


1987

Implementation of the Continuing Evaluation Model For The C.I.E Guatemalan Teacher Training Program

Mario A. Acevedo

University of Massachusetts Amherst

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.umass.edu/cie_capstones

 Part of the [Bilingual, Multilingual, and Multicultural Education Commons](#), [Curriculum and Instruction Commons](#), [Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Commons](#), and the [Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons](#)

Acevedo, Mario A., "Implementation of the Continuing Evaluation Model For The C.I.E Guatemalan Teacher Training Program" (1987). *Master's Capstone Projects*. 106.

Retrieved from https://scholarworks.umass.edu/cie_capstones/106

This Open Access Capstone is brought to you for free and open access by the Center for International Education at ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Capstone Projects by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. For more information, please contact scholarworks@library.umass.edu.

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONTINUING EVALUATION MODEL
FOR THE C. I. E. GUATEMALAN TEACHER TRAINING PROGRAM.

Masters Project

By

Mario Acevedo A.

Submitted to the Center for International Education
University of Massachusetts

August of 1987

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1- INTRODUCTION

2- THE EVALUATION MODEL

2.1 FOUNDATIONS OF THE MODEL2.2 COMPONENTS OF THE MODEL

2.2.1 Pre-Program-Implementation Activities

2.2.2 Participatory Curriculum Re-design

2.2.3 Factual Evaluation Activities

3- IMPLEMENTATION OF THE EVALUATION MODEL

3.1 PRE-PROGRAM-IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITIES

3.1.1 Review of the project proposal

3.1.2 Review of staff's training experience

3.1.3 Analysis of available data on participants

3.1.4 Formulation of Program Principles and
Tentative Program Goal3.2 PARTICIPATORY PROGRAM RE-DESIGN

3.2.1 PARTICIPATORY ASSESSMENT OF PARTICIPANTS' K.A.S.A.

* "Hopes and Fears" Exercise

* Group Interview

* Individual Interviews, Questionnaires and Drawings

* Presentation of KASA assessment results

3.2.2 REFORMULATION OF PROGRAM GOALS AND CURRICULUM NEGOTIATION

3.3 FACTUAL EVALUATION ACTIVITIES

3.3.1 FIRST FORMATIVE EVALUATION

3.3.2 SECOND FORMATIVE EVALUATION

3.3.3 DAILY CLASS EVALUATION

3.3.4 FINAL PROGRAM EVALUATION BY PARTICIPANTS

* Evaluation by Objective

* Evaluation by Category

* Action Planning and Personal Commitments

3.3.5 FINAL PROGRAM EVALUATION BY STAFF

3.3.6 OTHER EVALUATION ACTIVITIES

4- GENERAL CONCLUSIONS.

5- BIBLIOGRAPHY

STAGES OF IMPLEMENTATION

PRE-PROGRAM-IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITIES			PARTICIPATORY PROGRAM RE-DESIGN			FACTUAL EVALUATION ACTIVITIES		
Collective Analysis of Preliminary Info. • Project Proposal • Staff experience • Participant data	→	Collective Formulation of Principles & Tentative Program Goals	Participatory Assessment of Participants' K A S A	→	Open Negotiation of Program Goals & Curriculum	Formative Evaluation	Summative Evaluation	
						After each class	After each week	Final Program Evaluation

STAGE I

STAGE II

STAGE III

1- INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this paper is to analyze the implementation of the "Continuing Evaluation Design for the C.I.E. Guatemalan Teacher Training Program"(1). I attempt to answer the following questions:

- * What are the characteristics of this Ev. Model?
- * What is the difference between designing an Ev. Model and applying it in the context of an actual program?
- * To what extent was the model implemented?
- * What were the most useful results of its implementation?
- * What were the conditions that permitted those results ?
- * What were the constraints which worked against obtaining the best results (constraints of the context and constraints of the model itself) ?
- * In order to overcome those constraints: how to mitigate them? how to adjust the model implementation to them ? and, how to turn them into an advantage?

In order to answer those questions, I will briefly describe the model, its principles, its objectives and its components. Then, I will both describe its implementation in the actual context of this program and contrast the anticipated results of the model with the actual results of its application, analyzing both the enabling and hindering conditions for its implementation. Finally, I will make some recommendations for improving the Ev. process, indicating the necessary conditions for a success implementation of the model.

1- Submitted to Prof. David Kinsey as a final paper in the Course "Plan. & Evaluation for Non-Formal Education" -Educ.P623.

2- THE EVALUATION MODEL

FOUNDATIONS OF THE MODEL

This model is based on the principles of Participatory Evaluation. This means that the process of evaluating the program is not only the responsibility of "professional outsider evaluators" but also a task undertaken jointly by everyone involved in the program. The "evaluator" thus becomes a facilitator of the evaluation process. S/he must learn to trust the people to make their own decisions in an area in which evaluators consider themselves professionals. However, both staff and participants need to be trained for Participatory Evaluation, and the evaluation process must be closely related to the training activities of the program. For these reasons, the evaluation must not be a terminal, separate activity; it must be a continuing process which starts at the very beginning of the program. For the latter reason this model includes activities seemingly unrelated to evaluation, such as "Collective Analysis of Preliminary Information", "Tentative Formulation of Program Goals", "Assessment of Participants' K.A.S.A" and "Open Negotiation of Programs Goals and Curriculum". In fact, according to this model, the evaluation process should be linked also to management and administrative aspects of the program like budgeting and policy-making decisions.

In summary, evaluation should be integrated into the each step of the program, from its beginning to its conclusion, and should be considered the responsibility not of each person involved with program design and implementation, including the participants.

COMPONENTS OF THE MODEL

This model consists of three sequential components:

Component # 1: Pre-Program-Implementation Activities:

These are activities conducted by the program staff members after the program proposal has been written and before the participants arrive. These activities should be undertaken in a collective manner for the purposes of sharing information, power and responsibility, building a sense of team among staff members, and creating a common vision of the program that permits the collection and assessment of data for curriculum design. This first level of **participation** (participation of all staff members in the curriculum design) is very important for creating conditions for Participatory Evaluation. (How can evaluation be participatory if the training program is not?)

These activities are:

- 1.1 Collective Analysis of Preliminary Information, and
- 1.2 Formulation of Program Principles and Tentative Formulation of Program Goals.

Component # 2: Participatory Program Re-Design.

These are activities conducted by the trainers and participants together, at the very beginning of the training program, for the purpose of gathering the information necessary to develop and implement a curriculum which will be founded on a consensus among diverse participant needs and interests. This component offers a

second level of participation: Participation of the trainees in the program design and implementation. Such participation promotes a sense of joint ownership of the training program. The interrelation between training and evaluation activities is initiated with this component because the very fact of conducting its activities provides learning opportunities about using alternative models of both participatory assessment and curriculum design.

These activities are:

- 2.1 Participatory Assessment of Participants K.A.S.A., and
- 2.2 Collective Reformulation of Program Goals and Open Negotiation of Curriculum.

Component # 3: Factual Evaluation Activities

These are activities traditionally recognized as evaluation activities per se; that is, activities conducted for the purpose of determining the worth of the program and/or its parts, and with the aim of improving them. But in the context of this model, these activities also have the purposes of demonstrating and practicing a variety of participatory techniques for evaluating class content and methodology.

These activities are:

- 3.1 Formative Evaluation after each class
- 3.2 Formative Evaluation after each week
- 3.3 Summative Evaluation at the end of the program.

3- IMPLEMENTATION OF THE EVALUATION MODEL.

PRE-PROGRAM-IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITIES

The implementation of this Evaluation Model was closely related to the implementation of the program itself. Thus, the description of both of them will go interlaced. Such a implementation was initiated when the core staff of the training program undertook the **Collective Analysis of Preliminary Information**. We were interested in learning about the following aspects:

- * The program proposal submitted by the C.I.E.
- * The staff experience in Primary School / Teacher Training.
- * Participants' level of formal education and teaching experience.
- * Real-life conditions in Guatemala, especially as these impact upon the work of school teachers.

