



Empowering Teachers
for Automatic Recognition
ETAR project

**Empowering teachers
to make pupil mobility
a reality for everyone!**

Research report

The impact of the Training Model
on teachers' knowledge, skills, and attitudes
regarding the assessment
of pupils' transversal competences
developed via long-term individual mobility

Marta Kowalczyk-Wałędziak (University of Białystok)
In cooperation with Elisa Briga (EFIL) and Mattia Baiutti
(Fondazione Intercultura)



**Co-funded by
the European Union**

Białystok and Brussels

Version 11/24



Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

Table of contents

Executive summary

Chapter 1: Introduction and background

- 1.1. European and national context for the study
- 1.2. Overview of the *Training Model*

Chapter 2: Investigating the impact of the *Training Model*

- 2.1. Theoretical framework
- 2.2. Implementation of the *Training Model* in practice
- 2.3. Methodology and research design
 - 2.3.1. Research purpose
 - 2.3.2. Procedure and timing
 - 2.3.3. Research design
 - 2.3.3.1 Phase 1 (teacher trainers)
 - 2.3.3.2 Phase 2 (teachers)
 - 2.3.3.3 Phase 2 (teachers and teacher trainers)
 - 2.3.4. Ethical considerations

Chapter 3: Results

- 3.1. Impact of the *Training Model* from the perspective of teacher trainers
 - 3.1.1. Teacher trainers' opinions and perceptions regarding the *Training Model*
 - 3.1.2. Teacher trainers' confidence in adapting and delivering the *Training Model* to teachers in their own countries
 - 3.1.3. Teacher trainers' opinions on the training they received
- 3.2. Impact of the *Training Model* from the perspective of teachers
 - 3.2.1. Pre-test to post-test change in teachers' knowledge, skills, and attitudes regarding assessing transversal competences pupils gained via long-term individual mobility
 - 3.2.2. Teachers' opinions on the *Training Model*
- 3.3. Long term effects of the *Training Model* on teachers' pedagogical practices
 - 3.3.1. Teachers' perceptions regarding the usefulness of the knowledge, skills, and attitudes gained via the *Training Model* in preparing their students for a mobility period
 - 3.3.2. Teacher trainers' experiences in supporting teachers to adopt this newly gained knowledge and skill set into their practice

Chapter 4: Conclusions and next steps

References

Annexes

Annex 1. Training model adaptations - Overview in English

Annex 2. The impact of the Training Model on teachers' knowledge, skills, and attitudes regarding the assessment of pupils' transversal competences developed via long-term individual mobility (2023)

Annex 3. Survey questionnaire for teacher trainers

Annex 4. Survey questionnaire for teachers (pre-test)

Annex 5. Survey questionnaire for teachers (post-test)

Annex 6. Interview questions for teachers – pre-pupil mobility

Annex 7. Interview questions for teachers - after pupil mobility

Annex 8. Interview questions for teacher trainers

Executive summary

The *Training Model* is a course designed with the main aim of empowering secondary school teachers, headteachers, and other staff in their knowledge, skills, and attitudes towards assessing the transversal competences gained via long-term individual pupil mobilities (IPM). This model was created as a part of the *Expert Network on Recognition of outcomes of learning periods abroad in general secondary education*, in order to support secondary school teachers in recognising and assessing pupils' learning outcomes within a framework that goes beyond strict compliance with a national curriculum and the general assessment methods applied to their peers. It has been piloted in three countries, i.e. Belgium (Flanders), Estonia, and Poland, where there is a high demand for knowledge in this field due to a lack of national IPM recognition policies, resulting in pupils returning from long-term IPM requiring a gap year.

The overall purpose of the research presented in this report was to test and adapt a particular model of teacher professional development (TPD), i.e. the *Training Model* for teachers assessing the transversal competences developed via individual pupil mobility, in three European countries: Poland, Estonia, and Belgium. This research employs a mixed-methods design, using survey questionnaires and individual interviews to explore teacher trainers' and teachers' perceptions and experiences of the *Training Model*.

The findings revealed that almost all of the teacher trainers perceive the *Training Model* to be a useful form of teachers' professional development in terms of increasing teachers' knowledge of IPM and assessing the transversal competences acquired by pupils via long-term IPM. The teacher trainers' views are further confirmed by the teachers themselves, i.e. the main agents of IPM in their schools. Indeed, the results show that from the pre-test phase (before participating in *Training Model*) to the post-test phase (just after completing it), the teachers significantly expanded their knowledge, skills, and attitudes towards internationalisation and assessing the transversal competences gained by pupils via long-term IPM. The results also show that the teachers attribute these positive changes in their knowledge, skills, and attitudes to the specific qualities and structure of the *Training Model*. In particular, they appreciated that the *Training Model* created opportunities for them to: share their knowledge, experience, and ideas with other participants and the trainers; freely discuss and evaluate its content and proposed activities; as well as extend their knowledge and skills regarding the *Learning Agreement* as a tool for assessing transversal competences, especially intercultural competences.

Therefore, these findings show that the *Training Model* serves as a useful tool for empowering teachers in assessing the transversal competences developed by their pupils via IPM, suggesting that it is worth testing and implementing beyond Poland, Belgium (Flanders), and Estonia.

This report consists of four chapters. **Chapter 1** outlines the European and national context for the study as well as overviews the *Training Model's* structure and content and explains the need to pilot it in Belgium (Flanders), Estonia, and Poland. **Chapter 2** discusses the theoretical and methodological foundation for the piloting phase, as well as outlines the research design for gathering data from the teacher trainers and teachers involved in the pilot. **Chapter 3** presents the results from the pilot, encompassing the perspectives of both teacher trainers and teachers. **Chapter 4** identifies the study's main conclusions, and suggests some onward directions for implementing the *Training Model* in the wider European context.

Chapter 1. Introduction and background

1.1. European and national context for the study

In recent years, the European Union has promoted the implementation of programmes and strategies aimed at increasing educational mobility in the school sector, recognising its numerous benefits for pupils, teachers, schools, education systems, and the citizens of its member states. This commitment is reflected in the objectives of the European Education Area (EEA), where learning mobility is expected to become the norm by 2025. To achieve this aim, the EU has launched several policy initiatives, such as the 2018 Automatic Recognition Council Recommendation and the 2024 Europe on the Move Council Recommendation.

Running through all of these initiatives is a significant emphasis on creating favourable conditions for individual long-term pupil mobility (IPM). Briga and Looney (2021) define IPM as an educational programme for 14-18-year olds which: is a school-pupil exchange; involves individual pupils (rather than groups of pupils); is organised by any type of provider (i.e. whether public, non-profit or for-profit sector); runs for periods from 2-3 months up to a full school year; entails local school attendance abroad, usually in the host country language (rather than simply the attendance of a language course), as well as any type of living arrangement (e.g. host family, boarding school, or hostels). In addition, IPM programmes are temporary by definition, and pupils return to their home country at the end of the exchange. This type of mobility is found to be highly beneficial because it not only enhances students' personal development and intercultural competences, but also strengthens their academic and social skills. Furthermore, IPM fosters mutual understanding, builds a sense of European identity, and contributes to preparing young people for a globalised and interconnected world. Therefore, by addressing the financial, administrative, and recognition barriers to IPM, the EU can ensure that these opportunities are accessible to as many students as possible, thus maximising their potential benefits for both individuals and communities.

In line with these efforts and policy initiatives, the European Parliament established and funded the Preparatory Action Expert Network on Recognition of outcomes of learning periods abroad in general secondary education (operating between 2020 and 2021). Its primary aim was to examine recognition practices across member states, and to provide the tools and resources for policymakers and teachers to advance the objectives of automatic recognition outlined in the 2018 Council Recommendation on Automatic Recognition. These objectives include ensuring that 'the outcomes of a learning period abroad are recognised in the home country, without requiring the learner to undergo extensive examinations or repeat

the programme year in their country of origin'. This approach seeks to seamlessly integrate mobility experiences into pupils' educational journeys, reducing access barriers and encouraging their wider participation.

Expert Network on Recognition of outcomes of learning periods abroad in general secondary education: Member States Analysis revealed that, in 23 EU countries, recognising learning periods abroad lasting for up to five or six months is the responsibility of teachers in the sending school (with the exception of Greece where only periods of a full school year abroad are allowed). In addition, in 19 of these countries, the recognition of a full school year abroad officially depends on the assessment carried out by teachers in the sending school. However, evidence shows that, in reality, such recognition is rare or non-existent in 10 of these countries, because teachers do not have the tools or guidelines needed for recognising the learning outcomes of pupils returning from IPM via a framework that goes beyond strict compliance to their national curriculum and/or the assessment methods used for the pupil's peers (i.e. who have not embarked on IPM). This problematic situation, as highlighted in the *Member States Analysis*, is particularly evident in Belgium (Flanders), Estonia, and Poland – countries where recognition is rare where there is a lack of teacher training to drive systemic change in this area.

Having in mind the lack of provision mentioned above, the Expert Network developed a Training Model for education professionals on Assessment of Transversal Competences developed in long-term individual (Jurczik-Arnold & Baiutti, 2021) – a course designed to prepare and support schools in fostering the automatic recognition of pupils' long-term IPM learning periods abroad. In an effort to pilot and assess the effectiveness of the Training Model, the European Federation for Intercultural Learning (EFIL) launched the Erasmus+ project *Empowering Teachers for Automatic Recognition* (ETAR), which ran from 2022 to 2024 in Belgium (Flanders), Estonia, and Poland. These three countries were chosen because their implementation of the model provides an opportunity to observe the immediate impact of introducing recognition. While relatively few schools in these countries have experience with this type of recognition, there is significant willingness among key stakeholders to explore and develop this approach further, highlighting the potential for meaningful progress in this area.

Against this backdrop, this report presents research findings pertaining to the impact of the Training Model on secondary school teachers' knowledge, skills, and attitudes in terms of assessing pupils' transversal competences developed via long-term IPM – from the perspectives of both teacher trainers and teachers.

1.2. Overview of the *Training Model*

The *Training Model* is a course designed at empowering secondary school teachers, headteachers, and staff in their knowledge, skills, and attitudes towards assessing the transversal competences gained via long-term IPM. At the core of this model lies the principle that automatic recognition is possible because the curricula of both the sending and host countries are 'broadly in line'. That is to say, it recognises that the learning outcomes of IPM encompass not only subject-specific knowledge but also transversal competences (in particular intercultural competences), which can be assessed by teachers despite the differences between national curricula (Jurczik-Arnold & Baiutti, 2021).

The core content of the *Training Model* draws both from the existing literature and teacher training experiences gathered by Baiutti (2018; 2019; 2021) in the Italian context. The conceptual framework presented in the *Training Model* progressively introduces learners to defining learning outcomes as competences, which encompass knowledge, skills, and attitudes. It further examines the concept of transversal competences through various frameworks, ultimately concentrating on intercultural competences and corresponding assessment tools.

The *Training Model* is organised around three thematic sessions:

1. the context and value of long-term individual pupil mobility (IPM) within the wider process of internationalising school education;
2. learning outcomes and transversal competences relevant to long-term IPM;
3. assessment of the transversal competences developed via long-term IPM.

The recommended timeframe for the training course is approximately 12 hours if delivered in person, and approximately nine hours if delivered remotely or in a blended format (i.e. online plus in person). The intended learning outcomes of the *Training Model* (to be achieved via a variety of teaching methods, e.g. practical exercises, reflective questions, and open discussions) are as follows:

- understanding the context and pedagogy of long-term individual pupil mobility, including relevant European and national legislation
- developing openness and positive attitudes towards the internationalisation of schools, specifically long-term individual pupil mobility and its pedagogical value
- becoming aware of existing transversal competence frameworks, specifically intercultural competence frameworks
- developing a critical understanding of the expected learning outcomes gained via individual pupil mobility
- developing an understanding of the overall principles of competence-based assessment in the context of individual pupil mobility

- gaining the motivation and competences needed for assessing learning outcomes specific to individual pupil mobility, in particular intercultural competences
- becoming familiar with and being ready to use existing resources linked to the assessment of the learning outcomes achieved via individual pupil mobility

Having in mind that the Training Model is grounded in solid theoretical and conceptual foundations, it may serve as a comprehensive and solid teacher professional development programme that may empower teachers in assessing the transversal competences developed by pupils via IPM.

Chapter 2. Investigating the impact of the Training Model

2.1. Theoretical framework

The theoretical framework chosen for investigating the impact of the *Training Model* on secondary school teachers' knowledge, skills, and attitudes in terms of assessing pupils' transversal competences developed via long-term IPM is based on the teacher professional development (TPD) models devised by Guskey (2000) and Desimone (2009). Both models are widely recognised in the existing literature and provide condensed, uncomplicated, and workable methodological guidance for the evaluation of TPD impact on professional practice. Furthermore, both researchers point out that there is a need to regularly measure not only short-term but also long-term outcomes of TPD, using clear methodological approaches and many different research tools, in order to capture various elements and perspectives. The following section provides an overview of these models.

Guskey's model (2000) provides a detailed, five-level framework for evaluating the impact of teachers' professional development on their practice, followed by particular techniques that may be used to collect data:

- *Participants' reactions*: focused on assessing whether or not the participants are satisfied with the content and organisation of the TPD – carried out via questionnaires at the end of the course
- *Participants' learning*: focused on measuring the knowledge and skills that the participants gained during their TPD experience, i.e. the attainment of specific learning goals – carried out via paper-and-pencil instruments, simulation demonstrations, reflections (oral and/or written), and portfolios
- *Organisation support and change*: focused on exploring the organisation's support and change processes in practically implementing teachers' newly acquired knowledge and skills gained from their TPD activities – carried out via questionnaires, interviews with participants and district or school administrators, as well as portfolios
- *Participants' use of new knowledge and skills*: focused on investigating the implementation of new ideas and practices in teaching settings, preferably some time after the end of the TPD programme, because only then can the real impact of the new skills on professional practice be measured – carried out via questionnaires, structured interviews with participants and their supervisors,

participant reflections and portfolios, direct observations, and video or audio recordings

- *Student learning outcomes*: focused on examining how TPD activities affect student learning outcomes – carried out via student and school records; questionnaires; interviews with students, parents, teachers, and/or administrators; and participant portfolios

Desimone's (2009) TPD framework suggests five sequential levels for evaluating the effects of TPD: ranging from teachers' experiences of the core features of TPD; to changes in their knowledge, skills, and attitudes; to increased instructional practices; and to changes in student learning outcomes. The fifth and final component in this model is described as a 'context' – including, for example, teachers' and students' characteristics, leadership, and school policies. In contrast to Guskey, Desimone does not specify concrete methods for evaluation for each stage of her model, arguing that all observation, interview, and survey tools used to measure professional development and its effects on instruction have both strengths and weaknesses; she posits that it is, therefore, better to instead select data collection methods to suit each unique context or situation.

The theoretical framework of the *Training Model* impact developed for this study draws core elements from both models, namely:

- it purposefully focuses on changes generated by the *Training Model* in teachers' knowledge, skills, and attitudes regarding the assessment of the transversal competences gained via long-term pupil mobilities,
- it gathers information not only from teachers but also from other stakeholders (i.e. teacher trainers),
- it combines various methods of data collection, i.e. survey tools and interviews,
- it examines both short term effects (i.e. teachers' satisfaction with the *Training Model*) and long-term effects (i.e. teachers' implementation of their updated/new knowledge, attitudes, and skills via the *Training Model* before and after sending their students for a period of mobility)

Another important source of insight for devising the theoretical framework in this study were the guidelines for the implementation, assessment, and evaluation included in the *Training Model on assessment of transversal competences developed in IPM* (Jurczik and Baiutti, 2020). These guidelines offer the following principles:

- evaluate the short term impact of the training (i.e. immediately after completing the *Training Model*) and the long term impact of the training (i.e. six to ten months after completing the *Training Model*),
- gather feedback from diverse stakeholders: e.g., teachers and head teachers,
- be mindful that national legislation may influence the rules governing training

- accreditation and evaluation in practice,
- be ready to apply evaluation findings to adapt trainings going forwards.

2.2. Implementation and adaptation of the *Training Model* in practice

In line with the ETAR project aims, the *Training Model* was implemented and adapted in three complimentary phases.

Phase 1: Training teacher trainers (1st edition) from Poland, Estonia, and Belgium regarding the *Training Model on assessment of Transversal competences developed via IPM*, as well as its adaptation and implementation. The training of teacher trainers (1st edition) was delivered by project team members in a blended format: one online training session (June 2022) and a four-day residential training (August 2022). During this phase, teacher trainers were empowered to:

- adapt and deliver the *Training Model* for teachers in their own countries,
- support teachers after the *Training Model* course in using the approaches and tools covered,
- join a European network of teacher trainers knowledgeable about the assessment of transversal skills gained via individual pupil mobility (IPM) and eager to share good practices for the *Training Model* implementation.

The core programme of training for teacher trainers was organised around three main thematic sessions, drawn from the *Training Model*: (1) the context and value of long-term IPM within the process of internationalising school education; (2) learning outcomes and transversal competences relevant to long-term IPM; and (3) assessment of transversal competences developed via long-term IPM. These sessions were complemented by: one introductory session on the broader ETAR project; three reflection sessions on how to adapt the content just learned for use in their own context; one session on the monitoring framework and tools; and one session on the planning of trainings at national level.

Phase 2: Training teachers with direct IPM experience from Poland, Estonia, and Belgium (Flanders) on the *Training Model* and its implementation. Two editions of the training were conducted. The first edition took place in all three countries between November 2022 and March 2023. The second edition took place in Poland and Belgium (Flanders) between November 2023 and April 2024. The training was not offered in Estonia due to insufficient interest among teachers.

The training for teachers was delivered by teachers trainers and was organised around three core three thematic sessions: (1) the context and value of long-term individual pupil mobility (IPM) within the wider process of internationalising school education; (2) learning outcomes and transversal competences relevant to long-term IPM; (3) assessment of the transversal competences developed via long-term IPM.

Phase 3: Supporting teachers after the *Training Model* in implementing new knowledge and skills in their own teaching practice. Teacher trainers from three countries offered their support to teachers who had:

- a) participated in the 1st edition of the *Training Model* – by preparing the *Learning Agreement* for pupils starting their mobility period from the 1st of September 2023, as well as assessing of the outcomes of IPM learning periods via communication with host schools once pupils had returned
- b) participated in the 2nd edition of the *Training Model* – by preparing the *Learning Agreement* for pupils starting their mobility period from the 1st of September 2024

Each of these phases of the *Training Model's* implementation included **data collection in order to comprehensively evaluate** its impact on developing secondary school teachers' knowledge, skills, and attitudes regarding the assessment of pupils' transversal competences gained through long-term IPM. Data were collected from key stakeholders (i.e. teacher trainers and teachers) across the three phases of training implementation and adaptation, as summarised in Table 1.

Table 1. Evaluation framework for assessing the impact of the *Training Model*

1st phase	2nd phase	3rd phase
Who was evaluated?		
teacher trainers (attending the 1st ETAR training for teacher trainers in August 2022)	teachers (attending two editions of trainings in Estonia, Poland, and Belgium, delivered by the teacher trainers trained at the 1st ETAR training for teacher trainers)	teachers who have sent their pupils for mobilities within the project duration teacher trainers
What was evaluated?		
teacher trainers’: - opinions and perceptions of the <i>Training Model</i> ; - confidence in using it and adapting it to their own national contexts - opinions on the training they received	teachers’: - knowledge, skills, and attitudes regarding the assessment of transversal competences before and after the training opinions on the <i>Training Model</i>	teachers’: - perceptions regarding the utility of their newly gained knowledge and skills in their practice teacher trainers’: - experiences of supporting teachers in adapting this new knowledge to their practice
How was this evaluation carried out?		
survey questionnaires	survey questionnaires both before and after the training (pre- and post-test)	interviews ¹ with teachers (both before and after mobility) and interviews with teacher trainers
When was this evaluation carried out?		
at the end of the training for teacher trainers	before and after the training for teachers	before and after sending pupils for periods of mobility

¹ Originally, focus group interviews were planned; however, due to the very small number of teachers who sent their students on IPM during the project, individual interviews with these teachers were conducted instead.

2.3. Methodology and research design

2.3.1. Research purpose

The overall purpose of the research was to test and adapt a particular model of TPD, i.e. the *Training Model* for teachers assessing the transversal competences developed via individual pupil mobility, in three European countries (i.e. Poland, Estonia, and Belgium). This research employs a mixed-methods approach (Cohen et al., 2018), using survey questionnaires, and individual interviews in order to explore key stakeholders' perceptions and experiences of the *Training Model*.

2.3.2. Procedure and timing

Data were collected from two groups of key stakeholders: i.e. teacher trainers and teachers across the three phases of training implementation and adaptation (see Table 1). The research design for these three phases will be explained in more depth below.

2.3.3. Research design

2.3.3.1. Phase 1 (teacher trainers)

Aims

The main aims of data collection during this phase were:

- to examine teacher trainers' opinions and perceptions regarding the *Training Model*,
- to investigate their confidence in adapting and delivering the *Training Model* to teachers in their own countries,
- to explore their opinions on the training they received (in terms of structure, content, and activities).

