINUITY</p>	<p>33. Have measures been taken to assure the technical quality of the tests that will be used to appreciate the levels of achievement of the programme?</p> <p>34. At the time when the programme was designed, were the tests and other tools created for the collection of data planned with the aim to guarantee the maximum coherency with the objectives?</p> <p>35. Does the programme use varied information collection techniques that are both qualitative and quantitative, in accordance with the diversity of the objectives of the programme?</p> <p>36. Are the performance criteria and the levels of achievement of the programme specified?</p> <hr/> <p>37. Are the criteria and references or standards for appraising the final results of the programme specified in a clear and precise way?</p> <p>38. Are the criteria and references of the standards of quality applied, in compliance with the previsions and technical demands of these types of projects?</p> <p>39. Is there wide and precise information available, on the initial and proceeding stages of the programme, as a base for appraising the final results?</p> <hr/> <p>40. Would you describe the style of work between the persons responsible for developing the project as participative, collaborative, directive or authoritarian? ¿</p> <p>41. Is there an institutionalised evaluation process, in such a way that the results are laid out in new programme processes?</p> <p>42. Are specific tasks assigned to the persons responsible for the changes to be introduced in the programme?</p>

III. CRITERIA AND INDICATORS FOR THE EVALUATION OF PROGRAMMES

This document has been produced in accordance with the Autonomous Communities of the whole Spain. It is a guide for the evaluation of Comenius 1.1 projects, which attends to the aspects established by the European Commission and to some national aspects and those of Autonomous Communities, which has been created for use by evaluators to facilitate their work.

CRITERIA AND INDICATORS FOR THE EVALUATION OF EUROPEAN PROJECTS. CALL 2005

- These criteria and indicators have been agreed upon in the meeting of the National Assembly and representatives of Autonomous Communities for which reason they should be taken into account by the selection committees of the Socrates Programme in the 2005 call. Naturally, they should be adapted, if required to the calls of each Autonomous Community.
- We have focused on the selection criteria common to all types of projects, to these we will have to add the criteria specifically designed for linguistic and adult projects, as well as those pertaining to the Autonomous Communities, if there be any.
- In order to facilitate the work of the selection committees we have pointed out in the document the sections of the form where the information referring to each criteria can be found (we recommend, however, a thorough reading of the form before proceeding with the appraisal of each section).
- We do not show the score that each indicator should receive, since this depends on the existence of additional criteria in the Autonomous Communities. We will leave this theme for a later stage.

SECTIONS OF THE FORM	CRITERIA AND INDICATORS
Sect.A (summary of the project) Sect. C7-9 Sect. C7-9 Sect. D (Comenius Plan)	European Dimension (<i>it is not in the yardsticks but we must take it into account</i>) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exportability of the products or the methodology of the projects • Real exchange of information, experiences and good practices among participating teachers • Real exchange between students • Plan for overcoming language barriers • Contents focusing on questions related with Europeanism: citizenship, constitution, etc. • Products resulting from the join work of international association • Relation with the objectives of the Socrates Programme
Sect. B	1. Teaching staff, areas involved and the interdisciplinary aspect Quantitative criteria (0-30%, 40-80%, 80-100%) will be applied to the following aspects : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teaching staff • Areas involved • Interdisciplinary aspect • Management team
Sect. C1 Sect. C10 Sect. C3	2. Clarity in the objectives and expected results <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coherence between the justification/needs, objectives, activities, and results/products • Coherence with the PCC/PGA • Objectives and results shared with all partners
Sect. C1	3. Innovatory character <i>:This aspect will always be appraised from the context of the applicant and scores will be awarded to the project for the project's innovatory aspect in terms of:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Theme subject • Methodology • Resources • Results/product
Sect. B	4. Balanced representation of geographically dispersed countries, regions, types of centres... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Geographic balance • Variety of the types of centres
Sect. C2	5. Work plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coherent and realistic scheduling • Sequencing of individual and group activities • Precision in the detail of the activities • Coordination and task distribution in the centre and among the partners
Sect. C4	6. Evaluation plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Criteria which permit the detection of strong and transferable elements of the project as well as the aspects liable to improvement • Instruments that will be used for evaluation of both the process as well as the product. • Scheduling • Persons responsible for the evaluation
Apt. C5	7. Diffusion strategies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Target sectors • Procedures to be followed • Persons responsible • Approximate calendar
Sect. C6	8. Incidence of the project on the attention to improvement of school success of students with educative and social needs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is perceived • It is fixed • It appears clearly plausible • Action plan is set out in detail