Monitoring eTwinning Practice:
A pilot activity guiding teachers’ competence development
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The monitoring framework for eTwinning, developed by the Central Support Service (CSS), comprises two pillars:

1. a quantitative large-scale survey of eTwinners’ teaching practices and professional development activities and needs (eTwinning’s Monitoring Survey)

2. a small-scale qualitative activity tracking the progress of teachers’ competence development while working on eTwinning projects (the Monitoring eTwinning Practice – MeTP activity), which is the subject of this report.

This second activity, the MeTP Maturity Model, was developed to provide a tool to assist in tracking the impact of eTwinning projects on teachers’ practice and competence development in two areas, pedagogical competence and digital competence, as reported by eTwinners. The activity had a double approach:

- To explore whether there was a reported development in practice and competence as a result of involvement in eTwinning projects

- To test and evaluate the use of the MeTP reflection tools and processes of self- and peer assessment, to help teachers progress with and track their competence development while carrying out eTwinning projects

Teachers were asked to identify their starting level in relation to each competence in the model (by reflecting on level descriptors and accompanying self-assessment statements), as well as the target levels they wanted to achieve by the end of the activity. Following this, through peer exchanges and the uploading of concrete evidence illustrating their practice, participants were able to monitor and review if
and how their practice was changing since they started working on their eTwinning project. The MeTP activity was implemented over a period of 8 months, starting in December 2014 and ending in July 2015.

According to MeTP participants’ self-assessment, 60% of them agreed that they had fully mastered their target codes, associated to a higher level of competence than the codes they started with at the beginning of the activity, as a result of their involvement in an eTwinning project. An additional 31% stated that they had reached at least one of their target codes (and often more than one), and only 9% (representing three participants) believed they had not reached any of their target codes.

80% of participants rated the overall value of the MeTP activity for their professional learning as either ‘very good’ or ‘good’, and over 90% rated the various templates, tools and resources made available to participants (including the competence assessment sheets, live webinars, MeTP TwinSpace, and the individual tailored support from the MeTP coordinators) as very useful or useful for their learning.

90% strongly agreed or agreed that the MeTP activity encouraged them to reflect more than they usually did on their pedagogical competence. 80% also strongly agreed or agreed that the MeTP activity challenged some of their assumptions and beliefs. These results suggest that even those that reported less improvement in their pedagogical competence, nevertheless consciously reflected about their practice and even changed their beliefs, which is an important necessary step leading to change in practice.

An encouraging result emerging from the evaluation is that all MeTP teachers stated that they intended to use the tools, ideas and examples presented by their partner and/or other participants in their everyday teaching practice.

The results presented in this report illustrate that by implementing eTwinning projects, aided by the reflection tools and processes of the MeTP model, all participating teachers were able to make progress and track their competence development. This positive result confirms the usefulness of the model and the interest to deploy it again in some format in the future.

As evidenced by the 2015 monitoring report, surveying the opinions of 6,000 teachers across Europe, eTwinners report a high level of competence development as a direct result of their involvement in eTwinning projects and related professional development activities. However, this data is only based on self-reporting. The added-value of the small scale qualitative MeTP activity is that it provided us with actual evidence of the self-reported competence development of a group of eTwinners.
Another clear benefit of the MeTP activity is that it provided eTwinners for the first time with a set of reflective tools and processes that not only guided and encouraged their competence development, but also tracked their progress, as evidenced by the results and the evaluation presented in this report.

The benefits of integrating collaborative competence and/or project-based teaching competence into the MeTP model has emerged as one of the most prominent conclusions from this pilot evaluation. eTwinning projects provide an ideal environment for teachers to experiment and develop their collaborative and project-based teaching competences. Moreover, we know from research mentioned in this report that teachers are particularly in need of guidance in these areas, and they often have few opportunities to explicitly develop these competences in their daily teaching within the constraints of their national curriculum contexts and education systems. eTwinning therefore has a clear role to play here.

One possibility worthy of serious consideration is whether it would be possible to design a version of the MeTP model which could be used by any interested eTwinner to reflect on their practice while carrying out an eTwinning project, guiding their competence development and tracking their progress. Designing a scalable version of the MeTP activity would necessarily involve simplifying the process. It is the opinion of the coordination team that this is likely to be feasible while maintaining the use of the competence descriptors and self-assessment sheets, with the possibility of adding more competences to the model.

In addition to allowing a greater number of eTwinners to benefit from the self and peer review activities and competence development tracking tools, there is evidence from the pilot that being involved in this process could potentially help raise the quality of eTwinning projects and the likelihood that they will be successful.

If the MeTP activity were to be extended to the eTwinning community on a large scale, it could be beneficial to include the National Support Services and eTwinning ambassadors as part of the support network. They would be ideally placed to guide and assist teachers at national and local level in the MeTP reflection activities guiding their eTwinning project work.

The extension of the MeTP model opening up the benefits of self and peer reflection to the whole eTwinning community is therefore certainly worth investigating by eTwinning’s pedagogical monitoring team. It is hoped that the MeTP pilot activity and this evaluation report will be of use in further shaping the pedagogical direction of eTwinning in the coming years, and in reaching out towards political audiences and other stakeholders with a view to embedding eTwinning in school education systems.
1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 What is eTwinning?

eTwinning – The community for schools in Europe – is a safe internet platform providing a range of activities from joint projects for schools at national and international level, collaborative spaces and professional development opportunities for teachers. The action is currently funded by the European Commission under the Erasmus+ programme. However, eTwinning’s beginning precedes Erasmus+ as it started ten years ago in 2005. Since then the eTwinning community has grown to include more than 420,000 registered users.

eTwinning offers a high level of support for its users. In each of the participating countries (currently 361) a National Support Service (NSS) promotes the action, provides advice and guidance for end users and organises a range of activities and professional development opportunities at national level. At European level, eTwinning is coordinated by the Central Support Service (CSS) managed by European Schoolnet, a consortium of 31 Ministries of Education. This body liaises with the NSS and is responsible for the development of the platform, as well as offering a range of professional development opportunities and other activities such as an annual European Conference and a Prize Event which awards teachers and students for their involvement in outstanding projects.

eTwinning incorporates a sophisticated digital platform that has both public and private areas and is available in 28 languages. The public area2 offers browsing visitors

1 At the time of writing eTwinning is currently fully participated in by 36 countries. eTwinning additionally covers some other neighbor countries, and because of their different status in the action, they are referred to as ‘eTwinning Plus countries’.

2 www.eTwinning.net
a range of information about how to become involved in eTwinning; explaining the benefits the action offers and provides inspiration for collaborative project work.

The private area of eTwinning is restricted to registered users, mainly teachers, and comprises a range of communication and collaboration features.

This area acts as an interface for the registered user to find and interact with other members of the eTwinning community and includes specific collaborative spaces such as eTwinning Groups (private moderated platforms for eTwinners to discuss and work together on a specific topic or theme). It also provides access to online professional development opportunities such as Online Seminars (one hour lectures), Learning Events (lasting two weeks) and Online Courses (lasting six weeks).

eTwinning Live was launched in the autumn of 2015, with more advanced social networking and collaboration features, including the facility to set up live videoconferencing sessions. When the Monitoring eTwinning Practice (MeTP) activity took place, the former version of this interface, known as the eTwinning Desktop, was still in use.
1.2 eTwinning’s monitoring activities:

eTwinning’s monitoring framework comprises two pillars: a quantitative large-scale survey of eTwinners’ teaching practices and professional development activities and needs (eTwinning’s Monitoring Survey); and a small-scale qualitative activity tracking the progress of teachers’ competence development while working on eTwinning projects (the Monitoring eTwinning Practice – MeTP activity).

Both these monitoring activities are conducted every two years. This two-fold approach allows on the one hand large-scale monitoring of a sample of eTwinners, and on the other, the possibility of exploring in more depth the conditions behind certain trends.

eTwinning’s monitoring strategy has a long-term perspective, guaranteeing the possibility of monitoring progress over time, tracking trends and informing the pedagogical direction of eTwinning in the coming years.

