



12/2017

IMPACT ASSESSMENT PLAN (draft)
(Deliverable 18)



The European Commission support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents which reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

Table of Content

1.	Introduction and framework	3
2.	The QM-concept: criteria, experts, objects	10
2.1.	Criteria-based evaluation	10
2.1.1.	<i>Scientific and methodological correctness</i>	11
2.1.2.	<i>Transparency</i>	12
2.1.3.	<i>Holistic approach</i>	13
2.1.4.	<i>Feasibility</i>	14
2.1.5.	<i>The European dimension</i>	15
2.1.6.	<i>Target orientation</i>	16
2.2.	Definition of the evaluation expert	17
2.3.	Object of the project evaluation	19
3.	Evaluation of the project levels - methods, instruments and measuring points	24
3.1.	Level 1: quality assurance during the project process	24
3.1.1.	<i>Item 1: The snapshot analysis (deviation analysis)</i>	25
3.1.2.	<i>Item 2 and Item 3: Project meetings and phases</i>	49
3.1.3.	<i>Evaluation procedure – process level</i>	52
3.2.	<i>Level 2/Item 4: Administration level and financial management</i>	53
3.3.	<i>Level 3/Item 5: Product level (general perspective)</i>	55
3.3.1	Problem identification	55
3.3.2.	<i>Conclusion and ROIs of general relevance</i>	55
3.4.	<i>Level 4: Dissemination and exploitation level</i>	57
3.4.1.	<i>Introduction</i>	57
3.4.2.	<i>Item 6 and Item 7: Dissemination and valorisation concept (Deliverable 21)</i>	57
3.4.3.	<i>Item 8: The project website (Deliverable 22)</i>	59
3.4.4.	<i>Item 9: Information workshops (Deliverable 23) and Transnational Conference (Deliverable 27)</i>	61
3.5.	<i>External project monitoring</i>	62
3.5.1.	<i>External evaluator</i>	62
3.5.2.	<i>Evaluation by the EACEA</i>	62
4.	Overview and summary	63

1. Framework and deductions

1.1. Framework set by project idea and application

The *Impact Assessment Plan (IPA)* is the main instrument for measuring the impact potential of the project's main products on short-, mid- and long-term perspective.

In a first step, it is very important analyse once again what the main aims and objective of the project are. In accordance with the project application (*description of the action p44f*) the following should be achieved:

- Production of specific results for supporting policy actions aimed at preventing early school leaving among pupils (especially from areas at risk and/or disadvantaged backgrounds).
- Promoting of diversity in learning environment for ensuring educational success of children in primary and secondary junior schools.
- Development of models of intervention on early school leaving based on inclusive didactics to be replicated and exploited.
- Reduction of school dropouts in long-term perspective, and an increased levels of youth democratic participation.
- Focus on student's their personality development, emotional intelligence, life situation and cultural background as main drives for triggering self-assessment processes that could lead to early school leaving.
- Development of comprehensive policy based on results of an European survey implemented on main target groups (pupils, parents, teachers, school managers) in Bulgaria, Italy, Poland and Spain.
- Promotion of ESL prevention and addressing diversity in learning environment.
- Collecting and exchanging of European pedagogical practices and tools based on inclusive didactics and on diversity of learning styles, aimed at fostering integration of children with difficult backgrounds.
- Improvement of pupils' emotional and social competences.

-
- Creation of supportive learning environments.
 - Improving of knowledge, skills and competences of primary and secondary junior school teachers.
 - Initiation of new school curricula for improving pupils' emotional and social competences and create learning environment based on inclusive didactics.
 - Involvement of parents at main project activities on promotion, training and testing level.
 - Implementation of sustainable platform for peer learning and mutual exchange among national authorities in charge of school education (for adopting common policies and for implementing ET2020 framework and objectives)

To assure the best possible and also sustainable realisation of these aims, *Work Package 6 (WP)* make visible what already has changed during the project's lifetime and what is still likely to be changed after the project has finished. The main questions to be answered is how the project's work and outcomes can and will determine educational and social settings in each of the partner.

The project group's idea is to directly involve most relevant target groups (school managers, teachers, parents and policy makers) at monitoring, assessing and validating the learning model, including both the methods and the tools as early in the project as possible.

Methodologically, the application foresees a *peer assessment* procedure: In each of the pilot countries a peer of representatives of above mentioned target groups will be built up. These groups will meet regularly and will jointly give feedback concerning to which level they estimate real impact of the FAS model (including methods and tools); a main focus should be put on inclusive education in terms of pupils' level of wellness at school, perception of learning environment, emotional competences and life skills and awareness of their own learning style.

