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Document Summary

This Report presents the results of the evaluation of the TRAILs project which, at this final stage in the project life cycle, focuses on ‘summative’ evaluation – the outcomes and impacts that can be identified. The Report also includes in an Annex the Evaluation Approach and Methodology applied to produce the Report.

Evaluation Methodology

• The overall evaluation approach applied to deliver this evaluation is based on ‘realist evaluation’ – a ‘theory-based’ approach which aims to find out ‘what works, for whom under which circumstances’. The key methodology for implementing this approach uses ‘Theory of Change’, which assesses how far the project has travelled on its expected ‘change journey’ and whether the expected outcomes and impacts have been achieved. Theory of change also considers the project ‘mechanisms of action’ – the combination of factors that lead to observed outcomes.

• Applying the approach and methodology involved combining different evaluation methods and different types of data, including statistical data (for example participation rates in the TRAILs Winter School); an assessment of the learning outcomes of Winter School participants; observation of the classes delivered; participant diaries and feedback and Focus Groups. In addition the evaluation used feedback data from the TRAILs Multiplier Events and an analysis of the monitoring data collected over the project life cycle.

Evaluation of the Participant Experience

• Evaluation of the ‘participant experience’ of the Winter School showed that the TRAILs curriculum and Winter School were a resounding success. Key positive aspects from the participant perspective included the quality and richness of the content provided; the trans-national experience, providing opportunities to collaborate with teachers and students from different countries; the balance and structure of the course (plenary sessions plus group work); the variety of the topics covered and the creation of an LSP community that could form the basis of future trans-national collaboration

• Less positive aspects highlighted focused on what was seen as the over-ambitiousness of the course, reflected in the denseness of the information provided; lack of time available to fulfill activities and tasks, and linked to problems sometimes experienced with time management

• The main benefits of participation in the Winter School for participants included acquisition of new teaching practices that would be incorporated in future teaching; acquisition of new teaching tools and strategies; improved networking; increased self-confidence. For teaching staff delivering the course the main benefits reported covered improved LSP, inter-cultural and digital knowledge; increased collaboration and inter-cultural communication and the increased internationalization of LSP through bringing together students, teachers and experts from across Europe.

Key Learning outcomes

• Overall, TRAILs Winter School participants’ LSP self-assessment scores increased by 28% on average. The largest gain was for students with an increased score of 56%, and for in-service teachers, with an increased score of 44% on average. These large learning gains are statistically significant at the 0.01 confidence level and suggest the course was very effective
• Students benefited most from the course – they lagged behind in knowledge and practical application at the start but this gap was significantly reduced by the end – a statistically significant result. Perhaps surprisingly, delivery staff – the professional educators drawn from TRAILs partners who delivered the course – also increased their LSP knowledge and practice ability by almost 10%. This suggests even the experts gained from working with their peers and with participating in-service teachers and students.

• No statistically significant differences in test scores were identified between Modules, although scores for Module 9 - Teaching ESP through Corpora – were significantly lower.

TRAILs overall performance and achievements

• The research activities in the first phase of the project – covering IO1, IO2 and IO3, which prepared the ground for the development of the Winter School curriculum and the school implementation – demonstrate significant levels of achievement, with 122 LSP programmes analysed in 25 countries, followed by a survey of LSP teacher needs that included over 620 teachers.

• In its development phase, TRAILs achieved its target with a comprehensive Winter School curriculum developed covering 11 Modules. This was then piloted in the TRAILs Winter School, which involved a total of 52 participants – exceeding its planned targets.

• The Multiplier Events, including the final (online) Conference attracted around 300 participants from a rage of stakeholder groups. Around 100 additional dissemination activities were implemented, reaching around 2,000 individuals and organisations directly, but likely to encompass a much wider constituency through engagement in conferences, posting on web sites and active participation in social media channels like Researchgate.

• Analysis of the Partner Surveys implemented periodically over the project life cycle show a relatively high level of partner satisfaction with project performance.

Outcomes and Impacts Assessment

• A review of the TRAILs Theory of Change, set against the evaluation evidence, shows that the project has had a significant positive impact in terms of increasing participant awareness of LSP training, and contributing to increasing participant knowledge and skills. The evidence that TRAILs has significantly changed the behaviours and practices of delivery staff, in-service teachers and trainees is less strong, though there is some evidence that those who took part in the TRAILs Winter School are likely to apply what they have learned in their teaching practice going forward, and that the new skills acquired will contribute to enhancing their future professional opportunities.

• The evidence supporting the longer term expected impacts of TRAILs is relatively weak. Although feedback from TRAILs Multiplier Events suggest the project has contributed to some extent to LSP knowledge transfer and good practice dissemination, there is little hard evidence that this has strengthened EU-wide collaborations. Nor is there strong evidence to support the conclusion that TRAILs is stimulating the generation of new research collaborations or is supporting the development of new programmes of study based on the TRAILs programme, thereby contributing to establishing a network of language teacher training centres and LSP teachers. However, the potential to do this is there, as evidenced by the success of the current TRAILs partnership in securing funding for a new Erasmus+ project – LSP-TEOC.Pro – that will build on TRAILs going forward, as well as evidence that the Winter School appears to have been a success in creating a European community and network of established and fledgling LSP teaching experts. In addition the planned TRAILs book will contribute to supporting further collaboration and networking.
Implications for TRAILs going forward

- The evaluation highlighted a number of areas for improving the TRAILs LSP teacher training programme, focusing on reverting back to face-to-face delivery, through a ‘blended’ pedagogic model; reducing the range of content topics on offer; improving time management and allocating more time for student-teacher communication.

- More broadly, the evaluation suggests further work is needed to create the conditions to support the project’s longer term objectives of establishing a network of language teacher training centres and LSP teachers, and in LSP teaching; increasing teacher trainee employability and increasing the attractiveness of LSP teaching in Europe, focusing on increased engagement with a wider spread of stakeholder communities; raising policymakers’ awareness of LSP teacher training, and expanding the range of collaborating organisations beyond the Higher Education sector.

- A SWOT analysis carried out to assess the sustainability potential of TRAILs suggests that the strengths of the LSP teacher training programme significantly outweigh its weaknesses, and concludes that there are positive opportunities for TRAILs going forward, with the main threat being potential continued disruption of face to face teaching as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic.

- A ‘replication readiness’ analysis for TRAILs shows a relatively high replication potential, but suggests more work is needed to increase the replication/sustainability potential of TRAILs in financial/business analysis and planning; organisational structures and systems and brand identification and recognition.
### Glossary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition and source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action research</strong></td>
<td>Practice based research, which seeks to end the dislocation of research from practice and enhance the position of research as a direct mechanism for change and improvement. <a href="http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/evaluation/guide/guide_evalsed.pdf">http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/evaluation/guide/guide_evalsed.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attribution</strong></td>
<td>The ascription of a causal link between observed (or expected to be observed) changes and a specific intervention. Note: Attribution refers to that which is to be credited for the observed changes or results achieved. It represents the extent to which observed effects can be attributed to a specific intervention or to the performance of one or more partner taking account of other interventions, (anticipated or unanticipated) confounding factors, or external shocks. <a href="http://www.worldbank.org/oed/ecd/docs/annex_e.pdf">www.worldbank.org/oed/ecd/docs/annex_e.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behavioural additionality</strong></td>
<td>Changes in beneficiaries' behaviours resulting from an intervention <a href="https://www.researchgate.net/publication/254452904_The_Behavioural_Additionality_Dimension_in_Innovation_Policies_a_Review">https://www.researchgate.net/publication/254452904_The_Behavioural_Additionality_Dimension_in_Innovation_Policies_a_Review</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contribution analysis</strong></td>
<td>Contribution Analysis is an approach for assessing causal questions and inferring causality. It offers a step-by-step approach designed to help managers, researchers, and policymakers arrive at conclusions about the contribution their program has made (or is currently making) to particular outcomes. The essential value of contribution analysis is that it offers an approach designed to reduce uncertainty about the contribution the intervention is making to the observed results through an increased understanding of why the observed results have occurred (or not!) and the roles played by the intervention and other internal and external factors. <a href="http://betterevaluation.org/plan/approach/contribution_analysis">http://betterevaluation.org/plan/approach/contribution_analysis</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Counterfactual</strong></td>
<td>The situation which would have arisen had the intervention not taken place. <a href="http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/evaluation/guide/guide_evalsed.pdf">http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/evaluation/guide/guide_evalsed.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Critical Success Factors (CSF’s)</strong></td>
<td>'The critical areas whose high performance or success is important’ and also ‘the steps taken to succeed’ (Rockart, 1979)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ex ante evaluation</strong></td>
<td>An evaluation conducted before the implementation of an intervention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator</strong></td>
<td>A characteristic or attribute which can be measured to assess an intervention in terms of its outputs or results. <strong>Output indicators</strong> are normally straightforward. <strong>Result indicators</strong> may be more difficult to derive, and it is often appropriate to rely on indirect indicators as proxies. Indicators can be either quantitative or qualitative. <strong>Context indicators</strong> relate to the environment for a project or programme. <a href="http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/evaluation/guide/guide_evalsed.pdf">http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/evaluation/guide/guide_evalsed.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formative evaluation</strong></td>
<td>Evaluation which is intended to support programme actors, i.e., managers and direct protagonists, in order to help them improve their decisions and activities. It mainly applies to public interventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition and source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Performance Indicators</td>
<td>Key Performance Indicators (KPI’s) make the connection between the CSF’s and the KRIs. They track the <em>actions</em> between the CSF’s and the KRIs. So, first, they have to measure a process. Second, they have to be <em>key</em> - i.e. the only measures that are essential to demonstrate progress towards ‘results’. Third, they have to measure ‘live’ data - i.e. the information source used to measure process and progress is continually generating updated information. Fourth, they need to reflect ‘context’. Fifth, they have to be ‘metrics’ - i.e. a quantifiable measure that can demonstrate progress either from a baseline or in context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Results Indicators</td>
<td>Measure the ‘results’ (effects) of steps taken to succeed that are carried out in terms of the ‘end result’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory evaluation</td>
<td>Evaluative approach that encourages the active participation of beneficiaries and other stakeholders in an evaluation. They may participate in the design and agenda setting of an evaluation, conduct self evaluations, help gather data or help interpret results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process evaluation</td>
<td>Focuses on learning about, and potentially improving, delivery. Tavistock Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summative (or ex post) evaluation</td>
<td>It is conducted after completion and for the benefit of some external audience or decision-maker (e.g. funding agency, historian, or future possible users). (Scriven M., Evaluation Thesaurus). <a href="http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/evaluation/guide/guide_evalsed.pdf">http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/evaluation/guide/guide_evalsed.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory based evaluation</td>
<td>Theory-based approaches to impact evaluation allow for a systematic articulation and testing of the assumed connection (i.e. the theory) between an intervention and the anticipated impacts. The focus of theory-based evaluations is not only on understanding whether an intervention has worked but on why and under what conditions change has been observed. Tavistock Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory of change</td>
<td>Theory of Change is a systematic and cumulative study of the links between activities, outcomes, and context of an intervention. It involves the specification of an explicit theory of how and why an intervention might cause an effect which is used to guide the evaluation. It does this by investigating the causal relationships between context-input-output-outcomes-impact in order to understand the combination of factors that has led to the intended or unintended outcomes and impacts. Theory of Change therefore tests, and normally develops the implementation theory of an intervention and allows this to be modified or refined through the evaluation process. Tavistock Institute</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Evaluation Approach

1.1 Overall evaluation approach: theory-based (realist) evaluation

The overall evaluation approach applied in TRAILs is based on ‘realist evaluation’ – a ‘theory-based’ approach which aims to find out ‘what works, for whom under which circumstances’. One of the tasks of a realist evaluation is therefore to make the theories within an intervention explicit, by developing clear hypotheses about how, and for whom, projects might ‘work’. The implementation of the project, and the evaluation of it, then tests those hypotheses, and their underlying assumptions. This means collecting data, not just about intervention impacts, but also the processes of the intervention implementation, as well as data about the specific mechanisms that might be creating change.

Two things that are crucial in carrying out realist evaluation are ‘Theory of Change’ and the ‘mechanisms’ that underpin the change process. Theory of Change tells the project ‘story’ – from the ‘presenting problem’ it addresses through to the change it hopes to make on that problem at the end of the project and beyond (i.e. the project’s expected ‘impacts’). Mechanisms are defined as ‘underlying entities, processes, or structures which operate in particular contexts to generate outcomes of interest’ (Astbury and Leeuw, 2010). The mechanism is the response TRAILs triggers from the actors involved in the project – i.e. the combination of ‘Resources’ (e.g. the LSP training programme and Summer School) and ‘Reasoning’ (how actors use these resources; how this changes their awareness, attitudes and behaviours) – and how this results in outcomes. A key objective of the evaluation is therefore to identify the ‘mechanisms’ in TRAILS that contribute to its observed outcomes.

A simplified Theory of Change for TRAILs is presented in Figure 1 below.

![Theory of Change Diagram](image_url)

**Figure 1: TRAILs Theory of Change**

The ‘presenting problem’ TRAILs addresses is:

Not enough teachers have the necessary skills to deliver effective LSP training. There is therefore a need for new training methodologies that provide these skills to a wider constituency of professionals and trainee teachers.
TRAILs’s ‘theory’ about the *causes of this problem* is:

Too many higher education teachers have received little or no pedagogical training. Most LSP job offers tend not to be filled by qualified teachers. Pedagogical gaps in higher education and lack of university training focused on LSP teaching contribute to this mismatch. Most LSP teachers have been assigned to teach ESP courses without any initial training. Language teachers who accept a university training focused on LSP teaching contribute to this mismatch. Most LSP job offers tend not to be filled by qualified teachers. Pedagogical gaps in higher education and lack of university training focused on LSP teaching contribute to this mismatch. Most LSP teachers have been assigned to teach ESP courses without any initial training. Language teachers who accept a university training focused on LSP teaching contribute to this mismatch. Most LSP job offers tend not to be filled by qualified teachers. Pedagogical gaps in higher education and lack of university training focused on LSP teaching contribute to this mismatch. Most LSP teachers have been assigned to teach ESP courses without any initial training. Language teachers who accept a university training focused on LSP teaching contribute to this mismatch. Most LSP job offers tend not to be filled by qualified teachers. Pedagogical gaps in higher education and lack of university training focused on LSP teaching contribute to this mismatch. Most LSP teachers have been assigned to teach ESP courses without any initial training. Language teachers who accept a university training focused on LSP teaching contribute to this mismatch. Most LSP job offers tend not to be filled by qualified teachers. Pedagogical gaps in higher education and lack of university training focused on LSP teaching contribute to this mismatch. Most LSP teachers have been assigned to teach ESP courses without any initial training. Language teachers who accept a university training focused on LSP teaching contribute to this mismatch. Most LSP job offers tend not to be filled by qualified teachers. Pedagogical gaps in higher education and lack of university training focused on LSP teaching contribute to this mismatch. Most LSP teachers have been assigned to teach ESP courses without any initial training. Language teachers who accept a university training focused on LSP teaching contribute to this mismatch. Most LSP job offers tend not to be filled by qualified teachers. Pedagogical gaps in higher education and lack of university training focused on LSP teaching contribute to this mismatch. Most LSP teachers have been assigned to teach ESP courses without any initial training. Language teachers who accept a university training focused on LSP teaching contribute to this mismatch. Most LSP job offers tend not to be filled by qualified teachers. Pedagogical gaps in higher education and lack of university training focused on LSP teaching contribute to this mismatch. Most LSP teachers have been assigned to teach ESP courses without any initial training. Language teachers who accept a university training focused on LSP teaching contribute to this mismatch. Most LSP job offers tend not to be filled by qualified teachers. Pedagogical gaps in higher education and lack of university training focused on LSP teaching contribute to this mismatch. Most LSP teachers have been assigned to teach ESP courses without any initial training. Language teachers who accept a university training focused on LSP teaching contribute to this mismatch. Most LSP job offers tend not to be filled by qualified teachers. Pedagogical gaps in higher education and lack of university training focused on LSP teaching contribute to this mismatch. Most LSP teachers have been assigned to teach ESP courses without any initial training. Language teachers who accept a university training focused on LSP teaching contribute to this mismatch. Most LSP job offers tend not to be filled by qualified teachers. Pedagogical gaps in higher education and lack of university training focused on LSP teaching contribute to this mismatch. Most LSP teachers have been assigned to teach ESP courses without any initial training. Language teachers who accept a university training focused on LSP teaching contribute to this mismatch. Most LSP job offers tend not to be filled by qualified teachers. Pedagogical gaps in higher education and lack of university training focused on LSP teaching contribute to this mismatch. Most LSP teachers have been assigned to teach ESP courses without any initial training. Language teachers who accept a university training focused on LSP teaching contribute to this mismatch. Most LSP job offers tend not to be filled by qualified teachers. Pedagogical gaps in higher education and lack of university training focused on LSP teaching contribute to this mismatch. Most LSP teachers have been assigned to teach ESP courses without any initial training. Language teachers who accept a university training focused on LSP teaching contribute to this mismatch. Most LSP job offers tend not to be filled by qualified teachers. Pedagogical gaps in higher education and lack of university training focused on LSP teaching contribute to this mismatch.

TRAILs’s *solution* to this problem is:

- analyse LSP teacher training programmes in Europe
- analyse LSP teacher needs
- analyse the present and future LSP teaching skills that help teacher trainees enter the job market
- define the training outcomes and curriculum of an LSP teacher training programme
- test the LSP teacher training programme through the TRAILs Summer School
- disseminate the programme and project results across the EU.

TRAILs’s longer term *expected impacts* are:

- establishment of network of language teacher training centres and LSP teachers, and in LSP teaching
- increased teacher trainee employability
- increased attractiveness of LSP teaching in Europe.

TRAILs’s *immediate outcomes* (changes in awareness and knowledge) are:

- For LSP professionals and trainee teachers - positive changes in attitude towards LSP learning and teaching; increased teacher trainee and LSP teacher professional self-confidence; increased intercultural awareness; increased digital competences; an increase in the acquisition of the high-quality skills and competences necessary for quality LSP teaching
- For other stakeholders - increased awareness of good European practice and knowledge transfer;

TRAILs’s *intermediate outcomes* (changes in individual and institutional behaviours) are:

- for LSP professionals and trainee teachers - more extensive use of digital technologies and digitally-supported pedagogy in LSP training
- development of partnerships aimed at providing and promoting knowledge and skills for high quality teaching and learning of LSP in VET and in higher education
- for other stakeholders - sharing information and strengthening collaborations; integrating project results into national and regional policy.

The two ‘primary mechanisms’ identified for TRAILs are shown in Table 1.

**Table 1: TRAILs primary mechanisms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competence acquisition mechanism</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Competence acquisition mechanism</strong></td>
<td>LSP professionals and trainee teachers find out about TRAILs through the project website, multiplier events, partner awareness-raising actions and networks. They see that TRAILs fills a gap in their needs and sign up for the training programme and summer school. Participation in these activities increases their understanding of how LSP can be applied more effectively in teaching practice. Hands-on exercises, supported through the use of digital technologies, increases their competence in LSP pedagogy and gives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
them the confidence to apply it in practice. On graduation from TRAILs, they apply their new competences in their teaching practice. This has the aggregated and cumulative effect of improving the LSP competence base.

