

DECISION 12/2016/GB  
OF THE GOVERNING BOARD OF THE EUROPEAN POLICE COLLEGE

**ON CEPOL TRAINING EVALUATION METHODOLOGY**

Adopted by the Governing Board

on 25 May 2016

THE GOVERNING BOARD,

Having regard to regulation (EU) 2015/2219 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 November 2015 on the European Union Agency for Law Enforcement Training (CEPOL) and replacing and repealing Council Decision 2005/681/JHA(OJ L319/1, 4.12.2015) and in particular Article 3 (2), thereof;

Having regard to CEPOL Work Programme 2016 (Single Programming Document years 2016-2018, Section III, Strategy Goal 1, Specific activity 1.6) thereof;

Whereas:

“CEPOL shall develop and upgrade learning tools and methodologies and shall apply them in a lifelong learning perspective to strengthen the skills of law enforcement officials. It shall *evaluate* the results of such actions with a view to enhancing the quality, coherence and effectiveness of future actions at Union level”;

The revised evaluation methodology shall be finalised.

HAS ADOPTED THIS DECISION:

*Article 1*

CEPOL evaluates the quality and efficiency of learning and training products in a coherent and comprehensive way by following the evaluation guidelines provided in Annex I.

*Article 2*

The evaluation templates for training and learning activities listed in Annex II-VII shall be applied as from January 2017.

*Article 3*

In order to foster CEPOL’s quality assurance system and provide national authorities with a guaranteed level of competence formative and/or summative assessments (tests) shall be introduced for selected residential activities in two steps.

Step 1: Tests shall be introduced for courses listed in the annexed evaluation guideline under section 4 “Testing” of the Annex I as from January 2017.

Step2: as from January 2018 all courses that are 5 days or longer and are designed to enhance participants` knowledge and skills shall be tested. Tests should be considered for shorter courses where applicable.

Tests and their results shall be communicated to the agency with the Training Report<sup>1</sup>.

*Article 4*

The decision shall enter into force on the day following of its adoption.

Done at The Hague, 25 May 2016

*For the Governing Board*

*<Signature on file>*

*Mrs. Frederike Everts MPA  
Chair of the Governing Board*

---

<sup>1</sup> Provisions of the Governing Board decision 30/2006/GB apply

## **Annex I: Evaluation guideline for residential activities**

### **1. Scope**

This evaluation guideline covers the assessment methodology of residential activities such as courses seminars and conferences. Evaluation of other learning and training products (such as online courses, webinars) shall be applied by analogy as far as applicable considering the nature of the activities.

### **2. Principles of evaluation**

Evaluation is the integral component of the training process supporting the establishment of business needs, identification of training/performance gaps and the planning and implementation of the training and learning products.

CEPOL develops an evaluation system that effectively serves the quality improvement of training and learning products, guarantees the relevance of the implemented activities and remains proportionate, concentrating on the assessment of the key aspects of trainings bearing in mind the direct and indirect costs of such assessment.

The CEPOL evaluation system shall provide information on:

- ❖ quality of content/curriculum
- ❖ methodology
- ❖ quality of participants
- ❖ quality of experts/trainers
- ❖ learning environment
- ❖ continuity of learning
- ❖ general satisfaction
- ❖ knowledge/skills/competence gained
- ❖ cascading of knowledge
- ❖ personal benefit of training
- ❖ organisational impact

Evaluation of the various CEPOL products are harmonized to the possible extent to ensure unity.

### 3. Application of Kirkpatrick`s Evaluation model

CEPOL continues to apply the Kirkpatrick`s evaluation model which differentiates between four levels of the assessment:

- ❖ Level 1: Reaction evaluation - measures the participant`s satisfaction level
- ❖ Level 2: Learning evaluation – assesses the accumulation of knowledge, skills and changes in attitudes
- ❖ Level 3: Behaviour evaluation – calculates the change in job performance, the transfer of knowledge, skills and attitudes at the work place
- ❖ Level 4: Organisational results - calculates the effects on the organisation resulted from the changes in behaviour

In terms of courses and seminars the CEPOL evaluation system shall cover the first three levels of the Kirkpatrick`s model measuring the satisfaction with the activity, the obtained knowledge, assessing the detailed benefits of the training activity on the personal level (enhanced job performance). Through the line managers` survey the fourth level is partially assessed by looking at the organisational impact evidenced by concrete examples.