Instrument

Data were collected from teacher trainers via survey questionnaire at the end of their final training session. The survey was prepared in English and covered four sections (see Annexe 1). The first section consisted of 14 items (arranged on a five-point Likert scale from 5, i.e. strongly agree, to 1, i.e. strongly disagree) to explore teacher trainers' opinions and perceptions regarding the *Training Model*. In addition there were two open-ended questions regarding the strengths and weaknesses of the *Training Model*. The second section consisted of nine items (arranged on a five-point Likert scale from 5, i.e. very confident, to 1, i.e. not confident at all) exploring their confidence in their ability to adapt and deliver the

Training Model in their own countries following the training they received. Then there were three open-ended questions to identify teacher trainers' own professional strengths and concerns and/or challenges in adapting and delivering the *Training Model* to teachers in their own national contexts. The third section consisted of 13 items (arranged on a five-point Likert scale from 5, i.e. strongly agree, to 1, i.e. strongly disagree) investigating teacher trainers' opinions and experiences on the training they received, plus one open-ended question offering space for them to provide more detailed feedback. Some of the survey questions in this section were adopted from Makopoulou et al.'s (2021) study. The last section was designed to gather demographic data (e.g. age, gender, and years of experience in delivering training for teachers) and it consisted of seven questions.

Participants

All 11 teacher trainers who took part in the TTT filled out the English-language questionnaire. Among them, seven participants were women, three men, and one chose not to disclose their gender. Participants recorded their ages as follows: one aged under 25; four aged 25-35; three aged 36-45; and three aged 46-55. At the time of study, seven teacher trainers worked in the school-based sector; three in the higher education sector; and one represented both sectors. The participants' years of professional experience ranged from one year to 30 years ($M=13.13$). Seven teacher trainers held a master's degree, two a PhD/Ed degree, and two a bachelor's degree. Participants' experience in delivering training for teachers (on any topic) spanned from 0 to 20 years ($M=6.63$), and their experience in delivering teacher training on international mobility spanned from 0 to 7 years ($M=1.90$).

Data analysis

For the quantitative data, descriptive statistics (i.e. mean, median, and standard deviation) were calculated using R statistical software. The qualitative data, gathered from responses to open-ended questions, were analysed using thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Firstly, the principal investigator (PI) analysed all responses to each open-ended question in order to identify the initial codes and categories emerging from the data. Secondly, two other members of the research team discussed this coding and categorisation, then met with the PI in order to agree upon a final list of categories for each open-ended question.

2.3.3.2. Phase 2 (teachers)

Aims

The main aims of data collection during this phase were:

- to examine teachers' knowledge, skills, and attitudes regarding the assessment of pupils' transversal competences developed via long-term individual mobility – before and after they participate in the *Training Model*,
- to explore teachers' opinions on the *Training Model* (in terms of structure, content, and activities).

Instrument and procedure

Data were collected from the three cohorts of teachers (i.e., from Poland, Belgium (Flanders), and Estonia) recruited for the two editions of the training: i.e. between November 2022 and March 2023; and between November 2023 and April 2024. During each edition of the training teachers were surveyed at two points of the time: at least two weeks before the start of the *Training Model* (i.e. pre-test) and at the end of the *Training Model* (i.e. post-test).

For the **first edition of the training**, the data collection procedure was as follows:

- T1, pre-test: in Poland and Estonia, data were collected two weeks before the start of the *Training Model* in order to explore teachers' knowledge, skills, and attitudes in terms of assessing the transversal competences pupils developed via long-term individual pupil mobility. In Belgium (Flanders), pre-test data were collected at the start of the first day of training, before beginning the course;
- T2, post-test: data were collected at the end of the *Training Model* in order to examine the immediate changes in teachers' knowledge, skills, and attitudes occurring as a result of their participation in the *Training Model*, as well as their opinions on the training they received (in terms of structure, content, and activities). Due to some problems with the recruitment process in Estonia, this phase of evaluation was completed in Poland and Belgium (Flanders) only.

For the **second edition of the training**, the data collection procedure was as follows:

- T1, pre-test: in Poland and Belgium (Flanders), data were collected two weeks before the start of the *Training Model* in order to explore teachers' knowledge, skills, and attitudes in terms of assessing the transversal competences pupils developed via long-term individual pupil mobility.
- T2, post-test: in Poland and Belgium (Flanders), data were collected at the end of the *Training Model* in order to examine the immediate changes in teachers' knowledge, skills, and attitudes occurring as a result of their participation in the *Training Model*, as well as their opinions on the training they received (in terms of structure, content, and activities).

In Estonia, despite the significant efforts made by the project team, it was not possible to recruit teachers for the second edition of the *Training Model*. Instead, a meeting for teachers interested in promoting the idea of internationalisation in secondary schools in Estonia was

organised. During this meeting, a pre-test questionnaire was distributed, and was completed by 15 teachers. These data were subsequently included in further analysis.

Instruments

Survey questionnaires were used to gather both pre- and post-test data across both editions of the training.

The pre-test survey questionnaire consists of 38 items (arranged on a five-point Likert scale from strongly agree at 5 to strongly disagree at 1) designed to measure teachers' knowledge, skills, and attitudes regarding assessing the transversal competences pupils gained via individual long-term pupil mobility (IPM). The items were built upon the intended learning outcomes (i.e. teachers' knowledge, skills, and attitudes) specified for each thematic session included in the *Training Model*, namely: (1) the context and value of long-term IPM within the process of internationalising school education (items 1 to 17); (2) the pupils' learning outcomes and transversal competences relevant to long-term IPM (items 18 to 28); and (3) assessment of the transversal competences pupils developed via long-term IPM (items 29 to 38). The questionnaire also contains three open-ended questions intended to explore the teachers' strengths, concerns, and training needs' regarding assessing the transversal competences gained via long-term IPM, and six questions regarding the teachers' demographics (e.g. gender and years of professional teaching experience in general, as well as years of professional experience in sending pupils for long-term mobilities).

The post-test survey questionnaire consists of three sections. The first section consists of 40 items (arranged on a five-point Likert scale from strongly agree at 5 to strongly disagree at 1) designed to measure changes in the teachers' knowledge, skills, and attitudes regarding assessing the transversal competences pupils gained via long-term IPM, as the result of their participation in the *Training Model*. 38 of these 40 items are exactly the same as in the pre-test survey questionnaire, and the final two items explore the teachers' perceptions of the *Learning Agreement*. The second section consists of 18 items (arranged on a five-point Likert scale from strongly agree at 5 to strongly disagree at 1) exploring teachers' opinions and perceptions regarding the *Training Model* – followed by five open-ended questions offering the teachers space to provide more detailed feedback regarding various aspects of the *Training Model*. The third and last section consists of six questions designed to gather the teachers' demographic data (e.g. gender, years of professional teaching experience in general, and years of professional experience in sending pupils for long-term mobilities).

Both questionnaires were prepared in English, the project team's shared working language, then translated by team members into the teacher cohorts' respective languages (i.e. Polish,

Estonian, and Belgian), before being distributed to them online (in Poland and Estonia) and in a paper version (Belgium, Flanders).

Participants

For the first edition of the *Training Model*, the pre-test evaluation was completed by $n = 75$ teachers, of whom $n = 64$ were from Poland, $n = 7$ from Belgium (Flanders), and $n = 4$ from Estonia. The mean age of participants was $M = 46.08$ (min = 29, max = 61), and they reported their genders as: $n = 56$ female, $n = 10$ male, and $n = 9$ preferred not to say. Collectively, they taught a range of subjects, including mathematics, history, physics, sports, and languages. In terms of years of professional experience in sending pupils for long-term mobilities: $n = 45$ reported having none, $n = 21$ reported having some (min = 2 years, max = 30 years), and $n = 9$ did not answer this question. In terms of how many pupil mobilities they had facilitated, they reported as follows: $n = 50$ had facilitated no mobilities; $n = 19$ had facilitated 1 to 5 mobilities; $n = 2$ had facilitated 6 to 10 mobilities; and $n = 4$ had facilitated more than 10 mobilities. Please see Table 2 for an overview of participants' demographics.

The post-test evaluation was completed by $n = 59$ teachers, of whom $n = 52$ were from Poland and $n = 7$ from Belgium (Flanders). Teachers from Estonia did not take part in this phase of the study because they had not yet completed the full training cycle. The mean age of participants was $M = 46.5$ (min = 32 and max = 61), and they reported their genders as $n = 45$ female, $n = 10$ male, and $n = 4$ preferred not to say. Collectively, they taught a range of subjects, including mathematics, history, physics, sports, and languages. In terms of years of professional experience in sending pupils for long-term mobilities: $n = 40$ reported having none, $n = 14$ reported having some (min = 2 years, max = 30 years), and $n = 5$ did not answer this question. In terms of how many pupil mobilities they had facilitated, they reported as follows: $n = 38$ had facilitated no mobilities; $n = 15$ had facilitated 1 to 5 mobilities; $n = 2$ had facilitated 6 to 10 mobilities; and $n = 4$ had facilitated more than 10 mobilities. Please see Table 2 for an overview of participants' demographics.

For the second edition of the *Training Model*, the pre-test evaluation was completed by $n = 83$ teachers, of whom $n = 35$ were from Poland, $n = 33$ from Belgium (Flanders), and $n = 15$ from Estonia (see Table 2). The mean age of participants was $M = 46.08$ (min = 29, max = 61), and they reported their genders as: $n = 58$ female, $n = 23$ male, and $n = 2$ preferred not to say. Collectively, they taught a range of subjects, including mathematics, history, physics, sports, and languages. In terms of years of professional experience in sending pupils for long-term mobilities: $n = 56$ reported having none, $n = 21$ reported having some (min = 1 years, max = 34 years), and $n = 6$ did not answer this question. In terms of how many pupil mobilities they had facilitated, they reported as follows: $n = 55$ had facilitated no mobilities; $n = 11$ had facilitated 1 to 5 mobilities; $n = 4$ had facilitated 6 to 10 mobilities; and

$n = 11$ had facilitated more than 10 mobilities, and $n = 2$ did not answer this question. Please see Table 2 for an overview of participants' demographics.

The post-test evaluation was completed by $n = 62$ teachers, of whom $n = 41$ were from Poland and $n = 21$ from Belgium (Flanders). Teachers from Estonia did not take part in this phase of the study. The mean age of participants was $M = 47.5$ (min = 26 and max = 61), and they reported their genders as $n = 46$ female, $n = 16$ male. Collectively, they taught a range of subjects, including mathematics, history, physics, sports, and languages. In terms of years of professional experience in sending pupils for long-term mobilities: $n = 40$ reported having none, $n = 21$ reported having some (min = 1 years, max = 32 years), and $n = 1$ did not answer this question. In terms of how many pupil mobilities they had facilitated, they reported as follows: $n = 42$ had facilitated no mobilities; $n = 13$ had facilitated 1 to 5 mobilities; $n = 4$ had facilitated 6 to 10 mobilities; and $n = 2$ had facilitated more than 10 mobilities, and $n = 1$ did not answer this question. Table 2 outlines participants' demographics for both editions of the *Training Model*.

Table 2. Participant demographics for pre-test and post-test surveys for both editions of the *Training Model*

Demographic		1st edition of the Training Model		2nd edition of the Training Model	
		Pre-test (N=75)	Post-test (N=59)	Pre-test (N=83)	Post-test (N=62)
Gender	female	56	45	58	46
	male	10	10	23	16
	preferred not to say	9	4	2	-
National setting	Poland	64	52	35	41
	Estonia	4	0	33	-
	Belgium (Flanders)	7	7	15	21
Number of pupil mobilities facilitated	1-5	19	15	11	13
	6-10	2	2	4	4
	more than 10	4	4	11	2
	no mobilities	50	38	55	42
	no answer	-	-	2	1
Years of professional experience in sending pupils for mobilities	0	45	40	56	40
	1-5	13	9	7	9
	6-20	3	1	6	9
	>20	6	4	2	3

	no answer	8	5	6	1
--	-----------	---	---	---	---

Data analysis

For the quantitative data, descriptive statistics (i.e. percentages, frequencies, mean, median, and standard deviation) were calculated using R statistical software (The R Foundation, 2020). The pre- and post-test survey items were measured as parametric data (despite the ordinal nature of the Likert scale), and then compared using a one-tailed paired *t*-test. *P* values of <0.05 were considered significant. The qualitative data, gathered from responses to open-ended questions, were analysed using thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Firstly, the PI used Deepl to machine translate all of the participants' responses from Polish, Estonian, and Flemish into English, then analysed them in line with each open-ended question in order to identify the initial codes and categories emerging from the data. Where any concerns arose, the PI contacted members of the national teams to ascertain the best possible understanding of the respondent's words. Secondly, two other members of the research team discussed this initial coding and categorisation, then met with the PI to agree upon a final list of categories for each open-ended question.

Since the three countries under study share a similar context regarding individual long-term pupil mobilities, the data presented in Chapter 4 are presented as a whole, without specific reference to individual countries.

2.3.3.3. Phase 3 (teachers and teacher trainers)

Aims

The aim of this level of evaluation was twofold:

- to explore teachers' perceptions on the usefulness of the knowledge, skills, and attitudes gained by teachers during the *Training Model* in preparing their students to send them for a mobility period
- to examine teacher trainers' experiences in supporting teachers to adapt this newly gained knowledge and skillset into their practice

Procedure and instruments

Data at this level of evaluation were collected from teachers who have sent their students for mobilities (recruited from the pool of those trained at the national level) at two points in time:

T1: before sending students for their mobility period, via interviews with the trained teachers to ascertain the usefulness of the *Training Model* in preparing them to send their students on mobilities (i.e. drafting the *Learning Agreement*)

T2: after sending students for their mobility period, via interviews and document analysis (i.e. of learning agreements) to ascertain the usefulness of the *Training Model* in terms of teachers assessing the transversal (especially intercultural) competences gained by their students during their mobility period

The guide for interviews (Annexe 4) for T1 comprises eight questions distributed between demographics and introductory questions, pertaining the participants' recent experiences with student mobility, followed by five fundamental questions on: the usefulness of the *Learning Agreement*; the quality of support from teacher trainers, colleagues, and other institutions in sending pupils for mobilities; the relationships with host schools before sending students for mobilities; and the quality and relevance of the *Training Model* for preparing teachers to send their students for mobilities (especially for drafting the *Learning Agreement*). The interview closed with one question on participants' future, specific action/s in their schools around the theme of internationalisation.

The guide for interviews (Annexe 5) for T2 comprises nine questions distributed between demographics and introductory questions, pertaining the participants' recent experiences with student mobility, followed by five key questions on: the process and methods specific to post-mobility assessment of transversal competences and intercultural competences; the relevance of the *Training Model* in preparing participants to assess their students' learning outcomes post-mobility; the quality of support from the trainers, as well as colleagues and other institutions, in this process; and their perceptions regarding the recognition of learning outcomes gained during IPM, broadly in line with their national curriculum. The interview closed with one question on participants' experiences during this stage of the process in terms of challenges, plus lessons for the future.

At this level of evaluation, teacher trainers were also interviewed in order to explore their experiences in supporting teachers to adapt this newly gained knowledge and skillset into their practice. The interview guide (see Annexe 6) starts with eight demographic questions (e.g. age, gender, and years of experience in delivering training for teachers), followed by fundamental questions regarding the process of supporting teachers sending students for mobilities – e.g. general feedback from teachers about the tools they gained from the model; the kinds and frequency of difficulties reported by teachers; the ways teacher trainers had of supporting teachers; and teacher trainers' perceptions of their own efficacy in solving teachers' concerns/problems. The interview ends with one question on teacher trainers' feelings about navigating their roles as mentors.

All the interviews were conducted by the PI in English via Zoom and recorded, then transcribed verbatim.

Participants

Three teachers (two from Belgium (Flanders) and one from Estonia) who had sent their students on IPM programmes (organised by YFU, AFS, and Erasmus+) agreed to be interviewed. The length of mobility period for these students ranged from two to six months, and their destinations were Spain, Finland, Norway, Poland, and Germany. The online interviews were conducted in English by the PI, recorded, and then transcribed verbatim.

Seven teacher trainers (three from Poland, two from Belgium (Flanders), and two from Estonia) participated in online interviews with the PI. Of them, five participants were women and two men. Participants recorded their ages as follows: three aged 36-45 and four aged 46-55. At the time of study, five teacher trainers worked in the school-based sector and two in the higher education sector. The participants' years of professional experience ranged from 13 years to 30 years ($M=15.12$).

Data analysis

The interview data were analysed using thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Firstly, the principal investigator (PI) analysed the interview transcripts in order to identify the initial codes and categories emerging from the data. Secondly, two other members of the research team discussed this coding and categorisation, then met with the PI in order to agree upon a final list of codes and categories.

2.3.4. Ethical considerations

The study was approved by the Faculty of Education Ethical Committee at the University of Białystok. Before conducting surveys and interviews, a researcher explained to participants, both in verbal and written forms, that participation was voluntary and that they had the right to withdraw without explanation at any time – plus that their responses would be recorded anonymously and kept confidential. The study's procedure and objectives were also explained.

Chapter 3. Results

The results are presented and analysed around the three phases of the implementation and adaptation of the *Training Model*.

3.1. Impact of the Training Model from the perspective of teacher trainers

3.1.1. Teacher trainers' opinions and perceptions regarding the Training Model

The teacher trainers were asked to rate various aspects of the *Training Model* across 14 items (arranged on a five-point Likert scale from 5, i.e. strongly agree, to 1, i.e. strongly disagree) (Table 3).

Table 3. Teacher trainers' ratings of the *Training Model*

Item	Median*	Mean	SD
The <i>Training Model</i> helps broaden teachers' knowledge on internationalisation and pupil mobility.	5	4.72	0.46
The <i>Training Model</i> helps raise teachers' awareness of policy in terms of internationalisation and pupil mobility.	5	4.63	0.50
The <i>Training Model</i> answers key questions regarding the assessment of the transversal (especially intercultural) competences gained via pupil mobility.	5	4.36	0.80
The <i>Training Model</i> activities help teachers to develop their skills in the assessment of the transversal (especially intercultural) competences gained via pupil mobility.	4	4.36	0.67
The content of the <i>Training Model</i> offers new ways to assess transversal (especially intercultural) competences.	5	4.45	0.68
The Learning Agreement is a useful tool to facilitate the assessment of the transversal (especially intercultural) competences gained via pupil mobility.	5	4.81	0.40
The <i>Training Model</i> finds a good balance between online	4	4.09	0.70

and face-to-face activities.			
The <i>Training Model</i> offers concrete examples of best practices in assessing transversal (especially intercultural) competences.	5	4.36	0.92
The <i>Training Model</i> finds a good balance between theory and practice.	4	3.81	1.32
The <i>Training Model</i> offers teachers a satisfactory amount of hands-on experiences.	4	3.72	1.01
The <i>Training Model</i> may serve as a good basis to assess students' further competences (i.e. other than transversal or intercultural competences).	4	4.27	0.64
The <i>Training Model</i> should become a permanent part of regional/local continuous professional development (CPD) offers for teachers.	4	4.36	0.67
I will recommend the <i>Training Model</i> to continuous professional development (CPD) providers and policy makers in my country.	5	4.54	0.68
I will recommend the <i>Training Model</i> to teachers and headteachers in my country.	5	4.63	0.50

*Responses range on a five-point Likert scale from from 5, i.e. strongly agree, to 1, i.e. strongly disagree.

These results indicate that the majority of the participants evaluated the *Training Model* positively, as the mean ratings for nearly all of the items (i.e. 12 out of 14) were higher than 4.00. The participants particularly appreciated that the *Training Model*: helps broaden teachers' knowledge on internationalisation and pupil mobility (M=4.72; SD=0.46); offers a Learning Agreement as a useful tool for facilitating the assessment of transversal (especially intercultural) competences gained via pupil mobility (M=4.81; SD=0.40); helps raise teachers' awareness of policy in terms of internationalisation and pupil mobility (M=4.63; SD=0.50); and is worth recommending to teachers and headteachers (M=4.63; SD=0.50), as well as to continuous professional development (CPD) providers and policy makers in their countries (M=4.54; SD=0.68). On the contrary, teacher trainers gave lower ratings to other

aspects of the model, in particular: finding a good balance between theory and practice (M=3.81; SD=1.32) and offering teachers a satisfactory amount of hands-on experiences (M=3.72; SD=1.01).

The participants were invited to express more detailed explanations regarding the strengths and weaknesses of the *Training Model* in two open-ended questions.