2. LSP Multiplier Mechanism

TRAILs awareness-raising, outreach and dissemination activities combine with knowledge transfer derived from Summer School attendance to stimulate the development of partnerships providing and promoting knowledge and skills for high quality teaching and learning of LSP in VET and in higher education established. A network of language teacher training centres and LSP teachers is established, which promotes interaction between Universities. This contributes to improving teaching and research, and supports development of new programmes of study based on the TRAILs programme. Regional authorities, policy makers, researchers, LSP communities, researchers, media, share information that strengthens collaborations, and supports increased awareness of good European practice and knowledge transfer. This in turn leads to TRAILs methods and products being transferred for exploitation in other EU countries through international collaboration.

The evaluation approach, methodology and Toolkit is presented in detail in Annex I to this Report.

1.2 Implementation of the Evaluation Approach

The evaluation approach was implemented in TRAILs through a multi-methodological design and implementation plan that combined four evaluation ‘modes’ and related sets of activities, as shown in Figure 2 below.

- **Ex-ante (design)** mode – contributing to the project design and its development
- **Formative (process)** mode – assessing progress against key targets and milestones
- **Ex-post (summative)** mode – assessing project outcomes and impacts
- **Learning** mode – periodically reviewing evaluation results

Figure 2: Evaluation Modes and activities

- **Ex-ante (design)** activities – fed into the ongoing project design and its development, for example, by reviewing the pedagogic approach applied in the Summer School curriculum.
- **Formative (process)** activities – put into place a framework, mechanisms and tools to monitor project progress and assessing the effectiveness and efficiency of the project delivery. This included running a regular Partner Survey to collect and review partners’ views on how TRAILs was progressing, and developing a ‘process dashboard’ to assess progress against key targets and milestones.
• **Ex-post (summative)** activities – involved designing and implementing a methodology and tools to assess project outcomes and impacts, culminating in an overall assessment of the project’s results, and the main factors that have contributed to its outcomes.

• **Learning** activities – involved firstly applying the results from the evaluation through holding regular workshops to review the results of the partner survey and process dashboard results and their implications and, secondly, feeding evaluation results into an assessment of the sustainability potential of TRAILS.

This Evaluation Report focuses on the project ‘summative’ evaluation, since the ex-ante and formative evaluation activities were implemented continuously as the project developed. However, the learning from these activities and from the summative evaluation has shaped the assessment of the sustainability potential of TRAILS, which is covered at the end of this Report.

### 1.3 Summative Evaluation Methodology

The methodology designed for the TRAILS summative evaluation combined seven evaluation activities as shown in Table 2.

**Table 2: TRAILS Summative Evaluation Methodology and Evaluation Activities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method/Activity</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>How implemented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of indicator data</td>
<td>Quantitative analysis of statistical data gathered through a range of sources including Summer School registrations, website utilisation, attendance at multiplier events</td>
<td>Data on registrations collected and analysed. No website analytics data were available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer School Participant survey</td>
<td>‘Pre-test/post-test’ survey of LSP, digital and intercultural competences of participants prior to and at end of TRAILS Summer School</td>
<td>Self-assessment tool to measure participants’ self-reported learning outcomes on Course; 2 Questions per Module - 22 questions in total. Test administered at course start (pre-test) with 52 participants and at end (post-test) with 49 participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiplier Events Participant survey</td>
<td>Short feedback survey of people attending the eight events organised by TRAILS partners, including the Final Conference, aimed at introducing TRAILS objectives and Intellectual Outputs</td>
<td>Multiplier Events attracted 234 participants, with an additional 65 people participating in Final Conference, delivered online due to COVID-19 restrictions. Evaluation data collected from 175 Multiplier Event participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Groups</td>
<td>Group interview with sample of TRAILS summer school participants covering; participant experience, including problems encountered; extent to which expectations were met; benefits identified; recommendations for improving programme</td>
<td>Two online Focus Groups implemented at end of Summer School. One involved 30 LSP professionals and trainee teachers. The second involved 19 TRAILS programme delivery and teaching staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Method/Activity** | **Description** | **How implemented**
--- | --- | ---
Observation | Evaluators physical observation of summer school delivery and participant interactions | COVID-19 restrictions mean the Summer School was delivered online so observational work restricted to non-participant observation of Winter School sessions as delivered online
Participant diaries and open feedback document | Sub-group of Summer School participants record their experiences over the duration of the Summer School | 7 students and teachers recorded their observations on the experience of the Summer School using a personal ‘e-portfolio’. 16 participants recorded their daily experiences through an online open feedback document
Theory of Change analysis | Assesses the extent to which TRAILs achieved its planned ‘change journey’ from project start to completion and which factors ‘caused’ which outcomes | Data from the statistical analysis, participant surveys, Focus Groups and Diaries as well as data from the process evaluation triangulated and synthesised to interrogate the project ‘mechanisms’ and assess the main factors that contributed to observed outcomes.

As Table 2 shows, the methodology for the summative evaluation of TRAILs incorporated a range of quantitative and qualitative data, which were ultimately compared using ‘triangulation’ and the results integrated using Theory of Change analysis to assess the extent to which the expected project outcomes had been met, and which combinations of factors had led to the observed outcomes.

The effects of the COVID-19 pandemic conspired to reduce the scope of the evaluation. Most significantly, travel restrictions meant the Summer School had to be postponed and ultimately transformed into a ‘Winter School’ delivered in February 2021 entirely online. This meant that the planned face-to-face Focus Groups also had to be delivered online and the Observation activities – which rely on real-time collection of data on social interactions in a physical space – were restricted to remote observation of the teaching sessions delivered online.

A key element of the summative evaluation was the assessment of learning outcomes. This was done using an LSP assessment tool administered immediately before participants took part in the TRAILs Winter School (pre-test) and immediately following the end of the course (post-test). The assessment tool consisted of 22 questions – two questions for each of the 11 Modules that make up the course. The first question – a ‘Knowledge’ question – asked participants to rate their overall level of understanding and knowledge of the topics covered in each Module. The second question – a ‘Practice’ question – asked participants to rate their ability to apply this understanding and knowledge in LSP teaching and learning practice, using a self-anchoring (Likert) scale from 1 (‘I can’t do this at all’) to 5 (‘I can do this very well’). The scores for each question individually and the combined aggregate score were compared before and after to assess the extent to which participation in the School had increased trainee knowledge and LSP, digital and inter-cultural skills.

### 1.4 Structure of this Report

This Report is set out as follows:

- Following this Introduction, Section 2 presents the main results of the evaluation, covering the Winter School Participant Experience; Winter School Learning outcomes; TRAILs overall
performance and achievements; Factors contributing to TRAILs outcomes – Theory of Change Analysis.

- Section 3 presents the main conclusion of the evaluation.
- The concluding section – Section 4 – provides recommendations for TRAILs going forward, including an assessment of the project sustainability.
- Annex I sets out the detailed Evaluation methodology and Toolkit.
2. Evaluation Results

This Section presents the main results of the TRAILS evaluation. It covers the following:

- Winter School Participant Experience
- Winter School Learning outcomes
- TRAILS overall performance and achievements
- Factors contributing to TRAILS outcomes – Theory of Change Analysis.

2.1 Winter School Participant Experience

The evaluation of the TRAILS Winter School from the perspective of the participant experience was implemented through a set of qualitative data collection activities combining:

- ‘Classroom’ session observations over the one-week duration of the Winter School
- Winter School Daily Feedback (16 participants) via an open feedback MS-SharePoint document
- Personal ‘private’ daily diary experience records (7) in participant ‘e-companion books’
- Two focus groups in the group evaluation session on the final afternoon of the TRAILS Winter School, one involving 19 partners and trainers and the second involving 30 participants – in-service teachers and post-graduate students.

2.2.1 Observational analysis

The key findings from the observational analysis are:

- All training sessions, including the technical support, were interesting, well delivered, engaging and clearly valued by participants
- The Winter School was characterised by highly engaged participation and delivery.
- A key positive feature was mutual support - trainers and delivery teams, participating students and in-service teacher participants all supported each others’ involvement and learning
- Participants had good support material (the ‘e-companion’), but would have liked plenary material abstracts beforehand
- Plenary, group sessions and use of breakout rooms and practical work in groups worked really well, despite rare technical issues that were dealt with and resolved satisfactorily. The course structure and content modules were relevant and well planned.
- Overall, the Winter School was viewed by participants as an intense but really valuable experience - the scope and scale of the material included was enormous, although some paring down occurred in the process of delivery. A further reduction in 'volume' might be beneficial for future iterations.

Observation clearly showed a really high level of engagement and active participation by all participants. There was an indication that some students in particular, were feeling slightly overwhelmed at the start of the week by the sheer volume of material and rapid pace of most plenary sessions. This was not a significant issue and both students and in-service teacher participants engaged well and remained fully engaged throughout the week. Students that appeared to feel slightly overwhelmed on occasion, or struggled with confidence issues and finding their voices, participated with increasing confidence as the week progressed.

All participants found the supporting material in the extensive e-companion very helpful, however there were regular requests for summaries or more, of the plenary session material presentations. Student participants in particular expressed a wish for plenary summaries, as keeping up with the
volume of material and pace of many of the plenary sessions, was occasionally challenging. All participants were clearly appreciative of the scope and richness of the Winter School content throughout the week.

Group sessions worked well, despite occasional confusion as to what ‘tasks’ were expected. These confusion issues were resolved by trainer visits to the Zoom breakout rooms in most cases that were observed. Student and in-service teacher participants worked well together and most were appreciative of the mixing. Overall the TRAILS Winter School was an overwhelming success from day one. Technical management of the Zoom experience was really well managed by the hosting partner, with great commitment, continuous presence and support.

The greatest challenges for the TRAILS team were time and content management. The scope of the TRAILS school was comprehensive and as a result a challenge to deliver within the time limited plenaries in particular. The pace of most sessions was rapid and very tiring for participants (and trainers), frequently shortened breaks were also a feature. Nevertheless all plenary and group sessions were well managed, despite these time and content management issues.

Overall the TRAILS Winter School was a great success in terms of both delivery and participation, with participants expressing gratitude and appreciation throughout the week. The transfer of the TRAILS curriculum and Winter School, from a residential face to face teaching experience, to an online format at a late stage, though challenging was well thought out, prepared, planned and delivered, notwithstanding the difficulty such a shift and relative lack of experience presented.

2.2.2 Daily feedback

Participants were encouraged to feedback daily via two instruments. The first of these was via an online ‘open’ SharePoint document table, that the TRAILS hosting team (Croatia - University of Zagreb) shared via a new link daily. The second was a personal and private form that included some guiding questions to draw feedback in a semi-structured way, this was built into the participant’s e-companion at the end of each day’s e-companion support material. Both instruments were used by participants, with 16 participants using the open document, and 7 participants completing the e-companion ‘diary.’

The main findings from the open feedback document are as follows:

- All sessions throughout the week were consistently positively viewed by participants, who particularly highlighted the comprehensiveness and usefulness of the material provided; the efficient organization of the course; the support provided by the trainers and the opportunities for collaboration and learning from each other: “I think it was great; the break-out rooms allowed us to work as well as possible, given the fact that we were online. The trainers were brilliant, it was a unique opportunity for me, as a student. I am really grateful”

- Challenges reported highlighted the lack of time available to carry out tasks and group work, considering the vast amount of material being delivered: “The course seems a bit intense, but quite probably I would have a different perspective if it had been possible to organise an in-premises course, with the same timetable”. However, as the week progressed, participants felt more settled, and this combined with attempts by the delivery team to slow the pace down especially in the afternoon sessions, contributed to improving the participant experience: “Morning sessions were a bit hectic, with lots of valuable information that could have been delivered in two full days! Afternoon sessions were more relaxed”.

- Throughout the week participants expressed their appreciation of the breadth of knowledge and content of the TRAILS curriculum, whilst wishing there was more time and opportunity to fully comprehend the material they had been presented with: “Once again it was a great day of learning or confirmation of our practices. However when some notions are new it
might be a good idea to either slow down or to come up with some previous document so we can get familiar with the topic before working broadly with it.”

These findings were broadly re-affirmed through the daily experience records:

- The aspects of the Winter School highlighted as most positive by participants included the comprehensiveness, authenticity and intrinsic interest of the material provided and the group work and the collaborative spirit of the School: “I’m feeling grateful for this opportunity and a little bit sad that this has come to an end. It was a pity we had to have this online. I wish there were more courses like this one” …”I am really glad that I participated in this school. It provided me with so much information, resources, ideas and new connections to some people, experts, teachers”.

- Participants rated as less positive aspects of their Winter School experience the denseness of the information provided; lack of time available to fulfill activities and tasks, related to problems sometimes experienced with time management; insufficiently clear instructions on working with online functionalities (e.g. screen sharing): “Sometimes topics covered in plenary sessions were a bit ambitious and I didn’t have time to “digest” everything” ….“Too little time for too many topics. I had difficulties following the plenary sessions”.

2.2.3 Focus Groups

The main findings from the Participant Focus Group were:

- Participants’ key expectations of the Winter School covered opportunities to collaborate with other LSP experts; the opportunity to receive formal training/a qualification; the chance to refresh knowledge; the opportunity to get in touch with teachers (to gain from their perspectives, experiences, and future career prospects); to get inputs to research; to access more in-depth information in the LSP field; to gain access to training in ESP/LSP - many indicated that they had not had access to formal LSP specific training.

- Aspects of the Winter School viewed as most positive from the participant perspective included the connection between theory, research and practice – seen as excellent overall; the trans-national experience, providing opportunities to collaborate with teachers and students from different countries; the balance and structure of the course (plenary sessions plus group work); the variety of the topics covered.

- Aspects of the Winter School viewed as less positive from the participant perspective included the lack of time available – there was a general perception that the course felt rushed and too ambitious in places and that time management could have been improved (breaks were too short sometimes; some exercises had to be skipped); a perception that smaller groups might have have been better on occasion; written material could have been given before classes

- Key outcomes associated with participation in the Winter School included acquisition of new teaching practices that would be incorporated in future teaching; acquisition of new teaching tools and strategies; improved networking; increased self-confidence; additional ideas for research

- Participants recommendations for improving the Winter School included more focus specifically on LSP rather than Languages for General Purposes; improved time management with more breaks allocated; fewer topics; less intense time duration (possibly splitting the course into two weeks); provision of materials in advance; more time to communicate with teachers.

The main findings from the staff (partner) Focus Group were:
• Partners came to the Winter School with ‘huge expectations’ – mixed with anxiety as to the potential negative effects of delivering the programme entirely on-line as a result of the pandemic. These expectations were exceeded and the anxieties failed to materialise. Partners were surprised by the atmosphere of enthusiasm and collaboration.

• The most positive aspects of the Winter School from the staff perspective were: the highly collaborative and friendly atmosphere; the high level of planning and organization; creating an LSP community that could form the basis of future trans-national collaboration; the trainees’ high performance and motivation; the effectiveness of student-teacher parings.

• Aspects of the Winter School viewed as less positive from the staff perspective included: the absence of the ‘human’ dimension and face to face teaching mode; insufficient time and some time management issues; an element of over-ambition with possibly too many topics covered.

• Key outcomes associated with participation in the Winter School from the staff perspective included improved knowledge ("I kept learning from my colleagues throughout"); improved practice ("I’ve been learning something new every few minutes"); increased collaboration and inter-cultural communication ("It was important that the students and teachers were inter-connected"); increased internationalization of LSP ("The international perspective was very important.. it’s had an influence on Higher Education teaching perspectives"). Staff also highlighted a range of benefits for participating in-service teachers and students they had observed, including: participants got access to a wealth of priceless material they can now use in their practice; improvements in participant teaching practice going forward; increased collaboration and networking; increased digital skills and use of digital tools in teaching practice.

• Staff recommendations for improving the Winter School included: reverting back to face-to-face delivery mode (possibly through a ‘blended’ pedagogic model); re-assessment of the range and number of topics included in the curriculum to identify what is essential and what could be optional; improved time management (possibly splitting the course over a longer delivery period).

2.2.4 Summary: key findings on the evaluation of the Winter School Participant Experience

It is clear from triangulation and integration of the qualitative evaluation data that the TRAILs curriculum and Winter School were a resounding success. Feedback also points to many ways in which the Curriculum and winter ‘Summer’ School could be improved upon.

The Covid-19 related issues that have occurred over a significant part of the final year of this project, leading to the need for re-scheduling and a project extension, the considerable additional work involved in completing the tasks necessary for full curriculum development and delivery planning (IO4), and the move to a completely virtual delivery mode, have had a profound effect.

This challenge has also significantly impacted resources, as more work occurred over an additional 6 months of project life (two and a half years), for the same financial resources allocated for the original 2 years. In addition to this, one partner (JADE) dropped out of the final 3 months of development and the implementation phase, due to a lack of resources and the departure of the departmental lead to a new post in a different University. That ex-departmental lead did teach one of the two modules originally expected in the school in the end, which was appreciated, and a relief to the incredibly over-stretched remaining partners.

Taking into account these considerable issues, the TRAILs project partners showed great resilience, succeeded admirably, and delivered a really challenging, innovative and successful winter school, despite the times and challenges. It would also appear to have been a success in creating a European community and network of established and fledgling LSP teaching experts.
As already noted, there were clear suggestions for modifications and improvements that might occur over time. Interestingly TRAILs partners and the Winter School Trainers concurred on many points also raised by the participants. The most notable of these are the time and content management issues that the online delivery method exacerbated. Both TRAILs partners and participants have pointed to ‘down-sizing’, re-evaluation of core content, and alternative blended or split delivery methods that might be appropriate in the future.

2.2 Winter School Learning outcomes

As noted in Section 1, a key element of the summative evaluation was the assessment of learning outcomes. This was done using an LSP assessment tool administered immediately before participants took part in the TRAILs Winter School (pre-test) and immediately following the end of the course (post-test). The assessment tool consisted of 22 questions – two questions for each of the 11 Modules that make up the course. The first question – a ‘Knowledge’ question – asked participants to rate their overall level of understanding and knowledge of the topics covered in each Module. The second question – a ‘Practice’ question – asked participants to rate their ability to apply this understanding and knowledge in LSP teaching and learning practice, using a self-anchoring (Likert) scale from 1 ('I can't do this at all') to 5 ('I can do this very well'). The scores for each question individually and the combined aggregate score were compared before and after to assess the extent to which participation in the School had increased trainee knowledge and LSP, digital and intercultural skills.

