

Cooperative School Evaluation Project

# CSEP

Cooperative School Evaluation Project

CSEP



A Study of the Development of Non-Curricular School Policies  
in a School Development Planning Context

Final Report

SEPTEMBER 2006



The CSEP Project was organised under the auspices of the  
European Network of Policy Makers for the Evaluation of Education Systems/  
Réseau Européen des Responsables des  
Politiques d'Evaluation des Systèmes Educatifs/  
by the Inspectorate of the  
Department of Education and Science, Ireland



INSPECTORATE



Cooperative School Evaluation Project

# CSEP



A Study of the Development of Non-Curricular School Policies  
in a School Development Planning Context

Final Report

SEPTEMBER 2006



The CSEP Project was organised under the auspices of the  
European Network of Policy Makers for the Evaluation of Education Systems/  
Réseau Européen des Responsables des  
Politiques d'Evaluation des Systèmes Educatifs/  
by the Inspectorate of the  
Department of Education and Science, Ireland



INSPECTORATE

© 2005, Department of Education and Science

Designed by TOTAL PD  
Printed by Brunswick Press

Published by the Stationery Office, Dublin

To be purchased directly from the  
**Government Publications Sales Office,**  
**Sun Alliance House,**  
**Molesworth Street, Dublin 2**

or by mail order from  
**Government Publications,**  
**Postal Trade Section,**  
**51 St. Stephen's Green, Dublin 2**  
Tel: 01-647 6834 Fax: 01-647 6843

€10.00  
ISBN: [Number Here](#)

## Contents

Foreword.....	5
Executive Summary.....	7
Introduction.....	9
1. The Indicators.....	13
2. Instrumentation.....	23
3. Testing.....	27
4. Findings.....	29
5. Evaluation of Indicators and Instruments.....	35
Conclusion.....	41
Bibliography.....	43
Appendix 1. CSEP Indicator Framework.....	47
Appendix 2. CSEP Instrumentation Design Framework.....	49
Appendix 3. Document Review Instrument.....	60
Appendix 4. Interview Instruments: CSEP Triangulation Framework.....	74
Appendix 5. Instructions for using CSEP Instruments.....	83
Appendix 6. General Notes on Terminology.....	88
Appendix 7. CSEP Personnel.....	90

## Foreword

I welcome the Cooperative School Evaluation Project (CSEP) report as an innovative contribution to international cooperation in education evaluation. The indicators on the evaluation of non-curricular school policies designed by the project are equally applicable in an in-school context and in a system evaluation context. The project also demonstrates that it is possible to design international indicators that respect the cultural cadences which colour our country education systems. Indeed a further outcome of the project is that national mechanisms for evaluating aspects of school development planning at school and system levels can be enhanced through international cooperation in indicator development. I have no doubt that the project indicators will be of strong practical use to many key players in education such as teachers, school management interests, parents, students and policy makers. I would like to record a sincere thanks to the education authorities of Norway, Finland and Ireland for their strong support for the CSEP project and I trust that the project publication will be of use to many other countries.

**Gearóid Ó Conluain**

Irish Representative on the EU Network for Policy Makers

## Executive Summary

The CSEP project proposed indicators for the development of non-curricular school policies in a school development planning context. At an international workshop involving experts from many countries from within the European Union, four primary indicators were identified.

1. **INFRASTRUCTURE:** this indicator takes account of different national contexts, and the external and internal supports available to schools for involvement in planning.
2. **DESIGN:** the focus of this indicator is on the process by which non-curricular policies are formulated. It examines the link between specific policies and the operational culture of the school; the level of collaboration between stakeholders in the process; and the specificity of targets and resource identification.
3. **IMPLEMENTATION:** the focus of this indicator is on the way personnel are assigned to the implementation of the policy, the effectiveness of the monitoring process and the use of resources, as well as on the scope of implementation.
4. **IMPACT:** this indicator examines the provision made for evaluating the impact of the policy during the planning process. It examines the criteria for evaluation, data collection, and the evaluation process.

A number of sub-indicators were developed under each of these headings (Appendix 1).

In collaboration with partners from Finland and Norway, the Irish Steering Committee developed a set of instruments to test these indicators in schools. Two trials were conducted. At an initial trial, all partners focused on the development of anti-bullying policies in schools. In the main trial, five general non-curricular policy areas were addressed: the professional development of staff; legal requirements on schools; communications; student democracy; and partnership between school and community. Each partner agreed to examine three of these areas in the trial, which involved schools at primary and secondary levels.

The comprehensive trial process involved document analysis and in-depth interviews with school stakeholders - providers, management, teachers, parents and students. The trial process confirmed the indicators as an accurate reflection of good planning practice in both non-curricular and curricular areas. They helped schools involved in self-evaluation to reflect on their own performance in planning. The indicators also allowed external evaluators to work with schools in identifying good planning practice. By looking at a number of different schools, external evaluators identified key system issues in the promotion of good planning practice.

- Schools work well when there is a supportive infrastructure for planning. Infrastructure refers to policy initiatives from central or regional administration, and to an internal structure that allows flexible responses to these needs.
- Schools tend to be very pragmatic in the design and implementation of policies. However, they tend to leave issues of impact to external policy makers. Few schools had processes in place to evaluate the impact of any policy on performance.

## Introduction

The Cooperative School Evaluation Project (CSEP) was an international project organised under the auspices of the European Network of Policy Makers for the Evaluation of Education Systems. The project was managed by the Inspectorate of the Department of Education and Science in Ireland through a representative Steering Committee. Three member countries from the Network participated in the project: Finland, Ireland, and Norway. The Secretariat for the project was based in the Office of the School Development Planning Initiative, an agency managed by the Teacher Education Section of the Irish Department of Education and Science.

The European Network of Policy Makers for the Evaluation of Education Systems is an intergovernmental organisation, composed of senior officials in ministries of education, inspectorates and evaluation agencies in the EU member states and other European countries. It seeks to promote cooperation between member states in the evaluation of school-based education. The Network promotes best practice in various aspects of school evaluation and the use of evaluation outcomes to inform and develop educational policies at national level. The CSEP Project is one of a number of research projects organised under the auspices of the Network. The Secretariat of the Network is based in the *Ministère de l'Éducation Nationale* in Paris.

The theme of CSEP is expressed in the subtitle of the project: A Study of the Development of Non-Curricular School Policies in a School Development Planning Context. The project involved a study of the planning processes underpinning the formulation of non-curricular school policies across a range of primary and secondary schools. It entailed the drawing up, testing, and refinement of quality indicators for evaluating school performance in the area of policy development.

For the purposes of CSEP, the following definitions applied:

- **Non-curricular school policies** are policies on issues that relate to school-based management and organisation rather than to curriculum content
- **School Development Planning** is a systematic, collaborative approach to the process of identifying the school community's needs and developing plans to address them. The basic framework of the process is a cycle of planning operations that revolves around a central core. The planning operations are review, design, implementation, and evaluation (Fig. 1). They are grounded in and contextualised by the core of the planning process: the school's articulation of its mission, vision, and fundamental aims. The key focus of the process is on school improvement through collaborative action.




Fig. 1 Schematic Representation of the Planning Process

The aims of the project were to:

- develop, pilot test and refine an evaluative framework for school planning in non-curricular areas
- exchange information on practices related to school involvement in planning for non-curricular areas
- compare different approaches to planning for non-curricular areas in different education systems (and within systems)
- report on good practice in school planning observed in using the evaluation framework across different countries

It was envisaged that the project would have the following outcomes:

- a deepened understanding among participants of the processes underpinning effective policy formulation in schools
- shared knowledge of what constitutes good practice in the field of school policy formulation in schools in different education systems
- the identification of fruitful approaches to school policy formulation in the context of school development planning
- a set of quality indicators for evaluating schools' policy formulation processes
- validation of the indicators, in that they would:
  - reflect good planning processes
  - outline a useful framework for school self-evaluation
  - help external evaluators work with school personnel in assessing the planning process
  - provide pointers to improved practice where this is needed
- confirmation of the reliability of the indicators against a number of different types of non-curricular policies in different cultural settings
- a range of tools to help evaluators assess the planning process through the indicators
- a short inter-country report on the outcomes of the study

This inter-country report outlines:

1. The process used to develop the indicators, and describes the indicators
2. The development of instruments to measure the indicators
3. The results of two trials - initial and main - in the three countries
4. An assessment of the indicators and instruments designed

# 1. The Indicators

## 1.1. The formation of indicators

The indicators were developed through a collaborative process. There were three aspects to the process.

1. **The Irish Steering Committee** conducted initial research on a framework for indicators. This research was based on good planning practice and descriptive statements from countries that responded positively to the October 2003 invitation to participate in the project. The Steering Committee was responsible for presenting an initial framework of indicators. They discussed the development of the indicators at regular intervals, and processed feedback from meetings of partners, and from the initial and main trials. They also developed instrumentation for using the indicators. They clarified aspects of the indicator system and the instruments in light of issues that arose in the trial work.
2. **An international workshop** at the outset of the project, June 2004, brought together academics and educationalists from different countries, including members of the European Network. They discussed different models of planning, with an emphasis on non-curricular policies. They adopted a framework for the indicators and planned for two trials - an initial trial using a common theme of anti-bullying and a main trial using a number of different themes.
3. **Consultations with implementing partners** took place over a two-year period and included a two-day seminar in Dublin. Partners from Finland, Ireland and Norway reflected on the indicators as they planned the initial and main trials. Also, the experience of working with the indicators in the field gave rise to adjustments. These adjustments were mainly in terms of clarifying and standardising terminology.

## 1.2. The content of the indicators

The indicators were developed at two levels. Level 1 reflected four main perspectives on planning (Table 1):

- |  |
|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>INFRASTRUCTURE</b></li> <li>2. <b>DESIGN</b></li> <li>3. <b>IMPLEMENTATION</b></li> <li>4. <b>IMPACT</b></li> </ol> |
|--|

Table 1 Level 1 Indicators for Evaluating Planning Processes

Sub-indicators (Level 2) were developed for each of the indicators, based on a theory of good planning practice. The full set of indicators is outlined in Appendix 1.

