COMPETENCES EVALUATION TUTORIAL

Baptiste Campion & Patrick Verniers (IHECS)

OVERVIEW

As far as the 'universal evaluation tool' does not exist, each trainer must develop his own evaluation tools. Nevertheless it is not necessary to invent the wheel again for each training scenario! The eMEL experiments determined a set of concrete bases allowing each trainer doing it in the most efficient way following simple guidelines. This tutorial gives you general and specific guidelines to conceive, realize and interpret the results of your own evaluation test, specifically designed for your own use of the eMEL training scenarios in your specific context.

In this purpose, you'll find six different models (we called 'prototype'). Each prototype is focused on a specific range of competences (analysis competences, production competences, didactic analysis competences, didactic production competences) and show you several manners to evaluate it, with possible variants when it's relevant. For each prototype, hyperlinks will also guide you to eMEL experimentations that used this specific prototype as model for their competence evaluation test. You can use it as models.

Each prototype is based on the same method: a single task repeated twice: before the training scenario (pre-test) and after the training scenario (post-test). Each test give information about the trainees' level of competences at this specific moment (before and after the training). Comparison between the results of the two tests allows to highlight the trainees' evolution during the training.

For each prototype, you'll find:

- The set of competences the prototype is designed to evaluate;
- The main task the trainees will have to realize during the evaluation;
- The possible variants in the task or in the way presenting it to the trainees;

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

- The general data processing strategy and the evaluation scale and its signification;
- Eventual extra needed information;
- Examples of application in eMEL experiments.

You will find also a synthesis table of the 6 competences evaluation prototypes.

HOW TO USE IT?

It's quite easy. Follow these steps:

1. Identify the competences you want to evaluate
2. Find the prototype corresponding to these competences
3. Choose a method (within the prototype description) in regard of your aims and/or your own context
4. With the help of the prototype description, identify indicators specific to the (sub)competences you want to evaluate
5. Define the exact task: how the generic task described in the prototype become a real concrete task for trainees? You have to define: the exact requirements, the documents to comment/analyse, possible extra precision (like a thema, audience, etc.). You should produce 2 questionnaires with this task: (i) the pre-test and (ii) the post-test questionnaires.
6. Pass the pre-test questionnaire before the training scenario (provide enough time for it).
7. Pass the post-test questionnaire after the training scenario (provide enough time for it).
8. Correct the questionnaires with the help of the prototype interpretation table and the specific indicator you defined at step 4.
9. You may make comparison between pre- and post-tests to assess the trainees evolution during the training scenario.

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

EVALUATION PROTOTYPES LIST

Prototype 1 – Analysing competences – Media Literacy by systematic analysis

Prototype 2 – Analysing competences – Media Literacy by comparison

Prototype 3 – Analysing competences – Media Literacy by classification

Prototype 4 – Producing competences – Didactic axis

Prototype 5 – Analysing competences – Didactic axis

Prototype 6 – Media Literacy Production competences

#	Competence dimension	Method	Variants	Scoring method	Scoring indicators	Scoring levels	Conditions
1	Analysing competences – Media Literacy	Analyse media one by one	-Respond to observation questions -Analyse its practices	A. Key words B. Content analysis (CA)	A. Number of keywords B. CA based on the relevance, the accuracy, the coherence and the exhaustiveness	4-levels scale build on the evaluated competence	Same evaluator for pre- and post-tests

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

2	Analysing competences – Media Literacy	Compare 2 (or more) media objects	-Free comparison -Comparison based on/guided by detailed questions -Mindmap: trainees have to draw a mindmap reflecting their analysis of the objects/of the question	A. Key words B. Content analysis (CA) C. Coherence of the mindmap	A. Number of keywords B. CA based on the relevance, the accuracy, the coherence and the exhaustiveness C. Coherence of the mindmap	4-levels scale build on the evaluated competence	Same evaluator for pre- and post-tests
3	Analysing competences – Searching, selecting and classifying competences	Classifying media objects following differents criteria, arguing criteria	-Objects are given -Objects have to be searched -Possibility to ask for differents classifications following different criteria or for a specific task (i.e. "objects suitable for...")	A. Number of right/relevant criteria B. Justification of the criteria C. Ability to classify	A. Number of right/relevant criteria B. Relevancy of the criteria (regarding the task) C. "Richness" of the classification (number of criteria in the classification)	4-levels scale build on the evaluated competence	Evaluator will focus on: A. Media objects relevancy B. Criteria classification (depending on the task)
4	Producing competences – Didactic axis	Concieving (describing) a pedagogical situation	-Free page for responding -Formatted questions	A. Key words B. Content analysis (CA) C. Coherence of the mindmap	A. Number of keywords B. CA based on the relevance, the accuracy, the	4-levels scale build on the evaluated competence	Same evaluator for pre- and post-tests