A total of 52 Winter School Participants took part in the learning assessment pre-test – covering 100% of all participants. This included 21 of the TRAILs partner staff delivering the LSP training course, 12 in-service teachers and 19 students. 49 of these took part in the post-test assessment, giving a 94% post-test completion rate (Table 3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participating Group</th>
<th>N. Pre-test</th>
<th>N. Post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service teachers</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3 compares the average aggregate learning assessment test scores for each participant group before and after the Winter School.
Figure 3: Aggregate learning assessment scores pre-test and post-test

As Figure 3 shows the average LSP aggregate assessment score overall increased from 69.6 to 89.5 over the course of the Winter School – an average increase of just under 30%. As might be expected the partner teaching staff score shows the smallest increase – just under 10%. In-service teachers’ average aggregate score increased from 64.1 to 92.1 – an increase of 44% and students showed the largest increase in assessment score, from 51.9 to 80.7 – an increase of 56%.

These large increases are statistically significant at the 0.01 confidence level, as shown by a matched pair Students t-test which compared individual scores for the three groups pre and post-test. The results are shown in Table 4.

Table 4: Matched pair students t-test, learning assessment scores by group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Pre-test mean</th>
<th>Post-test mean</th>
<th>t value (1 tail)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>88.7</td>
<td>96.9</td>
<td>-4.791782263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>-8.628545565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>-7.506613688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>89.5</td>
<td>-9.13176219</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An interesting finding of the learning assessment is the differences in learning gains achieved by the different groups. Table 5 shows the results of an analysis of variance comparing the aggregate test scores for each group before and after taking part in the Winter School.
Table 5: Analysis of variance, learning assessment scores by group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Pre-test mean</th>
<th>Post-test mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>88.7</td>
<td>96.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>92.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>80.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-value</td>
<td>38.0390</td>
<td>9.7045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-critical</td>
<td>3.186</td>
<td>3.186</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 5 shows, before the Winter School, the differences between the three participating groups on the average aggregate learning assessment score were very large and highly statistically significant. By the end of the Winter School, these differences had reduced considerably, although they were still statistically significant. This suggests that collaborative working between the three groups in the Winter School had ‘bootstrapped’ the LSP learning of the participating groups – particularly for the students taking part.

Finally, the evaluation explored whether any differences in learning outcomes could be identified across the eleven Modules delivered through the Winter School. Figure 4 compares the aggregate assessment scores for each module at the end of the Winter School. As Figure 4 shows, the scores were broadly similar across the Modules delivered, with the exception of Module 9 – Teaching ESP through Corpora – which achieved a significantly lower score than the other Modules.

To summarise, the key conclusions from the learning outcomes assessment are:

- Overall, TRAILs Winter School participants’ LSP self-assessment scores increased by 28% on average
- The largest gain was for students with an increased score of 56%, and for in-service teachers, with an increased score of 44% on average
- These large learning gains suggest the course was very effective, and are statistically significant at the 0.01 confidence level
Students benefited most from the course – they lagged behind in knowledge and practical application at the start but this gap was significantly reduced by the end – a statistically significant result.

Perhaps surprisingly, delivery staff – the professional educators drawn from TRAILs partners who delivered the course – increased their LSP knowledge and practice ability by almost 10%. This suggests even the experts gained from working with their peers and with participating in-service teachers and students.

No statistically significant differences in test scores were identified between Modules, although scores for Module 9 were significantly lower.

2.3 TRAILs overall performance and achievements

Moving beyond the Winter School, this Section considers the overall success of TRAILs set against its key objectives and targets.

2.3.1 Key output results

Table 6 shows TRAILs performance against key project output targets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Status at: (date)</th>
<th>Project target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>No. LSP educational institutions surveyed</td>
<td>122 programmes in 25 countries</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. LSP teachers surveyed</td>
<td>621 surveyed – 29 in-depth interviews</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>No. of training units completed</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piloting</td>
<td>No. Institutions contacted for summer school</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. LSP staff recruited for summer school</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. in-service teachers/students recruited for summer school</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissemination</td>
<td>No. visits to project website</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. brochures/leaflets distributed</td>
<td>Over 1,000</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. contacts on social media</td>
<td>Active on Researchgate, Linkedin, Twitter, Facebook, YouTube</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. attendees at Multiplier Events</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NS= Target Not Specified

As Table 6 shows, only 2 performance targets were formally set for TRAILs in the project Grant Agreement – i.e. the targets for recruitment of professional staff, and in-service teachers and students for the Summer School. These targets were both exceeded.

The research activities in the first phase of the project – covering IO1, IO2 and IO3, which prepared the ground for the development of the Winter School curriculum and the school implementation –
demonstrate significant levels of achievement, with 122 LSP programmes analysed in 25 countries, followed by a survey of LSP teacher needs that included over 620 teachers.

In its development phase, TRAILs achieved its target with a comprehensive Winter School curriculum developed covering 11 Modules. This was then piloted in the TRAILs Winter School, which involved a total of 52 participants – exceeding its planned targets.

Analysis of TRAILs dissemination progress and achievements is difficult to assess. It has to be noted that the TRAILs public website was poorly-developed and poorly curated. No utilization data were collected for the site. Analysis of the data collected via the evaluation on dissemination activities (covered in more detail below) showed just under 100 discrete dissemination activities logged. These activities directly engaged just over 1,950 individuals and organisations, though the project reach is likely to be much greater as a result of indirect engagement with a broad spectrum of stakeholders through conference attendances, networking and awareness-raising by partners through their own websites and through social media. Data on social media reach was not systematically compiled by the project partners, but the evaluation shows that TRAILs was active on Researchgate, LinkedIn, Twitter, Facebook – including a dedicated project Facebook page - and YouTube. As an indication, the TRAILs project Researchgate group comprised around 100 active followers with 1,750 views at project end. The Multiplier Events, including the final (online) Conference attracted around 300 participants from a range of stakeholder groups, mainly Higher education institutions.

2.3.2 Project progress monitoring

A range of systems and tools were put into place to monitor TRAILs progress over its life cycle, the most important being the Quality System, Risk Management System and Partner Survey.

Data from the Quality System shows that all planned project outputs – including both formal outputs (Intellectual Outputs) and ‘informal’ outputs (for example the TRAILs Quality System) were produced as planned. All were successfully reviewed via the peer review process implemented through the TRAILs Quality System. In addition, the TRAILs Winter School Curriculum (IO4) was also reviewed by two external LSP experts.

9 risks were logged in the TRAILs Risk register over the project life cycle. The most severe risks identified were, firstly, disruption to the project implementation plan as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic – which had a particularly severe impact on the Summer School – and the loss of key staff from one of the project partners. All these risks were successfully mitigated.

The TRAILs Partner Survey was delivered in 5 rounds over the project life cycle, the first in March 2019 and the final one in March 2021. Partners rated the TRAILs project on three main evaluation criteria:

- Project management (covering governance, co-ordination, progress monitoring, quality control and finances)
- Communication and collaboration (covering technical platforms, communication and co-operation between partners, communication with the co-ordinator, communication with the Commission and National Agency and communication with stakeholders)
- Meeting objectives and targets (covering IOs 1 to 5, dissemination and project management).

The survey results are summarized in Figure 5, which shows the % aggregate score for each evaluation criterion (of a maximum 100%) as well as the overall combined score for each period. Figure 5 shows:
Overall, partners were relatively satisfied with how TRAILs was implemented over the project life cycle, as reflected by an average score of 69% at project start, reaching its highest level of 81% in February 2020, before falling back to 76% at project end.

Partners were least satisfied with the project management aspect of TRAILs, which from a strong position of 83% at project start, declined to 68% at project end.

Satisfaction with communications and collaboration increased from an average of 65% at project start to 72% at project end.

Partners were most satisfied with the project’s capacity to meet its objectives, which achieved an average score of 60% at project start – reflecting the fact that most activities had not yet started – rising to 87% at project end. Partners were least satisfied with project dissemination.

Figure 5: TRAILS Partner Survey Results

2.3.3 Dissemination

As noted above, it is difficult to make an evidence-based assessment of TRAILs dissemination activities due to the absence of systematic monitoring of website utilization and social media reach. This is offset to some extent by the inclusion of a range of tools in the evaluation methodology and Toolkit which included a dissemination Monitoring Tool for partners to log their activities, together with evaluation tools – including an Observation Template and Evaluation Feedback instrument – to capture data from the TRAILs Multiplier Events.

Analysis of the data available for 7 TRAILs Multiplier Events – including the Final Conference – shows that around 300 individuals participated in total. Figure 6 shows the results of analysis of the feedback data collected from these events from 175 participants in total. The evaluation instrument used covered participant responses on six evaluation criteria:

- Participants rating of the interest of the event as a whole (from 5 – extremely interesting – to 1 – not at all interesting)
- Participants rating of the interest of the content delivered (from 5 – extremely interesting – to 1 – not at all interesting)
- Participants rating of the usefulness of the content (from 5 – extremely useful – to 1 – not at all useful)
Participants rating of the extent to which the event changed the way they think about Language for Specific Purposes Teacher Training (from 5 – very much – to 1 – not at all)

Participants rating of the extent to which they learned new things from the event (from 5 – very much – to 1 – not at all)

Participants rating of extent to which the event will make them follow TRAILs and other LSP Teacher Training developments and opportunities in the future (from 5 – very much – to 1 – not at all)

---

**Figure 6: Feedback from TRAILs Multiplier Events**

Figure 6 shows:

- Overall, participants were very positive about their experience of the TRAILs Multiplier Events, with 93% rating the events extremely or very interesting; 92% rating the content provided extremely or very interesting and 85% rating the content extremely or very useful. In addition, 69% reported they had learned new things very much or a lot. These results suggest that TRAILs is associated with significant positive ‘immediate’ outcomes – changes in awareness and knowledge.

- The evaluation results are more mixed with regard to providing an indication of the extent to which participation in TRAILs is likely to lead to ‘intermediate’ outcomes – changes in behavior and practice. Although 89% of participants reported they were extremely or very likely to follow TRAILs and other LSP Teacher Training developments and opportunities in the future, less than half reported that TRAILs had changed the way they think about Language for Specific Purposes Teacher Training.

Table 7 shows the results of analysis of the data collected through the TRAILs dissemination Monitoring Tool covering the dissemination activities carried out by partners.
Table 7: TRAILs Dissemination actions carried out

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>N. actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conferences</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blog posts</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researchgate posts</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAILs website posts</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other website posts</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted e-mail</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media (Linkedin, Twitter, Facebook)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erasmus+</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiplier event publicity</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brochure/leaflet updates</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>98</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 shows just under 100 discrete TRAILs dissemination activities logged. These activities directly engaged just over 1,950 individuals and organisations, though, as noted above, the project reach is likely to be much greater as a result of indirect engagement with a broad spectrum of stakeholders through conference attendances, networking and awareness-raising by partners through their own websites and through social media. In particular, TRAILs partners presented the project at 10 LSP-related conferences, including the 19th conference of the European Association of LSP, which will have contributed to project awareness-raising and dissemination of knowledge. TRAILs was publicized extensively through partner websites and LSP-related websites, and through social media channels like Researchgate, Linkedin, Twitter, Facebook – including a dedicated project Facebook page - and YouTube. As an indication, the TRAILs project Researchgate group comprised around 100 active followers with 1,750 views at project end. Information about the project was also distributed through brochures and newsletters – although distribution data were not available, as well as through direct e-mail targeting.

2.4 Factors contributing to TRAILs outcomes – Theory of Change Analysis

This final sub-section reviews the TRAILs Theory of Change developed for the project. It looks at how far the project has travelled on its expected ‘change journey’ and assesses the extent to which the expected project outcomes and impacts embedded in the Theory of Change are supported by the evidence, as well as assessing whether the two project ‘primary mechanisms’ - the causal chains that are assumed to lead to project outcomes – can be substantiated by the evaluation results.

2.4.1 Outcomes and Impacts assessment

Table 8 shows the outcomes and impacts expected to be realized through the TRAILs activities, as set out in the project proposal and identified in the project Theory of Change, together with the available evaluation evidence against which to judge success.

Table 8: TRAILs outcomes and impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected outcomes and impacts</th>
<th>Evidence of success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Immediate outcomes</strong> (changes in awareness and knowledge)</td>
<td>Focus groups suggest participants more positive of value of LSP learning and teaching, although less than half of Multiplier Event participants reported that TRAILs had changed the way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For LSP professionals and trainee teachers – positive changes in attitude towards LSP learning and teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>increased teacher trainee and LSP teacher professional self-confidence</td>
<td>they think about Language for Specific Purposes Teacher Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>increased intercultural awareness</td>
<td>Focus groups suggest participants improved their self-confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>increased digital competences</td>
<td>Learning assessment analysis shows significant improvements in LSP teaching, intercultural and digital competences. These results supported by qualitative evaluation data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>increase in the acquisition of the high-quality skills and competences necessary for quality LSP teaching</td>
<td>For other stakeholders - increased awareness of good European practice and knowledge transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intermediate outcomes</strong> (changes in individual and institutional behaviours)</td>
<td>High level of attendance at Multiplier events – total 324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For LSP professionals and trainee teachers - more extensive use of digital technologies and digitally-supported pedagogy in LSP training</td>
<td>Feedback results show 69% of participants reported they had learned new things very much or a lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of partnerships aimed at providing and promoting knowledge and skills for high quality teaching and learning of LSP in VET and in higher education</td>
<td>Additional extensive dissemination actions, around 100 actions reaching a spectrum of stakeholders support conclusion that TRAILs increased awareness of European LSP good practice and stimulated knowledge transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For other stakeholders - sharing information and strengthening collaborations; integrating project results into national and regional policy.</td>
<td><strong>Intermediate outcomes</strong> (changes in individual and institutional behaviours)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Longer term expected impacts</strong></td>
<td>Limited evaluation evidence. Qualitative data from Winter School evaluation show majority of participating professionals and trainees intend to apply the digital skills they have learned in their practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment of network of language teacher training centres and LSP teachers, and in LSP teaching</td>
<td>Limited evaluation evidence. The Focus Groups strongly support the conclusion that collaborative partnerships were reinforced and expanded as a result of participation. TRAILs partners report they have expanded their collaborative partnerships and networks. The TRAILs dissemination activities show extensive and comprehensive partnership and networking activity through channels like Researchgate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased teacher trainee employability</td>
<td>A wide spectrum of stakeholders was engaged through TRAILs Multiplier Events and broader dissemination activities. There is no evidence that TRAILs project results are being or will be integrated into national and regional policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased attractiveness of LSP teaching in Europe.</td>
<td>It could be argued that TRAILs has begun to lay the foundations for an EU-wide network of teacher training centres. This will be further supported by the recently-funded Erasmus+ project LSP-TEOC.Pro, which expands the work of TRAILs. However, there is a long way to go before such a network is established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is no hard evaluation evidence to support this impact. However, data from the Focus Groups suggest that Winter School participants have increased optimism that their employment prospects have been enhanced through TRAILs. 89% of Multiplier Event participants reported they were extremely or very likely to follow TRAILs and other LSP Teacher Training developments and opportunities in the future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The development and piloting of the TRAILs LSP teacher training course will contribute to increasing the attractiveness of LSP teaching. Feedback from Winter School participants overwhelmingly positive on value and interest of LSP teaching. 93% of Multiplier Event participants rated the events extremely or very interesting; 92% rated the content provided extremely or very interesting and 85% rated the content extremely or very useful</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.4.2 Mechanisms Analysis

As outlined above in Section 1.1, the TRAILs Theory of Change incorporates two ‘primary mechanisms’ that specify the assumed ‘causal chains’ that link project activities and outputs to outcomes, and in particular explore how ‘Resources’ (e.g. the LSP training programme and Summer School) and ‘Reasoning’ (how actors use these resources; how this changes their awareness, attitudes and behaviours) – combine to result in outcomes.

Below is presented an analysis of these two primary mechanisms and their underlying assumptions, using the available evaluation evidence. The methodology for the analysis follows Mayne (2012) and Befani and Mayne (2014) and considers whether TRAILs’ Theory of Change and embedded mechanisms meet the following five criteria:

- Plausibility: Is the theory of change plausible?
- Implementation according to plan: Has the program been implemented with high fidelity?
- Evidentiary confirmation of key elements: To what extent are the key elements of the theory of change confirmed by new or existing evidence?
- Identification and examination of other influencing factors: To what extent have other influencing factors been identified and accounted for?
- Disproof of alternative explanations: To what extent have the most relevant alternative explanations been disproved?

Table 9 shows the analysis for the first primary mechanism – the ‘Competence Acquisition’ mechanism.

Table 9: Competence acquisition mechanism analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LSP professionals and trainee teachers find out about TRAILs through the project website, multiplier events, partner awareness-raising actions and networks. They see that TRAILs fills a gap in their needs and sign up for the training programme and summer school. Participation in these activities increases their understanding of how LSP can be applied more effectively in teaching practice. Hands-on exercises, supported through the use of digital technologies, increases their competence in LSP pedagogy and gives them the confidence to apply it in practice. On graduation from TRAILs, they apply their new competences in their teaching practice. This has the aggregated and cumulative effect of improving the LSP competence base.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plausibility: High</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The TRAILs Theory of Change shows high inter-connectivity between activities, outputs and outcomes and strong causal chains. The early phase of research work carried out in IO1, IO2 and IO3 showed a significant level of need for the proposed training programme, and identified the pedagogic approach, course structure and content areas needed to meet that need. TRAILs partners capitalized on their LSP networks to generate demand for the training programme. The quantitative evaluation data collected and analysed support the conclusion that the training developed for the Winter School closely matched participant needs and expectations. The learning assessment data strongly supports the conclusion that the expected learning outcomes attributed to the Winter School were realized. Data from the Focus groups, and feedback data from the TRAILs Multiplier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Events suggest that TRAILS participants are likely to apply what they have learned in their teaching practice.

**Implementation: High**

The evaluation shows a high level of project implementation fidelity. All planned activities went according to plan and all IOs were produced as planned. Recruitment to the TRAILS Winter School exceeded targets. The qualitative data collected and analysed during the Winter School shows the training course was delivered efficiently and effectively according to plan, despite the problems raised by the COVID-19 pandemic, and the learning assessment results show significant benefits from participation.

**Evidence confirmation: High**

Triangulation of the evaluation evidence shows a high level of consistency across and between the different sources of data. The Winter School observation analysis, diary feedback and Focus Groups all tell similar stories of a highly valued and efficiently implemented programme. The learning assessment data show that participant LSP self-assessment scores increased by 28% on average, with students increasing their scores by 56%, and in-service teachers increasing their score by 44% on average. Analysis of feedback from the TRAILS Multiplier Events shows significant impacts on participant awareness, attitudes and knowledge, with 69% reporting they had learned new things very much or a lot. The data suggest that participants are likely to change their practices as a result of engagement in TRAILS, with 89% of participants reporting they were extremely or very likely to follow TRAILS and other LSP Teacher Training developments and opportunities in the future. These results are reinforced by the qualitative data from the TRAILS Winter School, which shows a significant proportion of participants reporting they are likely to apply the skills they have learned in TRAILS in their practice.