As for the strengths of this model, the participants mainly highlighted its focus on automatic recognition (AR) and individual pupil mobility – an important yet relatively rarely discussed topic in their countries. Some representative examples of their feedback are as follows:

It [i.e. the *Training Model*] covers all the important factors connected to student mobility and AR, and supports a wider goal of making student mobility a norm and supporting participating pupils in an effective way. (Survey 4)

It [i.e. the *Training Model*] finally focuses on the thing (that is AR) which has been the topic of educational goals for some time. The topic of AR is not always discussed (e.g. in exchange organisations), however it should be one of the main goals for global education. (Survey 2)

Some other participants highlighted that the *Training Model* offers practical tools that could be easily adapted to their specific national contexts and used by teachers in their every-day practice:

It is quite flexible, so can be adapted to make a national version. (Survey 6)

Two teacher trainers also appreciated that model content combines practical and theoretical issues well, referring, for example, to:

... a good mixture of theory with practice. (Survey 8)

Participants were also asked to identify the weaknesses of the *Training Model*. Among them they mainly stressed: the huge amount of time and effort needed to adapt the *Training Model* to national contexts; the lack of terminological consistency (e.g. transversal competences vs. intercultural competences); and the insufficient number of clear, practical examples illustrating complex issues. The nature of these weaknesses are clearly illustrated in the quotation below:

[Adapting the model demands] huge amounts of work. Country-specific differences bring in a whole other layer to consider. Mindsets are the most difficult thing to

change. [These efforts] also include a lot of lobby work (e.g. with the Ministry of Education), which will also be an extra line of work for us. Both the project and AR generally have a lot of conditions to be fulfilled (e.g. the student has to want AR, has to go to another EU country, and has to learn at a school that is willing to automatically recognise pupil mobility), which make it quite a difficult one. (Survey 2)

Two teacher trainers also pointed out that the model places too much focus on frontal teaching methods – i.e. focusing mainly on transmitting knowledge rather than encouraging teachers to be actively engaged in the learning process.

The training model mostly uses frontal teaching methods which doesn't really go with the idea of student-centred teaching (i.e. if a teacher trainer doesn't teach in a way that a teacher should teach their own students, then the whole theoretical content fundamentally doesn't click). (Survey 4)

The participants also had an opportunity to share their recommendations for the further development of the *Training Model*. Two main themes emerged from this qualitative data, demonstrating that enrichment efforts should be made regarding, namely, teaching methods and hands-on examples.

As for the teaching methods, participants proposed that the model should include more interactive methods (e.g. tasks and midway points) in order to engage teachers more actively with the content. Some participants also suggested reflective/summary tasks before and after thematic sessions. For example:

The *Training Model* and trainer training cannot be a lecture. [...] If we are supposed to make the training (that we go on to give in the future) interactive and engaging for teachers then it would be great if some of the methods could be taken and adapted from the trainers' training we receive. (Survey 2)

It would be good to add more examples taken from real life experience to better explain the points. (Survey 9)

[I think you should] add well designed feedback and summary sessions between the topics and add more active teaching methods. (Survey 4)

As for the hand-on experiences, several teachers recommended including more practical examples in the model to help them better understand complex issues regarding the assessment of transversal competences.

[I think you should use] case studies from the national trainings as hands-on examples. (Survey 8)

3.1.2. Teacher trainers' confidence in adapting and delivering the Training Model to teachers in their own countries

The participants were asked to rate nine items (arranged on a five-point Likert scale from 5, i.e. very confident, to 1, i.e. not confident at all) regarding their confidence in their ability to adapt and deliver the *Training Model* in their own countries, following the training they received (see Table 4).

Table 4. Teacher trainers' ratings of their confidence in adapting and delivering the *Training Model*

After the training you have received, how confident are you in your ability to...	Median*	Mean	SD
adapt the <i>Training Model</i> to your own national context?	4	4.00	1.00
deliver the <i>Training Model</i> to teachers in your own national context?	4	4.36	0.67
deliver a thematic session on the context and value of long-term individual pupil mobility within the process of internationalising school education?	5	4.63	0.50
deliver a thematic session on learning outcomes and transversal competences relevant to long-term individual pupil mobility?	5	4.63	0.50
deliver a thematic session on the assessment of the transversal competences developed via long-term individual pupil mobility?	5	4.54	0.52
explain to teachers the value and usefulness of the Learning Agreement in assessing the transversal	4	4.18	0.87

(especially intercultural) competences gained via pupil mobility?			
provide teachers with instructional advice on how to use the Learning Agreement in assessing the transversal (especially intercultural) competences gained via pupil mobility?	4	4.09	0.53
support teachers in using the approaches and tools presented within the <i>Training Model</i> ?	4	4.09	0.83
answer any questions teachers may have regarding the <i>Training Model</i> ?	4	4.00	0.63

* Responses range on a five-point Likert scale from 5, i.e. very confident, to 1, i.e. not confident at all.

These results indicate that the participants generally felt confident (or very confident) after the training they received on adapting and delivering the *Training Model* to teachers in their own countries, since their mean ratings for all of the specified elements were 4.00 or more. The areas in which participants felt most confident were: delivering a thematic session on the context and value of long-term IPM within the process of internationalising school education (M=4.63; SD=0.50); delivering a thematic session on learning outcomes and transversal competences relevant to long-term IPM (M=4.63; SD=0.50); and delivering a thematic session on the assessment of transversal competences developed via long-term IPM (M=4.54; SD=0.52). These ratings may suggest that teacher trainers primarily felt empowered to transmit knowledge to teachers as a result of their training.

On the contrary, teacher trainers felt less confident in their abilities to: adapt the *Training Model* to their own national context (M=4.00; SD=1.00); provide teachers with instructional advice on how to use the Learning Agreement in assessing the transversal (especially intercultural) competences gained via pupil mobility (M=4.09; SD=0.53); support teachers in using the approaches and tools presented within the *Training Model* (M=4.09; SD=0.83); and answer any questions teachers may have regarding the *Training Model* (M=4.00; SD=0.63).

The participants were also asked to identify their own professional strengths and concerns and/or challenges in adapting and delivering the *Training Model* to teachers in their own national contexts.

Professional strengths

In terms of professional strengths, the analysis indicates that teacher trainers' answers can be grouped into two categories: their personal characteristics and traits, then their professional knowledge and skills.

Regarding their personal characteristics and traits, the teacher trainers highlighted that their qualities such as empathy, openness, flexibility, enthusiasm, and willingness to work hard would be very helpful in adapting the model to national contexts.

Regarding their professional knowledge and skills, several teacher trainers emphasised that they had extensive professional experience both at the school level (e.g. referring to 'being a teacher myself') and at the university level, plus in mobility youth organisations. Therefore, they had a breadth of pedagogical knowledge (e.g. on 'foundations of education'; 'assessment'; 'interculturalism'; and 'individualisation of education'), as well as specialist knowledge on the issues included in the *Training Model* (e.g. on 'international student mobility' and 'intercultural competence assessment'). The participants also mentioned a number of professional skills they already possess, which they believe could be very helpful in implementing the model, for example: linguistics, research, and assessment skills.

Concerns/challenges

Participants' responses on their concerns and/or challenges in adapting and delivering the *Training Model* to teachers in their own national contexts can be grouped into three categories: the needs and expectations of teachers as a target audience of the *Training Model*; the content and structure of the *Training Model*; logistic issues; and their individual resources.

Regarding the needs and expectations of teachers as the target group for the *Training Model*, teacher trainers feared that it could be difficult to get teachers interested by mobility issues when they are overworked and do not have enough time to undertake activities other than their core professional duties. For example, they expressed concerns about:

the motivation levels of the teachers I will train. (Survey 7)

and

time as a resource for teachers. (Survey 6)

Furthermore, participants emphasised that contemporary teachers are focused mainly on the formal achievements of their students, whereas international mobility is comparatively marginal in the day-to-day realities of school life in their countries. This gap makes it very

challenging to make these competences a priority in teachers' work with pupils. Participants worried about:

... teachers focusing primarily on academic outcomes, with a lack of attention or readiness towards transversal competences. (Survey 3)

... teachers' resistance or uncertainty. (Survey 8)

... schools having limited experience of IPM and few students being interested in IPM. (Survey 11)

Furthermore, several teachers pointed out that the aforementioned challenges related to teachers' needs and expectations could cause problems in the logistics of adapting the *Training Model* for their countries. More precisely, participants shared concerns regarding finding and recruiting enough – and diverse enough – teachers who send their students on mobility:

I am concerned about outreach: what about the range of participants? (Survey 1)

I think it will be difficult to find teachers eligible for the training. (Survey 10)

Several teacher trainers also highlighted concerns regarding the content and structure of the *Training Model* itself – in particular whether or not they would be able to incorporate their country-specific issues fully into the model and translate the model's terminology correctly into their own languages. They had questions around, for example:

... how much can I change the training (i.e. achieving the same learning outcomes but via different session outlines and methods). (Survey 4)

... how I can ensure that my own country-specific issues get addressed via the model. (Survey 2)

... what the length of the training should be and the amount of theory I should incorporate. (Survey 8)

Teacher trainers were also concerned about their own resources in terms of, among other things, a lack of time to adapt the model, a lack of experience in organising teacher trainings, and the huge effort involved in preparing teacher trainings. They highlighted that:

[it might be difficult to] find teachers, as well as a training time and location. (Survey 10)

[this would be my] first time doing that and I don't have much experience. (Survey 9)

[I would become] overloaded with the preparatory work. (Survey 8)

The participants were also asked to identify three further training needs that would improve their abilities to adapt and deliver the *Training Model* to teachers in their own national contexts. They explained that they primarily needed more training around Learning Agreements, and the response below is typical for those teacher trainers:

I need more practical direction on writing the Learning Agreement and assessment tools. (Survey 7)

They also suggested that training on competency-based assessment and more active teacher training methods would improve their abilities to adapt and deliver the *Training Model*. For example:

I need more training on competence-based assessment: the theoretical background of it, the general background of it, and the methodology of it, etc. (Survey 4)

3.1.3. Teacher trainers' opinions on the training they received

Teacher trainers were also asked to evaluate 13 items (arranged on a five-point Likert scale from 5, i.e. strongly agree, to 1, i.e. strongly disagree) covering their opinions on and experiences of the training they received (Table 5).

Table 5. Teacher trainers' ratings of the training they received

Item	Median *	Mean	SD
The course objectives were clearly formulated.	5	4.54	0.68
The course workload was manageable.	4	3.63	1.12
The course was well organised (e.g. timely access to materials, notification of changes, etc.).	4	3.63	1.43
Overall, the course was well structured towards achieving the learning outcomes.	5	4.00	1.41
The course found a good balance between theory and practice.	5	3.63	1.68
The course found a good balance between individual and group activities.	4	3.72	1.42
The course answered my most pressing questions regarding the adaptation and delivery of the <i>Training Model</i> for teachers in my own national context.	4	4.18	0.87
The learning and teaching methods encouraged participation.	4	3.54	1.57
The course found a good balance between online and face-to-face activities.	5	4.36	1.28
I had regular opportunities to freely discuss, criticise, and/or evaluate the content and proposed activities of the course.	5	4.45	0.93
The learning materials provided (e.g. course notes, etc.) were relevant and useful.	4	4.36	0.67
Via the course I was able to meet people who are knowledgeable and approachable on the assessment of the transversal (especially intercultural) competences gained via pupil mobility.	4	4.18	0.75
Overall, the course was worth the time I took away from my	5	4.00	1.54

regular routines and duties.			
------------------------------	--	--	--

**Responses range on a five-point Likert scale from from 5, i.e. strongly agree, to 1, i.e. strongly disagree.*

Overall, the results indicate that the participants rated their training experiences positively, with the mean ratings for 8 out of the 13 statements at 4.00 or more. The participants did indeed appreciate that: the course objectives were clearly formulated (M=4.54; SD=0.68); they had regular opportunities to freely discuss, criticise, and/or evaluate the content and proposed activities of the course (M=4.45; SD=0.93); the course found a good balance between online and face-to-face activities (M=4.36; SD=1.28); and the learning materials provided (e.g. course notes, etc.) were relevant and useful (M=4.36; 0.67). On the contrary, the participants rated the following items relatively lower: the manageability of the course workload (M=3.63; SD=1.12); its organisation in terms of, for example, timely access to materials and notification of changes (M=3.63; SD=1.14); the balance between theory and practice (M=3.72; SD=1.42); and whether or not learning and teaching methods encouraged participation (M=3.54; SD=1.57).

The participants were also encouraged to provide more detailed feedback on the training in an open-ended question. Three participants used this opportunity to thank organisers for the course preparation and delivery, as well as expressing their gratitude at meeting fellow professionals interested in mobilities.

3.2. Impact of the *Training Model* from the perspective of teachers

3.2.1. Pre-test to post-test change in teachers' knowledge, skills, and attitudes regarding assessing transversal competences pupils gained via long-term IPM

The effectiveness of our model in developing teachers' knowledge, skills, and attitudes regarding assessing the transversal competences gained via long-term IPM is shown in Tables 6, 7, and 8. These tables summarise the changes in participants' agreement levels with the statements included in the pre-test and post-test surveys.

Table 6. Pre-test to post-test change in teachers' knowledge

Item	Strongly agree/agree		Pre-test	Post-test	p value ^a
	Pre-test (n=158)	Post-test (n=121)	Mean (Sd)	Mean (Sd)	
	%	%			
I know the priorities of European policy regarding the internationalisation of school education.	33.3	94.2	2.89 (1.18)	4.45 (0.69)	.000*
I know the priorities of national policy regarding the internationalisation of school education.	33.5	84.3	2.89 (1.19)	4.20 (0.85)	.000*
I know the priorities of national legislation regarding educational mobility.	35.4	78.5	2.92 (1.15)	4.09 (0.93)	.000*
I know the priorities of European legislation regarding educational mobility.	46.8	88.4	3.30 (1.19)	4.25 (0.79)	.000*
I think that 'individual long-term mobility' should last for more than one year.	57.6	37.2	3.47 (1.29)	2.72 (1.63)	.000*
I am familiar with the quality principles of educational mobility.	38.0	93.4	3.04 (1.15)	4.45 (0.73)	.000*
I have a wide knowledge of the current data regarding individual pupil mobility in my country	17.7	66.9	2.34 (1.14)	3.80 (1.20)	.000*

(e.g. numbers of pupils undertaking mobilities).					
I think that competences for pupils' mobility can only be defined in terms of knowledge acquired.	19	30.6	2.32 (1.25)	2.48 (1.59)	.473
I am familiar with the <i>Key competences for lifelong learning</i> framework.	49.4	95.0	3.15 (1.41)	4.51 (0.73)	.000*
I am familiar with the <i>Reference framework of competences for democratic culture</i> .	22.2	80.2	2.44 (1.22)	4.15 (0.93)	.000*
I am familiar with the <i>Global competences</i> framework.	21.5	81.8	2.44 (1.16)	4.15 (0.92)	.000*
I am familiar with the <i>Intercultural competences</i> framework.	24.7	86.0	2.49 (1.20)	4.25 (0.93)	.000*
I am familiar with national guidelines/legislation on how to assess students' competences.	32.3	77.7	2.84 (1.23)	3.97 (1.05)	.000*
I am familiar with school guidelines/legislation on how to assess students' competences in general.	57.6	84.3	3.52 (1.27)	4.33 (0.89)	.000*
I am familiar with school guidelines/legislation on how to assess students' competences gained via individual pupil mobility.	31.0	70.2	2.76 (1.20)	4.00 (1.04)	.000*
I know where to search for relevant resources on tools for assessing	29.7	88.4	2.82 (1.18)	3.00 (0.78)	.110

transversal and intercultural competences.					
---	--	--	--	--	--

^a analysis conducted using paired *t*-test

*p value of <.05 considered significant

In terms of the *Training Model's* contribution to developing the teachers' knowledge, the greatest increase in their level of agreement, i.e. from pre-test to post-test, regarded their familiarity with the following: the *Global competences* framework (21.5% at pre-test and 81.8% at post-test); the *Intercultural competences* framework (24.7% at pre-test and 86.0% at post-test); the *Reference framework of competences for democratic culture* (22.2% at pre-test and 80.2% at post-test); the priorities of European policy regarding the internationalisation of school education (33.5% at pre-test and 94.2% at post-test); national guidelines/legislation on how to assess students' competences (33.5% at pre-test and 84.3% at post-test); as well as where to search for relevant resources on tools for assessing transversal and intercultural competences (29.7% at pre-test and 88.4% at post-test). Most items show highly significant differences between pre-test and post-test means, suggesting that there was a meaningful improvement or change following the intervention.

Table 7. Pre-test to post-test change in teachers' skills

Item	Strongly agree/agree		Pre-tes t	Post-te st	p value ^a
	Pre-test (n=158)	Post-tes t (n=121)	Mean (Sd)	Mean (Sd)	
	%	%			
I can use various strategies to promote internationalisation in my school.	58.9	93.4	3.54 (1.00)	4.45 (0.65)	.000*
I can identify false perceptions and assumptions around pupil mobility.	58.2	90.9	3.63 (0.99)	4.39 (0.71)	.000*
Through different methods and activities, I am able to foster the development of transversal competences among students in my classroom.	67.7	91.7	3.82 (0.95)	4.50 (0.63)	.000*
When reading a pupil mobility testimonial, I can recognise the particular learning outcomes that come from long-term individual pupil mobility.	47.5	86.0	3.35 (1.17)	4.29 (0.75)	.000*
I can involve different school stakeholders in planning and supporting long-term individual pupil mobility.	50.0	79.3	3.45 (1.10)	4.13 (0.79)	.000*

I can select the most appropriate types of and approaches to assessing students' competences.	50.6	87.6	3.34 (1.14)	4.33 (0.78)	.000*
Even if 'assessment' is a widely debated concept, I can precisely formulate the principles of competency assessment.	49.4	84.3	3.37 (1.15)	4.20 (0.79)	.000*
I can define criteria for transversal and intercultural competence assessment.	42.4	87.6	3.20 (1.07)	4.28 (0.80)	.000*
I can select the most appropriate tools for assessing the learning outcomes gained via long-term pupil mobility.	31.6	89.3	2.94 (1.07)	4.36 (0.77)	.000*
I can adapt existing models of assessment to my local/school context.	55.1	86.8	3.46 (1.06)	4.30 (0.76)	.000*
I can use the <i>Learning Agreement</i> to assess the transversal (especially intercultural) competences of my students who have experienced a mobility period.	-	94.9	-	4.64	

^a analysis conducted using paired *t*-test

*p value of <.05 considered significant

In terms of the *Training Model's* contribution to developing the teachers' skills, the greatest increase in their level of agreement, i.e. from pre-test to post-test phases, regarded the following: selecting the most appropriate tools for assessing the learning outcomes gained via long-term pupil mobility (31.6% at pre-test and 89.3% at post-test); defining criteria for transversal and intercultural competence assessment (42.4% at pre-test and 87.6% at post-test); recognising the particular learning outcomes that come from long-term IPM (47.5% at pre-test and 86.0% at post-test); and selecting the most appropriate types of and approaches to assessing students' competences (50.6% at pre-test and 87.6% at post-test). Most items show highly significant differences between pre-test and post-test means, suggesting that there was a meaningful improvement or change following the intervention.

Table 8. Pre-test to post-test change in teachers' attitudes

Item	Strongly agree/agree		Pre-test	Post-test	p value ^a
	Pre-test	Post-test	Mean	Mean	
	(n=158)	t (n=121)	(Sd)	(Sd)	
	%	%			
I believe that internationalisation is a necessary process for contemporary schools.	95.6	99.2	4.64 (1.18)	4.77 (0.52)	.203
Internationalisation in education is linked primarily to pupil mobility.	67.7	81.8	3.75 (1.15)	4.10 (1.05)	.020*
Internationalisation could be effectively promoted within our national contexts (i.e., in schools).	69.6	93.4	3.86 (1.19)	4.59 (0.70)	< .001*
I believe that the duration and format of a period of pupil mobility have an impact on its	86.7	94.2	4.24 (0.98)	4.54 (0.91)	.002*

educational value.					
I am aware of my own misunderstandings around pupil mobility.	78.5	96.7	4.06 (0.94)	4.57 (0.65)	< .001*
Pupil mobility brings many benefits to students.	93.7	99.2	4.67 (0.59)	4.83 (0.48)	.026*
Pupil mobility brings many benefits to schools.	92.4	99.2	4.54 (0.67)	4.70 (0.55)	.038*
Pupil mobility needs to be underpinned by appropriate quality assurance measures.	88.0	95.0	4.39 (0.71)	4.61 (0.65)	.008*
Transversal competences should be the main expected result of long-term individual pupil mobility.	62.7	84.3	3.72 (1.03)	4.34 (0.91)	<.001*
Intercultural competences have a significant place in the curriculum of the subjects I teach.	56.3	82.6	3.65 (1.15)	4.31 (0.83)	< .001*
I describe myself as an intercultural competent teacher.	62.0	86.0	3.64 (1.09)	4.37 (0.77)	< .001*
I usually assess the competences of my students.	65.2	79.3	3.68 (1.05)	4.10 (0.82)	.053
When I assess students' competences, I usually assess all three components: knowledge, skills, and attitudes.	73.4	86.8	3.97 (0.92)	4.26 (0.85)	.059

I think it is crucial to assess learning outcomes gained via long-term pupil mobility.	66.5	89.3	3.80 (0.85)	4.40 (0.80)	< .001*
In order to meaningfully assess the transversal and intercultural competences gained via long-term pupil mobility, there is a need to use a variety of perspectives and methods.	67.7	89.3	3.82 (0.89)	4.50 (0.73)	.085
The <i>Learning Agreement</i> is a useful tool for facilitating the assessment of the transversal (especially intercultural) competences gained via pupil mobility.	-	93.4	-	4.63	-

^a analysis conducted using paired *t*-test

*p value of <.05 considered significant

In terms of the *Training Model's* contribution to developing the teachers' attitudes, the greatest increase in their level of agreement, i.e. from pre-test to post-test phases regarded the following: the need to assess the learning outcomes gained via long-term IPM (66.5% pre-test and 89.3% post-test); the need to use a variety of perspectives and methods in assessing the learning outcomes gained via long-term IPM (67.7% pre-test and 89.3% post-test); and perceiving themselves as interculturally competent teachers (62.0% pre-test and 86.0% post-test). Most items show highly significant differences between pre-test and post-test means, suggesting that there was a meaningful improvement or change following the intervention. It should also be noted here that the vast majority of teachers surveyed (93.4%) agreed that the *Learning Agreement* is a useful tool for facilitating the assessment of the transversal (especially intercultural) competences gained via long-term IPM.