### 1.2.1 The infrastructure indicator

INFRASTRUCTURE was taken as a Level 1 indicator, as it is necessary to acknowledge the different context in which planning for non-curricular activities takes place. This context reflects the organisation of education in different countries. It also allows for legitimately different approaches to planning depending on the nature and scope of the policy area being addressed.

In general, three approaches to the process of educational planning can be distinguished:

- **INDEPENDENT** In this approach policy makers are independent of the schools and their management. Policies are derived outside the schools and communicated to them for implementation. Thus, decisions on the purposes of schooling and the allocation of resources are external to the schools, and the schools adapt to the setting of these policies. The independent group also monitors activities within the schools and controls the behaviour of those who run the schools.
- **EXPERT** In this approach, policy makers work in partnership with the school. Involvement in the process is based on the partner holding specific expertise in the policy area and bringing a value-added dimension to decision-making. The focus is on a strategic level of decision-making, leaving operational details to the local level.
- **POLITICAL** In this approach, individuals or groups represent their interests and decision-making involves resolving differences or choosing between interests.

These approaches are not mutually exclusive. In most countries, there is a mixture of all three elements in the interaction between the international community (OECD and EU); national government, with a focus on economic and social development; a Department of Education with overall responsibility for the schooling system; local municipalities; and governance structures of individual schools.

National systems differ in the balance between central control and local autonomy given to schools in the area of policy development. In general, there are three main sources of policy: national government; regional education providers; the local school community. In each of the three participating countries, the national government exercises a co-ordinating role with regard to education policy. The main focus of this coordination is on the curriculum, which is monitored through national testing or external examinations. The government also regulates non-curricular aspects of schooling.

In Finland and Norway, the main providers are the regional municipalities, who have responsibility for primary and upper secondary schools. They may also provide vocational education. The autonomy of the municipality relates to both curricular and non-curricular issues, provided that they are in line with national policies. The municipality responds to local needs and also provides advice and resources for the schools. In Ireland, the educational providers at primary level are mainly private patrons, many of them representative of Church groups. At secondary level, voluntary schools are privately owned. Vocational Schools are provided by a local government region and Community Schools report directly to the Department of Education and Science. The Education Act, 1998 provides for the establishment in each school of a Board of Management representative of the patron, the teachers and the parents. Supports for schools are mainly developed at national level, an example being the School Development Planning support service at primary and secondary level.

Schools are affected by external decision-making in different ways. This can be termed a tight-loose connection. A tight link to a policy comes in the form of a **regulation** that applies to all schools. This regulation is formulated at central level and is mandated for all schools. On the other hand, governments may issue **directives** which have both a tight and a loose element. The tight element refers to the value dimension of the policy, and what the expected outcome will be. The loose element can be seen in the method of implementation, which allows for variation and initiative. Governments sometimes issue **recommendations**, which can be termed loose as there is no obligation or mandate attached to them. They are statements of desired outcomes which encourage schools towards particular behaviours.

An example of schools' involvement in a tight-loose arrangement is the link between schools and external inspection systems. Finland and Norway do not have a formal inspection system, although the local municipality is involved in the evaluation of the impact of education policy. All schools are involved in self-evaluation and produce regular reports for the municipality. In Norway, the self-evaluation process includes a mandatory Pupil-Inspectorate, where students give electronic feedback on aspects of school life and management. In Ireland, the national inspectorate carries out Whole School Evaluations and Subject Inspections in individual schools.

The INFRASTRUCTURE indicator therefore developed two sub-indicators (Table 2). The first of these reflected external issues related to system support. The second reflected planning infrastructure within schools. Each sub-indicator encompassed two elements: confirmation of the existence of supports, and a judgement on how appropriately and how well they were used in the process.

<b>1. INFRASTRUCTURE</b>	<b>This indicator examines the general context of planning as it affects the school</b>
1.1 External Supports	There are external supports available to help the school develop policies in non-curricular areas The school uses these supports appropriately
1.2 Internal Supports	The school has internal supports (structures and resources) to promote an environment of planning The school partners are supportive of the planning process

Table 2 Level 2 Sub-Indicators for the Infrastructure Indicator

### 1.2.2 The design indicator

The next three Level 1 indicators from Table 1 are taken from a general literature on planning, action research and reflective practice. Each of these activities can be described as a cycle of events. A felt need gives rise to an articulation of a way to meet that need (DESIGN). This planned solution is articulated in terms of an action, and a process is put in place to support and carry out the action (IMPLEMENTATION). The effect of the action, and in particular its effectiveness in meeting the expressed need, is then evaluated (IMPACT). The implications of the evaluation then give rise to further cycles of policy or action.




Fig. 2 A School energised by its Vision and Beliefs (Starratt, 1995)

The articulation and analysis of the need, and the creation of a policy or action to meet that need, can be termed a DESIGN phase. Starratt (1995) developed the concept of the school as an onion. He claimed that coming to understand a school was like peeling the different layers of skin from an onion. As one gradually peels away layers of activity, one arrives at a core set of assumptions and a myth about good education and schooling. In high performing schools, this core vision guides all activities. There is a reflective interaction between the answers to What? How? and Why? questions (Fig. 2). The centrality of vision in effective schools is also present in Sergiovanni's notion of moral leadership (1996), in Fullan's concept of moral purpose (2003), in Leithwood's concept of transformational leadership (1999), and in Bolman and Deal's assertion of the importance of symbolic narrative in school development (2003).

The centrality of vision is core to the design process. Four of the seven sub-indicators of the DESIGN indicator reflect this central role (Table 3). Good policies emerge from good theory or in response to sound social policy. The planning process is based on this premise (**Origin**). In the absence of vision, planning proceeds on an *ad hoc* basis, and merely responds to whims or fashions. In developing a policy design, it is important that the values behind the policy be made explicit (**Value-Driven**), and that these values be clearly understood by the planners and by those who receive the policy (**Rationale**). Otherwise, planning might become an empty exercise, engaged in as a compliant response to external requests. Where there is a centrality of vision, there is a link between different school policies, and there is a deliberate attempt to harmonise new policies and existing ones (**Holistic**).

<b>2. DESIGN</b>	<b>This indicator examines approaches to policy design.</b>
2.1 Origin	The policy has a basis in educational or social values.
2.2 Value Driven	The values behind the policy are explicit.
2.3 Rationale	The values behind the policy are understood.
2.4 Holistic	The policy is linked to other school policies.
2.5 Collaborative	School partners are involved in the design at an appropriate level.
2.6 Targets	The design includes targets to be reached.
2.7 Resources	The design identifies resources needed for implementation.

Table 3 Level 2 Sub-Indicators for the Design Indicator

The fifth sub-indicator examines the involvement of stakeholders in the process. The rhetoric for educational planning is that of participative democracy and partnership. The partners are recognised variously as administrators, teachers, parents, students and other key groups affected by decisions. Depending on the policy area under design, these groups can make informed contributions to the process. The **Collaborative** sub-indicator seeks to examine the process of identifying and involving stakeholders at an appropriate level.

The sixth and seventh sub-indicators examine technical aspects of the planning process. The **Target** sub-indicator examines the way in which the goals of the policy are made explicit in the Design phase. A common approach to target evaluation is to ask if they are SMART targets, which is an acronym for Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Realistic, Time-frame. The **Resources** sub-indicator examines the process by which the resources necessary to implement the policy are identified in the Design phase. Realistic planning works within the confines of existing resources, or else plans to obtain the necessary resources for future implementation.

**1.2.3 The implementation indicator**

The IMPLEMENTATION indicator was developed with three sub-indicators that focused on the processes of implementation and one sub-indicator that focused on the beneficiaries of implementation (Table 4).

<b>3. IMPLEMENTATION</b>	<b>This indicator examines the way the policy is being implemented</b>
3.1 Personnel	Personnel are assigned to implement the policy There is a structure to coordinate different aspects of the implementation phase There are communication structures to keep partners informed.
3.2 Monitoring	There are clear monitoring points in place The monitoring process supports implementation
3.3 Use of Resources	The implementation is well resourced The resources are used effectively
3.4 Scope	The policy is being implemented for all those for whom it was intended in its design

Table 4 Level 2 Sub-Indicators for the Implementation Indicator

The first sub-indicator is termed **Personnel**. In any implementation process, responsibility for implementation must be clear. This suggests that a planned policy or activity must designate personnel who will take on definite roles and responsibilities with regard to implementation. The sub-indicator takes account of possible complex policy areas that may require personnel with a specific coordination function and also personnel with specific responsibility for on-going communication during implementation. This can be particularly important when different stakeholders have been involved in the design phase, and maintain an interest in the implementation.

The second sub-indicator deals with **Monitoring**. It is important to have on-going monitoring systems in place to ensure that the policy or action is having the desired effect. The sub-indicator reflects different perspectives on monitoring. It allows for the provision of regular reports in the course of implementation. It also signals the formative function of the monitoring process during implementation.

The third sub-indicator focused on **Use of Resources**. In the design phase, the identification of resources was listed as a sub-indicator. In the implementation phase, the focus is on whether these resources have been procured and put in place, and whether they are being used effectively. For instance, in implementing an IT policy, the necessary resources may have been identified in the design phase and new hardware may have been purchased. Nevertheless, it may be the case that the computers are not being used because staff members have not been trained in their use.

The fourth sub-indicator was developed to check on the **Scope** of the implementation process. Reports on school improvement activities sometimes highlight goal displacement in implementation. This could mean that a policy is implemented in a narrow way, dealing with only some of the intended beneficiaries. An example of this might be a sports programme that provides more for boys than for girls. Another example of goal displacement might be an anti-bullying policy with full provision for prevention and remediation measures that in practice focuses on dealing only with instances of bullying.

### 1.2.4 The impact indicator

The IMPACT indicator examines the outcome of the policy or action undertaken. It looks for impact, rather than activity. The main question here is: Does the policy have the impact that was intended? From a planning perspective, this means that evaluation procedures are built into the planning process to ensure that the policy is effective. This differs from the monitoring aspect of the implementation phase, which is concerned with information flow. However, the monitoring aspect of implementation is clearly linked with the overall evaluation of the policy's impact.