**Other Influencing factors: Low**

The research work carried out in the early phases of the project: in IO1 – with over 125 HE programmes linked to LSP reviewed and in IO2 and IO3 – with over 600 LSP teachers surveyed and 29 in-depth interviews carried out – clearly identified a high level of demand for quality LSP teacher training set against limited supply. The qualitative evaluation data collected and analysed through the TRAILS Winter School showed the majority of participants had not formerly received adequate training in applying LSP in practice, that they were unable to find suitable learning opportunities elsewhere and that they highly valued the TRAILS curriculum offer. This combination of evidence strongly supports the conclusion that no plausible set of influencing factors can explain the evaluation results – in particular significant improvements in LSP, intercultural and digital knowledge and skills – other than the effects of the TRAILS project.

**Disproof of alternative explanations: High**

The learning outcomes assessment provides strong evidence that the delivery of the TRAILS LSP training curriculum can be directly associated with significant improvements in participants’ LSP, inter-cultural and digital skills. There is no plausible evidence that these increases can be attributed to other factors. The evaluation found no evidence that TRAILS participants had engaged in other training programmes that could be associated with the observed outcomes of the TRAILS evaluation.

Table 10 shows the analysis for the second primary mechanism – the ‘LSP Multiplier’ mechanism.

**Table 10: LSP Multiplier mechanism analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
TRAILS awareness-raising, outreach and dissemination activities combine with knowledge transfer derived from Summer School attendance to stimulate the development of partnerships providing and promoting knowledge and skills for high quality teaching and learning of LSP in VET and in higher education established. A network of language teacher training centres and LSP teachers is established, which promotes interaction between Universities. This contributes to improving teaching and research, and supports development of new programmes of study based on the TRAILS programme. Regional authorities, policy makers, researchers, LSP communities, researchers, media, share information that strengthens collaborations, and supports increased awareness of good European practice and knowledge transfer. This in turn leads to TRAILS methods and products being transferred for for exploitation in other EU countries through international collaboration.

**Plausibility: Low**

The mechanism analysis identified only weak causal chains. This reflects to some extent the limited evaluation evidence available – highlighted by the lack of website utilization analytics and limited data on social media reach. The ‘LSP Multiplier’ mechanism requires a number of ‘high bar’ assumptions to be met – for example the assumption that significant numbers of key decision-makers at strategic Higher Education and policy-making levels are actively engaged in the project, and that TRAILS has established a core of active, and highly-engaged LSP researchers within Europe. There is no strong evidence to support these assumptions, although TRAILS partners have been relatively active for example in making Conference presentations and posting on relevant websites.

**Implementation: Moderate**

The Implementation plan for delivering the key dissemination, networking and partnership-building activities required was delivered to a reasonable degree of fidelity. The planned activities were largely carried out as planned. However, the impact of this implementation was patchy and variable. On the one hand, feedback on the Multiplier Events was very positive, with 93% of participants rating the events extremely or very interesting; 92% rating the content provided extremely or very interesting and 85% rating the content extremely or very useful. However, although the Multiplier Events were largely implemented according to plan, attendance levels varied from country to country and the attendance profile over-represented the higher education sector. In addition, the Final Conference is likely to have a less than expected impact not least because it had to be moved online due to the COVID-19 pandemic. This naturally severely curtailed the face to face interactions that are important to the success of these kinds of events. The broader pattern of dissemination activities in addition to the Multiplier Events was also variable. The project website was poorly-developed and curated and, with the exception of some well-managed social media initiatives, particularly using the Researchgate platform, there is little evidence that the power of social media to support extensive trans-national and trans-disciplinary collaboration and partnership working was harnessed effectively. The evaluation data able to be collected for these broader activities was also limited.

**Evidence confirmation: Low**

The evaluation data collected and analysed suggest that although the Higher Education community was well-represented and engaged in TRAILS, other significant stakeholder constituencies – particularly policy-makers – were less engaged. There is little hard evidence that significant steps have been taken to establish a network of language teacher training centres and LSP teachers through TRAILS, although the evaluation highlighted mainly anecdotal evidence that the will and commitment for an embryonic LSP ‘ecosystem’ is present. Although there is some evidence that TRAILS increased awareness of LSP teacher training and supported knowledge transfer – for example with 69% of Multiplier Event participants reporting they had learned new things very much or a lot, and 89% reporting they were extremely or very likely to follow TRAILS and other LSP Teacher Training developments and opportunities in the future – there is little hard
evidence that this has strengthened EU-wide collaborations. Nor is there strong evidence to support the conclusion that TRAILs is stimulating the generation of new research collaborations or is supporting the development of new programmes of study based on the TRAILs programme. However, the potential to do this is there, as evidenced by the success of the current TRAILs partnership in securing funding for a new Erasmus+ project – LSP-TEOC.Pro – that will build on TRAILs going forward, as well as evidence that the Winter School appears to have been a success in creating a European community and network of established and fledgling LSP teaching experts. In addition the planned TRAILs book will contribute to supporting further collaboration and networking.

Other Influencing factors: Low

The evidence collected in the research phase of TRAILs – which reviewed 125 example of LSP teaching programmes and surveyed over 600 LSP teachers throughout Europe – strongly supports the conclusion that LSP trans-national and trans-disciplinary collaboration, networking and partnership working is embryonic and that, in particular, activities aimed at supporting LSP teacher training is under-developed. This view has subsequently been reinforced by the research carried out by LSP-TECO,Pro, the successor to TRAILs. Although there are pockets of collaboration outside of TRAILs, for example the CATAPULT project, there is little hard evidence that trans-national collaboration, networking and partnership-building is proceeding apace outside the TRAILs orbit that will have had a significant impact on the activities of TRAILs in this sphere.

Disproof of alternative explanations: High

Since there is little evidence within or outside the TRAILs project that points to the emergence of a trans-national Europe-wide LSP teaching ‘ecosystem’ it is unlikely that external factors have contributed to limiting the impact TRAILs has had on developing a network of language teacher training centres and LSP teachers; promoting interaction between Universities; improving teaching and research, and supporting the development of new programmes of study based on the TRAILs programme, leading to TRAILs methods and products being transferred for exploitation in other EU countries through international collaboration.
3. **Key Evaluation Findings and Conclusions**

3.1 **Evaluation of the Participant Experience**

- Evaluation of the ‘participant experience’ of the Winter School showed that the TRAILs curriculum and Winter School were a resounding success. Key positive aspects from the participant perspective included the quality and richness of the content provided; the transnational experience, providing opportunities to collaborate with teachers and students from different countries; the balance and structure of the course (plenary sessions plus group work); the variety of the topics covered and the creation of an LSP community that could form the basis of future trans-national collaboration.

- Less positive aspects focused on what was seen as the over-ambitiousness of the course, reflected in the denseness of the information provided; lack of time available to fulfill activities and tasks, and linked to problems sometimes experienced with time management.

- The main benefits of participation in the Winter School highlighted for participants included acquisition of new teaching practices that would be incorporated in future teaching; acquisition of new teaching tools and strategies; improved networking; increased self-confidence. For teaching staff delivering the course the main benefits reported covered improved LSP, inter-cultural and digital knowledge; increased collaboration and inter-cultural communication and the increased internationalization of LSP through bringing together students, teachers and experts from across Europe.

3.2 **Key Learning outcomes**

- Overall, TRAILs Winter School participants’ LSP self-assessment scores increased by 28% on average. The largest gain was for students with an increased score of 56%, and for in-service teachers, with an increased score of 44% on average. These large learning gains are statistically significant at the 0.01 confidence level and suggest the course was very effective.

- Students benefited most from the course – they lagged behind in knowledge and practical application at the start but this gap was significantly reduced by the end – a statistically significant result. Perhaps surprisingly, delivery staff – the professional educators drawn from TRAILs partners who delivered the course – also increased their LSP knowledge and practice ability by almost 10%. This suggests even the experts gained from working with their peers and with participating in-service teachers and students.

- No statistically significant differences in test scores were identified between Modules, although scores for Module 9 - Teaching ESP through Corpora – were significantly lower.

3.3 **TRAILs overall performance and achievements**

- The research activities in the first phase of the project – covering IO1, IO2 and IO3, which prepared the ground for the development of the Winter School curriculum and the school implementation – demonstrate significant levels of achievement, with 122 LSP programmes analysed in 25 countries, followed by a survey of LSP teacher needs that included over 620 teachers.

- In its development phase, TRAILs achieved its target with a comprehensive Winter School curriculum developed covering 11 Modules. This was then piloted in the TRAILs Winter School, which involved a total of 52 participants – exceeding its planned targets.

- The Multiplier Events, including the final (online) Conference attracted around 300 participants from a rage of stakeholder groups. Around 100 additional dissemination activities were implemented, reaching around 2,000 individuals and organisations directly,
but likely to have reached a much wider constituency through engagement in conferences, posting on web sites and active participation in social media channels like Researchgate.

- Analysis of the Partner Surveys implemented periodically over the project life cycle show a relatively high level of partner satisfaction with project performance.

### 3.4 Outcomes and Impacts Assessment

- A review of the TRAILs Theory of Change, set against the evaluation evidence, shows that the project has had a significant positive impact in terms of increasing participant awareness of LSP training, and contributing to increasing participant knowledge and skills. The evidence that TRAILs has significantly changed the behaviours and practices of delivery staff, in-service teachers and trainees is less strong, though there is some evidence that those who took part in the TRAILs Winter School are likely to apply what they have learned in their teaching practice going forward, and that the new skills acquired will contribute to enhancing their future professional opportunities.

- The evidence supporting the longer term expected impacts of TRAILs is relatively weak. Although feedback from TRAILs Multiplier Events and qualitative evidence from evaluation of the Winter School suggest the project has contributed to some extent to LSP knowledge transfer and good practice dissemination, there is little hard evidence that this has strengthened EU-wide collaborations. Nor is there strong evidence to support the conclusion that TRAILs is stimulating the generation of new research collaborations or is supporting the development of new programmes of study based on the TRAILs programme, thereby contributing to establishing a network of language teacher training centres and LSP teachers in Europe. However, the potential to do this is there, as evidenced by the success of the current TRAILs partnership in securing funding for a new Erasmus+ project -- LSP-TEOC.Pro -- that will build on TRAILs going forward, as well as evidence that the Winter School appears to have been a success in creating a European community and network of established and fledgling LSP teaching experts.
4. Implications of the evaluation

This final section of the Report firstly sets out recommendations for the improvement of the TRAILs programme going forward. This is followed by an assessment of the potential sustainability of the TRAILs LSP teacher training programme.

4.1 Recommendations for improving TRAILs

The evaluation highlighted a number of areas for improving the TRAILs LSP teacher training programme:

- reverting back to face-to-face delivery mode (possibly through a ‘blended’ pedagogic model)
- re-assessment of the range and number of topics included in the curriculum to identify what is essential and what could be optional
- improved time management (possibly splitting the course over a longer delivery period of two weeks rather than one), and with more breaks allocated
- more focus specifically on LSP rather than Languages for General Purposes
- provision of materials in advance
- more time allocated for students to communicate with teachers.

More broadly, the evaluation suggests further work is needed to create the conditions to support the project’s longer term objectives of establishing a network of language teacher training centres and LSP teachers, and in LSP teaching; increasing teacher trainee employability and increasing the attractiveness of LSP teaching in Europe. Relevant actions could cover:

- Engaging stakeholder communities from outside the immediate Higher Education sector more actively in creating the conditions for stronger and more effective trans-national and trans-disciplinary collaboration, networking and partnership-building in LSP teacher training.
- In particular, putting more effort into raising policy-makers’ awareness of LSP teacher training through, for example, developing a ‘Green Paper’ and ‘Road Map’ to support training policy going forward, as a complement to the more academically focused TRAILs book.
- Capitalising on the successful Erasmus+ funded successor to TRAILs – LSP-TEOC.Pro – to expand the range of research activities in LSP teacher training by targeting additional research programmes and expanding the range of collaborating organisations beyond the Higher Education sector, for example to include ‘third sector’ organisations working on the ground in areas such as supporting migrants, as well as business sectors with an interest in LSP.

4.2 TRAILs sustainability potential

This sub-section presents an assessment of the sustainability potential of TRAILs. To do this it uses two assessment tools: SWOT analysis (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats) 3 and Replication analysis, which draws on methods and tools developed by the Spring Impact Replication Readiness Toolkit 4 and the Designscapes Toolbox 5.

Table 11 shows the TRAILs SWOT analysis.

---

3 http://diytoolkit.org
4 https://toolkit.springimpact.org/Home
5 https://designscapes.eu/resources/
Table 11: TRAILs SWOT Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highly developed training programme with strong evidence of usability, user-friendliness and user effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong evidence base that the programme achieves significant learning outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong evidence of demand for TRAILs products and services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly skilled, professional delivery, management and support staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embryonic LSP training and research ecosystem in Europe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course over-ambitious and could benefit from 'down-sizing'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatively low level of buy-in from key policy-makers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network of LSP training centres yet to be established</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The SWOT analysis in Table 11 suggests that the strengths of the TRAILs LSP teacher training programme – characterized by high quality content with strong evidence of usability, user-friendliness and user effectiveness and strong evidence of significant learning outcomes, coupled with strong evidence of demand for TRAILs products and services, a highly skilled, professional delivery, management and support staff, and an embryonic LSP training and research ecosystem in Europe, significantly outweigh its weaknesses (i.e. over-ambitiousness; a relatively low level of buy-in from some key stakeholders and the current low level of development of a supportive EU network of LSP training centres). Similarly, in light of the low level of competition in current LSP training market, there are positive opportunities for TRAILs going forward, with the main threat being potential continued disruption of face to face teaching as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic.

Table 12 shows the results of the TRAILS replication analysis, which scores TRAILs across a range of 'replication readiness' criteria. Each criteria has a maximum score of 3 and a minimum score of 1.

Table 12: TRAILs replication analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention replication readiness criteria</th>
<th>TRAILs Rating (1 low 3 high)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is the nature of the project?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Straightforward design with a logic model and/or a manual describing it and how it should be implemented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Straightforward / simple design that is well explained – but no manual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Several activity strands, no logic model or manual that describes the project and there are several hard to define components</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much do you know about what the essential parts of your project are that make it successful?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 No knowledge about which parts make the intervention successful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Some knowledge (e.g. from introducing the project into different contexts or theory of change)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Strong evidence and evaluation-based knowledge about aspects of the intervention that are responsible for its impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will your project work in other contexts?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 The project is culture or context specific</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 There is some evidence of the project working elsewhere</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 There is strong evidence that the project will work elsewhere</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Intervention replication readiness criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What evidence do you have that that your project has an impact?</th>
<th>TRAILS Rating (1 low 3 high)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 The impact is unknown or unclear</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Reasonable evidence from evaluation or other measurement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Strong and rigorous evidence from rigorous evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relevant to the scale and nature of the intervention.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Replication plans, strategies and structures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is the main reason or motivation to replicate the intervention?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 To increase scale: the delivery setting allows rapid scaling</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 To increase financial returns: is there robust cost / benefit data?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 No reasons specified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is your business model for replication?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 No business model</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Outline business model</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Detailed business model</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is there a clear owner of the replication project?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Yes - there is one individual with relevant skills and experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Yes, the project owner is an experienced individual with previous experience in scaling and is trusted by stakeholders.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What understanding and evidence do you have of the match between the social, economic and environmental needs of the local and replication contexts?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 No understanding</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Some understanding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 In-depth field research implemented to understand differences and similarities in needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What evidence do you have of the supply or people or organisations willing to deliver the</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 No interested parties or only some initial contacts</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 There is evidence of a supply of people or organisations willing and qualified to take on the replicated project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 There is strong evidence of several people or organisations eager and qualified to take on the replicated project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Organisational culture, capability, capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are the functions and organisational values necessary for replication (relating to process, systems, training, legal agreements, procedures and ensuring quality) well defined</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Yes, a few are defined and developed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Yes, all are accurately defined and developed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is the quality of staff involved in the replication effort?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 They generally display a low level of curiosity, and willingness to learn.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 They display some degree of curiosity, and willingness to learn.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 They display a high degree of curiosity, and willingness to learn and may have prior experience of replication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is the seniority of staff involved in the replication effort?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 mainly junior and not able to take many autonomous decisions</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 have some degree of autonomous decision making ability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 sufficiently senior to work autonomously and take decisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To what extent are organisational and project technologies transferable to different contexts?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 They are specific to the context in which they were created.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 With some changes, they can be used in different contexts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 There is evidence to show that they can be used in a different context.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Intervention replication readiness criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is the nature of communication patterns within the project and with external stakeholders?</th>
<th>TRAILS Rating (1 low 3 high)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1 Communication is siloed and technocratic.  
2 Cross team communication is possible but not ‘habitual’  
3 Individual, team and cross team communication patterns are fluid | 3 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To what extent do staff and external stakeholders support replication?</th>
<th>TRAILS Rating (1 low 3 high)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1 Most are hostile to replication  
2 Most are supportive of replication  
3 All are supportive of replication | 3 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is the brand understood and valued by your audience (beneficiaries, customers, funders etc.)?</th>
<th>TRAILS Rating (1 low 3 high)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1 No or very little understanding  
2 Brand is partially understood and valued  
3 Brand and organisational values are clearly documented. | 2 |

As Table 12 shows, TRAILS scores 39 out of a possible maximum score of 60 (65%) – demonstrating a relatively high replication potential. The analysis suggests that more work to increase the replication/sustainability potential of TRAILS is needed in the following areas:

- financial/business analysis and planning
- organisational structures and systems (putting into place systems and tools to support process, systems, training, legal agreements, procedures and ensuring quality)
- establishing a brand and working on brand consolidation and recognition.
ANNEX I: Evaluation Methodology and Toolkit

1.1 Background and Context to the Evaluation

TRAILS is an experimental project that will develop, test and disseminate an innovative approach to training Languages for Specific Purposes (LSP) teachers. It aims to deliver an innovative curriculum, applicable throughout the European higher education area, for the training of LSP teachers, with particular reference to the use of ICT in classroom and blended learning and teaching; pilot test the curriculum through the TRAILS Summer School programme and, as a result, improve the physical and virtual mobility, language, digital and intercultural skills of Summer School participants and project team members.

The main outcomes and impacts expected following completion of the project include a network of language teacher training centres and LSP teachers; an increase in the acquisition of the high-quality skills and competences necessary for quality LSP teaching; more extensive use of digital technologies and digitally-supported pedagogy in LSP training and in teaching; increased teacher trainee and LSP teacher professional self-confidence and increased teacher trainee employability. Overall, it is expected that TRAILS will contribute to increasing the attractiveness of LSP teaching in Europe.

To achieve these objects and expected outcomes, the project methodology and implementation incorporates a range of activities, involving different approaches, methods and tools, including:

- an analysis of LSP teacher training programmes in Europe, in terms of entry requirements, outcomes, syllabii, learning and teaching methodologies, assessment methods, ICT used, reference books and other reference materials, forms of practical training
- an analysis of LSP teacher needs in terms of the needs of junior/experienced LSP teachers, the required qualifications, teaching skills and methodology, materials design, use of ICT, testing and assessment, research methodology, disciplinary knowledge
- an analysis of the present and future LSP teaching skills that help teacher trainees enter the job market
- definition of the training outcomes and curriculum of an LSP teacher training programme
- testing of the LSP teacher training programme through the TRAILS Summer School
- dissemination of the programme and the project results.

