

EVALUATION OF THE EEC PILOT PROJECTS
EDUCATION TO WORKING

AN INITIAL REPORT TO THE DEPARTMENT
SCIENCE ON THE NATIONAL EVALUATION OF
CAREERS GUIDANCE INTEGRATION PROJECTS

5

ON "TRANSITION FROM
LIFE"

OF EDUCATION AND
OF PROJECT 27 - THE
F.

MARCH 31, 1979

CAREERS GUIDANCE OBSERVED (CARGO) - THE FIRST SIX MONTHS

1. Focus of the Report

1.1 Having forwarded in February 1979 a copy of the Initial Report to IFAPLAN on the first four months of the evaluation, we intend this report to concentrate on outlining more fully the initial activity of the evaluation.

2. Goals of the Evaluation

2.1 The Evaluation proposal stated three goals:

2.2 "To create an adequate characterisation of the project in terms of its values, theories, methods, actions and accomplishments."

2.3 "To create a parallel characterisation of off-site provision such that evaluative comparisons may be drawn."

2.4 "To critique both the foregoing in the light of related features of the EEC programme and alternative approaches to careers guidance."

3. Stages of Evaluation

3.1 Again, as stated in the Evaluation proposal, priorities in year one were expected to be:

3.2 Getting to know the programme participants;

3.3 Communicating clearly the nature, purposes and independence of the evaluation;

3.4 Getting a feel for the careers area and its issues;

3.5 Negotiating opportunities for access to its work and conditions for data-gathering;

3.6 Monitoring the initial actions of the team;

3.7 Summarising the experience of the first year.

4. Progress 1

- 4.1 All of the year one priorities have been pursued to a greater or lesser extent, depending both on the progress of the project and unforeseen factors such as industrial action in local authorities.
- 4.2 A resource bank has been established. This contains publications reporting previous research, and literature and information from a variety of sources such as Industrial Training Boards, relevant professional bodies (e.g. the Institute of Careers Officers) H.M.S.O., Schools Council, Manpower Services Commission, numerous journals and newspapers. In particular an effort has been made to keep abreast of current initiatives and developments in the area by compiling a press file from the "T.E.S." and since November 1978 the "Guardian" and "Education".
- 4.3 Local, informal, consultancy has been engaged in, through relevant contacts in the Norwich area. This includes interviews with transition personnel from the industrial sector, as part of our attempt to gauge the current practices and concerns of employers.
- 4.4 Similarly a general orientation to the field has been facilitated by informal reports from CARE doctoral students with interests relevant to the evaluation. Mr. Torrance has been interviewing Careers Officers and Careers Teachers both locally and in Haringey in connection with the transition process. He has also been interviewing recruitment personnel from larger employers. Ms. Amos has been pursuing fieldwork in Birmingham in connection with her thesis on the transfer from school to work of black girls. Mr. Torrance and Ms. Amos hope to engage in fieldwork which will directly feed CARGO in the immediate future.

5. Progress 11

- 5.1 More specific contributions have come from the two other doctoral students mentioned in the proposal. Mr. Norris has assisted with the preparation of guidelines for the conduct of the CARGO evaluation: 'Principles and Procedures' (draft document attached); Mr. Kushner has interviewed Careers Service personnel in Knowsley.
- 5.2 Mr. MacDonald and Mr. Atkin have attended IFAPLAN's conferences and visited NICEC headquarters on several occasions to talk over the project, the evaluation, and their relationship to each other. They have also attended Steering Committee meetings.
- 5.3 Mr. Atkin in particular has built a close working relationship with the NICEC team while observing their initial activity and interviewing them about it. His task has been to take the major responsibility for monitoring the first phase of the CGIP activity.
- 5.4 Our experience to date suggests that our summary of the first year of the project is likely to be based far more on experience derived from action in Bedfordshire and Knowsley than action in Haringey, as was initially envisaged. The project is already established in Bedfordshire schools, and Knowsley F.E. colleges, but, because of initial rejections and industrial action, access to Haringey remains problematic. However, one school in Haringey now seems likely to participate. Negotiations are continuing with others.

6. The Immediate Future

- 6.1 The resources bank will continue to be expanded and updated. Ideas towards a history and critique of careers guidance policy are beginning to emerge. These will be pursued.

- 6.2 Attendance at CRAC courses for careers teachers, counsellors and officers, is planned, to further contribute to our general understanding of current careers guidance theory and practice.
 - 6.3 The possibility of case-studying some of the institutions presently participating in the CGIP is now being considered.
 - 6.4 Thus considerable attention will now be given to planning, negotiating and implementing such case-studies. They will entail liason with the project team and the institutions concerned.
 - 6.5 When the project has achieved some substantial institutional footholds in the three Authorities, the PMM financial evaluators will discuss with the Project team means of collecting cost data.
7. Summary
- 7.1 The evaluation is under way but, sensitive to the Project team's need for "space" during early negotiations for access, is concentrating on building up its knowledge of the historical and organisational context of transition services and avoiding premature intrusion into the institutional settings where the Project is taking its first steps.
 - 7.2 Relationships between CGIP and the evaluators are amicable although there are technical problems of reconciling the needs of both teams for access to the pilot sites.
 - 7.3 The evaluation has had no difficulty so far in meeting the EEC requirements, and has submitted the two reports requested by IFAPLAN.

- 7.4 There seems no point yet in utilising the limited
available from the financial sub-project, until the
Project's form of involvement with schools and colleges
has reached a more developed stage.

Barry MacDonald
Director
Careers Guidance Observations

March 31, 1979

The CGIP Evaluation - Principles and Procedures of Enquiry and Reporting

Draft Guidelines

The CARGO evaluation will seek to render the work of CGIP accessible to a range of relevant audiences, both during the life of the programme and after it has ended. Among the audiences for the evaluation are the institutions in which the NICEC team will be working, the NICEC team itself, the DES and EEC. It is anticipated that there will be a number of external audiences who have a legitimate interest in the evaluation of CGIP and the CARGO project will be seeking to find ways of reporting to these interested parties. The CARGO guidelines are intended to cover the handling of information about the Project. They are principles and procedures for the guidance of the CGIP team, CARGO evaluators, schools, colleges, students and others with respect to arrangements for access to, control of, and distribution of evaluation data.

Confidentiality

1. Interviews, meetings, verbal and written exchanges will not be considered "off the record", but those involved are free, both before and after, to restrict aspects or parts of such transactions, or to correct and improve their statements.
2. Quotations, verbatim transcripts, and attributed observations, judgements, conclusions or recommendations need the explicit authorisation of the respondent.
3. Confidential material held by CARGO will be kept in locked files when not in use by authorised persons.
4. Information to be used in summarising findings across institutions or project sites or in speaking generally

about project activity which is sufficiently obscure as to be unrecognisable or unattributable will require no special clearance from the institutions or persons concerned.

5. The rules for confidentiality cannot be used to suppress evaluation reports.

Access to data and its release

1. The evaluation will seek only reasonable access to the work and personnel of the project or institutions.
2. The evaluation will seek only reasonable access to the written documents of the project or institutions. The team will not examine files, correspondence, or other internal documents without explicit authorisation and will not copy from those sources without permission.
3. Respondents will be given the opportunity to comment on the fairness, accuracy and relevance of reports concerning them and opportunities will be sought if necessary and possible to improve reports in respect of these comments. In some instances the CARGO team could be unwilling to change the report: if this should arise the report will contain whatever additional commentary those concerned wish to attach to it.

March, 1979