



Education and Culture

**Leonardo da Vinci**

# **REFLECTIVE QUALITY DEVELOPMENT FOR TEACHERS AND TRAINERS THROUGH SELF EVALUATION**



REFLECTIVE EVALUATION

**(SECOND COUNTRY REPORT)**  
**(GERMANY)**

*(IRINA MICHEL; MANFRED SALLACH)*

*(BIAT, UNIVERSITY OF FLENSBURG)*

*(MAY 2007)*

---

|          |  |           |
|----------|--|-----------|
| <b>1</b> | <b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>                              | <b>1</b>  |
| 1.1      | CONTEXT OF TESTING .....                               | 2         |
| 1.2      | BACKGROUND OF TESTING.....                             | 2         |
| <b>2</b> | <b>EVALUATION OF TESTING.....</b>                      | <b>3</b>  |
| 2.1      | WORKING WITH A SELF REFLECTION INSTRUMENT.....         | 3         |
| 2.2      | FEEDBACK ON THE TOOL STRUCTURE .....                   | 4         |
| 2.2.1    | <i>System level.....</i>                               | <i>5</i>  |
| 2.2.2    | <i>Institutional level.....</i>                        | <i>5</i>  |
| 2.2.3    | <i>Team/Interpersonal level.....</i>                   | <i>6</i>  |
| 2.2.4    | <i>Individual level.....</i>                           | <i>6</i>  |
| 2.3      | SIX TRANSVERSAL QUALITY AREAS.....                     | 7         |
| 2.3.1    | <i>Values &amp; Roles .....</i>                        | <i>7</i>  |
| 2.3.2    | <i>Teaching &amp; Learning.....</i>                    | <i>8</i>  |
| 2.3.3    | <i>Self evaluation &amp; Quality Development .....</i> | <i>8</i>  |
| 2.3.4    | <i>Work conditions.....</i>                            | <i>9</i>  |
| 2.3.5    | <i>Assessment &amp; Recognition.....</i>               | <i>9</i>  |
| 2.3.6    | <i>Networking &amp; Collaboration.....</i>             | <i>10</i> |
| 2.4      | REFLECTION METHODS.....                                | 10        |
| 2.4.1    | <i>View of teachers and trainers.....</i>              | <i>10</i> |
| 2.4.2    | <i>View of institutions .....</i>                      | <i>11</i> |
| 2.4.3    | <i>View of stakeholders.....</i>                       | <i>11</i> |
| 2.5      | REFLECTION APPLICATIONS (PICTURES, VIDEO, AUDIO).....  | 11        |
| 2.5.1    | <i>Using pictures.....</i>                             | <i>12</i> |
| 2.5.2    | <i>Using audio.....</i>                                | <i>12</i> |
| 2.5.3    | <i>Using video.....</i>                                | <i>12</i> |
| <b>3</b> | <b>CONCLUSIONS.....</b>                                | <b>13</b> |
| 3.1      | RECOMMENDED IMPROVEMENTS FOR THE TOOL .....            | 13        |
| 3.1.1    | <i>Improving the layout.....</i>                       | <i>13</i> |
| 3.1.2    | <i>Improving the structure .....</i>                   | <i>13</i> |
| 3.1.3    | <i>Improving the content.....</i>                      | <i>13</i> |
| 3.1.4    | <i>Improving the methods for reflection .....</i>      | <i>14</i> |
| 3.1.5    | <i>Improving the usability.....</i>                    | <i>14</i> |
| 3.1.6    | <i>Improving the communication.....</i>                | <i>14</i> |
| 3.2      | HELP TEACHERS AND TRAINERS REFLECT .....               | 14        |
| 3.3      | REFLECTIVE QUALITY DEVELOPMENT IN EUROPE .....         | 15        |
| <b>4</b> | <b>ATTACHMENTS.....</b>                                | <b>16</b> |
| 4.1      | QUESTIONNAIRS .....                                    | 16        |
| 4.2      | LIST OF TESTED INSTITUTIONS .....                      | 22        |

# 1 Introduction

At a cursory glance, the project Reflective Evaluation leads to a confusion for those who get across the concept of the newly constructed self reflection instrument. The measurement of quality and result oriented quality objectives is not part of the methodology of this reflective quality development tool.