Against this background, the evaluation approach chosen for TRAILS needs to reflect its particular features and characteristics. Ideally, project stakeholders – people with a ‘stake’ in the project results, particularly those who fund it – look to the most robust evaluation approaches available in order to demonstrate results, impact and value. These approaches usually imply using ‘experimental’ methods to demonstrate results and impact – in particular the use of ‘Randomised controlled trials’ (RCT’s), which are seen as the ‘gold standard’ in evaluation and impacts assessment. 6

The attraction of experimental methods is that they are good at establishing the ‘counterfactual’ 7. Counterfactual evaluation involves comparing the outcomes of interest of those who have benefitted from an intervention (the ‘treatment group’) with those of a group similar in all respects to the treatment group (the ‘comparison/control group’), but who have not been exposed to the intervention. The comparison group provides information on what would have happened to the participants in the intervention had they not been exposed to it. In the case of TRAILS, this would imply i) randomly selecting the participants for the training programme and summer school and ii) randomly selecting a similar group of teacher trainees and LSP professionals who did not participate in the programme iii) comparing the two groups’ levels of LSP, digital and intercultural


competences following completion of the programme.

However, a consistent problem identified in the literature on evaluation and impacts assessment in fields involving social interventions – as is the case with TRAILs - is the difficulty in maintaining the ‘temporal priority’ required in RCTs - the assumption that a suspected cause precedes an event (for example, in clinical trials that the application of a particular drug will ‘cause’ the relief of particular symptoms). There are a number of factors that conspire to undermine temporal priority: history effects (the effects of ‘external’ variables unconnected with the intervention being evaluated that may have an influence on its outcomes); selection effects (statistical bias in the treatment and control groups); instrumentation effects (for example using measurement tools in different settings); attrition (uneven loss of participating subjects in treatment and control groups). In short, the range and complexity of ‘intervening variables’ that may influence the effects of a social intervention are potentially unmanageable. 8 One option in these situations is to use ‘quasi-experimental’ approaches – for example ‘double difference’ (comparing ‘before and after’ effects without randomisation); ‘propensity scores’ (statistically creating comparable groups based on an analysis of the factors that influenced people’s propensity to participate in the programme); ‘matched comparisons’ (matching participants, individuals, organizations or communities) with a non-participant on variables that are thought to be relevant. The problem is, interventions like TRAILs create evaluation challenges in which even quasi-experimental methods will struggle to demonstrate a credible counterfactual case. These include complexity and unpredictable change; nonlinear response outcomes; high rates of outcome variability; treatments that comprise multiple interventions; infrequent data sampling, non-existent baselines, and large measurement error; long time lag between intervention and response; complex spill-over effects 9 10.

What is needed, therefore, in the case of interventions like TRAILs, is a more ‘pluralist’ evaluation perspective, one which combines some of the ‘rigour’ of experimentalism with approaches that can reflect the context of the intervention, and the perspectives of the stakeholders involved. 11 This has led to the development of what has come to be known as ‘theory-driven evaluation’ (Chen, 1990). We need to have an underlying ‘theory’ about our intervention that can explain its context, its process and its ‘mechanism of change’ in order to explain subsequent outcomes that can be tested by observation (Pawson and Tilley, 1997) 12 and which reflects the range of particular characteristics of the intervention being evaluated. Finally, the evaluation needs to reflect project ‘evolution’. As Pawson and Weiss argue, interventions – and their evaluation – can be seen as a ‘discontinuous process’ which involves a number of complex steps over time, rather than the implementation of a clear, and subsequently unchanging logic at the beginning. 13 All interventions are subject to ‘knowledge creep’ – that is their vision, logic, objectives and purpose change over time as the intervention develops. Evaluation therefore needs to be able to capture this evolutionary process and, in particular, how the values of the actors engaged in the intervention shape its evolution and how their practices within the intervention also change it. 14

1.2 Overall evaluation approach – ‘realist’ evaluation

Taking the above factors into consideration, the overall conceptual framework chosen for the TRAILs evaluation system is based on an adaptation of the ‘realist evaluation’ approach (Pawson, 2006). This is an approach grounded in realism, a school of philosophy which asserts that both the material and the social worlds are ‘real’ and can have real effects; and that it is possible to work towards a closer understanding of what causes change. Realist evaluation allows for context to be taken into consideration when assessing interventions. The process looks at how something is supposed to work, with the goal of finding out what strategies work for which people, in what circumstances, and how.

The key features of the approach are as follows:

- Programmes and interventions are viewed as an attempt to address an existing problem – that is, to create some level of change. The focus of evaluation should therefore be on assessing whether and how this change has occurred.
- Programmes and interventions work by enabling participants to make different choices, so a key objective of evaluation is to capture how and why these choices are made.
- Making and sustaining different choices requires a change in participant’s ‘reasoning’ (for example, values, beliefs, attitudes, or the logic they apply to a particular situation) and the resources (e.g. information, skills, material resources, support) they have available to them. This combination of ‘reasoning and resources’ is what enables the programme to ‘work’ and is defined as a programme ‘mechanism’.
- Programmes and interventions work in different ways for different people - a key task of evaluation is therefore to capture ‘what works, for whom under what conditions’.
- The contexts in which programmes and interventions operate make a difference to the outcomes they achieve. Mapping context and how it affects outcomes is crucial to the evaluation – for example whether and in what ways project participants get involved in the TRAILs Programme in its different pilot locations. There is always an interaction between context and mechanism, and that interaction is what creates the intervention’s impacts or outcomes: Context + Mechanism = Outcome.
- The evaluation design needs to reflect a number of ‘pragmatic’ considerations: the ‘object’ of the evaluation; the purposes of the evaluation; the resources available to carry it out.

A realist approach is essentially about testing a theory about what ‘might cause change’, even though that theory may not be explicit. One of the tasks of a realist evaluation is therefore to make the theories within an intervention explicit, by developing clear hypotheses about how, and for whom, programmes might ‘work’. The implementation of the programme, and the evaluation of it, then tests those hypotheses. This means collecting data, not just about intervention impacts, but also the processes of the intervention implementation, as well as data about the specific mechanisms that might be creating change.

Data collection and analysis needs to reflect the different positions of stakeholders and the information these stakeholders will have. So, rather than simply comparing changes for participants who have taken part in an intervention with a group of people who have not (as is done in random control or quasi-experimental designs), a realist evaluation compares mechanisms and outcomes within programmes.

Learning is key to collecting and measuring data on evaluation outcomes and impacts, but more importantly it is key to understanding whether the ‘theory of change’ underlying the intervention is the ‘right’ one. In this sense, evaluation is similar to ‘action research’, where a ‘change hypothesis’ is tested by observing how the theory works in practice.

1.2.1 Theory of Change

Two things that are crucial in carrying out realist evaluation are ‘Theory of Change’ and the ‘mechanisms’ that underpin the change process. Theory of Change tells the project ‘story’ – from the ‘presenting problem’ it addresses through to the change it hopes to make on that problem at the end of the project and beyond (i.e. the project’s expected ‘impacts’).

Connecting the presenting problem and expected impacts are:

- Activities – actions carried out by TRAILs, that lead to……
- Outputs – things that are produced by these activities, that lead to……
- immediate outcomes - changes in awareness and knowledge, that lead to……
- intermediate outcomes- changes in behaviour and structures.

Underlying this ‘change journey’ are ‘theories’ (assumptions and hypotheses), for example:

- A theory of what is causing the ‘presenting problem’
- A theory of what is needed to bring about the desired solution
- Assumptions that if we take Action ‘X’, this will produce Output ‘Y’, which will then lead to Outcome ‘Z’.

These theories, hypotheses and assumptions need to be tested as the project develops and, if necessary, revised in light of evaluation evidence. A simplified Theory of Change for TRAILs is presented in the Figure below.

The ‘presenting problem’ TRAILs addresses is:

Not enough teachers have the necessary skills to deliver effective LSP training. There is therefore a need for new training methodologies that provide these skills to a wider constituency of professionals and trainee teachers.

TRAILs’s ‘theory’ about the causes of this problem is:

Too many higher education teachers have received little or no pedagogical training. Most LSP job offers tend not to be filled by qualified teachers. Pedagogical gaps in higher education and lack of university training focused on LSP teaching contribute to this mismatch. Most LSP teachers have been assigned to teach ESP courses without any initial training. Language teachers who accept a position at a university on a LSP profile have to surmount the complexity of the context and assume a wide variety of roles, without much support.
### Theory of problem

- **Pedagogic gaps and lack of training in LSP**

### ACTION

- **Review of existing LSP programmes**
  - Teacher needs analysis

### OUTPUT

- **Design of LSP training programme**
  - Summer School Guidelines

### OUTCOME

- **Improved mobility**
- **Increased language, digital & intercultural skills**

### Expected Change

- **Better trained LSP teachers**
- **LSP Network of centres & teachers**
- **Increased employability**

---

**Presenting Problem:**

Lack of LSP training for both educators and students

01/02/2019

**TRAILs's solution** to this problem is:

- analyse LSP teacher training programmes in Europe
- analyse LSP teacher needs
- analyse the present and future LSP teaching skills that help teacher trainees enter the job market
- define the training outcomes and curriculum of an LSP teacher training programme
- test the LSP teacher training programme through the TRAILs Summer School
- disseminate the programme and project results across the EU.

**TRAILs's longer term expected impacts** are:

- establishment of network of language teacher training centres and LSP teachers, and in LSP teaching
- increased teacher trainee employability
- increased attractiveness of LSP teaching in Europe.

**TRAILs's immediate outcomes** (changes in awareness and knowledge) are:

- For LSP professionals and trainee teachers - positive changes in attitude towards LSP learning and teaching; increased teacher trainee and LSP teacher professional self-confidence; increased intercultural awareness; increased digital competences; an increase in the acquisition of the high-quality skills and competences necessary for quality LSP teaching
- For other stakeholders - increased awareness of good European practice and knowledge transfer;

**TRAILs's intermediate outcomes** (changes in individual and institutional behaviours) are:

- for LSP professionals and trainee teachers - more extensive use of digital technologies and digitally-supported pedagogy in LSP training
- development of partnerships aimed at providing and promoting knowledge and skills for high quality teaching and learning of LSP in VET and in higher education
• for other stakeholders - sharing information and strengthening collaborations; integrating project results into national and regional policy.

This ‘baseline’ Theory of Change will be reviewed and revised as the project develops, in light of evaluation evidence.

1.2.2 Mechanisms

Mechanisms are key to understanding how the Theory of Change works. Mechanisms can be defined as:

‘underlying entities, processes, or structures which operate in particular contexts to generate outcomes of interest’ (Astbury and Leeuw, 2010).

As noted above, interventions like TRAILs are intended to encourage the target groups they are aimed at to make and sustain different choices – for example choosing to participate in the TRAILs programme and summer school. Making these choices requires a change in the participant’s ‘reasoning’ (for example the values, beliefs, attitudes, or the logic they apply to a particular situation). It also requires a change in the ‘resources’ participants have available to them. For example TRAILs will provide information, skills, material resources, and support which will in turn increase participants’ individual resources (in LSP, digital competences, intercultural skills) and ultimately the resources available to their institutions and networks. This combination of ‘reasoning and resources’ is what enables TRAILs to ‘work’ and is defined as a project ‘mechanism’. The way the mechanism works depends on the ‘context’ in which it operates. TRAILs’s training programme will work – or not – in different ways for different people depending on ‘contextual factors’ – like the time and economic resources available to professionals and trainee teachers to participate. There is always an interaction between context and mechanism, and that interaction is what creates the intervention’s impacts or outcomes: Context + Mechanism = Outcome.

The mechanism is not the intervention itself – TRAILs – nor the actions and services - like the training programme - it provides. The mechanism is the response TRAILs triggers from the actors involved – i.e. the combination of Resources (training programme) and Reasoning (how actors use these resources; how this changes their awareness, attitudes and behaviours) – and how this results in outcomes.

In the famous story of how Sir Isaac Newton developed his theory of gravitational force, legend has it he was sitting under an apple tree thinking about how planetary bodies revolved around each other when he noticed an apple falling from the tree. He later described – in mathematical notation – the process that caused the apple to fall. In other words he described the ‘mechanism’ of gravity, i.e. \( F = G \frac{m_1 m_2}{r^2} \). It’s the mechanism that causes the apple to fall. Not the tree. Nor the apple. Moreover, this mechanism is invisible. You can’t see it – you can only see its effects.

Similarly, in pharmacology, the term ‘mechanism of action’ refers to the specific biochemical interaction through which a drug acts on the body to generate its effect. It isn’t an antibiotic that ‘cures’ an infection. It’s the ‘mechanism of action’ of the antibiotic acting on the cell wall of a bacterium – which inhibits bacterial cell wall synthesis and so contributes to its eventual death.

Mechanisms have five key properties, as shown in the illustration below:

• They define what has been described as the ‘missing middle’ between what an intervention does (its activities) and how these lead to desired goals being achieved
• Their ‘mechanism of action’ – the ‘black box’ or capsule in which the intervention operates – is largely invisible. The task in evaluation is open up the capsule to understand how it works.

---

Interventions – and their ‘mechanisms of action’ – are influenced by, and in turn influence, ‘resources’
Interventions – and their ‘mechanisms of action’ – are influenced by, and in turn influence, ‘reasoning’ – the social and psychological processes by which actors make choices and changes
Interventions – and their ‘mechanisms of action’ – don’t always work, and sometimes miss their target. They work for some people, some of the time, in some situations.

Five key properties of Mechanisms
A key task for the evaluation is therefore to identify the ‘mechanisms’ that underpin TRAILs’s Theory of Change; how they reflect the interactions between ‘resources’ and ‘reasoning’ and how these influence TRAILs outcomes and impacts. The evaluation explores these mechanisms as the project develops in terms of:

- the assumptions that underpin them
- the evidence available to support them
- possible 'alternative mechanisms' - that are unconnected with TRAILs - that could make a significant contribution to the project outcomes.

The ‘primary mechanism’ proposed for TRAILs is shown in Table 1 below.
Table 1: TRAILs primary mechanism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competence acquisition mechanism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resources:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Immediate outcomes:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intermediate outcomes:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Long term impact:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assumptions:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternative mechanism:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2.3 Contribution Analysis

Contribution analysis works with TRAILs’s Theory of Change to deliver an evaluation ‘counterfactual’. It aims to create a causal chain – or ‘contribution story’ that links the context of the project to outcomes, through interrogating the project ‘mechanisms’. It explores ‘attribution’ – whether and in what ways TRAILs has ‘caused’ expected outcomes and impacts - through assessing the contribution the project is making to observed results. It sets out to verify the theory of change behind TRAILs and, at the same time, takes into consideration other influencing factors (Toulemonde, 2010; Mayne, 2012). In a nutshell, by developing a Theory of Change showing the links between the activities, outcomes and contexts of the project and collecting evidence from various sources to test this theory, the aim of Contribution Analysis is to build a credible ‘performance’ story of that project. Following Mayne (2012) and Befani and Mayne (2014) the methodology applied to develop this contribution analysis for TRAILs involves six steps:

1. Set out the attribution problem to be addressed – specifying the outcome or target that is hoped to improve or change, as well as the key evaluation questions to be addressed

2. Develop a theory of change about how the intervention is supposed to work, together with i) the assumptions underpinning the theory ii) the risks to realisation of the intended outcomes and impacts iii) the mechanisms involved

3. Gather evidence to assess whether the Theory of Change works, and explore and discuss plausible alternative explanations and mechanisms - identifying the most likely alternative explanations and the evidence associated with them

4. Assemble the Contribution Story – explain how and why a result is caused by a particular sequence of events and actions, and why it is reasonable to assume that the actions of the intervention have contributed to the observed outcomes. Specify the weaknesses in the story

5. Gather new evidence on the implementation of the intervention

6. Revise and strengthen the contribution story – using the new evidence gathered and assessed.

Ultimately, Contribution Analysis aims to infer ‘plausible association’ between a project and a set of relevant outcomes by means of systematic inquiry. To demonstrate this ‘plausible association’, TRAILs’ embedded Theory of Change needs to meet the following five criteria Mayne (2011):

- Plausibility: Is the theory of change plausible?
- Implementation according to plan: Has the program been implemented with high fidelity?
- Evidentiary confirmation of key elements: To what extent are the key elements of the theory of change confirmed by new or existing evidence?
- Identification and examination of other influencing factors: To what extent have other influencing factors been identified and accounted for?
- Disproof of alternative explanations: To what extent have the most relevant alternative explanations been disproved?

Ultimately, contribution analysis asks: ‘what would have changed if TRAILs had never happened?’ In the evaluation, we will construct the contribution story by measuring changes in behaviours of both individuals – for example professionals and trainee teachers participating in the TRAILs Training Programme – and organisations – for example changes in the strategies adopted by higher education institutions to support LSP training.

### 1.3 Evaluation Purposes and Evaluation Modes

In the context of the ‘realist evaluation’ approach outlined above, the TRAILs evaluation has four main purposes:

- A developmental purpose - following the project ‘process’ and supporting the different stakeholders involved in assessing how the initiative is doing and whether it is ‘on track’
- An accountability purpose - understanding whether project goals are being achieved, and whether the project is providing value for money
- A knowledge purpose - providing evidence on the outcomes and impacts of the project, including an assessment of the extent to which the project has achieved its intended objectives and outcomes, as well as contributing to an evidence base about ‘what works’
- A learning purpose – on the one hand, reflecting on the activities carried out in the project as it develops to influence and improve project delivery and, at the end of the evaluation,
assessing the transferability of the project results to similar initiatives in the future and contributing to supporting the replication and sustainability of the project’s innovations.

These purposes mean that the evaluation has to work in four modes, as shown in the Figure below.

- **Ex-ante (design)** mode – contributing to the project design and its development. For example, reviewing the pedagogic approach applied in the curriculum.

- **Formative (process)** mode – putting into place a framework, mechanisms and tools to monitor project progress and assessing the effectiveness and efficiency of the project delivery. For example, developing a ‘process dashboard’ to assess progress against key targets and milestones.

- **Ex-post (summative)** mode – designing and implementing a methodology and tools to assess project outcomes and impacts. For example, delivering a ‘counterfactual’ evaluation for TRAILS based on ‘contribution analysis’.

- **Learning (sustainability)** mode – applying the results from the evaluation either through formative evaluation – for example holding regular ‘action learning sets’ to review the process dashboard results and their implications – or ‘post-summative’ evaluation – for example feeding evaluation results into a TRAILS exploitation effort.

The different modes pose different evaluation questions that need to be answered. The Table below sets out some of these questions.