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

			-Mindmap: trainees have to draw a mindmap reflecting their analysis of the objects/of the question		coherence and the exhaustiveness C. Coherence of the mindmap		
5	Analysing Competences – Didactic axis	Analysing and criticizing an existing pedagogical resource	-Analysing & criticizing -Analysing, criticizing and adaptating to a specific (new) situation -Summarizing and commenting for a colleague	A. Key words B. Content analysis (CA)	A. Number of keywords B. CA based on the relevance, the accuracy, the coherence and the exhaustiveness	4-levels scale build on the evaluated competence	Same evaluator for pre- and post-tests
6	ML Production	Producing a scenario presenting a media about [subject] to [audience]	-Free page to describe scenario -In two steps: (i) collect and analyse existing presentations; (ii) “what will you do?”	A. Key words B. Content analysis (CA)	A. Number of keywords B. CA based on the relevance, the accuracy, the coherence and the exhaustiveness	4-levels scale build on the evaluated competence	Dependant of TS Same evaluator for pre- and post-tests

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

PROTOTYPE 1: ANALYSING COMPETENCES — MEDIA LITERACY BY SYSTEMATIC ANALYSIS

OVERVIEW

This evaluation test provide you a simple procedure to evaluate the level of the trainees competences in analysis (media literacy competences). The test allows to evaluate each trainee individually before and after the training, and to assess the progression during the training by comparison between the two tests. The test is based on the idea that at most the trainees are competent, at the most they are able to analyse spontaneously media objects.

TASK

The trainees have to analyse one (or several) media object(s). At most they can do it following different various and relevant dimensions, at most they are considered as competent.

Just provide the trainees the media object(s) to be analyzed.

Method 1 - Free analysis in an open questionnaire: “Analyse these media objects following several dimensions.”
This method is especially interesting with presumed high-level trainees or to highlight the spontaneous approach they put in place. This method is less interesting with presumed low-level trainees because they may not see what is expected.

Method 2 – Structured analysis guided by detailed questions: “Analyse these media objects according to the following criteria: (i) the author of the document, (ii) the targeted audience, (iii) the way the message was fabricated, (iv) the effect on the receivers (etc.)”

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

This method is especially interesting with presumed low-level trainees. This method is less interesting with presumed high-level trainees because the guided answers may be not sufficiently discriminant (all high-level trainees will reach the maximal level, avoiding to highlight a progression during the training).

Method 3 – Mixed approach: in a first time ask a general open question (Method 1 above), in a second time ask more specific and detailed questions (Method 2 above). This mixed method is especially interesting when you don't have indications about the level of the trainees. It is also really discriminant between low and high-level trainees. The main inconvenient is that answering the questionnaire is longer, and the repetition between open and specific questions may disturb some trainees.

INTERPRETATION

Each answer is individually coded with the following scale:

Level	Criteria	Interpretation
0	The trainee is unable to analyse the media objects whatever the considered dimension (or only with unrelevant dimension: "I like it", etc.)	The trainee has no analysis competence.
1	The trainee is able to analyse the media objects using only 1 relevant dimension (for example: targeted audience).	The trainee has basic analysis competences.
2	The trainee is able to analyse the media objects using several relevant dimensions (for example: targeted audience and sender's intentions).	The trainee has good analysis competences.

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

3	The trainee is able to analyse the media objects using several relevant dimensions that are justified and organised in a coherent manner. He/she is able to make links between the considered dimensions. (For example targeted audience, sender's intention and highlight that the audience is chosen following intentions).	The trainee has excellent analysis competences and may be viewed as an "expert" in these competences.

The progression is evaluated by comparison between the scores before and after the training. You should expect that the final score is (individually and/or globally) higher at the end of the training that at the beginning.