National and international discussions put a tremendous weight on the aspect of quality *assurance*. The different characters of the European Quality Assurance Framework (CAQF) are based on the statement of output oriented quality characteristics on the system level and on the level of the VET provider (cf. EC 2004; <http://www.qavet.com>). The project Reflective Evaluation, however, aims at creating an instrument which will promote self evaluation for quality *development* based on a set of reflection methods on four levels of reflection (system, institution, interpersonal, individual level) and six quality development areas (Work Conditions, Teaching & Learning, Values & Roles, Assessment & Recognition, Self evaluation & Quality Development, Networking & Collaboration). A new conception of the *development of quality* was considered necessary for the construction of the self reflection instrument. This reflection instrument is aiming at a reflection oriented design of quality development. It is meant to support teachers and trainers working in CVET to reflect on their teaching/training quality. In other words: The reflection on teaching/training quality is the crystallization field of the instrument for self evaluation and reflection. As a main product of the project Reflective Evaluation the reflective quality development instrument and its new conception of the development of quality is in the focus of this second country report. This report gives a detailed description of the test phase results of the prototype tool and informs about the organisation of the test phase and its methodology.

## 1.1 Context of testing

Teachers and trainers involved in testing the tool worked with the tool. Prior to the final testing the interviewed teachers and trainers had a chance to get acquainted with the content of the tool and to carry out preliminary testing. Standardized questionnaires followed by interviews/discussions were the main method of recording teachers' and trainers' comments, views and perspectives. Prior to this second testing the teachers and trainers were involved into the construction discussion of the instrument for self evaluation and reflection at the basis (i.e. asked about their perception of self evaluation and reflection, quality development and self empowerment as well as their needs for tools of reflection and technical features for a quality reflection instrument)<sup>1</sup>. Thus above all they have been involved in finding answers to the key question: "What kind of reflection methods and materials lead to a change in one's own teaching and training quality"?

## 1.2 Background of testing

The testing of the tool was carried out mostly with teachers and trainers representing institutions from the northern states in Germany that work with long time unemployed with reduced aid taking part in government make-work projects. One questionnaire for each main actor in CVET and one for stakeholders was developed. The testing was carried through thoroughly in May and June 2007 and helped answering the key question "which role do self evaluation and reflection play for quality development" in the field of CVET.

The following sections discuss the teachers' and trainers' feedback, suggestions and comments that have arisen as a result of testing the self evaluation tool.

---

<sup>1</sup> The results of the first testing are summarized in the First National Report by all partners of the project team and can be downloaded at <http://reflective.bazaar.org> .

## 2 Evaluation of Testing

### 2.1 Working with a Self reflection Instrument

It is presumed that the teachers and trainer's reflection and self evaluation of their daily actions pave the way for a successful and ongoing quality improvement. All interviewed teachers and trainers but also the responsible of their respective institutions as well as stakeholders considered self evaluation and reflection as *the motor* for quality development. Especially teachers and trainers expressed their appreciation to work with an instrument that would help them to look at their daily work performance and motivate them to yield new findings for their teaching and training quality. All interviewed teachers and trainers agreed that a systematic and consistent reflection on the quality development of their work performance should be part of their daily quality approach but admitted also not to see an opportunity to allocate time for this important task within their daily schedule. Thus, construction the tool for the purposes of the institution's own needs the amount of exercises needs to be reduced to the main key questions so the tool does not appear to be overwhelming with too many exercises to start with.

Furthermore a great need in the communication of personal experiences with teaching and training was expressed by all teachers and trainers when working with a self evaluation tool for a reflective quality development.

## 2.2 Feedback on the Tool Structure

The self evaluation tool is categorised into four different levels (system, institution, team, individual level and six quality development areas (dimensions)). The four levels are related to each other; they determine or influence each other in different ways.

The overall feedback given by the interviewed groups was positive and encouraging. Most of the interviewed teachers and trainers considered the tool structure to be easy to use and it was emphasised that the accessibility and transparency of the tool are the important and encouraging features for employing the tool in practise. The interviewed teachers and trainers emphasised also, that the strength's of the tool lies in its availability, flexibility, adaptability and consolidation of different perspectives. However, at the start of the test phase it was noted that more explanations are needed on various terms and definitions and that it was not clear enough what was meant by each level.