**Evaluation Questions and Evaluation Modes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Ex-post (Summative)</th>
<th>Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ex-ante</td>
<td>What does the analysis of LSP teacher training programmes in Europe tell us about how the curriculum should be designed?</td>
<td>Is the project on track towards meeting its planned milestones, objectives and KPI’s?</td>
<td>Did participation in TRAILS increase LSP professional and trainee teacher competences and in what ways?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are the pedagogic models and practices</td>
<td>Are TRAILS’s dissemination actions delivering the right</td>
<td>Did Summer School participants apply what they had learned in their</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-post (Summative)</td>
<td>Did the Summer School participants apply what they had learned in their</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
that shape the Training Programme appropriate? messages to the right target groups? practice and in what ways? factors ‘caused’ which outcomes?)

These evaluation questions will be further developed as the project evolves, in light of the results of TRAILs’ activities.

1.4 Triangulation

Triangulation allows for the synthesis of evidence of different types and from different sources, drawn from different kinds of evaluation activities, in order to arrive at conclusions in situations where attributing causality is difficult. In particular, a key aim of triangulation is to capture and reflect the ‘voice’ of different stakeholders in order to identify and understand their different positions and perspectives. Triangulation is essential in a realist evaluation approach for the following reasons. First, it allows for the capture of complex contextual data. Second, it avoids relying on ‘expert’ knowledge and evidence (for example that derived solely from peer-reviewed journals) and third, it provides a means to consider ideologies, values and power relations between different actors. Triangulation supports generalisability and transferability of findings in a situation like this domain, where the project is innovative and evolving, and the evidence base is limited and lacks ‘robustness’. This is because it increases the ‘robustness’ and transferability of findings through cross-checking of data derived from different sources and from different actors thus helping to boost the internal validity of the research.¹⁹ Triangulation can be seen as the penultimate stage of the ‘realist evaluation cycle’. It entails synthesis of the evaluation evidence from the different evaluation activities carried out in TRAILs, i.e.: secondary data (drawn from sources such as management and quality monitoring reports) and primary data (acquired for example through user surveys), combining quantitative analysis with qualitative data.

1.5 Designing indicators for the evaluation

An important remit of the TRAILs evaluation is the creation of data, data sets and measures to evaluate impact. This requires the careful creation of indicators.

1.5.1 Constructing KPIs, KRI’s and CSFs

Several commentators have noted that, when people are trying to design useful and relevant indicators to measure ‘success’, they tend to confuse and conflate three important but distinct elements: Critical Success Factors (CSF’s); Key Results Indicators (KRI’s) and Key Performance Indicators (KPI)’s (Parmenter, 2007). ²⁰

Critical Success Factors (CSF’s) can be defined both as ‘the critical areas whose high performance or success is important’ and also ‘the steps taken to succeed’ (Rockart, 1979). ²¹ Key Results Indicators (KRI’s) measure the ‘results’ (effects) of these steps that are carried out in terms of the ‘end result’ – so they are ‘summative’ (looking back at the impacts of an intervention). Key Performance Indicators (KPI)’s make the connection between the CSF’s and the KRI’s. They track the actions between the CSF’s and the KRI’s. So, first, they have to measure a process. Second, they have to be key - i.e. the only measures that are essential to demonstrate progress towards ‘results’. Third, they have to measure ‘live’ data - i.e. the information source used to measure process and progress is continually generating updated information. Fourth, they need to reflect ‘context’. For example it’s no use having a KPI for TRAILs that measures the number of visits to the website without measuring who visits and what they visit for. Fifth, they have to be ‘metrics’ - i.e. a quantifiable measure that

---

can demonstrate progress either from a baseline or in context - not just a ‘measure’ (which is ‘absolute’ or ‘unit-specific’). For example, if we wanted to measure the increase in LSP professionals and trainee teachers' LSP and digital competences as a result of participating in TRAILs we’d need to compare the increase in their mean scores before and after participating in the training programme. A good illustration of how CSA’s, KRI’s and KPI’s work, what are the differences between them and how they relate to each other, is a successful football team. Let’s take the case of Liverpool FC.

This is John W Henry, founder of Fenway Sports Group, owners of Liverpool FC. His main focus is on KRI’s – the key ‘wins’ that define overall success.

This is Jurgen Klopp, Liverpool FC manager. He focuses on Critical Success Factors – the actions that can be turned into ‘wins’.

This is Zeljko Buvac, First Assistant Coach. He’s mostly interested in evaluating what happens on the training ground, then making improvements that can feed into success on the pitch.

Creating KPIs and KRI’s – the example of Liverpool FC

1.5.2 KPIs, KRI’s and CSFs for the evaluation of TRAILs

The TRAILs evaluation needs to combine all three elements in order to assess the success of the project - looking at the big ‘wins’ at project end; the critical success factors that are needed to make these happen and the key performance indicators that can tell us how we are progressing on the journey towards achieving the desired project results. Broadly, the three elements correspond to a simple ‘input-transformation-output’ model, as shown in the Figure below.
As the Figure shows, the ‘inputs’ to the project are the TRAILs resources and activities – for example the training programme and summer school. These are critical to the subsequent TRAILs final results (impacts) – for example contributing to increased trainee teacher employability, which is one of the ‘key result indicators’ the evaluation needs to measure. Connecting the support programme with the end results are the ‘effects’ of these actions – these can be thought of as ‘outcomes’ that need to be measured for example an expected % increase in participants’ LSP, digital and intercultural competences. Key performance indicators give us a way of tracking how far we are on the road to achieving these expected outcomes. For example measuring the change in registrations for the summer schools at points in time along the project life cycle will tell us to what extent we are likely to have enough attendees to make a difference in increasing competence levels. However, the TRAILs CSFs, KPIs and KRIIs need to be aligned with the project ‘Theory of Change’, as shown in Section 1.2.2 above. Theory of Change replaces the simple input-transformation-output (or ‘logic’) model with an explicit theory of how and why TRAILs might cause an effect - which is then used to guide the evaluation. It does this by investigating the causal relationships – mechanisms - between ‘context-input-output-outcomes-impact’ in order to understand the combination of factors that has led to the intended or unintended outcomes and impacts. In this model, KPIs therefore play an important role in defining, describing and assessing these ‘mechanisms’. They provide a measure of how the 'process' of the mechanism is evolving, and so whether the assumptions underpinning the mechanism are the right ones.

In TRAILs, CSFs – the critical areas whose success is important, and the key steps that need to be taken to succeed - include:

- understanding the characteristics that support effective LSP training (through undertaking TRAILs’s analysis of EU LSP training programmes)
- understanding the needs of of TRAILs’s stakeholders (and building a user-friendly and effective curriculum and summer school)
- understanding pedagogic and training needs of TRAILs’s stakeholders (and building a training programme that works)

TRAILs’s KRIIs – the results (effects) of these steps that are carried out in terms of the ‘end result’ – include:

- building an effective EU LSP training network
- increasing the attractiveness of LSP for trainee teachers
- in the long term, improved quality of LSP teaching in the EU.

A first baseline set of CSFs, KPIs, Immediate and intermediate outcomes and expected impacts are shown in Table 2 below. These will be reviewed in light of evolving project results.
### Table 2: TRAILs Baseline Evaluation Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSFs (activities &amp; outputs)</th>
<th>CSF indicators</th>
<th>Immediate Outcomes</th>
<th>IMO Indicators</th>
<th>Intermediate Outcomes</th>
<th>INO Indicators</th>
<th>KPIs</th>
<th>KRI s (impacts)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research on LSP training programmes feeds into pedagogic framework and curriculum. Needs assessment identifies competence gaps</td>
<td>No. of LSP teacher training programmes in Europe reviewed and analysed No. LSP teachers surveyed and interviewed</td>
<td>Increase in partner awareness of LSP drivers, barriers and training needs</td>
<td>Level of LSP training provided in EU tertiary institutions % surveyed teachers reporting receiving LSP training No. unmet needs identified</td>
<td>Stakeholders, in particular HE institutions, seek more information about LSP training needs and opportunities</td>
<td>No. stakeholders receiving information on TRAILs research results</td>
<td>% HE survey target reached % LSP teacher survey target reached % increase in stakeholders informed of project research results</td>
<td>Increase in LSP awareness across EU HE institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition of LSP training outcomes</td>
<td>Production of Report on design and development of LSP course curriculum</td>
<td>Increase in partner and stakeholder awareness of gaps in LSP teacher training provision at national and EU level Increase in understanding of LSP training outcomes needed</td>
<td>No. and range of gaps and outcomes identified</td>
<td>Transferability and take up of gaps and outcomes results at partner and EU level</td>
<td>No. stakeholders utilising the gaps and outcomes results</td>
<td>Progress towards gaps and outcomes targets Progress towards transferability targets</td>
<td>Increase in awareness of training gaps and needed training outcomes across EU HE institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative training curriculum developed and piloted</td>
<td>Production of training methodology, training units, selection guidelines, assessment instrument. Piloting with teachers and Programme participants will improve their LSP, digital and intercultural competences Programme participants will learn from each other and share</td>
<td>No. of teachers and students recruited for summer schools Increase in LSP, digital and intercultural competences after summer school attendance</td>
<td>Programme participants apply the competences they have acquired in their pedagogic practice</td>
<td>% programme participants reporting they have applied or intend to apply their TRAILs competences in their practice % trainee teachers reporting</td>
<td>Progress towards meeting targets on curriculum development Progress towards summer school recruitment targets</td>
<td>Relevant and high-quality skills and competences necessary for quality LSP teaching will be developed and shared. LSP teachers will be supported in...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSFs (activities &amp; outputs)</td>
<td>CSF indicators</td>
<td>Immediate Outcomes</td>
<td>IMO Indicators</td>
<td>Intermediate Outcomes</td>
<td>INO Indicators</td>
<td>KPIs</td>
<td>KRI (Impacts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students in 2 summer schools</td>
<td>experience and materials through mobility</td>
<td>% summer school participants reporting increased knowledge of LSP through networking with their peers</td>
<td>increased employability prospects</td>
<td>% participants reporting increased attractiveness of LSP teaching</td>
<td>the use of digital technologies. Pedagogies using ICT will be explored and consolidated Teacher trainee employability enhanced Attractiveness of LSP teaching increased</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissemination, replication and sustainability systems set up and actions carried out.</td>
<td>No. visits to project portal No. project Leaflet and Results Summaries distributed. No. multiplier events delivered and no. of attendees</td>
<td>Awareness of TRAILs and key outputs, including the curriculum and evaluation results, increased</td>
<td>% multiplier event participants report increased knowledge of LSP issues, TRAILs approach and pedagogic methodology</td>
<td>New partnerships and networks to promote knowledge and skills in LSP teaching and learning develop Higher Education and VET institutions explore adoption of TRAILs approach and curriculum in their training systems and practices HE institutions explore new LSP teaching and research programmes</td>
<td>No. HE and VET actors involved in TRAILs-related partnership and networking activities % of collaborating HE and VET institutions indicating intention to explore adoption of TRAILs approach and curriculum in their training systems and practices % of identified TRAILs stakeholders indicating</td>
<td>Change in website visits Change in project leaflets, brochures and results reports distributed Growth in TRAILs-related partnerships and networks</td>
<td>Partnerships providing and promoting knowledge and skills for high quality teaching and learning of LSP in VET and in higher education established. Network of language teacher training centres and LSP teachers established. Interaction between Universities will improve teaching and research, and develop new programmes of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSFs (activities &amp; outputs)</th>
<th>CSF indicators</th>
<th>Immediate Outcomes</th>
<th>IMO Indicators</th>
<th>Intermediate Outcomes</th>
<th>INO Indicators</th>
<th>KPIs</th>
<th>KRI (Impacts)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>based on TRAILS approach</td>
<td>Key stakeholders increase their collaboration to support adoption of LSP training in HE</td>
<td>intention to explore new LSP teaching and research programmes and increasing their collaboration</td>
<td>study based on the TRAILS programme. Regional authorities, policy makers, researchers, LSP communities, researchers, media, will share information and strengthen collaborations, and gain increased awareness of good European practice and knowledge transfer. TRAILS methods and products transferred for exploitation in other EU countries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key stakeholders increase their collaboration to support adoption of LSP training in HE.
2. Putting the approach into practice – the TRAILs Evaluation Methodology

Having set out the overarching framework for the TRAILs evaluation in the previous section, this Section discusses the evaluation methods to be used in each of the evaluation modes: ex ante, process, summative evaluation and learning.

2.1 Ex-ante evaluation

2.1.1 Definition

In simple terms, ex-ante evaluation can be defined as “An evaluation conducted before the implementation of an intervention”. Ex-ante evaluation is used to plan and prepare programmes and projects so as to ensure they comply with requirements, meet their objectives and deliver expected returns on investment. For example, as defined by the European Commission: “Ex ante evaluation is a process that supports the preparation of proposals for new or renewed Community actions. Its purpose is to gather information and carry out analyses that help to define objectives, to ensure that these objectives can be met, that the instruments used are cost-effective and that reliable later evaluation will be possible”.

Applying this to TRAILs, ex-ante evaluation means setting up systems, processes and tools to ensure that:

- the project plan is conceptually ‘coherent’ and reflects the project vision, aims and objectives
- the project meets its objectives and expected outcomes
- the project collects the right data to assess whether it meets its objectives and expected outcomes
- it applies these data to support continuous improvement.

2.1.2 Purposes of ex-ante evaluation

Ex-ante evaluation is primarily linked to two main evaluation purposes:

- a design purpose
- a learning purpose.

The design purpose aims to help clarify the intended aims and outcomes of a project plan. Ex ante evaluation activities therefore generally tend to be concentrated in the preparatory phase of a project. However, the evaluation design for TRAILs is based on a ‘Theory of Change’ model. This means that the assumptions about how the project is expected to evolve need to be constantly tested and, if necessary, revised – particularly at key points, or ‘milestones’ along the project’s ‘change journey’. This sometimes requires ‘re-design’ of the work plan.

The learning purpose reflects the fact that evaluation as understood and applied in TRAILs is about continuous and evolutionary improvement. Design is therefore intimately linked to ‘learning’. Ex-ante evaluation is supported in TRAILs through ‘peer learning workshops’, where the evidence from the evaluation is reviewed and reflected on, and feeds evolving knowledge from the TRAILs evaluation back into the project and offers scenarios for possible future trajectories.

2.1.3 Tools for Ex-Ante Evaluation

Four main tools are used to do ex-ante evaluation:

- Theory of Change and project intervention logic
- Questionnaires and Focus Groups
- Documentation Review and Content Analysis
Peer Learning Workshops.

Theory of Change and project intervention logic

As outlined above, Theory of Change therefore develops, and tests, the implementation theory (or ‘intervention logic’) of TRAILs and allows this to be modified or refined through the evaluation process. The Theory of Change model specifies the underlying assumptions of TRAILs and so incorporates a number of hypotheses about how the activities carried out by TRAILs as the project develops will promote changes at each stage of the project. The evaluation design and implementation approach follows this ‘change journey’. The evaluation data collected along the way enables these embedded change hypotheses to be tested. If the evaluation data do not support a particular hypothesis, then this hypothesis needs to be discarded or modified. Theory of Change shows the ‘causal pathways’ between TRAILs’ objectives, its activities, and its expected outcomes and impacts. It says: “if we take action X, then this will cause effect Y and this will eventually lead to outcome Z”.

The Theory of Change model therefore provides a key input to the project’s preparatory and planning activities. It specifies the overall ‘vision’ of TRAILs; how this vision will be implemented through the project activities; the outputs these activities are intended to achieve; the short and intermediate outcome associated with using these outputs and how these are expected to lead to the longer-term impacts of the project. As TRAILs develops, this ‘baseline’ theory of change will be reviewed in line with emerging evaluation data. The results of this review will then feed into reviewing and, if necessary, re-designing the project work plan.

The baseline TRAILs Theory of Change is set out in Section 1.2.1 above.

Questionnaires, interviews and Focus Groups

Partner surveys will be delivered to understand satisfaction with project implementation and capture improvement suggestions (see process evaluation section). These surveys will also include topical questions on particular and topical aspects of project implementation in order to capture ideas that could be directly fed back into implementing these activities. These surveys may be followed up with partner interviews where necessary and beneficial, with interviews focusing on ex ante evaluation questions.

Documentation Review and Content Analysis

Documentation review – including content analysis of specific documents (e.g. deliverables; management reports; website content; the project work plan; coordination meeting minutes; discussions and contributions on the website; drafts of ideas and framework developed by work packages) - will feed into the ex-ante evaluation.

Peer Learning Workshops

Interactive peer learning workshops follow the principles of action learning, reflective practice of key stakeholders and joint sense-making. They will provide a space for the evaluation team to communicate progress set as part of the theory of change (e.g. progress towards milestones/targets) and to enable the joint exploration of, and convergence on, what is working and why (or why not), which will feed back into the project. These will be carried out using an ‘action learning set’ method. This will involve representatives of all partners meeting either face to face or online in order to: discuss, review and amend the evolving TRAILs theory of change; review past and discuss upcoming project activities in light of the updated theory of change; review and where necessary amend evidence collection methods. For practical reasons it is envisaged that peer learning events will take place during partner meetings.
2.1.4 Evaluation support to partners

Evaluation support to partners will need to focus on activities that will help them evaluate their piloting activities (i.e. implementing the curriculum in the summer schools). We therefore envisage that it would encompass:

- Engaging in and communicating on the TRAILS evaluation approach as it develops and once finalised (e.g. in partner meetings and partner telcos)
- Information / training sessions on specific evaluation tools - such as any data capture technologies or guidance documents designed (again, in partner meetings and partner telcos).

2.2 Process evaluation (internal evaluation)

2.2.1 Definition and purpose

The overall purpose of the process evaluation is to determine how well TRAILS is working and the extent to which project activities are being implemented as intended. It focuses on the mechanisms through which the project delivers its objectives, targets and expected outcomes. It will therefore be a vehicle through which we will track the implementation process of the project in order to make sense of it as a system. This will enable partners to be supported in their own learning and understanding of whether TRAILS is ‘on course’.

The process evaluation will be an ongoing task which happens continuously as the project is being implemented and is supported by partner and stakeholder input to particular data collection activities. Results from the evaluation will feed into all of the other evaluation activities and be particularly important for the outcome evaluation (see next section). This is because they collect data that provide a basis for ensuring that any implementation issues that may impact on project outcomes are identified and worked through. In addition, they can explain project results.

2.2.2 Tools for the process evaluation

The tools used for the TRAILS process evaluation, outlined in more detail below, will include:

- Partner surveys, which will involve periodic collection and analysis of partner perceptions of project progress.
- Process dashboard, which will provide a picture of where TRAILS is on its ‘change journey’, and will also feed into the evaluation ‘counterfactual analysis’ and overall summative (outcomes) evaluation of TRAILS.
- Periodic updating of the TRAILS theory of change.

All of these activities are a pre-requisite for tracking programme progress towards outcomes and impacts.

Partner surveys

The purpose of the partner surveys is to generate data on different aspects of the ‘internal’ dimension of TRAILS. This includes, for example, capturing views on operational and governance aspects of the project, such as: Project Management, communication systems and collaboration across the partnership, and on progress towards scheduled objectives.