Review of the Project Proposal:

In December, 1986, the Center for International Education (C.I.E.) submitted to the Partners for International Education and Training (P.I.E.T.) a proposal for conducting a training program for 40 Guatemalan rural primary school teachers. This proposal contained information related to:

- I. COURSE DESIGN AND STRUCTURE.
 - * Training Philosophy and Methodology .
 - * Course Description
- II. COURSE MANAGEMENT
 - * Logistical Arrangements and Continuity
 - * Coordination of Resources
 - * Staff Orientation and Preparation
 - * Course Evaluation and Report to PIET
- IV. STAFFING PATTERN AND MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE
- V. INSTITUTIONAL CAPABILITIES

The review of the project proposal by the program staff was limited to studying some curricular aspects of the program (Course Design

and Structure). A number of basic administrative decisions about both staffing patterns and budgetary issues were made without the participation of all core program staff members; nor were these decisions openly shared or clarified, subsequently. This situation created confusion and negatively affected the implementation of the Evaluation Model (not to mention the overall training program) because it weakened the mutual confidence among the program staff which is necessary for the success of any participatory process. Nevertheless, the review of the first part of this Proposal gave us the opportunity to identify those aspects of the proposal (both theoretical and methodological) with which we were in agreement, and those which we felt it necessary to change. In other words, we took the C.I.E.'s proposed training philosophy and methodology not as ironclad guidelines but as a starting point subject to modifications. For example, we the program staff, shared the "Participatory Orientation" expressed by C.I.E. in the proposal (See Exhibit #_1_: C.I.E.' Training Philosophy), and coincided in some training components like "Ongoing Needs Assessment" and "Goal Agreement". We equally coincided in our understanding of adult learning which states that "adults learn best when the subject matter is relevant and able to be applied to the learners' immediate needs". (2)

2- *Keeping this in mind, the Guatemalan Teacher Training Program stresses relating theory to the practical needs found in the Guatemalan classrooms. The overall program goals and objectives not only give the participants a chance to learn the most current information about curriculum planning and effective teaching, but also a chance to practice those skills and to plan ways in which they can be brought back to their home classrooms. By involving

Exhibit # 1

C. I. E. 'S TRAINING PHILOSOPHY

Participatory Orientation

In contrast to more traditional methods of training, CIE utilizes and demonstrates a learner-centered approach which is both participatory and experiential. CIE maintains that participatory and experiential models ensure long-term retention and integration of skills being learned. While some theory and principles are best communicated through short lectures or presentations by the trainers, participants are encouraged to apply their learning by participating in learner-centered activities such as small group discussions, structured roleplays, simulations, case studies, demonstrations, critical incidents, the use of problems and learning instruments, and independent study. Participants are also encouraged to take part in dialogue with other participants, trainers, students and colleagues. All learning activities will be processed in order to enable the participants to identify the specific learning which has taken place. (Training Program Proposal, Pg. 4)

Review of the Staff's Training Experiences:

Another important set of "pre-program" activities was the review of the staff training experience vis-a-vis anticipated program needs. This review was done not only with the purpose of making decisions about areas of responsibility but also with the aim of building a sense of team among staff members. A collective inventory was made of the various skills brought by each staff member to the program, such as experience in teacher training and in working with Guatemalans, etc. This information served as baseline data for staffing decisions.

An additional activity not originally contemplated in the evaluation model was a two-day workshop conducted for core staff with the following goals:

- 1- To develop a common framework of participation for the project

participants in every stage of planning, we hope to be able to provide material will be useful in Guatemala" (Proposal, Pg.5).

- 2- To promote a better interpersonal knowledge among staff
- 3- To increase the sense of community among staff members
- 4- To discuss, negotiate and clarify project job descriptions
- 5- To establish the appropriate structures and processes to facilitate logistics, communications and coordination.
- 6- To assign responsibilities among training staff for particular curriculum needs.
- 7- To share any additional resources and information among staff about political, economic or social conditions in Guatemala.

It is interesting to observe the results of the evaluation carried out at the end of the workshop in which the participants (staff members) were asked to rate (on a scale 1-10) the extent to which they felt the goals were accomplished. Such a evaluation showed that the goals which were assigned a lower degree of realization were those which deal with the issues of both "participation" and "increasing the sense of community among staff members".

In this workshop the first contradictions and tensions among staff members appeared . These tensions and contradictions were generated specifically in relation to remaining budgetary and financial concerns, many of which involved issues of equity in contract obligations and financial compensation. These issues remained unresolved because, as I mentioned before, decisions relating to both budget and staffing patterns had been made previously in a non-participatory way, and the criteria for them were never addressed in a straightforward manner. The "sense of community among staff members" was not increased by this workshop; and, unfortunately, it progressively decreased during the course of the program. Reasons for the interpersonal difficulties that developed among the program staff are multiple and complex, and certainly merit a thorough examination in another context.

Analysis of Available Data on Participants:

The scant data available about participants through institutional channels forced the program staff to seek other sources of information about the potential trainees. This was provided in the form of detailed background information about Guatemala and its educational system shared by staff members with extensive living experience in Guatemala, including a native Guatemalan, himself a former teacher and teacher trainer. (See Final Report, Curriculum Implementation, Pg.2). These contributions proved to be extremely useful in filling other staff members in as to the likely working and living context of the participants.

Further background information about the trainees was surmised through the experience of several staff members with previous CAPS programs participants. These pieces of information, taken together, helped fill the gap and made it possible to conduct the pre-program planning on a more realistic basis than would have been possible if we had depended only on data originated from the program sponsor. This set of activities culminated with the **Formulation of Program Principles and Tentative Program Goals**. The process of formulating the Program Principles together served as a kind of values clarification exercise, allowing staff members to arrive at consensus about the way we wanted to work. It also functioned as a tool for building a sense of team. The program principles themselves (Exhibit #_2_) express the educational philosophy of both the C.I.E. and the staff. They also served as a guide for formulating the Tentative Programs Goals and Curriculum.

Exhibit # 2

PRINCIPLES OF THE TRAINING PROGRAM

- 1- The program will be based on the concrete working situation of the participants as perceived and expressed by them.
- 2- We will promote the active participation of the students in the design, implementation and evaluation of the training program.
- 3- The curricular, cultural, and evaluative activities will be integrated.
- 4- The learning process will be based on active observation and practical experience on the part of the participants.
- 5- The learning experience will be the result of both the study of content areas and the methodology employed in the classes.
- 6- We will respect the cultural differences which exist among everyone involved in the training program.
- 7- there will be a mutual learning experience on the part of both participants and facilitators.

----- 0 -----

The Formulation of the Tentative Program Goals in a collective way, on the other hand, served not only as a guide for planning program activities but also as a procedure to realize other aspects of the participatory approach in a twofold mode:

- a) Contributing (through its collective character) in the creation of both a common vision and a sense of joint ownership of the program among staff members, and
- b) Becoming our starting point (given the goals' tentative nature), along with the Program Principles, for designing the curriculum to be negotiated with the participants.

(See Exhibit # 3)

Exhibit # 3

TENTATIVE PROGRAM GOALS (3)

The Training Program will offer its participants the opportunity to:

- 1- Examine the role of education in the development of the individual, the community and the nation.
- 2- Reflect on the role of the teacher in the classroom, in the community, and in the Guatemalan educational system.
- 3- Adapt the Guatemalan National Curriculum for primary schools to the local situation according to the students' and community's needs.
- 4- Observe and practice new teaching methods for primary education.
- 5- Acquire new abilities for educational planning, implementation and evaluation.
- 6- Select, develop and use methods and materials appropriate to their needs and sources.
- 7- Share their knowledge and experience through workshops and other group activities.
- 8- Get to know the U.S. culture through a variety social activities and fieldtrips.
- 9- Develop an action plan or project to be implemented in their work in Guatemala.
- 10- Increase their self-confidence as teachers.

3- These goals were formulated by the program staff during the Curriculum Planning Activities prior to the arrival of the Participants

PARTICIPATORY PROGRAM RE-DESIGN.

As Marilyn Gillespie asserts in her report, "the decision to involve the participants in curriculum planning was made as a reflection of our philosophy of adult education, but it was also necessary due to our lack of prior information about the participants level of educational preparation and teaching experience". (Gillespie, M. Final Report, Pgs. 1 & 2). In order to re-design the program in a participatory way we had a double starting point:

- a) The trainers' philosophical conception of Participatory Education as expressed in both the Program Principles and the Tentative Program Goals; and
- b) The participants' experience, knowledge, skills, attitudes, needs, and aspirations related to the program.

The format chosen to share the Program Principles with the participants -**The Fishbowl Technique** (4)- reflects another purpose behind nearly all these activities: to present and discuss new techniques as vehicles for conveying content . As one of the Program Principles states "the learning experience will be the result of both the study of content areas and the methodology employed in the classes". Also, one of the principles upon which

4- This is a training device entailing a group-on-group activity, the inner group (A) serving as the discussion group and the other group (B) the observation group. In this occasion the trainers simulated the discussion they had for formulating the Program Principles (group A) while the participants (group B), observed the discussion. Once the simulation was over, we generated a discussion about both the principles presented through the fishbowl and the technique itself. They could either modify or suppress those principles, and/or add new ones.

the evaluation model is based states that "Participatory Evaluation is closely interrelated to the training activities of the program, moreover, it becomes a training activity in and or itself" (5) . By extension, the double objective of using teaching / evaluation techniques not only for presenting contents or gathering data, but also for demonstrating methods which include the participants actively in the process, is a strategy that characterizes the entire training (and evaluation) model.