EXTRA COMMENTS

It is recommended that the objects used in the pre-training and post-training tests are equivalent in difficulty. Do not use easier objects at the end of the training: it should false the results.

It is recommended that the same evaluator does the scoring in the pre-training and post-training tests to ensure that the interpretation of the scoring indicators are constant.

EXAMPLES IN EMEL

- Belgium – Understand and decrypt TV news show > Method 2
- Belgium – Mediatized images in context > Method 3
- Finland – TS1 Media Cultures >
- Portugal – TS1 Understanding the current world > Method 3
- Portugal – TS2 Media uses and audiences in a digital environment > Method 3

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

PROTOTYPE 2: ANALYSING COMPETENCES — MEDIA LITERACY BY COMPARISON

OVERVIEW

This evaluation test provide you a simple procedure to evaluate the level of the trainees competences in analysis (media literacy competences). The test allows to evaluate each trainee individually before and after the training, and to assess the progression during the training by comparison between the two tests. The test is based on the idea that at most the trainees are competent, at the most they are able to compare spontaneously media objects.

TASK

The trainees have to compare 2 (or more) media objects, according to different criteria. At most they can make a reasoned and nuanced comparison implying a high number of relevant criteria, at most they are considered as competent.

Just give your trainees 2 (or more) media objects and ask to compare them.

Method 1 - Free comparison in an open questionnaire: “Compare these objects according several criteria that you explain” or “what make those objects similar/different and why?”
This method is especially interesting with presumed high-level trainees or to highlight the spontaneous approach they put in place. This method is less interesting with presumed low-level trainees because they may not see what is expected.

Method 2 – Structured comparison guided by detailed questions: “Compare these objects according to the following criteria: (i) the author of the document, (ii) the targeted audience, (iii) the way the message was fabricated, (iv) the effect on the receivers (etc.)”

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

This method is especially interesting with presumed low-level trainees. This method is less interesting with presumed high-level trainees because the guided answers may be not sufficiently discriminant (all high-level trainees will reach the maximal level, avoiding to highlight a progression during the training).

Method 3 – Mixed approach: in a first time ask a general open question (Method 1 above), in a second time ask more specific and detailed questions (Method 2 above). This mixed method is especially interesting when you don't have indications about the level of the trainees. It is also really discriminant between low and high-level trainees. The main inconvenient is that answering the questionnaire is longer, and the repetition between open and specific questions may disturb some trainees.

Method 4 – Mindmapping. Comparison is presented in a mindmap showing similarities and differences between the considered media objects. The mindmap may ber created with "traditionnal" tools (paper and pencil) or with specialized digital tools (like Mapmind, XMind, etc.). Using a specialized software may be intimidating for some trainees unfamiliar with digital tools; using specialized software makes the mindmap sharing easier on the platform.

INTERPRETATION

Each answer is individually coded with the following scale:

Level	Criteria	Interpretation
0	The trainee is unable to compare the media objects whatever the considered criteria (or only with unrelevant criteria).	The trainee has no analysis competence.
1	The trainee is able to compare the media objects using only 1 relevant criteria (for example: targeted audience).	The trainee has basic analysis competences.

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

2	The trainee is able to compare the media objects using several relevant criteria (for example: targeted audience and sender's intentions).	The trainee has good analysis competences.
3	The trainee is able to compare the media objects using several relevant criteria that are justified and organised in a coherent manner. He/she is able to make links between criteria. (For example targeted audience, sender's intention and highlight that the audience is chosen following intentions).	The trainee has excellent analysis competences and may be viewed as an "expert" in these competences.

The progression is evaluated by comparison between the scores before and after the training. You should expect that the final score is (individually and/or globally) higher at the end of the training that at the beginning.

EXTRA COMMENTS

It is recommended that the objects used in the pre-training and post-training tests are equivalent in difficulty. Do not use easier objects at the end of the training: it should false the results.

It is recommended that the same evaluator does the scoring in the pre-training and post-training tests to ensure that the interpretation of the scoring indicators are constant.

EXAMPLES IN EMEL

- Italy – TS1 Digital storytelling as self-presentation and social/civic agent (analysis test)
- France – TS2 Images of Science in the Media > close to Method 4 (mindmapping)

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

PROTOTYPE 3: ANALYSING COMPETENCES — MEDIA LITERACY BY CLASSIFICATION

OVERVIEW

This evaluation test provide you a simple procedure to evaluate the level of the trainees competences in analysis (media literacy competences). The test allows to evaluate each trainee individually before and after the training, and to assess the progression during the training by comparison between the two tests. The test is based on the idea that at most the trainees are competent, at the most they are able to analyse classify media objects.

