



Contract No. 028545-2

QUING

Quality in Gender⁺ Equality Policies

Integrated Project

Priority 7 – Citizens and Governance in a knowledge Based Society
7.1.2. Gender and Citizenship in a Multicultural Context

**Deliverable No. 58: Monitoring and evaluation protocol for the training of trainers.
Monitoring and evaluation protocol of the on-line forums**

Authors:

Maxime Forest, Maria Bustelo
With inputs of Lut Mergaert

Due date of deliverable: 31.10.2009
Actual submission date: 03.12.2009

Start date of project: 01.10.2006

Duration: 54 Months

IWM Vienna

Project co-funded by the European Commission within the Sixth Framework		
Dissemination Level		
PU	Public	X
PP	Restricted to other programme participants (including the Commission Services)	
RE	Restricted to a group specified by the consortium (including the Commission Services)	
CO	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	

Annex II (D68)

Monitoring and evaluation protocol of the on-line forums

About monitoring and evaluating in a CoP

As stated in Guidelines for curricula standards for Gender+ training (D65), « to promote trainings with a long term impact, gender+ training should be monitored and evaluated ». In the case of a community of practice which is not merely a training activity, monitoring and evaluation should be an *internal part* of the social learning process by which the community is established. Since one of its main objectives is to trigger self-reflexivity and since its members are expressing the willingness to evaluate their own practice, monitoring and evaluation will therefore consist in a collective endeavor.

As usual, it is necessary to distinguish between monitoring and evaluation. Monitoring is strongly related to the management of the activity, in this case the CoP, and aims at controlling it is running smoothly with respect to targeted objectives. Monitoring, in particular, implies systematically gathering information and data about participation (both extensively - attendance - and intensively – degree of commitment of the members), but also other elements which are integral to the activity such as advertising, planning and content development. Meanwhile, evaluation suggests a global perspective for the assessment of the whole activity. In the case of a CoP developed on-line, evaluation should be designed in resonance with the following main objectives:

- Did the on-line forums produce knowledge on the issues addressed?
- Did they trigger self-reflexivity among participants?
- Did they favor the identification of shared concerns and repertoires of techniques, references and experiences?
- Did they generate commitment and self-identification among participants?
- Did a real community of practice emerged from the on-line forums?

Designing monitoring and evaluation protocols at the same time offers the advantage to set up systematic and periodical data collection that will adequately answer the overall purposes of the evaluation to be carried out after the 3 scheduled on-line forums.

1. Monitoring

In the case of the CoP in Gender+ training, monitoring will consist in a 5 steps and bi-dimensional process, as it will include both the collection of data by the administrator, and regular intermediate evaluation of the forums by the participants and moderators.

(A) Preliminary collection of information

Who? The Administrator

When? After pre-registration in prelude to the first on-line forum

At a first stage, biographical data of pre-registered participants will be collected by the administrator, including organizational affiliation, curriculum in gender+ training, country of exercise, audiences usually targeted. Future members will also briefly expound, in a few sentences, which personal outcomes they do expect from the upcoming forums.

At a second stage, monitoring will consist in the individual assesment by participants of each on-line forum right after closure, in the form of short questionnaires sent by e-mail to registered participants by the administrator (B), and a two pages report issued by the moderator of the active working session (forum) – (C).

(B) Individual assessment of the forum :

Who? The participants

When ? Right after the closure of the forum

- ✓ Did you find the on-line forum useful?
- ✓ Did you find the on-line forum easy to use?
- ✓ Did you find that the topics appropriately covered the issue addressed by the forum?
- ✓ Did you personally experience any problem, be it technical or cognitive, for taking part to the on-line discussions? (If yes, please indicate which problem)
- ✓ Did you learn something new about unknown or unexpected situations /experiences?
- ✓ How would you rate your own participation to the forum?

very passive

passive

active

very active

- ✓ Did you had the impression, through your contribution, to :

Mostly introducing questions

Mostly answering questions

Making a balanced contribution between asking/answering questions

✓ How would you define the overall contribution of other participants?

(2 possible answers)

vague

limited

irrelevant

well argued

stimulating

instructive

challenging

✓ How would you rate the contribution of the moderator to the framing of the discussion?

very bad

bad

good

very good

✓ How do you rate the overall usefulness of the forum if compared to the previous one?

Much worse

Worse

Similar

Better

Much better

(C) Report of the forum by the moderator

Who? The moderators

When? Within 1 week after the forum

It will include a brief outline of the working session, a reminder of the schedule and its observance (submission of topics in advance), the mention of additional data or documents uploaded on the webpage of the forum, an a short synthesis of the main arguments in relation with the selected topics. The moderator will also briefly states the strengths and weaknesses of the forum both from her/is own point of view and the one of the participants.

(D) Collecting statistical data on each forum

Who? The Administrator

When? After the completion of the on-line active working session & after the closure of the access to the forum (1 month later)

The administrator will collect basic data such as:

- The number of participants at H 0, H+2 and H+4
- The number of posts / per participants / per session / average

More substantively, s/he will attempt to collect data about:

- The number of posts sharing experience
- The number of posts providing examples / references
- The number of posts introducing new questions
- The number of duplicated posts (same comment)

The same data will be updated after the closure of the forum, i.e., one month after the completion of the active on-line working session.

(E) Aggregating data for the 3 on-line forums

Who? The administrator

When? 1 month after the completion of the 3rd on-line forum

Above-mentioned statistical data on the intensity and quality of participation will be aggregated for the whole duration corresponding to the most interactive lifetime of the CoP, that is the 3 on-line forums. These data will make possible to establish learning and participation curve lines along each forum and for the whole duration of the process.

2. Evaluation

What is to be evaluated?

➤ ***The quality and appropriateness of the on-line forum format :***

- ✓ Accessibility
- ✓ Interactivity
- ✓ Capacity to generate participation
- ✓ Consistence in participation (do the on-line forum produce desirable or undesirable effects as regarding the degree of dedication of the participants, for instance?)
- ✓ Impact on the production of knowledge on gender+ training? Contributions made through the forums to each of the topics targeted
- ✓ Learning and knowledge gained by participants. Usefulness and applicability for their practices
- ✓ Capacity to foster a real community of practice through mutual confidence and self-identification (see: definition, Section 1)?

➤ ***Degree of satisfaction of participants and moderators***

- ✓ Overall satisfaction of participants as regarding :
 - ergonomics
 - methodology
 - content
- ✓ Overall satisfaction of moderators as regarding :
 - ergonomics
 - participation, in terms of density/relevance/innovation
- ✓ Individual and collective outcomes
- ✓ Potential impact on daily work?

➤ ***Perspectives***

- ✓ Sustainability of the CoP on the basis of the 3 on-line forums
- ✓ Capacity to produce long-lasting effects?
- ✓ Changes introduced as regarding sharing experiences?
- ✓ Overcame resistances?
- ✓ A good practice?

What for evaluation will be used?

An important point is to consider what evaluation will be used for. There are at least three general main purposes for evaluation: for improvement, for accountability and for enlightenment. In the case of a CoP, however, its innovative character makes necessary to evaluate on the first place its reproducibility and its overall contribution to producing and transferring knowledge about training the trainers' activities in particular, and gender+ training in general. At a second stage, monitoring data and evaluation can be further used to set up new technical solutions, reinforce pedagogical content, adopting new incentives and tools to improve participation, for instance.

In terms of accountability, evaluation will be used to analyze the specific skills to be developed both by participants and moderators to fruitfully contribute to the making of a true community of practice.