PARTICIPATORY ASSESSMENT OF PARTICIPANTS' K.A.S.A.

The activities included in this component of the Continuing Evaluation Model constitute the first part of the "Participatory Program Re-design", and served to provide the data needed to reformulate our training goals and negotiate with the participants the contents of the curriculum to be implemented. Like any other needs assessment process, this one was undertaken for the purposes of identifying the participants' level of educational preparation and teaching experience as well as establishing a baseline information about who they are and what they do in their jobs. But in the context of this model, these activities were also planned with other purposes:

- * To demonstrate various techniques for participatory needs assessment.
- * To acknowledge participants' experience and validate skills and knowledge brought by them to the program.

5- Please refer to "Continuing Evaluation Design for the C.I.E. Guatemalan Teacher Training Program", Pg.1.

- * To provide opportunities for getting to know each other and enhance the sense of community among participants and staff.
- * To create a consensus of, and help to prioritize, diverse participant needs and interest.

The first activity related to Assessment of Participants KASA was the **Hopes and Fears exercise**. This exercise was accomplished in the following way:

In groups of eight, participants shared their expectations and concerns about the training program. Each group selected three or four of the most commonly mentioned hopes and fears and recorded them on newsprint to present to the whole class. Trainers also took part in the activity, forming their own group and presenting their results (Exhibit #_4_). They were displayed and analyzed in the classroom, and gave us our first picture of the participants' and trainers' aspirations and doubts. As an evaluation exercise, this sharing of our hopes and fears was valuable not only because it provided information useful as part of the KASA assessment process, but because it allowed us to do so in a more personal, informal manner which yielded results more revealing than "cold facts". The chance to air and address together some of our various concerns enhanced the trust-building process between participants and facilitators, paving the way for a open exchange of information during the rest of the assessment activities. It also cultivated a sense of community among participants and contributed to the "demystification" of the trainer role.

Exhibit # 4

RESULTS OF THE "HOPES AND FEARS" EXERCISE

GROUP # 1

FEARS:

- 1- Subjects to be studied
- 2- Language barrier in studying and shopping
- 3- The evaluation process of the training program
- 2- Our behavior (i.e., the participants)

HOPES:

- 1- Return home satisfied and with new skills and knowledge
- 2- Share the program material with colleagues at home
- 3- Visit Washington D.C. and New York City (The Statue of Liberty)
- 4- Take home souvenirs and purchases from the U.S.

GROUP # 2

FEARS:

- 1- Applicability of course material to our situation in Guatemala
- 2- What exactly the program expects of the group of teachers
- 3- If the instructors understand Guatemalan educational reality

HOPES:

- 1- Assimilate the subject matter and put it into practice
- 2- Learn English in order to communicate with other people
- 3- Improve our educational level

GROUP # 3

FEARS:

- 1- If the course is oriented to a specific educational level
- 2- For what purpose were we given this scholarship?
- 3- Communication with people outside the university

HOPES:

- 1- Acquire teaching skills and learn English
- 2- Reach new horizons in our profession
- 3- Acquire some kind of documentation of our training

GROUP # 4

FEARS:

- 1- Adaptation to the environment and communication
- 2- Not achieving the program's objectives
- 3- Not having resources to apply in our country what we learn here

HOPES:

- 1- Improve our academic level
- 2- Find ways to improve education in Guatemala
- 3- Get to know the culture, customs and language of this country
- 4- That these training programs be continued to provide assistance to teachers in their work

Exhibit # 4 (Cont.)

GROUP # 5

FEARS:

- 1- What is expected of us as teachers?
- 2- The lifestyle and cultural level here
- 3- We haven't represented ourselves as professionals and educators in the eyes of the instructors
- 4- Illness

HOPES:

- 1- Learn new teaching/learning skills
- 2- That we receive moral support when we need it
- 3- That we be understood

GROUP # 6 (Facilitators)

FEARS:

- 1- That someone may get sick
- 2- That we burn out
- 3- That the participants take away a whitewashed image of the U.S.
- 4- Not having enough time to spend with the participants on a personal level

HOPES:

- 1- That there be good human relations between all of us
- 2- That the participants feel free to ask about positive and negative aspects of this country
- 3- That whatever the participants learn here can be shared with their colleagues in Guatemala
- 4- That we learn a lot from the participants
- 5- That the program responds to the participants' aspirations.

Other techniques employed in the participatory assessment of participants' KASA were:

a) Group Interviews, in which the participants first generated a list of questions which they felt were pertinent, and which we all understood designed to produce a "group profile".

These questions were:

- * Who are we? (Personal information)
- * Where do we work? (Description of the school & the community)
- * Who are our students?
- * What does our work consist of? (Inside & outside the school)
- * What problems have we encountered in our work?
- * What successes have we had?.

Divide at random into small groups, each of which included a staff member, we addressed these questions in an informal manner, with each individual sharing relevant personal information while someone recorded. Staff and participants facilitated the "interview" process as needed. The results from each small group were then collectively tabulated on newsprint posted on the wall of the training room, and the emerging profile was left on view for all to study at their convenience. The data generated from this activity was not precise quantitatively, and somewhat inconsistent from group to group; but the process was very personal and definitely fostered a heightened sense of interpersonal acquaintance among small group members.

b) Individual Interviews:

Each staff member was assigned to conduct a personal interview with four or five participants, filling a written survey guide which addressed points of specific interest to the staff. Through these interviews and the individual questionnaire we were able to "attach names" to pertinent data about each participant. The results from both were tabulated, combined and recorded on newsprint for posting and review by the group.

c) Individual questionnaires were distributed to each person to fill out while s/he waited in turn to be interviewed. These questionnaires were much more open-ended in their structure, designed to allow each person time to reflect on information they might provide about themselves to supplement their responses to the individual interviews.

d) Personal Drawings. Finally, each individual was asked to make a drawing to describe the relationship of the school where they work to the rest of the community. The resulting graphics offered a vivid and detailed portrait of the participants' various communities, and were displayed on the wall for analysis along with other results of the KASA assessment.

PRESENTATION OF K. A. S. A ASSESSMENT RESULTS:

Exhibit # 5 is a translation of the data presented to the participants the morning following the implementation of the individual interviews and questionnaires. The information from both was tabulated in a combined and summarized form, highlighting the facts about the group which seemed most pertinent to the curriculum negotiation scheduled for the afternoon of the following day. The data were written up on newsprint and posted, along with the drawings made by each participant representing the position of the school within their respective communities. After allowing sufficient time for the participants to circulate and study the posted information, facilitators asked for comments, pointing out key features in the emerging group profile and comparing certain categories of information such as how many people were actually teaching at the educational level for which they were trained, the heterogeneity of the group in aspects such teaching experience and professional formation, etc. This information was also linked with the information from the group interviews in order to get a more expanded picture of the reality of the group.

The drawings mentioned above were very useful to visualize how the participants perceived both the role of their schools in the communities and the relationship between their schools and other institutions. Moreover, the use of creative expression facilitate the emergence of some aspects of the participants' perception of their reality, generating data particularly rich for interpretation.

Exhibit # 5

RESULTS OF THE INDIVIDUAL INTERVIEWS AND QUESTIONNAIRES

1- PROFESSIONAL FORMATION:

* Pre-primary education	4
* Rural Primary education	5
* Urban " "	27
* Home Economics "	2
* High School "	2
* Certified Accountant	1
* Law (Sociology major at the University)	1

2- ACTUAL TEACHING POSITIONS:

* Pre-primary	13	
* Primary	27	Rural 15
* High School	7	Urban 25
* Private schools	34	
* Public schools	4	
* Cooperative schools	2	

3- ARE YOU TEACHING AT THE LEVEL FOR WHICH YOU WERE TRAINED ?

* Yes	24	No	13
-----------------	----	--------------	----

4- YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE

* Less than one year	9
* One year	5
* One year and a half	6
* Two years	5
* Three years	3
* Four years	2
* Five years	2
* Between 6 and 10 years	5
* More than ten years	2

5- PERSONAL INFORMATION:

* Age range	18 - 35 years old
* Average age	25 " "
* Religions:	
Catholic	32
Protestant	5
No specific	2
* Civil Status:	
Married	10
Single	28
Separated	1
* Birthdays:	
June 5, Paulino Bachan	
June 6, Dora Ramirez	
June 27, Koki Diaz	

Exhibit # 5 (Cont.)