TASK

The trainees have to classify several media objects following different criteria they have to explain and justify. At most they can do it following different various and relevant/justified criteria, at most they are considered as competent.

Media objects may be provided by the trainer or searched by the trainees (for example in another exercise – following context and available time: see the different submethods below).

Method 1 – Objects to classify are given by the trainer. Trainees only have to classify them following different criteria and justify these criteria.

Method 2 – Object to classify are searched by the trainees. For example in a search-and-classify exercise: “Look on the Internet for different media objects that are similar or different from each other. Create categories with almost 3 different media objects in each. Justify the central criteria that defines each created category.”

Method 3 – Successive classifications. After a first classification, trainees are asked to find another classifications with the same set of media objects, in an iterative way. The idea is to see if they are able to envisage successively the same objects following different criteria.

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

INTERPRETATION

The evaluator will focus on the media objects relevancy (especially in the Method 2 perspective) and the relevancy of classification criteria in regard to the instructions (all methods).

Each answer is individually coded with the following scale:

Level	Criteria	Interpretation
0	The trainee is unable to classify the media objects whatever the considered criteria (or only with unrelevant dimension: "I like it", etc.)	The trainee has no analysis competence.
1	The trainee is able to classify the media objects using only 1 relevant criteria (for example: targeted audience). He/she is for example unable to find another possible classifications in a given set of media objects (method 3).	The trainee has basic analysis competences.
2	The trainee is able to classify the media objects using several relevant criteria (for example: targeted audience and sender's intentions). He/she is for example able to find another possible classifications in a given set of media objects (method 3).	The trainee has good analysis competences.
3	The trainee is able to classify the media objects using several relevant criteria that are justified and organised in a coherent manner. He/she is able to find another possible classifications in a given set of media objects (method 3). He/she is able to make links between the considered dimensions. (For example	The trainee has excellent analysis competences and may be viewed as an "expert" in these competences.

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

	targeted audience, sender's intention and highlight that the audience is chosen following intentions).

The progression is evaluated by comparison between the scores before and after the training. You should expect that the final score is (individually and/or globally) higher at the end of the training that at the beginning.

EXTRA COMMENTS

It is recommended that the objects used in the pre-training and post-training tests are equivalent in difficulty. Do not use easier objects at the end of the training: it should false the results.

It is recommended that the same evaluator does the scoring in the pre-training and post-training tests to ensure that the interpretation of the scoring indicators are constant.

EXAMPLES IN EMEL

(No direct example in the tested TS)

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

PROTOTYPE 4: PRODUCING COMPETENCES — DIDACTIC AXIS

OVERVIEW

This evaluation test provide you a simple procedure to evaluate the level of the trainees competences in production (dicatic axis). The test allows to evaluate each trainee individually before and after the training, and to assess the progression during the training by comparison between the two tests. The test is based on the idea that at most the trainees are competent, at the most they are able to describe a pedagogic sequence using various terms and linking them.

TASK

The trainees have to conceive (describing) a pedagogical sequence about a given topic. At most they are able to draw a coherent sequence mobilizing objectives, relevant activities and relevant resources, at most they are considered as competent.

The topic of the pedagogical sequence as wel the targeted audience is given by the trainer. Another elements may be given by the trainer or be left free to the trainees appreciation (see Mehods below).

Method 1 – Free page for responding: “Describe a pedagogical sequence about [topic] addressed to [audience] in [extra relevant framing elements].”
This method is especially interesting with presumed high-level trainees (for example in-service teachers) or to highlight the spontaneous approach they put in place. This method is less interesting with presumed low-level trainees (for example in-training future teachers) because they may not see what is expected.

Method 2 – Responding in formatted questions: “Describe your pedagogical sequence following the different items: (i) objectives, (ii) activities, (iii) resources, (iv) timing (etc.)”
This method is especially interesting with presumed low-level trainees (for example in-training future teachers). This method is less interesting with

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

presumed high-level trainees (for example experimented in-service teachers) because the guided answers may be not sufficiently discriminant (all high-level trainees will reach the maximal level, avoiding to highlight a progression during the training).

