

Report on: Students' Evaluation of C1 Meeting

This meeting took place at Gymnazium Celakowice in Celakowice, Czech Republic from December 17 to 21, 2018 and focused on the project issues **Agriculture and Traditional Remedies**. The total number of guest participants in this meeting was 24 (6 from Greece, 5 from Spain, 4 from Germany, 5 from Turkey and 4 from Italy) and there were also 10 local participants out of which only 4 responded to the evaluation questionnaire. Therefore, the total number of respondents, i.e. students who evaluated this meeting is 28. They answered a set of "How far ... " questions seeking answers on a Linear scale from 1 to 4. These aimed at eliciting the degree to which the project goals and meeting objectives were achieved. There were also questions providing options in checkboxes to reveal the ways in which the goals and objectives were achieved.

Questions 1-15 are about the meeting as a whole, questions 15-18 concern the presentations made at this meeting, questions 19-31 focus on each of the meeting activities separately and questions 31 and 32 refer to the cooperation among students for this meeting.

Evaluation of the meeting as a whole

Q 1 seeks after the degree to which students felt that this meeting helped them realise their European identity; which is a macro-goal and priority of this project.

Half of the students felt that this meeting did help them become better aware of their European identity to a great extent while the other half felt that this was achieved to a fairly good extent. This being one of the priorities of our project we find the students' responses quite encouraging.

Qs 2 -5 refer to the objectives of this particular meeting.

Q 2 concerns the degree to which students were able to discover the common agricultural heritage among their countries.

Agriculture being a fundamental aspect of culture, one of the main objectives of this meeting was to help our students discover how much of the agricultural heritage of Europe is actually common among all six counties participating in this project. We found out that only 32% of the participants in this meeting did assess the degree to which they were able to do so as really high while 50% of them felt that they discovered it only to an extent. The low achievement of this objective may be attributed to the fact that the students had no time to work on a common product comparing the agricultural wealth across our countries during the meeting. They did cooperate to create a common presentation of the shared agricultural heritage as a follow-up activity but the evaluation had been completed prior to that.

Q 3 focuses on the added value of this meeting as to the students' appreciation of their own country's agricultural heritage.

Another important objective of this meeting was to foster our students' appreciation of their country's agricultural heritage. Their responses to this evaluation question were quite encouraging since almost 6 out of 10 students answered that they did so to a great extent and 3 out of 10 did so to a satisfactory extent.

Q 4 aims at assessing how far each student was encouraged to appreciate the traditional remedies in their country.

The traditional remedies sustained in each cultural context are another aspect of cultural heritage; quite relevant to agriculture, too. Therefore, this meeting aimed at the students' appreciation of them at national level. Their responses to revealed that this objective was actually met quite satisfactorily since half of the students rated their appreciation of the traditional remedies in their country as great and the other half as quite high.

Q 5 assesses the students' awareness of how many traditional remedies their country has in common with the other project countries.

As regards the percentage of the students who were helped by this meeting to discover the common traditional remedies across the project countries, it is clearly lower than that referring to the traditional remedies of one's own country. Only 4 in 10 students were able to realise to a great extent how many traditional remedies our countries share and about 3 in 10 did so quite easily but there were also 3 out of 10 students who responded that they hardly managed to see the similarities in the traditional remedies among our countries from the presentations. This is another indication that it is essential for students to work on a common product during the meetings in order to be able to juxtapose the information from each individual country's perspective. Hopefully, this objective was met through the students' cooperation for the follow-up activity compiling a table of traditional remedies across all countries; but this could not be reflected in the evaluation which was conducted shortly after the meeting.

Qs 6 – 9 are about entrepreneurship which is another project priority and macro-goal.

Q 6 addresses the meeting's contribution to each of the students' awareness of their entrepreneurial potential.