<b>4. IMPACT</b>	<b>This indicator examines the way the policy is evaluated.</b>
4.1 Criteria	Criteria have been set to evaluate the effectiveness of the policy.
4.2 Data	Data is collected about the impact of the policy. The data is up-to-date.
4.3 Evaluation	There is a process for evaluating the impact of the policy. The evaluators are skilled in this area. The planning process can respond to the outcomes of the evaluation.

Table 5 Level 2 Sub-Indicators for the Impact Indicator

Three sub-indicators were developed (Table 5). The first looks for evaluation **Criteria** built into the planning process. This counters a tendency in evaluation exercises to develop new criteria at the time of evaluation which may embody a level of rationalisation in the face of problems encountered at implementation.

The second sub-indicator signals the importance of up-to-date **Data** in the evaluation process.

The final sub-indicator examines the process of **Evaluation**. This requires that there is some formal mechanism to carry out an evaluation and that those who carry out the evaluation are competent to do so. The evaluation process must also address the organisation's capacity to respond to the results. This sub-indicator is particularly relevant to self-evaluation. The engagement of participants in the process may give rise to micro-politics that blocks critical analysis and underestimates the capacity for change. Similarly, an external evaluation can create tensions between the criteria used and the local reality of the school.

## 2. Instrumentation

At the initial international seminar in June 2004, it was decided that a common approach to evaluation in both the initial trial phase and the main trial phase would be appropriate. This would help clarify issues that might be pertinent to individual cultures. At that meeting, it was decided that the three participating countries would focus on the policy of anti-bullying in the initial trial phase. A design brief for the evaluation instruments was prepared for the Irish Steering Committee.

The focus of the indicators was on planning within a school development planning process. Hence, the focus of instrumentation was on individual schools, rather than on a system level evaluation. In designing instrumentation, a comprehensive approach to evaluation was used. The aim was to triangulate as much evidence as possible on planning activities in a school. Therefore, methodologies that produced in-depth information were preferred to methodologies that gave rise to summary information. As a result, there was a preference for structured interviews over questionnaires. It was appreciated that at a later stage, once the indicators had been verified, a less intense approach to data gathering could give rise to valid and reliable evaluations depending on the purpose of the evaluator in using the indicators.

Evaluation instruments for the initial trial were developed taking account of the feedback received at the June meeting, and in September 2004, the following instruments, with supporting documentation, were circulated to the participating partners (Table 6). National authorities/agencies had an opportunity to translate the documentation for use in their own countries during October 2004.

1. **CSEP Guidelines for Evaluators**
2. **Instrument A: Document Review** provides prompts for the evaluator when reviewing school planning documentation
3. **Instrument B: Interview with Management** provides a structured interview schedule for gathering information from school management personnel
4. **Instrument C: Interview with Teachers** provides a structured interview schedule for gathering information from teachers
5. **Instrument D: Questions for Parents** provides a set of questions that can be used in a structured interview or as the basis for a questionnaire to gather information from parents
6. **Instrument E: Interview with Pupils** provides a structured interview schedule for gathering information from pupils
7. **Reporting Template**

Table 6 Documents Provided for CSEP Trials

Based on the results of this initial trial, the implications for the indicator framework and for the instrumentation were evaluated by the Irish Steering Committee and at a plenary session of the participating partners in Malahide, Co. Dublin in September 2005.

The main trial phase allowed participants focus on a range of non-curricular policies in a school. The same evaluation process was used in this main phase as in the trial phase - a review of whole-school planning documentation in relation both to the general culture of planning and to the specific non-curricular policy areas that had been selected, as well as structured interviews with a range of school partners. In the case of each school, evaluators decided on the appropriate range of partners to be interviewed in relation to the specific policy areas selected. The Irish Steering Committee revised the instruments from the initial trial phase to take account of the wider range of policies and to ensure that the focus was on the planning process, rather than on the outcome of the policy area itself. The revised instruments were circulated in October 2005 (Appendices 3-5).

In developing the instruments, codes of practice were agreed for contacting schools, preparing them for the evaluation process and also for using the structured interviews. These codes of practice were circulated with the instruments.

Evaluators were requested to make detailed notes of the responses to questions and prompts under each of the four primary indicators. They were to be alert to the strong concurrence of evidence from different sources, and also to any significant inconsistencies. The evaluators were asked to make evaluative judgements under the four indicators concerning the planning process underpinning the selected non-curricular policies in the school and to elaborate on these judgements in relation to the sub-indicators.

Evaluators were encouraged to give oral or written feedback to the school. It was decided that feedback should show sensitivity towards the school context and the school's stage of development with regard to both the general process of planning and the specific policy area that was the focus of the trial. Findings were to be communicated in a supportive and constructive manner. The aim of the feedback was to enhance the motivation and overall capacity of the school community to achieve its goals and strive for further improvements.

Evaluators developed summary reports on both the initial and the main trials according to an agreed template. This template included a report on the findings in the individual schools, but also required evaluators to assess the usefulness of the indicators in focusing on the planning process and in making evaluative judgements on activities in the school. Evaluators also assessed the instruments for their validity and reliability.

### 3. Testing

Testing the indicators took place in two exercises. In the initial trial phase, all three partners focused on a single extra-curricular policy in schools - anti-bullying. Each partner country examined that policy in one primary school and in one secondary school, using the indicator framework and evaluation instruments. The initial trial took place during the period November 2004-February 2005. A report on the initial trial in each participating country was sent to the CSEP Steering Committee in Ireland by early March 2005.

At a meeting of CSEP country representatives in September 2005, five broad non-curricular policy areas were selected as focuses for the main trial:

- professional development of staff
- legal requirements on schools
- partnership between school and community
- student democracy
- communications.

Each participating country undertook to carry out an evaluation of the planning process for non-curricular policies in **four schools**, two at primary level and two at secondary level. Each country agreed to focus on at least **three of the broad areas of policy** during the main trial. It was envisaged that they would choose one policy related to one of the broad areas in each school, preferably a different policy in each school (Table 7).

	Policy Area	Specific Policy	Country
1.	Professional development of staff	Vision Statement	Norway
		Differentiated Learning	Norway
		General Policy on Staff Development	Finland
2.	Policies required by legislation	Health and Safety	Ireland
		Tobacco, Drug and Alcohol	Ireland
		General Process	Finland
3.	Partnership between school and community	Community Involvement in preventing Substance Misuse	Ireland
		International School Partnership	Norway
4.	Student democracy	Student Council	Ireland
5.	Communications	Improving Communication	Norway
		Improving Communication	Finland

Table 7 General and specific policy areas reviewed by participating partners to test the indicator framework in the main trial

In the light of the initial trial and discussion at the plenary meeting in September 2005, the Irish Steering Committee revised the indicator framework, instrumentation and reporting template for use by evaluators/ inspectors during the main trial phase. The evaluations took place between November 2005 and January 2006. Evaluators worked either individually or in teams, according to evaluation practice in the participating country. Evaluators used their discretion in deciding which partners were relevant in relation to each policy selected for study.

## 4. Findings

The INFRASTRUCTURE indicator revealed important differences in approaches to planning between the three countries and also within the countries, especially as applied to different levels of schools. In Norway, schools are allowed five days per year for planning. There is a strong tradition of planning and teachers are organised into teams and students into core groups. This gives the teachers time to meet to review progress and plan for the future. In Finland, the main initiative for planning comes from the municipality. There is a strong link between curricular and non-curricular developments in defining the operational culture of each school. In recent years, schools have been encouraged to develop their own strategies for planning, with help coming from the municipality. In Ireland a school plan is a legal requirement, and it is expected that the plan will be developed in a spirit of partnership. Support services at primary and secondary level are in place as a resource for the different schools. In the three countries, there were differences between primary and secondary schools in terms of organisation and commitment to collaborative planning.

In the main trial, the two Norwegian primary schools and the lower secondary school all participated in developmental work initiated by the local school authority. As a consequence, the schools got special advice on and in-service training in aspects of the topic focused on in the developmental work. These schools had both external and internal resources available. The upper secondary school used internal resources for the planning of the chosen policy. In Finland, there was evidence of a culture of planning in the individual schools, as the practice of setting up small teams of teachers to deal with specific issues was evident. The schools used the municipal resources and governmental financial support well for these activities and also for coordinating the views of different stakeholders. In Ireland, the schools availed of the services of the School Development Planning Initiative, and of resources produced by the Department of Education and Science in implementing policies related to health and safety or substance use. They invited external agencies involved in the policy area to address the school partners as part of the planning process. The schools also had access to external facilitation, especially at the design phase.

The DESIGN indicator also revealed different cultural approaches to planning. In the initial trial, it was found that approaches to anti-bullying had both a curricular and non-curricular aspect to them in all three countries, raising questions about the boundary between the curriculum and non-curricular activities. In Norway, one school had implemented a curricular programme, ZERO, which was chosen from a number of alternatives. In Finland and in Ireland, curricular provision was made for dealing with anti-bullying within other programmes. In Norway and Finland, there was a tendency to focus on creating a positive school atmosphere, where bullying did not occur, rather than on creating a specific policy focused on anti-bullying. Although they may not have had a specific policy, schools had procedures for dealing with cases of bullying. These policies were linked to codes of behaviour and discipline policies.

In the main trial, different types of projects were examined. Some had a consistent and pervasive effect in the school. In Norway, for example, two of the projects involved a differentiated approach to learning and the development of a vision for the school. A third project involved improving communication, which involved teachers in specific reporting activities at different times of the year. In the fourth school, the focus was on International School Partnership, which involved activities concentrated in special weeks during the school year, called Project Weeks. In Finland, policies on staff development and policies in response to legal requirements focused mainly on the effective use of resources available to enhance the teaching-learning environment. As such, there was a strong link between the non-curricular planning process and the curriculum. For all the schools, the design included vision and mission statements, priorities for action and an identification of personnel resources needed. In Ireland, policies evaluated included health and safety policies related to tobacco, alcohol, drugs and other issues of substance use. Another project involved the setting up and support of a Student Council.

