

Global Schoolroom.
2015 Volunteer Evaluation

The Evaluation format was similar to previous years.

1. An open forum feedback from participants based on Maslow's hierarchy if needs..
2. A short personal self-evaluation (retained by participants).
3. A group exercise on ranking the experience.
4. An individual questionnaire.

A. OPEN FORUM FEEDBACK

1.1 Pre-departure.

- *Training and bonding was excellent, especially on sessions 1 & 2.*
- Pre-departure emails – too many additions to the handout. Need to prioritise and minimise the number of emails. Focus on important logistical issues.
- More clarity needed on suitable gifts for hosts
- More discussion on 'taking useful resources' – past participant advice.
- Role of the 'leader' – unnecessary now that ICM in place. Also creates a false hierarchy. Perhaps just needed as a liaison for communications. (Note also high luggage load for the 'leader' with materials).
- More clarity on in-country trips and excursions. Who pays? What is expected of hosts/participants?
- *Local staff had excellent response to requests from the team.*
- Wider 'India' briefing – geography, culture, environment, etc
- Include more 'local centre' information. Perhaps a few photos to help with expectations.
- Most participants felt the accommodation and food standard was better than they expected. Some concern over iron content in the water – advice needed. One issue re mattresses and 'bed-bugs' – sorted locally with help from ICM.
-

1.2 Travel.

- *Arriving on Saturday was great with time to rest and prepare. Suggestion – organize an excursion to get to know the area.*
- Calcutta meeting was too soon after arrival – exhaustion!
- Luggage allowance is determined by the 'local' flight allowance, not the international allowance.
- Can evaluation materials be forwarded, rather than carried as luggage.
- Advice needed on car travel – most drivers excellent but not always on other trips. Some concern over widespread 'chewing of Chat (Khat)' by drivers.
- Seat belt use.

1.3 IT and communication.

- Issues around opening the USB stick for materials and also access to a laptop/printer/copying.
- Better advice on buying and using a local SIM card for phones.
- Better advice on access to local Wifi.
- Phone needed at Indian departure airport to keep in touch with arriving group[s], etc

2.1 Team and local issues

- Training for hosts in their expectations of the Irish group. ‘They think we are a team and have worked together in Ireland.’
- *Priests very helpful.*
- Catholic ethos. Irish ‘Catholics’ felt some pressure to conform while resident. *Those Irish participants from minority religions felt very welcome and enjoyed discussions with priests on many issues.*
- *Unanimous praise for the ICM team – both a practical help and a ‘friendly shoulder’ to rely on.*
- *Meeting participants at the airport was much appreciated.*
- More advice/agreement on local ‘freedom’ – safety of walking alone?
- First weekend plan – excursion, social activities, local knowledge, etc
- *Mix of Primary and Secondary teachers was great.*
- Possible liaison or meetings with local teachers groups/Union?
- One participant had a less than helpful exchange with the medical back-up. A phone consultation to Ireland during the programme was not helpful.

2.2

- *A privilege to participate in the experience and share the ‘simpler’ life style*
- *Valuable experience for self-reflection*
- *Truthful and honest communication enjoyed*
- *Eye-opening trip to see gender inequality in the raw*
- *Inspired discussion and reflection on the value of ‘Christian missionary’ work.*

3. Handbook/Course and Training issues.

3.1

- There was a serious and heated debate over the value of the course. Academic v Practical training. Too remote from school/teacher needs. ‘Western’ values and approach.
- Need for better alignment with local curriculum.
- Some specific issues –
Value of ‘chairing a staff-meeting’ – not a reality for most of the students.
Not all participants are teachers – lab technicians.
Plagiarism – same answers from students from one school.
Some sample classes re-submitted over 2 years.
Pages 125 – 130 Sort by criteria, not grade.
- Need for ‘model lessons’ – in handbook?
- Video and micro-teaching?
- Use ‘Adult Education’ methodologies during training.

- Need for more ‘unpacking’ and reference to the Handbook during the training sessions.
- Need for a facilitator H/B and a Student H/B?
- Are grades necessary? Especially in teaching practice.
- Hard to assess students teaching in their own language.
- No opportunity to address prior experience and training in students
- How to support students who miss sessions.
- More observation and skill-sharing during week 1 in India.

B. Group Ranking Exercise

Participants were asked to rank a series of statements about their experience and motivation for the trip. (see attached).

The highest ranking statement was:

An opportunity to be part of a long-term project to improve education provision.

Among the top ranking statements were those that reflected higher level objectives and aspirations about contributing to a better world.

Helping to combat poverty and injustice.

An opportunity to share my teaching skills.

Participants were also given the opportunity to add their own statement if they felt it was necessary. Only one group did this, but the statement reflected the earlier discussion about appropriate training and suitability of the course.

To respond in a practical way to the specific educational needs of Indian teachers in a culturally appropriate way.

C. Individual questionnaire.

Participants scored a set of 15 statements on their relevance and importance to their individual experience. (See attached)

Statements scored as below with 1 = very little and 5 = a lot/significant

Please rate 1,2,3,4,5 1 = very little 5 = a lot/significant

Statement	Average score
1 . One way process from Irish to Indian.	2.4
2. One way process from Indian to Irish.	2.0
3. Balanced, 2 way process.	3.2

<i>4. Enlightened me.</i>	4.4
<i>5. Enlightened my partners in India.</i>	4.1
6. Expanded my professional opportunities.	2.8
7. Expanded my partners professional opportunities.	3.8
<i>8. Links were respectful.</i>	4.4
<i>9. Links were mutually beneficial.</i>	4.5
<i>10. Enriched my educational experience.</i>	4.5
11. Enriched my partners experience.	4.0
<i>12. Widened my cultural experience.</i>	4.4
13. Widened my partners cultural experience.	3.4
14. Built a strong local framework.	3.0
15. Sustainable without GS	2.0

Significant scores above suggest that:

- a. The process is very much a two-way exchange
- b. The programme is not sustainable without GS.
- c. It is a very respectful, enlightening and mutually beneficial programme.

End. DRAFT 1