Method 3 – Mixed approach: in a first time use a free page for responding (Method 1 above), in a second time ask more formatted questions (Method 2 above). This mixed method is especially interesting when you don't have indications about the level of the trainees. It is also really discriminant between low and high-level trainees. The main inconvenient is that answering the questionnaire is longer, and the repetition between open and specific questions may disturb some trainees.

Method 4 – Mindmapping. The sequence is presented in a mindmap showing alignment between objectives, tasks, resources, evaluation, and so on. The mindmap may ber created with "traditional" tools (paper and pencil) or with specialized digital tools (like Mapmind, XMind, etc.). Using a specialized software may be intimidating for some trainees unfamiliar with digital tools; using specialized software makes the mindmap sharing easier on the platform.

INTERPRETATION

Each answer is individually coded with the following scale:

Level	Criteria	Interpretation
0	The trainee is unable to describe a pedagogical sequence. His/her answer is incoherent and/or focus on the content without preoccupation for methods and mean ("I will say that").	The trainee has no production (didactic) competence.
1	The trainee is able describe a basic pedagogical sequence. His/her description counts a few keywords indicating that he/she makes the difference between content, objectives and method ("objective", "method", etc.).	The trainee has basic production (didactic) competences.

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

2	The trainee is able describe a coherent pedagogical sequence. His/her description counts most keywords indicating that he/she masters the whole process: objectives, task, ressources, evaluation, timing, etc.	The trainee has good production (didactic) competences.
3	The trainee is able describe a coherent pedagogical sequence and to justify each element. His/her description counts all keywords indicating that he/she masters the whole process (objectives, task, ressources, evaluation, timing, etc.) and makes links between these elements showing their coherence/alignment.	The trainee has excellent production (didactic) competences and may be viewed as an "expert" in these competences.

The progression is evaluated by comparison between the scores before and after the training. You should expect that the final score is (individually and/or globally) higher at the end of the training that at the beginning.

EXTRA COMMENTS

It is recommended that the same evaluator does the scoring in the pre-training and post-training tests to ensure that the interpretation of the scoring indicators are constant.

EXAMPLES IN EMEL

- Belgium – Mediatized images in context > Method 3
- Finland – TS2 Transcultural competences in media education > Method 1
- Italy – TS1 Digital storytelling as self-presentation and social/civic agent (didactic test)
- France – TS2 Images of Science in the Media (didactic test)

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

PROTOTYPE 5: ANALYSING COMPETENCES — DIDACTIC AXIS

OVERVIEW

This evaluation test provide you a simple procedure to evaluate the level of the trainees analysing competences (dicatic axis). The test allows to evaluate each trainee individually before and after the training, and to assess the progression during the training by comparison between the two tests. The test is based on the idea that at most the trainees are competent, at the most they are able to analyse and criticize an existing pedagogic sequence using various terms and linking them.

TASK

The trainees have to analyse and criticize an existant pedagogical sequence about a given topic. At most they are able deconstruct in a coherent way the sequence identifying and citicizing objectives, relevant activities and relevant resources, at most they are considered as competent.

The sequence is given by the trainer. Another elements may be given by the trainer or be left free to the trainees appreciation (for example, assessing the relevancy of the sequence to another specific audience).

Method 1 – Free page for responding: “Analyse the following pedagogical sequence.”
This method is especially interesting with presumed high-level trainees (for example in-service teachers) or to highlight the spontaneous approach they put in place. This method is less interesting with presumed low-level trainees (for example in-training future teachers) because they may not see what is expected.

Method 2 – Responding in formatted questions: “Analyse the pedagogical sequence following the different items: (i) objectives, (ii) activities, (iii) resources, (iv) timing (etc.)”

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

This method is especially interesting with presumed low-level trainees (for example in-training future teachers). This method is less interesting with presumed high-level trainees (for example experimented in-service teachers) because the guided answers may be not sufficiently discriminant (all high-level trainees will reach the maximal level, avoiding to highlight a progression during the training).

Method 3 – Mixed approach: in a first time use a free page for responding (Method 1 above), in a second time ask more formatted questions (Method 2 above). This mixed method is especially interesting when you don't have indications about the level of the trainees. It is also really discriminant between low and high-level trainees. The main inconvenient is that answering the questionnaire is longer, and the repetition between open and specific questions may disturb some trainees.