In most schools, leadership involvement in the planning process was seen as crucial. Some schools had a history of positive involvement in planning. They had structures of consultation in place with formal bodies such as student councils and parent associations. The role of leadership was to initiate new policy areas for development and to encourage on-going participation. In schools where formal structures did not exist, leaders faced the added challenge of devising and resourcing structures to involve the different stakeholders. The priority that they gave to this impacted on the quality of the planning process.

In the initial trial, interviews with school partners revealed that the partners were generally well informed about what to do with incidents of bullying. However, they seemed less clear on the rationale behind a specific policy. It seems that, in the design phase, most schools developed a pragmatic approach - to produce something concrete - rather than engaging in detailed discussion of values and disseminating these values. In some schools, there was a strong sense that bullying was not a problem, so there seemed little need to be involved in explicit statements about mutual respect. The positive values were taken for granted. Where external programmes such as ZERO were adopted, it was assumed that, as professionally designed programmes, they had a link with definite values and with good practice. The focus was therefore on the implementation of the programme.

In the main trial, it was found that the planning process was directly linked with the vision and values of the school. Two of the Norwegian schools were involved in policies directly related to the value system of the school - one was developing a vision statement for its work with students and the second was designing an improved communication system to enhance its educational platform. In Finland, there was a strong emphasis on vision as determined by the national curriculum and on involving partners in the planning process. In Ireland, policies on health and safety, especially those involving substance use, were legally mandated. However, schools made a conscious effort to link the policy to the culture of care that it espoused.

In the initial trial there was little evidence of a high level of partner involvement in the design, although the partners were often very happy with the outcomes. Policies tended to be discussed and adopted by teachers, who then informed parents and students. In the main trial, some of the policies involved a high level of collaboration with partners. In Norway, the development of the differentiated learning policy was a partnership between the school, the student and the parents. In Ireland partners were involved in different aspects of the substance use policies, mainly with regard to information that would lead to mutual support between school and home. In general, there was a greater involvement of parents and students in the implementation aspects of the policy than in the design, especially where they could give active support to their children. This often occurred when there was a significant event - a child was bullied, or took part in a Project - rather than as a general practice. In Norway, students were involved in giving regular feedback on the school through the Pupil Inspectors, an IT based feedback mechanism.

When designing the policy, the focus seemed to be on statements of value, rather than on generating specific targets that could then be measured. In the case of the anti-bullying policy, where there was an emphasis on a positive school culture, this was understandable. It revealed a particular approach to planning which gave autonomy to individual teachers in implementation.

The IMPLEMENTATION indicator showed that schools had systems in place to implement policies. For the most part, implementation depended mainly on the teaching staff within the school. In all schools, there was an awareness of roles, and who had designated responsibility for activities. In Finland, for instance, this responsibility evolved as part of the process, rather than individuals having a specially designated role. There was a high level of teamwork in implementing the policies. Teachers worked together, and at times, students worked in teams with their peers and also with the teachers. There was a clear focus on resources for the policies. In some cases these resources were supplied by the school. In others, the resources were developed as part of the policy, or were acquired from parents during the implementation phase. In general, planning at the implementation phase focused on strategies to establish the policy. Planning for the maintenance and development of the policy was more difficult. A particular example of this was the work of establishing the Student Council in a school in Ireland. Considerable effort went into the first Student Council, but in subsequent years, with changes of personnel at student and support teacher level, the policy was less successful.

There was very little emphasis on monitoring process, although in some cases, students and teachers celebrated successes. In Finland, some criteria for evaluation were defined at an early stage by the Ministry of Education or the education provider. In the initial trial, there was little evidence of ongoing communication about the success of the anti-bullying policy, yet students enjoyed the stress-free environment and parents reported that they were satisfied with the school. In Norway, differentiated learning and school vision became part of the school culture and were taken for granted, whereas the outcomes of the **International School Partnership Project** were widely celebrated. In Finland, the school provided yearly reports of their activities to the public and to parents. In Ireland, some projects produced annual reports on key events - e.g. fire drills, etc - whereas other policies needed a more long-term perspective.

The IMPACT indicator revealed this area as the weakest element in the planning process. The country reports for the initial phase indicated that many schools were not aware of the need to include strategies for evaluation in the design phase. There seemed to be a general lack of success criteria, of data collection relating to evaluation, and of formal evaluation processes. Evaluation tended to be informal and subjective, and carried out through teacher discussion. In Norway, schools were conscious of getting feedback from students about life in the school. However, such evaluation tended to be general, about the culture of the school as a whole, rather than directed at specific policies or targets related to these policies. In the initial trial, many school reviews took place with regard to incidences of anti-bullying, but this did not extend to an evaluation of the policy. In Finland, self-evaluation dealt mainly with monitoring a policy. The impact was evaluated by the municipality and by the Ministry of Education. It seems that schools were inclined to leave the question of impact to an external evaluation.

The indicator revealed that schools generally did not conceptualise planning in terms of impact. It seems that schools often engaged in planning from

- a need to be compliant with either a national or a regional directive
- a desire to implement good practice
- a need to improve a specific situation within the school

As a result, they planned policies and activities. In general, if there was no crisis, they were happy with their design and implementation. They assumed that, if they followed good practice, then the impact would be positive. They did not engage in formal evaluation of impact. If planning is to lead to school improvement, there needs to be a greater focus on setting specific targets and evaluating how well they have been attained. There was little evidence of this mindset.

## 5. Evaluation of Indicators and Instruments

Arising from the design and trial of the indicators, the partners reflected on the process and evaluated the validity and reliability of the indicators for use in different contexts. This evaluation involved:

- the validity of the indicators for use in evaluating the planning process for non-curricular areas in schools
- the reliability of the indicators as applied to different policies in different contexts
- the accessibility of the indicators to standard evaluation tools, with special reference to the application of the instrumentation developed during this project

### 5.1 Indicators

There was overall satisfaction with the indicators as statements of good planning practice. The following quotations reflect the responses of the evaluators who used the indicators in the trials.

#### ***Infrastructure***

*The infrastructure indicators successfully identified the culture of planning within the schools, the extent of prior planning, including the identification and procurement of internal and external resources, as well as the extent of collaborative policy making.*

#### ***Design***

*Overall, the indicators were found to be helpful in examining the different aspects of the design phase of the specific policy evaluated, and in identifying its associated strengths and weaknesses.*

### **Implementation**

*The implementation indicators were suitable for the purpose. They indicated whether the school had expressed monitoring points in the documentation of the process. The interviewees expressed satisfaction with the way questions were formulated and commented that they pointed at crucial issues concerning implementation.*

### **Impact**

*The impact indicators disclosed the routines of evaluating impact of the policy. The main impression after the interviews is that the schools wanted to improve the description of their targets, data gathering and analyses of information. The quality of the proposals for on-going monitoring, developing criteria and evaluation of the policy was to be emphasised more in the development of the policy.*

Some criticism of the indicators referred to the fact that they began from a certain 'expected' level of good practice, and at times appeared to be presumptuous. In practice, the planning approach of the school did not always fit into the theoretical model implied in the indicators. This reflected the context in which schools engaged in the planning process. At times the actual planning process was dictated by particular circumstances, in particular the external supports available to the school and the internal flexibility of the school to respond to situations.

The Steering Committee was satisfied that the indicators were valid and reliable guides to the evaluation of planning process for non-curricular policies in schools. They helped clarify key aspects of the planning process. They gave schools the opportunity to compare their process against good practice. They affirmed schools in some aspects, and challenged schools in others. Clearly, caution needs to be applied in how the indicators are used. They are not meant to be applied in a prescriptive way, in terms of forming absolute judgements on the quality of a planning process. They help situate a school's effort within a theoretical framework. As well as clarifying issues for an individual school, the indicators may reveal issues for school planning that have system-wide implications in terms of the supports given to schools to engage in the planning process.

## **5.2 Use of indicators**

The response of the evaluators reflected on the usefulness of the indicators at individual school level.

*The indicators, and the instruments to measure them, gave detailed information about planning processes encompassing the whole school.*

*The indicators could be of particular benefit to schools in that they provide a framework for ensuring that the planning process is well structured and includes a number of phases, e.g. design, implementation and impact.*

There were also implications at a system level, as the evaluators reflected on what promoted good practice.

*The CSEP project revealed the extent of the work undertaken in a voluntary capacity by teachers in schools. While voluntary work and a spirit of goodwill are important, they may be insufficient in terms of the work required to drive forward the process, to implement and evaluate it and to ensure the maintenance of the policy into the future. The issue of time is a critical factor and the provision of adequate time for planning should be a prerequisite for new policy development.*

Schools respond well both to the value dimension of policy formation and to consultation within the process where there are external resources available: facilitation, knowledge and expertise. In systems where these resources are available, a culture of planning has become embedded in the system.

The judgements formed using these indicators need to take into account the context of the school in terms of these external resources. They also need to take into account the internal difficulties faced by schools. For instance, the design phase can be easy to organise, as teams contribute their current expertise to developing a template for a policy or activity. However, turnover in staff and students has a major effect on the implementation and impact phases of planning. Individuals change roles and at times their expertise is lost to the school. New people may not have been involved in the design, or may not share the same perspective as the previous person in the role. This makes for difficulty in having continuity in implementation. Evaluations that show deficits in these areas of planning may well point to a need for system support, rather than reflect badly on schools.

### 5.3 Instrumentation

The instrumentation involved two main techniques - document review and interview.

Document review gave valuable insights into the history of the planning process. The analysis template in Instrument A was rated as very helpful. In some cases, however, the process was found to be a time-consuming and complex activity. A policy might be described over a range of different documents. Difficulties also arose when schools did not retain documentary evidence of a planning process beyond a certain number of years. In general, documentary evidence tended to deal with the product of planning rather than the process. This difficulty should not necessarily be interpreted negatively in the evaluation of a school's approach to the process of planning.

The interview approach gave rise to good quality information and enhanced the dialogue with partners. It was found that the interview instruments B, C, D, and E, provided useful guidelines for evaluators. The instruments, as published, were intended as templates for evaluations rather than for use in a prescriptive way. For instance, when dealing with younger students in a primary school, interview questions had to be adapted. Individual and focus-group interviews are intense and involve a limited number of participants. They provide rich data. They are highly effective in uncovering the internal dynamics of the planning process. Some evaluators queried whether a balance between questionnaire and interview techniques might increase the participation of some partners without losing out on the quality of the information. Questionnaire instruments could be developed to suit different purposes and contexts.