Surveys will be scheduled to coincide with the cycle of partner meetings, in view of which data from the survey will be analysed. The meetings themselves will provide the space for the analysis to be, presented, and collectively discussed in view of generating collective learning and improvement ideas.
The surveys will therefore provide regular ‘snapshots’ throughout the project life cycle of the state of the project and partnership, as well as supporting joint sense-making, which, as outlined in the previous section, is an important part in the evaluation of complex programmes.

**Process Dashboard**

The process dashboard has four purposes: i) to enable monitoring of project progress set against key progress indicators, or baselines ii) to provide a picture of where TRAILs is in relation to the ‘change journey’ specified in the project ‘Theory of Change’ (and also to review whether the underlying assumptions and hypotheses embedded in the project ToC hold true or need revision) iii) to provide an evolving database and record of evidence that can feed into the implementation of the evaluation ‘counterfactual analysis’ iv) more broadly, to feed data into the overall summative (outcomes) evaluation of TRAILs (including the counterfactual analysis). It is a list of baseline core project outputs together with key performance indicators (KPIs) that together build up a snapshot at a point in time of the extent to which TRAILs is meeting its planned operational objectives. The dashboard and associated indicators are regularly monitored and updated in line with the TRAILs project and evaluation life cycle. An integrated spreadsheet containing the process monitoring data is uploaded to Google Docs. Data entry and updating enables a ‘snapshot analysis’ of TRAILs progress to be carried out, which feeds into the ‘evidence snapshots’ produced in the evaluation ‘learning mode’ and which provides a set of time series assessments that ultimately feed into the overall summative evaluation of the project.

**Periodic updating of the TRAILs theory of change**

The data gathered via the activities outlined above will be used for a periodic updating of the TRAILs theory of change. The updated theory of change will both capture the ‘distance travelled’ by the project towards its ultimate results and also represent any developments and changes in implementation. This will in turn support the design of evaluation tools and also feed into any ante evaluation activities. For the summative evaluation, the evolution of the project as captured in the theories of change will also be used for the contribution analysis (see next section) and provide valuable insight to frame and contextualise interpretation of results achieved.

### 2.3 Summative evaluation

#### 2.3.1 Definition and purpose

Summative (or ‘ex post’) evaluation is done at project end. It is mainly concerned with "assessing achieved impacts, identifying and judging unexpected impacts and verifying the sustainability of the intervention's benefits."\(^{22}\) Counterfactual analysis (i.e. the question “what would have happened in the absence of the intervention”) is an integral part of summative evaluation.

The purpose of summative evaluation in TRAILs is to both address the accountability and the knowledge purpose of the evaluation: to provide evidence on whether the project’s goals have been met, to provide insights into the value of TRAILs contribution to individual and institutional change, to assess the replicability of solutions and the usefulness and transferability of the evaluation methodology and indicators. The bulk of summative activities of the TRAILs evaluation will therefore be concentrated towards the end of the project – though some data collection activities will take place during TRAILs project implementation.

#### 2.3.2 Tools for the summative evaluation

The summative evaluation consists of the following evaluation tools and elements:

---

• Analysis of indicator data
• Summer School Participant survey
• Multiplier Events Participant survey
• Stakeholder interviews
• Evaluation of Piloting activities (including observation, interviews and focus groups)
• Contribution analysis.

The first five evaluation elements and activities focus on TRAILs’ outcomes: ‘what worked, for whom, under what circumstances’. The last element also considers outcomes but places additional focus on the potential impacts of TRAILs in the longer term. Each of these elements are explored in more detail in the following sections.

**Analysis of Indicator data**

The summative evaluation will carry out a quantitative analysis of the data captured around the KPIs, CSFs and KRIls in aggregated form in order to assess the success of TRAILs overall and at piloting level. These indicators cover the range of TRAILs activities and outputs – including results of dissemination activities, covering data on utilisation of the portal and tools; participation in and satisfaction with TRAILs learning and multiplier events.

**Summer School Participant Survey**

This will collect data from the LSP professionals and trainee teachers taking part in the two TRAILs Summer Schools. It is expected that the survey will include a 'longitudinal' element. This means it will take place over two stages:

• Stage 1 – ‘baseline’ survey: at the start of the Summer School, focusing on participant reasons for enrolling and their expectations. This will also include an assessment of participants' existing 'baseline' LSP, digital and intercultural competences

• Stage 2 - 'post-test' survey: at the end of the Summer School focusing on participant experiences and outcomes, including assessing participant's LSP, digital and intercultural competences following completion of the Summer School. This will also cover participants' intentions to apply their learning in practice and future employment strategies.

Pre-test and post-test assessment of LSP, digital and intercultural competences can be done in two ways. First, by using self-reported metrics that allow participants to evaluate their competence levels using a simple Likert-type scale - 1 ('I can't do this at all') to 5 ('I can do this very well'). The second way is to use 'situational knowledge-based question items'. These aim to assess the participants' LSP, digital and intercultural competences in dealing with situations of the use of these competence in actual educational settings. Knowledge-based question items can be used in a number of formats, including multiple-choice questions, order interaction items, 'fill in the blanks' questions, associate interaction items. Examples of these are shown in Annex I. The advantage of using knowledge-based items instead of self-assessed rating scales is that they are embedded in actual educational practice. However, they need to be linked to a detailed 'competence framework' and take more time and effort to construct.

**Multiplier Event Participant Survey**

This will collect data from participants in the eight events organised by TRAILs partners, including the Final Conference. The Survey will be delivered through a short feedback instrument using mainly closed questions - either paper-based (distributed and collected at the end of each event) or on-line (through a platform like Surveymonkey).
Stakeholder interviews

These interviews will focus in more depth on key results of the project, from the perspective of 'external' stakeholders and will elicit their views particularly on the sustainability of the curriculum going forward and the expected changes at institutional level likely to be realised in the future. The target groups include:

- TRAILs delivery partners
- Policy-makers (e.g. Representatives of relevant Ministries)
- Research centres and associations
- LSP communities

Evaluation of Piloting activities

The evaluation of the TRAILs piloting activities – testing of the curriculum through the Summer Schools - focuses on three main elements:

- evaluation of the implementation process
- evaluation of the participant experience
- evaluation of the outcomes for individual participants and participating organisations.

The process evaluation focuses on:

- who was involved in the pilot implementation process
- the methods and tools used to deliver the curriculum and the organisational setting in which it was implemented and how effective these were
- the issues and challenges encountered in implementing the programme and how these were addressed
- what can be learned from the implementation process for the future development and exploitation of TRAILs.

The evaluation of the participant experience focuses on:

- the expectations of Summer School participants and whether and in what ways these were met

The outcomes evaluation focuses on:

- the outputs produced (e.g. the course units) and their relevance, usability and
- participant self-reported assessment of the outcomes associated with participating in the project (improvements in LSP, digital and intercultural competences; expected effects on future practice and employment; expected institutional changes)

The data collection tools used in the pilot activities evaluation are shown in the Table below. Some of these tools dovetail with the overall process and summative evaluations.

Evaluation methods and data for TRAILs pilot activities evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation activity/method</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Evaluation elements covered</th>
<th>Groups covered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant survey (baseline)</td>
<td>Self-administered questionnaire (SAQ) completed by users before participating in</td>
<td>Process (expectations of TRAILs) Summative - baseline assessment of competences</td>
<td>LSP professionals and trainee teachers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Evaluation activity/method

| Participant survey (follow-up) | Self-administered questionnaire (SAQ) completed by users after participating in TRAILS summer school | Process (profiles of participants; problems encountered; participant experience) | LSP professionals and trainee teachers |

| TRAILS summer school | Outcomes (extent to which expectations were met; benefits identified; changes in competence levels) |

| Interviews | Semi-structured interview with small sample of summer school participants focusing in depth on TRAILS pilot | Process (profiles of participants; problems encountered) |

| Participant experience | Participant experience Outcomes (extent to which expectations were met; benefits identified) |

| Focus Group | Group interview with small sample of TRAILS summer school participants | Process (profiles of participants; problems encountered) |

| Participant experience | Participant experience Outcomes (extent to which expectations were met; benefits identified) |

| Observation | Evaluators observation of summer school delivery and participant interactions | Process: Experience of participating in the programme |

| Outcomes (extent to which expectations were met) |

| LSP professionals and trainee teachers |

**Capturing the counterfactual: contribution analysis**

Many discussions of impact evaluation argue that it is essential to include a ‘counterfactual’. As noted above, counterfactual impact evaluation involves comparing the outcomes of interest of those who have benefitted from an intervention (the ‘treatment group’) with those of a group similar in all respects to the treatment group (the ‘comparison/control group’), but who have not been exposed to the intervention.

The evaluation methodology used for this counterfactual analysis will be ‘contribution analysis’. As outlined above, contribution Analysis is an approach for assessing causal questions and inferring causality in interventions and aims to create a causal chain – or ‘contribution story’ – that links actions and events to outcomes.

The counterfactual analysis implementation process begins with the TRAILS baseline Theory of Change (outlined above). This baseline ToC provides the foundation for the analysis by:

---

23 **LOI, M AND RODRIGUES, M (2012) A NOTE ON THE IMPACT EVALUATION OF PUBLIC POLICIES: THE COUNTERFACTUAL ANALYSIS, JRC SCIENTIFIC AND POLICY REPORTS:**

[HTTP://PUBLICATIONS.JRC.EC.EUROPA.EU/REPOSITORY/BITSTREAM/JRC74778/LBNA25519ENN.PDF](HTTP://PUBLICATIONS.JRC.EC.EUROPA.EU/REPOSITORY/BITSTREAM/JRC74778/LBNA25519ENN.PDF)
• Specifying the conceptual framework for the analysis, together with the initial hypotheses to select and interpret pieces of evidence and the outcomes to be analysed
• Specifying the attribution problem for the contribution analysis, together with the assumptions underpinning the theory of change, the risks to realisation of the intended outcomes and impacts, how strong or weak are the links in the underlying causal chain, and the strength or weakness of available evidence.

The contribution analysis is then developed from this starting position, and updated with each round of data collection completed. Data from the surveys, interviews and evaluation of piloting activities provide the main evidence gathering vehicles for the counterfactual analysis by identifying plausible alternative explanations for the contribution analysis, and assembling the contribution story.

2.4 Learning

The learning purpose of the TRAILs evaluation is both about feeding ongoing evaluation results into project management, to improve the delivery of TRAILs, and about contributing to supporting the replication, and sustainability, of TRAILs outputs. Being able to do so will require an in depth examination and understanding of the factors that contribute to success (and those that don’t) and those that cause which outcomes and why.

Learning is a horizontal activity in the TRAILs evaluation which is part of each mode of evaluation. Thus, there will be three key activities that will form part of the learning dimension of evaluation of TRAILs: a) evidence snap-shots of the evolution of the TRAILs project; b) peer learning workshops, where the evidence from the evaluation is reviewed and reflected on, which will feed evolving knowledge from the TRAILs evaluation back into the project system and offer scenarios for possible future trajectories and c) replication and sustainability analysis.

The evidence snapshots will consist of the data collected by partners in order to track the progress of the project, which the evaluation team will collate throughout the course of the project’s activities and synthesise at each of TRAILs’s consortium meetings. These will include: monitoring data, a summary of the data collected via the process dashboard, both of which are a pre-requisite for tracking programme progress towards outcomes and impacts. While this information focuses on determining what is happening, it also provides the basis for understanding how and why change is happening, which is crucial for the learning dimension of the evaluation.

This synthesised evidence will thus be reviewed and reflected on in interactive peer learning workshops, following the principles of action learning, and joint sense-making that are important in the evaluation of projects. In practical terms, they will provide a space for the evaluation team to communicate progress set as part of the theory of change (e.g. progress towards milestones/targets) and to enable the joint exploration of, and convergence on, what is working and why (or why not), which will feed back into the project.

Finally, the learning generated as part of the evaluation will feed into an assessment of the overall replicability and sustainability of TRAILs. This will be done through the synthesis from different data sources and will involve a cross-comparison of outcomes and impacts data to identify ‘what worked, for whom under what conditions’.
3. Evaluation Toolkit

The practical outputs of the evaluation framework outlined in this document will be delivered in the Evaluation Toolkit – a practical Handbook containing all of the tools and instruments to deliver the evaluation. Because TRAILs is an evolving project, which will develop different outputs over the life of the project, the Evaluation Toolkit - IO5 - is itself seen as a living document, periodically amended and updated to reflect changing developments and changing evaluation needs. In addition, some tools will be downloadable from the TRAILs website.

Since the structure – and in particular the content – of the evaluation tools and instruments will be shaped by the outcomes of project activities as they develop through TRAILs’s evolution, it is premature to specify them in detail in this document. For example, it’s not possible to develop specific questions for the Multiplier Event Survey without having more detailed information about the events. This applies equally to the Participant Survey, where we would need detailed information about the curriculum, including content modules developed, in order to construct an adequate survey instrument. However, some initial *generic templates* have been developed, mainly aimed at specifying the structure and content of data collection instruments that subsequently will need to be adapted and fleshed out following the results of TRIALs research activities, and the production of IO1, 2 and 3. These are summarised in the Table below. Annex I provides examples of these generic templates.

*A revised Toolkit will therefore be developed in successive drafts of IO5.*

**List of Evaluation Instruments in Toolkit V1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Mode</th>
<th>Evaluation Tool</th>
<th>Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Internal Partner Survey</td>
<td>Collects data on partner perceptions of implementation of TRAILs. Scheduled to coincide with cycle of partner meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design/Process/</td>
<td>Action Learning Set</td>
<td>Generic tool to run interactive workshops with partners and stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process/Summative</td>
<td>Process Dashboard</td>
<td>Regular monitoring of TRAILs evolution and progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process/Summative</td>
<td>Summer School Participant Survey</td>
<td>Pre-test/post-test instrument for collecting data on participant experience of summer schools, including contribution to participant competence levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process/Summative</td>
<td>Multiplier Event Participant Survey</td>
<td>Feedback survey instrument for collecting data on participant experience of multiplier events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summative</td>
<td>Observation Guideline</td>
<td>Guideline and template to collect observational data on process and outcomes of summer school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design/Process/</td>
<td>Stakeholder Interview</td>
<td>Generic tool to collect data from 'key informants'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process/Summative</td>
<td>Focus Group Guideline</td>
<td>Generic Group Interview Guideline</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Planning, Responsibilities and Timing

The steps required for implementation of the evaluation design and plan specified in the preceding sections, together with the partners responsible, and the timetable for the key activities are summarised as follows:

- Evaluation Methodology and Toolkit (V1 of IO1) – January 2019 (Arcola)
- Partner Survey and Peer Review Workshops (4) – one per Consortium Meeting (Arcola + all partners)
- Multiplier Events Feedback – May 2020 (Arcola + host partners – data collection)
- Conference Feedback – Sep 2020 (Arcola + host partners – data collection)
- Summer School pre-test survey (Staff and Students) – Sep 2020 (Arcola + host partners – data collection)
- Summer School post-test survey (Staff and Students) – Sep 2020 (Arcola + host partners – data collection)
- Stakeholder interviews - Sep 2020 (Arcola + host partners – data collection)
- Evaluation Report (Final IOS) – Sep 2020 (Arcola)
- Ongoing: Quality Register; Process Dashboard (Arcola and UB)
Annex I: Evaluation Instrument Templates

1. Partners Survey

Purpose
To periodically collect data on partners’ perceptions of how TRAILs is being managed and how it is progressing. The data analysis feeds into TRAILs’s project management and also into the summative evaluation.

Procedure
The Survey is intended to be delivered as a cross-sectional ‘snapshot’ survey at points in time throughout the project life cycle. The Survey should be e-mailed to all members of the Consortium, i.e. everyone’s views should be collected rather than one institutional survey per partner organisation. This should be done at least 2 weeks before scheduled Partners Meetings. Each successive round of surveys should be entered into the same spreadsheet to enable a time series analysis of the data to be carried out.

Partner Survey Questionnaire

NAME: ________________________________

PARTNER ORGANISATION: _______________________________________________________

For each question please think about your experience of how ① Project Management, ② Communication System and ③ Scheduled Objectives have been carried out in TRAILs and for each aspect indicated, write down:

- in Column A, any problems you have experienced;
- in Column B, what changes or improvements you would like to see;
- in Column C, your satisfaction with this particular aspect of the project (write in the number which applies, using the following scale):

-2 ...................... -1 ...................... 0 ...................... +1 ...................... +2 ......................
very dissatisfied  dissatisfied  neither satisfied  satisfied  very satisfied  nor dissatisfied

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASPECT</th>
<th>(A) PROBLEMS</th>
<th>(B) CHANGES YOU WOULD LIKE TO SEE</th>
<th>(C) SATISFACTION (-2 TO +2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governance (decision-making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and consultation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ordination of activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TRAILS**  
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Progress control and monitoring

Quality control

Financial matters

Are there any other points or suggestions on project management you would like to make?

**COMMUNICATIONS AND COLLABORATION: PROBLEMS, SUGGESTIONS FOR CHANGES AND SATISFACTION RATING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASPECT</th>
<th>(A) PROBLEMS</th>
<th>(B) CHANGES YOU WOULD LIKE TO SEE</th>
<th>(C) SATISFACTION (-2 TO +2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical matters (e.g. using project platform and tools)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication and co-operation between partners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication and responses from coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication with the European Commission/National Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication with external stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are there any other points or suggestions on communications and collaboration you would like to make?

**MEETING OBJECTIVES AND TARGETS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASPECT</th>
<th>(A) PROBLEMS</th>
<th>(B) CHANGES YOU WOULD LIKE TO SEE</th>
<th>(C) SATISFACTION (-2 TO +2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keeping to overall project workplan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2. Action Learning Set

#### Purpose
The ALS is a generic procedure and tool for group work in TRAILs. It’s main purpose is to support collaborative learning.

It is intended to be used in the following evaluation modes and scenarios:

- **In ‘design’ (ex-ante) mode** – through partner ‘sense making’ workshops. This will involve representatives of all partners meeting either face to face or online in order to: discuss, review and amend the evolving TRAILs theory of change; review past and discuss upcoming project activities in light of the updated theory of change; review and where necessary amend the indicator system and evidence collection method.

- **In ‘developmental’ (process) mode** – to valorise and disseminate learning from the evaluation at key time points in the project lifecycle, for example to present and review the ‘evidence snapshots’ delivered over the lifecycle of TRAILs.

- **In ‘summative’ mode** – for example towards the end of the Project through an interactive partner workshop to reflect on lessons learned and to support future sustainability.

A specific Action Learning Set will need to be tailored to: the evaluation ‘mode’ in which it is applied; the topic(s) to be addressed; the participating audience (their profile and expectations).
Action Learning Set Guidelines and Template

What is a TRAILs Action Learning Set?