6- SUGGESTED SUBJECTS TO BE COVERED:

A- According to the Interviews

* Teaching methods and techniques	20
* Preparing and using educational materials (puppets, visual aids, games, natural objects)	19
* New methods for planning classes	16
* Child Psychology	18
* Adult Education	8
* Community development/organization	6
* Class management	6
* Human relations	5
* Incentive/motivation of child learners	5
* Pre-primary Education	4
* Family Planning	3
* Evaluation methods	2
* Home Economics	2
* How cultivate creativity	1
* Effective communication with children	1
* Handicrafts	1
* Agriculture	1
* Organization of parents	1
* How to improve written reports	1
* Techniques for promoting and working with groups	1
* Vocational Orientation	1
* How to manage diverse activities simultaneously	1

B- Suggested Subjects derived from Questionnaires:

Teaching/learning methods (general)	24
* Discovery	12
* Participatory	11
* Behavioral	11
* Montessori	10
Teaching techniques (general)	20
* Small group	12
* Individual	10
* Role-play	9
* Educational games	9
* Simulations	8
* Reading	6
* Brainstorming	5
* Popular Theatre	5
Planning	
* Classes	14
* Teacher training	10
* Long-range	10
Evaluation	14
Production of educational materials	11

Exhibit # 5 (Cont.)

Techniques for maintaining discipline	9
Management of classes with diverse age groups	5
Students with special needs	5
Strategies for teaching with scarce material resources	3

7- WHAT WE WANT TO LEARN ABOUT EDUCATION IN THE U.S.?

* How classes are conducted	23
* New teaching methods/techniques	4
* Visit to Pre-primary and Primary schools	11
* Structure of the educational system	10
* How teachers plan their classes	3
* Teachers' guides/curriculum	2
* Differences between U.S. and Guatemala	
* Handling of psychological problems	
* Bilingual education	
* Educational materials	
* Methods of teaching reading and writing	
* Handicrafts / Student-teacher relations	
* Motivation of students	
* Community organization/projects	

8_ SKILLS / KNOWLEDGE / EXPERIENCES WHICH THE PARTICIPANTS CAN OFFER TO THE PROGRAM:

- * Class planning, goal formulation, design of work methods, teaching techniques and Ev. methods.
- * Techniques for producing materials (such as puppets, drawings), how to make teaching materials from real life objects, and maximum use of available resources.
- * Handicrafts, painting on cloth, macramé, and crafts with popsicle sticks.
- * Icebreaker exercises, games, songs, dances, music, theatre, dramatizations, stories, and poems for children.
- * Knowledge of conditions of the rural areas and supporting institutions. How to form community groups and cultural groups, and how to identify leaders.
- * Methods for teaching reading, writing, and pre-school math,
- * Radio communications for education
- * Writing skills and typing.
- * Sports.

REFORMULATION OF PROGRAM GOALS

The second part of the "Participatory Program Redesign Process" began with a collective examination of two sets of goals proposed for the training program: the staff's Tentative Program Goals(6), and a second list derived from the individual Questionnaires filled out by the participants during the KASA assessment conducted the previous day

Before presenting either list to the group, however, in order to share the background information about the program and to provide a framework for both the reformulation of goals and the subsequent curriculum negotiation, the following activities took place:

a) A presentation of the history of the C.A.P.S. program accompanied by a graphic description of the inter-institutional relationships between the various agencies involved. This addressed the doubts of both many participants and some trainers about the nature and purpose of the training course vis-a-vis U.S.AID and U.S. foreign policy in Central America, and clarified the position of the C.I.E. and program staff.

b) The presentation of the theoretical and methodological principles of participatory education as contrasted with the traditional formal educational system, in order to define the approach and philosophy underlying the strategies employed in this program and to explain the techniques selected for implementing the KASA assessment, and other program activities. This presentation

6- These goals were introduced and commented in the "pre-program-implementation activities" section of this paper.

was important for the participants to contextualize in a conceptual framework the activities in which they were involve so far.

c) A presentation of two curriculum design models, to illustrate ways in which educational theory may be implemented by and reflected in the process of curriculum design. Emphasis was placed in the participatory curriculum design in order to improve the conditions for the immediate following activities.

At this point, the list of goals suggested by the participants (Exhibit # 6) was presented and reviewed, followed by the staff's Tentative Program Goals. Then a collective process of comparison, elimination and combination produced a synthesis of the two - a final set of Training Program Goals reflecting the input of both participants and staff (Exhibit # 7). The skillful facilitation of this unification process resulted in a heightened sense of program ownership and satisfaction on the part of everyone.

CURRICULUM NEGOTIATION

The Program Redesign phase of the evaluation model was completed by participants and staff collaborating on the design of a draft curriculum for our program. In order to avoid the tendency for trainees to "rubber stamp" a curriculum outline when it is presented in a completed format, and to promote the active participation of the group of teachers in a curriculum design exercise, the activity was structured as follows:

A large five-week calendar was "unveiled" to the group. Program activities which had already taken place (i.e. during the first

week) had been written on small pieces of paper and posted on the appropriate days. Activities scheduled for the following week, which were not subject to change, had likewise been posted on their respective days. Beside the calendar, the list of content areas suggested as topics for classes (derived from KASA assessment results) was also presented. The most frequently mentioned of these topics, and others proposed by the staff, had been copied onto paper slips, ready to be posted, and blank slips were also available to allow for other themes to be added. After reviewing these materials and explaining their use, the facilitator invited the group to finish designing the curriculum - and the staff then withdrew. The product of the participants' collective efforts was taken as the basis for the final curriculum, subsequently modified by the staff to accommodate logistical considerations, trainer availability, etc., and renegotiated with the group.

The collective reformulation of the program goals and the open curriculum negotiation was one of the most successful phases of the implementation of this evaluation model. Both the resulting program goals and the calendar for the remaining weeks were the evidence of a decision made by participants and staff together. We the trainers were excited proving once more that the participatory approach can work, and the participants, perceiving that we were certainly sharing the information and the decision making power, took upon themselves their part of responsibility for the successful implementation of the program.

Exhibit # 6

PROGRAM GOALS PROPOSED BY PARTICIPANTS(S)

The participants hope that the Training Program will give them the opportunity to:

- 1- Discover and develop their own educational quality and capacity.
- 2- Develop their ability to promote and manage educational activities both in the schools and the communities.
- 3- Observe and practice new methods and techniques for improving their teaching skills.
- 4- Develop their ability for maximizing the scarce local resources.
- 5- Train them according to the needs of their communities so as to enable them to foster a new form of teaching.
- 6- Find ways to apply new methods and techniques for improving the educational condition of the Guatemalan children.
- 7- Share learning experiences and unify criteria in order to improve their teaching skills, adapting them to different educational environments.
- 8- Observe how classes are conducted and how educational methods are applied in U.S. schools.
- 9- Practice what they learn, looking for ways to apply it to their work particular conditions.

5- These goals were proposed by the participants during the process of "Assessment of Participants K.A.S.A. ".

Exhibit # 7

TRAINING PROGRAM GOALS (6)

The Training Program will offer its participants the opportunity to:

- 1- Examine the role of education in the development of the individual, the community and the nation.
- 2- Reflect on the role of the teacher in the classroom, the community, in the Guatemalan educational system.
- 3- Discover and develop their abilities to promote and manage educational activities in both schools and communities.
- 4- Develop themselves, according to community needs, in new teaching skills utilizing local resources to the maximum.
- 5- Find ways to apply new methods and techniques for improving education in Guatemala.
- 6- Enhance their awareness of the importance of putting into practice what they learn, adapting it to their working conditions.
- 7- Share their knowledge, skills and experiences through group activities, in order to unify criteria for improving their teaching methods and for adapting what they learn to different environments.
- 8- Observe how classes are conducted and how educational methods are applied in the U.S. schools, and become familiar with other aspects of culture in the U.S.
- 9- Acquire skills in education planning, implementation, and evaluation.
- 10- Develop an action plan or project that can be applied to their work in Guatemala.
- 11- Increase their self-confidence as teachers who value their own knowledge, skills and experience.

6- These goals resulted from the Reformulation of Program Goals conducted between participants and trainers, and represent a process of unifying the goals proposed by participants with the tentative goals formulated by staff.

FACTUAL EVALUATION ACTIVITIES.