Method 4 – Mindmapping. The sequence is presented in a mindmap showing alignment between objectives, tasks, resources, evaluation, and so on. The mindmap may be created with "traditional" tools (paper and pencil) or with specialized digital tools (like Mapmind, XMind, etc.). Using a specialized software may be intimidating for some trainees unfamiliar with digital tools; using specialized software makes the mindmap sharing easier on the platform.

INTERPRETATION

Each answer is individually coded with the following scale:

Level	Criteria	Interpretation
0	The trainee is unable to analyse a pedagogical sequence. His/her answer is incoherent and/or focus on the content without preoccupation for methods and mean ("it says that…").	The trainee has no analysing (didactic) competence.
1	The trainee is able analyse a basic pedagogical sequence. His/her analyse counts a few keywords indicating that he/she	The trainee has basic analysing (didactic) competences.

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

	makes the difference between content, objectives and method ("objective", "method", etc.).	
2	The trainee is able analyse and/or evaluate a pedagogical sequence. His/her analysis counts most keywords indicating that he/she masters the whole process: objectives, task, ressources, evaluation, timing, etc.	The trainee has good analysing (didactic) competences.
3	The trainee is able analyse and evaluate a pedagogical sequence and to justify interest (or limitations) of each element. His/her analysis counts all keywords indicating that he/she masters the whole process (objectives, task, ressources, evaluation, timing, etc.) and makes links between these elements showing their coherence/alignment.	The trainee has excellent analysing (didactic) competences and may be viewed as an "expert" in these competences.

The progression is evaluated by comparison between the scores before and after the training. You should expect that the final score is (individually and/or globally) higher at the end of the training that at the beginning.

EXTRA COMMENTS

It is recommended that the same evaluator does the scoring in the pre-training and post-training tests to ensure that the interpretation of the scoring indicators are constant.

EXAMPLES IN EMEL

(No direct example in the tested TS)

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

PROTOTYPE 6: MEDIA LITERACY PRODUCTION COMPETENCES

OVERVIEW

This evaluation test provide you a simple procedure to evaluate the level of the trainees media literacy production competences. The test allows to evaluate each trainee individually before and after the training, and to assess the progression during the training by comparison between the two tests. The test is based on the idea that at most the trainees are competent, at the most they are able to describe a production activity.

TASK

The trainees conceive (describing) a scenario presenting a media about a given topic to a specific audience. At most they are able describe the sequence in a coherent way, at most they are considered as competent.

The topic and the audience are given by the trainer. Another elements may be given by the trainer or be left free to the trainees appreciation.

Method 1 – Free page for responding: “Describe a sequence about [topic] addressed to [specific audience].”

Method 2 – Responding in two steps: (i) collecting and analysing existing presentation, (ii) developing his/her own.

INTERPRETATION

Each answer is individually coded with the following scale:

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

Level	Criteria	Interpretation
0	The trainee is unable to conceive a coherent production.	The trainee has no ML production competences.
1	The trainee is able to conceive a basic sequence. His/her answer counts a few keywords indicating that he/she makes the difference between content, objectives and method (“objective”, “method”, etc.).	The trainee has basic ML production competences.
2	The trainee is able conceive a coherent production sequence and to plan it in different aspects. His/her analysis counts most keywords indicating that he/she masters the whole process: objectives, task, ressources, evaluation, timing, etc.	The trainee has good ML production competences.
3	The trainee is able conceive and plan a complete ML production sequence and to justify interest (or limitations) of each element. His/her answer counts all keywords indicating that he/she masters the whole process (objectives, task, ressources, evaluation, timing, etc.) and makes links between these elements showing their coherence/alignment.	The trainee has excellent ML production competences and may be viewed as an “expert” in these competences.

The progression is evaluated by comparison between the scores before and after the training. You should expect that the final score is (individually and/or globally) higher at the end of the training that at the beginning.

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

EXTRA COMMENTS

It is recommended that the same evaluator does the scoring in the pre-training and post-training tests to ensure that the interpretation of the scoring indicators are constant.

EXAMPLES IN EMEL

- Italy: TS 1 Digital Storytelling as self-representation and social/civic agent (Production test)
- Italy: TS 2 Make Map Talking about Arts (Production test)

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union