Generally speaking, in comparing the pre- and post-*Training Model* participation changes in the teachers' knowledge, skills, and attitudes regarding assessing pupils' transversal competences developed via long-term IPM, their knowledge seems to have been the area most significantly impacted (i.e. more so than their skills and attitudes). By way of explanation, since the teachers reported possessing a fairly high level of these skills and attitudes at pre-test, it seems likely that their participation in the model has had less of an impact on these particular aspects of their development.

3.2.2. Teachers' opinions on the *Training Model*

The teachers were asked to rate various aspects of the *Training Model* across 18 survey items, arranged on a five-point Likert scale from strongly agree at 5 to strongly disagree at 1 (see Table 9).

Table 9. Teachers' opinions on the *Training Model*

Item	5		4		3		2		1		Mean
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	
During the <i>Training Model</i> I had opportunities to share my knowledge, experience, and ideas with other participants and the trainers.	97	80.2	20	16.5	3	2.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	4.78
During the <i>Training Model</i> I had opportunities to extend my knowledge and skills regarding assessment of the transversal (especially intercultural) competences gained via pupil mobility.	100	82.6	17	14.0	3	2.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	4.80
During the <i>Training Model</i> I had opportunities to extend my knowledge and skills regarding the <i>Learning Agreement</i> as a tool for assessing transversal (especially intercultural) competences.	100	82.6	16	13.2	4	3.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	4.80
During the <i>Training Model</i> I had regular opportunities to freely discuss and evaluate the content and proposed activities of the course.	100	82.6	16	13.2	4	3.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	4.80

The <i>Training Model</i> helped raise my awareness of policy in terms of internationalisation and mobility.	99	81.8	17	14.0	4	3.3	0	0.0	3	2.5	4.79
The <i>Training Model</i> finds a good balance between online and face-to-face activities.	75	62.0	20	16.5	17	14.0	0	0.0	1	1.8	4.42
The <i>Training Model</i> offers concrete examples of best practices in assessing transversal (especially intercultural) competences.	86	71.1	18	14.9	15	12.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	4.56
The <i>Training Model</i> finds a good balance between theory and practice.	84	69.4	32	26.4	3	2.5	1	0.8	0	0.0	4.65
The <i>Training Model</i> finds a good balance between individual and group activities.	86	71.1	27	22.3	6	5.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4.65
The <i>Training Model</i> answered my most pressing questions regarding assessment of the transversal (especially intercultural) competences gained via pupil mobility.	80	66.1	33	27.3	5	4.1	2	1.7	1	0.8	4.56

The content of the <i>Training Model</i> offers new ways to assess transversal (especially intercultural) competences.	88	72.7	26	21.5	4	3.3	2	1.7	0	0.0	4.66
The <i>Training Model</i> offered me a satisfactory amount of hands-on experience.	87	71.9	27	22.3	5	4.1	1	0.8	1	0.8	4.63
Via the <i>Training Model</i> I was able to meet people who are knowledgeable and approachable on the assessment of the transversal (especially intercultural) competences gained via pupil mobility.	95	78.5	20	16.5	4	3.3	1	0.8	0	0.8	4.74
I intend to implement these new assessment strategies in different areas of my own work.	85	70.2	31	25.6	4	3.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	4.68
I intend to engage with the online resources provided during the <i>Training Model</i> in order to expand/deepen my knowledge.	87	25.6	26	21.5	6	5.0	1	0.8	0	0.0	4.65
I intend to share my new knowledge with my school colleagues/headteacher.	89	73.4	29	24.0	2	1.7	0	0.0	1	0.8	4.69

I will recommend the <i>Training Model</i> to my colleagues.	95	78.5	24	19.8	1	0.8	0	0.0	1	0.8	4.75
Overall, the course was worth the time away from my regular routines and duties.	92	76.0	22	18.2	4	3.3	2	1.7	0	0.0	4.70

These results indicate that the majority of the participants evaluated the *Training Model* positively, with the mean ratings for nearly all items (i.e. 15 out of the 18) being higher than 4.60. The participants particularly appreciated that the *Training Model*: helps broaden their knowledge and skills regarding assessment of the transversal (especially intercultural) competences gained via long-term IPM (M=4.80); offers opportunities to extend their knowledge and skills regarding the *Learning Agreement* as a tool for assessing transversal (especially intercultural) competences (M=4.80); creates opportunities to share their knowledge, experience, and ideas with other participants and the trainers (M=4.78), and to freely discuss and evaluate the content and proposed activities of the course (M=4.80), as well as raises their awareness of policy in terms of internationalisation and mobility (M=4.79). The teachers gave comparatively lower ratings to other aspects of the model, in particular: finding a good balance between online and face-to-face activities (M=4.42); offering concrete examples of best practices in assessing transversal (especially intercultural) competences (M=4.56); and answering their most pressing questions regarding assessment of the transversal (especially intercultural) competences gained via pupil mobility (M=4.56). Despite these slightly lower ratings, the majority of respondents (76%) emphasised that the course was worth the time away from my regular routines and duties, and that they will share their new knowledge with their school colleagues/headteacher (78.5%), creating cause for optimism.

The participants were invited to share more detailed explanations regarding the strengths and weaknesses of the *Training Model* in five open-ended questions.

Firstly, teachers were asked to share their opinions about the *Training Model's* contribution to their knowledge regarding assessing the transversal (especially intercultural) competences developed via IPM. The majority of respondents pointed out that the *Training Model* had significantly broadened or systematised their knowledge of assessing these competences, in particular:

- enabling them to learn about new tools for assessing transversal (especially intercultural) competences
- helping them to understand the importance and necessity of assessing these competences in their wider teaching processes (i.e. not only in relation to IPM)
- increasing their willingness and confidence to assess these competences.

Some representative examples of their feedback are follows:

The *Training Model* helped me to consolidate my knowledge and to clarify important aspects of my competences. (Survey 8)

I learnt about assessment methods and their criteria. (Survey 11)

I understood the important role transversal competences play in a modern school. (Survey 26)

Secondly, the teachers were also asked to indicate which activities offered during the *Training Model* they found most helpful, and they mainly highlighted:

- discussions
- group work
- practical exercises on preparing the *Learning Agreement*
- case studies

Thirdly, in addition to these significant knowledge gains, a high proportion of respondents indicated that the *Training Model* increased their skills for assessing the transversal (especially intercultural) competences developed via IPM. Teachers particularly appreciated the model's contribution to the development of their skills in identifying, naming, and defining transversal competences, as well as in using a variety of tools to assess them. For example:

I have learnt to describe these competences and to think about what activities can develop them; I am aware of how to carry out evaluation. (Survey 14)

However, several respondents indicated that the model did more to confirm than improve their proficiency in skills they already possessed, as this statement clearly illustrates:

This training did not enhance but rather *organised* my abilities to assess transversal competences [emphasis ours]. (Survey 16)

In contrast, other teachers acknowledged that the model provided them with fundamental motivations and skills, ready for practical implementation and improvement in the future, for example:

I still need to practise, but it has given me impulses in which direction to go. (Survey 42)

Fourthly, a high percentage of the respondents said that the *Training Model* did not significantly challenge or change their attitudes towards assessing the transversal (especially intercultural) competences developed via IPM, but that it strengthened their belief in the importance of these competences in contemporary schools, as well as the need to assess them.

It is worth paying more attention to transversal competences when teaching in the classroom (Survey 31)

It has confirmed my positive position regarding the assessment of these competences (Survey 41)

Fifthly, respondents were also asked what topics they thought should be addressed via the *Training Model* in the future. The vast majority of respondents stated that they would like to increase their knowledge of the organisational, legal, and financial aspects of long-term IPM:

Formal issues relating to mobility (Survey 27)

Legal aspects, as well as the question of insurance for those leaving and being received (Survey 39)

Financial aspects, accounting, and fundraising for mobility (Survey 47)

Several respondents also noted the need to motivate wider school communities to support long-term IPM:

I would like to know how to build a team of people building/creating a 'sphere' of school mobility at school (Survey 14)

3.3. Long term effects of the *Training Model* on teachers' pedagogical practices

3.3.1. Teachers' perceptions regarding the usefulness of the knowledge, skills, and attitudes gained via the *Training Model* in preparing their students for a mobility period

All three of the interviewed teachers indicated that the knowledge, skills, and attitudes they gained via the *Training Model* were very useful both before and after sending their students for long-term IPM. Two key aspects of the *Training Model* were particularly valuable in their professional settings: the *Learning Agreement* (LA) training, and the various tools and resources for assessing transversal competences gained via IPM.

These teachers highlighted that they used an LA between their school and the host school prior to sending their students for mobility. Two of the teachers used the template designed and promoted by the ETAR project team; one teacher used a template that had already been created in their school. All three teachers stressed the crucial role of the LA in ensuring the success and recognition of their students' mobility periods, with it serving as a formal framework outlining the objectives, expectations, and responsibilities of all stakeholders involved in the IPM process, including students, teachers, and administrators. Furthermore, two of the teachers said that the LA acts as a quality assurance tool, guaranteeing that the IPM programme meets the standards and requirements of both the sending and hosting institutions. As such, the LA reduces potential misunderstandings or conflicts regarding the student's activities or academic progression, as well as fosters collaboration between the different people involved in the two schools. As one teacher said:

The learning agreement promotes transparency by clearly outlining the roles and responsibilities of all parties involved. They hold students, teachers, and schools accountable for fulfilling their commitments. (Teacher 2)

All three teachers explained that they always tried to incorporate transversal competences in the LA as a learning outcome, such as problem-solving, adaptability, and cultural awareness:

I have always aimed to define learning outcomes as transversal competences. For me, this is the greatest added value of mobility. (Teacher 3)

In drafting the LA, and throughout the entire IPM process, all three teachers highly valued frequent communication and cooperation with hosting schools:

Good cooperation with the hosting school is fundamental. Then everything is transparent, and you are kept informed not only about problems but, most importantly, about the student's progress. (Teacher 1)

However, they did express some ambivalence regarding the levels of support for IPM within their own schools. They reported that, while their colleagues often emphasised the importance and value of mobility on principle, when it came to making concrete decisions regarding their taught subjects, they frequently withdrew their previously declared support – more specifically, arguing that their own taught subject was the most important, and that passing it would require any students returning from IPM to take additional exams.

In terms of putting what they had learned from the *Training Model into practice*, all three of the interviewed teachers explained that it had been beneficial for learning about new tools and resources for assessing the transversal competences gained via IPM. However, they further explained that after the *Training Model* they did not always feel able to use them in assessing their own pupils post-IPM. Instead they used tools such as interviews, PowerPoint presentations, or talks delivered to the school community. This example is illustrative:

I was aware that during the *Training Model* we talked about the *Intercultura Protocol*. However, afterwards I didn't feel confident enough to use this Italian tool to assess my students' competences. Instead, I had one of my students prepare a presentation about their experiences in Germany. (Teacher 2)

All of the interviewed teachers mentioned that, as a follow-up from their involvement in the *Training Model*, they will implement or have already implemented some actions in their schools and beyond around the theme of internationalisation, including: organising workshops for teachers and headteachers; initiating a series of meetings with students and parents regarding the value of long term IPM; establishing stronger relationships with their National Agencies for the Erasmus+ programme; and building networks with other secondary schools at regional and national levels.

3.3.2. Teacher trainers' experiences in supporting teachers to adopt this newly gained knowledge and skill set into their practice

Having been asked about their experiences in supporting teachers to adopt this newly gained knowledge and skill set into their practice, all of the teacher trainers put forward positive feedback from teachers about the tools and knowledge they gained from the *Training Model*. They stressed that participation in the training sessions had provided teachers with a broader perspective on assessing learning outcomes: leading them to not

only evaluate the knowledge, but also the skills and attitudes of students going on long-term IPM. Moreover, they explained that the teachers appreciated the set of tools they gained from the *Training Model*, and felt optimistic about the possibilities for their practical application. The following citation is illustrative:

The teachers were very satisfied with the training, highlighting that the *Learning Agreement* was explained exceptionally well. (Teacher trainer 3)

However, as all of the trainers emphasised, despite the teachers' intentions to use this knowledge in their practice, unfortunately in reality they found limited opportunities to apply it.

As a result, only a few of the participating teachers reached out to the trainers for support or guidance in using the tools they had gained from the *Training Model*. In Poland and Estonia, such communications (via phone or email) were instead generally about establishing cooperation regarding internationalising their schools or requesting contacts for schools abroad where they could send students for IPM, for example:

Several teachers asked me if we could continue our collaboration, as they wanted to organise a seminar on internationalisation at their schools. They invited me as a lecturer. (Teacher trainer 7)

In Belgium (Flanders), one teacher trainer mentioned that teachers contacted them for support in drafting LAs and in understanding the educational regulations governing student mobility.

All of the teacher trainers acknowledged that they were very willing to respond to these inquiries from teachers, striving to reinforce their enthusiasm for sending students on IPM. Moreover, they aimed to make it clear to teachers that they were always available and open to fostering their ideas on how to advance the process of internationalisation in their schools and regions.

All teacher trainers agreed that both their own and teachers' participation in the *Training Model* significantly contributed to raising awareness among various stakeholders (e.g., school principals, CPD providers, and education policymakers) of the role and importance of internationalisation and IPM in their respective countries. Moreover, thanks to their involvement in the training, 'islands of mobility enthusiasts have been created' (Teacher trainer 6). While perhaps small in size, these groups hold great potential for spreading this enthusiasm further. All of the teacher trainers unanimously stated their intention to disseminate the knowledge and skills acquired through the *Training Model*, with the aim of

encouraging a growing lobby to advocate for changes in national regulations regarding IPM and/or to address negative attitudes among teachers.

Chapter 4. Conclusions and next steps

This study shows that all participants perceive the *Training Model* to be a useful form of teacher professional development in terms of increasing their knowledge of IPM and assessing the transversal competences acquired by pupils via long-term IPM. Indeed, the results demonstrate that, from the pre-test phase (i.e. before participating in *Training Model*) to the post-test phase (i.e. just after completing it), the teachers significantly expanded their knowledge, skills, and attitudes towards internationalisation and assessing the transversal competences gained by pupils via long-term IPM. The results also show that the teachers attribute these positive changes in their knowledge, skills, and attitudes to the specific qualities and structure of the *Training Model*. In particular, they appreciated how the *Training Model* created opportunities for them to: share their knowledge, experience, and ideas with other participants and the trainers; freely discuss and evaluate its content and proposed activities; as well as extend their knowledge and skills regarding the *Learning Agreement* as a tool for assessing transversal competences, especially intercultural competences.

Teacher trainers also agreed that the *Training Model* is a useful tool for teachers' professional development regarding internationalisation, IPM, and assessment of transversal competences. They particularly appreciated the fundamental focus of the model, i.e. IPM and transversal competences: topics which are very important in Europe's contemporary education landscape, yet rarely adequately addressed in Poland, Estonia, and Belgium (Flanders).

However, both groups of participants also highlighted aspects of the model that need to be improved in order to increase its usefulness in practice, namely: the inclusion of more practical examples to more clearly illustrate the content of the model; the inclusion of more practical tips on how to prepare a *Learning Agreement*; and the use of active teaching and learning methods to stimulate greater teacher involvement in the learning process.

While the teacher trainers felt ready to go on to adapt and deliver the *Training Model* in their own countries, they also explained that they would benefit from additional training in both drafting *Learning Agreements* and transversal competence assessment methods. Additionally, the teachers declared that they still needed to increase their knowledge of the organisational, legal, and financial aspects of long-term IPM in general, not only the assessment of transversal competences.

Although very few of the teachers had the opportunity to actually apply the new knowledge, skills, and attitudes they had gained via the *Training Model* in their subsequent practice of sending students for mobility (to date), they highlighted the crucial role of the *Learning Agreement* in ensuring the success and recognition of their students' mobility periods, with it serving as a formal framework for outlining the objectives, expectations, and responsibilities of all stakeholders involved in the IPM process, including students, teachers, and administrators. The usefulness of *Learning Agreements* was also stressed by the teachers who contacted the teacher trainers after their training. Indeed, they pointed out that these teachers reported how their participation in the training sessions had provided them with a broader perspective on assessing learning outcomes – leading them to not only evaluate the knowledge, but also the skills and attitudes, of students returning from long-term IPM.

Moreover, the teachers and teacher educators mentioned that, following their involvement in the *Training Model*, they have already taken or plan to take action in the area of internationalisation in their schools and beyond, including: organising workshops for teachers and headteachers; initiating a series of meetings with students and parents regarding the value of long term IPM; establishing stronger relationships with their National Agencies for the Erasmus+ programme; and building networks with other secondary schools at regional and national levels. This is a highly optimistic result, offering hope that the outcomes of the *Training Model* will be sustainably integrated into regional and national initiatives aimed at fostering the internationalisation of schools.

However, considering the limitations of this research (namely the relatively small number of teachers participating in the *Training Model* and the even smaller number who have, to date, applied it in practice), it is worth conducting further studies in Poland, Estonia, Belgium (Flanders), and other countries on the *Training Model's* impact on teachers' knowledge, skills, and attitudes pertaining to internationalisation and recognition of learning outcomes from IPM.

In sum, this research shows that the practical usefulness of the *Training Model* was rated very highly by both teacher trainers and teachers in Poland, Estonia, and Belgium (Flanders), regardless of whether they had prior experience with IPM or not. This indicates that the *Training Model* can be used as an effective tool for promoting IPM in these and other contexts, as well as for building coherent school policies on how to foster and recognise any IPM initiatives, whether organised via Erasmus+, AFS, YFU, or other programmes and providers.

References

- Briga, E., & Looney, J. (2021). *Expert Network on recognition of outcomes of Learning Periods Abroad in General Upper Secondary Education. Member states analysis*. European Union Directorate-General for Education, Youth, Sport and Culture.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77–101.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2018). *Research methods in education*. Routledge.
- Desimone, L. (2009). Improving impact studies of teachers' professional development: Toward better conceptualizations and measures. *Educational Researcher, 38*(3), 181–199.
- Guskey, T. (2000). *Evaluating professional development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Jurczik-Arnold, I, & Baiutti, M. (2021). *Training Model for education professionals on Assessment of Transversal Competences developed in long-term individual pupil mobility*.
https://d22dvi4pfop3.cloudfront.net/wp-content/uploads/sites/81/2022/12/07141405/Training-Model_assessment_transversal_competences.pdf.
- Makopoulou, K., Neville, R. D., Ntoumanis, N., & Thomas, G. (2021). An investigation into the effects of short-course professional development on teachers' and teaching assistants' self-efficacy. *Professional Development in Education, 47*(5), 780–795.

Annexes

[Annex 1](#). Training model adaptations - Overview in English



Empowering Teachers
for Automatic Recognition
ETAR project

Adaptation of Training Model for education professionals on assessment of Transversal Competences developed in long-term individual pupil mobility



Co-funded by
the European Union



Co-funded by
the European Union

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

© European Federation for Intercultural Learning, 2024

Author: Elisa Briga

Introduction

The [Training model for education professionals on Assessment of Transversal Competences developed in Long-term individual pupil mobility](#) was published as output of the [Expert Network on Recognition of outcomes of learning periods abroad in general secondary education](#) in November 2021. This was a first attempt to provide a standard training course on the topic, in line with the [Council recommendation on automatic recognition](#) adopted by the Council of the EU in November 2018.

As the Training Model was only created conceptually by the Expert Network, and not piloted, EFIL, together with other organisations members of the Expert Network, initiated the follow up project '*Empowering Teachers for Automatic Recognition-ETAR*' aimed at delivering the Training Model in three countries: Belgium (Flanders), Estonia and Poland. These were chosen as the Member states analysis conducted by the Expert Network had shown that in these countries teachers had the competence to recognise the learning of the pupils returning from an individual mobility programme.