FIRST FORMATIVE EVALUATION

The first formative evaluation of the program was conducted on Tuesday, June 16 as part of the afternoon session. It took place nearly two and a half weeks into the course of the program and after having realized the following activities:

- 1- Assessment of the participants' knowledge / experience and needs / expectations.
- 2- Joint negotiation of the program training goals/curriculum.
- 3- Analysis of the National Curriculum for Primary Education currently used in Guatemala and its application under local conditions.
- 4- Presentation of classes on "Child Learning", visits to local schools, and discussion how some of what participants observed might be applied to situations in Guatemala.
- 5- First visit to Boston, to the Children Museum.
- 6- Presentation of the topic: "The impact of socioeconomic conditions on child psychology".
- 7- Fieldtrip to Arcadia Wild Sanctuary.
- 8- Presentation/application of such teaching techniques as: lecture, individual presentations, small group work, brainstorming, fish-bowl, simulated case studies, etc.
- 9- Numerous shopping trips and weekend trips to local points of interest.
- 10- Social activities such as a welcome party .
- 11- A Problem-Solving exercise called "Difficulties and Suggestions

for Living and Working Together". (This exercise can be considered as an additional form of evaluation and will be presented as such later).

12- E.S.L. classes, usually in the evenings, and

13- Barbecue with another Guatemalan CAPS program from Brattleboro.

The technique for the first formative evaluation was the one known as "Accomplishments, Difficulties and Recommendations" (Itemized Response). The evaluation process was initiated by a discussion led by the facilitator about the concept of evaluation, the difference between evaluating learning v.s. evaluating programs; and a clarification of the concepts of formative and summative evaluation.

Following this discussion, the participants generated a list expressing the accomplishments realized so far in the program, while the facilitator recorded them down on newsprint pages.

Another list was generated of difficulties experienced by the participants. To conclude the exercise, a final list was compiled entitled "Suggestions to maximize accomplishments and overcome difficulties". The results appear in the accompanying material.

(See Exhibit # 8 : "Results of the First Formative Evaluation").

These results allow the participants to realize both what they had accomplished so far and some problems that were appearing among the group. Such results also were useful for the trainers to make some decisions in order to better adapt the program to the participants' aspirations.

Exhibit # 8

RESULTS OF THE FIRST FORMATIVE EVALUATION

A- ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

- * Recall what we studied in teacher training
- * Collect data on the realities of Guatemala.
- * Seek possible solutions to our problems.
- * Learn new "Dinámicas" (Icebreakers)
- * Improve our human relations.
- * Design our training program.
- * Learn principles & methodology of Participatory Education.
- * Learn something about U.S. Culture.
- * Observe the application of teaching methods in American Schools.
- * Share experiences and concerns about education in Guatemala (rural & urban)
- * Practice developing materials observed in local schools
- * Enjoy trips and sightseeing in a various places and stores.
- * See museums.
- * Experience new forms of transportation.
- * Learn a little more English.
- * Get to know and spend time with new people including the program staff.
- * Learn to respect the ideas of others.
- * Become more aware of our responsibilities as teachers.
- * Appreciate and value more highly our students.
- * Adapt ourselves to a new environment.
- * Appreciate and value more highly our families.
- * Become familiar with lifestyles in the U.S.

B - DIFFICULTIES

- * The language barrier (We can neither ask questions nor consult books in the library)
- * Lack of written resources in Spanish (to go into some topics in more depth.
- * Limited time for small group work.
- * New topics not treated in depth.
- * Treatment of topics too general, without concrete solutions of the participants' problems.
- * We have not learned to be punctual.
- * Lack of participation.
- * Lack of attention in classes.
- * We have not received copies of materials produced in the classes. and we have not taken notes.
- * The meal schedule
- * The food provided on field trips.
- * Lack of an orderly format for giving opinions in class.
- * Some people do not let others get any sleep at night.
- * The fire alarms.

Exhibit# 8 (Cont.)

C - SUGGESTIONS:

- * More visits to schools.
- * Program the interest groups' activities so that we do not miss the opportunity to participate in various areas of interest.
- * Add the theme "Community Development".
- * Treat themes in more depth and in a more concrete manner (less theoretical).
- * Allow time for the group to evaluate its own participation.
- * Give orientation before and during each field trip (for example what type of clothes to wear).
- * Each small group should work on a different problem and with very specific instructions.
- * Provide reference materials on class topics.
- * Do more Problem-Solving Exercises (such as the human relations one).
- * Distribute class materials on time.
- * More variety in the field trip meals (not always sandwiches).
- * Check the fire alarms.
- * Make a "Guatemalan-Style Meal".

SECOND FORMATIVE EVALUATION

On Tuesday, June 23, the second formative evaluation of the program was conducted. It had several purposes:

First, to determine to what extent, in the opinion of the participants, the recommendations from the first evaluation had been put into practice.

Second, to identify what topics not scheduled up to this point were of interest to the group.

Third, to identify which of the topics already covered in the program were considered by the group worth expanding on or complementing in other sessions.

Fourth, to gather other suggestions for curricular and extracurricular activities.

Due to the limited time designated for this activity (One hour!?), it was not possible to discuss each of the recommendations before discussing to what extent they had been put into practice. For this reason the results of the First Point (Exhibit # 9) are somewhat difficult to interpret - due to the nature of some of the recommendations, it was difficult to determine whether they had been implemented or not. (For example, the recommendation # 14 had not been realized by that time, but it had been planned for the following week.) (7)

7- In Exhibit # 9, the numbers appearing in each column show the number of participants who indicated the correspondent percentage. The last column at the right shows the average percentage each recommendations has been put into practice, based on participants' responses.

Exhibit # 9

SECOND FORMATIVE EVALUATION RESULTS

The following is a list of the recommendations produced in the First Formative Program Evaluation. Please indicate the degree to which each recommendation has been put into practice.

RECOMMENDATION	PERCENTAGE OF APPLICATION					
	0	25	50	75	100	%
1- Make further visits to local schools	18	13	2		2	16.9
2- Schedule the interest groups in such a way that the opportunity is not lost to 67.6 participate in other themes	1	2	10	14	7	
3- Add the topic of Community Development	11	15	4	3	2	28.6
4- Treat themes in more depth and in a more concrete manner	4	4	9	13	7	60.1
5- Allow more time for the group to evaluate its own participation.	6	9	8	8	3	44.8
6- Give orientations before and during each field trip	10	4	7	9	6	47.9
7- Each small group should work on a different problem	6	4	6	9	9	58.1
8- Assign more time for work in small groups	5	6	7	8	8	52.7
9- Provide reference materials on class topics	8	8	7	7	3	41.6
10- Do more exercises focused on solving specific problems	6	10	7	8	2	42.4
11- Distribute class materials on time	8	9	5	10	3	43.6
12- Vary the food on field trips	17	6	1	5	3	27.3
13- Check smoke alarms	7	4	2	6	11	58.3
14- Make a "Guatemalan Style" meal	22	2		1	6	24.2
	128	96	75	111	72	45 %

The low percentages accorded some of points in the second formative evaluation create the impression that the participants recommendations from the first formative evaluation were not been implemented to substantial degree. This in fact was not the case, nor did it appear that the participants perceived it to be so. The statistical results are low because many recommendations had ~~been scheduled~~ for later in the program, ~~after~~ the date on which this evaluation took place, as has already been mentioned. But the implication of low achievement from the numbers appearing in the results is problematic; it could undermine the empowerment process which the formative evaluation are designed to promote, reducing them to an academic exercise meaningless in terms of providing a real voice in decision-making - and thus power - to the participants. Trust in this process is a major key to any participatory approach, and it must be cultivated. In the case of an evaluation structured so as to produce statistical results, care should be taken to clarify or systematize the basis for participants to assign percentages.

In spite of the difficulties mentioned above, some observations can be inferred from these results:

1- It is clear that the participants felt that the formation of the interest groups did not impede their participation in activities other than those of their respective groups, to the extent they had feared.

2- It was also clear that the class themes were less superficial and general, as recommended.

3- The recommendation about the organization of classes had been respected, such as allowing more time for small group work and assigning them different aspects of a given theme in order to avoid repetition in their presentations.

4- It is obvious that further visits to schools continued to be considered of great importance by the group. (However, it should be noted that the local school year had come to an end; for this reason school visits had been scheduled as early as possible in the training program, and participants had been made aware of this limitation from the beginning.)

Some other difficulties had not been resolved because they related to factors outside of the control of the program staff, such as the smoke alarms and the food.

In contrast, points 2; 3 and 4 (See Exhibit # 10) yielded very concrete results as can be observed from the list of topics which the group desired to have included or repeated in more depth in the time available during the following week. With respect to this list, the group assigned high priority to the following topics:

- * "Classroom Management",
- * "Creativity and Creative Teaching Methods", and
- * "Production of Educational Materials".

This coincides with the results of the daily evaluations which will be addressed later in this paper.

Exhibit # 10.

RESULTS OF THE SECOND FORMATIVE EVALUATION (Points 2, 3 & 4)

QUESTION:

What topics not already programmed would you like to see included during the available time next week ?

ANSWERS:

* Human Relations	12
* The role of the woman in education	5
* Techniques for using textbooks	1
* Short review of the program	1
* Psychology of the Adolescent	1
* First Aid	1
* Sex Education	1
* Christian Education	1

QUESTION:

What topic that has already been touched upon would you like to see expanded upon during the next week ?