The first edition of eTwinning’s Monitoring Survey was launched in the autumn of 2014, and the results were published in the 2015 monitoring report: eTwinning Ten Years On: Impact on teachers’ practice, skills, and professional development opportunities, as reported by eTwinners. The second edition of eTwinning’s Monitoring Survey was launched in autumn 2016 and the results will be published in eTwinning’s 2017 monitoring report.

The current report constitutes the analysis of the pilot of the Monitoring eTwinning Practice – MeTP activity.

On the occasion of eTwinning’s tenth anniversary, the 2015 monitoring report was used to take stock of the key elements achieved by the programme over the past decade, and to look forward to the best ways to harness eTwinning’s potential to foster innovation through international school collaboration and professional development. The current 2016 monitoring report, focusing on the qualitative analysis of the competence development of a group of 35 first-time eTwinners, contributes to furthering this goal.

1.3 Rationale for developing the MeTP pilot activity

As described in the 2015 eTwinning monitoring report, published during eTwinning’s tenth anniversary, the first decade of the programme has achieved a lot, not least reaching the involvement of a critical mass of teachers across Europe and beyond. Now that the programme has reached a high level of popularity and
teacher engagement, together with the wide range of resources and professional development opportunities available, it is the programme’s intention to focus further on the quality of the pedagogy and professional learning it contributes to. The Quality Labels at European and national level already help ensure this in relation to the projects developed within eTwinning. However, the CSS pedagogical monitoring team considered it also important to develop some tools for individual teachers within eTwinning to track their learning and competence development. It is for this reason that the Monitoring eTwinning Practice (MeTP) Maturity Model was developed, and a pilot was run to test its implementation with a group of 35 teachers from across Europe.

The MeTP Maturity Model is a reflective instrument allowing teachers to self-assess and peer review the progress of one another’s competence development while carrying out eTwinning projects. The aim of the MeTP pilot activity, centred around the MeTP Maturity Model, was to test and evaluate the use of the MeTP reflection tools and processes, facilitating self- and peer assessment, as a way of tracking teachers’ competence development while carrying out eTwinning projects.

We know already that eTwinners do consider eTwinning projects to have an impact on their competence development (as evidenced by the survey results of 6,000 teachers analysed in the 2015 eTwinning monitoring report). However, until now there have not been specific tools developed for teachers to explicitly target specific aspects of their competence development, and importantly track their progress while working on an eTwinning project. The primary interest of this report is evaluating the MeTP activity as a tool which assists teachers to analyse the progress of their development in certain competences during the implementation of their eTwinning projects through a guided reflection process.
2. METP PILOT METHODOLOGY

2.1 The MeTP Maturity Model

The MeTP Maturity Model was developed to qualitatively measure the impact of eTwinning projects on teachers’ practice and competence development, as reported by eTwinners. The aim of the MeTP pilot activity, centred around the MeTP Maturity Model, was to test and evaluate the use of the MeTP reflection tools and processes, facilitating self- and peer assessment, as a way of tracking teachers’ competence development while carrying out eTwinning projects.

Teachers were asked to identify their starting level in relation to each competence in the model (by reflecting on level descriptors and accompanying self-assessment statements), and then through peer exchanges and the uploading of evidence monitor and review if and how their practice (and therefore level) was changing since they started working on their eTwinning project. The MeTP activity was implemented over a period of 8 months, starting in December 2014 and ending in July 2015.

The MeTP Maturity Model consists of 4 components:

- **COMPETENCES**: The current version of the model which was used for the pilot activity is based on 2 competences: pedagogical competence, and digital competence. The plan is for more competences to be progressively added to the model in the coming years.

- **LEVELS**: Each of these competences can be implemented and experienced by a teacher at different levels; level 1 being at the lowest and level 5 at the highest level of maturity. A ‘competence descriptor’ describes each competence at each level, in terms of the required knowledge, skills and attitudes.
SELF-EVALUATION STATEMENTS: Each competence at each level is related to a set of concrete action-based statements which teachers can use to reflect on their own practice. Teachers were required to check which set of statements best reflected their practice, in relation to each competence, to ascertain their level. They were then asked to select specific statements which they wanted to work on. Each statement had a code differentiating it from all other statements and associating it to a specific level.

EVIDENCE: Teachers were provided with suggestions for possible evidence they could submit to illustrate the knowledge, skills and attitudes referred to in the competence descriptors and statements. Teachers were required to entitle each piece of evidence they provided using the code number in the left hand column next to the evaluation statements. This approach enabled participants to review their partners’ evidence and make an informed judgment as to whether it actually demonstrated what was intended.

How the MeTP Maturity Model was used and implemented is described in more detail in section 4 of this report.

2.2 Inspiration from existing frameworks

It was not the objective of the MeTP activity to design a new competence framework for teachers. Rather the idea was to be inspired by existing validated frameworks which lent themselves to being simplified and adapted for the purposes of the MeTP activity. The pedagogical competence model was particularly inspired by the Australian Professional Standards for Teachers. The Australian Professional Standards for Teachers comprise seven interconnected standards which outline what teachers should know and be able to do. They are grouped into three domains of teaching: Professional Knowledge, Professional Practice and Professional Engagement. In practice, teaching draws on aspects of all three domains. Moreover, focus areas and specific descriptors are provided for each domain at four professional career stages. An effective teacher is able to integrate and apply knowledge, practice and professional engagement as outlined in the descriptors to create teaching environments in which learning is valued. The Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership have created an online self-assessment tool allowing teachers to monitor their progress in the teaching standards’ three domains. This self-assessment tool has a variety of action-based statements which teachers were asked how frequently they practiced. These statements informed the development of the self-assessment statements in the MeTP pedagogical competence model.
Regarding the MeTP digital competence model, the self-evaluation statements are based on those used in The Teacher Mentor for Digital Competence, developed by the Norwegian Centre for ICT in Education. The Teacher Mentor is a free, online service for teachers aimed at guiding teachers in their self-reflection about how they use technology for teaching and learning. It is based on the Self-Review Framework offered by the UK National Association of Advisors for Computers in Education, as well as Hooper and Rieber’s Teaching with Technology Model (1995). The Teacher Mentor self-assessment tools has four areas: Pedagogy and ICT; Digital Production; Digital Communication; and Digital Judgement. The MeTP digital competence model uses statements from all four areas under each of its levels.

The descriptors and self-assessment statements in both MeTP competence models aim to encapsulate the thinking and planning process required for teaching. They help guarantee that the learning activities teachers will design and the general way in which they practice their profession are grounded in evidence on what we know works in pedagogy and technology-enhanced teaching, based on research. The MeTP Maturity Model is intended to spark more reflective teaching practice and dialogue among teachers, hopefully accompanied by enhanced outcomes for student learning.

### 2.3 Self and peer assessment

The MeTP Maturity Model has been designed around self and peer assessment, which are both essential for reflective practice and professional learning.

Each self-assessment and peer assessment activity is described in detail in section 4 of this report, which focuses on the process.

What MeTP participants learned about self and peer assessment is described in the results of the activity, presented in section 5.
3. PROFILE OF PARTICIPATING TEACHERS

3.1 Recruitment of MeTP participants

For this first pilot the decision was taken by the CSS in accordance with the NSS to target teachers new to eTwinning and preferably involved in their first eTwinning project. It was felt that this group of eTwinners would be particularly motivated and have a lot to benefit from an activity that aimed to guide them in their pedagogical journey in eTwinning, by monitoring their competence development. It was also felt that, in recruiting a group of teachers with a similar level of eTwinning experience, this would give solidarity to the group. As peer learning is at the core of the MeTP activity, it was also considered a good opportunity for new eTwinners to work closely together with a colleague from another country, and build a relationship that might lead to future mutual support and involvement in eTwinning projects.

eTwinning’s National Support Services (NSS) were therefore invited to nominate between one and four recently registered eTwinners in their country preferably implementing their first eTwinning project. 69 teachers were originally nominated at national level and consequently contacted by the CSS. Out of these, 55 expressed an interest to take part, and finally 35 teachers from 19 countries committed to the MeTP activity and succeeded in participating to all activities leading to an eTwinning professional development certificate (see section 4.13).

