

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR THE ICHPB COURSES

Draft concept by Claudio Acioly Jr.

During the evaluation of the course ICHPB 61, it became clear that the existing guidelines and numerical grading system were not sufficient to provide an objective, clear and simple reference to evaluate the overall performance of the participants. The evaluation of the ICHPB 62 confirmed this statement and the outcome of the evaluation raised a number of complaints from the participants.

1. CHANGES

A number of changes are suggested:

- 1.1. A simple "course unit" evaluation sheet is filled by the course unit coordinator immediately after the end of the course unit and delivered to the course secretariat . It is sent by the course secretariat to the coordinator of the workshop where the participant is registered (see model in the appendix).
- 1.2. A simplification of the existing guideline and grading system in order to meet the different categories of diplomas issued by the IHS.
- 1.3. A definition of clear criteria for awarding a "distinction" and a commendation".
- 1.4. A more strict evaluation criteria in order to issue a "certificate of attendance" whenever it is necessary.
- 1.5. The definition of evaluation components and their weight in the final evaluation.
- 1.6. The introduction of a "fact and evaluation sheet" to be delivered with the diploma and the "you" document. This will show the general performance of the participant in terms of value and not in numerical points. The numerical values are only used internally for the IHS.
- 1.7. The introduction of values that express a range of numerical values, like BA=below average, A=average, G=good and VG=very good. Within these ranges, the coordinators will use their numerical marks to make differences among the performance of participants.
- 1.8. The formulation of the "minutes" of the staff evaluation meeting of the ICHPB in order to register the discussion and the main decisions.
- 1.9. The elaboration of a simple spreadsheet for making the final calculation. The records must reflect the components of the final evaluation & fact sheet.

2. POINTS OF DEPARTURE FOR AN EVALUATION SYSTEM

In my view, it is necessary to simplify the numerical grading system and make it as clear and objective as possible.

In order to make the evaluation process as objective as possible, it is important to define what component must be evaluated, what grading system and its meaning should be used, etc. It is necessary to establish some points of departure.

2.1. The IHS issues four (4) different diplomas:

- a. Post Graduation Diploma with Distinction
- b. Post Graduation Diploma with Commendation
- c. Post Graduation Diploma
- d. Diploma of Attendance

2.2. These four categories of diploma must reflect a grading system and an evaluation criteria based on the general performance of the participant during the whole course.

2.3. The two first categories are applied to only those participants whose scores and grades are really placed above the acceptable average performance for all activities and assignments during the whole course program. Both "distinction" and "commendation" should only be awarded to those who have outstanding results.

2.4. The normal diploma is awarded to those who have had a steady and average performance during the whole course program, thus not outstanding and not special.

2.5. The diploma of attendance should be awarded to those participants who was often absent from activities and delivering assignments of poor quality, below the minimum standard acceptable by the IHS. It should be awarded to those typical passive, snicky, evasive participants.

3. THE PROPOSED FINAL NUMERICAL GRADING SYSTEM

This is a simplification of the existing numerical grading system;

NUMERICAL GRADE	GRADE	EXPLANATION
800 to 1000	VG Very Good	This might lead to a distinction if the participant did not score below 80 in all components of the evaluation & fact sheet. There is a pre-condition for awarding a distinction.
700 to 790	G Good	This might lead to a commendation if the participant did not score less than 75 in all components of the evaluation & fact sheet. There is a pre-condition for awarding a commendation.
550 to 690	A Average	This is the normal diploma. <i>Sufficient</i>
00 to 549	BA Below Average	This is a negative distinction and leads to a certificate of attendance. It is applied to those whose performance stand below the acceptable level. <i>Below Sufficient</i>

4. WHAT IS A DISTINCTION ?

A distinction is awarded to a participant who has had an excellent performance along the whole course, accomplishing high marks and higher quality standards in all assignments and activities he or she has been involved in the course units and workshop programmes.