The six key quality areas allowed teachers and trainers to reflect on their daily work performance and the target groups' specific requirements and needs. It was stressed that the tool could help to highlight a number of issues that need to be taken into account when developing quality. The division of the dimensions was viewed as sensible and relevant in the context of the tool. All dimensions were regarded important for reflection as well as most of the examples given in the instrument. The bibliography and search function which was not fully developed by the time of this testing period was considered to be important and necessary to include.

The tool was considered to be a potentially helpful instrument to be used if there is time allocated for such activity. Nevertheless, it has been noted that the tool could not be employed on a daily basis but rather used as a pool of materials and reflection ideas and methods during special training days when teachers and trainers have time to work with their colleagues developing quality.

The layout of the tool was considered to be appealing and sophisticated. Apart from some minor technical suggestions for improvements the teachers and trainers did appreciate very much the reflection possibilities and the multi-media approach for reflection.

### **2.2.1 System level**

The system level takes into account the societal conditions, the political conditions and the economic context of CVET provision. On this level criteria are formulated which point out power relations in society. It is obvious that these conditions can not be influenced or changed directly by a single person or a small group, but the idea was to give teachers and trainers the opportunity to talk about their suggestions regarding these conditions which are worth to discuss with others and which could then be put forward to local policy and decision makers.

Teachers and trainers considered the system level to be important as society promotes the interests of the teachers' profession and the interest of the public in relation to the profession but for the reflection on their daily actions they did not prefer to work with this level. The exercises in this level were not considered to support reflection adequately on daily work actions but rather as a support for the discussion on the distribution of information concerning the feasibility, restriction, costs and benefits of training quality and evaluation which was seen as low by the teachers and trainers who tested the instrument.

### **2.2.2 Institutional level**

The institutional level focuses in detail on the conditions and requirements within the institution which provides a CVET scheme/ course. On this level the teachers and trainers find questions which deal with the activities and the processes within CVET courses and programmes. The criteria in this level are mostly formulated as questions and contain exercises that concern the personal situation of the teachers and trainers and their participants in the institution. The interviewed teachers and trainers saw a large potential for the exchange of information and experiences among their colleagues on this level.

The institutional level was viewed by teachers and trainers to support staff in enterprises to communicate in a more structured way, work together more efficiently and effectively and to help reflection to come to widely accepted decisions within the institution.

### **2.2.3 Team/Interpersonal level**

The team level focuses on the interaction and the relation between teachers and trainers and the learners of their schemes/courses. On this level teachers and trainers find different methods to reflect and evaluate about their interpersonal actions as a teacher and trainer.

The interviewed teachers and trainers were mostly interested in this level concerning interpersonal contacts as they wished to communicate their experiences and looked out for feedback given by colleagues and students. They believed that productive teamwork moves you toward challenge, through change, with more confidence, working well on any team generating energy and enthusiasm for work and related quality. They were convinced that a set of problems can be overcome if an atmosphere of trust can be established. With such a trustworthy atmosphere furthermore inclusion is encouraged and a start given for a corroborative, balanced strategy for reaching the committed vision. The instrument helped them to reflection on what tasks and help are necessary to realise the overall vision. And they believed that the team mates themselves were in the best position to supply this information.

### **2.2.4 Individual level**

The individual level focuses on the perspective of teachers and trainers. On this level teacher and trainers find many different methods to reflect and evaluate actions and experiences of teachers and trainers in CVET.

The individual level and the material presented in this level were of most interest to the teachers and trainers as this level refers to their personal perspective of teaching and training quality. Not only for their own professional development, but to use also for the development of classroom quality, teachers and trainers are interested to reflect about resources and lesson plans as well as related materials as well as their role and value as a teacher and trainer.



## **2.3 Six Transversal Quality Areas**

The quality reflection areas are developed in the course of the Leonardo da Vinci project “Reflective Evaluation” aiming to yield at reflection processes which can be used for a continuing improvement of quality. The quality reflection areas are defined in a way that they do not focus on the delectability or measurability of a condition but that the actual teaching and training situation is in the focus of reflection as reflection itself is presumed to help detect actions to improve quality. The quality reflection area “Work conditions” was in the main interest in Germany and therefore mainly tested by the involved CVET institutions though all dimensions were considered relevant or important by the tested institutions. The most outstanding feedback given was that teachers and trainers expressed their need for more practical topics, among which a step-by-step plan for implementation, examples or references to evaluation models, portfolios, timetables for teachers/pupils, trajectory maps, modules, supporting general education, trajectory guidance for teachers/students, references to legislations should be given. The examples were considered to be clear but were seen as not stimulating enough to come to findings. It was considered to be more stimulating if colleagues would directly get a feedback from the instrument and could directly talk and learn from each other. However, the possible answers proposed in the exercises were considered to be eye-openers.