3.2 Countries in which participants teach

The following table shows the countries represented by participating teachers, and how many participants come from each country.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number of participating teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 Gender of participants

77% of participants are female, and 23% male, reflecting the predominantly female teaching population in Europe.
3.4 Participants’ position at school

The majority of participants identified their main position at school as either a secondary school teacher (around 60%) or a primary school teacher (around 30%) as shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer choices (multiple choices possible)</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school teacher (students age 12-19)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary school teacher (students age 5-11)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-primary teacher</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special needs teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5 School profile of participants

Participants were asked to what extent they agreed with 4 statements which were developed in 2014 as part of the first edition of the eTwinning Monitoring Survey, used to indicate the profile of the school in which a participant teaches. In order to be able to observe whether teachers working in schools with certain characteristics experience eTwinning any differently, two categories of school profile were defined. The first category comprises responses from teachers who strongly agree or agree that their school is involved in innovative practices, promotes collaboration among teachers, actively participates in international projects, and is engaged in self-evaluation. This first category of respondents are understood for the purposes of our analysis as teachers working in ‘innovative schools’. The second category comprises responses from teachers who strongly disagreed or disagreed that their school is involved in innovative practices, promotes collaboration among teachers, actively participates in international projects, and is engaged in self-evaluation. This second category of respondents are understood for the purposes of our analysis as teachers working in ‘non-innovative schools’. While these are the definitions used for the purposes of this analysis, it should be noted of course that there is no commonly accepted understanding of what precisely constitutes an innovative or non-innovative school and there are certainly more factors to be take into account than those we have the possibility of mentioning here. Moreover, these categories have been made purely on the basis of teachers’ opinions concerning the schools they work in.

In the MeTP pilot 22 teachers in total strongly agreed or agreed with all 4 statements, meaning that for our purposes of analysis we can consider that 63% of MeTP participants work in innovative schools. On the other hand, 2 MeTP teachers strongly disagreed or disagreed with 3 out of the 4 statements, indicating that they are working
in non-innovative schools. The remaining 11 teachers’ answers to the statements were more balanced, indicating a school profile which is not particularly innovative nor non-innovative.

3.6 Subjects taught by MeTP participants

A wide range of subjects are taught by MeTP participants, often with teachers teaching more than one subject. The majority however teach foreign languages (46%), which interestingly reflects the predominance of foreign language teachers among the eTwinning community. The second most common group of subjects taught by the MeTP group are primary school subjects (17%). The full list of subjects taught by MeTP participants includes: pre-school subjects, primary school subjects, vocational training subjects, biology, chemistry, citizenship, drama, economics, foreign languages, geography, history, history of culture, informatics/ICT, language and literature, mathematics/geometry, physical education, physics, psychology, social studies/sociology, special needs education and technology.

3.7 eTwinning experience

Around 70% of MeTP participants joined eTwinning for the first time in the same year they started the MeTP pilot, while 30% stated they had registered to eTwinning earlier on, but had not been very active. Around 75% declared that the eTwinning project they were involved in during the MeTP pilot was the very first eTwinning project they had ever been involved in, and only 25% stated this not to be the case, often commenting they had started a project in the recent past but the project had not continued. We can therefore conclude that the group was fairly homogenous in terms of being new to eTwinning and to working on eTwinning projects.

3.8 Age and teaching experience of MeTP participants

40% of MeTP participants are aged between 36 and 45 years old, 35% between 46 and 55, 23% between 26 and 35, and only 1 participant is over 55 years old. The MeTP group represent a very experienced group of teachers, despite the majority being new to eTwinning and mostly involved in their first eTwinning project. Around 70% have 11 years of teaching experience or more, and 30% of those have more than 20 years teaching experience. 20% have between 6 and 10 years experience and only around 10% have 5 years experience or less.
3.9 MeTP participants’ experience of using ICT for pedagogical purposes

The majority of MeTP participants (40%) have between 6 and 10 years experience of using ICT for teaching and learning, and around 35% have between 1 and 5 years experience. A minority of around 18% have 11 or more years experience, while only around 10% have less than 1 year experience.
4. THE PROCESS

4.1 What was the aim of the MeTP activity?

The activity’s aim was to explore what impact being involved in an eTwinning project had on improving teachers’ pedagogical and digital competence development over an 8 month period, using a self and peer assessment model. The MeTP pilot activity also aimed to evaluate the usefulness of the MeTP activities themselves; including the use of reflection tools and processes, facilitating self- and peer assessment, helping teachers progress with and track their competence development while carrying out eTwinning projects.

4.2 How was this achieved?

At the start of the activity each teacher self-assessed their pedagogical and digital competences according to a rubric which included self-evaluation statements associated to competence levels ranging from 1 to 5. For each competence, they firstly identified their starting level (i.e. the level they felt most reflected their current competence and practice), and then their target level (i.e. the level they would like to strive to reach by the end of the activity).

The next step was for teachers to upload evidence to demonstrate their starting levels, and to discuss this evidence with a partner on the basis of the competence descriptors and statements. After this peer discussion they were asked to jointly reach a peer-certified agreement on each participants starting levels.

Teachers then identified target levels for themselves in relation to each competence, and during six months worked on achieving those targets while working on their eTwinning project. During this period, teachers provided evidence to demonstrate
to themselves and other participating teachers how they were reaching their target levels in practice. Teachers uploaded their evidence on the MeTP TwinSpace, a closed group within eTwinning Live allowing participants to access key documents and communicate with one another.

During the process teachers engaged continually in self and peer assessment activities which served as a validity and reliability check.

The activity cycle is summarized visually in the diagram below, and discussed in more detail in the sections that follow.

### 4.3 The process in a nutshell

![Activity Cycle Diagram]

### 4.4 Phase 1: Self-assessment

Each participant was asked to self-assess their starting level and their target level in relation to the MeTP pedagogical and digital competence self-assessment sheets. These self-assessment sheets include statements related to various aspects of relevance to developing competence in these two areas. Participants were therefore instructed to select at least two statements per competence, using the statement codes provided.

To complete the self-assessment exercise each participant was required to:
• Read the competence descriptor at each level to get a general understanding of the knowledge, skills and attitudes referred to in each competence;

• Read the set of self-evaluation statements listed under each level and assess which set of statements best reflects their practice;

• Identify their starting level on this basis for each competence

• Think of concrete examples in their teaching practice which illustrate the activities described in the self-evaluation statements for the starting levels chosen;

• Justify their identified starting levels by providing evidence. The evidence uploaded to the MeTP TwinSpace could be in a variety of formats, illustrating one or more aspects of the various knowledge, skills and attitudes described in any one of the levels. As few or as many pieces of evidence could be provided.

4.5 Phase 2: 1st partner review

The MeTP coordinators analysed the group of 35 participant teachers and grouped them into 16 pairs of two, and one group of 3. The pairs were randomly selected, deliberately not trying to pair teachers from the same/similar countries, subjects, and student age groups together.

After completing their first self-assessment exercise resulting in the identification of their starting and target levels with accompanying evidence for their pedagogical and digital competences, the next step was to contact their partner and review each other’s starting levels and accompanying evidence. Through discussion and analysis of the competence criteria against the evidence provided, participants were encouraged to question and critically challenge one another, before agreeing together on whether the starting and target levels were accurate and realistic. Participants used this opportunity to decide whether to keep their starting and target levels the same as identified in their original self-assessments, or change them to a lower or higher level, on the basis of the discussions had during their peer review.