The instrumentation sought triangulation of evidence from a number of different sources. The value of planning for triangulation of data was strongly supported by the evaluators. In most of the trials there was a strong element of congruence in the data. However, the focus on different partners was important in highlighting different perspectives on the planning process.

The instrumentation was designed as a comprehensive set of tools to verify the validity and reliability of the indicators. The evaluators were satisfied that the instruments achieved their purpose.

- The instruments identified evidence of the existence of the planning process, e.g. if there were written procedures familiar to stakeholders in school or to what extent students and parents were involved.
- In the opinion of the interviewees the questions pointed at crucial issues in the planning process of the chosen policy by identifying existing good practice as well as areas for further development

When used in practice, the same comprehensiveness of approach may not be needed. Once the indicators have been confirmed, then different approaches can be used to verify that the indicator has been implemented and the extent to which it has achieved its purpose. The comprehensiveness used will depend on the use being made of the evaluation. As in all evaluations, there needs to be a sensitive balance between challenge and support in using an external template against which any policy process is evaluated.

## Conclusion

The CSEP project designed and tested a series of indicators on how the planning process for non-curricular areas in schools was conducted. The indicators were found to have a base in the theory of planning and school development. They pointed to good practice and allowed schools to place their own practice within a theoretical framework. In particular, the primary indicators

- Infrastructure
- Design
- Implementation
- Impact

provided useful guidelines for reflecting on the overall process of planning. The development of sub-indicators in each of these areas helped reflect on the practical application of the planning model. When the sub-indicators were applied sensitively, taking into account the context of planning in the school, they provided a good framework for reflection and for giving developmental feedback to the school. Evaluations from partners who used the indicators and associated instruments, and from the schools who received feedback on the basis of the use of the indicators, show the indicators to be valid and reliable in a variety of different situations both within (primary, lower secondary and upper secondary) and between the partner countries.

The instruments designed were comprehensive and provided data which triangulated perceptions of the planning process by consulting with different school partners. The instruments can be used by a school as part of a self-evaluation and reflection exercise. They can also be used by an external evaluator as part of a transparent system of working with schools in a developmental way. The comprehensiveness of the instruments as designed is a cost factor in the development of the indicator system. A less intense approach to instrumentation is possible, once the indicators have been established, without compromising the quality of the data. The use of questionnaires rather than interviews would allow for greater involvement of partners in the process.

As well as being of benefit to the individual schools evaluated, the indicators outlined some key strengths and weaknesses at system level. When considering the infrastructure of planning, it was found that schools responded positively to external resources that promoted the planning process. These resources were helpful at the design, implementation and evaluation phases. The indicators also revealed that schools tended to have an informal approach to evaluating the impact of policies and activities. They often celebrated successes related to good implementation, but policy impact had not been formulated in terms of targets to be achieved, and measurements to monitor the impact of the policy had not been included in the process. Training and support in this area would seem to be important for systemic support of planning for non-curricular areas in schools.

The indicators were developed with a view to evaluating non-curricular areas. When applied across a variety of non-curricular policies, the focus of the indicators was clarified as being more related to the process of planning rather than to the outcomes of particular non-curricular policies. Where the boundaries between curricular and non-curricular areas were unclear, it was found that the indicators had a general application to all aspects of planning in schools, and could validly be used to evaluate the planning process in curricular areas as well.

## Bibliography

Bolman, L.G. and Deal, T.E. (2003) *Reframing Organizations: Artistry, Choice and Leadership*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Wiley.

Department of Education and Science, Ireland (2003) *Looking at our School: An aid to self-evaluation in primary schools*, Dublin: Stationery Office.

Department of Education and Science, Ireland (2003) *Looking at our School: An aid to self-evaluation in second-level schools*, Dublin: Stationery Office.

Fullan, M. (2003) *The Moral Imperative of School Leadership*, CA: Corwin Press.

Government of Ireland (1999) *Developing a School Plan: Guidelines for Primary Schools*, Dublin: Stationery Office.

Government of Ireland (1999) *School Development Planning: An Introduction for Second Level Schools*, Dublin: Stationery Office.

Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D., & Steinbach, R. (1999) *Changing Leadership for Changing Times*, Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Sergiovanni, T. (1996) *Moral Leadership: Getting to the heart of school improvement*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Wiley.

Starratt, R.J. (1995) *Leaders with Vision*, CA: Corwin Press.

Tuohy, D. (1997) *School Leadership and Strategic Planning*, Dublin: ASTI.

## Appendices



## Appendix 1: CSEP Indicator Framework

<b>1. INFRASTRUCTURE</b>	<b>This indicator examines the general context of planning as it affects the school</b>
1.1 External Supports	There are external supports available to help the school develop policies in non-curricular areas The school uses these supports appropriately
1.2 Internal Supports	The school has internal supports (structures and resources) to promote an environment of planning The school partners are supportive of the planning process
<b>2. DESIGN</b>	<b>This indicator examines approaches to policy design</b>
2.1 Origin	The policy has a basis in educational or social values.
2.2 Value Driven	The values behind the policy are explicit
2.3 Rationale	The values behind the policy are understood
2.4 Holistic	The policy is linked to other school policies
2.5 Collaborative	School partners are involved in the design at an appropriate level
2.6 Targets	The design includes targets to be reached
2.7 Resources	The design identifies resources needed for implementation
<b>3. IMPLEMENTATION</b>	<b>This indicator examines the way the policy is being implemented</b>
3.1 Personnel	Personnel are assigned to implement the policy There is a structure to coordinate different aspects of the implementation phase There are communication structures to keep partners informed
3.2 Monitoring	There are clear monitoring points in place The monitoring process supports implementation
3.3 Use of Resources	The implementation is well resourced The resources are used effectively
3.4 Scope	The policy is being implemented for all those for whom it was intended in its design
<b>4. IMPACT</b>	<b>This indicator examines the way the policy is evaluated</b>
4.1 Criteria	Criteria have been set to evaluate the effectiveness of the policy
4.2 Data	Data is collected about the impact of the policy The data is up-to-date
4.3 Evaluation	There is a process for evaluating the impact of the policy The evaluators are skilled in this area The planning process can respond to the outcomes of the evaluation

## Appendix 2: CSEP Instrumentation Design Framework

**This framework outlines:**

- the indicators and sub-indicators
- the scope of each sub-indicator-what it is intended to measure and how it links to the overall evaluation
- the type of evaluation or measurement that might be possible in relation to each sub-indicator

1. INFRASTRUCTURE		
The aim of this indicator is to look at the general culture/environment of planning in the school rather than at the planning process for a specific policy		
SUB-INDICATOR	SCOPE OF SUB-INDICATOR	MEASUREMENT
<b>1.1 External Supports</b>		
There are external supports available to help the school develop policies in non-curricular areas.	This sub-indicator deals with the external support context for non-curricular policies: <b>Content resources:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>helping schools understand content area of policies (theory behind issues)</li> </ul> <b>Process Resources:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>helping schools develop a process for planning (theory behind process)</li> <li>helping schools implement the planning process (practical help with process)</li> </ul>	This sub-indicator can be documented from the evaluator's knowledge of the environment, and may be enhanced from information supplied by the school. The report might <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>indicate that resources were (or were not) present</li> <li>list the resources in each category</li> <li>make a judgment on the adequacy of the resources</li> </ul>
The school uses these supports appropriately.	This sub-indicator deals with the way in which the school makes use of external resources available to it: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What resources are used and by whom?</li> </ul>	Ask the partners about the resources that aid good planning and judge the level of their involvement with these resources: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are they aware of the resources?</li> <li>Have they used the resources?</li> <li>How useful have they found the resources?</li> </ul>

1. INFRASTRUCTURE		
The aim of this indicator is to look at the general culture/environment of planning in the school rather than at the planning process for a specific policy		
SUB-INDICATOR	SCOPE OF SUB-INDICATOR	MEASUREMENT
<b>1.2 Internal Supports</b>		
The school has internal supports (structures and resources) to promote an environment of planning.	This sub-indicator deals with the internal environment that supports planning for non-curricular areas in the school. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>structures such as time, etc.</li> <li>personnel with responsibility</li> </ul>	Describe the structures that are in place by looking at documents, getting information from management. Triangulate that information by determining who is involved in these planning structures and the basis of their involvement (voluntary or assigned job) and the amount of time given to these planning activities. Make a judgement about the effectiveness of these structures by looking at the output from the structures in recent time.
The school partners are supportive of the planning process.	This sub-indicator deals with the level at which each of the partners is supportive of the planning process.	Identify the different partners appropriate to the area being investigated. Ask questions of the partners about the effect of internal structures on their attitude to school planning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>knowledge of planning issues and processes</li> <li>level of actual participation</li> </ul>

<b>2. DESIGN</b>		
This indicator looks at the design phase of the planning process. Sub-indicators 2.1 - 2.3 look at underlying beliefs of how planning is designed. The other sub-indicators look at technical aspects of the design phase. This indicator is concerned with the historical aspect of the planning process - what has happened in the past.		
SUB-INDICATOR	SCOPE OF SUB-INDICATOR	MEASUREMENT
<b>2.1 Origin</b>		
The policy has a basis in educational or social values.	Is the policy linked to some theoretical approach to good education practice and/or to the social values driving the area?	Check documents for evidence that the policy is based on some educational theory or some developmental rationale. If the policy was mandated by government, how well did the school community appreciate the purpose of the policy.
<b>2.2 Value Driven</b>		
The values behind the policy are explicit.	Does the policy link to a clear statement of school (district) aims and values?	Check the policy documents for any link to a school (district) mission or vision statement or purpose of education. Ask partners what value they see in the policy and how it contributes to school life and evaluate the links they make.