Conferences are assessed by the Kirkpatrick`s model level 1 with an adapted evaluation template that takes into account the nature of event.

### 4. Two-step evaluation for courses and seminars

Two-step evaluation is implemented for courses and seminars as follows:

CEPOL Evaluation for courses and seminars		When it is done?	What level of assessment?	Extent
Step 1	<b>Course/Seminar Evaluation</b>	End of the course/seminar	Reaction evaluation (level 1)	Full
Step 1	<b>Testing</b>	Beginning (placement) and /or end of the course/seminar	Learning evaluation (level 2)	Full
Step 2	<b>Post Course Evaluation</b>	4-10 months after the course/seminar	Behaviour evaluation (level 3) and Organisational results (level 4)	Partial

Course/seminar evaluation (step 1):

At the end of the training event (course or seminar) the course manager gathers the data on participants' satisfaction with the content/methodology, trainers (individual assessment), networking possibilities, learning environment and general satisfaction by using the mandatory evaluation templates (Annex II, III and V). Evaluation data can be collected electronically through CEPOL Learning Management System (LMS) or in paper format. In the latter case evaluation data shall be summarized in the applicable compulsory form (CT12).

Course managers shall always inform experts/trainers in advance (in the invitation letter) that their contribution will be assessed by participants.

Testing (step 1):

Introduction of testing is an important step to strengthen CEPOL's quality assurance system as it makes possible to measure the increase of knowledge in residential activities. By the mandatory application of course tests CEPOL achieves a higher level in the standard of evaluation (Kirkpatrick's level 2: Learning evaluation) and takes a step forward to future certification. Formative and summative assessments signal expectations and are likely to influence participants' learning strategies.

It is proposed to consider the following approaches to testing:

- 1) Formative testing of the increase of knowledge, skills and competencies by organising a placement test and a test at the end of the event to assess level of the knowledge/skills/competencies acquired during the event.
- 2) Summative testing to ascertain that a participant possesses a certain level/standard of knowledge/skills/competences through a course-end test.

The tests shall be aligned with the pre-determined learning objectives attending to the aspects of knowledge/skills/competences.

Where applicable (such as language, forensic examinations courses) the testing against existing certified standards shall be offered. If the services of a certified institute (according to Bologna or Bruges-Copenhagen criteria) or a professional body are used for the testing, the related costs shall be reimbursable by CEPOL; adequate procurement rules shall be applied.

Tests shall be valid, aligned with the pre-determined learning objectives and either:

- measure the increase in knowledge, skills and competencies defined, or
- measure the level of knowledge, skills and competencies as defined by learning outcomes or a standard, if such is established.

The design, organisation and conducting the testing falls in the remit of the course manager. The course manager can engage support from content experts. Such experts may be reimbursed in line with the provisions of the Governing Board Decision 30/2006/GB.

CEPOL ensures the highest level of transparency of its evaluation system and at the same time guaranteeing the confidentiality of the test results.

Course managers shall always inform participants in advance (in the invitation letter) that they will be tested by conducting either summative or formative assessment during the training activity.

Participants not passing the tests shall have an opportunity to appeal against the decision. An appeal procedure must be developed and adopted by CEPOL until January 2017. Information on the appeal procedure must be included in the invitation letters of all applicable training activities.

Outcome of the tests are used

- for overall assessment of the success of the activity measuring the level of the increase of knowledge,
- for individual assessment of participants` performance (pass/fail) for certification purpose

In case of summative assessment course managers shall provide CEPOL information in the CT13 Organiser Training Report (to be submitted 6 weeks following the training activity) on the overall pass/fail rate of participants without detailing individual test results.