Participants were free to engage in any way they liked with their partner, and for as little or as much as necessary (through emails, the MeTP TwinSpace/forum/chat, through Skype or other digital communication tools). The aim was for them to have full control of their mode of communicating and collaborating together, while providing
them with solid support tools such as the competence model and self-assessment sheets, as well as the MeTP TwinSpace. Once the first partner review process was completed, each pair was asked to summarize their partner review in a forum entry on the MeTP TwinSpace. This enabled each pair to document their peer reviews, and importantly make them public, allowing other MeTP participants to access them so that they could learn from the exchanges of other MeTP pairs. Participants were provided with written instructions for carrying out the 1<sup>st</sup> partner review.

4.6 Phase 3: Working towards the target levels and building evidence

Following the first partner review, it was time for teachers to start focusing their attention on explicitly working towards their target levels for the development of their pedagogical and digital competences (in the specific areas selected on their self-assessment sheets indicated by codes). To do this they were asked to specifically incorporate particular activities which would allow them to achieve their target statements, within the eTwinning project they were currently working on. In this way participants were actively seeking opportunities within the implementation of their eTwinning projects to improve certain pre-identified aspects of their pedagogical and digital competences. Participants were asked to share examples with their partners and with the whole group in the MeTP TwinSpace and during MeTP webinars (see below), to help one another and give each other inspiration.

Participants were then asked to provide evidence to illustrate how they were improving their competences in their specific target areas. Participants provided evidence twice during the MeTP activity: firstly, at the beginning of the activity during the self-assessment phase (see above) to demonstrate their starting levels in relation to both competences; and secondly towards the end of the activity to demonstrate whether or not they had reached their target levels.

In order to ensure that each piece of evidence was directly linked to one of the target statements in the self-assessment sheets, participants were asked to entitle each piece with a target statement code. This enabled partners to identify which aspect of pedagogical or digital competence each piece of evidence was intended to demonstrate.

The evidence provided by MeTP participants to demonstrate their level of competence in relation to pedagogical and digital practice was rich and varied and included:

- Simple written descriptions explaining how the participant is implementing one or more aspects of the knowledge, skills and attitudes related to the
competences described in the descriptors and statements, in their teaching practice.

- **Lesson plans** illustrating one or more aspects of the competences described in the descriptors and statements in action.

- Links to **videos illustrating classroom practice** where one or more aspects of the competences are visually evident.

- Links to **presentations** made for students, other teachers, members of staff, management, parents or other members of the wider community which illustrate one or more aspects of the competences described in the descriptors and statements.

- **Student observation notes** illustrating one or more aspects of the competences.

- **Learning resource** used or created illustrating one or more aspects of the competences.

- **Students’ work** (e.g. extracts from portfolios etc.) illustrating one or more aspects of the competences.

- Class/school **blogs or websites** illustrating one or more aspects of the competences.

**4.7 Phase 4: 2nd partner review**

Once participants had uploaded their second set of evidence to demonstrate whether or not they had reached their target levels, they were asked to contact their partner to conduct their 2nd partner review. The focus of this 2nd partner review was for each participant to analyse with their partner whether the new evidence provided reflected the target levels; and if not, to give each other advice to help achieve these levels. The 2nd partner review involved each participant writing a short self-reflection about their progress towards meeting their target codes, as well as a review of their partner’s progress in meeting their target codes, taking into account the evidence provided.

Participants were provided with written instructions for carrying out the 2nd partner review.
**4.8 Phase 5: Final evaluation**

Once the activity cycle was completed, phase 5 was dedicated to evaluating the pilot. The evaluation consisted of three components:

1. a detailed evaluation survey which was compulsory for each participant to complete in order to gain their final certificate (see section 4.13)

2. a debriefing webinar open to all participants

3. the establishment of the MeTP steering group and in-depth interviews with its members.

   - The results of the evaluation are explained in section 6 of this report.

**4.9 The MeTP steering group**

The MeTP steering group was created towards the end of the activity. MeTP participants interested in contributing to the pilot’s evaluation as well as guiding the design of the next edition were invited to volunteer to be part of the group. Seven teachers volunteered and have acted as valuable contributors to the evaluation of the pilot. The MeTP steering group is composed of 4 secondary school teachers, and 3 primary school teachers from different subject backgrounds. 6 out of the 7 members were new to eTwinning when they joined the MeTP activity, and 5 out of 7 were involved in their first eTwinning project.

Six members of the steering group ran a joint workshop summarizing their experiences and top tips for teachers during the 2015 eTwinning annual conference in Brussels. This workshop is reported on in section 5 of this report. In-depth interviews were also conducted with five members of the steering group, and these are reported on in section 6 of this report.
4.10 Collaboration and communication

The MeTP pilot was coordinated by the CSS Monitoring Manager and Pedagogical Manager, who had overall responsibility for the design, implementation and evaluation of the activity.

All MeTP participants were invited to a dedicated MeTP TwinSpace where they could take part in the activities and exchange with other participants. Each MeTP participant was asked to set up a profile providing the following information: name and photo; subject/s and age-range of students they teach; title and short description of their eTwinning project.

This collaborative learning space was used by participants to access the competence models and self-assessment sheets, and upload their self and peer assessments as well as their supporting evidence. The MeTP TwinSpace forum was actively used by participants to engage with one another on content related questions, and conduct the peer reviews. The MeTP TwinSpace was also used by the coordinators for management purposes. The message board was used to communicate key milestones of the activity, remind participants of upcoming tasks and deadlines, and announce the time, date and access details of all MeTP activity webinars.

A mailing list for the MeTP group was also set up allowing the European Schoolnet coordinators and participants to conveniently send messages to the whole group as appropriate.

4.11 MeTP webinars

During the pilot five webinars open to all participants were conducted using Webex (a web conferencing tool which combines desktop sharing through a web browser with online conferencing and video). Each webinar was planned to take place in accordance with the activity’s milestones, and to provide guidance and support to participants during the process. The details of each webinar are given below.
The first webinar was attended by the largest number of participants, which was as expected, as this was a preparatory information session where those interested could learn more. After this first webinar, those who were prepared to commit to the MeTP activity joined regularly, with an average of around 25 participants attending each webinar, representing around 70% of the final MeTP group. This is an encouraging percentage, indicating the high level of engagement in the activity, and the usefulness of these webinars for participants. Indeed, this is supported by the results of the pilot’s evaluation survey in which over 90% of participants stated that they found the webinars very useful or useful for their learning and progress in the activity.

All webinars were recorded and the link was made available following each meeting on the MeTP TwinSpace and through the MeTP mailing list. This allowed participants who were unable to attend one or more of the webinars the possibility of catching up in their own time.

Webinar 1: Introduction & self-assessment activity
Date: 4 December 2014
Number of participants: 47

Focus: This webinar served as an introduction to the activity. All participants were explained what they needed to do in the first phase of the activity: the self-assessment phase, requiring them to self-assess their starting and target levels on various elements of pedagogical and digital competence, and to provide evidence to justify their identified levels. They were also explained that they would be paired up with a partner to conduct their first partner review, requiring both participants to discuss and reach an agreement concerning each of their starting and target levels, on the basis of the evidence provided.

There was a high participation to this first webinar, which was mainly an information session, allowing participants to better understand the nature of the activity and the time they would need to commit to it. The CSS coordinators were available to answer any questions from participants about the activity.

Webinar 2: Debriefing of 1st partner review activity
Date: 25 February 2015
Number of participants: 31

Focus: MeTP’s second webinar was dedicated to debriefing the self-assessment and first partner review exercises. Participants were asked to explain what they found useful and challenging about the process. Each pair that had successfully completed the first partner review were also asked to present to the group the results of their peer review work, including whether or not they had changed their starting or target levels as a result of the
discussions they had with their partner, on the basis of the evidence they had provided. While some pairs were on target and were in a position to present what they had done, others had started the activities but had either not fully understood the process or had not been able to contact their partner, so were unable to present at the webinar. These participants however were able to learn from the participants who were further ahead and able to present what they had done. Moreover, the webinar was also an opportunity for those participants who had not yet started any work on the MeTP activity to hear from those that had, and to ask any questions in order to be able to catch up.