As a result of the pilot, the Training Model was adapted to the context of the three countries involved ([Belgium Flanders](#), [Estonia](#), [Poland](#)). In this document we aim at presenting an overview of the main adaptations applied to the Training Model as result of the piloting, and some recommendations for the future use of the Training Model.

The Pilot of the Training Model consisted in three phases:

1. Training the Teacher Trainers in the three project countries (August 2022)
2. Delivering the 1st Round of training courses at national/regional level (October 2022-May 2023)
3. Delivering the 2nd Round of training courses at national/regional level (October 2022 - March 2024)

The research report on the Pilot of the Training Model can be found [here](#).

Along the lines of the pilot structure, the adaptation to the national/regional context of the Training Model followed three phases:

1. 1st adaptation by the Teacher trainers to deliver the 1st Round on training courses
2. 2nd adaptation based on the feedback received from the 1st Round, in view of the deliver of the 2nd Round of training courses
3. Final adaptation based on the feedback received in the 2nd Round of training courses.

Next to the text of the Training Model adapted to the specific context, the project partners have also developed a deck of PPT slides for delivering the content.

The trainers delivering the Training model in the project countries have met regularly online to exchange their experience with adaptation and delivery of the training, as well as feedback from the teachers they trained. This approach helped the gathering of different perspectives and mutual inspiration.

In addition to the Pilot in the three project countries, ETAR included two further editions of the Training for Teacher Trainers (TTTs) held in 2023 and 2024, to expand the outreach of the Training Model beyond the project countries. Thanks to these additional TTTs, the Training Model was delivered in Cyprus to all English teachers by the Inspector of English language of the Ministry of Education (September 2023). Moreover in autumn 2024 a group

of teacher trainers from Portugal submitted a proposal for a 25 hours course for accreditation to the Regional training centre of the Porto District. Finally, the Training Model will be integrated by the Erasmus+ National agency in Spain in training courses they regularly offer to the Erasmus+ accredited schools.

Adaptations of the Training Model to the different contexts

In all three adaptations, the paragraphs describing the European level legislation and context of Individual Pupil Mobility were tailored to specifically describe the specific context, in particular the national curriculum. Recommendations and remarks were added as well as suggestions received from teachers during the pilot. The adaptations also aimed at avoiding repetitions across the different sessions. Trainers highlighted that while in Belgium (Flanders) and Estonia teachers are familiar with competence assessment, this is rather a new topic in Poland, hence this topic covered in Thematic Section 2.1 and 3.1 needed to be dealt with more at length.

Finally, a common feedback received was to provide more practical examples of learning agreements and concrete situations, not covered enough in Thematic Section 2.3. Therefore when piloting the Training Model the trainers included at the end a specific session dedicated to drafting Learning agreements. In addition, the part of the Model dedicated to the historical development of IPM within the Thematic section 1 was shortened, and by the end of the project Fondazione Intercultura (associate partner) developed a [video](#) on this topic to provide the content of the session in a shorter and engaging way.

Belgium (Flanders)

Based on the piloting, the trainers decided to shorten the Training Model for a target group of participants who already have some knowledge of learning mobility programmes in the school sector and internationalisation, and offer an extended version of the Training Model for those who have no knowledge on the topic. In addition, they have foreseen the provision of knowledge and theories through online tools, so that the in-person sessions are more concise and specifically focused on dialogue, discussion and presentation of concrete cases.

Poland

In line with the approach of the other countries' piloting, the adaptation to the Polish context included more interactive exercises. The trainers applied the approach of always starting a new topic with brainstorming with participants first to gather their existing knowledge, and then summing up their answer to complement the prepared content for the session. Finally, in terms of duration, the Training Model adaptation foresees 10 hours of sessions.

Estonia

The phrase "To develop nationally/locally" was translated and kept in some cases without any adaptations for encouraging trainers to always update the Model as local schools have

very specific contexts and needs due to the high level of school autonomy and different curricula.

Recommendations for the future implementation of the Training Model

- Include the development of more practical skills by
 - using tools such as already filled in learning agreements as examples, which then can be further developed based on the grade and school of the student, and the contact with the host school;
 - including more exercises related to the formulation of competences within the Learning agreement;
 - focusing specifically on developing the reintegration plan within the Learning agreement, if possible extending the reintegration to the full duration of the following school year;
 - providing an adaptation of the Europass mobility template - which serves as Learning agreement - in line with the principles and approaches enshrined in the Training Model
 - setting time aside during and after the training course to provide feedback to the learning agreements filled in during the course.
- Make sure the training course always includes the live testimonials of pupils who took part in a long-term IPM, interviewed based on the Intercultura Assessment Protocol tools (IAP)
- Adapt the training so that it can address also the needs of teachers in VET secondary schools - as it has happened during the pilot in Belgium (Flanders)
- Ensure that trainers learn about other educational systems and recognition of learning outcomes in other countries in order to be able to answer the questions of the audience (see resources here)
- Reflect on whether to also address the role of teachers in welcoming pupils hosted within an IPM programme in their school, and their role in assessing competences of hosted students during their stay, as well as exploring the legal and administrative aspects of admitting the exchange pupils in their schools.
- Develop further a possible adaptation consisting in one day training and covering IPM and its value, the presentation of the Intercultura Assessment Protocol and the practical implementation of one of its assessment tools by interviewing students returning from a long-term IPM.

Annex 2.

**The impact of the Training Model on teachers' knowledge, skills, and attitudes
regarding the assessment of pupils' transversal competences
developed via long-term individual mobility**

Preliminary results from the piloting trial

Marta Kowalczyk-Wałędziak
(University of Białystok)

In cooperation with: Elisa Briga (EFIL) and Mattia Baiutti (Fondazione Intercultura)

Białystok and Brussels

January 2024 version

Table of contents

Executive summary

Chapter 1. Introduction and background

Chapter 2. Theoretical insights

Chapter 3. Research design

Research design for teacher trainers

Research design for teachers

Chapter 4. Results

The impact of the *Training Model* from the perspective of teacher trainers

The impact of the *Training Model* from the perspective of teachers

Chapter 5. Conclusions and next steps

References

Executive summary

The [Training Model](#) is a course designed with the main aim of empowering secondary school teachers, headteachers, and other staff in their knowledge, skills, and attitudes towards assessing the transversal competences gained via long-term individual pupil mobilities (IPM). This model was created as a part of the [Expert Network on Recognition of outcomes of learning periods abroad in general secondary education](#), in order to support secondary school teachers in recognising and assessing pupils' learning outcomes within a framework that goes beyond strict compliance with a national curriculum and the general assessment methods applied to their peers. It has been piloted in three countries, i.e. Belgium (Flanders), Estonia, and Poland, where there is a high demand for knowledge in this field due to a lack of national IPM recognition policies, resulting in pupils returning from long-term IPM requiring a gap year.

This report presents preliminary survey results pertaining to the impact of the [Training Model](#) on secondary school teachers' knowledge, skills, and attitudes in terms of assessing pupils' transversal competences developed via long-term IPM – from the perspectives of teacher trainers (n=11), as well as teachers (n=75 for the pre-test phase; n=59 for the post-test phase).

The findings revealed that almost all of the teacher trainers perceive the [Training Model](#) to be a useful form of teachers' professional development in terms of increasing teachers' knowledge of IPM and assessing the transversal competences acquired by pupils via long-term IPM. The teacher trainers' views are further confirmed by the teachers themselves, i.e. the main agents of IPM in their schools. Indeed, the results show that from the pre-test phase (before participating in [Training Model](#)) to the post-test phase (just after completing it), the teachers significantly expanded their knowledge, skills, and attitudes towards internationalisation and assessing the transversal competences gained by pupils via long-term IPM. The results also show that the teachers attribute these positive changes in their knowledge, skills, and attitudes to the specific qualities and structure of the [Training Model](#). In particular, they appreciated that the [Training Model](#) created opportunities for them to: share their knowledge, experience, and ideas with other participants and the trainers; freely discuss and evaluate its content and proposed activities; as well as extend their knowledge and skills regarding the *Learning Agreement* as a tool for assessing transversal competences, especially intercultural competences.

Therefore, these findings show that the [Training Model](#) serves as a useful tool for empowering teachers in assessing the transversal competences developed by their pupils via IPM, suggesting that it may be worth testing and implementing beyond Poland, Belgium (Flanders), and Estonia.

This report consists of five chapters. Chapter 1 outlines the [*Training Model's*](#) structure and content, as well as explains the need to pilot it in Belgium (Flanders), Estonia, and Poland. Chapter 2 overviews the theoretical foundation for the piloting phase. Chapter 3 outlines the research design for gathering data from the teacher trainers and teachers involved in the pilot. Chapter 4 presents the results from the pilot, encompassing the perspectives of both teacher trainers and teachers. Chapter 5 identifies the study's main conclusions, and suggests some onward directions for implementing the *Training Model* in the wider European context.

Chapter 1. Introduction and background

The [Expert Network on Recognition of outcomes of learning periods abroad in general secondary education: Member States Analysis](#) highlights that, in 23 EU countries, recognising learning periods abroad lasting for up to five or six months is the responsibility of teachers in the sending school (with the exception of Greece where only periods abroad of a full school year are allowed). In addition, in 19 of these countries, the recognition of a full school year abroad officially depends on the assessment carried out by teachers in the sending school. However, evidence shows that, in reality, such recognition is rare or non-existent in 10 of these countries, because teachers do not have the tools or guidelines needed for recognising the learning outcomes of pupils returning from IPM via a framework that goes beyond strict compliance to their national curriculum and/or the assessment methods used for the pupil's peers (i.e. who have not embarked on IPM). This problematic situation is particularly evident in Belgium (Flanders), Estonia, and Poland as countries where recognition is rare, plus which lack training for teachers to bring about systemic change in this area. Having this lack of provision in mind, the ETAR (Empowering Teachers for Automatic Recognition) project consortium decided to pilot the [Training Model](#) in these three countries because its implementation here allows for the observation of the immediate impact of introducing recognition. Indeed, while, as yet, few schools in these countries have experience with this type of recognition, there is profound willingness among key stakeholders to explore this avenue of development.

The [Training Model](#) is a course designed with the main aim of empowering secondary school teachers, headteachers, and staff in their knowledge, skills, and attitudes towards assessing the transversal competences gained via long-term IPM. It was created by Jurczik-Arnold & Baiutti (2021) as a part of the [Expert Network on Recognition of outcomes of learning periods abroad in general secondary education](#), and is now being piloted within the ETAR project in three countries: Belgium (Flanders), Estonia, and Poland. The core content of the *Training Model* draws both from the existing literature and teacher training experiences gathered from the Italian context. It is organised around three thematic sessions: (1) the context and value of long-term IPM within the wider process of internationalising school education; (2) learning outcomes and transversal competences relevant to long-term IPM; and (3) assessment of the transversal competences developed via long-term IPM. The recommended timeframe for the training course is approximately 12 hours if delivered in person, and approximately nine hours if delivered remotely or in a blended format (i.e. online plus in person). The intended learning outcomes of the *Training Model* (to be achieved via a variety of teaching methods, e.g. practical exercises, reflective questions, and open discussions) are as follows:

- understanding the context and pedagogy of long-term individual pupil mobility, including relevant European and national legislation
- developing openness and positive attitudes towards the internationalisation of schools, specifically long-term individual pupil mobility and its pedagogical value
- becoming aware of existing transversal competence frameworks, specifically intercultural competence frameworks
- developing a critical understanding of the expected learning outcomes gained via individual pupil mobility
- developing an understanding of the overall principles of competence-based assessment in the context of individual pupil mobility
- gaining the motivation and competences needed for assessing learning outcomes specific to individual pupil mobility, in particular intercultural competences
- becoming familiar with and being ready to use existing resources linked to the assessment of the learning outcomes achieved via individual pupil mobility

As such, the [Training Model](#) serves as a comprehensive and solid teacher professional development programme that may empower teachers in assessing the transversal competences developed by pupils via IPM.

Chapter 2. Theoretical background

The theoretical framework chosen for the current investigation is based on the teacher professional development (TPD) models devised by Guskey (2000) and Desimone (2009).

Guskey's model (2000) provides a detailed, five-level framework for evaluating the impact of teachers' professional development on their practice, followed by particular techniques that may be used to collect data:

- *Participants' reactions*: focused on assessing whether or not the participants are satisfied with the content and organisation of the TPD – carried out via questionnaires at the end of the course
- *Participants' learning*: focused on measuring the knowledge and skills that the participants gained during their TPD experience, i.e. the attainment of specific learning goals – carried out via paper-and-pencil instruments, simulation demonstrations, reflections (oral and/or written), and portfolios
- *Organisation support and change*: focused on exploring the organisation's support and change processes in practically implementing teachers' newly acquired

knowledge and skills gained from their TPD activities – carried out via questionnaires, interviews with participants and district or school administrators, as well as portfolios

- *Participants' use of new knowledge and skills*: focused on investigating the implementation of new ideas and practices in teaching settings, preferably some time after the end of the TPD programme, because only then can the real impact of the new skills on professional practice be measured – carried out via questionnaires, structured interviews with participants and their supervisors, participant reflections and portfolios, direct observations, and video or audio recordings
- *Student learning outcomes*: focused on examining how TPD activities affect student learning outcomes – carried out via student and school records; questionnaires; interviews with students, parents, teachers, and/or administrators; and participant portfolios

Desimone's (2009) TPD framework suggests five sequential levels for evaluating the effects of TPD: ranging from teachers' experiences of the core features of TPD; to changes in their knowledge, skills, and attitudes; to increased instructional practices; and to changes in student learning outcomes. The fifth and final component in this model is described as a 'context' – including, for example, teachers' and students' characteristics, leadership, and school policies. In contrast to Guskey, Desimone does not specify concrete methods for evaluation for each stage of her model, arguing that all observation, interview, and survey tools used to measure professional development and its effects on instruction have both strengths and weaknesses; she posits that it is, therefore, better to instead select data collection methods to suit each unique context or situation.

In sum, the evaluation framework developed via this ETAR project derives core elements from both models, namely:

- it purposefully focuses on changes generated by the *Training Model* in teachers' knowledge, skills, and attitudes regarding the assessment of the transversal competences gained via long-term pupil mobilities
- it gathers information not only from teachers but also from other stakeholders (i.e. teachers trainers)
- it combines various methods of data collection, i.e. survey tools, interviews, and document analysis
- it examines both short term effects (i.e. teachers' satisfaction with the *Training Model*) and long-term effects (i.e. teachers' implementation of their updated/new knowledge, attitudes, and skills via the *Training Model* before and after sending their students for a period of mobility)

Another important source of insight for devising the evaluation framework in this study were the guidelines for the implementation, assessment, and evaluation included in the *Training Model for education professionals on Assessment of Transversal Competences developed in long-term individual pupil mobility* (Jurczik-Arnold & Baiutti, 2021). These guidelines offer the following principles:

- evaluate the short term impact of the training (i.e. immediately after completing the *Training Model*) and the long term impact of the training (i.e. six to ten months after completing the *Training Model*)
- gather feedback from diverse stakeholders: e.g., students, teachers, and head teachers
- be mindful that national legislation may influence the rules governing training accreditation and evaluation in practice
- be ready to apply evaluation findings to adapt trainings going forwards

As this project is still ongoing, in this report we present the methodology and results of the research pertaining exclusively to piloting this model among teacher trainers and teachers in Belgium (Flanders), Estonia, and Poland.

Chapter 3. Research design

Research design for teacher trainers

Aims and procedure

The main aims of gathering data from the teacher trainers were:

- to examine their opinions and perceptions regarding the *Training Model*
- to investigate their confidence in adapting and delivering the *Training Model* to teachers in their own countries
- to explore their opinions on the training they received (in terms of structure, content, and activities)

The training of teacher trainers (TTT) was delivered by the three core project team members in a blended format: one online training session (June 2022) and a four-day residential training (August 2022). 11 teacher trainers representing four European countries took part in this training – two from Belgium (Flanders), one from the Netherlands, four from Poland, and four from Estonia. During the TTT, teacher trainers were empowered to:

- adapt and deliver the *Training Model* for teachers in their own countries,
- support teachers after the *Training Model* course in using the approaches and tools covered,

- join a European network of teacher trainers knowledgeable about the assessment of transversal skills gained via individual pupil mobility (IPM) and eager to share good practices for the *Training Model* implementation.

The core programme of TTT was organised around three main thematic sessions, drawn from the *Training Model*: (1) the context and value of long-term IPM within the process of internationalising school education; (2) learning outcomes and transversal competences relevant to long-term IPM; and (3) assessment of transversal competences developed via long-term IPM. These sessions were complemented by: one introductory session on the broader ETAR project; three reflection sessions on how to adapt the content just learned for use in their own context; one session on the monitoring framework and tools; and one session on the planning of trainings at national level.

Data collection and instrument

Data were collected from teacher trainers via survey questionnaire at the end of their final training session. The survey was prepared in English and covered four sections. The first section consisted of 14 items (arranged on a five-point Likert scale from 5, i.e. strongly agree, to 1, i.e. strongly disagree) to explore teacher trainers' opinions and perceptions regarding the *Training Model*. In addition there were two open-ended questions regarding the strengths and weaknesses of the *Training Model*. The second section consisted of nine items (arranged on a five-point Likert scale from 5, i.e. very confident, to 1, i.e. not confident at all) exploring their confidence in their ability to adapt and deliver the *Training Model* in their own countries following the training they received. Then there were three open-ended questions to identify teacher trainers' own professional strengths and concerns and/or challenges in adapting and delivering the *Training Model* to teachers in their own national contexts. The third section consisted of 13 items (arranged on a five-point Likert scale from 5, i.e. strongly agree, to 1, i.e. strongly disagree) investigating teacher trainers' opinions and experiences on the training they received, plus one open-ended question offering space for them to provide more detailed feedback. Some of the survey questions in this section were adopted from Makopoulou et al.'s (2021) study. The last section was designed to gather demographic data (e.g. age, gender, and years of experience in delivering training for teachers) and it consisted of seven questions.

Participants

All 11 teacher trainers who took part in the TTT filled out the English-language questionnaire. Among them, seven participants were women, three men, and one chose not to disclose their gender. Participants recorded their ages as follows: one aged under 25; four aged 25-35; three aged 36-45; and three aged 46-55. At the time of study, seven teacher trainers

worked in the school-based sector; three in the higher education sector; and one represented both sectors. The participants' years of professional experience ranged from one year to 30 years (M=13.13). Seven teacher trainers held a master's degree, two a PhD/Ed degree, and two a bachelor's degree. Participants' experience in delivering training for teachers (on any topic) spanned from 0 to 20 years (M=6.63), and their experience in delivering teacher training on international mobility spanned from 0 to 7 years (M=1.90).

Data analysis and ethical considerations

For the quantitative data, descriptive statistics (i.e. mean, median, and standard deviation) were calculated using Microsoft Excel. The qualitative data, gathered from responses to open-ended questions, were analysed using thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Firstly, the principal investigator (PI) analysed all responses to each open-ended question in order to identify the initial codes and categories emerging from the data. Secondly, two other members of the research team discussed this coding and categorisation, then met with the PI in order to agree upon a final list of categories for each open-ended question.

The study was approved by the Faculty of Education Ethical Committee at the University of Białystok. Before conducting the assessments, a researcher explained to participants, both in verbal and written forms, that participation was voluntary, and that responses would be recorded anonymously and kept confidential. The study's procedure and objectives were also explained.

Research design for teachers

Aims and procedure

The data from the teachers were collected with these main aims:

- to examine teachers' knowledge, skills, and attitudes regarding the assessment of pupils' transversal competences developed via long-term individual mobility – before and after they participate in the *Training Model*
- to explore teachers' opinions on the *Training Model* (in terms of structure, content, and activities)

Data were collected at two points in time between November 2022 and March 2023 from the three cohorts of teachers (i.e., from Poland, Belgium (Flanders), and Estonia) recruited for the training:

- T1, pre-test: in Poland and Estonia, data were collected two weeks before the start of the *Training Model* in order to explore teachers' knowledge, skills, and attitudes in terms of assessing the transversal competences pupils developed via long-term

individual pupil mobility. In Belgium (Flanders), pre-test data were collected at the start of the first day of training, before beginning the course;

- T2, post-test: data were collected at the end of the *Training Model* in order to examine the immediate changes in teachers' knowledge, skills, and attitudes occurring as a result of their participation in the *Training Model*, as well as their opinions on the training they received (in terms of structure, content, and activities). Due to some problems with the recruitment process in Estonia, this phase of evaluation was completed in Poland and Belgium (Flanders) only.

Data collection and instruments

Survey questionnaires were used to gather both pre- and post-test data.