In case of formative assessment – when a tests are conducted in the beginning and in the end of the activity as well – course managers shall provide CEPOL information in the CT13 Organiser Training Report (to be submitted 6 weeks following the training activity) on the overall change in the assessment results.

Individual test results are confidential information that are not to be published only provided to the participant. The course manager shall provide the individual test result to CEPOL only if that is required for the consideration of the appeal of the former participant.

#### Gradual introduction of testing:

Acknowledging the necessity to apply a caution in introduction of testing to ensure it brings the desired results, the testing will have a two-step launch:

Step 1: Testing phase for the following activities in 2017:

- ❖ Illicit laboratory dismantling
- ❖ Operational Intelligence Analysis

- ❖ Social Network Analysis
- ❖ European Police Leadership - Future Leaders
- ❖ Language Development: Instruments and Systems of European Police Cooperation (English)
- ❖ Train the Trainers Step 1-2
- ❖ Fundamental Rights and Police Ethics - Step 1 and Management of Diversity - Step 2

Step 2: As from January 2018 the testing shall be at least launched for all those activities that are designed to enhance participants` knowledge and skillset and last 5 days or longer.

To support the course managers CEPOL will develop further guidelines for testing.

Post-course evaluation (step 2):

Post-course evaluation is conducted by CEPOL 4-10 months following the course/seminar by approaching the former participants of the training event and their line managers, usually through an online survey. Post-course evaluation collects information on the extent of cascading of the gained knowledge at national level, learning continuity, the magnitude of change in participants` individual job performance and on the scale of overall organisational impact of the training on law enforcement agencies.

The following table shows responsibilities and evaluation tools for each evaluation step.

	<b>Focus of the assessment</b>	<b>Responsible actor</b>	<b>Evaluation tool</b>
<b>Course/Seminar Evaluation</b>	Content/methodology Trainers (individually) Students/networking Learning environment General satisfaction	Course manager	Course evaluation template (Annex II), Seminar evaluation template (Annex III) Trainers Feedback (Annex V)
<b>Testing</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Formative assessment: Ascertaining increase in knowledge, skills or competences</li> <li>- Summative assessment: Ascertaining a certain level/standard of knowledge, skills and competencies</li> </ul>	Course manager	Test to be developed by course manager in cooperation with course experts

<p><b>Post-Course Evaluation (PCE)</b></p>	<p>Cascading of knowledge                      Learning continuity                      Change in job performance                      Organisational impact</p>	<p>CEPOL</p>	<p>PCE for participants template (Annex VI),                      PCE for Line managers template (Annex VII),</p>
--	--	--------------	---

## 5. Single step evaluation for conferences

Single step evaluation is carried out for conferences in the end of the event as follows:

CEPOL Evaluation for conferences		When it is done?	What level of assessment?	Extent
Step 1	<b>Conference Evaluation</b>	End of the course	Reaction evaluation (level 1)	Full

### Conference evaluation (step 1):

In the end of the training event the course manager gathers the data on participants' satisfaction with the content/methodology, speakers (individual assessment), networking possibilities, learning environment and general satisfaction by using the mandatory evaluation templates (Annex IV). Evaluation data can be collected electronically through CEPOL Learning Management System (LMS) or in paper format. In the latter case evaluation data shall be summarized in the applicable compulsory form (CT12).

Due to the nature of conferences neither tests nor post-course evaluations are implemented.

Course managers shall always inform speakers in advance (in the invitation letter) that their contribution will be assessed by conference participants.

The following table shows responsibilities and the evaluation tool.

	Focus of the assessment	Responsible actor	Evaluation tool
<b>Conference Evaluation</b>	Content/methodology Speakers (individually) Networking Learning environment General satisfaction	Course manager	Conference evaluation template (Annex IV)

## 6. Use of outcomes

Course managers must built on the accumulated experience when they are design training activities. CEPOL supports this effort by sharing the available former evaluation results and relevant course documentation of previous CEPOL activities with the National CEPOL Units and the course managers organising similar training events.