Webinar 3: Working towards the target levels  
Date: 15 April 2015  
Number of participants: 20

**Focus:** This webinar was aimed to be an intermediate implementation check to see how participants were progressing. A recap of all previous steps was made, and the coordinators answered any questions concerning remaining issues from the previous steps. Issues included: incomplete work (starting level and/or evidence missing for one or both competences); no codes and/or explanations provided (Evidence not labelled with a code from the self-assessment sheets); only written descriptions of teachers’ practice provided as evidence (participants were encouraged to use a variety of formats to provide evidence, such as lesson plans, presentations, videos, and learning resources); and non-responsive participants who were not reacting to contact from their partners. The coordinators explained the above issues that were apparent from the interaction on the MeTP forum, and also from direct contact from participants. Issues that could be solved immediately were dealt with during the webinar, and issues such as inactive participants were followed-up through bilateral emails and Skype calls with those concerned.

During this third webinar, participants were asked to describe how they were working on their target statements for each competence in their eTwinning projects, and their experiences so far. Inspiring examples from participants were shared. Participants were then asked to fill in a Google Sheet shared by the whole MeTP group stating their agreed starting and target codes, and to describe next to each target code how they planned to work on this aspect within their eTwinning project work.

Webinar 4: Debriefing of 2nd partner review activity  
Date: 11 June 2015  
Number of participants: 26

**Focus:** This webinar was dedicated to debriefing all participants’ experiences during the second partner review. The coordinators reviewed the content of the second partner
reviews posted in the MeTP TwinSpace forum as well as the accompanying evidence, and asked three pairs of teachers in advance to present their work at the 4th webinar. This proved to be inspiring for all participating teachers. Showcasing some good examples of teachers’ work and progress in the MeTP activity allowed these good examples to be viewed and appreciated by everybody, so that teachers had access to this work and not just the work of their partner. Although all partner reviews and evidence items were available to the whole group on the MeTP Twinspace, in practice participants rarely found the time to look at other teachers’ examples; they devoted the limited time they had available to working on their own competence development and exchanging with their partner. This is why sharing a few good examples in a live webinar, where teachers could explain and answer any questions, was of real value.

Once again, not everyone was on target, sometimes because of delays in their own eTwinning project work which meant that they were unable to implement the new skill or knowledge they were working towards to meet their target levels; other times because they had difficulty in contacting or working with their partner. This was the case for around one third of participants, who received individual support (see below), and managed to catch-up later in the process.

The evaluation survey was also announced at this webinar, and participants were invited to fill this in before the next webinar where the preliminary results would be shared.

**Webinar 5: Evaluation of the MeTP pilot**

**Date:** 15 July 2015  
**Number of participants:** 25

**Focus:** The first part of the webinar was devoted to gathering feedback from participants regarding their experiences during the MeTP activity, from various perspectives: in terms of the progress they felt they had made in developing their pedagogical and digital competences over the 6 month period during their work on their eTwinning project; the usefulness of the self and peer assessment activities for their own professional development; and the adequacy of the pedagogical and practical support they received from the coordinators during the process. The next part of the webinar was used to present some key results from the evaluation survey filled in by the majority of participants, and to ask participants present to explain the reasoning behind their answers. Those who had not yet filled in the evaluation survey were reminded and given an extended deadline, so that the full results could be presented in the current report.

The issues of recognition (see section 4.13), and the setting up of an MeTP steering group (see section 4.9) were also discussed at this webinar.
4.12 Individual support

In addition to the group dynamic provided by the regular webinars, it became clear that individual support was necessary to help teachers who were not only new to the MeTP activity, but also to the specific methodology used including self and peer assessment, as well as to eTwinning itself. This individual support was provided through bilateral emails, exchanging on the forum and Skype calls with those that requested them. As reported in the evaluation section of this report (section 6), individual support was very much appreciated by those who requested or benefited from it, and it was instrumental in counteracting some of the negative aspects experienced by participants, such as a non-responsive partner.

4.13 Recognition

Everyone who completed all phases of the activity was entitled to receive a certificate from the CSS coordination team. The few participants who were lagging behind in the activity were helped and encouraged to complete all phases so that they could also get full recognition for their work. By September 2015 all 35 participants completed all five phases of the activity and were duly rewarded with a certificate. During the evaluation phase of the activity all participants were asked to report the average number of days they had spent on the activity, and on this basis an average number of hours was calculated and mentioned on each participant’s certificate. The time spent ranged from between 1-5 days work (average of 21 hours); 5-10 days work (average of 49 hours); more than 10 days work (average of 84 hours).

In addition to the recognition provided to each participant on a personal level, through their respective certificates which could be used at national level as evidence of their professional development, we felt it important that their work on the MeTP activity be also recognized more publicly within the eTwinning community. To achieve this, each teacher’s participation in the MeTP was listed on their profile pages together with their other eTwinning projects. Moreover, the MeTP activity was also listed as an event in which each teacher participated in.
5. RESULTS

5.1 Teachers’ self-assessment of their starting levels

26 teachers agreed with their partners’ starting codes (i.e. the coded statements teachers assessed themselves on relating to the skills, knowledge and attitudes concerning a specific aspect of competence development, under one of five levels).

Interestingly however, 9 teachers did not agree with the starting levels their partner had identified themselves with, either in one or both competences. This represents around 25% of all participating teachers. All 9 teachers suggested their partner should rate their starting levels higher than originally indicated in their self-assessment. The tendency therefore within this specific group of teachers was for participants to underestimate their level of competence.

The evaluation results show that in discussing with their partner why they did not agree with the self-assessments made on the basis of concrete evidence provided, teachers changed their mind about their starting levels. This is very interesting as it shows the important added value that peer assessment can bring. While self-assessment is a crucial starting point, we cannot only rely on ourselves to see things objectively. Had these 9 teachers not participated in the partner review, and carried on the activity aiming for lower or higher levels than eventually agreed, they may have found the process misguided and less useful for their professional development. In gaining the external perspective of another fellow teacher and having their starting level validated in this way, teachers were able to work with a common understanding of the levels, and have a more accurate appreciation of their current and target levels of competence.
5.2 Teachers’ self-assessment of their target levels

In the MeTP evaluation survey, participants were asked if they believed they had reached their target codes and secondly if their partner agreed, based on the evidence provided.

According to MeTP participants’ self-assessment, 60% of them agreed that they had fully mastered their target codes, while working on their eTwinning project, associated to a higher level of competence than the codes they started with at the beginning of the activity. An additional 31% stated that they had reached at least one of their target codes (and often more than one), and only 9% (representing three participants) believed they had not reached any of their target codes. The codes of teachers in the group that stated they only partly achieved their target codes were quite evenly distributed between pedagogical and digital competence codes, although there was a slight majority of teachers that stated the target codes they hadn’t reached were related to digital competence. The two reasons stated by the three participants that thought they hadn’t properly reached any of their target codes were lack of time, or their eTwinning projects finishing during the MeTP period either because they were completed or because they failed to continue.

Below is an example of an excerpt taken from the MeTP TwinSpace in which a teacher explains how she reached her target codes:

Description of eTwinning project: “Legends and Tales from our Hometowns”

“This project involved 14 schools in 10 different countries: the Czech Republic, Croatia, France, Greece, Italy, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia and Spain. The main idea was to share a tale or legend both in English and in our mother languages and to present our hometowns to each other. The final eBook we produced is indeed a collaborative work because each school illustrated a legend from another school, instead of illustrating their own. This meant students got to understand their own culture as well as those of peers while also learning to work together. This work was great fun and our students enjoyed working with texts written by their peers.”

