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Process monitoring in school prevention trials

- **Purposes:** interpretation, dissemination
- **Measures:** fidelity, quality, emerging problems
- **Characteristics:** multilevel
- **Tendence to report in literature:** three models
Principles of process monitoring in

- Eco-ergonomy
- Fidelity and critical issues
- Cultural adaptation
Report system

- **Structured forms**
  - Units (12)
  - Peers (7)
  - Parents (3)
  - Additional/alternative programs (2)

- **Mail, fax, e-mail**

- **Reminders**
Report on "Unplugged" base program- UNIT 1

Remember: you must fill a form for each unit you carry on. Tick the box corresponding to the unit you are now reporting on.

☐ Unit 1: Opening "Unplugged"

The unit was carried on in approximately:

-hours

-minutes

Number of students participating in this unit:

The following activities were performed; please, tick the boxes corresponding to the activities actually carried out during this particular unit. Please report the reasons for skipping any activity among the free commentaries.

Activity | Activity code
---|---
Opening | 1A
Set up rules/sanctions | 1B
Closure: assignment of tasks for unit 2 | 1C

Your subjective rating on the work with this unit:

Students' interest

Interactivity level

How comfortable the teacher felt teaching this unit

None/ Not at all | Moderate/ Moderately | High/ Fairly | Very high/ Very much
Compliance with the report system (interim data Feb 05, 8 centres)
Compliance with the report system (Oct 05, 6 centres)
Degree of implementation
Core Units
(interim data Feb 05, 7 centres)
Conduction time of core units

Average time per program core unit in 6 centres (Oct 05)
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% classes with completed unit
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Complementary components: peers’ and parents’ involvement

- **Peers:** low degree of report (all centres but 2) and implementation (all centres but 2)

- **Parents:** low participation rates (<20%) in 4 out of 7 reporting centres
Conclusions I

- Reporting system feasible and informative
- Reporting attitude influenced by application
- Clarity, timing and accessibility for delivery important
- Large variations between centres
Conclusions II

- Program critical points
  - Base curriculum: length of units, cultural adaptation
  - Peers: clarity of tasks
  - Parents: strategies of involvement

- Suggestions
  - Incorporate monitoring data in analysis of effects