## **7. Data Protection**

Processing evaluation results will involve the recording and processing of personal data. Such data will be processed pursuant to Regulation (EC) No 45/2001 on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data by the Community institutions and bodies and on the free movement of such data.

Unless indicated otherwise, such information will be processed solely for the purpose of improving teaching and learning by CEPOL, and anonymised afterwards.

Data subjects are entitled to obtain access to their personal data on request. Any queries concerning the processing of personal data may be addressed to the Training and Research Unit of CEPOL, or to the Data Protection Officer of CEPOL. Data subjects have the right of recourse at any time to the European Data Protection Supervisor for matters relating to the processing of their personal data.

**Annex II: Course evaluation form**

To be completed by participants either in hard copy and collected by the organiser or completed online (e-Net in the Learning Management System) at the end of the activity

**PARTICIPANTS' COURSE EVALUATION**

[Name of the organising institute]

[CEPOL Reference Number]

**[TITLE OF THE ACTIVITY]**

[Start/End Dates]

[Venue, City, Country]

*Your assessment will help us to understand and improve future training programmes. Therefore, we kindly ask you to reflect and give your opinion by marking your choices. Your written comments are appreciated as these will provide a better understanding of your ratings.*

**I CONTENT, METHODOLOGY**

<i>Strongly Agree (SA)</i>	<i>Agree (A)</i>	<i>Slightly Agree (SLA)</i>
<i>Strongly Disagree (SD)</i>	<i>Disagree (D)</i>	<i>Slightly Disagree (SLD)</i>

1. Have the intended learning outcomes been achieved?

Learning outcomes <i>(to be listed by the organiser, in accordance with the course curriculum)</i>	SA	A	SLA	SLD	D	SD
a) To [...]						
b) To [...]						
c) To [...]						
d) To [...]						
e) To [...]						

- 2. The course content was relevant
- 3. The course content was up-to-date
- 4. I will be able to use the newly gained knowledge/skills/competencies in my profession.
- 5. The pre-course information helped me to prepare for the course.
- 6. The training methods were adequately chosen and balanced.

SA	A	SLA	SLD	D	SD

*I suggest the following changes to improve the content of the courses:* \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

## II TRAINERS and EXPERTS

7. Please evaluate the performance of each trainer/expert (note: multiply the following section as many times as needed to ensure all experts/speakers are assessed):

Name of the trainer:.....

Topic:.....

- a) Knew the subject matter well
- b) Was well prepared
- c) Demonstrated good pedagogical skills
- d) Had a good command of English

SA	A	SLA	SLD	D	SD

*Please provide specific comments:*

---



---



---

### III STUDENTS, NETWORKING

<i>Strongly Agree (SA)</i> <i>(SLA)</i>	<i>Agree (A)</i>	<i>Slightly Agree</i>
<i>Strongly Disagree (SD)</i> <i>(SLD)</i>	<i>Disagree (D)</i>	<i>Slightly Disagree</i>

- 8. I feel that I was at the right course
- 9. The fellow participants are my potential professional networking partners

SA	A	SLA	SLD	D	SD

*Please provide specific comments:*

---



---



---

### IV LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

- 10. The course was well organised and supported my learning (transport, accommodation, meals, etc.)
- 11. The course climate was positive and constructive.

SA	A	SLA	SLD	D	SD

*Please explain your rating:*

---

---

---

---

**V GENERAL SATISFACTION**

12. I am satisfied with the course as a whole (content, trainers, networking, learning environment)

SA	A	SLA	SLD	D	SD

*What I found most useful about this course was* \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

*What I found least useful about this course was* \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

*I suggest the following changes to improve future CEPOL courses:*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

*Thank you for your feedback*

**Annex III: Seminar evaluation form**

To be completed by participants either in hard copy and collected by the organiser or completed online (e-Net in the Learning Management System) at the end of the activity

***PARTICIPANTS' SEMINAR EVALUATION***

[Name of the organising institute]

[CEPOL Reference Number]

**[TITLE OF THE ACTIVITY]**

[Start/End Dates]

[Venue, City, Country]