- A group of people working with a facilitator bringing to the surface and exploring issues arising from the TRAILs activities
- Sharing real issues, problems or opportunities arising from the TRAILs activities
- Questioning and challenging in relation to learning from TRAILs
- Making action points in order to support the over-arching TRAILs objective of supporting youth inclusion

Purposes and Objectives of the ALS

The ‘classical’ action learning set ‘cycle’ is shown in Figure 1. As Figure 1 shows, the main purposes and objectives of running an ALS are:

- to identify the problems and issues that need to be explored to support the over-arching TRAILs objective
- to collaboratively analyse these problems and issues in the light of available evidence
- to reflect on and evaluate the evidence
- to decide on the next steps (actions) that should be taken

Figure 1: Cycle of learning promoted in an ALS

Procedure for running an ALS

Introduction – facilitator explains:

- the focus and ‘boundaries’ within which the ALS participants will be working (e.g. if the focus of the ALS is on ‘problems’, define the ‘presenting problems’; if the focus is
on reviewing results – as in an ‘evidence snapshot’, specify the evidence that will be reviewed)

- the questions the workshop will explore
- how the group will work
- the agenda and timeframe for carrying out the tasks of the workshop
- the expected outputs and outcomes of the workshop and how these will be used

**Implementation** – the facilitator co-ordinates the running of the workshop, ensuring that the specified questions are covered within the allotted time. The tools usually required to do this are:

- presentational tools – e.g. lap-top, projector, PowerPoint
- data collection tools – e.g. flip chart, audio, video recording (ensure that ‘informed consent’ is obtained from participants for data collection purposes), ‘post-it’ notes

**Summary and Review** – the facilitator presents a summary of the results of the collaborative group work, using an appropriate method (e.g. flip chart). The group as a whole are then invited to:

- discuss and review the summary, identifying possible corrections, points of disagreement, additional points that need to be included
- agree on a final summary (including, if appropriate ‘dissenting opinions’)

Action points and close-down – the facilitator then invites a group discussion on the actions and next steps that are appropriate. This could cover:

- any follow-up group events that need to be scheduled on the topic of the ALS
- new actions/activities that could be developed
- who should be involved
- the timing of these actions/activities.

The facilitator then explains how the results of the workshop will be used (including proposed dissemination – e.g. uploading a report on the workshop to the Project platform) and then closes the workshop.

**ALS working modes**

There are a number of working modes and styles that can be adopted to run the ALS. The design of the workshop – and its working mode – should take into account who the participants are and what they would feel comfortable with. Essentially, the guiding principle of the ASL is on collaborative learning, so ‘trans-missive’ modes of working – for example where the participants are ‘presented to’ and remain largely passive consumers of information – are to be avoided.

Three modes of working that are typically used are:

- Open Forum
- ‘Learning Café’ style
- Role-playing

**Open Forum**

The Open Forum method focuses on ‘whole group’ work. The ALS would typically be delivered in a ‘Round Table’ format. The questions to be addressed and the tasks to be
carried out are worked with sequentially through open discussion between the whole
group, guided by the facilitator.

Learning Café

The Learning Café format adopts a combination of ‘small group’ and ‘whole group’ work.
Small groups – normally around 3 in number – can be assigned a particular set of questions,
or tasks to work on in a ‘break-out’ space. However, these small groups are fluid – i.e.
participants in each small group will move on to another small group at regular intervals, so
that all participants will have engaged with all the small groups over the duration of the
workshop. Each small group needs to be assigned its own facilitator.

The small groups will merge into a ‘whole group’ at key points in the workshop – for
example to review and discuss the results of each small group and produce an integrated
summary for the group as a whole.

Role-playing

The Role-Playing format adopts some of the principles, procedures and tools of Tavistock
‘Group Relations’ and P3C programmes, so that the classical ALS is modified to introduce an
element of ‘role playing’, in which different stakeholder groups take on the ‘point of view’ of
other groups in order to explore a problem or reflect on an action that needs to be done.
One reason for doing this is to try to ensure a more balanced reflection of different
stakeholder ‘voices’, since often the less powerful voices tend to be drowned by the more
powerful stakeholders. The role-playing element of the ALS enables these less powerful
voices to at least be represented in some form. In this form of ALS, the whole group is sub-
divided into usually three small sub-groups, each of which takes on the point of view (PoV)
of its assigned group in order to carry out a common task.

Reporting on Outcomes and Results

A template for reporting on the outcomes and results of the ALS is provided below.

ALS Reporting Template

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of ALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitated by:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants and their organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode of delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose and Objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAILS areas covered (e.g. IO number; tasks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic(s) subjects(s) covered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues covered</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Key questions covered

### Summary Report – provide a brief summary of the main results of the ALS

### Follow-up actions/activities – list any actions/activities planned, including what, who and when

### Other relevant observations/comments not covered above
3. Process Dashboard

The Table below summarises the process dashboard that will be used in the TRAILs evaluation.

### TRAILs Process Dashboard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Status at: (date)</th>
<th>Project target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>No. LSP educational institutions surveyed</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. LSP teachers surveyed</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>No. of training units completed</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Action Learning Sets implemented</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piloting</td>
<td>No. Institutions contacted for summer school</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. LSP staff recruited for summer school</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. trainee teachers recruited for summer school</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissemination</td>
<td>No. visits to project website</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. brochures/leaflets distributed</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. contacts on social media</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. attendees signed up for Multiplier Events</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPIs</td>
<td>% HE survey target reached</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% LSP teacher survey target reached</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% increase in stakeholders informed of project research results</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change in website visits</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change in social media contacts</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Growth in TRAILs-related partnerships and networks</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% project output target achieved</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% risks detected and resolved</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NS** = Target not specified in project proposal and workplan.
**NA** = Not applicable. KPIs do not have targets. They measure progress towards a specified target from a particular baseline.
4. Summer School Participant Survey

This will collect data from the LSP professionals and trainee teachers taking part in the two TRAILs Summer Schools. The Survey will cover:

- Participant profile
- Reasons for participating in the Summer School and expectations of outcomes
- Experience of participating, including issues and problems encountered
- Satisfaction with the Summer School
- Outcomes associated with participation on LSP, digital and intercultural competences
- Intentions on using what has been learned in teaching practice and employment
- Suggestions for improving the TRAILs curriculum.

Both the pre-test and post-test surveys will assess the level of participants’ LSP, digital and intercultural competences using either a self-rating scale:

*Example:*

How would you rate your competence level on using digital presentation tools to deliver a lecture on Business English?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I can’t do this at all</td>
<td>I can’t do this very well</td>
<td>I can do this moderately well</td>
<td>I can do this well</td>
<td>I can do this very well</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

or by using situational knowledge-based question items:

*Example:*

You’re giving a lecture on how to use digital tools to give a presentation on effective Business English. Which of the following tools allows you to create such presentations?

- Prezi
- Microsoft Excel
- Microsoft PowerPoint
- SurveyMonkey
- Visme
5. Multiplier Event Participant Survey

This will collect data from participants in the eight events organised by TRAILs partners, including the Final Conference. The Survey will be delivered through a short feedback instrument using mainly closed questions - either paper-based (distributed and collected at the end of each event) or on-line (through a platform like Surveymonkey). Questions will include:

- Participant profile
- Reasons for participating and expectations
- Participant experience of the event
- Participant satisfaction with the event
- Assessment of TRAILs intellectual outputs
- Intentions to participate in TRAILs summer schools and and expectations of potential benefits

*Examples of closed questions*

*How would you rate the event on the following criteria? Click on the button that best describes your feelings about the event*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The way the event was organised</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The topics covered by the event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which the event informed me about TRIALS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which I learned something new</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which the event motivated me to get more involved in TRAILs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. **Observation Guideline and Template**

The template provides a guideline for carrying out structured observation in the Summer School, using a classic observational analysis approach (Goetz and LeCompt, 1984) based on ‘Non-participant Structured Observation’ (Bryman, 2001; Angrosino, 2005). The main objective of this method is to capture what happens during the Summer School ‘as seen through the eyes of the different actors involved’.

The observational dimensions – or ‘units of analysis’ - of the observation (i.e. ‘what to observe?’) cover:

- The environment (the physical space in which the summer school takes place)
- People and their body language, their interactions and their verbal behaviour
- Objects – the 'devices' used (for example the course units; the digital tools used)
- Process - how the curriculum is delivered and the effectiveness of the pedagogic approach applied
- Outcomes – what participants appear to learn from taking part.

The Observational Analysis will be carried out using the **Observation Template** provided below. The Observation Template also includes two techniques to gather information on audience behaviours - the MARCS audience response analysis tool (Cowie et al, 2000) and the audience response rating scale – ART – (Glass, 2006).

The Templates can be used in a number of ways:

- as the sole medium for observation data capture – i.e. the event is recorded in real-time as it happens by the researcher/observer taking notes, using the Template as a Guideline to structure the notes
- as an ’ex-post’ analysis tool – i.e. the event is recorded in real-time on video by the researcher/observer and the images are subsequently analysed using Template as a content analysis guideline
- in ’hybrid’ mode – the event is recorded in in real-time in note form by the researcher/observer, using the Template, and is also recorded on video.

---

**Observation Template**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site location</th>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Observation Carried out</td>
<td>Describe the space in which the event takes place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation carried out by</td>
<td>Functions/services provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Observation started</td>
<td>Impressions of atmosphere of the space (e.g. welcoming; friendly; forbidding)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Observation Finished</td>
<td>Other observations on environment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>People</th>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Who is present in this space and what are their roles?</td>
<td>Who is present in this space and what are their roles?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do summer school participants interact with staff? (e.g. collaborative; isolated)</td>
<td>How do summer school participants interact with staff? (e.g. collaborative; isolated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other observations on participants</td>
<td>Other observations on participants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objects</th>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What objects – e.g. technologies – are used, by whom and for what purposes?</td>
<td>What objects – e.g. technologies – are used, by whom and for what purposes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do participants experience any issues/problems with using these objects?</td>
<td>Do participants experience any issues/problems with using these objects?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What learning takes place over the duration of the observation?</td>
<td>What learning takes place over the duration of the observation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>how is this learning delivered?</td>
<td>how is this learning delivered?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• who is involved?</td>
<td>• who is involved?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• what methods are used to deliver learning?</td>
<td>• what methods are used to deliver learning?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• how effective are these methods?</td>
<td>• how effective are these methods?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• can any problems/issues be identified that prevent learning?</td>
<td>• can any problems/issues be identified that prevent learning?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• are there particular things about the way learning is delivered that appear to work well?</td>
<td>• are there particular things about the way learning is delivered that appear to work well?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What important things happen over the duration of the event – what are the critical incidents?</td>
<td>What important things happen over the duration of the event – what are the critical incidents?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For each critical incident listed, specify:</td>
<td>For each critical incident listed, specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What leads up to the incident (the ‘causes’)</td>
<td>• What leads up to the incident (the ‘causes’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Who is involved in the incident</td>
<td>• Who is involved in the incident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What happens</td>
<td>• What happens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are your impressions on how the summer school is organised?</td>
<td>What are your impressions on how the summer school is organised?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational/management issues that can be identified?</td>
<td>Organisational/management issues that can be identified?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What would you describe as the main outcomes of the event?</td>
<td>What would you describe as the main outcomes of the event?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What would you say were the participant views on the usefulness, usability and relevance of the curriculum?</td>
<td>What would you say were the participant views on the usefulness, usability and relevance of the curriculum?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any evidence identified on nhow it might be improved?</td>
<td>Any evidence identified on nhow it might be improved?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Audience response analysis

Using the rating scales below, provide an assessment of the audience reaction to the event observed. Add any observations in the comments box for each scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please tick one box for each item on this list</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>A lot</th>
<th>Very much</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How interesting did the audience find the event</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much did it grab their attention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent did they understand what was</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>going on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much did it make them think</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent did they learn something new</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much did they enjoy participating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent did it get them emotionally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>involved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent did they work together as a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using the Table below, provide an assessment of the audience reaction to the event observed. The assessment covers two response analysis elements: how active – passive is the audience response; how positive – negative is the audience response. Base this assessment on your observation of the whole event from start to finish. It’s possible the audience response may vary from active to passive and from positive to negative as the event progresses. Use your judgement to provide a balanced assessment. Circle ANY of the words you think apply in the Table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Negative - Very Passive</th>
<th>Very Positive - Very Passive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indifferent</td>
<td>Relaxed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bored</td>
<td>Content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sad</td>
<td>Serene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depressed</td>
<td>Blissful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Despairing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furious</td>
<td>Pleased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrified</td>
<td>Happy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disgusted</td>
<td>Interested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Negative - Very Active</td>
<td>Very Positive - Very Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angry</td>
<td>Delighted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afraid</td>
<td>Excited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exhilarated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. **Stakeholder Interview Guideline**

**Purpose**
The Interview is a generic procedure and tool based on a semi-structured interview that enables more in-depth information to be gathered on an evaluation topic than would be possible using a survey approach. The Interview will typically be carried out with a ‘key informant’ with in-depth knowledge of the topic, for example a delivery partner in TRIAls.

**Procedure**

The instrument used for data collection is a semi-structured interview schedule. This allows scope for the interviewer to shape the questions according to the expertise and background of the interviewee and to tailor the question content to the interviewee’s responses as the interview progresses.

In essence, the aim of the interview is to allow the interviewee to express his or her opinions as they emerge, with the interviewer steering the course of the interview by asking open-ended questions that are nonetheless structured to reflect the common research areas of the case study. This is based on a number of themes, preceded by an initial set of background-setting questions.

Each theme has three kinds of questions:

- **main questions** – these address the evaluation areas from a general perspective, by ‘setting the scene’ for the discussion
- **supplementary questions** – these drill down more deeply into the general questions. The interviewer should pose these questions on the basis of the interviewee’s response to the main questions, as appropriate. The interviewee should write down the supplementary questions asked in the space provided in the Guideline below
- **clarifying questions** – intended to clarify and expand the responses to the additional questions, for example ‘So what you are saying is ….. ‘Can you give me more detail on........ ‘Can you give me an example of........

The key informant interview process is as follows:

- The interview should begin with an explanation of the interview objectives and how the interview will be carried out.
- The interviewer goes through the questions shown in the Guideline sequentially. The responses can either be recorded – having obtained the interviewee’s permission – or the responses can be taken down in written (note) form. **Note**: there is no need to fully transcribe the interviews (unless a particular interviewer feels this would be helpful in producing the summary).

**Data Analysis**

On completion of the interview, the interviewer should summarise the key results of the interview using a content analysis procedure, as set out below.

**Analysis of Stakeholder Interview Data using Content Analysis**

In a nutshell, content analysis of interview material is aimed at scanning the material to find examples of ‘evidence’ that will enable us to answer the research questions. This can be done in two ways – manually, or by using software (either using ‘Word’ and then searching the text for key words or using a specialist content analysis software package like NVivo). The manual approach uses a method based on ‘reduction’ (Creswell, 1998). In practice, this requires:
an initial reading of the item being analysed, looking for examples of the key themes and evaluation questions covered and any additional themes suggested by the Key Informant interview

making a note of the substantive points and issues that crop up as the reading progresses in relation to these themes, and the ‘emerging constructs’ that can be identified that define these substantive points and issues

returning to the notes made of the reading, and the list of constructs identified and clustering together those that are similar to make a ‘master list’ of key constructs.

re-reading the item and analysing it more systematically to find examples of the ‘master list’ of constructs, and recording in the content analysis template descriptors of examples of each construct that can be identified in the text.
7. Focus Group Guideline

Purpose
Focus groups can be thought of as group semi-structured face to face interviews. The group discussion is ‘focused’ or structured by a ‘facilitator’, using a ‘guideline’ in the form of a set of questions and prompts. There should in addition be present one or two additional observers or recorders to gather data on the outputs of the discussion. Tape recordings of the discussion will assist in subsequent analysis of the data, but there is a trade off in using tape recorders in terms of confidentiality and respondent resistance. Transcription and analysis of tapes is also very resource-intensive and time-consuming. A flip chart will help the participants to refer back to the key points emerging from the discussion.

Who should be involved in the Focus groups?
A representative sample of the ‘target’ audience, for example participants in the TRAILs summer school. This sample needs to reflect the characteristics of the people involved in the initiative. Strictly speaking, different user groups should be separated in order that their views do not get ‘tainted’, or in situations where one group could feel constrained in making observations that may be controversial in the face of others’ (for example learners with instructors). However, time and resources may require a pragmatic approach in which one focus group is carried out with representatives of all stakeholders combined.

How many people to include in the focus group?
A good rule of thumb is a maximum of around ten people per group.

Procedure
The group discussion is ‘focused’ or structured by a ‘facilitator’ and there should in addition be present one or two additional observers or recorders to gather data on the outputs of the discussion. The Focus Group should take between 1 and 1.5 hours in total. The proceedings of the discussion should either be recorded verbatim using an audio recorder or through written notes. Tape recordings of the discussion will assist in subsequent analysis of the data, but there is a trade off in using tape recorders in terms of confidentiality and respondent resistance. Transcription and analysis of tapes is also very resource-intensive and time-consuming.

The sequencing of activities is as follows:

- Stage 1: provide a brief presentation of the TRAILs project, supplemented with a small number of visual slides.
- Stage 2: provide a brief presentation of the purposes of the Focus Group and how it works. Establish ground rules: everyone will be asked to talk; each person’s opinion counts; participants should not interrupt each other.
- Stage 3: introduce the discussion topics and questions in sequence. Allow around 15 minutes for participants to discuss each topic and question. Facilitator writes down question on white board/flip chart. Participants are given a few moments to jot down responses to the question. Facilitator asks each participant to present their answer in turn. Facilitator writes down on flip chart each response, noting major similarities and differences in questions.
- Stage 4: summarise the results of the discussions. Facilitator leads group discussion about responses. Facilitator summarises group discussion, highlighting group agreements and disagreements. Focus group discussion unpicks in more detail the major agreements and disagreements.
Stage 5: Close-down. Allow an additional 15 minutes for participants to give their feedback. Close the Focus group by thanking the participants. Provide contact details for any further questions from participants and record any requests for future involvement.

Stage 6: Reporting. Provide a summary of the Focus Group audio tape or written notes using a Focus Group Reporting Template

The **discussion topics** depend on the evaluation purposes and questions that need to be addressed. For example, in running a Focus Group with participants in the Collaborative Support programme, topics could cover:

- **Theme 1:** characteristics of participants. Ask the participants to provide brief information on demographic and socio-cultural characteristics (e.g. age, gender, job description; educational qualifications)
- **Theme 2:** Establish the experiences of the group before getting involved in this initiative, and their reasons for getting involved. (e.g. What made the Summer School attractive? What were the expectations about getting involved?)
- **Theme 3:** Establish the experiences of the group in relation to involvement in this initiative. What learning is carried out? How was the learning organised? (e.g. learning methods). What was actually learned? Were any problems experienced?
- **Theme 4:** Outcomes and impacts. What would you say was the main type of learning benefit for participants? In what ways did it contribute to their personal development? Has the experience had any unforeseen or any undesired outcomes? Has it led to other things (e.g. other learning/better job)?
- **Theme 5:** Improvements. In what ways do you think this initiative could be improved?

**Data Analysis**

Analysis of the outputs of data from Focus Groups usually involve a combination of **content analysis** and **interpretation** of Focus Group transcripts (see above for ALS).