To promote the students' entrepreneurial potential and help them self-assess their entrepreneurial spirit has been another priority of this project. To this end, an online questionnaire had been shared among the students to respond to prior to this first project meeting and to be repeated at a later stage. Only six of the students participating in this meeting had already responded to this pre-meeting requirement so the responses to this question in the meeting evaluation questionnaire are independent from the self-assessment quiz in entrepreneurship and rely only on the meeting activities and what the participants could infer about their entrepreneurial attitudes while participating in them. The responses reveal that about 86% of our students were helped by this meeting to become aware of their entrepreneurial potential (half of them to a great extent and the other half to a satisfactory extent) whereas more than 10% did not notice any difference made through this meeting regarding entrepreneurship. This is far from surprising because no special work had been done to his goal prior to the meeting.

Q 7 refers to the students' awareness of the entrepreneurial potential of agriculture through this meeting.

When it comes to the entrepreneurial potential of agriculture in particular, our students' responses suggest that only 4 out of 10 were able to fully appreciate the entrepreneurial potential of agriculture – in its sustainable/organic idea, of course. A slightly higher

percentage (43%) became better aware of it to a satisfactory but not a great extent while 2 out of 10 students hardly considered agriculture as an enterprise for themselves. Upon reflection, we attribute the low achievement of this objective to the negative attitudes of our students towards a rural lifestyle, as assumed from the everyday classroom discussions and also manifested during a discussion at the meeting. It remains a challenge for this project to promote more positive attitudes towards nature, the countryside, agriculture and rural lifestyle by combining them with entrepreneurship and sustainability.

Q 8 regards the enhancement of the students' awareness of the entrepreneurial potential of traditional remedies through this meeting.

Another objective of this meeting was to enhance our students' awareness and appreciation of the entrepreneurial potential of traditional remedies. Their responses to this particular question in the evaluation questionnaire are slightly more favourable than the ones referring to the entrepreneurial potential of agriculture. This could be an indication of the fact that enterprises promoting natural health products and cosmetics as well as health practitioners are more prestigious among young people than agricultural practice.

Q 9 concerns the students' awareness of the entrepreneurial potential of tourism and how far this was increased through this meeting.

Tourism was beyond the scope of this meeting – and within the scope of the next one – so we did not expect to elicit very favourable answers to the question on the degree to which our students were helped by this meeting to appreciate the entrepreneurial potential of tourism. However, it was revealed by their responses that for vast majority of them (60%) did so to a great extent while another 32,1% were made better aware of the entrepreneurial potential of tourism through this meeting, perhaps thanks to the sightseeing tour in Prague.

Qs 10-15 address macro-goals and macro-skills that this project aims at.

Q 10 is about the familiarisation of students with the culture of the hosting school.

Becoming better acquainted with the host culture is a macro goal of this project among the priorities of which it is to foster the awareness of the European heritage. Half of the students felt very satisfied and a high proportion of them (35,7 %) felt quite satisfied with the degree of their familiarisation with the Czech culture through this meeting.

Q 11 seeks to assess the students' self-evaluation of the enhancement of their foreign language skills, i.e. communicative competence in English.

Foreign language communicative competence is a key competence our project has been aiming at. According to their responses, 3 out of 4 of our students felt that their communicative skills in English have greatly increased through their participation in this meeting.

Q 12 asks students to reflect on this meeting's contribution to the development of their interpersonal skills of cooperation and negotiation.

Another key competence is cooperation in teams which requires interpersonal skills of presentation, negotiation and communication. It was found out that this meeting was felt to have helped our students develop these macro-skills with 6 in 10 students deeming this progress made at the meeting as great and another 3 in 10 students as quite satisfactory.

Q 13 address the promotion of the students' digital skills through this meeting.

Another crucial set of macro-skills are digital skills whose promotion our project aims at in the wider context of key competencies. It was felt by our students that this meeting helped them further develop their digital skills only moderately with half of them considering this development to be great and about 20% considering it satisfactory while about 15% thought of it as just marginal and one in ten students having hardly noticed any difference. The low achievement of this goal might be attributed to the fact that our students had not yet started to explore the digital tools available for their cooperation and the dissemination of our products.