Reflection on competence improvement:

“I think I successfully reached my target codes both in relation to my pedagogical and digital competences, while working on this eTwinning project. I managed to get my students actively engaged through class discussions and group work in reading and illustrating our partner’s legend. Our legend to illustrate was “The birth of Rome” and the students were very interested and motivated. We obtained a license to use
Magazine Factory which allowed us to publish our work and disseminate widely. I achieved my target level 3 in my pedagogical competence, and level 4 in my digital competence, and below I summarize how:

The main pedagogical competences I improved were related to:
- Cooperative learning
- Clearly presenting learning objectives at the start of each task
- Reflecting on my own practice, through keeping a diary
- Conducting a research laboratory
- Experiment teaching in an interdisciplinary way
- Sharing objectives and content with students
- Building knowledge about our own roots, both local and European
- Differentiating tasks for students with different abilities

The main digital competences I improved were related to:
- Learning and teaching to use Prezi and other presentation tools
- Using the TwinSpace to exchange materials
- Using the internet more effectively in preparation and during class
- Communicating with digital tools
- Integrating ICT into the teaching and learning process, allowing students to participate actively
- Digitalize written works and designs
- Using Magazinefactory.edu.fi as a public platform to disseminate the outcomes of the project
- Using Papiruseditor.com to create an e-book"

MeTP Teacher: Monica Giansanti; history and geography teacher (Italy)

5.3 Teachers’ assessment of their partners’ target levels

Interestingly, all participants agreed with their partners concerning whether or not they had managed to put into action the series of coded statements they had selected under their target level. This is encouraging as it indicates that the evidence provided by participants was sufficient and clear enough for partners to make an informed
decision which was in line with what the participant was aiming to demonstrate. Analysing this further, it is not surprising that there was more agreement at this stage of the activity (i.e. during the second partner review) than at the earlier stage (during the first partner review). This is firstly because in the first phase of the activity participants had to provide evidence of work they had already done in the past, to demonstrate their current level, according to the criteria provided. It was therefore perhaps not always easy to find one or more pieces of evidence which accurately reflected the exact statements in the self-assessment sheets.

However, in the later phase of the activity participants were familiar with the exact content of the target statements they needed to demonstrate, and so creating new evidence to fit this purpose was a more guided task. This may explain in part why there was less ambiguity and more agreement from partners in this latter phase of the activity. It also indicates that participants may have become better at assessing themselves and one another once they had experienced a first round of peer reviews, and also had the time to reflect and work on the competence statements. The building of trust and respect for one another as fellow teachers took some time as we learned from the evaluation interviews. Moreover, by the time partners were doing their second peer review, they had learned to speak the same language concerning the competences they were trying to enhance, and importantly the meaning behind each of the action-based statements.

5.4 The usefulness of the MeTP activity for teachers’ learning

80% of participants rated the overall value of the MeTP activity for their professional learning as either ‘very good’ (the top rating) or ‘good’, with 50% of these participants choosing the highest rating, 13% found it average, and 7% found it poor. This last group of participants explained in the open comments of the evaluation survey, that their lack of satisfaction was unrelated to the MeTP activity content or organization, and rather due to personally not being able to commit sufficient time to benefit from it.

Below are some quotes from teachers commenting on the usefulness of the MeTP activity for their professional development:

“I really valued this experience because it made me question my own practice and this is useful to help me improve my teaching methods.”

“The self and peer assessment materials provided have been really motivating and interestingly useful for improving my competence levels.”
“It made me rethink some of my practices by having to evaluate them and by being required to make an action plan to enhance my work as teacher.”

“It was very useful for me to see how other teachers from other countries work and which learning strategies they use. It was also great to get feedback from an impartial review from my partner.”

Participants were also asked to rate each of the activity’s main activities, in terms of how useful they were for their learning. The most favourably rated activities were those related to self-assessment (the first self-assessment at the start of the activity, and the second reflection on the achievement of their target levels). Around 95% of teachers rated these activities as ‘very useful’ or ‘useful’, with over 50% giving them the top rating. In very close second position were the activities related to evaluation – including the debriefing webinar, interviews and the completion of the detailed evaluation survey. These activities were rated by 92% as ‘very useful’ or ‘useful’, with around 40% giving them the top rating.

Interestingly, in last position (although still rated very highly) were the two peer review exercises. Around 85% of participants rated these as ‘very useful’ or ‘useful’ for their learning, with around 40% giving them the top rating. In the open question related to this issue, participants commented that often they found this the most interesting dimension of the activity, and potentially the one they had the most to learn from. However, it was also the most challenging in their opinion, and whether they had a useful learning experience largely depended on who they were partnered with and the availability of this teacher to engage with them. This explains the slightly lower rating of the peer learning activities, and also indicates the need for the coordinators to reflect seriously on how to better guarantee the quality of the peer learning experiences. The peer learning activities were also those to get the highest negative rating with almost 15% (5 participants) rating the first peer review experience as ‘poor’ or ‘very poor’, and 5% the second. We can therefore deduct from this result, which is also supported by the interviews, that while the most significant reasons for a dissatisfying peer review experience was caused by the lack of availability of a teacher’s partner, there is evidence that peer review experiences improved the second time teachers engaged in this process. This indicates that given more time and opportunities for peer learning, teachers are more likely to benefit positively from the experience.
5.5 Teachers’ competence and skill development during the MeTP activity

In the MeTP evaluation survey, respondents were asked to rate to what extent the MeTP activity guided the development of specific skills, ranging from a large extent to no extent. Overall, the highest rated skill was ‘collaborative skills in working with other teachers’ with an impressive 94% stating that this skill was developed during the activity to either a large or moderate extent. In close second position was ‘digital competence’ with 92% stating that this skill was developed during the activity to either a large or moderate extent. The percentage of teachers stating that their digital competence was largely developed during the activity is in fact slightly higher (66%) than those stating this in relation to collaborative skills in working with other teachers (63%). This is unsurprising as one of the two competences the activity specifically focused on was indeed digital competence. In close third position, rated by 89% of teachers to have been developed during their MeTP experience, was ‘project based teaching skills’, which again is unsurprising considering that teachers were asked to target and monitor their competence development while carrying out an eTwinning project.

Analysing the data more closely we can see that three other items in the skills list teachers were asked to rate, were also related to their collaborative competence. In the most general, encompassing item ‘collaborative skills in working with other teachers’ we already saw that teachers rated this in first position, with 94% agreeing that these skills were developed during the activity to a large or moderate degree. Interestingly however, when they were asked about specific aspects of the collaborative competence needed by teachers, they rated these aspects much lower. Only 62% stated that their ‘communication skills in working with parents and other stakeholders in the wider community’ was developed to a large or moderate extent during the MeTP activity, with 28% stating that these were only developed to a small extent or not at all. 71% stated that their ‘collaborative skills in working with other school staff (e.g. senior management, administrative staff, ICT coordinators, special needs staff etc.)’ were developed to a large or moderate extent during the MeTP activity, with 26% stating that these were only developed to a small extent or not at all. Finally, 78% stated that they felt their ‘collaborative skills in working with teachers from other subjects’ were largely or moderately developed during the activity, with 23% stating that these were only developed to a small extent or not at all. It would seem logical that teachers rated collaborating with teachers from other subjects more highly than the other two items focusing on collaboration skills with other school staff or external stakeholders, as the MeTP activity included an important element of working with a partner teacher, who often taught a different subject. Working with other school staff or parents and the wider community however were never specifically targeted, and teachers would only have been exposed to these opportunities if their eTwinning
These results indicate that while teachers rated their overall collaboration competence as being most developed during the activity, we should be careful how we interpret this data as when asked more specifically about certain aspects of their collaborative competence, we see that less progress was made. It might therefore be a good idea to add collaborative competence to the MeTP competence model in the activity’s next edition, so that teachers can explicitly work on developing this competence in a ‘collaboration friendly’ eTwinning environment, and can explore in more detail the various skills and stakeholders they need to be able to work with to be effective collaborators in their profession. Moreover, we know from education research in this area that collaborative teaching and learning is defined and understood in many ways, and often is used synonymously with active learning, problem-based learning and particularly cooperative learning, despite them being related but distinct ways of working (Prince 2004; Davidson & Howell Major 2014).