### **2.3.1 Values & Roles**

The teacher is considered to be the learning tutor/consultant. In this quality area for reflection it is presumed that teachers and trainers can improve their training and class quality if they change their self-conception (values) and their different ways of acting (roles). Teachers and trainers are well aware of the fact that their self-conception and different ways of acting can contribute to the improvement of teaching and training quality. Therefore the key question for the quality reflection area Values & Roles was formulated asking: “What kind of self-conception supports the teaching and training quality”?

The interviewed teachers and trainers are mostly interested in finding out how their Values & Roles influence the learning quality of their students and how they can support those Values & Roles that help different ways of knowing about an issue, including personal stories, life experiences. Teachers and trainers were interested in continuous learning, experimentation, improvisation and creativity to foster creative and critical thinking which would lead to informed, competent decisions when dealing with Values & Roles topics.

### **2.3.2 Teaching & Learning**

The interviewed teachers and trainers want to support the learner's needs. They know that they have a strong influence on the learning process. They are aware that the teaching and training methods can improve the quality of teaching. The Teaching & Learning quality reflection area encourages reflection on teaching and training and how organisational, institutional, interpersonal and societal contexts influence this. Teachers and trainers like to shape their teaching and training contents and therefore preferred methods for reflection that help them think about the underlying didactic orientations and how the acting of the learners can be supported. The quality area for reflection in the tool aimed at the key question: "How can the students be placed in the centre of the learning process".

Inclusion was considered to be an important topic by teachers and trainers as they wanted to ensure that their students could contribute and influence the decision-making process. Furthermore they were interested to cultivate mutual trust and respect for dialogue among people with diverse backgrounds and viewpoints. Therefore creative, collaborative solutions, an improved communication were most important to the interviewed teachers and trainers when looking at the quality reflection area Teaching & Learning.

### **2.3.3 Self evaluation & Quality Development**

This section aims to encourage reflection on self-evaluation and quality development in the training process in order to promote and improve the performance of teachers and trainers, as well as their attitude and behaviour. It also addresses other aspects such as planning, strategies, resources, evaluation and outcomes.

In recent years self evaluation has received more attention in Germany and consequently, there exist different approaches and methods. Whereas only a few decades ago, evaluation has been mostly applied to assess programmes and their corresponding impacts, evaluation and as a special form of it self evaluation is now additionally linked to quality management and organisational development. The teachers and trainers mentioned that this evolution will lead to an increasing demand for discussions concerning theories, models and methods to be used by professionals who teach evaluation or conduct evaluation research. So the teachers and trainers wish for a continuous interchange among all people who are concerned with or interested in (self-) evaluation. The increasing demand for evaluation was considered though to have many risks but also chances. One of the risks of evaluation they related to the quality of evaluation and the professionalizing of practitioners which they found was addressed well in the exercises of the tool.

### **2.3.4 Work conditions**

Work conditions play a great role in influencing the improvement of training and teaching quality. The interviewed teachers and trainers were aware of the fact that their work conditions, learning environments and conditions for training and teaching influence the conditions of training and teaching quality. By influencing the conditions of teaching and training, teachers and trainers realise to have an immediate influence on the improvement of training and teaching quality. Therefore teachers and trainers preferred reflection possibilities that focus on the environmental support that makes a development of training and teaching possible. How work conditions be shaped to improve the quality of teaching and training is the key question in the tool's quality reflection area. Teachers and trainers preferred the reflection on: the organisation of work at their institution, employment opportunities, the social status they have as a teacher/trainer and the possibilities for continuous training and how they affect their work and well being.

### **2.3.5 Assessment & Recognition**

Few CVET teachers are prepared to face the challenges of courses assessment because they have not been given the opportunity to learn to do so. Thus teachers rarely have the opportunity to learn how to use assessment as a teaching and learning tool. They believe that the vigorous efforts to assess learning through various layers of standardised tests cannot overcome the effects of misdiagnosis of student needs, students' misunderstanding of their own ability to learn, miscommunication about the students progress.