Based on the outcomes and results of the impact evaluation *P6/Fondazione Alario* should be able to create a report which contains at least following areas (mainly deducted from WP5):

- Efficiency of the new learning model in preventing and reducing ESL;
- Effectiveness of the new learning methods in enhancing pupils' wellness at school, perception of learning environment, emotional competences and life skills and awareness of their own learning style;
- Quality of the interaction among teachers and students/teachers and parents;
- Quality of the interaction between students;
- Level of improvement in learning assessment;
- Satisfaction level about new models of teachers/students and parents;
- Level of integration of the performed activities in the institutional didactic activities of the schools involved.

Overall, following outputs and results of the FAS will be considered by the impact evaluation activities

Fig. 1: Project outcomes and results effected by impact evaluation

WP N°	Start	End	Results & outcomes	Medium available	Languages available	Target groups/potential beneficiaries
WP4	02-2018	05-2019	N° 10-EUROPEAN PEDAGOGICAL MODEL FOR INCLUSIVE EDUCATION – experimentation protocol – preliminary version	Electronic format	ENG, ESP, ITA, POL, BUL	Primary and secondary junior schools, policy makers, project stakeholders
WP4	02-2018	05-2019	N° 11-STUDY CIRCLES PLAN FOR TEACHERS TRAINING	Electronic format	ENG	Primary and secondary junior school teachers, policy makers, project stakeholders
WP4	02-2018	05-2019	N° 12- STUDY CIRCLES FOR TEACHERS TRAINING	Meetings, Skype call, videos	ENG, ESP, ITA, POL, BUL	Primary and secondary junior school teachers
WP4	02-2018	05-2019	N° 13-TRAINING PATHS FOR PARENTS - PLAN	Electronic format	ENG	Primary and secondary junior school pupils' parents, policy makers, project stakeholders
WP4	02-2018	05-2019	N° 14- TRAINING PATHS FOR PARENTS	Meetings, Skype call, videos	ENG, ESP, ITA, POL, BUL	Primary and secondary junior school pupils' parents
WP4	02-2018	05-2019	N° 15-LEARNING COMMUNITY	Web	ENG	Primary and secondary junior schools, policy makers, project stakeholders, teachers and parents
WP7	04-2017	01-2020	N° 25-STAKEHOLDER FORUM	Meetings, Web	ENG, ESP, ITA, POL, BUL	Primary and secondary junior school key actors, policy makers, project stakeholders
WP7	04-2017	01-2020	N° 26-RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE REFERENCE POLICY IN EU MEMBER STATES	Electronic format	ENG, ESP, ITA, POL, BUL	Primary and secondary junior school key actors, policy makers, project stakeholders

1.2. Deductions and considerations for the *IPA* development

Following deductions and considerations provide the basis of the *IPA* as developed until December 2018:

- a) Actually, it is a good indicator of high-quality assessment and evaluation work if it starts very early in the project. On the other hand, this has the disadvantage that the plan cannot consider all those activities, outcomes and results which still are to be developed. This means, only at a later stage, when the project had made more progress and products as well as their aims are clear, a valid *IPA* can be developed. The *IPA* developed at the moment has to be understood as a draft concept.
- b) In the application, the *IPA* is very much focussed on pedagogical, personal-development and social levels. Of course, these levels are very important for assessing or estimating the project's impact. However, additionally to these levels we also would suggest to have a look at its transferability to other settings (institutions, countries, cultures etc.), not only spotted from a pedagogical point view but also from a set of feasibility indicators (such resources available, learning cultures, awareness of topics etc.)
- c) When working with the peer group assessment method, one has the clear advantage that experts from different fields can contribute with their knowhow and experience which often leads to holistic evaluation results of high quality. However, the weak point of group assessment is that not members of a peer have always same expertise towards an objective of evaluation and that often more dominant members influence the assessment output of less dominant one (although there is not necessarily a positive correlation between *dominance* and *expertise*.) This has to be considered when working with peer groups.
- d) As already considered in the Quality Management Plan, the *IPA* in general has to follow basic requirements of *scientific and methodological correctness*. One of the essential quality indicators is a high degree of

transparency. It should assure that all relevant parties (pupils, school managers, teachers, parents, public authorities etc.) participate cooperatively and with a spirit of mutual confidence in the evaluation process. Therefore, they need to get informed in a transparent manner about the concept, procedure, results and consequences of the evaluation and if they have unrestricted access to the data and the results.