The pre-test survey questionnaire consists of 38 items (arranged on a five-point Likert scale from strongly agree at 5 to strongly disagree at 1) designed to measure teachers' knowledge, skills, and attitudes regarding assessing the transversal competences pupils gained via individual long-term pupil mobility (IPM). The items were built upon the intended learning outcomes (i.e. teachers' knowledge, skills, and attitudes) specified for each thematic session included in the *Training Model*, namely: (1) the context and value of long-term IPM within the process of internationalising school education (items 1 to 17); (2) the pupils' learning outcomes and transversal competences relevant to long-term IPM (items 18 to 28); and (3) assessment of the transversal competences pupils developed via long-term IPM (items 29 to 38). The questionnaire also contains three open-ended questions intended to explore the teachers' strengths, concerns, and training needs' regarding assessing the transversal competences gained via long-term IPM, and six questions regarding the teachers' demographics (e.g. gender and years of professional teaching experience in general, as well as years of professional experience in sending pupils for long-term mobilities).

The post-test survey questionnaire consists of three sections. The first section consists of 40 items (arranged on a five-point Likert scale from strongly agree at 5 to strongly disagree at 1) designed to measure changes in the teachers' knowledge, skills, and attitudes regarding assessing the transversal competences pupils gained via long-term IPM, as the result of their participation in the *Training Model*. 38 of these 40 items are exactly the same as in the pre-test survey questionnaire, and the final two items explore the teachers' perceptions of the *Learning Agreement*. The second section consists of 18 items (arranged on a five-point Likert scale from strongly agree at 5 to strongly disagree at 1) exploring teachers' opinions and perceptions regarding the *Training Model* – followed by five open-ended questions offering the teachers space to provide more detailed feedback regarding various aspects of the *Training Model*. Some of the survey questions in this section were adopted from

Makopoulou et al.'s (2021) study. The third section consists of six questions designed to gather the teachers' demographic data (e.g. gender, years of professional teaching experience in general, and years of professional experience in sending pupils for long-term mobilities).

Both questionnaires were prepared in English, the project team's shared working language, then translated by team members into the teacher cohorts' respective languages (i.e. Polish, Estonian, and Belgian), before being distributed to them online (in Poland and Estonia) and in a paper version (Belgium, Flanders).

Participants

The pre-test (T1) evaluation was completed by $n = 75$ teachers, of whom $n = 64$ were from Poland, $n = 7$ from Belgium (Flanders), and $n = 4$ from Estonia (see Table 1). The mean age of participants was $M = 46.08$ (min = 29, max = 61), and they reported their genders as: $n = 56$ female, $n = 10$ male, and $n = 9$ preferred not to say. Collectively, they taught a range of subjects, including mathematics, history, physics, sports, and languages. In terms of years of professional experience in sending pupils for long-term mobilities: $n = 45$ reported having none, $n = 21$ reported having some (min = 2 years, max = 30 years), and $n = 9$ did not answer this question. In terms of how many pupil mobilities they had facilitated, they reported as follows: $n = 50$ had facilitated no mobilities; $n = 19$ had facilitated 1 to 5 mobilities; $n = 2$ had facilitated 6 to 10 mobilities; and $n = 4$ had facilitated more than 10 mobilities. Please see Table 2 for an overview of participants' demographics.

The post-test evaluation (T2) was completed by $n = 59$ teachers, of whom $n = 52$ were from Poland and $n = 7$ from Belgium (Flanders). Teachers from Estonia did not take part in this phase of the study because they had not yet completed the full training cycle. The mean age of participants was $M = 46.5$ (min = 32 and max = 61), and they reported their genders as $n = 45$ female, $n = 10$ male, and $n = 4$ preferred not to say. Collectively, they taught a range of subjects, including mathematics, history, physics, sports, and languages. In terms of years of professional experience in sending pupils for long-term mobilities: $n = 40$ reported having none, $n = 14$ reported having some (min = 2 years, max = 30 years), and $n = 5$ did not answer this question. In terms of how many pupil mobilities they had facilitated, they reported as follows: $n = 38$ had facilitated no mobilities; $n = 15$ had facilitated 1 to 5 mobilities; $n = 2$ had facilitated 6 to 10 mobilities; and $n = 4$ had facilitated more than 10 mobilities. Please see Table 2 for an overview of participants' demographics.

Table 1. Number of participants taking part in *Training Model* and pre- and post-test surveys per country

Country	Number of participants completed pre-test survey	Number of participants attending <i>Training Model</i>	Number of participants completed post-test survey
Poland	64	60*	52
Estonia	4	4	0
Belgium (Flanders)	7	7	7
Total	75	71	59

*The difference in the numbers of teachers from Poland participating in the pre-test and participating in the *Training Model* is due to these participants dropping out before the course started.

Table 2. Participant demographics for pre-test and post-test

Demographic		Pre-test (N)	Post-test (N)
Gender	female	56	45
	male	10	10
	preferred not to say	9	4
National setting	Poland	64	52
	Estonia	4	0
	Belgium (Flanders)	7	7
Number of pupil mobilities facilitated	1-5	19	15
	6-10	2	2
	more than 10	4	4
	no mobilities	50	38
Years of professional experience in sending pupils for mobilities	0	45	40
	1-5	13	9
	6-20	3	1
	>20	6	4
	no answer	8	5

Data analysis and ethical considerations

For the quantitative data, descriptive statistics (i.e. mean, median, and standard deviation) were calculated using Microsoft Excel. The qualitative data, gathered from responses to open-ended questions, were analysed using thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Firstly, the PI used Deepl to machine translate all of the participants' responses from Polish, Estonian, and Flemish into English, then analysed them in line with each open-ended question in order to identify the initial codes and categories emerging from the data. Where any concerns arose, the PI contacted members of the national teams to ascertain the best possible understanding of the respondent's words. Secondly, two other members of the research team discussed this initial coding and categorisation, then met with the PI to agree upon a final list of categories for each open-ended question.

For the purpose of this preliminary report, the research results drawn from all three countries are presented collectively in Chapter 4, without any reference to the other variables included in this study (e.g. age or gender).

Chapter 4. Results

The impact of the Training Model from the perspective of teacher trainers

Teacher trainers' opinions and perceptions regarding the Training Model

The teacher trainers were asked to rate various aspects of the *Training Model* across 14 items (arranged on a five-point Likert scale from 5, i.e. strongly agree, to 1, i.e. strongly disagree) (Table 3).

Table 3. Teacher trainers' ratings of the *Training Model*

Item	Median *	Mean	SD
The <i>Training Model</i> helps broaden teachers' knowledge on internationalisation and pupil mobility.	5	4.72	0.46
The <i>Training Model</i> helps raise teachers' awareness of policy in terms of internationalisation and pupil mobility.	5	4.63	0.50
The <i>Training Model</i> answers key questions regarding the assessment of the transversal (especially intercultural) competences gained via pupil mobility.	5	4.36	0.80
The <i>Training Model</i> activities help teachers to develop their skills in the assessment of the transversal (especially	4	4.36	0.67

intercultural) competences gained via pupil mobility.			
The content of the <i>Training Model</i> offers new ways to assess transversal (especially intercultural) competences.	5	4.45	0.68
The Learning Agreement is a useful tool to facilitate the assessment of the transversal (especially intercultural) competences gained via pupil mobility.	5	4.81	0.40
The <i>Training Model</i> finds a good balance between online and face-to-face activities.	4	4.09	0.70
The <i>Training Model</i> offers concrete examples of best practices in assessing transversal (especially intercultural) competences.	5	4.36	0.92
The <i>Training Model</i> finds a good balance between theory and practice.	4	3.81	1.32
The <i>Training Model</i> offers teachers a satisfactory amount of hands-on experiences.	4	3.72	1.01
The <i>Training Model</i> may serve as a good basis to assess students' further competences (i.e. other than transversal or intercultural competences).	4	4.27	0.64
The <i>Training Model</i> should become a permanent part of regional/local continuous professional development (CPD) offers for teachers.	4	4.36	0.67
I will recommend the <i>Training Model</i> to continuous professional development (CPD) providers and policy makers in my country.	5	4.54	0.68
I will recommend the <i>Training Model</i> to teachers and headteachers in my country.	5	4.63	0.50

*Responses range on a five-point Likert scale from 5, i.e. strongly agree, to 1, i.e. strongly disagree.

These results indicate that the majority of the participants evaluated the *Training Model* positively, as the mean ratings for nearly all of the items (i.e. 12 out of 14) were higher than 4.00. The participants particularly appreciated that the *Training Model*: helps broaden teachers' knowledge on internationalisation and pupil mobility (M=4.72; SD=0.46); offers a Learning Agreement as a useful tool for facilitating the assessment of transversal (especially intercultural) competences gained via pupil mobility (M=4.81; SD=0.40); helps raise teachers' awareness of policy in terms of internationalisation and pupil mobility (M=4.63; SD=0.50); and is worth recommending to teachers and headteachers (M=4.63; SD=0.50), as well as to continuous professional development (CPD) providers and policy makers in their

countries (M=4.54; SD=0.68). On the contrary, teacher trainers gave lower ratings to other aspects of the model, in particular: finding a good balance between theory and practice (M=3.81; SD=1.32) and offering teachers a satisfactory amount of hands-on experiences (M=3.72; SD=1.01).

The participants were invited to express more detailed explanations regarding the strengths and weaknesses of the *Training Model* in two open-ended questions.

As for the strengths of this model, the participants mainly highlighted its focus on automatic recognition (AR) and individual pupil mobility – an important yet relatively rarely discussed topic in their countries. Some representative examples of their feedback are as follows:

It [i.e. the *Training Model*] covers all the important factors connected to student mobility and AR, and supports a wider goal of making student mobility a norm and supporting participating pupils in an effective way. (Survey 4)

It [i.e. the *Training Model*] finally focuses on the thing (that is AR) which has been the topic of educational goals for some time. The topic of AR is not always discussed (e.g. in exchange organisations), however it should be one of the main goals for global education. (Survey 2)

Some other participants highlighted that the *Training Model* offers practical tools that could be easily adapted to their specific national contexts and used by teachers in their every-day practice:

It is quite flexible, so can be adapted to make a national version. (Survey 6)

Two teacher trainers also appreciated that model content combines practical and theoretical issues well, referring, for example, to:

... a good mixture of theory with practice. (Survey 8)

Participants were also asked to identify the weaknesses of the *Training Model*. Among them they mainly stressed: the huge amount of time and effort needed to adapt the *Training Model* to national contexts; the lack of terminological consistency (e.g. transversal competences vs. intercultural competences); and the insufficient number of clear, practical examples illustrating complex issues. The nature of these weaknesses are clearly illustrated in the quotation below:

[Adapting the model demands] huge amounts of work. Country-specific differences bring in a whole other layer to consider. Mindsets are the most difficult thing to change. [These efforts] also include a lot of lobby work (e.g. with the Ministry of Education), which will also be an extra line of work for us. Both the project and AR generally have a lot of conditions to be fulfilled (e.g. the student has to want AR, has to go to another EU country, and has to learn at a school that is willing to automatically recognise pupil mobility), which make it quite a difficult one. (Survey 2)

Two teacher trainers also pointed out that the model places too much focus on frontal teaching methods – i.e. focusing mainly on transmitting knowledge rather than encouraging teachers to be actively engaged in the learning process.

The training model mostly uses frontal teaching methods which doesn't really go with the idea of student-centred teaching (i.e. if a teacher trainer doesn't teach in a way that a teacher should teach their own students, then the whole theoretical content fundamentally doesn't click). (Survey 4)

The participants also had an opportunity to share their recommendations for the further development of the *Training Model*. Two main themes emerged from this qualitative data, demonstrating that enrichment efforts should be made regarding, namely, teaching methods and hands-on examples.

As for the teaching methods, participants proposed that the model should include more interactive methods (e.g. tasks and midway points) in order to engage teachers more actively with the content. Some participants also suggested reflective/summary tasks before and after thematic sessions. For example:

The *Training Model* and trainer training cannot be a lecture. [...] If we are supposed to make the training (that we go on to give in the future) interactive and engaging for teachers then it would be great if some of the methods could be taken and adapted from the trainers' training we receive. (Survey 2)

It would be good to add more examples taken from real life experience to better explain the points. (Survey 9)

[I think you should] add well designed feedback and summary sessions between the topics and add more active teaching methods. (Survey 4)

As for the hand-on experiences, several teachers recommended including more practical examples in the model to help them better understand complex issues regarding the assessment of transversal competences.

[I think you should use] case studies from the national trainings as hands-on examples. (Survey 8)

Teacher trainers' confidence in adapting and delivering the Training Model to teachers in their own countries

The participants were asked to rate nine items (arranged on a five-point Likert scale from 5, i.e. very confident, to 1, i.e. not confident at all) regarding their confidence in their ability to adapt and deliver the *Training Model* in their own countries, following the training they received (see Table 4).

Table 4. Teacher trainers' ratings of their confidence in adapting and delivering the Training Model

After the training you have received, how confident are you in your ability to...	Median*	Mean	SD
adapt the <i>Training Model</i> to your own national context?	4	4.00	1.00
deliver the <i>Training Model</i> to teachers in your own national context?	4	4.36	0.67
deliver a thematic session on the context and value of long-term individual pupil mobility within the process of internationalising school education?	5	4.63	0.50
deliver a thematic session on learning outcomes and transversal competences relevant to long-term individual pupil mobility?	5	4.63	0.50
deliver a thematic session on the assessment of the transversal competences developed via long-term individual pupil mobility?	5	4.54	0.52
explain to teachers the value and usefulness of the Learning Agreement in assessing the transversal (especially intercultural) competences gained via pupil mobility?	4	4.18	0.87
provide teachers with instructional advice on how to use	4	4.09	0.53

the Learning Agreement in assessing the transversal (especially intercultural) competences gained via pupil mobility?			
support teachers in using the approaches and tools presented within the <i>Training Model</i> ?	4	4.09	0.83
answer any questions teachers may have regarding the <i>Training Model</i> ?	4	4.00	0.63

* Responses range on a five-point Likert scale from 5, i.e. very confident, to 1, i.e. not confident at all.

These results indicate that the participants generally felt confident (or very confident) after the training they received on adapting and delivering the *Training Model* to teachers in their own countries, since their mean ratings for all of the specified elements were 4.00 or more. The areas in which participants felt most confident were: delivering a thematic session on the context and value of long-term IPM within the process of internationalising school education (M=4.63; SD=0.50); delivering a thematic session on learning outcomes and transversal competences relevant to long-term IPM (M=4.63; SD=0.50); and delivering a thematic session on the assessment of transversal competences developed via long-term IPM (M=4.54; SD=0.52). These ratings may suggest that teacher trainers primarily felt empowered to transmit knowledge to teachers as a result of their training.

On the contrary, teacher trainers felt less confident in their abilities to: adapt the *Training Model* to their own national context (M=4.00; SD=1.00); provide teachers with instructional advice on how to use the Learning Agreement in assessing the transversal (especially intercultural) competences gained via pupil mobility (M=4.09; SD=0.53); support teachers in using the approaches and tools presented within the *Training Model* (M=4.09; SD=0.83); and answer any questions teachers may have regarding the *Training Model* (M=4.00; SD=0.63). The participants were also asked to identify their own professional strengths and concerns and/or challenges in adapting and delivering the *Training Model* to teachers in their own national contexts.

Professional strengths

In terms of professional strengths, the analysis indicates that teacher trainers' answers can be grouped into two categories: their personal characteristics and traits, then their professional knowledge and skills.

Regarding their personal characteristics and traits, the teacher trainers highlighted that their qualities such as empathy, openness, flexibility, enthusiasm, and willingness to work hard would be very helpful in adapting the model to national contexts.

Regarding their professional knowledge and skills, several teacher trainers emphasised that they had extensive professional experience both at the school level (e.g. referring to 'being a teacher myself') and at the university level, plus in mobility youth organisations. Therefore, they had a breadth of pedagogical knowledge (e.g. on 'foundations of education'; 'assessment'; 'interculturalism'; and 'individualisation of education'), as well as specialist knowledge on the issues included in the *Training Model* (e.g. on 'international student mobility' and 'intercultural competence assessment'). The participants also mentioned a number of professional skills they already possess, which they believe could be very helpful in implementing the model, for example: linguistics, research, and assessment skills.

Concerns/challenges

Participants' responses on their concerns and/or challenges in adapting and delivering the *Training Model* to teachers in their own national contexts can be grouped into three categories: the needs and expectations of teachers as a target audience of the *Training Model*; the content and structure of the *Training Model*; logistic issues; and their individual resources.

Regarding the needs and expectations of teachers as the target group for the *Training Model*, teacher trainers feared that it could be difficult to get teachers interested by mobility issues when they are overworked and do not have enough time to undertake activities other than their core professional duties. For example, they expressed concerns about:

the motivation levels of the teachers I will train. (Survey 7)

and

time as a resource for teachers. (Survey 6)

Furthermore, participants emphasised that contemporary teachers are focused mainly on the formal achievements of their students, whereas international mobility is comparatively marginal in the day-to-day realities of school life in their countries. This gap makes it very challenging to make these competences a priority in teachers' work with pupils. Participants worried about:

... teachers focusing primarily on academic outcomes, with a lack of attention or readiness towards transversal competences. (Survey 3)

... teachers' resistance or uncertainty. (Survey 8)

... schools having limited experience of IPM and few students being interested in IPM. (Survey 11)

Furthermore, several teachers pointed out that the aforementioned challenges related to teachers' needs and expectations could cause problems in the logistics of adapting the *Training Model* for their countries. More precisely, participants shared concerns regarding finding and recruiting enough – and diverse enough – teachers who send their students on mobility:

I am concerned about outreach: what about the range of participants? (Survey 1)

I think it will be difficult to find teachers eligible for the training. (Survey 10)

Several teacher trainers also highlighted concerns regarding the content and structure of the *Training Model* itself – in particular whether or not they would be able to incorporate their country-specific issues fully into the model and translate the model's terminology correctly into their own languages. They had questions around, for example:

... how much can I change the training (i.e. achieving the same learning outcomes but via different session outlines and methods). (Survey 4)

... how I can ensure that my own country-specific issues get addressed via the model. (Survey 2)

... what the length of the training should be and the amount of theory I should incorporate. (Survey 8)

Teacher trainers were also concerned about their own resources in terms of, among other things, a lack of time to adapt the model, a lack of experience in organising teacher trainings, and the huge effort involved in preparing teacher trainings. They highlighted that:

[it might be difficult to] find teachers, as well as a training time and location. (Survey 10)

[this would be my] first time doing that and I don't have much experience. (Survey 9)

[I would become] overloaded with the preparatory work. (Survey 8)

The participants were also asked to identify three further training needs that would improve their abilities to adapt and deliver the *Training Model* to teachers in their own national contexts. They explained that they primarily needed more training around Learning Agreements, and the response below is typical for those teacher trainers:

I need more practical direction on writing the Learning Agreement and assessment tools. (Survey 7)

They also suggested that training on competency-based assessment and more active teacher training methods would improve their abilities to adapt and deliver the *Training Model*. For example:

I need more training on competence-based assessment: the theoretical background of it, the general background of it, and the methodology of it, etc. (Survey 4)

Teacher trainers' opinions on the training they received

Teacher trainers were also asked to evaluate 13 items (arranged on a five-point Likert scale from 5, i.e. strongly agree, to 1, i.e. strongly disagree) covering their opinions on and experiences of the training they received (Table 5).

Table 5. Teacher trainers' ratings of the training they received

Item	Median *	Mean	SD
The course objectives were clearly formulated.	5	4.54	0.68
The course workload was manageable.	4	3.63	1.12
The course was well organised (e.g. timely access to materials, notification of changes, etc.).	4	3.63	1.43
Overall, the course was well structured towards achieving the learning outcomes.	5	4.00	1.41
The course found a good balance between theory and practice.	5	3.63	1.68
The course found a good balance between individual and	4	3.72	1.42

group activities.			
The course answered my most pressing questions regarding the adaptation and delivery of the <i>Training Model</i> for teachers in my own national context.	4	4.18	0.87
The learning and teaching methods encouraged participation.	4	3.54	1.57
The course found a good balance between online and face-to-face activities.	5	4.36	1.28
I had regular opportunities to freely discuss, criticise, and/or evaluate the content and proposed activities of the course.	5	4.45	0.93
The learning materials provided (e.g. course notes, etc.) were relevant and useful.	4	4.36	0.67
Via the course I was able to meet people who are knowledgeable and approachable on the assessment of the transversal (especially intercultural) competences gained via pupil mobility.	4	4.18	0.75
Overall, the course was worth the time I took away from my regular routines and duties.	5	4.00	1.54

*Responses range on a five-point Likert scale from 5, i.e. strongly agree, to 1, i.e. strongly disagree.

Overall, the results indicate that the participants rated their training experiences positively, with the mean ratings for 8 out of the 13 statements at 4.00 or more. The participants did indeed appreciate that: the course objectives were clearly formulated (M=4.54; SD=0.68); they had regular opportunities to freely discuss, criticise, and/or evaluate the content and proposed activities of the course (M=4.45; SD=0.93); the course found a good balance between online and face-to-face activities (M=4.36; SD=1.28); and the learning materials provided (e.g. course notes, etc.) were relevant and useful (M=4.36; 0.67). On the contrary, the participants rated the following items relatively lower: the manageability of the course workload (M=3.63; SD=1.12); its organisation in terms of, for example, timely access to materials and notification of changes (M=3.63; SD=1.14); the balance between theory and practice (M=3.72; SD=1.42); and whether or not learning and teaching methods encouraged participation (M=3.54; SD=1.57).