The quality reflection area Assessment & Recognition helps teachers and trainers to identify and reflect on the many different forms of learner assessment, its mechanisms and methodologies as well as its purpose, aims and impacts from all four perspectives, from the individual teacher/trainer up to the institution and broader system. It also addresses the recognition of learning / skills e.g. course accreditation or certification of competencies. Teachers and trainers believed that the reflection on assessment could help to serve the two purposes of assessment: inform decisions and motivate learning. They also believed that assessment could not only contribute to the development of effective institutions but also be used for the assessments for learning. Especially engaging students in regular self-assessment so that students can watch themselves grow over time and thus feel in charge of their own success concerned most teachers and trainers. Teachers and trainers expressed their need for

reflection exercises to assess for learning, to use the course assessment process and the continuous flow of information about student achievement to provide to advance student learning.

### **2.3.6 Networking & Collaboration**

In this quality reflection area the teachers and trainers find a number of exercises and debate questions regarding networking and cooperation. The interviewed teachers and trainers agreed mostly that there are many good reasons for working and cooperating in a network and that it can contribute to personal development. Teachers and trainers found a number of exercises which strengthened and improved their reflection and understanding on the concepts of networking and cooperation. Teachers and trainers believed that the best support for them comes from other teachers and trainers most often. This is why they were interested how to support a wide range of networks and courses that can help them to further professional development.

## **2.4 Reflection Methods**

The interviewed parties were asked what kind of reflection methods they believe lead to an optimisation of teaching and training situations. The answers were expectedly diverse but all believed that without the appropriate reflection methods a reflection process could not be started. The tool offers at least five options to work with reflection exercises: drag & drop, continue a text phrase, one choice answer (radio), checkbox question, textbox with comment box which the interviewed parties tested jointly.

### **2.4.1 View of teachers and trainers**

The more a reflection method helped teachers and trainers to “play” with the answers the more they liked the challenge of answering the reflective exercises. Drag & drop questions were first choice whereas to continue a text phrase was disliked as it did not seem to support

an interesting start into reflection. If pictures, audio or video were attached, teacher's and trainer's motivation was higher to pay attention to the presented exercise.

### **2.4.2 View of institutions**

The responsible within an institution believed that teachers and trainers would be most interested working with reflection methods that included multimedia. They did not expect teachers and trainers would like to fill out exercises with text answers. Thus they did expect teachers and trainers to like reflection methods that would help them to answer in a creative, playful way.

### **2.4.3 View of stakeholders**

Stakeholders believed teachers and trainers would be most interested working with reflection methods that included multimedia. They did not expect teachers and trainers would like to fill out exercises with too many playful choices. Stakeholders did though expect teachers and trainers to be interested in reflection methods that they could themselves develop.

## **2.5 Reflection applications (pictures, video, audio)**

User motivation is something that has to be earned and maintained throughout useful experiences. Most of the interviewed teachers and trainers did not at first put as much emphasis on multimedia applications (audio, video) as those responsible and stakeholders believed they would. But almost all of them preferred those materials in the self reflection instrument that were using pictures or technical challenges (as drag and drop). In this context it is important to mention that by the time of the testing in May 2007 rather view translated materials using audio and video were implemented in the self reflection instrument and therefore teachers and trainers were not able to rely on examples. Further testing after May 2007 showed though how important multimedia applications are for reflection and all

interviewed<sup>2</sup> agreed that pictures, audio and video helped them to find the tool more appealing and useful.

### **2.5.1 Using pictures**

Pictures were used as an additional help for reflection or sometimes even introduced as a method for reflection. Teachers and trainers preferred exercises when pictures were included.

“Pictures stimulate reflection” was mentioned by one of the interviewed teachers and this also summarises what most of the teachers and trainers mentioned when asked about their motivation to use the instrument when pictures are attached or used for reflection.

### **2.5.2 Using audio**

Audio exercises interested especially teachers and trainers that were also during their spare time listening to a lot of broadcasting or other audio options (teaching materials, read out news paper articles etc.). Teachers and trainers stated that audio exercises should be connected to real teaching and training class situations or to authentic problems or help the reflection by reading out the longer text versions of exercises so they become more entertaining.