Q 14 concerns the students' creativity and how far they felt that this meeting helped them to develop it further.

A major key competency is creativity whose development is aimed through activities involving the production of multi-modal texts for presentation. This meeting was felt to have greatly contributed to this goal by about 6 in 10 respondents and quite satisfactorily by 2 in 10 respondents while another 2 in 10 thought this goal was hardly achieved at this meeting.

Q 15 regards the contribution of this meeting to developing the students' thinking skills.

Another set of macro-skills we have been aiming at is critical thinking skills. It was found out that the participants in this first meeting felt their thinking skills to have been greatly fostered through this meeting by 60% and to have been satisfactorily fostered by about 30%.

Evaluation of the presentations made at this meeting

Q 16 asks students about the degree to which they benefited from making a presentation at this meeting.

As regards the degree to which they benefited from making a presentation at this meeting, half of our students (53%) responded that they did greatly benefit and three in ten did so quite satisfactorily while two in ten considered the benefit to be little.

Q 17 asks them about the degree to which they benefited from the presentations made by the other partner school teams at this meeting.

Compared to the ones given to the previous question, the responses to this one about the degree to which our students benefited from the presentations made by the other school teams are significantly less favourable. Only half of them were quite satisfied while the other half felt they did only barely or hardly benefit from the presentations of the partner schools. This low level of satisfaction could be attributed to the fact that this was only the first meeting.

Q 18 requires students to reflect on the ways in which they benefited from the presentations on the issues this meeting focused on: Agriculture and Traditional Remedies.

When asked to explain how they benefited from the presentations on Agriculture and Traditional Remedies, 3 in 4 students selected the option stating that their communicative competence in English was improved. The next most popular option (with about 70%) was that they realised how much of the European agricultural heritage our countries shared; which is really surprising compared to their low response to this objective in Q 2 above.

Similarly, a strangely high percentage of respondents opted for the benefit of having realised how many traditional remedies they have in common with the other project countries; which contradicts their responses to Q 5 above.

Evaluation of the workshops and activities of this meeting

Q 19 asks students how far they benefited from their participation in the Physiotherapy workshop.

On the second project day we attended a workshop in Physiotherapy by a Czech specialist who has developed her own technique known as ACT (Acral Co-activation Therapy). We were shown various exercises and tried them individually and in pairs. The expert also talked to us about the profession of the physiotherapist. When asked to assess this workshop, 66,7 % of the students were greatly satisfied and 28,6% of them were quite satisfied by it while just 7,1% were hardly satisfied.

Q 20 requires them to select the best options in order to explain how they believe that they benefited from it.

Surprisingly, the vast majority of our students chose to explain the ways in which they mostly benefited from the Physiotherapy workshop in terms of its contribution to their appreciation of the entrepreneurial potential of Physiotherapy. As stated above, this could be attributed to the relatively high prestige of the profession of the therapist among young people when compared to that of the farmer. A significant percentage (over 60%) deemed this workshop as highly beneficial because it provided them with a hands-on-experience of physiotherapy. Similarly, half of the students considered it important that they were acquainted with an innovative system of therapeutic exercise, namely ACT.

Q 21 is about the students' participation in the workshops involving manufacturing soap, candle and chocolate in a traditional way. It asks them how far they benefited from them.

Following to the Physiotherapy workshop we visited the Chocolate Factory where we took a workshop in manufacturing soap, candle and chocolate in a traditional way. A lot of the students who participated in it (about 60%) found it great and three out of five found it quite satisfactory.

Q 22 asks them which of the three workshops they found most beneficial.

When asked which of the three products they most enjoyed manufacturing, a striking percentage of 46,4% answered in favour of chocolate while about 30% preferred the candle making and only 21,4% enjoyed manufacturing soap. Considering the fact that all three workshops were similarly structured, this difference may be explained by the age of the respondents who are fond of chocolate.

Q 23 requests them to choose the ways in which they benefited from these workshops.