*Your assessment will help us to understand and improve future training programmes. Therefore, we kindly ask you to reflect and give your opinion by marking your choices. Your written comments are appreciated as these will provide a better understanding of your ratings.*

**I CONTENT, METHODOLOGY**

<i>Strongly Agree (SA)</i>	<i>Agree (A)</i>	<i>Slightly Agree (SLA)</i>
<i>Strongly Disagree (SD)</i>	<i>Disagree (D)</i>	<i>Slightly Disagree (SLD)</i>

1. Have the intended objectives of the seminar been achieved?

Seminar Objectives	SA	A	SLA	SLD	D	SD
a) To [...]						
b) To [...]						
c) To [...]						
d) To [...]						
e) To [...]						

- 2. The programme of the seminar was relevant
- 3. The content provided in the presentations were up-to-date and informative
- 4. I will be able to use the newly gained knowledge in my function
- 5. I was satisfied with the level of exchange during the seminar
- 6. The programme of the seminar was well balanced (duration, sequence of topics, active/passive)

SA	A	SLA	SLD	D	SD

*I suggest the following changes to improve the content of the seminar:* \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

## II SPEAKERS

7. Please evaluate the performance of each speaker (multiply the following section as many times as needed to ensure all speakers are assessed):

Name of the speaker:.....

Topic:.....

- a) Session was related to the general topic of the seminar
- b) Speaker demonstrated good presentation skills
- c) Presented information met my expectations
- d) Session will help me fulfil my duties more effectively
- e) Speaker had a good command of English

SA	A	SLA	SLD	D	SD

*Please provide specific comments:*

---



---



---

**III NETWORKING**

<i>Strongly Agree (SA)</i> <i>(SLA)</i>	<i>Agree (A)</i>	<i>Slightly Agree</i>
<i>Strongly Disagree (SD)</i> <i>(SLD)</i>	<i>Disagree (D)</i>	<i>Slightly Disagree</i>

8. I feel that I was at the right seminar

9. The fellow participants are my potential professional networking partners

SA	A	SLA	SLD	D	SD

*Please provide specific comments:*

---



---



---

**IV LEARNING ENVIRONMENT**

10. The seminar was well organised and supported my active participation (transport, accommodation, meals, etc.)

11. The seminar climate was positive and constructive

SA	A	SLA	SLD	D	SD

*Please explain your rating:*

---

---

---

---

**V GENERAL SATISFACTION**

12. I am satisfied with the seminar as a whole (content, speakers, networking, learning environment)

SA	A	SLA	SLD	D	SD

*What I found most valuable from the seminar was* \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

*What I found least valuable from the seminar was* \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

*I suggest the following changes to improve future CEPOL seminars:*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

*Thank you for your feedback*

**Annex IV: Conference evaluation form**

To be completed by participants either in hard copy and collected by the organiser or completed online (e-Net in the Learning Management System) at the end of the activity

**CONFERENCE EVALUATION**

[Name of the organising institute]

[CEPOL Reference Number]

**[TITLE OF THE ACTIVITY]**

[Start/End Dates]

[Venue, City, Country]

*Your assessment will help us understand and improve future training programmes. Therefore, we kindly ask you to reflect and give your opinion by marking your choices. Your written comments are appreciated as these will provide a better understanding of your ratings.*

**I CONTENT**

<i>Strongly Agree (SA)</i>	<i>Agree (A)</i>	<i>Slightly Agree (SLA)</i>
<i>Strongly Disagree (SD)</i>	<i>Disagree (D)</i>	<i>Slightly Disagree (SLD)</i>

1. Have the intended objectives of the conference been achieved?

Conference objectives	SA	A	SLA	SLD	D	SD
a) To [...]						
b) To [...]						
c) To [...]						
d) To [...]						
e) To [...]						
	SA	A	SLA	SLD	D	SD

- 2. The programme of the conference was relevant
- 3. The content provided in the presentations were up-to-date and innovative.
- 4. I will be able to use the newly gained knowledge in my function.
- 5. The conference narrative was useful and helped me to orientate and prepare.
- 6. I was satisfied with the conference materials provided.
- 7. The programme of the conference was well balanced (duration, sequence of topics, active/passive)


*I suggest the following changes to improve the conference programme:*

---



---



---



---

**II KEYNOTE SPEAKERS/SPEAKERS**

8. Please evaluate the performance of each keynote speaker/speaker (please multiply as many times as needed to ensure all keynote and other speakers are assessed) :

Name of the keynote speaker:.....  
 Topic:.....