We also know that teacher collaboration is not very common in schools across Europe. As reported in the 2015 eTwinning monitoring report, recent research from TIMMS and PIRLS shows that across the 17 EU countries surveyed, on average, only around one third (36%) of fourth graders are taught by teachers reporting a high degree of collaboration with other teachers, aimed at improving teaching and learning. When analysing the nature of this collaboration we find that on average, not much more than half of students are taught by teachers who share what they have learned about their teaching experiences (57.45%) and discuss how to teach a particular topic (51.24%) with others on a weekly basis. A lower share of students still (42.42%, on average) are taught by teachers collaborating weekly in planning and preparing instructional materials. Practices that require closer collaboration, such as working together to try out new ideas and visiting another teacher’s classroom, are even less frequent as compared to the other forms of collaboration mentioned above (European Commission (b) 2015). These results are confirmed by those of the recent KeyCoNet consultation which illustrates that there is a real need for greater teacher collaboration within and beyond schools (KeyCoNet (b) 2014). The traditional organisation of schools has meant that teachers are often isolated in their classrooms and have few opportunities to exchange ideas and insights. Only 36% of teacher respondents from the consultation stated to have experienced collaboration and networking as a means of professional development. This research in addition to the results of this small-scale MeTP pilot call for more opportunities for teachers to explicitly focus on developing their collaborative skills related to teaching and learning.

Foreign language skills for teaching was rated as either being developed during the activity to a large or moderate extent according to 86% of MeTP teachers, while pedagogical competence was rated positively by 85%, and teaching and
assessing cross-curricular skills (such as teach work, creativity etc.) by around 80%. Although pedagogical competence is still rated highly overall, it is interesting to note that despite it being one of the two targeted competences in the activity, **more teachers felt that their digital competence had been improved to a larger extent.** This is also consistent with their answers concerning which competence codes they had managed to achieve (see section 5.2). Analysing the open comments from the evaluation survey, as well as those made in the interviews, we understand this to be because the digital competence statements were specific and included the use of concrete tools, so it was easier to create opportunities to include these in a teacher’s eTwinning project. On the other hand, the pedagogical competence statements although specific and action-based, often referred to practices which needed to be built-up over time, and so teachers felt that while they made progress, this wasn’t necessarily as immediate and obvious in comparison to their digital competence development. We of course know that pedagogy is a complex process, and for real change to occur much reflection and trial and error are needed over a considerable amount of time. Interestingly however, **when teachers were asked whether they agreed that the MeTP activity encouraged them to reflect more than they usually did on their pedagogical competence, 90% strongly agreed or agreed. 80% also strongly agreed or agreed that the MeTP activity challenged some of their assumptions and beliefs.** These results suggest that even those that reported less improvement in their pedagogical competence, nevertheless consciously reflected about their practice and even changed their beliefs, which is an important necessary step leading to change in practice.

### 5.6 Teachers’ practice since participating in the MeTP activity

Teachers were asked to what extent they agreed with the following statements listed in the table below. The percentages have been rounded up and are therefore approximate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Since participating in the MeTP activity…</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It has positively influenced my daily teaching as well as my eTwinning project work</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I learned something new which has positively influenced my teaching</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Since participating in the MeTP activity...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Since participating in the MeTP activity…</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have gained practical ideas of how I can improve my professional practice</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will use the tools, ideas and examples presented by my partner and/or other teachers in my everyday teaching practice</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel more confident and able to use effective teaching and/or assessment methods</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have adapted my teaching methods or tried out a new teaching method</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have used a new tool I discovered to improve my teaching</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have adapted my assessment methods or tried out a new assessment method</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have changed my classroom setup</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have shared what I have learned with other colleagues in my school</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have shared what I have learned with other colleagues outside of my school</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am still in contact/intend to continue to be in contact with my partner</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am still in contact/intend to continue to be in contact with other participants</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use technology more effectively in the classroom</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have tried out a new technology in my teaching</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is encouraging to see that all MeTP teachers stated that they will use the tools, ideas and examples presented by their partner and/or other participants in their everyday teaching practice. This demonstrates that the activity was of real practical value to them and that on completing the activity participants were already aware of the
exact tools and examples they would reuse in their daily teaching, whether related to eTwinning or not. Related to this statement are the following two, which 90% of participants either strongly agreed or agreed with: ‘I have gained practical ideas of how I can improve my professional practice’ and ‘I have used a new tool I discovered to improve my teaching’. Also very encouraging is that 90% of participants either strongly agreed or agreed that they adapted their teaching methods or tried out a new teaching method as a result of their participation in the MeTP activity.

The majority of other statements were strongly agreed or agreed on by around 80% of teachers. Exceptions include changing classroom set-up which less teachers reported doing as a result of their MeTP experience, as well as sharing what they had learned with colleagues outside their school.

70% teachers stated that they strongly agreed or agreed that they would continue to be in contact with their partner, compared to 50% who stated they would also maintain contact with other MeTP participants. It is logical that a higher percentage of teachers would be motivated to keep in contact with their partner with whom they worked with on a bilateral basis and had the time to develop a stronger relationship. It is nevertheless encouraging that half of all participants are committed to also staying in contact with other MeTP teachers who they met virtually during the MeTP webinars and also with whom they shared experiences and examples of their work on the MeTP TwinSpace.

5.7 What MeTP participants learned about self and peer assessment

The MeTP steering group were invited to run a joint workshop with the MeTP coordinator at the 2015 eTwinning annual conference in Brussels on 23 October. The workshop focused on summarizing the aims and results of the MeTP activity, as well as providing participants the opportunity to engage in some self and peer assessment.
activities and a collective debate. The objective was to disseminate the learning outcomes of the MeTP activity to a wider audience of eTwinners present at the workshop, and invite them to take part in the second edition of the activity to be run in 2017.

Participants were asked to reflect on and discuss how teachers’ self and peer assessment is perceived in their specific school, and within their national culture. To fuel the debate further participants were presented with some common barriers teachers face when trying to implement self and peer assessment, and were asked to discuss these. The barriers presented included:

- Uncertainty concerning how to self and peer assess effectively
- Heavy workload
- Lack of time
- Non-encouraging school environment
- Fear of judgement
- Lack of self-confidence

Each member of the MeTP steering group presented their top tips for teachers concerning self-assessment and peer assessment, based on their experience of being involved in the MeTP activity. Their tips are summarized in the figures below.

### Top tips for teacher self-assessment:

1. Ask yourself the hard questions!
2. Keep a Teaching Diary!
3. Look at yourself with someone else’s eyes
4. There is no right answer!
5. Concentrate on your strengths and weaknesses
6. Be innovative!

### Top tips for teacher peer-assessment:

1. Provide sufficient and detailed feedback
2. Set goals with your partner
3. Early and regular contact with your partner
4. Clear criteria is necessary
5. Provide constructive criticism
6. Be collaborative and cooperative!
6. EVALUATION

6.1 The expectations and motivations of MeTP participants

All participants were asked in the evaluation survey to what extent they agreed that the MeTP activity met their expectations. Around 90% agreed or strongly agreed that the MeTP activity met their expectations, while around 10% disagreed or strongly disagreed. In the open comments, the few teachers that stated their expectations were not met, mentioned that the activity was more time consuming than they had expected.

In the in-depth interviews, MeTP teachers were asked what motivated them to join the activity in the first place. An interesting comment made by the most experienced eTwinner in the MeTP steering group (who has been involved in eTwinning for the last eight years) is that during this time she has noticed that in the projects she and other eTwinners have been involved in, there has often been very little or no focus at all on evaluating teachers’ practices while working on eTwinning projects. She believes that it is essential for teachers to evaluate their own work throughout the various stages of an eTwinning project in order for these results not only to feed into the next steps of the project, but also to fuel the professional development of the teacher as a whole. She strongly believes that participating in eTwinning projects should not just have a positive effect on students, but also on teachers. For these reasons she was excited to be part of the MeTP activity which focused precisely on tracking teachers’ development through their work on eTwinning projects.

