

# Evaluation and Testing (105)

**Louise Fryer**  
Utopian Voices Ltd.



Blaricum, TPM, 28th Sept. 2018

Dept. of Legal, Language, Translation and Interpreting Studies, Section of in Modern Languages for Interpreters and Translators  
University of Trieste, Via Filzi, 14 - 34144 Trieste, Italy  
Project numberStudies: 2016-1-IT02-KA203-024311  
[www.adlabproject.eu](http://www.adlabproject.eu)

FUNDED BY THE ERASMUS + PROGRAMME OF THE EUROPEAN UNION





# Evaluations completed to date

- Review Meetings held = 18
- Review Meetings evaluated, EF's completed, data analysed, reports written = 15
  
- Disparity due to:
- Missing EFs



# Missing EFs at 20.09.18

- RM Efs
- RM16: AMU & UA
- RM17: SF
- RM18: UA UNITS
  
- TPM evaluation forms
- TPM EF 1: RNIB



# Missing EFs at 19.09.18 ctd.

- Multiplier Events evaluation forms

None missing!

- Quality Meetings evaluation forms

- QM1: RNIB

- QM2: RNIB



# Reasons to be Cheerful

- Since the request in June, 8 missing EFs have been recovered! Thanks everyone.
- Note to Laura: sometimes a form appears “missing” because the partner didn’t attend (we won’t always have 8 Efs for every meeting, especially RMs).



# We're still missing 8: Partners to discuss

- At what stage do we write off a missing form? E.g. after 6 weeks; 2 months?; a year? Never?
- Why we shouldn't: The agency needs them (Does it?)
  - Without a form, the report can't be written
  - It's not fair on partners who complete their forms on time.
- Why we should: If the partner hasn't completed it, they won't remember and the retrospective data won't be valid.
- If we wait too long for a report, it's no longer useful.



# Evaluation and quality indicators

- “A data reduction process that involves the collection of large amounts of data which are analysed and synthesized into an overall judgement of worth or merit.” Wigley (1988, p.21)
- We have accumulated some useful data.



# Ingredients of a good meeting

- In creating the EFs we chose the following QIs:
- Pre-meeting information
- The communication system
- The agenda (clear and appropriate)
- Chairing quality (smooth running)





# Qualitative comments

- Pooled 82 negative comments (The thing I liked least about the meeting was)
- Themes emerging:
  - Technical – total 42 (over 50%)
  - No comment or nothing negative to say Total=29 c.35%
  - Duration – Total=7 c. 12%



# Positive comments

- Pooled 84 positive comments (The thing I liked best about the meeting was)
- Technical: 7
- Duration: 7
- No comment: 4 (left blank or stated they had nothing to say)
- Focus/relevance: 7
- Progress: 7
- Perceived usefulness: 7
- Clarity: 6
- Bonding: 4



- Effectiveness
- Chairing quality
- Structure
- Equal representation of views
- New Knowledge acquired

# Other factors



# Ingredients of a good (ADLAB PRO) meeting

- **Administrative** (Structure; duration; content; focus; clarity)
- **Social** (group bonding, giving people a voice)
- **Perceived usefulness** (new knowledge; progress; decisions taken)



# Examples: administrative

- Administrative (Structure; duration; content; focus; clarity)
- "very well structured and efficient"
- "It was more focused, to the point"
- "The clear explanation of how 103 and the Antwerp multiplier event will proceed"
- "It was quick and efficient."



# Examples: Social

- Social (group bonding, giving people a voice)
- "The presence of most partners and their contribution"
- "Catching up with the project partners and updates on the developments."
- "Partners were well represented; important updates on M2 were given; contribution of participants was constructive and very useful."



# Examples: perceived usefulness

- Perceived usefulness (new knowledge; progress; decisions taken)
- “An excellent way to move the project forward and get an overview of ongoing work”
- “seeing that the project is making excellent progress”
- Decisions taken thanks to effective communication, getting accurate update on ME2 and interacting to determine way of action, partners all very focused and collaborative”



# So What?

- Currently we have quantitative QI's for
  - Pre-meeting information
  - The communication system
  - The agenda (clear and appropriate)
  - Chairing quality
  
- Should we add new ones from our own qualitative data?





# Potential New QI's :

- The meeting was focused
- The meeting was of an appropriate duration
- The meeting was well-structured
- Good progress was made towards the project's goals
- The meeting increased my knowledge/understanding
- Everyone was heard
- Everyone contributed
- The meeting strengthened bonds between project members



# Why we should introduce new QI's

- To avoid fatigue through repetition
- Of known relevance (ecologically valid for ADLAB PRO)
- We'd be able to measure what WE value.



# Why we shouldn't

- If the system ain't broke don't fix it.
- Won't be able to compare future & past meetings.
- People won't be left with anything to put in the qualitative comments box.



# Leaving qualitative comments empty

- Negative comments: No comment or nothing negative to say  
Total=29 c.35%
- Positive comments: No comment: 4 (left blank or stated they had nothing to say) c. 5%
- Why the difference? We're really happy with the meetings
- We're really nice people and find it hard to be critical
- Current indicators target the negative stuff better



# A final thought

- “It is time for communication scholars to give their very best observational and reflective energies to the study of meetings; our society needs it.” (Tracy & Dimock 2016, p.149)
- Reference: Tracy, K. and Dimock, A. (2016). Meetings: Discursive Sites for Building and Fragmenting Community *Annals of the International Communication Association*.



# 105. Testing of 104 samples

- To be discussed

What (samples from UAB)	Who	When (received by UV)	When (external evaluation by)
Reading list	UAB	asap	02/11/18 (deadline for partner comments on all reading lists)
tasks and assessments (including multiple choice)	UAB	12/11/2018	03/12/18 (final instructions due from UAB 10/12/18)
Introductory video sample	RTV-SLO	?	? (final due by 12/04/19)
Trainer's guide sample	UAB	?	?