- a) Session was at high scientific / practical level
- b) Presented information met my expectations
- c) Session will help me fulfil my duties more effectively

SA	A	SLA	SLD	D	SD

*Please provide specific comments:*

---



---



---



---

**III NETWORKING**

<i>Strongly Agree (SA)</i> (SLA)	<i>Agree (A)</i>	<i>Slightly Agree</i>
<i>Strongly Disagree (SD)</i> (SLD)	<i>Disagree (D)</i>	<i>Slightly Disagree</i>

9. I feel that I was at the right conference

10. The people I met during the conference can be potential partners in my professional network

SA	A	SLA	SLD	D	SD

*Please provide specific comments:*

---



---



---

**IV LEARNING ENVIRONMENT**

11. I was satisfied with the conference facilities

12. The conference was well organised (transport, accommodation, meals, etc.)

13. The conference climate was positive and constructive.

SA	A	SLA	SLD	D	SD

*Please explain your rating:*

---



---



---

**V GENERAL SATISFACTION**

14. Overall this conference met my needs, goals and aspirations (content, speakers, networking, learning environment)

SA	A	SLA	SLD	D	SD

*What I found most valuable from the conference was* \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

*What I found least valuable from the conference was* \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

*I suggest the following changes to improve future CEPOL conferences:*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

***Thank you for your feedback***

**Annex V: Feedback form of trainers**

To be completed by trainers and collected before their departure

**FEEDBACK FROM EXPERTS/TRAINERS**

[Name of the organising institute]

[CEPOL Reference Number]

**[TITLE OF THE ACTIVITY]**

[Start/End Dates]

[Venue, City, Country]

*Thank you for your contribution to this CEPOL activity.*

*Please take some time to provide us with your feedback on the following aspects:*

<i>Strongly Agree (SA)</i> <i>(SLA)</i>	<i>Agree (A)</i>	<i>Slightly Agree</i>
<i>Strongly Disagree (SD)</i> <i>(SLD)</i>	<i>Disagree (D)</i>	<i>Slightly Disagree</i>

1. I was invited to contribute to this activity at an adequate timeframe to have enough time to prepare for my contribution

SA	A	SLA	SLD	D	SD

*Please explain your rating:*

---



---

---



---



---

2. The information provided on what was required of me was clear (target group, content, time, links with other topics, etc.)

SA	A	SLA	SLD	D	SD

*Please explain your rating:*

---



---



---



---

3. The participants on the course were the right target group

SA	A	SLA	SLD	D	SD

If not, how has this affected the process of learning?

---



---



---



---

#### 4. Pre-course study material/assignments

a) I provided the participants with pre-course material/assignments and/or reference to literature.

Yes

No

b) In my judgement the participants fulfilled the pre-course study

SA	A	SLA	SLD	D	SD

c) In my judgement the participants were well prepared

*Please explain your rating:*

---



---



---

5. The participants were motivated and took active part in the learning process

SA	A	SLA	SLD	D	SD

*Please explain your rating:*

---



---



---



---

6. The participants' level of English language skills was sufficient for an effective learning process

SA	A	SLA	SLD	D	SD

*Please explain your rating:*

---



---



---



---

7. I encouraged participants to post-course learning by making reference to forums, literature, etc.

Yes

No

*If your answer is yes, please provide details:*

---

---

---

---

---

8. I suggest the following changes to improve future courses/seminars:

---

---

---

---

---

---

[Name]