- e) A high-quality impact assessment concept must take into account to clearly communicate at the start from which perspective the evaluation is being carried out, which quality standards, indicators and parameters are being used as benchmarks and what ultimately it is intending to achieve.
- f) In this context it also seems only to be fair that all parties involved get informed about any consequences the outcomes of their impact evaluation might have or if there aren't any.
- g) The IPA must also assure that it pictures a holistic view on the objective of assessment. The FAS project works on a very complex objective determined on many levels by many indicators; this means, the whole topic can be viewed from different perspectives, and their quality changes depending upon the approach and the observer. It is obvious that such complexity cannot be captured exclusively by using *one* method or *one* instrument. The application already provided that different stakeholders and experts get questioned however the IPA has now to make sure that they won't get asked the same questions.
- h) *Feasibility* is the next quality indicator to be respected. The IPA needs to be aligned with the available financial, personnel and time resources. Additionally, it has to be relatively simple to use and quick to understand.
- i) The IPA also has to take into considerations that its strategic planning as well as its operational implementation will occur from a distance:

Partner organisations implementing the assessment and the organisation in charge setting up this assessment plan and developing the assessment tools are located in different countries. They do not meet shortly before or during the assessment phase. Therefore, instructions must be clear and understandable, also for the assessment managers.

- j) The IPA also should allow assessment on different activity levels, such as institutional, local/regional, national and European. This is even more important since the FAS project is funded under ERASMUS+/Support of Policy Reform/Policy experimentations.

2. Data collection – draft guidelines and forms

Below you find forms which support you to collect evaluation feedback by all partners in charge of pilot implementation, either alone or in cooperation with other partners. When working with them, please consider the following:

- a) The areas of impact assessment are based on:
- frameworks given by the application
 - indicators defined in connection with setting-up the field research
 - findings/outcomes of field research and deductions made (still in progress)
 - feedback/recommendations given by external experts, target groups etc. (still in progress)
 - desk research by P8, supported by all partners (still in progress)
- b) At the moment, forms are available for 7 areas of impact; each of the areas is defined by 10 indicators.
- c) Before starting with the work, each form needs to be customise by inserting pending data and by selecting the country where the assessment was implemented, the partners involve and the sample of assessors.

-
- d) Not for all areas of assessment all assessors have necessarily to be involved; much more it is recommended to select only those experts which are competent enough to give *reliable* and *valid* feedback.
- e) The indicators will be assessed on bases of an eleven-score Likert Scale reaching from "-5/*very negative/poor*" to "+5/*very positive/good*"; the score "0" stands for "*neither/nor*".
- f) For assuring a certain level of *objectivity*, all assessors involved have to agree on one(!) quantitative score.
- g) For explaining the choice of selection, short statements need to be inserted at the box "Comments".
- h) If an agreement cannot be reached, the box called "NCA" "*no consensus achieved*" needs to be ticked. In this case, the box "Comments" is obligatory to be filled with detailed information explaining why no agreement was able to be achieved and what the main arguments of the conflicting persons/groups was.
- i) Partners will be granted a certain flexibility when implementing the different peer assessments. Of course, the best possible was if all members of a peer regularly meet physically and present their individual assessment, discuss it with all others and then will jointly negotiate and agree on one quantitative evaluation plus a short written comment. However, this seems not to be realistic in all cases since it will be difficult always to gather all members of a peer physically at the place at the same time. Therefore, following methods (and their combination) of data collection are valid:
- physical meeting of peer
 - virtual meeting of peer (e.g. by Skype meeting)
 - written assessment by peer members
- j) In any case, it will be the obligation of the partner in charge of the national impact assessment to summarise all assessment received (orally or in written) and to provide P8 with one(!) completed assessment form for each assessment area.



2.1. Impact Area N°1: Wellbeing

Impact Area N°1:	Wellbeing		
Location of implementation:	[please insert]	Date/period:	DD/MM/YYY-DD/MM/YYYY
Country:	<input type="checkbox"/> BG <input type="checkbox"/> ES <input type="checkbox"/> IT <input type="checkbox"/> PL	Partners involved:	<input type="checkbox"/> P1 <input type="checkbox"/> P2 <input type="checkbox"/> P3 <input type="checkbox"/> P4 <input type="checkbox"/> P5 <input type="checkbox"/> P6 <input type="checkbox"/> P7
Sample of peer:	[insert number] students (over 10 years) [insert number] parents		

Did the following items change to the better, worse or remain the same:	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4	5	NCA	Comments
1 Feeling comfortable and safe													
2. enjoying class room(s) and school premises													
3. enjoying learning in general													
4. enjoying classes													
5. feeling respected and treated fair by teachers													
6. feeling respected and treated fair by classmates													
7. knowing to be heard and supported when struggling with learning													
8. knowing to be heard and supported at other kind of troubles/problems													
9. feeling that school is interesting													
10. feeling that school is important													