The participants were also encouraged to provide more detailed feedback on the training in an open-ended question. Three participants used this opportunity to thank organisers for the course preparation and delivery, as well as express their gratitude at meeting fellow professionals interested in mobilities.

The impact of the Training Model from the perspective of teachers

Pre-test to post-test change in teachers' knowledge, skills, and attitudes regarding assessing transversal competences pupils gained via long-term IPM

The effectiveness of our model in developing teachers' knowledge, skills, and attitudes regarding assessing the transversal competences gained via long-term IPM is shown in Tables 6, 7, and 8. These tables summarise the changes in participants' agreement levels (in percentages and means) with the statements included in the pre-test and post-test surveys.

Item	Strongly agree/agree		Mean*	
	Pre-t est	Post-test	Pre-t est	Post-t est
	%	%		
I know the priorities of European policy regarding the internationalisation of school education.	41.3	100	3.09	4.49
I know the priorities of national policy regarding the internationalisation of school education.	38.7	88.2	3.01	4.35
I know the priorities of national legislation regarding educational mobility.	44.0	88.2	3.16	4.27
I know the priorities of European legislation regarding educational mobility.	40.5	91.5	3.19	4.33
I think that 'individual long-term mobility' should last for more than one year.	65.3	37.3	3.62	2.62
I am familiar with the quality principles of educational mobility.	46.7	91.5	3.28	4.52
I have a wide knowledge of the current data regarding individual pupil mobility in my country (e.g. numbers of	21.3	72.9	2.54	3.89

pupils undertaking mobilities).				
I think that competences for pupils' mobility can only be defined in terms of knowledge acquired.	22.7	33.9	2.28	2.52
I am familiar with the <i>Key competences for lifelong learning</i> framework.	56.0	96.6	3.49	4.57
I am familiar with the <i>Reference framework of competences for democratic culture</i> .	26.7	83.1	2.69	4.25
I am familiar with the <i>Global competences</i> framework.	25.3	84.7	2.58	4.25
I am familiar with the Intercultural competences framework.	30.7	89.8	2.68	4.35
I am familiar with national guidelines/legislation on how to assess students' competences.	32.0	84.7	2.89	4.10
I am familiar with school guidelines/legislation on how to assess students' competences in general.	67.6	91.4	3.85	4.55
I am familiar with school guidelines/legislation on how to assess students' competences gained via individual pupil mobility.	39.2	89.7	3.08	4.37
I know where to search for relevant resources on tools for assessing transversal and intercultural competences.	42.7	94.9	3.18	4.64

*Responses range on a five-point Likert scale from 5, i.e. strongly agree, to 1, i.e. strongly disagree.

In terms of the *Training Model's* contribution to developing the teachers' knowledge, the greatest increase in their level of agreement, i.e. from pre-test to post-test, regarded their familiarity with the following: the *Global competences* framework (25.3% at pre-test and

84.7% at post-test; the *Intercultural competences* framework (30.7% at pre-test and 89.8% at post-test); the *Reference framework of competences for democratic culture* (26.7% at pre-test and 83.1% at post-test); the priorities of European policy regarding the internationalisation of school education (41.3% at pre-test and 100.0% at post-test); national guidelines/legislation on how to assess students' competences (32.0% at pre-test and 84.7% at post-test); as well as where to search for relevant resources on tools for assessing transversal and intercultural competences (47.0% at pre-test and 94.9% at post-test).

Table 7. Pre-test to post-test change in teachers' skills

Item	Strongly agree/agree		Mean*	
	Pre-t est	Post-test	Pre-t est	Post-t est
	%	%		
I can use various strategies to promote internationalisation in my school.	68.9	96.6	3.79	4.55
I can identify false perceptions and assumptions around pupil mobility.	66.2	89.8	3.81	4.44
Through different methods and activities, I am able to foster the development of transversal competences among students in my classroom.	85.9	96.6	4.18	4.53
When reading a pupil mobility testimonial, I can recognise the particular learning outcomes that come from long-term individual pupil mobility.	54.8	89.8	3.57	4.47
I can involve different school stakeholders in planning and supporting long-term individual pupil mobility.	60.8	86.2	3.71	4.24
I can select the most appropriate types of and approaches to assessing students' competences.	60.8	94.8	3.64	4.44

Even if 'assessment' is a widely debated concept, I can precisely formulate the principles of competency assessment.	61.3	89.8	3.65	4.32
I can define criteria for transversal and intercultural competence assessment.	48.0	93.2	3.30	4.42
I can select the most appropriate tools for assessing the learning outcomes gained via long-term pupil mobility.	42.7	91.5	3.18	4.37
I can adapt existing models of assessment to my local/school context.	67.1	84.5	3.98	4.31
I can use the <i>Learning Agreement</i> to assess the transversal (especially intercultural) competences of my students who have experienced a mobility period.	-	94.9	-	4.64

*Responses range on a five-point Likert scale from 5, i.e. strongly agree, to 1, i.e. strongly disagree.

In terms of the *Training Model's* contribution to developing the teachers' skills, the greatest increase in their level of agreement, i.e. from pre-test to post-test phases, regarded the following: selecting the most appropriate tools for assessing the learning outcomes gained via long-term pupil mobility (42.7% at pre-test and 91.5% at post-test); defining criteria for transversal and intercultural competence assessment (48.0% at pre-test and 93.2% at post-test); recognising the particular learning outcomes that come from long-term IPM (54.8% at pre-test and 89.8% at post-test); and selecting the most appropriate types of and approaches to assessing students' competences (60.8% at pre-test and 94.8% at post-test).

Table 7. Pre-test to post-test change in teachers' attitudes

Item	Strongly agree/agree		Mean*	
	Pre-test	Post test	Pre-test	Post-test

	%	%		
I believe that internationalisation is a necessary process for contemporary schools.	98.7	100	4.69	4.84
Internationalisation in education is linked primarily to pupil mobility.	76.0	88.1	3.97	4.28
Internationalisation could be effectively promoted within our national contexts (i.e., in schools).	82.7	91.5	4.20	4.62
I believe that the duration and format of a period of pupil mobility have an impact on its educational value.	93.3	93.2	4.34	4.59
I am aware of my own misunderstandings around pupil mobility.	88.0	94.9	4.25	4.69
Pupil mobility brings many benefits to students.	94.7	100	4.69	4.84
Pupil mobility brings many benefits to schools.	94.7	100	4.66	4.81
Pupil mobility needs to be underpinned by appropriate quality assurance measures.	96.0	96.6	4.52	4.66
Transversal competences should be the main expected result of long-term individual pupil mobility.	68.0	83.1	3.84	4.33
Intercultural competences have a significant place in the curriculum of the subjects I teach.	64.4	87.5	3.86	4.30
I describe myself as an interculturally competent teacher.	68.5	91.2	3.82	4.45

I usually assess the competences of my students.	67.6	79.3	3.79	4.17
When I assess students' competences, I usually assess all three components: knowledge, skills, and attitudes.	78.4	94.8	4.10	4.51
I think it is crucial to assess learning outcomes gained via long-term pupil mobility.	68.0	93.2	3.81	4.49
In order to meaningfully assess the transversal and intercultural competences gained via long-term pupil mobility, there is a need to use a variety of perspectives and methods.	73.3	96.6	3.98	4.66
The <i>Learning Agreement</i> is a useful tool for facilitating the assessment of the transversal (especially intercultural) competences gained via pupil mobility.	-	94.9	-	4.74

*Responses range on a five-point Likert scale from 5, i.e. strongly agree, to 1, i.e. strongly disagree.

In terms of the *Training Model's* contribution to developing the teachers' attitudes, the greatest increase in their level of agreement, i.e. from pre-test to post-test phases regarded the following: the need to assess the learning outcomes gained via long-term IPM (68.0% pre-test and 93.2% post-test); the need to use a variety of perspectives and methods in assessing the learning outcomes gained via long-term IPM (73.3% pre-test and 96.6% post-test); and perceiving themselves as intercultural competent teachers (68.5% pre-test and 91.2% post-test). It should also be noted here that the vast majority of teachers surveyed (94.9%) agreed that the *Learning Agreement* is a useful tool for facilitating the assessment of the transversal (especially intercultural) competences gained via long-term IPM.

Generally speaking, in comparing the pre- and post-*Training Model* participation changes in the teachers' knowledge, skills, and attitudes regarding assessing pupils' transversal competences developed via long-term IPM, their knowledge seems to have been the area most significantly impacted (i.e. more so than their skills and attitudes). By way of

explanation, since the teachers reported possessing a fairly high level of these skills and attitudes at pre-test, it seems likely that their participation in the model has had less of an impact on these particular aspects of their development.

Teachers' opinions on the Training Model

The teachers were asked to rate various aspects of the *Training Model* across 18 survey items, arranged on a five-point Likert scale from strongly agree at 5 to strongly disagree at 1 (see Table 8).

Table 8. Teachers' opinions on the *Training Model*

Item	5		4		3		2		1		Mean
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
During the <i>Training Model</i> I had opportunities to share my knowledge, experience, and ideas with other participants and the trainers.	5 5	93. 2	3	5.1	1	1.7	0	0. 0	0	0. 0	4.91
During the <i>Training Model</i> I had opportunities to extend my knowledge and skills regarding assessment of the transversal (especially intercultural) competences gained via pupil mobility.	5 3	89. 9	4	6.8	2	3.4	0	0. 0	0	0. 0	4.86
During the <i>Training Model</i> I had opportunities to extend my knowledge and skills regarding the <i>Learning Agreement</i> as a tool for assessing transversal (especially intercultural) competences.	5 2	88. 1	5	8.5	2	3.4	0	0. 0	0	0. 0	4.84
During the <i>Training Model</i> I had regular opportunities to freely discuss and evaluate the content and proposed activities of the course.	5 3	89. 8	4	6.8	2	3.4	0	0. 0	0	0. 0	4.86

The <i>Training Model</i> helped raise my awareness of policy in terms of internationalisation and mobility.	5 3	89. 8	4	6.8	2	3.4	0	0. 0	0	0. 0	4.86
The <i>Training Model</i> finds a good balance between online and face-to-face activities.	3 5	62. 5	9	16. 1	1 1	19. 6	0	0. 0	1	1. 8	4.37
The <i>Training Model</i> offers concrete examples of best practices in assessing transversal (especially intercultural) competences.	4 9	83. 1	6	10. 2	4	6.8	0	0. 0	0	0. 0	4.76
The <i>Training Model</i> finds a good balance between theory and practice.	4 4	74. 6	1 3	22. 0	1	1.7	1	1. 7	0	0. 0	4.69
The <i>Training Model</i> finds a good balance between individual and group activities.	4 7	79. 7	9	15. 3	3	5.1	0	0. 0	0	0. 0	4.74
The <i>Training Model</i> answered my most pressing questions regarding assessment of the transversal (especially intercultural) competences gained via pupil mobility.	4 3	72. 9	1 3	22. 0	2	3.4	1	1. 7	0	0. 0	4.66
The content of the <i>Training Model</i> offers new ways to assess transversal (especially intercultural) competences.	4 5	76. 3	1 0	16. 9	3	5.1	1	1. 7	0	0. 0	4.67
The <i>Training Model</i> offered me a satisfactory amount of hands-on experience.	4 7	79. 7	1 0	16. 9	1	1.7	1	1. 7	0	0. 0	4.74

Via the <i>Training Model</i> I was able to meet people who are knowledgeable and approachable on the assessment of the transversal (especially intercultural) competences gained via pupil mobility.	5 1	86. 4	7	11. 9	1	1.7	0	0. 0	0	0. 0	4.84
I intend to implement these new assessment strategies in different areas of my own work.	4 1	69. 5	1 7	28. 8	1	1.7	0	0. 0	0	0. 0	4.67
I intend to engage with the online resources provided during the <i>Training Model</i> in order to expand/deepen my knowledge.	4 5	76. 3	1 2	20. 3	2	3.4	0	0. 0	0	0. 0	4.72
I intend to share my new knowledge with my school colleagues/headteacher.	4 9	83. 1	9	15. 3	1	1.7	0	0. 0	0	0. 0	4.81
I will recommend the <i>Training Model</i> to my colleagues.	4 7	79. 7	1 2	20. 3	0		0		0		4.79
Overall, the course was worth the time away from my regular routines and duties.	5 1	86. 4	7	11. 9	1	1.7	0	0. 0	0	0. 0	4.84

These results indicate that the majority of the participants evaluated the *Training Model* positively, with the mean ratings for nearly all items (i.e. 16 out of the 18) being higher than 4.70. The participants particularly appreciated that the *Training Model*: creates opportunities to share their knowledge, experience, and ideas with other participants and the trainers (M=4.91), and to freely discuss and evaluate the content and proposed activities of the course (M=4.86); helps broaden their knowledge and skills regarding assessment of the transversal (especially intercultural) competences gained via long-term IPM (M=4.86), as

well as raises their awareness of policy in terms of internationalisation and mobility (M=4.86); and offers opportunities to extend their knowledge and skills regarding the *Learning Agreement* as a tool for assessing transversal (especially intercultural) competences (M=4.84).

The teachers gave comparatively lower ratings to other aspects of the model, in particular: finding a good balance between online and face-to-face activities (M=4.37); offering new ways to assess transversal (especially intercultural) competences (M=4.67); and encouraging them to implement these new assessment strategies in different areas of their own work (M=4.67). Despite these slightly lower ratings, the vast majority of respondents (84%) emphasised that the course was worth the time away from my regular routines and duties, and that they will share their new knowledge with their school colleagues/headteacher (83%), creating cause for optimism.

The participants were invited to share more detailed explanations regarding the strengths and weaknesses of the *Training Model* in five open-ended questions.

Firstly, teachers were asked to share their opinions about the *Training Model's* contribution to their knowledge regarding assessing the transversal (especially intercultural) competences developed via IPM. The majority of respondents pointed out that the *Training Model* had significantly broadened or systematised their knowledge of assessing these competences, in particular:

- enabling them to learn about new tools for assessing transversal (especially intercultural) competences
- helping them to understand the importance and necessity of assessing these competences in their wider teaching processes (i.e. not only in relation to IPM)
- increasing their willingness and confidence to assess these competences.

Some representative examples of their feedback are follows:

'The *Training Model* helped me to consolidate my knowledge and to clarify important aspects of my competences' (Survey 8)

'I learnt about assessment methods and their criteria' (Survey 11)

'I understood the important role transversal competences play in a modern school' (Survey 26)

Secondly, the teachers were also asked to indicate which activities offered during the *Training Model* they found most helpful, and they mainly highlighted:

- discussions

- group work
- practical exercises on preparing the *Learning Agreement*
- case studies

Thirdly, in addition to these significant knowledge gains, a high proportion of respondents indicated that the *Training Model* increased their skills for assessing the transversal (especially intercultural) competences developed via IPM. Teachers particularly appreciated the model's contribution to the development of their skills in identifying, naming, and defining transversal competences, as well as in using a variety of tools to assess them. For example:

I have learnt to describe these competences and to think about what activities can develop them; I am aware of how to carry out evaluation (Survey 14)

However, several respondents indicated that the model did more to confirm than improve their proficiency in skills they already possessed, as this statement clearly illustrates:

This training did not enhance but rather *organised* my abilities to assess transversal competences [emphasis ours] (Survey 16)

In contrast, other teachers acknowledged that the model provided them with fundamental motivations and skills, ready for practical implementation and improvement in the future, for example:

I still need to practise, but it has given me impulses in which direction to go (Survey 42)

Fourthly, a high percentage of the respondents said that the *Training Model* did not significantly challenge or change their attitudes towards assessing the transversal (especially intercultural) competences developed via IPM, but that it strengthened their belief in the importance of these competences in contemporary schools, as well as the need to assess them.

It is worth paying more attention to transversal competences when teaching in the classroom (Survey 31)

It has confirmed my positive position regarding the assessment of these competences (Survey 41)

Fifthly, respondents were also asked what topics they thought should be addressed via the *Training Model* in the future. The vast majority of respondents stated that they would like to increase their knowledge of the organisational, legal, and financial aspects of long-term IPM:

Formal issues relating to mobility (Survey 27)

Legal aspects, as well as the question of insurance for those leaving and being received (Survey 39)

Financial aspects, accounting, and fundraising for mobility (Survey 47)

Several respondents also noted the need to motivate wider school communities to support long-term IPM:

I would like to know how to build a team of people building/creating a 'sphere' of school mobility at school (Survey 14)

Chapter 5: Conclusions and next steps

The results from this pilot show that participants perceive the *Training Model* as a useful form of teacher professional development in terms of increasing their knowledge of IPM and assessing the transversal competences acquired by pupils via long-term IPM. What the teachers and teacher trainers particularly appreciated was the fundamental focus of the model, i.e. IPM and transversal competences – topics that are very important in Europe's contemporary education landscape, yet rarely addressed in their own countries. However, both groups of participants also highlighted aspects of the model that need to be improved in order to increase its usefulness in practice, namely: the inclusion of more practical examples to more clearly illustrate the content of the model; the inclusion of more practical tips on how to prepare a Learning Agreement; and the use of active teaching and learning methods to stimulate greater teacher involvement in the learning process.

While the teacher trainers felt ready to adapt and deliver the *Training Model* in their own countries, they also explained that they would benefit from additional training in both drafting Learning Agreements and transversal competence assessment methods. Additionally, the teachers declared that they still need to increase their knowledge of the organisational, legal, and financial aspects of long-term IPM in general, not only the assessment of transversal competences.

Regarding next steps, once the data has been collected from the teacher trainers and teachers piloting the national trainings, they will need to be combined with the results from the second-round trial involving a new group of teacher trainers (i.e. a more international group) and teachers (i.e. in these three countries) – in order to holistically and comprehensively improve the *Training Model* and its fundamental usability in teaching practice.

References

- Desimone, L. (2009). Improving impact studies of teachers' professional development: Toward better conceptualizations and measures. *Educational Researcher*, 38(3), 181–199.
- Guskey, T. (2000). *Evaluating professional development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Jurczik-Arnold, I, & Baiutti, M. (2021). *Training Model for education professionals on Assessment of Transversal Competences developed in long-term individual pupil mobility*.
https://d22dvi4pfop3.cloudfront.net/wp-content/uploads/sites/81/2022/12/07141405/Training-Model_assessment_transversal_competences.pdf.
- Makopoulou, K., Neville, R. D., Ntoumanis, N., & Thomas, G. (2021). An investigation into the effects of short-course professional development on teachers' and teaching assistants' self-efficacy. *Professional Development in Education*, 47(5), 780–795. DOI: 10.1080/19415257.2019.1665572.

Annex 3.

Survey questionnaire for teacher trainers

Dear teacher trainers,

thank you for agreeing to serve as teacher trainers in the ETAR project. Please complete this survey to let us know your opinions on the Training Model, as well as your overall experience with our course (both online and in person). Your responses will be invaluable in helping us to improve our teaching and learning environment.

All responses are recorded anonymously so please feel free to provide honest feedback. All of your responses will be kept confidential. No personally identifiable information will be associated with your responses in any reports made from these data.

Thank you very much for your time and cooperation.

. What are your views regarding the Training Model?

In the following, you will find several statements related to the Training Model that you covered during your training. Please indicate to what extent you agree with these statements.

1. The *Training Model* helps broaden teachers' knowledge on internationalisation and pupil mobility.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. The *Training Model* helps raise teachers' awareness of policy in terms of internationalisation and pupil mobility.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. The *Training Model* answers key questions regarding the assessment of the transversal (especially intercultural) competences gained via pupil mobility.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. The *Training Model* activities help teachers to develop their skills in the assessment of the transversal (especially intercultural) competences gained via pupil mobility.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. The content of the *Training Model* offers new ways to assess transversal (especially intercultural) competences.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. The *Learning Agreement* is a useful tool to facilitate the assessment of the transversal (especially intercultural) competences gained via pupil mobility.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. The *Training Model* finds a good balance between online and face-to-face activities.
strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. The *Training Model* offers concrete examples of best practices in assessing transversal (especially intercultural) competences.
strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. The *Training Model* finds a good balance between theory and practice.
strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. The *Training Model* offers teachers a satisfactory amount of hands-on experiences.
strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. The *Training Model* may serve as a good basis to assess students' other competences (i.e. other than transversal or intercultural competences).
strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. The *Training Model* should become a permanent part of regional/local continuous professional development (CPD) offers for teachers.
strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. I will recommend the *Training Model* to continuous professional development (CPD) providers and policy makers in my country.
strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. I will recommend the *Training Model* to teachers and headteachers in my country.
strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. What are – in your opinion – the major strengths of the *Training Model*?

.....

0. What are – in your opinion – the major weaknesses of the *Training Model*?

.....