Trainer/Expert

*Thank you for your feedback*

**Annex VI: Post-course evaluation template for participants**

**Post-Course Evaluation questions for PARTICIPANTS:**

<i>Strongly Agree (SA)</i>	<i>Agree (A)</i>	<i>Slightly Agree (SLA)</i>
<i>Strongly Disagree (SD)</i>	<i>Disagree (D)</i>	<i>Slightly Disagree (SLD)</i>

**I BENEFITS, IMPACT:**

1. The skills, knowledge and competences gained during the training were relevant to my personal training needs
2. I have been able to use the newly gained knowledge/skills/competencies in my profession.
3. I have applied what I have learnt
4. The training has resulted in concrete actions in my work

SA	A	SLA	SLD	D	SD

5. My performance in my job has improved thanks to the CEPOL training as

- I understand better the cross-border elements of the training subject
- I improved my personal working practice
- I cooperated more internationally
- I developed in other ways
- my performance did not improve

(multiply choices)

Please give examples: \_\_\_\_\_

6. The outcome of the training activity was beneficial to my organization

SA	A	SLA	SLD	D	SD

7. The training activity was beneficial to my organization as

- my and my colleagues general competence/knowledge had been improved
- internal working practices had been developed due to the new knowledge

- it enhanced our international cooperation
  - it resulted having more operational results
  - it provided other advantages
  - the performance of my organization did not improve
- (multiply choices)

Please give examples: \_\_\_\_\_

**II. CASCADING:**

8. I have shared my skills, knowledge and competence gained from the learning activity:

- a) Yes/No
- with my line manager(s)
- with my colleagues
- with my staff
- with others

**III. NETWORKING:**

9. I have maintained the contacts made with other participants and/or trainers during the activity and they are now part of my professional network

SA	A	SLA	SLD	D	SD

Please state how: \_\_\_\_\_

**IV. LEARNING CONTINUITY:**

10. The course encouraged me to continue to learn

a) Yes/No

If yes: I continued to learn after the activity by (please tick):

- re-reading course material(s)
- researching the topic(s) further to broaden my knowledge thereof
- discussions with others knowledgeable on the subject
- in other ways

**V. RECOMMENDATIONS:**

**11.** If I were to attend the same activity again I would have proposals for changes.

a) Yes/No

b) I would propose the following changes:

**Annex VII: Post-course evaluation template for line managers**

**Post-Course Evaluation questions for Line Managers:**

**I. SELECTION:**

1. I was able to select and nominate the right person for the event on the basis of information provided by CEPOL prior to the activity
  - Yes/No/I did not receive any information
  - Please specify why not:\_\_\_\_\_

**II. CASCADING:**

2. After her/his return, the course participant shared the knowledge gained from the activity

Yes	No

Please specify:\_\_\_\_\_

**III. BENEFITS, IMPACT:**

3. I have noticed that the course participant used the knowledge, skills, competence obtained from the course/seminar in her/his work

Yes	No

4. Which of the following statements are true (please tick relevant boxes)? The course participant
  - understands better the cross-border elements of the training subject thanks to the CEPOL training.
  - improved her/his personal working practice
  - cooperates more internationally
  - performance developed in other ways
  - performance did not improve

Please provide concrete example:\_\_\_\_\_

Yes	No

5. The CEPOL activity has been beneficial to my organisation/unit

--	--

6. The training activity was beneficial to my organization as (please tick relevant boxes)

- general competence/knowledge of the officers had been improved through cascading the gained knowledge
- internal working practices had been developed
- it enhanced the international cooperation of my unit/agency
- it resulted in more operational results
- it provided other advantages
- the performance of my organization did not improve

Please provide concrete example: \_\_\_\_\_

#### IV. GENERAL SATISFACTION, RECOMMENDATIONS

7. My expectations of the participant's attendance in the CEPOL activity were met

Yes	No

Please specify if not: \_\_\_\_\_

8. I would send participant to future CEPOL activity.

Yes	No

Please specify if not: \_\_\_\_\_

9. I propose changes to increase the effectiveness of future CEPOL activities.

Yes	No

I propose the following, to increase the effectiveness of future CEPOL activities: \_\_\_\_\_