A distinction will be awarded to those who can fulfil the following conditions:

- 4.1. The total number of points scored by the participant should be in the range 800-1000.
- 4.2. The participant should not have scored less than 80 points in every component of the evaluation & fact sheet.
- 4.3. The project report must score at least 80 points in the evaluation of the tutor.
- 4.4. The project report must score at least 80 points in the evaluation of the second reader.

- 4.5. In case the second reader is also involved in the workshop (as a tutor or workshop coordinator), a third reader must give a mark to the report as well, and that must be at least 80 points.

Is there a stereotype profile of a participant that reaches a distinction ?

Usually, he or she is a motivated, creative and active participant during the classroom sessions, reacting upon issues and presenting very clear understanding about the subjects dealt with in the workshop programme. He or she accomplishes very good results and high standards in the assignments. He or she can work independently, is able to express himself/herself both verbally and graphically, is able to formulate his/her ideas, has a logic thinking and makes use of the information provided through lectures, classroom sessions, bibliographic references, etc. This participant is able to formulate a well structured report, concise but with substance and objectivity, and with some degree of innovation while dealing with problems and searching for solutions.

5. WHAT IS A COMMENDATION ?

A commendation is awarded to those who have been a hard working participant, accomplishing good results in most of the activities he or she has been involved in the course units and workshop, reacting upon questions and issues dealt with during the course and showing familiarity with the key problems. Unfortunately, this participant is not able to reflect that in his final work. He or she misses a further conclusive step that would lead him/herself to a distinction. This participant is placed above the average and shows an ascendent line in terms of personal development from the beginning to the end of the course.

A commendation will be awarded to those who can fulfill the following conditions:

- 5.1. The total number of points scored by the participant in the final evaluation should be in the range of 750-790.
- 5.2. The participant should not have scored less than 70 points in every component of the evaluation & fact sheet.
- 5.3. The project report must score at least 75 points in the evaluation of the tutor.
- 5.4. For this category, it is not required a second reader's opinion.

COURSE UNIT EVALUATION SHEET

NAME: COUNTRY: PROFESSION: POSITION AT WORK:	photo			
COURSE UNIT I: _____				
	BA A G VG			
ATTENDANCE				
PERFORMANCE / PARTICIPATION				
EXERCISES & ASSIGNMENTS				
FINAL GRADE ACCOMPLISHED				
COMMENTS FROM COORDINATOR: 				
COURSE UNIT II: _____				
	BA A G VG			
ATTENDANCE				
PERFORMANCE & PARTICIPATION				
EXERCISES & ASSIGNMENTS				
FINAL GRADE ACCOPLISHED				
COMMENTS FROM COORDINATOR: 				
VG = Very Good (80-100) A = Average (55-69) G = Good (70-79) BA = Below Average (0-54)				

4. THE FINAL PRESENTATION

Issues to be considered when giving a mark for the presentation.

1. The participant shows a good preparation and organization for the presentation.
2. The participant shows clear improvement with the English language and is able to present his work and respond to the question in an understandable way.
3. There is clarity in the way the presentation is carried out.
4. The participant makes use of very effective visual means.
5. It is a lively and dynamic presentation that can capture the attention and interest of the audience.
6. The participant shows a great deal of creativity when dealing with the information and the main topics of his work.
7. The presentation is logic and concise, has cohesion and a well structured line.
8. The participant shows confidence in his ideas, shows strong arguments and is able to clarify the doubts of the audience.

Penalties that should be applied during the presentation:

1. Small letters and difficult to read messages that are used in the transparent sheets or in any visual material used.
2. The participant speaks with a very low volume of voice which becomes difficult for the audience to follow the presentation.
3. The participant is not able to use the time available in a proper way.