ANSWERS:

* Classroom Management	12
* Production of Educational Materials	9
* Creativity and Creative Teaching Methods	8
* Reading and Writing	3
* How children learn (Classroom Observation Methods)	1
* Child Psychology	1

OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS: (Point #4)

- 1- Have a Guatemalan Style Meal.
- 2- Every one should participate (one way or another) in the presentations of the interest groups.
- 3- Each interest group should make a summary of its work to be included in The Manual.
- 4- Permit us to see the photos taken of us.
- 5- The staff should prepare a presentation for the "Cultural Evening".
- 6- Form a committee to coordinate the Cultural Evening and the clean-up afterwards.
- 7- Organize an activity (such a forum) to share the experiences we have had in the evenings spent with North American families.
- 8- Give us more time to prepare educational materials.

DAILY CLASS EVALUATIONS

In order to evaluate each class, the following techniques were proposed:

- 1- A short discussion at the end of each session oriented around the question of how participants could apply what they learned that day to their respective work in Guatemala.
- 2- A short questionnaire whose purpose was to indicate what was the most important learning activity for each participant and how it could be improved. This questionnaire was to be answer individually and voluntarily.

In actual practice, the first technique was mainly employed to evaluate some of the field trips such as "The Other American Reality", the visit to Sturbridge Village, the first trip to Boston, and the visit to Arcadia Wildlife Sanctuary. Since there were no meetings beforehand of all the different trainers, this technique was not consistently used after each class. Only after some few sessions, participants were asked for evaluatory comments about the classes, but there exists no written documentation of these comments.

The questionnaires, on the other hand, were used in a goodly number of activities. Following is a summary of the comments on those activities to which a substantial number of participants responded in writing by means of the evaluation questionnaire sheet. (See the copy of the Written Daily Evaluation sheet in exhibit # 11).

Exhibit # 11

DAILY EVALUATION

Name of the ACTIVITY _____

Date _____

The most important thing I learned from this activity was:

WHY ? _____

In order to improve this activity, I would suggest _____

Summary of comments: Daily Evaluation Questionnaires:

(By Activity or Class)

SCHOOL VISITS

As previously stated, this activity was of great importance to the participants. It allowed them to observe the differences between a school of this region and their own realities as experienced in Guatemalan schools, both urban and rural. It should be noted that all observations were made in comparative terms to the Guatemalan situation. Among these observations is the outstanding fact that in spite of the lack of material resources in Guatemala, participants picked up innumerable ideas about how to produce and use materials to promote active participation by their students. The majority coincide in recommending more visits similar to these.

IMPACT OF SOCIOECONOMIC CONDITIONS IN CHILD PSYCHOLOGY

The majority of those participants who evaluated this class coincide in emphasizing the importance of this topic in their work and in their overall understanding of some aspects of Child Psychology. However, a number of participants mentioned that the theme was too generally treated and offered few concrete solutions applicable to the Guatemalan children with whom they work.

CREATIVITY AND CREATIVE METHODS

This was one of the classes that received the most numerous and most positive comments from participants, not only because they learned a lot on the theoretical level but also because of its

active character, practical and very applicable to their work environment. In all the evaluation sheets submitted, comments appear related to specific techniques learned by participants and how these might be applied in their work. All recommended that the free hours of the evenings "when we are not doing anything" be used to program similar activities. Also they requested copies of written materials and the opportunity to obtain or make some of the educational games. (These were subsequently provided).

PRODUCTION OF EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS WITH LIMITED RESOURCES.

Like the previous theme, and for similar reasons, this class stimulated a great deal of interest among the participants. The fact that it is not necessary to have a lot of resources at one's disposal to create a good class was especially mentioned; and they wrote that they got good ideas about how to use the materials available in their environment. "You do not need anything special to create learning materials, you just need inventiveness". The discovery method (The "Aha!" Method) and the drawing technique were indicated as two outstanding learning experiences in these classes. Some participants recommended against using non-Spanish speakers for this type of class, since simultaneous translation makes for a slower communication process with the instructor. Others suggested allowing more time for these activities and programming similar ones during free hours.

TEACHING READING AND WRITING.

In evaluating this class, participants remarked on the novel, easy, and creative techniques one can use to teach children to read. They commented on the fact that the techniques demonstrated in class had easy applicability to their work in Guatemala since the method relied more on the creativity of the teacher than on material resources.

It is important to point out that due to the voluntary nature of this written evaluation, questionnaires were not filled out for all the classes. The themes mentioned here are those which, for diverse reasons, received a large number of written evaluations.

Nevertheless, it is obvious that the practical character of these classes and their applicability in Guatemala made them of great value to the participants.

FINAL PROGRAM EVALUATION BY PARTICIPANTS

This was the only opportunity during the whole training program when a entire session (3.5 Hrs.) was designated for an evaluation activity. This permitted the implementation of diverse evaluation techniques, and gave the participants more time to analyze the various categories to be evaluated. The evaluation techniques employed were as follows:

1- Evaluation by Objectives:

The participants had the opportunity to determine to what degree the training program was actually based on the pedagogical principles formulated by the trainers during the Pre-program Activities and presented to the group during the first week, and to what extent it realized the objectives that resulted from the negotiation process carried out on June 5. (See Exhibit # 12)

2- Evaluation by Category:

The participants, divided in small groups, made recommendations to improve the program in the following categories:

- * Teaching, Instructors and Educational Methodology.
- * Field Trips and visit to schools.
- * Cultural and Monetary Orientation.
- * Formation of, work in, and presentation of the results of the interest groups.
- * E.S.L. classes.
- * K.A.S.A. assessment and the evaluation process.
- * Group living situation and training site.

(See exhibit# 13 : "Results of the Evaluation by Category.

Exhibit # 12.

RESULTS OF THE EVALUATION BY OBJECTIVES

In this section we asked participants to identify to what extent the Program Principles were actually applied and how well the program achieved its General Objectives.

PROGRAM PRINCIPLES	PERCENTAGE OF APPLICATION					Average
	0	25	50	75	100	
1- The program was based on the concrete working situation of participants as perceived and expressed by them.			6	22	11	78.2%
2- We promoted the active participation of trainees in the design, implementation and evaluation of the program.			1	8	31	93.7%
3- The curricular, cultural, and evaluative activities were integrated.			5	16	19	83.7%
4- The learning process was based on active observation and practical experience on the part of the participants.	1			14	25	89.4%
5- The learning experience was the result of both the study of content areas and the methods employed in the classes.				12	28	92.5%
6- We respected the cultural differences which exist among everyone involved in the training program.			2	10	28	91.2%
7- There was a mutual learning experience on the part of both participants and facilitators.				5	35	96.9%
						89.4%

NOTE:

The average percentages indicate to what extent the program principles were applied, calculated on the basis of how many persons indicated each percentage column.

Exhibit # 12 (Cont.)

GENERAL OBJECTIVES	PERCENTAGE OF ATTAINMENT					Average
	0	25	50	75	100	
The training program offered its participants the opportunity to:						
1- Examine the role of education in the development of						
a) the individual			6	16	18	82.5%
b) the community			7	21	12	78.1%
c) the nation	4		9	19	8	69.4%
2- Reflect on the role of the teacher						
a) in the classroom			1	13	26	90.6%
b) in the community		2	3	17	18	81.9%
c) in the Guatemalan Ed. System	2	2	6	16	9	70 %
3- Discover and develop their abilities to promote & direct educational activities in						
a) Schools			1	12	25	90.8%
b) their communities	1		4	11	13	81 %
4- Develop themselves						
a) according to community needs			2	25	11	80.9%
b) in new teaching skills	1		1	12	26	89.4%
c) utilizing local resources to the maximum				12	28	92.5%
5- Find ways to apply new methods & techniques for improving Ed. in Guatemala.						
			4	14	22	86.2%
6- Enhance their awareness of the importance of putting into practice what they learned, adapting it to their working conditions.						
			2	6	31	93.6%
7- Share their knowledge, skills and experiences through group activities, in order to unify criteria for improving their teaching and for adapting what they learned to different environments.						
				10	30	93.7%

Exhibit # 12 (Cont.)

8- Observe: a) how classes are conducted and Ed. Methods are applied in U.S. schools	1	3	12	13	19	67.1%	
and b) some other aspects of culture in the U.S.		3	9	17	8	70.2%	
9- Acquire new skills in							
a) Planning	1	1	8	15	17	81.2%	
b) implementation	2		8	14	16	76.2%	
c) evaluation	2	1	5	1	31	86.2%	
of teaching.							
10- Develop an action plan or project that can be applied to their work in Guatemala	4	4	6	15	11	65.6%	
11- Increase their self-confidence as teachers who value their knowledge, skills and experiences.				1	9	30	93.1%
							81.9%

NOTE:

The average percentages were calculated on the basis of the number of persons who indicated each column. For example, in point # 10, four persons indicated that the goal was not met; four that it was met 25%; six that it was met 50%; fifteen that it was met 75%; and eleven that it was met 100%. This yields an average percentage of 65.6%.

