

Pop-up example for programme theory/intervention logics

Denmark – Retention caravan

The programme theory (simplified version)

This example concerns the programme 'Retention Caravan' in Denmark which aims to:

- Increase the number of young people from ethnic minority backgrounds who make a positive choice to enter vocational education and training – i.e. they choose the track because they believe it is a good choice for them.
- Improve the retention of young people who start VET. The target for improving retention was set at 20% in each of the participating VET schools.

The underlying theory which justifies the choice of activities could be described as follows:

Young people from minority/migration background have a negative image of VET. They and their parents are not aware that in Denmark VET can lead to good quality jobs, with good employment and salary prospects. Therefore, they (and their parents) prefer to choose academic pathways even though they are more likely to struggle. The expectations placed on them ultimately makes them more likely to drop out. When they enrol in VET, they often do so under pressure and adopt a negative attitude towards their education.

The programme aims to develop a positive perception of VET so that they choose VET more frequently, and do so with positive expectations.

Teachers too often use pedagogies that identify gaps in young people's knowledge, rather than emphasising their strengths and building on these. This reinforces a negative self-perception for young people. This can demotivate them, and ultimately lead to them dropping out.

The programme aims to adapt teachers' practices to make them more positive, so that young people are aware of their value and their potential for improvement. This is expected to be motivating and result in greater retention.

	How the theory translates into an intervention logic	What does it mean for the evaluation?
Activities and inputs	<p>The programme aims to reach these objectives by targeting teachers and trainers. The key programme activities for each school are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ setting up a ‘retention coordinator’ function ■ training teachers to prepare them to use pedagogies that emphasise a young person’s strengths and possibilities ■ putting in place outreach activities towards parents and work with educational counsellors as contact points between the school and parents ■ setting up a local group of role models with young people from ethnic minority and migration backgrounds ■ developing learning groups in which young people are supported with homework <p>The costs and human resources mobilised to implement the programme should also be reflected in the evaluation.</p>	<p>The volume of inputs/activities should be monitored.</p> <p>This should be used to explain variations in results a) compared to expectations and b) between participating schools.</p> <p>For example: do schools that put in place more training for teachers report better results than others?</p>
Outputs	<p>By putting these activities in place, the programme should lead to the following outputs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ teachers took part in training ■ a coordinator function is in place ■ young people take part in learning groups ■ parents have contact with the schools ■ local role models have contact with the local community 	<p>These should be turned into output indicators. For example:</p> <p>The number of teachers trained, number of training hours delivered, number of young people taking part in learning groups, number of schools with a coordinator function, etc.</p> <p>These indicators can be compared to the indicators for the whole school – for example the share of teachers trained.</p> <p>The evaluation can look at the relationship between outputs and results. For example: do schools where a high proportion of teachers were trained report better results than others?</p>

<p>Immediate results</p>	<p>The immediate changes that these activities should trigger are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ teachers are more aware of the importance of using positive pedagogies ■ teachers have new skills, competences and practical tools to use positive pedagogies ■ coordinators put in place actions to monitor who is at risk of dropping out and provide them with support ■ young people receive individualised support during learning groups ■ young people feel comfortable in learning groups ■ the rate of completion of homework is increased for those taking part in learning groups ■ parents are better aware of the situation of their children in school ■ parents have a positive relationship with school staff ■ young people from minority/migration backgrounds are aware of positive examples of VET graduates similar to them ■ etc. 	<p>These expected changes are translated into result indicators. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ share of teachers who report being better prepared to use positive pedagogies ■ share of parents who report having positive, regular contact with the school <p>These indicators capture the immediate expected changes. If the higher-level results and impacts are not sufficiently evident, the problems are to be found at this level of the logical chain of effects.</p>
<p>Intermediate results (higher level than the immediate ones)</p>	<p>The above should in turn lead to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ teachers applying positive pedagogies in practice ■ young people having better school results ■ parents being more supportive of their children's education ■ parents having a positive image of VET ■ young people having a positive image of VET ■ etc. 	<p>These statements should be translated into result indicators, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ number and share of teachers trained who changed their teaching practices ■ number and share of parents who changed their perception of VET <p>If there is little change in these results, this could be explained by the intensity and quality of activities put in place and the volume of outputs (e.g. not enough teachers were reached, the training was not practical enough, etc.)</p>
<p>Impacts (highest level)</p>	<p>Ultimately, the chain of actions should result in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ higher number of young people from minority/migration backgrounds registering in VET programmes; ■ lower number of drop-outs from VET programmes 	<p>These are the main indicators to assess the programme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ number and share of young people from minority/migration backgrounds registered in VET ■ number and share of young people who drop out <p>If these indicators are not changing but the indicators at lower levels are changing positively, this suggests that there is possibly a flaw in the programme theory – i.e. that the expected relationship between some of the levels of the intervention logic is not clear in practice.</p>