The opportunity to have a hands-on-experience of manufacturing everyday products in a natural way as well to cooperate in an international team in doing so where the most preferred options among the respondents asked to explain how they benefited from the soap, candle and chocolate workshops (with 71,4% in both cases). Surprisingly, six in ten

students agreed that the benefit of these workshops lay in its contribution to realising the business potential of this activity.

Q 24 addresses the degree to which students found that they benefited from the workshops involving bread making, basket weaving and pottery making.

On the third project day we participated in three more workshops involving bread making, basket weaving and pottery making. Almost 7 in 10 of the participants thought they were highly beneficial and the rest of them found the workshops quite beneficial.

Q 25 asks them in which ways they felt that they benefited from them.

When asked how they benefited from their participation in the bread, basket and pottery workshops, almost 8 in 10 students chose the option referring to the development of their creativity, probably having pottery in mind. A significant percentage (71, 4%) appreciated the opportunity to have a hands-on-experience manufacturing these products. Another great percentage (about 70%) appreciated the opportunity to cooperate with others and six in ten students saw the business potential of sustainable practices in manufacturing. Interestingly, one of the respondents added the option “I admired the activity of the museum there” which probably refers to the entrepreneurial potential of such activities, too.

Q 26 concerns the visit to the sustainable homes and asks students about the degree to which they benefited from it.

On the last project day our students visited the sustainable homes in a village where they saw replicas of traditional homes, everyday objects and how people lived about 200 years ago. About half of them regarded this visit as highly beneficial and one in five as quite beneficial.

Q 27 requires students to say how they benefited from this visit by selecting on or more of the given options.

Trying to account for the benefits they drew from this activity, the vast majority of the students (85, 7%) chose the option that they could vividly see how people lived two centuries ago while one in two was helped to visualise what sustainability involves when it comes to clothes, furniture, heating and other aspects of traditional practices to meet everyday needs.

Q 28 addresses the socialisation party and asks students how far they benefited from it.

On the second project day, there was a party for the students to get better acquainted with each other. This activity involved playing traditional music from our countries and dancing to it. Although this aspect of culture was to be dealt with at a later meeting, we included a question to assess its benefits. Almost 9 in 10 students found it extremely enjoyable and one in ten found it quite enjoyable.

Q 29 seeks to elicit the ways in which students felt that they benefited from this party.

Predictably, the most beneficial aspect of the socialisation party was thought to be the lively atmosphere while a good number of the respondents (71, 4%) also appreciated the opportunity to share music and dance (intangible cultural goods) with their peers from the other countries. Interestingly, six in ten found it beneficial to discover how much their traditional music and dance had in common with those from the other countries.

Q 30 focuses on the guided tour to Prague. It asks how far they benefited from it.

The most cherished activity was clearly the tour in Prague. Almost 93% of the students enjoyed it to a great extent and 7, 1% found it quite beneficial.

Q 31 asks about the ways in which students benefited from the trip to Prague.

Among the most popular benefits our students thought they drew from the tour to Prague was their appreciation of the most beautiful architectural masterpieces in the old city. Interestingly, half of them were able to identify the entrepreneurial potential of tourism as another benefit from this activity.

Self-evaluation of the cooperation among students

Q 32 asks students to reflect on the extent to which they cooperated with their peers from their own school on the presentation products of this meeting.

Almost six in ten students did cooperate closely and successfully with their peers from their own school on the presentation products of this meeting and three in ten stated that they cooperated loosely. We acknowledge this weakness and have tried to make up for it.

Q 33 asks them about the extent they cooperated with their peers from the other partner schools on the follow-up products of this meeting.

The extent to which the participants in this first meeting cooperated with their peers from the other partner schools was felt to be great only by 28,6% while 50% found it just satisfactory and about 18% thought poorly of it. Let it be added that this cooperation in international groups was only made possible for the creation of the follow-up products of this meeting since the timetable of the meeting did not allow students enough time to work in international teams there. This drawback was taken into account when preparing the timetable of the following meetings.