Issues to be considered in the evaluation of the Final Project Work Report:

1. A good and logic structure with an easy sequence of the subjects.
2. Clarity in the formulation of ideas and argumentation.
3. There is a cohesion in the text.
4. The English is good and very little grammatical errors.
5. There is an innovation in the way the ideas are formulated, new subjects are presented and new points of view are explored in the report.
6. There is a convincing and well formulated conclusion.
7. The introduction is well formulated.
8. The report is objective and goes straight to the points.
9. The report is easy to read and provides the reader with a pleasant feeling.

FINAL EVALUATION & FACT SHEET

NAME:

COUNTRY:

PROFESSION:

POSITION AT WORK:

	BA	A	G	VG
COURSE UNIT I				
COURSE UNIT II				
WORKSHOP ASSIGNMENTS				
PROJECT WORK REPORT				
PROJECT WORK FINAL PRESENTATION				
WORKSHOP ATTENDANCE				
PERFORMANCE & PARTICIPATION				

TRANSLATION OF THE GRADES:

VG = Very Good (80 - 100)

G = Good (70 - 79)

A = Average (55 - 69)

BA = Below Average (00 - 54)

GUIDE TO THE NUMERICAL GRADING SYSTEM

This 'Guide' gives an overview of the numerical grades that can be used to assess all kinds of participants' work: exercises, assignments, general performance, presentations, project work, directed studies, etc. The purpose of this 'Guide' is to provide a general standard, to encourage consistent and comparable grading by different course unit and workshop coordinators.

range of numerical grades	general meaning	explanatory comments
90-100	outstanding, exceptional, unusually good, perfect	Use sparingly, only if there is not the slightest doubt. In case of straightforward, numerical assignments/exercises those whose work was faultless would qualify. For project work generally , very few if any participants would qualify.
80-89	very good, excellent	Generally out of a group of 10 participants, 0 to 2 might qualify. This should represent very good or excellent results and hard work. (This level or above maintained consistently during the whole course may lead to a 'distinction').
70-79	good towards very good	Generally, this is a rather big category. The reasons why somebody might end up in this category include: hard work, leading to a very satisfactory result; or, a good result based on adequate work and good knowledge/intelligence/skills. This represents performance clearly above the average.
60-69	okay, fair, average	Again a large category. Here we find those who worked hard, with satisfactory results, but also knowledgeable bright people who worked less than they could have; this is the category for solid, 'average' results.
55-59	passable; adequate but nothing more than that; below average	This is a marginal category for those, for example, who worked hard and made progress but still produced poor results, because of lack of skills/experience/intelligence.
45-54	poor, not passable; well below average	Severe lack of skills/knowledge/understanding, or lack of attendance and/or interest, as well as a certain degree of laziness, can lead to this result. Use sparingly in case of lack of skills and understanding - only if there is no improvement over time. (This level maintained throughout the course, or a final result within this range, may lead to 'certificate' (no diploma), although in special circumstances a diploma may still be given.)

30-44	very bad (and very sad); far below acceptable level for a practicing professional	Very low quality of work. In some cases, the participants may be hampered by special factors such as chronic illness or language incapability in English, etc. This level maintained throughout the course will lead to a 'certificate' (no diploma).
below 30 (or slightly above)	self-inflicted: unacceptably bad performance (or non-performance). bad, but not sad	Only in case of clear lack of interest, very frequent non-attendance, clear 'sabotage' of course elements, etc. If this level (below 30) is maintained throughout the course: no certificate.

Point Range Award:

- 800 - 1000 Diploma; award of a Distinction will be considered, particularly if performance in all areas has been high throughout the course.
- 750 - 799 Diploma; award of Commendation will be considered.
- 550 - 749 Post-Graduate Diploma.
- 450 - 549 The award of a Diploma will be considered if, for example, performance has improved significantly during the course or if the low marks are in subjects of work outside the participant's previous experience and training.
- 300 - 449 Certificate of Attendance.
- 0 - 300 No Award.