Exhibit # 13.RESULTS OF THE EVALUATION BY CATEGORY
(PARTICIPANTS' RECOMMENDATIONS)CATEGORY #1: TEACHING

- 1- Guest instructors should speak Spanish.
- 2- Trainers should use various methods of instruction for greater variety.
- 3- Materials reproduced as class notes should be distributed on time, and if possible, improved before reproducing.
- 4- More information on the participants should be obtained before the course starts.
- 5- In the Curriculum Negotiation, the trainer's plan should be presented and related to the available time.
- 6- The scholarship recipients should be selected from similar areas (urban or rural) or from similar level (primary or pre-primary).
- 7- Schedule more practical, hands-on activities.
- 8- Time should be assigned to each topic according to its importance. For example, more time should be spent on "Evaluation of Student Learning" and "Creativity and Creative Methods".
- 9- "Dinamicas" - i.e. "Icebreakers" - should be related to the class topics.
- 10- Finally, the group indicated that, given the number of participants and the length of the program, the number of facilitators was appropriate.

CATEGORY #2: CULTURAL ORIENTATION.

- 1- Repeat the orientation (guided tour) of the training site, showing the use of different areas so that the participants can take full advantage of them.
- 2- Visit U.S. families that speak Spanish and who are not involved in the program.
- 3- Schedule a "U.S. Cultural Night".
- 4- Organize a committee to schedule socio-cultural activities.
- 5- The "Cultural Night" activities should represent the reality of Guatemala without scorning it.

Exhibit # 13 (Cont.)

CATEGORY #3 : FIELDTRIPS AND SCHOOL VISITS

- 1- Better planning on fieldtrips and better organization of schedules.
- 2- Vary the food provided for fieldtrips.
- 3- Better planning of the shopping schedule.
- 4- Offer more opportunities to visit schools.
- 5- Contract friendlier drives for fieldtrips.
- 6- Do not include the Montessori School visit because it does not provide learning experience applicable to the Guatemalan Reality.
- 7- Consider the possibility of going more than once to amusement parks like "Riverside".
- 8- Plan trips to museums with sufficient advance notice.
- 9- Give us the chance to walk through the streets of cities which we visit, not on the bus but on foot, to get to know them better.

CATEGORY #4: INTEREST GROUPS.

- 1- Plan and organize the work of the interest groups with sufficient time.
- 2- The work of the interest groups should be programmed continuously to get the most from the content areas.
- 3- Evaluate the presentation of each interest group.
- 4- Each group should have more time to prepare and to make its presentation.
- 5- Combine the theoretical and the practical in the contents.
- 6- There should be a more direct relation between the mornings' topics and the work of the interest groups in the afternoon.

Exhibit # 13 (Cont.)CATEGORY #5: ENGLISH CLASSES.

- 1- Have daily classes during the first week and diminish them gradually.
- 2- Modify the schedule to allow a greater lapse between supper and the E.S.L. classes.
- 3- Grammatical explanations should be in Spanish, and the practical exercises in English.
- 4- The content of the classes should be as basic as possible, relating to the environment.

CATEGORY #6: LIVING TOGETHER AND TRAINING SITE.

- 1- Leave the first program day free for the participants and training staff to get to know each other better . This would promote better relations.
- 2- Have more cultural activities with only the participants and all the training staff.
- 3- Promote the formation of non-homogeneous groups so that everyone has a chance to get to know everyone else.
- 4- Acquire the necessary materials for each activity beforehand.
- 5- Have a facilitator on hand every night to resolve any problems that may turn up.
- 6- Enforce greater punctuality and greater responsibility on behalf of the participants in accomplishing program support activities like making coffee.
- 7- Better time distribution on off-site trips
- 8- Limit telephone use to cases of necessity/urgency.
- 9- Check fire alarms before the group of students arrive.
- 10- Include sports activities.
- 11- Establish norms for living together, at the beginning of the program.

CATEGORY #7: NEEDS IDENTIFICATION AND EVALUATION PROCESS.

This group indicated that, due to lack of time, the program did not respond to all of the expectations of all of the participants and as a result made the following recommendations:

- 1- Use the daily class evaluation sheets, but keep the group informed about the feedback obtained from them.
- 2- The Individual Interviews should have concrete questions allowing more time for the interviewees to respond.
- 3- A.I.D. Guatemala should study the interests of the group so that the trainers can have a wider vision of them and better plan their work.
- 4- The "Human Relations" activity should be carried out frequently.
- 5- Other groups which have gone through this experience should relate to the new groups their "Fears and Hopes" but in Guatemala (before their trip).

3- Action Planning and Personal Comments:

The participants, individually, expressed in writing what was the most important thing s/he learned during the whole training program and how s/he would apply it in Guatemala. The resulting text is an interesting collection of participants' personal commitments to engage themselves in new practices in which they can apply the results of the training program. It is a very important evaluation tool because participants write their intentions in a very unobstrusive manner, revealing, consequently, the things they actually feel will be significant in their work once they return to their communities.

Finally each one was asked for their "Very Personal" (anonymous) comments and suggestions for improving the program, were it to be repeated. More than suggestions, these comments were praises, thanks, gratitude and expressions of affection to the trainers, showing that, due the sense of friendship created during the program between participants and trainers, the participants were reluctant to be critical at the end of the program.

FINAL PROGRAM EVALUATION BY THE STAFF.

After the group left, the program staff had a meeting for the purpose of evaluating the program and made the following recommendations for improving any future programs of similar nature:

- 1- Hold the training program in U.Mass., or in a site closer to Amherst so that the participants are freer to move around in their time off from classes. The meal schedule should be more flexible so that it does not become a limitation on all the other activities.
- 2- Expand the full-time training staff to include another trainer with primary school experience. Also, reorganize the extra-curricular activities staff to include a full-time coordinator and two half-time assistants.
- 3- Contract a full-time secretary for the whole length of the program, to participate in staff meetings so as to be fully informed about what is going on in the program and so as to be able to collaborate in activities more substantial than merely typing.
- 4- Inform the participants about the specific responsibilities of each staff member so that they can ask the right person to help them resolve any given problem.

5- Establish one or various coordinating committees of participants to deal with problems or difficulties and to organize cultural and sport activities. These committees should not simply be created but also supported, assigning them specific responsibilities and requiring reports on their activities.

6- Organize and plan shopping time in such a manner that it does not interfere with other activities. Also, use free time to provide the chance for participants to share experiences and to include presentations on specific topics.

7- Send a letter "to whom it may concern" with recommendations about the process of selecting participants and requesting complete information, in sufficient time, on the nature of the group.

OTHER EVALUATION ACTIVITIES:

In addition to the formal evaluations described above, some other activities (both formal and informal) took place which provided valuable information about how both trainees and staff viewed the implementation of the training program. It is worthwhile to take into account certain sections of the document contained in the final report of this program, specifically the comments and recommendations made by the facilitators about each class, and the reports of the curriculum coordinator, the extra-curricular activities coordinator, the E.S.L. coordinator, and the program

director.

With reference to this report, I would like to call attention to the results of the activity carried out on Tuesday, June 9 in the afternoon, a Problem-Solving exercise focused on resolving interpersonal difficulties among participants and referred to by them as the "Human Relations Exercise". This activity was considered of great importance by the participants who repeatedly asked that it be re-applied and that it be used to deal with other problems.

Another type of informal evaluation which produced good results was the "SUGGESTION BOX" in which the participants could leave written messages making recommendations to the program, to the facilitators or even to other participants. The second trip to N.Y.C. was scheduled on the basis of the thirty-four (34) suggestions which appeared one morning in the "Box", requesting this trip for the purpose of "visiting the Statue of Liberty".

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS:

The continuous evaluation model under discussion in this paper was designed on the basis of previous training and evaluation experiences, (especially those gained during various training programs in I.T.D.), synthesizing ideas from various sources and taking into account the lessons learned from other programs. In this sense, we often find ourselves "fighting the battles from the last war", in other words, modifying the model to correct deficiencies and to incorporate recommendations derived from

previous programs. While this process of refinement is essential and of obvious utility, yet each program is as different as the individuals who bring it to life, and for this reason it is difficult or impossible to evolve a "perfect model". One can only hope to devise a flexible one, and be ready to accommodate the unforeseen and to seize whatever opportunities present themselves to create that hope called "Participatory Evaluation". As for a critique of the model itself, it appears that there will always be "things we would have done differently".