<b>2. DESIGN</b>		
This indicator looks at the design phase of the planning process. Sub-indicators 2.1 - 2.3 look at underlying beliefs of how planning is designed. The other sub-indicators look at technical aspects of the design phase. This indicator is concerned with the historical aspect of the planning process - what has happened in the past.		
SUB-INDICATOR	SCOPE OF SUB-INDICATOR	MEASUREMENT
<b>2.3 Rationale</b>		
The values behind the policy are understood.	The aim of this sub-indicator is to see how well the process engaged with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• understanding the issues</li> <li>• exploring different possible responses to the issues</li> <li>• choosing the “best” response as the basis for the policy</li> </ul> (The alternative is to import a policy which does not arise from an issue identified by the school, or to have a policy that is given by someone else and those involved do not see the relevance). This has two levels: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the existence of the rationale, and</li> <li>• partnership understanding and support of it.</li> </ul>	Ask partners about rationale to determine <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• awareness</li> <li>• understanding</li> <li>• support</li> </ul> Ask those involved why the current policy was chosen and if other ways of dealing with the problem were considered.
<b>2.4. Holistic</b>		
The policy is linked to other school policies.	Does the policy link to other cognate policy areas in a holistic manner?	Check if non-curricular policies are linked and work from complementary philosophies. See if these are mentioned in documents. Ask partners how they see links between this area and others.

<b>2. DESIGN</b>		
This indicator looks at the design phase of the planning process. Sub-indicators 2.1 - 2.3 look at underlying beliefs of how planning is designed. The other sub-indicators look at technical aspects of the design phase. This indicator is concerned with the historical aspect of the planning process - what has happened in the past.		
<b>SUB-INDICATOR</b>	<b>SCOPE OF SUB-INDICATOR</b>	<b>MEASUREMENT</b>
<b>2.5 Collaborative</b>		
School partners are involved in the design phase at an appropriate level.	Have all the appropriate partners for this project been identified? Is there a strategy for meaningful and appropriate engagement of the different partners?	Look for evidence of who was involved in the planning process. Ask partners if they found their involvement meaningful in that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• they had something to say on the issue</li> <li>• they were treated seriously in the process</li> <li>• their views were incorporated in the final version of the policy</li> </ul>
<b>2.6 Targets</b>		
The design includes targets to be reached.	This sub-indicator seeks to establish the practical way in which the implementation of the policy was envisaged in the design phase. There are three elements. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Were specific targets aimed for?</li> <li>• Was a time line envisaged to reach the targets?</li> <li>• Was a monitoring process envisaged to support implementation?</li> </ul> (Indicator 3 deals with the implementation phase.)	Look for documentary evidence of specific targets and time scale. Judge whether these were practical and specific. Ask relevant personnel what they hoped to achieve from the policy. Ask relevant personnel how they hoped to check on progress with implementation.

<b>2. DESIGN</b>		
This indicator looks at the design phase of the planning process. Sub-indicators 2.1 - 2.3 look at underlying beliefs of how planning is designed. The other sub-indicators look at technical aspects of the design phase. This indicator is concerned with the historical aspect of the planning process - what has happened in the past.		
<b>SUB-INDICATOR</b>	<b>SCOPE OF SUB-INDICATOR</b>	<b>MEASUREMENT</b>
<b>2.7 Resources</b>		
The design identifies resources needed for implementation.	This sub-indicator looks at the way the design phase prepared to support the implementation through providing resources: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Physical</li> <li>• Personnel (this could involve the assignment of people to tasks or the provision of in-service training for people already in position)</li> </ul>	Look for evidence that the need for resources was addressed in the planning process and not solely negotiated afterwards: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Check documents.</li> <li>• Ask partners</li> </ul>

<b>3. IMPLEMENTATION</b>		
This indicator examines the implementation of the policy. It has a past and present tense aspect to it.		
SUB-INDICATOR	SCOPE OF SUB-INDICATOR	MEASUREMENT
<b>3.1 Personnel</b>		
Personnel are assigned to implement the policy	The aim of this sub-indicator is to see how the school has involved personnel in the implementation of the policy.	Examine documents and organisational charts for designated responsibilities. Look at the basis for these responsibilities - formal or informal, etc. Ask those with responsibility about the clarity of their roles.
There is a structure to coordinate different aspects of the implementation phase.	This sub-indicator applies particularly if more than one person is involved, or if the policy requires multiple actions for implementation. It looks to the coordination of the implementation.	Examine documents and organisational charts for designated responsibilities. Look at the basis for these responsibilities - formal or informal, etc. Ask those with responsibility about the clarity of their roles.
There are communication structures to keep partners informed.	The aim of this sub-indicator is to see how the school communicates with partners: (a) in introducing the policy and (b) in the ongoing maintenance of the policy.	Examine documents (letters home, notices, etc) for evidence of a communication structure and practice. Ask partners about how well informed they are.
<b>3.2 Monitoring</b>		
There are clear monitoring points in place.	Have fixed points of time been set to check on whether aspects of the policy are in operation and/or specific targets have been achieved as envisaged in the planning process?	Look for monitoring points in the documentation and in the reports. Ask relevant personnel about the time frame for any targets mentioned above.
The monitoring process supports implementation.	This sub-indicator seeks to establish if the monitoring process is effective in providing feedback on implementation leading to affirmation or adjustment of current practice.	Ask those responsible for implementation about the monitoring process and any adjustments that have been made as a result.

<b>3. IMPLEMENTATION</b>		
This indicator examines the implementation of the policy. It has a past and present tense aspect to it.		
SUB-INDICATOR	SCOPE OF SUB-INDICATOR	MEASUREMENT
<b>3.3 Use of resources</b>		
The implementation is well resourced.	The aim of this sub-indicator is to check that adequate resources have been put in place to support implementation: • As identified in the planning process • As a response to unanticipated needs (Link with 2.7 for scope of resources.)	Ask relevant personnel about the resources. Ask those with responsibility for the implementing the policy to list the resources and supports they have received.
The resources are used effectively.	The aim here is to check that physical resources obtained are being used, and that any personnel designated to implementation are actually involved in the implementation and using the training they received.	Ask those with responsibility for implementing the policy how well prepared they felt for their role initially, and how well supported they now feel. Ask them which resources they use most, or what training was most beneficial. Ask them if any resources provided to support the implementation of the policy were ineffective.
<b>3.4 Scope</b>		
The policy is being implemented for all those for whom it was intended.	The aim is to ensure that the policy is being implemented for all for whom it was designed, not just a subset - or that it has not spread beyond its intended scope in an unplanned way, possibly leading to burn-out of personnel or exhaustion of resources.	Ask partners who they think benefit from the policy at the moment. Ask them who they think are not benefiting.

<b>4. IMPACT</b>		
The aim of this indicator is to ensure that a self-evaluation process is built into the planning process and that the policy is adjusted appropriately in the light of experience. It examines the evaluation criteria to establish whether they are linked with the aims of the policy.		
<b>SUB-INDICATOR</b>	<b>SCOPE OF SUB-INDICATOR</b>	<b>MEASUREMENT</b>
<b>4.1 Criteria set</b>		
Criteria have been set to evaluate the effectiveness of the policy.	Are there clear guidelines for the evaluators - criteria against which they judge the impact of the policy in the school?	Check whether there are criteria stated for the evaluation. Check when these criteria were devised - at implementation or just prior to evaluation? Are the criteria linked with the aims of the policy or do they simply seek to justify practice?
<b>4.2 Data available</b>		
Data is collected about the impact of the policy.	Did the school put systems of gathering information in place that would facilitate an evaluation of the impact of the policy at a later stage?	Describe the systems of gathering information the school put in place that would facilitate an evaluation at a later stage. Check documents.
The data is up-to-date.	Has the school used the data systems fully? Is the information adequate for evaluation of the policy itself?	Evaluate if the data systems are being used and if the data is up-to-date.

<b>4. IMPACT</b>		
The aim of this indicator is to ensure that a self-evaluation process is built into the planning process and that the policy is adjusted appropriately in the light of experience. It examines the evaluation criteria to establish whether they are linked with the aims of the policy.		
<b>SUB-INDICATOR</b>	<b>SCOPE OF SUB-INDICATOR</b>	<b>MEASUREMENT</b>
<b>4.3 Evaluation</b>		
There is a process for evaluating the impact of the policy.	Has the school made provision in the planning process for evaluation of the policy's impact?	Check if the school has a provision for evaluation of the impact of the policy after 1, 3 or 5 years (Documents, questions to management?) Judge the planning for the evaluation in terms of the policy values and aims.
The evaluators are skilled in this area.	Who does the evaluation? Is it external or internal, and what level of expertise is brought to the evaluation?	Ask partners if they know who did the evaluation, and whether they had confidence in the outcome of the evaluation.
The planning process can respond to the outcomes of the evaluation.	Is there an ongoing spirit of planning that responds to the strengths and weaknesses revealed in the evaluation?	Ask if an evaluation has taken place and if the school responded to the outcomes.

## Appendix 3: Document Review Instrument

INDICATOR	PROBE/QUESTION	FINDING Yes/No/Unsure/Not applicable	EVIDENCE (List documents examined or the evidence that the indicator is in place)
1. INFRASTRUCTURE			
1.0 General	Has the school been involved in planning as part of its culture?		
1.1 External Supports			
There are external supports available to help the school develop policies in non-curricular areas. (See <i>Guidelines for Evaluators</i> , Appendix 1: CSEP Instrumentation Design Framework)	Are there supports available to help schools with the content aspect of the areas being planned? Are there resources available to help schools understand how to go about planning? Are there resources available to help schools do the planning? Would the resources available adequately support policy development for non-curricular areas?		
The school uses these supports appropriately.	Do the documents examined (as named) provide evidence that the school has used the resources listed above?		
1.2 Internal Supports			
The school has internal supports (structures and resources) to promote an environment of planning.	Does the documentation examined provide evidence of support structures such as time, personnel with designated responsibility, expenditure etc? Do recent records provide evidence of the work of these structures in practice?		
The school partners are supportive of the planning process.	Do the documents provide evidence of meaningful partner support for the planning process?		