2.2. Impact Area N°2: Social relations at school

Impact Area N°2:	Social relations at school		
Location of implementation:	[please insert]	Date/period:	DD/MM/YYYY-DD/MM/YYYY
Country:	<input type="checkbox"/> BG <input type="checkbox"/> ES <input type="checkbox"/> IT <input type="checkbox"/> PL	Partners involved:	<input type="checkbox"/> P1 <input type="checkbox"/> P2 <input type="checkbox"/> P3 <input type="checkbox"/> P4 <input type="checkbox"/> P5 <input type="checkbox"/> P6 <input type="checkbox"/> P7
Sample of peer:	[insert number] students (over 10 years) [insert number] teachers [insert number] parents [insert number] managers/directors		

Did the following items change to the better, worse or remain the same:	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4	5	NCA	Comments
1. relation/cooperation between students and directorate													
2. relation/cooperation between students and teachers													
3. relation/cooperation between parents and directorate													
4. relation/cooperation between parents and teachers													
5. relation/cooperation between parents and students													
6. relation/cooperation between parents													
7. relation/cooperation between students													
8. relation/cooperation between teachers													
9. relation/cooperation between other: [please indicate]													
10 relation/cooperation between other: [please indicate]													



2.3. Impact Area N°3: Learning styles

Impact Area N°3:	Learning styles		
Location of implementation:	[please insert]	Date/period:	DD/MM/YYYY-DD/MM/YYYY
Country:	<input type="checkbox"/> BG <input type="checkbox"/> ES <input type="checkbox"/> IT <input type="checkbox"/> PL	Partners involved:	<input type="checkbox"/> P1 <input type="checkbox"/> P2 <input type="checkbox"/> P3 <input type="checkbox"/> P4 <input type="checkbox"/> P5 <input type="checkbox"/> P6 <input type="checkbox"/> P7
Sample of peer:	[insert number] students (over 10 years) [insert number] teachers [insert number] parents		

Did the following items change to the better, worse or remain the same:	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4	5	NCA	Comments
1. Did learning get a better/worse meaning?													
2. Feeling of pressure by parents													
3. Feeling of pressure by teachers													
4. Level of learning motivation													
5. Awareness of different learning styles													
6. Acquisition of new learning styles													
7. Time investment in learning													
8. Increasing of personal strengths													
9. Decreasing o personal weaknesses													
10. Improvement of grads/marks													



2.4. Impact Area N°4: Life skills

Impact Area N°4:	Life skills		
Location of implementation:	[please insert]	Date/period:	DD/MM/YYYY-DD/MM/YYYY
Country:	<input type="checkbox"/> BG <input type="checkbox"/> ES <input type="checkbox"/> IT <input type="checkbox"/> PL	Partners involved:	<input type="checkbox"/> P1 <input type="checkbox"/> P2 <input type="checkbox"/> P3 <input type="checkbox"/> P4 <input type="checkbox"/> P5 <input type="checkbox"/> P6 <input type="checkbox"/> P7
Sample of peer:	[insert number] students (over 10 years) [insert number] teachers [insert number] parents		

Did the following items change to the better, worse or remain the same:	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4	5	NCA	Comments
1. Awareness of life skills													
2. Skills in decision making/problem solving													
3. Creativity skills													
4. Critical thinking skills													
5. Effective communication skills													
6. Personal relationship skills													
7. Self-awareness skills													
8. Empathy skills													
9. Coping with emotions													
10. Managing stress													



2.5. Impact Area N°5: Social & emotional competences

Impact Area N°5:	Social & emotional competences		
Location of implementation:	[please insert]	Date/period:	DD/MM/YYYY-DD/MM/YYYY
Country:	<input type="checkbox"/> BG <input type="checkbox"/> ES <input type="checkbox"/> IT <input type="checkbox"/> PL	Partners involved:	<input type="checkbox"/> P1 <input type="checkbox"/> P2 <input type="checkbox"/> P3 <input type="checkbox"/> P4 <input type="checkbox"/> P5 <input type="checkbox"/> P6 <input type="checkbox"/> P7
Sample of peer:	[insert number] teachers [insert number] parents [insert number] managers/directors		