In addition to the final award, each participant receives an official Performance report, which describes the components of the participant's work together with a brief qualitative statement about the level of performance. In addition, each participant will receive a confidential Assessment document with a full comment on performance in each part of the course, written by the individual staff teachers.

COMMENTS ON USE OF NUMERICAL GRADING SHEETS

The format for numerical appraisal for regular participants is subdivided in three parts:

- course units
- workshop
- report project work

Since course units make up about one-fourth of the course (in duration) their 'weight' is one-fourth (max. 250 out of max. 1000 points). Workshop and project work account for the remaining 750 points (maximum) with a high relative weight for the project work report.

(there is a separate numerical assessment sheet for Special Programme participants).

SEE "GUIDE TO NUMERICAL ASSESSMENT" FOR AN EXPLANATION OF THE MEANING OF GRADES OR MARKS.

These 'Comments' are intended to provide some hints about what to take into account in assessments.

- o PERFORMANCE: the score for course unit or workshop performance could take into account the following:
 - attendance
 - attention/interest
 - activity (questions, contributions to group discussions)
 - enthusiasm (in discussions, debates, role games, etc.)
 - participation in (small) group work, helping out other participants, etc.
- o REPORT (joint appraisal by tutor and second reader). Various things must be taken into consideration when judging a report. Depending on the subject, the relative weights of matters-to-be-judged may and will vary; the quality of illustrative material is more important for a design than for a policy proposal. In the following list (rough) guidelines/suggestions are given for totals of 'relative weights' (in percentages):

	Weight (%)
Structure of the report	around 10%
Originality of subject	40 - 50%
Originality of approach	
Quality of contents (originality of ideas, solidity, completeness, clarity of argument, etc.)	
Achievement of own objectives	
'Process' (self initiative, creative use of tutoring, increasing understanding/quality over time)	around 10%
Creative 'critical' use of sources (reports, data, literature, interviews, course unit/workshop lectures)	around 10%

Creative/appropriate use of illustrations
Creative/appropriate use of tables/schedules
Correctness (mention of sources, bibliography, etc.) 20 - 30%
Neatness (writing, illustrations)
Clarity/language

A tutor could work out his/her own appraisal schedule based on the above, using grades for these or other variables and applying appropriate multipliers.

o Oral presentation (appraisal by listener)

Though it is difficult to separate the quality of a report from the quality of a presentation, this is exactly what is expected from the 'listener'. The basic question to be answered is: was the participant able to present this work to an audience in a clear manner.

Take into consideration:

- timing (much longer or shorter than 20 minutes?)
- structure of the presentation (introduction, main part, conclusions; emphasis on important points, or emphasis on less important details?)
- verbal communication (loudness/clarity of voice; addressing the audience, or addressing blackboard/overhead sheets; clarity of language)
- use of visual material (appropriateness; too little, too much, just-right?)
- quality of visual material (for instance readability of overhead sheets)
- quality of discussion; did the participant answer questions in a satisfactory and clear manner?

SOME REMARKS ON THE ROLE OF 'LISTENER'

Though it is difficult to separate the quality of a report from the quality of a presentation, this is exactly what is expected from the listener. The basic question to be answered is: was the participant able to present his/her work to an audience in a clear manner.

Please take into considerations:

- timing (much longer or shorter than 20 minutes - regular participants, much longer or shorter than 30 minutes - special programme participants)
- structure of the presentation (introduction, main part, conclusions; emphasis on important points, or emphasis on less important details?)
- verbal communication (loudness/clarity of voice; addressing the audience, or addressing blackboard/overhead sheets; clarity of language)
- use of visual material (appropriateness; too little, too much, just right?)
- quality of visual material (for instance readability of overhead sheets)
- quality of discussion; did the participant answer questions in a satisfactory and clear manner?

At the end of the presentation, you are asked to give your verbal comments to the participant as well as a score in the range from 1 to 100. The score you can give either to the tutor or to Carolien.