INDICATOR	PROBE/QUESTION		FINDING Yes/No/Unsure/Not applicable	EVIDENCE (List documents examined or the evidence that the indicator is in place)
2. DESIGN				
2.1 Origin				
The policy has a basis in educational or social values.	Do the documents provide evidence that the policy is based on some theoretical approach to good education practice or on the social values driving the policy area?			
2.2 Value Driven				
The values behind the policy are explicit.	Do the documents specify any link to a school (or district) mission or vision statement or to a clear statement of aims and values?			
2.3 Rationale				
The values behind the policy are understood.	Does school documentation suggest that the process of developing this policy was informed by an understanding of its purpose and its relevance? Is there evidence in the documents that a range of possible measures was considered before the approach set out in the policy was adopted?			
2.4 Holistic				
The policy is linked to other school policies.	Do the documents show any link between this specific policy and other related policy areas?			

INDICATOR	PROBE/QUESTION		FINDING Yes/No/Unsure/Not applicable	EVIDENCE (List documents examined or the evidence that the indicator is in place)
2.5 Collaborative				
School partners are involved in the planning process at an appropriate level.	Do the documents identify partners who have been involved in the process? Do the documents outline a strategy for the meaningful engagement of these partners? Have records of partner contributions to the process been kept? Does the final policy document reflect partner contributions and views?			
2.6 Targets				
The planning process includes targets to be reached.	Have specific and practical targets and a time scale been documented? Do the documents outline an associated monitoring process?			
2.7 Resources				
The planning process identifies resources needed for implementation.	Do records and process documents show that physical and human resources required to implement the policy were identified when the policy was being drawn up?			

INDICATOR	PROBE/QUESTION		FINDING Yes/No/Unsure/Not applicable	EVIDENCE (List documents examined or the evidence that the indicator is in place)
3. IMPLEMENTATION				
3.1 Personnel				
Personnel are assigned to <b>implement</b> the policy	Does the documentation record that identified school personnel have been assigned specific responsibilities in the context of this policy area? Do these responsibilities have a formal rather than an informal basis? Do the documents provide evidence that these responsibilities are being carried out?			
There is a structure to <b>coordinate</b> different aspects of the implementation phase.	Do the documents suggest that a structure to coordinate the implementation of the policy has been devised and put in place?			
There are communication structures to keep partners informed.	Is there documentary evidence of communication with the partners in relation to the policy? Do the documents show that this communication with the partners is ongoing?			
3.2 Monitoring				
There are clear monitoring points in place.	Do the documents show that fixed <b>time-points</b> have been set when a check will be done to see whether aspects of the policy are in operation as planned? Do records show that fixed time-points have been set to check on whether <b>targets</b> have been <b>achieved</b> as envisaged in the planning process?			
The monitoring process supports implementation.	Is there documentary evidence of any adjustments having been made to the policy as a result of the monitoring process?			

INDICATOR	PROBE/QUESTION		FINDING Yes/No/Unsure/Not applicable	EVIDENCE (List documents examined or the evidence that the indicator is in place)
3.3 Use of resources				
The implementation is well resourced.	Do records show that the resources identified as necessary for implementation when the policy was being designed have actually been put in place? <i>(See 2.7 above.)</i> Is there evidence to suggest that further resource needs arose in the course of implementing the policy? If so, is there evidence to suggest that unanticipated resource needs were met?			
The resources are used effectively.	Do documents show that personnel who were designated to implement the policy are actually involved in the implementation in practice? Is there documentary evidence that these designated personnel are making use of any specific training they received to help them to implement the policy? Is there evidence that any physical resources provided to support implementation are actually being used as planned?			
3.4 Scope				
The policy is being implemented for all those for whom it was intended.	Do records suggest that the policy is being applied in relation to all those for whom it was intended? Is there any documentary evidence of the application of the policy having been extended beyond its original scope? If the scope of the policy has been extended, is there evidence that this extension was planned for?			

INDICATOR	PROBE/QUESTION		FINDING Yes/No/Unsure/Not applicable	EVIDENCE (List documents examined or the evidence that the indicator is in place)
4. IMPACT				
4.1 Criteria set				
Criteria have been set to evaluate the effectiveness of the policy.	Does the documentation record an identified set of criteria for evaluating the impact of the policy in the school? Is there evidence as to when success criteria were devised? Is there evidence of an explicit link between the success criteria and the aims of the policy?			
4.2 Data				
Data is collected about the implementation of the policy.	Do records provide evidence that systems are in place for collecting data in relation to the impact of the policy?			
The data is up-to-date.	Is there evidence of the regular up-dating of data in relation to the impact of the policy?			

INDICATOR	PROBE/QUESTION		FINDING Yes/No/Unsure/Not applicable	EVIDENCE (List documents examined or the evidence that the indicator is in place)
4.3.Evaluation				
There is a process for evaluating the impact of the policy.	Do records show that a policy evaluation process has been devised? If so, is there evidence that the aims of the policy were taken into account in the design of the evaluation process? Is there evidence that any evaluation of the policy has actually taken place?			
The evaluators are skilled in this area.	Do records show that personnel with evaluation skills were selected to evaluate the impact of the policy? Is there documentary evidence that appropriate training was provided to school personnel to enable them to evaluate the impact of the policy?			
The planning process can respond to the outcomes of the evaluation.	Does school documentation show that there is a system in place for responding to the outcomes of an evaluation of the policy? If an evaluation of the policy has taken place, is there evidence that the school took steps to respond to the strengths and weaknesses that were identified in the course of the evaluation?			

# Appendix 4: Interview Instruments CSEP Triangulation Framework

INTERVIEW WITH MANAGEMENT	INTERVIEW WITH TEACHERS		INTERVIEW WITH PARENTS	INTERVIEW WITH PUPILS
<p><b>1. Infrastructure</b></p>	<p><b>1. Infrastructure</b></p>		<p><b>1. Infrastructure</b></p>	<p><b>1. Infrastructure</b></p>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is the school involved in School Development Planning?</li> <li>2. What external resources are available to the school to help with School Planning?</li> <li>3. Has the school used these supports?</li> <li>4. How is planning organised in the school?</li> <li>5. Who is involved in planning in the school?</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Has your school been involved in School Development Planning?</li> <li>2. What internal planning structures are in place in the school? Who is involved and on what basis?</li> <li>3. How has the involvement of teachers in the planning process been facilitated?</li> <li>4. What supports do teachers find most useful in planning for non-curricular areas?</li> </ol>		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How well do you think the school plans for the future? Have you ever been consulted about, or involved in, any planning developments in the school? <i>If the answer is YES:</i> How did you feel about the process? What could have been done to improve your participation?</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is your school well organised?</li> <li>2. Is the school good at solving problems?</li> <li>3. Have you or any of the pupils ever been involved in planning things or in making the rules for the school? <i>If the answer is YES:</i> Is this a good idea? How does it work? <i>If the answer is NO:</i> Do you think they should be? How could this happen?</li> </ol>

INTERVIEW WITH MANAGEMENT	INTERVIEW WITH TEACHERS	INTERVIEW WITH PARENTS	INTERVIEW WITH PUPILS
<p><b>2. Design</b></p>	<p><b>2. Design</b></p>	<p><b>2. Design</b></p>	<p><b>2. Design</b></p>
<p>6. What was the stimulus for devising the policy?                      7. How does the policy relate to other policies in the school?                      8. What is the essential purpose of the policy?                      9. For whom is this policy of particular benefit?                      10. What was your involvement in developing the policy?                      11. Who else was involved in the development of the policy?                      12. How did you go about designing the policy?                      13. Who set the time frame for implementation of the policy?                      14. Were specific targets set for implementation?                      If YES, give examples.                      15. Was the timeframe realistic?                      16. What resources were required for implementation?                      17. When were these resources identified?                      18. When were they acquired?</p>	<p>5. What is the essential purpose of this policy?                      6. How does it contribute to school life?                      7. Do you see links between this policy and other school policies? If so, which ones?                      8. What value do you see in this policy?                      9. How would you describe your commitment to/support for this policy?                      10. In your school, how was this policy area chosen as an area for development?                      Was it an issue in the school prior to the development of the policy?                      11. Who was involved in the process of developing the policy?                      How were they chosen?                      What part did they play?                      12. Did the school consider a range of options for dealing with issues related to the policy before adopting the approach set out in this policy?                      13. Did the policy include specific targets for implementing the specific measures?                      Can you give some examples of the targets?                      Was a time-frame envisaged to achieve the targets?                      14. How do teachers know if these implementation targets are being met?  <i>OR, if no targets have been identified by the interviewee:</i>                      How does the school check on progress in implementing the policy?                      When were monitoring arrangements put in place?                      15. Were resource needs for implementation considered when the policy was being developed?</p>	<p>2. Why, do you think, did the school develop this policy?                      3. Do you think the policy is a good one? Why?                      4. Were you consulted or involved in any way in the development of the policy?                      What form did your involvement take?                      Do you know if other parents were involved?                      5. How does the policy in this school compare with other schools that you know?</p>	<p>4. Why do you think the school developed the policy?                      5. Did anyone ask your opinion about the policy while it was being made?                      Were any other pupils asked?                      6. Is this a good policy?                      Do you think it could be improved?</p>

INTERVIEW WITH MANAGEMENT	INTERVIEW WITH TEACHERS	INTERVIEW WITH PARENTS	INTERVIEW WITH PUPILS
<b>3. Implementation</b>	<b>3. Implementation</b>	<b>3. Implementation</b>	<b>3. Implementation</b>
<p>19. Is there a person or persons who have specific responsibility for implementing the policy in the school?</p> <p>20. How was the policy explained to Parents?</p> <p>21. How was the policy explained to Pupils?</p> <p>22. Who gets reports on issues related to the policy?</p> <p>23. Are the resources adequate to implement the policy? Explain.</p> <p>24. How effective is the use of resources?</p> <p>25. As the policy is implemented, who benefits most?</p> <p>26. What improvements need to be made?</p>	<p>16. What is your role in implementing this policy?</p> <p>17. Do any other teachers in the school have specific roles in implementing the policy? Are these roles coordinated? How?</p> <p>18. Have you ever referred an issue in the school related to this policy to someone with designated responsibility for dealing with such an issue?</p> <p>19. Do you know what is happening in the school as a whole about the policy and how well it is working? How do you know?</p> <p>20. Have there been any adjustments to the policy since it was introduced? Why?</p> <p>21. What resources and supports have been used in the school in implementing the policy?</p> <p>22. How was the need for these resources and supports identified?</p> <p>23. You said earlier that your role in implementing the policy is <i>[summarise earlier answer]</i> How were you prepared to take on your role in implementing this policy? What training did you receive? How useful was that training in practice?</p> <p>24. What resources and supports have you used in carrying out your role in relation to this policy? Which resources have you found most useful?</p> <p>25. Who has benefited from the actual implementation of the policy in your school? Are there individuals or groups who have not benefited as the school intended?</p>	<p>6. How has the implementation of the policy affected you or your child? Have you ever had to refer an issue related to this policy to someone in the school? Have you heard of incidents related to this policy?</p> <p>7. Are you kept informed of developments or improvements related to the policy?</p>	<p>7. How does this policy affect you or other pupils?</p> <p>8. If you had a suggestion or problem related to the policy, what would you do? What do you think the school would do? Have you made suggestions or reported problems? Do you know anyone else who has made suggestions or reported problems? Do you know of anyone who knew about a problem related to the policy but didn't report it?</p> <p>9. Are pupils involved in implementing the policy?</p> <p>10. Has anyone discussed the policy with you or your classmates since it came into effect?</p>