### **2.5.3 Using video**

Most teachers referred to the potential drawbacks of using video and the different possibilities of using video for reflection. Criteria for selecting video were that the videos should be authentic and would animate them to want to watch the video. Furthermore scenes should be chosen that are visual. The more visual a video is, the easier it is to understand as long as the pictures illustrate what is being said. The picture and the sound needs to be clear as well as the density of the amount of language spoken in a particular time for comprehension. So the clarity of speech, speech rate and accents are all factors in determining how appealing a video is to teachers and trainers.

---

<sup>2</sup> The results of the testing will be published.....

The content of the video should be suitable and appropriate for the reflection on quality development of teaching and learning. Additionally completeness was mentioned to be important to teachers and trainers, so that the video told a complete story or a complete message. Furthermore the length was also mentioned to be of importance as it should not have been longer than 30 seconds to 10 minutes depending on the reflection objective.

## **3 Conclusions**

### **3.1 Recommended improvements for the tool**

The instrument for self evaluation and reflection aiming at quality development was viewed as potentially beneficial in terms of reflecting on planning, constructing and implementing changes into the work process. The tested groups shared the view that the tool works best with the a given flexible approach that allows teachers and trainers to work with exercises at their own pace, either on their own or within a group of experts.

#### **3.1.1 Improving the layout**

Since the layout was approved by all tested groups only minor changes need to be taken into account for the intensity of colours and the size and type of the font used.

#### **3.1.2 Improving the structure**

The levels need to be made explicit and more explanation should be given. The dimensions need more explanation and background information.

#### **3.1.3 Improving the content**

The exercises should aim at a more practical and personal approach to motivate teachers and trainers reflect. The amount of exercises need to be reduced to the main key questions so the tool does not appear to be overwhelming with too many exercises to start with. The bibliography needs to contain more interesting and useful materials.

### **3.1.4 Improving the methods for reflection**

From the given feedback the conclusion can be drawn that the methods for reflection should enhance the playfulness and creativity of the teachers and trainers for reflection. Furthermore the visual support must be enhanced as well as more multimedia applications included.

### **3.1.5 Improving the usability**

The registration should be made explicit by giving feedback that the user has been registered. The instruction information area should be improved and enlarged. A search function needs to be included to find interesting topics more easily. The instrument needs to be technically improved; some bugs need to be taken out and some features reviewed or changed in order to be more self explaining.

### **3.1.6 Improving the communication**

The instrument was considered to be even more useful if the communication between the teachers and trainers would be enhanced. In order to achieve this a handbook on recommendations about ‘how to work with the tool’ and “ how to improve the internal communication with such an instrument” should be handed out to the institutions.

## **3.2 Help teachers and trainers reflect**

The tested instrument was considered by all interviewed to be of help for the reflection on the quality of one’s own work performance. Reflection was seen as a transversal quality area and clearly outlined to be the starting point for any evaluation activity in the field of CVET. However, to succeed with such an instrument, a “quality push” must engage the enthusiasm of the entire institution. The institutional leaders must create the right atmosphere for this to



happen. They must create an environment where each employee feels totally free to express an idea or concern through the instrument. This can only be done if there is no stigma attached to being incorrect. For this all criticism must be seen as kind and constructive and failure must be accepted. If the team is unable to try out ideas without rebuke for errors, then the scope of solutions would be severely limited.

Furthermore to be lasting, quality must become a habit and a habit is accustomed practise which would take time and training. To habituate the staff working in an institution to quality, everybody's views and suggestions must be heard. Regular weekly meeting to discuss quality can be a starting point. Benefits are that regularity will lead to habit, the formality will provide a simple opportunity for the expression of ideas, and the inclusion of the whole group at the meeting will emphasize the collective responsibility.

Quality is a question of attitude. Quality costs less than its lack. If one of the team spots a modification in the procedures which will have a long term benefit, so time should be allocated specifically to discussing improvement.

### **3.3 Reflective quality development in Europe**

The teachers and trainers shared the view that the tool could become a really important and helpful instrument for reflection on a transnational basis. The tool's value is emphasised by its international aspect, which would allow considering and taking into account examples and possible approaches from a number of European countries. Furthermore the comments box in the tool was seen to provide opportunities for both national and transnational cooperation and sharing expertise. A reflective quality development in Europe could be started if a number of institutions would agree to work together using the instrument as a basis for common reflection.