Above all else, the application of the model enriches and informs it. This program provided the opportunity to transfer ideas from a neat design on paper to the realities of training. Nearly all the activities projected -and some other besides - were implemented in a fairly systematic manner. This process of implementation has been described, as it happened, in this paper, which also includes the results of the various activities and touches on some of the constraints encountered along the way. At this point it seems appropriate to critique the evaluation model as a whole, in retrospect, and then to highlight some of the features which provided the most remarkable learning experiences.

SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS AND COMMENTS:

1- The presentation of the staff's own Program Principles was a successful experience. It was well received by the participants: they enjoyed the fishbowl format (novel to them) more personal and revealing than simply posting a list of principles. And by sharing from an early stage the staff's commitment to a participatory process, we were able to set a common ground for the rest of the KASA assessment.

2- If the first week could be restructured, it would be a good idea to interpose some of the conceptual presentations like "Theory and Methodology of Participatory Education", "Two models of Curriculum Design" and "The CAPS programs", throughout the KASA assessment time-line. This recommendation is made for two reasons:

- a) The sooner the participants understand various aspects of the participatory educational model being applied, the more sense the KASA process will make to them and the fuller their participation will be. This understanding, however, can only be achieved by exposing the participants to new ideas and allowing them time to assimilate and react.
- b) This restructuring would help alleviate the initial sense among participants that "concrete" program activities were being constantly deferred in favor of seemingly endless data-gathering ("When is the program going to start?" was the way many of them expressed their concern). By interposing more "informative" activities (some staff members also suggested moving up one or two of the class

sessions scheduled for the following week) and also by sharing the Continuing Evaluation Model, participant satisfaction during the first week could indubitably have been enhanced.

3- Design and Use of written instruments for gathering information:

A major headache for trainers during the KASA assessment, the second formative evaluation, and the final evaluation by participants proved to be (as it usually is) the necessary prompt tabulation of the copious data generated from the written instruments. In spite of the care taken in the design of the individual interview guide and the personal questionnaire, for example, two problems common to these instruments arose:

- a) Some duplication in the information derived from the two instruments.
- b) Somewhat skewed results on certain items because different interpretations were placed on the questions.

One suggestion for minimizing these difficulties could be to restructure the group interviews in such a manner as to include some of the questions from the written instruments - although this technique can become very cumbersome when used to extract numerical data. Other suggestions include:

- *- Better orientation for the staff conducting interviews, so that the purposes of the questions in the guide are clear.
- *- Streamline both instruments as much as possible, checking for duplication; and,

- *- Recruit some of the participants to help edit, or even to help design them. Their input would surely have been informative and have cut down on ambiguously-phrased questions.

A further extension of this idea would be to set the participants to interview each other, instead of using staff interviewers. This would require that the written guides be clearly understood by participants but could greatly reduce the time needed for this process. It would also certainly enhance the sense of program ownership if the participants helped design the KASA assessment instruments and then implemented them and tabulated their results.

4- Fuller exploitation of the personal drawings:

The wealth of information provided by the drawings made by each participant to depict the relationship of their schools to their communities surpassed expectations and underscore the utility of graphics to convey many facts that might not surface otherwise. Although this technique did not appear in the original KASA assessment design, it was definitely worth including, and ways should be sought to capitalize fully on the results. For example, instead of merely posting them perhaps certain data could be extrapolated and included in the tabulation process.

5- Daily Class Evaluation:

In this program, as mentioned before, oral class evaluation were not always carried out nor sufficiently documented; the written evaluation sheets were optional, and their results were not shared

with the participants. In a future program, some of these problems could be avoided by forming a rotating evaluation committee of participants to be in charge of distributing, collecting, tabulating and presenting the results of daily evaluation sheets, which could still remain optional. This would put more responsibility for the continuing evaluation process into the hands of the trainees, provide more consistent feedback on classes, and share the critiques of the previous day's classes with everyone.

6- Formative Evaluations:

The process of obtaining and responding to participants' comments on the ongoing program is crucial to its success and to participant satisfaction. As mentioned in the section which deals with the implementation of formative evaluation techniques, we had problems when the technique involved the assigning of percentages to measure the extent to which recommendations generated in the first mid-training evaluation had put into practice. While it can be useful to establish clearly the areas where changes are needed, quantitative evaluations depend upon setting up a clear-cut basis for judgement if the results are to be accurate. The type of inconsistency which skewed our second evaluation can damage a program by making participants feel that these procedures are an exercise in futility. Care should be taken to avoid this pitfall. This requires allotting sufficient time to give a enough explanation and instructions.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- 1- A.C.V.A.F.S. (1983) Evaluation Sourcebook for PVC. New York, N.Y.
- 2- BHOLA, H.S. (1982) Evaluating Development Training Programs. German Foundation for International Development. Bonn. W.G.
- 3- FERNANDEZ, W. & TANDON R. (Eds.) (1981) Participatory Research and evaluation. Indian Social Institute. New Delhi.
- 4- GILLESPIE, M. (1987) "Curriculum Implementation". In Guatemala teacher Training Program Final Report.
- 5- KINSEY, D. (1981) "Participatory Evaluation and Adult and Non-Formal Education". Adult Education Vol.31 #3. Spring, 1981.
- 6- KINSEY, D. (1978) Evaluation in Non-Formal Education. C.I.E. U. of Mass. Issues in N.F.E. #3.
- 7- RUGH, J. (1986) Self-Evaluation. Ideas for Participatory Ev. of Rural Community Development Projects. World Neighbors. Oklahoma City.

CONTINUING EVALUATION DESIGN : C.I.E. GUATEMALAN TEACHERS TRAINING PROGRAM

	COLLECTIVE ANALYSIS OF PRELIMINARY INFO (#1)	TENTATIVE FORMULATION OF PROGRAM GOALS (#2)	ASSESSMENT OF PARTICIPANTS' KASA (#3)	OPEN NEGOTIATION OF PROGRAM GOALS & CURRICULUM (#4)	FORMATIVE EVALUATION		SUMMATIVE EVALUATION (#7)
					AFTER EACH CLASS (#5)	AFTER EACH WEEK (#6)	
?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To assemble & assess data for designing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tentative program goals • Training curriculum • Assessment activities - To share the information, power & responsibility 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To create a common vision of the program - To build a sense of team among staff members 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To apply a model of participatory assessment. - To acknowledge & validate participants' skills and experience. - To gather useful information for program design and implementation. - To get to know each other and create a sense of community. - To arrive at a consensus among diverse participant needs and interests. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To set a guide for planning program activities - To establish a basis for evaluating the program - To promote a joint sense of ownership of the program - To provide an alternative model of curriculum design 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To obtain feedback for improving classes. - To demonstrate a variety of techniques for evaluating content & methodology. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To determine if goals are being met. - To identify & implement modifications - To practice participatory evaluation techniques. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To determine to what extent goals were met (participant satisfaction). - To improve any future programs. - To identify strategies for applying new skills and experiences.
date	STAFF	STAFF	STAFF & PARTICIPANTS together	TRAINERS & PARTICIPANTS	TRAINERS & PARTICIPANTS (together & separately)	TRAINERS & PARTICIPANTS (together)	STAFF & PARTICIPANTS (together & separately)
M?	STAFF	STAFF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PARTICIPANTS - TRAINERS - OTHER STAFF 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - TRAINERS - PARTICIPANTS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PARTICIPANTS - TRAINERS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - TRAINERS - PARTICIPANTS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - STAFF - PARTICIPANTS - FUTURE STAFF & PARTICIPANTS - FUNDING AGENCY
?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of project proposal • Review of staff's previous training experience • Analysis of available data on participants 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General discussion • Individual "task" assignments • Collective negotiation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individual interviews based on written guides • Group interviews based on questions generated by group • Collective tabulation of data from group interviews • Individual questionnaires (open-ended) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation of tabulated data (individual results) • Content analysis: goals; curriculum • Collective discussion • Small Group discussion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Short discussions (collective & in small groups) • Observations by training staff • Suggestion box • Optional class evaluation sheets • Sentence completion (eg "If I were...") 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Itemized response • Q-sort • Conditional tense • Objective tests • Evaluation by goals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individual reflection & action planning. • Evaluation by categories selected by participants. • Comparison of concepts developed during program. • Evaluation by goals (%). • Specific recommendations by participants & staff • Individual response to collectively designed questionnaire.
<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; align-items: center;"> <div style="text-align: center;">↑</div> <div style="text-align: center;">→ NEEDS vis-a-vis GOALS →</div> </div> <p style="text-align: center;">- [Reformulation of GOALS] - - - - -</p>							