INTERVIEW WITH MANAGEMENT	INTERVIEW WITH TEACHERS	INTERVIEW WITH PARENTS	INTERVIEW WITH PUPILS
<b>4. Impact</b>	<b>4. Impact</b>	<b>4. Impact</b>	<b>4. Impact</b>
27. Has provision been made for formal evaluation of the policy? 28. What data is available about the impact of the policy? 29. How is the data collated?	26. What criteria does the school use for judging the success of the policy? When were these criteria established by the school? 27. Has the school gathered data to show whether or not the policy is working? If so, what kind of data? When is the data collected? 28. How does the school evaluate the impact of the policy? 29. Has the school conducted an evaluation of the policy in the past 2 to 3 years? Who conducted the evaluation? How were they chosen? Were any changes made to the policy as a result?	8. Do you think the school is a better place for pupils because of this policy? How do you judge this? 9. Does the present policy need to be improved? In what way?	11. Are your friends happy about the effect this policy has on them? 12. Does the policy make this a better/happier/safer school?

# Appendix 5: Instructions for using CSEP Instruments

## Instructions for Document Review

When evaluating the planning process in relation to a school policy, one very valuable source of information on how the planning was conducted and on how it is being implemented is the written records of the school. These may include:

- the completed policy statement (the code or manifesto)
- official documentation, from an external source, which underpins the development of the policy
- organisational charts describing structures and roles relating to the policy
- records of planning meetings (minutes)
- evidence of data collected since the implementation of the policy
- formal and informal communications with the different partners by means of letters to parents or students; notices in classrooms; newsletters, etc.

*(This list is not exhaustive.)*

Evaluators are advised to look for such evidence to evaluate the formal dimension of the planning process. It is suggested that evaluators discuss, in advance, with the Principal or relevant school authority the type of documentation that might be relevant to this exercise.

This instrument is constructed from the description of the different indicators in the CSEP indicator framework. The **indicator** is given in the first column. The second column lists some **questions** that evaluators might have in seeking documents from the school or in looking through documents that they are given by the school. In the third column they record a **judgement**, based on the documentary evidence, on how well the indicator is in place in the school. In the fourth column they record the **evidence** they observed by naming the relevant document or by outlining the nature of the written evidence in the document.

## Instructions for Interview with Management

This instrument contains questions to be asked of school administrators. The questions require detailed information on the planning process in the school.

### Selection of school administrators/management personnel for interview

- In general, **the school principal or head-teacher** should **be interviewed** / will be able to answer the questions. However, depending on the school, a specific person may have responsibility for planning in the area under review. In that case, this person may be the person interviewed.
- In some schools, there is a local **Board of Management** which is responsible for policy documents. It may be appropriate to interview members of this school Board, particularly the chairperson.
- In some countries, a **Municipality or Regional Department of Education** may have designed the policy for a number of schools in its region. Here, it may be appropriate to interview some members of that Department.

It is left to the evaluators to decide whether to ask questions at school level, local school Board level or regional Department level, or whether to use some combination of interviews. In the report, they should indicate the source of any information, and/or reflect the concerns of each level of management.

The evaluators may need to reword the questions, depending on the context of the interview (responsible person, school principal, Board member). Depending on the planning process used, it may not be appropriate to ask some questions in an interview.

The instrument is designed as a structured interview with a single individual. The evaluators may feel it appropriate to send a copy of the questions beforehand to the interviewees so they can gather factual data, if relevant. The evaluators can decide on the most appropriate process for their context.

## Instructions for Interview with Teachers

This instrument contains questions to be asked of individual teachers. The questions relate to the planning process in the school.

The instrument is designed as a structured interview to be conducted with teachers on an individual basis. It is left to the evaluators to decide, in the context of practice in their respective countries, whether it is appropriate to supply a copy of the questions beforehand to the interviewees so that they can gather factual data, where relevant.

### Selection of teachers for interview

It is suggested that in each school in the main trial phase, an individual interview should be conducted with:

- A teacher with a significant role in **drawing up** a school's policy in the selected area (provided that such a teacher has not been selected for interview as fulfilling a management role)
- A teacher with designated responsibility for **implementing** the school's policy in the selected area (provided that such a teacher has not been selected for interview as fulfilling a management role)
- A teacher with no particular role or responsibility in relation to the policy (other than that of any member of the teaching staff)

In some cases, a single teacher may satisfy the first two criteria listed above. Accordingly, this evaluation activity may involve interviews with 2 or 3 individual teachers, depending on circumstances.

## Instructions for Interview with Parents

This instrument contains questions to be asked of parents. The questions relate to the planning process in the school.

It is envisaged that, in most cases, these questions will be asked in the context of a structured interview with individual parents. They may also be used in a focus group.

Some evaluators may decide that it is more appropriate to adapt these questions for use as a questionnaire.

### **Selection of parents**

It is left to evaluators, in consultation with the individual schools, to decide on the most appropriate method of selecting parents for interview. If members of a representative Parents' Group are selected for interview, however, it is suggested that other parents might also be interviewed.

## Instructions for Interview with Pupils

This instrument contains questions to be asked of pupils. The questions relate to the planning process in the school.

The instrument is designed as a structured interview to be conducted with individual pupils or with a group of pupils. The evaluator will decide on the most appropriate approach.

The procedure for interviewing pupils will be agreed by the evaluator with the principal of the school.

The pupils will be told not to mention any names of other pupils when answering. The interviewer will make this point at appropriate times during the interview.

The pupils will be assured on the issue of confidentiality.

## Appendix 6: General Notes on Terminology

<b>Indicator:</b>	An aspect of the planning process to be evaluated.	<b>Policy:</b>	This word refers to the written document the school works from, outlining the approach used to the area under consideration. The school may use terms such as Code, Charter, or Manifesto in the publication of its policy, and evaluators may adapt instruments to suit the term used by the school.
<b>Instrument:</b>	A method of eliciting information about the planning process.	<b>Project:</b>	This word is used to refer to CSEP - developing indicators for school planning. It refers to the range of activities through the three years of the project, including the initial meeting, the design, the initial trial, the evaluation and re-design, the main trial, the final review and the evaluation at the end.
<b>Management:</b>	This word refers to any person with administrative responsibility. In general it will refer to the school principal or middle-management person. In some cases, it may be appropriate to involve other levels of administration such as members of local school Boards of Management, members of local government or municipality Boards of Education, or owners of private schools - depending on their involvement in developing policies.	<b>Pupil</b>	In the documentation, the word 'pupil' is used throughout. In some countries (Ireland being one of them) a distinction is made between pupils (4-12 year olds) and students (12-18 year olds). Evaluators may need to change the terms used in some instruments, depending on who they talk to.
<b>Partners:</b>	The term partners is used to indicate any individual or group involved as a stakeholder in the planning process in school, who might have information relevant to the evaluation. These will include pupils, parents, teachers or management (including principals, members of local school Boards of Management or Municipal Boards of Education, where these exist.) When the term is used in the documentation, the evaluator can choose the relevant groups from whom to elicit information.		
<b>Planning Process:</b>	This term refers to the exercise undertaken in introducing a policy in a school. It includes the design of the policy, its implementation and the evaluation of its impact. The CSEP aims to design indicators to help evaluate the effectiveness of the process.		

# Appendix 7: CSEP Personnel

## NATIONAL COORDINATORS FOR CSEP

<b>Finland</b>	Kirsti STENVALL National Board of Education, Finland E-mail: Kirsti.Stenvall@oph.fi
<b>Ireland</b>	Michael CONNOLLY, Department of Education and Science, Ireland (to February 2005) Lynda O'TOOLE Department of Education and Science, Ireland (from February 2005) E-mail: Lynda_OToole@education.gov.ie
<b>Norway</b>	Eva SCHÖYEN Directorate of Primary and Secondary Education, Norway E-mail: evs@utdanningsdirektoratet.no

## EVALUATORS FOR CSEP MAIN TRIAL

<b>Finland</b>	Kaija SALMIO Kirsti STENVALL	Kaija.Salmio@oph.fi Kirsti.Stenvall@oph.fi
<b>Ireland</b>	Martin LALLY Niamh MURRAY	Martin_Lally@education.gov.ie Niamh_Murray@education.gov.ie
<b>Norway</b>	Åse STREITLIEN	Ase.Streitlien@hit.no

## MEMBERS OF CSEP STEERING GROUP, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE, IRELAND

<b>Chairperson</b>	Lynda O'TOOLE Department of Education and Science	Lynda_OToole@education.gov.ie
<b>Secretary</b>	Sinéad BREATHNACH School Development Planning Initiative	sineadbreathnach@sdpi.ie
	Emer EGAN Department of Education and Science	Emer_Egan@education.gov.ie
	Eileen FLYNN School Development Planning Support	eflynn@sdps.ie
	Deirdre MATHEWS Department of Education and Science	Deirdre_Mathews@education.gov.ie
	Niamh MURRAY Department of Education and Science	Niamh_Murray@education.gov.ie
<b>Academic Advisor</b>	David TUOHY SPELL Training and Development	dtuohy@jesuit.ie