## 4 Attachments

### 4.1 Questionnaires

Questionnaire for stakeholders/experts

Do you think that this instrument can help teachers and trainers (in CVET) to improve the quality their work?    yes  no

Do you think this form of self evaluation can be seen as continuing training?    yes  no

What do you think of the reflection possibilities in the tool?

a)        **Checkbox**    **good**  **bad**

b)        **Drag and Drop**    **good**  **bad**

c)        **Continuing text phrase**    **good**  **bad**

d)        **Radio choice**    **good**  **bad**

e)        **Textbox**    **good**  **bad**

What do you think of supporting reflection with multi-media?

- f) Pictures good  bad
- g) Audio good  bad
- h) Video good  bad

What do you think of the structure of the instrument?

- i) Six dimensions good  bad
- j) Four levels good  bad

Should each user be able to put in his own materials/questions

so he can share these materials with others? yes  no

What would you like to change about the instrument?

What do you like most about the instrument?

*Working with the instrument as a user (Trainer / Teacher)*

What do you think of the layout? Is it

- k) attractive
- l) clearly layed out
- m) confusing
- n) takes some time to get used to it
- o) well known through other applications
- p) not pleasant

What do you think of the structure of the instrument? Is it

- q) Sixdimensions good  bad
- r) Four levels (System-level, Institution-Level, Team/Interpersonal-Level, Individual-Level) good  bad

How convenient is it to use this instrument for self evaluation? Is it

good  bad

Do you believe this tool to be user friendly? Is it

good  bad

What do you think of the amount of information given?

too much  too little

What do you think of the methods for reflection?

s) Checkbox

good  bad

t) Drag/drop

good  bad

u) CTP

good  bad

v) Radio

good  bad

w) Textbook

good  bad

What do you think of using the following multi-media items for reflection?

x) pictures

yes  no

**y) audio**

yes  no

**z) video**

yes  no

**Does this instrument meet your need for reflection?**

yes  no

**aa) Which methods do you prefer when reflecting about yourself and your work performance?**

---

---

**bb) Which methods in the instrument do you think of to help you best to reflect about your experiences and quality of your work?**

---

---

**Do you think there is a need for such an reflection instrument (not necessarily in your institution)?**

high  low

---

**Do you think your institution could profit from such an instrument?**

yes  no

**Do you believe this instrument can help you to improve the quality of your work?**

yes  no

**Do you believe the reflection about the national and international structures of CVT can help you to improve the quality of your work?**

yes  no

**Is the computer as a tool helpful for your self evaluation, is it**

- cc) bothering**
- dd) helpful**
- ee) motivating**
- ff) indifferent as the same can be expected by working on paper**

**Do you find that this form of self evaluation is part of your own continuing training?**

yes  no

**How well can you describe yourself?**

---

**Do you need to be encouraged to use the instrument? If that is the case which incentive would you need?**

yes  no

---

**Do you like to add your own material to the tool (criteria for self evaluation)?**

yes  no

**Which recommendations and wishes do you have for the further development of this self evaluation instrument?**

---

|  |
|--|
| <b><i>II. Work with the instrument as a developer of materials (questions)</i></b> |
|--|

**Does the material/questions encourage you to gather up more information?**

yes  no

**Would you like to develop further materials for your institution?**

yes  no

**Would your team/kolleagues like to use this instrument?**

yes  no

**What would you like to change/improve in this tool?**

**What do you like best about this self evaluation instrument?**

What would you like to use this self evaluation instrument for?

**III. Those responsible**

What do you think of the structure of the instrument?

a. Six dimensions  
good  bad

b. Four levels (System-Level, Institution-Level, Team/Interpersonal-Level, Individual-Level)  
good  bad

2. How big do you estimate is the need to use an instrument for self evaluation (not necessarily this one) in your institution?

high  low

Do you believe your institution could profit from this self evaluation tool?

yes  no

Would your department/project like to use this self evaluation instrument?

yes  no

What would you like to be changed?

What do you like best about the instrument?

What would you like to use this instrument for?

