



Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union



Teachers' assessment (Zaprešić meeting) - Report

The Zaprešić meeting was the second meeting in our Erasmus+ KA229 project about New Teaching Methodologies (NTM). After the meeting, we asked all the participating teachers to complete a Google Form answering questions about the coordination and distribution of tasks within the project as well as the communication between the partner countries.

Furthermore, there were specific questions related to the Zaprešić meeting. Teachers were asked about the schedule, activities and student accommodation.

To conclude, partner countries were asked to assess each other's NTM presentations.

In total, 12 participating teachers completed this form. This means that in percentages, every answer counts for 8.3% of the total.

Project coordination & distribution of tasks

In general, 11 out of the 12 participants believes that the **tasks** within the project have been **distributed adequately** among the members of the team and that **responsibilities** are **shared very well or fairly well**. One participant believes that the workload is slightly unbalanced.

It was positively noted that **every member successfully presented their assignments** and that tasks were often distributed based on interests or necessary skills.

Furthermore, all respondents are **rather pleased** and most of them **very pleased** with the way the **coordinator** performed his duties of management and supervision throughout the project. Partner countries felt that they were informed well in advance of the tasks to be done and deadlines. They also received sufficient and detailed information to properly carry out the task(s) assigned to them.

In a later question, some did suggest a closer cooperation or **more information to be provided in advance**. There are of course practical limitations to how much information can be given in advance. **eTwinning** was said to be a **difficult**



Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union



platform to work with and **Messenger**, on the other hand, an **efficient medium for communication**. Everyone is still OK with Messenger and Google Drive being used as our main platforms of communication.

Some final remarks were that **more teachers** should be **involved** in every school - and in particular in the host school - to successfully carry out this project and that teachers being present during presentations of students may help to relieve stress.

Zaprešić schedule

Overall, 11 out of 12 participants were **very pleased** with the Zaprešić schedule. 1 thought it was too full. Everyone was also very pleased with the overall organisation.

2 out of 12 participants indicated that there was slightly too much work during the week. The rest believed the work/leisure balance to be adequately divided.

Zaprešić activities

Overall, there were **no negative remarks** about the types of activities. One recurring suggestion about the Zaprešić activities was that there could have been **more involvement of students and teachers** in shared activities. For example, the teachers being present while students give their presentations.

Zaprešić student accommodation

There was an overall positive score for the way student accommodation was handled. 80% gave a score of 5/5, 1 respondent 4/5 and another 3/5. So an **average of 4.8/5** for student accommodation, which is very similar to the score the students gave for their accommodation (4.7/5).

NTM presentations

Croatia, Portugal and **Spain** got an (almost) **perfect score** on whether the work and products that were presented complied with the fundamentals and main ideas of the methodology (ICT-Based Learning and Flipped Learning).



Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union



Belgium, Lithuania and Turkey convinced most partnest (but not everyone) that the work they presented mostly showed the intended NTMs. Most respondents still thought it was a good implementation of the methodologies, though.

Belgium

What were the **strong points**?

The video on Shakespeare's sonnet was a good example of preparation at home to be used in class. The explanatino of Google Forms for assessments was also easy, simple and can be used immediately in a variety of subjects. These tests also have immediate results and many participants in this survey reported that they would therefore also use this ICT tool in their actual classes in the future. Finally, the presentations were also reported to be clear and structured.

What **could be improved**?

ICT was only about Google Forms. Some would have liked to see how the Belgian colleagues actually introduce this in their subjects. More examples would have been nice. Similarly, about the flipped classroom activity, it was clear what the activity at home was, but not clear what would later happen inside the classroom after the students have watched the video.

Croatia

What were the **strong points**?

Overall the presentations of the activities were magnificent: clearly well-organised and very well-presented. The content matched the expectations; the project was focused on the topic, interesting and useful for the students. They presented completed works and an excellent selection of applications and methods. Furthermore, it was clear how students had to learn things at home and then create products in class.

What **could be improved**?



Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union



Some colleagues suggested that the flipped learning project could be split up into smaller projects since it sometimes seemed complex. The lessons could be kept small and remain a good practice of flipped learning.

Lithuania

What were the **strong points**?

This delegation worked with good and interesting topics and showed nicely edited videos, combining traditional content with modern tools. It was a clear skill-based approach. There were many good ideas that were put into practice, despite the sometimes limited resources.

What **could be improved**?

There were some communication issues and as a result, the information was not always perfectly clear. It was unclear what the exact use of ICT or tools was. Products of a class were presented, but it would also have been interesting if the process was discussed. Participants also pointed out the extensive use of videos in the presentation.

Portugal

What were the **strong points**?

The presentations were interesting to know more about the flipped classroom activities. They showed how to make a subject more interdisciplinary. The shown activities also had a good balance between fun and learning. The use of robots was said to be very interesting and this clearly motivated and engaged both the teachers and students.

interdisciplinary. The presentations were not too complicated, straightforward, clear and well-structured.

What **could be improved**?

Some details, examples and presentation of results were sometimes missing. It was unknown how assessment was done. And finally, one project was not entirely finished yet.



Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union



Spain

What were the **strong points**?

They delivered good, structured presentations that were easy to follow. Nearly all the participants reported on the value of their interdisciplinary approach - how their flipped classroom integrater several subjects within one project. It was also clear that students did research at home, worked collaboratively and later discuss and create at school. Furthermore, the reasons for the use of online tools were clearly justified.

What **could be improved**?

Some participants wanted more information about how to develop other aspects of the ICT applications and most partner countries would like to have seen fewer examples, and instead more details about the ones that were discussed.

Turkey

What were the **strong points**?

They gave an innovative presentation with nice tools and the projects included the whole group of teachers because the social network they use. There was a clear interdisciplinary approach when doing a lesson on cultural heritage in their country. The presentation was well-presented and organised.

What **could be improved**?

Several partner countries reported that they didn't actually see the details of how the methodologies that were presented were actually implemented in a classroom. They were given general ideas, without actual examples or evidence of the methodologies at work in the school and the process followed to do so.

What other countries will incorporate into their own practice

From all the NTMs that were presented by every country, the tools that other countries will also start using are mainly: Google Forms, video classes, Scratch, Madmagz, Sketchup, Zentation, Makey and many more. For a full, more detailed report, consult the Google Form that was used to create this report.



Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union



Conclusion

From all the remarks for improvement that were given, there was one that came back again and again, certainly when not everyone agreed on whether the work and products that were presented complied with the fundamentals and main ideas of the methodology (which is one of the main goals of this part of the project).

The main suggestion that was given to improve the quality of the presentations and the implemented methodologies even more was that there had to be a clear **focus on the process instead of only on the product**. It is more interesting to see **how students got to their results**. It contributes to our own teaching practice when we are shown results of **work that was actually done by the students in class, resulting from the New Teaching Methodologies** implemented by the teachers.