0. What are your recommendations for the further development of the *Training Model*?

.....

II. What is your confidence in adapting and delivering the *Training Model* to your national context?

After the training you received, how confident are you in your ability to...

1. adapt the *Training Model* to your own national context?
very confident 5 4 3 2 1 not confident at all

0. deliver the *Training Model* to teachers in your own national context?
very confident 5 4 3 2 1 not confident at all

0. deliver a thematic session on:

a. the context and value of long term individual pupil mobility within the process of internationalisation of school education?

very confident 5 4 3 2 1 not at all confident

b. learning outcomes and transversal competences relevant to long term individual pupil mobility?

very confident 5 4 3 2 1 not at all confident

c. assessment of the transversal competences developed via long term individual pupil mobility?

very confident 5 4 3 2 1 not at all confident

0. explain to teachers the value and usefulness of the *Learning Agreement* in assessing transversal (especially intercultural) competences gained via pupil mobility?

very confident 5 4 3 2 1 not at all confident

0. provide teachers with instructional advice on how to use the *Learning Agreement* in assessing the transversal (especially intercultural) competences gained via pupil mobility?

very confident 5 4 3 2 1 not at all confident

0. support teachers in using the approaches and tools presented within the *Training Model*?

very confident 5 4 3 2 1 not at all confident

0. answer any questions teachers have regarding the *Training Model*?

very confident 5 4 3 2 1 not at all confident

0. What are three of your professional strengths in adapting and delivering the *Training Model* to teachers in your own national context?

.....

0. What are three of your concerns and/or challenges in adapting and delivering the *Training Model* to teachers in your own national context?

.....

0. Please identify three further training needs that would improve your ability to adapt and deliver the *Training Model* to teachers in your own national context.

.....

III. Can you tell us about your training (course) experiences (both online and in Koningsteen)?

Please indicate to what extent you agree with these statements.

1. The course objectives were clearly formulated.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. The course workload was manageable.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. The course was well organised (e.g. timely access to materials, notification of changes, etc.).

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. Overall, the course was well structured towards achieving the learning outcomes.
strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. The course found a good balance between theory and practice.
strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. The course found a good balance between individual and group activities.
strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. The course answered my most pressing questions regarding the adaptation and delivery of the *Training Model* for teachers in my own national context.
strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. The learning and teaching methods encouraged participation.
strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. The course found a good balance between online and face-to-face activities.
strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. I had regular opportunities to freely discuss, criticise, and/or evaluate the content and proposed activities of the course.
strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. The learning materials provided (e.g. course notes etc.) were relevant and useful.
strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. Via the course I was able to meet people who are knowledgeable and approachable on the assessment of the transversal (especially intercultural) competences gained via pupil mobility.
strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. Overall, the course was worth the time I took away from my regular routines and duties.
strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. Any further comments

IV. Your demographics

1. What age are you?

- a. < 25
- a. 25-35
- a. 36-45
- a. 46-55
- a. > 55

2. Which country are you teaching in?

.....

3. What is your gender?

.....

4. What type of institution do you work in?

- a. higher education-based (e.g. university)
- a. school-based (e.g. secondary school)

5. How many years' professional experience do you have in education?

.....

6. What is the highest level of formal education you have obtained?

- a. pre-university
- a. bachelor's degree
- a. Master's degree
- a. PhD/EdD

7. How many years' experience do you have in delivering trainings for teachers (on any topic)?

.....

8. How many years' experience do you have in delivering teacher training on international mobility?

.....

Annex 4.

Survey questionnaire for teachers (pre-test)

Teachers' knowledge, skills, and attitudes regarding assessing the transversal competences developed via long term individual pupil mobility

Dear teacher,

We kindly ask you to participate in our cross-national survey-based study (under the framework of the ETAR project) aimed at exploring teachers' knowledge, skills, and attitudes regarding assessing the transversal competences developed via long term individual pupil mobility. This survey consists of 38 short, Likert scale questions – ranging from 5 (strongly agree) to 1 (strongly disagree) – plus 3 open-ended questions to explore your needs and experiences regarding training in this field.

The survey is brief and will only take about 15 minutes to complete. Please click the link below to go to the survey (or copy and paste the link into your internet browser).

Your participation in the survey is completely voluntary and all of your responses will be kept confidential. No personally identifiable information will be associated with your responses in any reports made from these data.

Thank you very much for your time and cooperation.

I. Below you will find several statements exploring your knowledge, skills, and attitudes regarding assessing the transversal competences developed via long term individual pupil mobility. Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with these statements.

1. I believe that internationalisation is a necessary process for contemporary schools.
strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree
0. I know the priorities of European policy regarding the internationalisation of school education.
strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree
0. I know the priorities of national policy regarding the internationalisation of school education.
strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree
0. I know the priorities of national legislation regarding educational mobility.
strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree
0. I know the priorities of European legislation regarding educational mobility.
strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree
0. Internationalisation in education is linked primarily to pupil mobility.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. Internationalisation could be effectively promoted within our national contexts (i.e., in schools).

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. I can use various strategies to promote internationalisation in my school.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. I think that 'individual long term mobility' can last for more than one year.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. I believe that the duration and format of a period of pupil mobility have an impact on its educational value.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. I can identify false perceptions and assumptions around pupil mobility.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. I am aware of my own misunderstandings around pupil mobility.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. Pupil mobility brings many benefits to students.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. Pupil mobility brings many benefits to schools.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. Pupil mobility needs to be underpinned by appropriate quality assurance measures.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. I am familiar with the quality principles of educational mobility.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. I have a wide knowledge of the current data regarding individual pupil mobility in my country (e.g. numbers of pupils undertaking mobilities).

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. I think that competences for pupils' mobility can only be defined in terms of knowledge acquired.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. Transversal competences should be the main expected result of long term individual pupil mobility.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. Through different methods and activities, I am able to foster the development of transversal competences among students in my classroom.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. I am familiar with the following frameworks on transversal competences (in general and intercultural competences in particular):

a. Key competences for lifelong learning (European Union)

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

b. Reference framework of competences for democratic culture

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

c. Global competences (OECD PISA)

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

d. Intercultural competences (UNESCO)

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. Intercultural competences have a significant place in the curriculum of the subjects I teach.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. When reading a pupil mobility testimonial, I can recognise the particular learning outcomes that come from long term individual pupil mobility.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. I describe myself as an interculturally competent teacher.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. I can involve different school stakeholders in planning and supporting long term individual pupil mobility.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. I usually assess the competences of my students.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. When I assess students' competences, I usually assess all three components: knowledge, skills, and attitudes.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. I am familiar with national guidelines/legislation on how to assess students' competences.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. I am familiar with school guidelines/legislation on how to assess students' competences in general.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. I am familiar with school guidelines/legislation on how to assess students' competences gained via individual pupil mobility.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. I can select the most appropriate types of and approaches to assessing students' competences.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. Even if 'assessment' is a widely debated concept, I can precisely formulate the principles of competency assessment.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. I can define criteria for transversal and intercultural competence assessment.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. I think it is crucial to assess learning outcomes gained via long term pupil mobility.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. I can select the most appropriate tools for assessing the learning outcomes gained via long term pupil mobility.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. In order to meaningfully assess the transversal and intercultural competences gained via long term pupil mobility, there is a need to use a variety of perspectives and methods.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. I can adapt existing models of assessment to my local/school context.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. I know where to search for relevant resources on tools for assessing transversal and intercultural competences.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

II. Your strengths, concerns, and training needs' regarding assessing the transversal competences gained via long term individual pupil mobility

1. What are three of your professional strengths in assessing the transversal competences gained via long term mobility?

.....

0. What are three of your concerns and/or challenges regarding assessing the transversal competences gained via long term mobility?

.....

0. Please identify three training needs that would improve your ability to assess the transversal competences gained via long term mobility.

.....

III. Your demographics

1. What age are you?

.....

0. What is your gender?

.....

0. Which country are you teaching in?

.....

0. What subject/s do you teach?

.....

0. How many years of professional experience do you have in sending pupils for long term mobilities? ...

0. How many pupil mobilities have you facilitated?

.....

Annex 5.

Survey questionnaire for teachers (post-test)

Teachers' knowledge, skills, and attitudes regarding assessing the transversal competences developed via long term individual pupil mobility after the *Training Model*

Dear teacher,

We kindly ask you to participate in our cross-national survey-based study (under the framework of the ETAR project) aimed at exploring teachers' knowledge, skills, and attitudes regarding assessing the transversal competences developed via long term individual pupil mobility, after the training in which you participated. This survey consists of Likert scale questions – ranging from 5 (strongly agree) to 1 (strongly disagree) – plus five open-ended questions to explore your opinions and perceptions of the Training Model.

The survey is brief and will only take about 20 minutes to complete. Please click the link below to go to the survey (or copy and paste the link into your internet browser).

Your participation in the survey is completely voluntary and all of your responses will be kept confidential. No personally identifiable information will be associated with your responses in any reports made from these data.

Thank you very much for your time and cooperation.

I. Below you will find several statements exploring your knowledge, skills, and attitudes regarding assessing the transversal competences developed via long term individual pupil mobility. Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with these statements.

1. I believe that internationalisation is a necessary process for contemporary schools.
strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree
0. I know the priorities of European policy regarding the internationalisation of school education.
strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree
0. I know the priorities of national policy regarding the internationalisation of school education.
strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree
0. I know the priorities of national legislation regarding educational mobility.
strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree
0. I know the priorities of European legislation regarding educational mobility.
strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree
0. Internationalisation in education is linked primarily to pupil mobility.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. Internationalisation could be effectively promoted within our national contexts (i.e., in schools).

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. I can use various strategies to promote internationalisation in my school.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. I think that 'individual long term mobility' can last for more than one year.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. I believe that the duration and format of a period of pupil mobility have an impact on its educational value.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. I can identify false perceptions and assumptions around pupil mobility.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. I am aware of my own misunderstandings around pupil mobility.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. Pupil mobility brings many benefits to students.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. Pupil mobility brings many benefits to schools.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. Pupil mobility needs to be underpinned by appropriate quality assurance measures.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. I am familiar with the quality principles of educational mobility.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. I have a wide knowledge of the current data regarding individual pupil mobility in my country (e.g. numbers of pupils undertaking mobilities).

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. I think that competences for pupils' mobility can only be defined in terms of knowledge acquired.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. Transversal competences should be the main expected result of long term individual pupil mobility.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. Through different methods and activities, I am able to foster the development of transversal competences among students in my classroom.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. I am familiar with the following frameworks on transversal competences (in general and intercultural competences in particular):

- a. Key competences for lifelong learning (European Union)
strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree
- b. Reference framework of competences for democratic culture
strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree
- c. Global competences (OECD PISA)
strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree
- d. Intercultural competences (UNESCO)
- strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree
0. Intercultural competences have a significant place in the curriculum of the subjects I teach.
strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree
0. When reading a pupil mobility testimonial, I can recognise the particular learning outcomes that come from long term individual pupil mobility.
strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree
0. I describe myself as an interculturally competent teacher.
strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree
0. I can involve different school stakeholders in planning and supporting long term individual pupil mobility.
strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree
0. I usually assess the competences of my students.
strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree
0. When I assess students' competences, I usually assess all three components: knowledge, skills, and attitudes.
strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree
0. I am familiar with national guidelines/legislation on how to assess students' competences.
strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree
0. I am familiar with school guidelines/legislation on how to assess students' competences in general.
strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree
0. I am familiar with school guidelines/legislation on how to assess students' competences gained via individual pupil mobility.
strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree
0. I can select the most appropriate types of and approaches to assessing students' competences.
strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. Even if 'assessment' is a widely debated concept, I can precisely formulate the principles of competency assessment.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. I can define criteria for transversal and intercultural competence assessment.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. I think it is crucial to assess learning outcomes gained via long term pupil mobility.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. I can select the most appropriate tools for assessing the learning outcomes gained via long term pupil mobility.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. In order to meaningfully assess the transversal and intercultural competences gained via long term pupil mobility, there is a need to use a variety of perspectives and methods.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. I can adapt existing models of assessment to my local/school context.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. I know where to search for relevant resources on tools for assessing transversal and intercultural competences.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. The *Learning Agreement* is a useful tool for facilitating the assessment of the transversal (especially intercultural) competences gained via pupil mobility.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. I know how to use the *Learning Agreement* to assess the transversal (especially intercultural) competences of my students who have experienced a mobility period.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

II. Your opinions on the *Training Model*

Please indicate to what extent you agree with these statements.

1. During the *Training Model* I had opportunities to share my knowledge, experience, and ideas with other participants and the trainers.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. During the *Training Model* I had opportunities to extend my knowledge and skills regarding assessment of the transversal (especially intercultural) competences gained via pupil mobility.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. During the *Training Model* I had opportunities to extend my knowledge and skills regarding the *Learning Agreement* as a tool for assessing transversal (especially intercultural) competences.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. During the *Training Model* I had regular opportunities to freely discuss and evaluate the content and proposed activities of the course.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. The *Training Model* helped raise my awareness of policy in terms of internationalisation and mobility.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. The *Training Model* finds a good balance between online and face-to-face activities.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. The *Training Model* offers concrete examples of best practices in assessing transversal (especially intercultural) competences.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. The *Training Model* finds a good balance between theory and practice.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. The *Training Model* finds a good balance between individual and group activities.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. The *Training Model* answered my most pressing questions regarding assessment of the transversal (especially intercultural) competences gained via pupil mobility.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. The content of the *Training Model* offers new ways to assess transversal (especially intercultural) competences.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. The *Training Model* offered me a satisfactory amount of hands-on experience.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. Via the *Training Model* I was able to meet people who are knowledgeable and approachable on the assessment of the transversal (especially intercultural) competences gained via pupil mobility.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. I intend to implement these new assessment strategies in different areas of my own work.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. I intend to engage with the online resources provided during the *Training Model* in order to expand/deepen my knowledge.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. I intend to share my new knowledge with my school colleagues/headteacher.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. I will recommend the *Training Model* to my colleagues.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. Overall, the course was worth the time away from my regular routines and duties.

strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 strongly disagree

0. How has the *Training Model* contributed to your knowledge in terms of assessing the transversal (especially intercultural) competences developed via IPM?

.....

0. Which *Training Model* activities did you find most helpful?

.....

0. How has the *Training Model* increased your skills for assessing the transversal (especially intercultural) competences developed via IPM?

.....

0. How has the *Training Model* challenged or changed your attitudes towards assessing the transversal (especially intercultural) competences developed via IPM?

.....

0. What topics do you think should be addressed via the *Training Model* in the future?

.....

III. Your demographics

1. What age are you?

.....

0. What is your gender?

.....

0. Which country are you teaching in?

.....

0. What subject/s do you teach?

.....

0. How many years of professional experience do you have in sending pupils for long term mobilities?

.....

0. How many pupil mobilities have you facilitated?

.....

Annex 6.

Interview questions for teachers – pre-pupil mobility

. Your demographics

1. What age are you?

.....

0. What is your gender?

.....

0. Which country are you teaching in?

.....

0. What subject/s do you teach?

.....

0. How many years of professional experience do you have in sending pupils for long term mobilities?

.....

0. How many of your students have enrolled in an individual mobility programme in the current school year?

.....

0. What type of programme will the mobility use? (e.g., AFS, Erasmus+, etc.)

.....

.....

.....

0. Next, please provide details about the students who have enrolled.

Student one:

- gender:
- school year:
- length of mobility planned:
- mobility destination:

Student two:

- gender:
- school year:
- length of mobility planned:
- mobility destination:

Student three:

- gender:
- school year:
- length of mobility planned:
- mobility destination:

II. MAIN QUESTIONS

1. Did you use a learning agreement between your school and the host school, prior to sending your students for mobility?
 - a. If yes, does this agreement foresee the recognition of learning outcomes gained via IPM broadly in line with your national curriculum?
 - a. If yes, how did you identify the learning outcomes? Did you involve the student in the definition of the learning outcomes? What template did you use (the one suggested during the *Training Model* or a different one? please specify)?
 - a. If not, please explain why. What other kind of learning agreement did you use – if any?
2. Did you receive adequate support from the trainers who worked with you during the *Training Model*?
 - a. If yes, what types of support did you receive?
 - a. If not, what types of support did you want but not receive, and why were they absent?
2. Did you receive any support from colleagues/other institutions?
 - a. If yes, what types of support did you receive?
 - a. If not, what types of support did you want but not receive, and why were they absent?
3. Did you have the opportunity to be in contact with the host school before the period of mobility?
 - a. If yes, how many times?
 - a. If yes, did you develop the expected learning outcomes together?
 - a. If not, what type of contact would you have liked and why was it absent?
4. Was the training that you received during the *Training Model* sufficient for preparing you to draft the Learning Agreement?

- a. If yes, please specify which of the skills/competences etc. covered you found to be most useful in this part of the process
 - a. If not, please specify what was missing for you
0. As a follow-up from your involvement in the *Training Model*, did you go on to implement any specific action/s in your school around the theme of internationalisation?
- a. If yes, could you please describe them?
 - a. If not, please explain why.

Annex 7.

Interview questions for teachers - after pupil mobility

Your demographics

1. What age are you?

.....

0. What is your gender?

.....

0. Which country are you teaching in?

.....

0. What subject/s do you teach?

.....

0. How many years of professional experience do you have in sending pupils for long term mobilities?

.....

0. How many of your students have enrolled in an individual mobility programme in the current school year?

.....

0. How many of your students have now completed an individual mobility programme?

.....

0. What type of programme did their mobility use? (e.g., AFS, Erasmus+, etc.)

.....

.....

.....

0. Next, please provide details about the students who participated.

Student one:

- gender:
- school year:
- length of mobility:
- mobility destination:

Student two:

- gender:
- school year:
- length of mobility:

- mobility destination:

Student three:

- gender:
- school year:
- length of mobility:
- mobility destination:

II. MAIN QUESTIONS

- Post-mobility, did you assess transversal competences and intercultural competences specifically?
 - a. If yes, when did you assess these competences?
 - during the mobility
 - after the mobility
 - both
 - a. For this purpose, did you use the Intercultura Assessment Protocol from the *Training Model*?
 - . not at all – please explain why and specify which other kind of tools you used
 - . partially – please specify which tools you used:
 - log book
 - rubric
 - presentation
 - . completely – i.e. all three
- 0. Was the *Training Model* sufficient in preparing you to assess the learning outcomes of your students post-mobility?
 - a. If yes, please specify which of the skills/competences etc. covered you found to be most useful in this part of the process
 - a. If not, please tell us why and specify what was missing for you
- 0. Did you receive adequate support from the *Training Model* trainers in this part of the process ?
 - a. If yes, what types of support did you receive?
 - a. If not, what types of support did you want but not receive, and why were they absent?

0. Did you receive any support from colleagues/other institutions?
 - a. If yes, what types of support did you receive?
 - a. If not, what types of support did you want but not receive, and why were they absent?

0. Did the *Learning Agreement* support the recognition of learning outcomes gained via IPM broadly in line with your national curriculum?

0. Please tell us some more about your experiences during this stage of the process.
 - a. what kind of challenges did you encounter?
 - a. what went well?
 - a. what would you keep as part of your future practice?

Annex 8.

Interview questions for teacher trainers

I. YOUR DEMOGRAPHICS

1. What age are you?
 - a. < 25
 - a. 25-35
 - a. 36-45
 - a. 46-55
 - a. > 55
2. Which country are you teaching in?
.....
3. What is your gender?
.....
4. What type of institution do you work in?
 - a. higher education-based (e.g. university)
 - a. school-based (e.g. secondary school)
5. How many years' professional experience do you have in education?
.....
6. What is the highest level of formal education you have obtained?
 - a. pre-university
 - a. bachelor's degree
 - a. Master's degree
 - a. PhD/EdD
7. How many years' experience do you have in delivering trainings for teachers (on any topic)?
.....
8. How many years' experience do you have in delivering teacher training on international mobility?
.....

II. MAIN QUESTIONS

1. What would you say was the *general* feedback that the teachers had about the tools they gained from the model? (e.g. generally positive, neutral, generally negative)
2. How many teachers contacted you for trouble-shooting/problem-solving in using the tools they gained from the model? (e.g. all or most of the teachers, around half of the teachers, only a few teachers)

- a. Of those who contacted you, approximately how often would you say they did so? (e.g. very often, from time to time, not very often)
2. What kinds of difficulties did the teachers you worked with report to you?
3. Did you feel able to help these teachers to solve these problems? (e.g. very much so, mixed, not at all)
 - a. If so, *how* did you help these teachers to tackle these problems?
 - a. If not, what did you do?
2. How did you organise the support you gave to these teachers?
 - a. How often? (e.g. only when problems arose/regular check-ins)
 - a. Via what means? (e.g. video calls/email)
2. How did you feel navigating your role as a mentor?
 - a. Did you have any positive experiences? If so, please describe.
 - a. Did you have any negative experiences? If so, please describe.



Empowering Teachers
for Automatic Recognition
ETAR project



Co-funded by
the European Union