## 4.2 List of Tested Institutions

| Date       | Location  | Duration | Interview partners       | Name of the Organisation | Professional background     | Background of the Institution                          |
|------------|-----------|----------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|--|
| 07.05.2007 | Flensburg | 60 min.  | Werner Nielsen<br>Tatzel | Zeitraum e.V. Flensburg  | Responsible                 | CVET institute work with                               |
| 21.05.2007 | Flensburg | 75 min.  | Ute<br>Schönamsgruber    | Zeitraum e.V. Flensburg  | Trainer for young<br>adults | with reduced aid taking p                              |
| 09.05.2007 | Flensburg | 60 min.  | Claudia Schreier         | Universität Flensburg    | Scientific researcher       | BIAT (Institute for Vocat                              |
| 09.05.2007 | Flensburg | 60 min.  | Matthias Becker          | Universität Flensburg    | Juniorprofessor at<br>biat  | including Work Research<br>is an institute of the Univ |
| 09.05.2007 | Flensburg | 60 min.  | Bodo Reiner              | Universität Flensburg    | Scientific researcher       |  |



Attachments

|            |            |          |                    |   |   |  |
|------------|------------|----------|--------------------|---|---|--|
| 09.05.2007 | Flensburg  | 60 min.  | Stephan Schmidt    | Universität Flensburg   | Student at biat   | in this field.                                     |
| 09.05.2007 | Flensburg  | 60 min.  | Christian Bauer    | Universität Flensburg   | Scientific researcher                                   |  |
| 09.05.2007 | Flensburg  | 60 min.  | Reiner Schlausch   | Universität Flensburg   | Professor at biat                                       |  |
| 13.05.2007 | Itzehoe    | 120 min. | Silke Dibbern-Voss | Jugend und Beruf e.V.,<br>Wilster   | Responsible   | Educational training insti                         |
| 21.05.2007 | Wilster    | 20 min.  | Sonja Mohr         | Jugend und Beruf e.V.,<br>Wilster   | Trainer for long-time-<br>unemployed                    | Working with long time                             |
| 14.05.2007 | Flensburg  | 60 min.  | Michael Schmidt    | IG-Metall, Flensburg  | Responsible for<br>Flensburg and CVT<br>trainings       | Metal Union  |
| 15.05.2007 | Birkenfeld | 70 min.  | Fr. A. Fey         | Elisabeth-Stiftung des DRK<br>Birkenfeld  | Responsible und<br>trainer for a Youth-<br>Help-Program | One of the biggest CVET                            |
| 15.05.2007 | Birkenfeld | 15 min.  | Hr. Fett           | Elisabeth-Stiftung des DRK<br>Birkenfeld  | Responsible for job<br>preparation courses              | They work with long tim                            |
| 15.05.2007 | Birkenfeld | 40       | Hr. Fett           | Elisabeth-Stiftung des DRK<br>Birkenfeld  | Teacher   | One of the biggest CVET<br>They work with long tim |
| 15.05.2007 | Flensburg  | 25       | Hr. E. Ewald       | IHK Flensburg   | Consultant for CVET                                     | Chamber of commerce an                             |
| 17.05.2007 | Brokdorf   | 90       | Udo Schirmmacher   | Deutsche Telekom Training   | CVT teacher and<br>trainer                              | Telecom internal vocatio                           |
| 22.05.2007 | Flensburg  | 45       | Michael Lüthje     | bequa, Beschäftigungs- und<br>Qualifizierungsgesellschaft<br>Flensburg mbH              | Trainer in a wood<br>workshop                           |  |
| 22.05.2007 | Flensburg  | 45       | Kurt Juhl          | bequa, Beschäftigungs- und<br>Qualifizierungsgesellschaft<br>Flensburg mbH              | CVT teacher and<br>trainer                              | CVET training institute<br>They work with long tim |
| 24.05.2007 | Flensburg  | 35       | Matthias Rüth      | bequa, Beschäftigungs- und<br>Qualifizierungsgesellschaft<br>Flensburg mbH              | Consultant for joun<br>adults and their<br>parents      |  |
| 23.05.2007 | Flensburg  | 60       | Marion Namann      | Internationaler Bund<br>Bildungszentrum Elmshorn,<br>IB GmbH Nord /<br>Zweigstelle Nord | Responsible of<br>department                            | CVET training institute<br>They work with long tim |