

Evaluation of CECRA Thesis

Guidelines for Evaluators

These guidelines for evaluators form a single unit together with the description of the requirements for the CECRA thesis (Annex 6).

Goal of evaluator's job

The aim is an assessment by the evaluators for the candidates on selected competences. The focus is on competence in advisory methods, competence in designing interactions and reflection competence. The evaluators provide the participants with written feedback on these competencies. At the same time, the evaluators assess whether the candidate's thesis meets the requirements.

Notes on the handling of the form "Evaluation criteria for the CECRA thesis"

Our evaluators provide written feedback to the candidates, using the grid with the evaluation criteria for the final thesis.

The idea is that evaluators fill in the column "Feedback to advisor" directly and overwrite the questions completely (delete superfluous questions). Evaluators are encouraged to use their own wording or that of candidates for their feedback. The questions are intended as a suggestion: they should serve as "assistance" to make the individual criteria even more tangible.

The evaluators then make their assessment in the right-hand column: If the criterion is met, they leave "yes". They then check whether sufficient criteria have been met to consider the proof of the relevant competence as "fulfilled".

Written feedback to the candidates is given using the form "Written feedback on the thesis".

Acceptance/rejection of the thesis

In order for the thesis to be accepted, all three competences of the form must be fulfilled.

Reviewers ask the participants to revise the thesis if one or more of the three competences are not fulfilled. Candidates are free to decide whether they want to revise their thesis or submit a completely new one. Whether reviewers wish to give advice is at their own discretion.

Interaction of task description and form with assessment criteria

Our experience shows that the candidates' work is structured differently from the order of our list. This is not an indication of a lack of structure or an unfavourable structure of the candidates. We expect our reviewers to do the "search work" because we deliberately avoid giving too much structure: Otherwise we simply cannot assess the structuring ability of candidates.

We also expect candidates to be somewhat vague and do not include the assessment criteria in the task description: We want to give them room to think/work/reflect independently. And we want to avoid "faithful completion of tasks" by not providing detailed lists of what all belongs in the final paper and according to which criteria it will be evaluated. Because if tasks are processed faithfully, e.g. according to evaluation criteria, the reviewers would hardly be able to judge whether they were actually evaluating the competence to reflect or not primarily the "faithful processing of tasks".

IALB-Geschäftsstelle:

Porschestraße 5a

84030 Landshut

Deutschland

kontakt@cecra.net

Tel.: +49 (0)871/9522-4318

www.cecra.net

Fax: +49 (0)871/9522-4399

Evaluation criteria for the CECRA thesis

Name:

Case:

Date of thesis:

Evaluator 1:

Evaluator 2:

Criteria	Feedback to advisor Guiding questions for the evaluators	Requirements for the assessment	fulfilled <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> / not fulfilled <input type="checkbox"/>
Competence in advisory methods			
Structuring capability	How comprehensible is your case/sequence description for me as evaluator? How did you structure the case/ advisory sequence?	Is a comprehensible and structured case management recognizable?	<input type="checkbox"/>
Preparation and forming a hypothesis	What information have you caught up? How did you prepare? What was your idea/previous knowledge of the case?	Is the preparation or hypothesis formation described in a comprehensible way and is the planned procedure appropriate?	<input type="checkbox"/>
Clarify request/concern with the parties involved	How have the clients concerns, the advisory goals or advisory topics been worked out?	Took a mission statement place?	<input type="checkbox"/>
Making agreements (on procedure)	How was the procedure discussed with the clients? Was a validation of the concern/request carried out or an ok picked up? How did you manage to reach agreements?	Have arrangements been made for the advisory process?	<input type="checkbox"/>
Interventions, techniques and adaptation of them	How do the described procedures, techniques and interventions fit the described concerns / advisory objectives / situation and/or your hypotheses? What leads you to leave your previous work or to stick to it? What effects are associated with this?	Are the selected techniques and interventions congruent or well-founded with concerns/goals, situation and hypotheses?	<input type="checkbox"/>

Criteria	Feedback to advisor Guiding questions for the evaluators	Requirements for the assessment	fulfilled ☒ / not fulfilled ☐
Clarification of the achievement of objectives by asking questions of clients	How do you determine whether the consultation was successful from the client's point of view? What conclusions do you draw from the client's response?	Have you checked the achievement of the objectives during advisory process?	<input type="checkbox"/>
Perception of and dealing with incidents	Have you noticed any incidences in the advisory process? If so, how did you deal with them?	Have you interfered to any incidences?	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advisory competence		≥ 5 times yes = fulfilled	<input type="checkbox"/>

Interactive Competence			fulfilled ☒ / not fulfilled ☐
Description of the role(s)	How have you clarified your role(s)? How did your role(s) possibly change during the course of the advisory process? If so, what led to this?	Were you aware of your role(s)?	<input type="checkbox"/>
Perception of conversation leadership (and facilitation)	How did you facilitate the participation of the clients in the advisory situation? In which phase did you use which interventions to influence the contact between the consultants? Who participated in the discussion and to what extent? How high was your own speaking rate?	Did you take the lead in the advisory situation and/or promote interaction between the participants?	<input type="checkbox"/>
Interaction between client/ advised persons and advisors	How did you come into contact with the person(s) being advised? What were your contributions to the climate of conversation, the atmosphere between the person(s) present and you in the advisory situation?	Is it comprehensible how you have arranged the contact with the persons advised?	<input type="checkbox"/>
Interactive competence		≥ 2 times yes = fulfilled	<input type="checkbox"/>

Reflection competence			fulfilled ☒ / not fulfilled ☐
Taking a Observer's Position	<p>Is the course of the advisory process not only described in the work, but also reflected upon?</p> <p>This also includes developments/changes in the course of the consulting process.</p>	Can you take an outside perspective on your own case?	☐
Reflection of the own behaviour	<p>How have roles, concerns/ issues/ objectives, feelings changed during the advisory process (for you and/or the clients)?</p> <p>Were there different phases with ups and downs in the course of the advisory process?</p> <p>How did you deal with them?</p> <p>Did the involvement of the clients have an influence on the advisory process?</p>	If the own procedure/behaviour is described as advisor reflected?	☐
Dealing with feedback from others	<p>How have you provided feedback, what do you do with it?</p> <p>What did feedback from the consultants do with:</p> <p>a) your role;</p> <p>b) you as a person;</p> <p>c) the situation itself?</p>	Is feedback received, examined and classified in a way that is conducive to the further development of the own competence?	☐
Emotional response to the case	<p>How do you feel before/during/after the advisory situation? How do you deal with it?</p> <p>Which feelings were triggered and perceived by or during the case in me and/or the client?</p>	Are emotions (personal or others') mentioned or reflected in the work or reflection?	☐
Conclusions drawn from the case Concerns / ideas for your methodical development	<p>What conclusions do you draw from your advisory case or advisory sequence? Which questions or suggestions regarding your advisory competences / understanding of advisory processes have you continued to ask or newly gained?</p> <p>What do you intend to do to optimize your advisory competence in the future? Which measures are suitable?</p>	Are the consequences for your own concept of advising made clear?	☐
Reflection competence			≥ 3 times yes = fulfilled ☐

Overall evaluation score