Did the following items change to the better, worse or remain the same:	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4	5	NCA	Comments
1. Pro-active contributions of students to learning activities													
2. Pro-active contributions of students to other activities (games, theatre, sports etc.)													
3. Student's behaviour towards teachers													
4. Student's behaviour toward parents													
5. Pro-active engagement in peers/groups													
6. Abilities to express own feelings/emotions													
7. Keeping rules and regulations													
8. Abilities and openness to express own feelings/emotions													
9. Vandalising of school property													
10. Pro-active conflict-solving within students' peers													



2.6. Impact Area N°6: Drop-out rate

Impact Area N°6:	Drop-out rate		
Location of implementation:	[please insert]	Date/period:	DD/MM/YYYY-DD/MM/YYYY
Country:	<input type="checkbox"/> BG <input type="checkbox"/> ES <input type="checkbox"/> IT <input type="checkbox"/> PL	Partners involved:	<input type="checkbox"/> P1 <input type="checkbox"/> P2 <input type="checkbox"/> P3 <input type="checkbox"/> P4 <input type="checkbox"/> P5 <input type="checkbox"/> P6 <input type="checkbox"/> P7
Sample of peer:	[insert number] teachers [insert number] managers/directors		

Did the following items change to the better, worse or remain the same:	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4	5	NCA	Comments
1. Drop-out rate within pupils (<10 years) ¹													[insert number of % of drop-out rate's increasing/decreasing]
2. Drop-out rate within students (>10 years)													
3. Pupils announcements to drop-out school soon													
4. Students announcements to drop-out school soon													
5. Parents announcements to take pupils out of school													
6. Parents announcements to take students out of school													
7. Image of "early school leaving" within pupils													
8. Image of "early school leaving" within students													
9. Expected development of drop-out rate within the next 2 years (pupils)													
10. Expected development of drop-out rate within the next 2 years (students)													

¹ please note: "-5" means strong increasing of drop-out rate, "5" means strong decreasing of drop-out rate



2.7. Impact Area N°7: Sustainability, transferability, impact

Impact Area N°5:	Soc		
Location of implementation:	[please insert]	Date/period:	DD/MM/YYYY-DD/MM/YYYY
Country:	<input type="checkbox"/> BG <input type="checkbox"/> ES <input type="checkbox"/> IT <input type="checkbox"/> PL	Partners involved:	<input type="checkbox"/> P1 <input type="checkbox"/> P2 <input type="checkbox"/> P3 <input type="checkbox"/> P4 <input type="checkbox"/> P5 <input type="checkbox"/> P6 <input type="checkbox"/> P7
Sample of peer:	[insert number] managers/directors [insert number] external stakeholders		

How do you estimate the following:	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4	5	NCA	Comments
1. Sustainable usage of FAS method and tools at pilot schools (by staff involved at pilots)													
2. Sustainable usage of FAS method/tools by pilot schools' staff not involved at pilots													
3. Transferability of FAS method/tools to other schools in your country													
4. Transferability of FAS method/tools to schools outside your country													
5. Transferability of FAS method/tools to other education providers facing high drop-out rates													
6. Impact on institutional school policy level (=at your school)													
7. Impact on local/regional policy level													
8. Impact on national school policy level													
9. Impact on European school policy level													
10. Impact on future EU projects on combating early school leaving													

3. Timeline and responsibilities (draft)

For the moment, following draft impact assessment plan can be drawn:

Timeline	Activities	Partners involved
Dec 2017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development Impact Assessment Plan draft version (Del. 16a) 	P8
Jan – Mar 2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revision of basic structure, approaches, impact areas and indicators of impact assessment plan Discussion and joint deductions at project meeting 2 	P8, all partners
until Oct 2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of European Model for Inclusive Education (Del. 10) 	All partners
until Dec 2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of Study Circles Plan for Teachers' Training (Del. 11) 	P1
until May 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementation of Study Circles for Teacher's training (Del. 12) 	All partners
until Dec 2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Training paths of parents – plan (Del. 13) 	P7
until May 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Training paths of parents (Del. 14) 	Pilot partners
until May 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Learning community (Del. 15) 	NA
May – June 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identification of new impact according to finalised products and lessons learnt during project implementation Elaboration of 10 indicators for each of the new impact areas Revision of assessment areas and indicators from the draft impact plan Elaboration of Impact plan – final version 	P8
Jun – Aug 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluation of final version of Impact plan and revision 	All partners, P8
Jun – Aug 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Set-up of national peers for impact evaluation (10 schools managers, teachers, parents, students and policy makers) 	Pilot partners
Sept – Oct 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementation of 5 peer assessment sessions and data collections in each of the pilot countries 	Pilot partners
Oct – Nov 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of four national peer group assessment reports and delivery of data to P6 	Pilot partners
Dec 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of overall impact report 	P6