Various other expectations and motivations were mentioned by members of the MeTP steering group, and are presented in the following quotes extracted from their interviews.
“By participating in the MeTP activity, I wanted to learn more about the effects on teachers’ professional development experienced by those participating in an eTwinning project and to understand the meaning and importance of self- and peer-assessment and how to carry these out effectively. All the MeTP activities were interesting and useful in helping me meet these expectations.”

Valentina Marinova, primary school teacher, Bulgaria

“I became involved in the MeTP activity the same year I became an eTwinner. It was the first time I was presented with the opportunity to take part in such an experience, so I didn’t know what to expect. However, the prospect of meeting European colleagues and sharing experiences with them persuaded me to join. Initially, the idea of evaluating myself and being evaluated by other teachers worried me a little because of my inexperience. On the other hand I was curious and ready to learn! Now the activity has concluded I can say that all my expectations were met: my journey through the fantastic world of European school collaboration has started and is still going on!”

Monica Giansanti, secondary school teacher, Italy

“What first motivated me to take part was the opportunity to come into contact with the e-Twinning community, including the teachers, ideas and practices from all over Europe. Furthermore, the idea of monitoring my progress as a teacher in a structured way, thanks to the self and peer assessment process appealed to me as it was an area in which I wanted to improve myself. MeTP gave me the opportunity through the use of comprehensive self-assessment sheets to identify the level of my pedagogical and digital competences and to find out which areas I needed to develop. The codes and sets of self-evaluation statements helped me in substantial way to determine what level my practices reflected, and allowed me to set achievable goals arranged in a systematic way thanks to the target level system. This was the first time I engaged in this type of reflection in such a well-structured way. I have kept these self-assessment sheets as precious instruments which still help me today to evaluate the level of my practices and set targets, in order to develop my competences.”

Chrysa Tsamopoulou, primary school teacher, Greece

“Since I was developing my first eTwinning Project I was very interested to participate in the MeTP pilot, expecting that it could be a very positive factor towards the improvement of the quality of my eTwinning project. The MeTP activity exceeded my initial expectations, because apart from the positive impact it had as a way of regulating the quality of my eTwinning project, it also allowed me to engage in an
Participating in eTwinning and the accompanying MeTP activity provided me with a great opportunity to improve my pedagogical and digital skills as well as my ability to reflect and learn from other teachers. The opportunity to meet teachers from Europe with different perspectives and school environments was another appealing challenge for me because until this activity I had had few opportunities to be in a European network of teachers such as the MeTP one. I had high expectations for the MeTP activity and in the end of the first stage of the activity I was already very satisfied with the results! [Manuela Ortigão, secondary school teacher, Portugal]

Interestingly, the interviews with the MeTP steering group also revealed that the MeTP model was found to be of such interest and relevance to participating teachers, that one teacher mentioned they used it to design a school-based project proposal under Erasmus+ which was submitted in March 2015, and another teacher volunteered to present the preliminary results of her MeTP experience at a national teachers’ conference in Portugal.

6.2 Reasons for participating in the MeTP activity until its completion

An open question was asked to participants in the evaluation survey concerning what were the main reasons for participating in the MeTP activity until the very end. The most popular reason for wanting to fully complete the MeTP activity was that participants felt a **personal commitment to achieving their goals**. This was particularly strong in the MeTP activity as everyone began with starting levels and target levels, which served to motivate and sustain participants’ engagement right until the end of the activity. Participants commented that they knew it would not be possible to gain the maximum learning benefit or at least have the best opportunity to fully achieve their objectives unless they saw the activity through until the end.

In addition to this personal commitment to achieve their goals, several participants also mentioned a **sense of responsibility to their MeTP partners** as one of the main reasons for participating until the very end. Those that built strong and constructive relationships with their partners, wanted to ensure they helped one another make
it to the end of the activity. Once again this motivation is closely linked to how the activity was set-up, as in order to successfully complete it, you needed to complete two partner reviews, meaning each participant was dependent on his/her partner. Several participants also expressed that the second partner review, in which they would have a final discussion with their partners concerning whether they had reached their target goals was what drove them to continue, as this expert opinion of a colleague was really valuable to them.

Participants also mentioned a general curiosity to reach the end of the activity to finally find out if they and their partners as well as other fellow participants were able to reach their target levels, and if not, why, and how might they work on this in the future. A few participants also mentioned that they kept on working on the activity until the end because they enjoyed working with their partner, and wanted to continue.

Another popular motivation for persisting until the end of the activity was in order to receive the final certificate, which participants were only eligible for if they completed all five phases of the activity.

Finally, one participant also mentioned that he considered his MeTP partner and the MeTP group as a whole as a ‘help network’ which could contribute to the successful fulfilment of his eTwinning project, and this motivated him to continue working on the activity until its completion.

6.3 Time spent by participants working on the MeTP activity

All participants were asked in the evaluation survey, as well as in the debriefing webinar to quantify how much time they spent overall working on the MeTP activity. The large majority of participants (almost 80%) stated that they worked at least 5 days in total on the MeTP activity. 40% stated they worked between 5 and 10 days (which was calculated as an average of 49 hours) and 37% stated that they worked more than 10 days (which was calculated as an average of 84 hours). Only one participant stated they worked less than 1 day in total on the activity.

We can therefore conclude that the activity was demanding in terms of participants’ time. However, it is important to note that although part of the time indicated was certainly dedicated to MeTP work only, at least some of that specified time was spent carrying out their eTwinning project. This is because phase 3 of the MeTP activity involved participants working on their target levels within the implementation of their eTwinning project. This means that some of the MeTP work was not extra to their eTwinning project work; but simply enhanced the eTwinning project work they were already doing.
The fact that more than a third of participants spent over 10 days working on the MeTP activity can also be interpreted as demonstrating their motivation and commitment to the activity.

6.4 The usefulness of the templates, tools and resources provided within the MeTP activity

In the evaluation survey, participants were asked to rate the usefulness of the various templates, tools and resources made available to them during the MeTP activity for their learning. The results are presented in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Templates, tools and resources</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Very poor</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The MeTP TwinSpace</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical competence assessment sheet</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital competence assessment sheet</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update emails from MeTP coordinators</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MeTP live webinars</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar presentations</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MeTP recorded webinars</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MeTP coordinators’ exchanges/ feedback on MeTP TwinSpace forum</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forum discussions on the MeTP TwinSpace with fellow teachers</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual tailored support from MeTP coordinators</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As we can observe from these results, the update emails from the MeTP coordinators were found to be essential and useful by all participants, with 89% stating these to have been very good and 11% stating they were good. These emails were sent out by the lead coordinator at regular intervals clearly stating what had been achieved so far, what were the next steps and how to get there, and reminding participants of the ways in which they could engage with the coordinators and with one another. The open comments offered by participants highlighted their regularity and clear structure as particularly useful for participants’ understanding and progress in the activity.
A very large majority of participants also found the coordinators’ exchanges and feedback on the MeTP TwinSpace forum as either very good (86%) or good (9%). Interestingly however when asked about the quality of forum discussions on the MeTP TwinSpace between fellow teachers, a much lower percentage found these to be very good (34%), although around half of all participants did find these to be good nonetheless. This could be explained in part by a number of potential factors, including sometimes unclear language used by participants with low level English, a lack of time available for participants to engage in this seriously, teachers being shy on the forum, and also by the fact that they could have benefited more stimuli from the coordinators to exchange with one another. In general however, 94% of participants rated the MeTP TwinSpace as a whole, including its various functions (profile pages, resources repository, forum, message-board, chat facility etc.) as either very good or good.

Individual tailored support from the MeTP coordinators was also very much appreciated by participants with 94% stating this to have been very good or good. From the email exchanges, interviews and open comments in the survey we learn that this was particularly appreciated when: teachers were dealing with non-responsive partners; when they were in need of catching-up and recappping on the activity basics which they preferred not to bother their partner with; and when they needed support in evaluating the quality and relevance of their work.

The competence assessment sheets, which were at the core of the activity and facilitated participants’ self and peer assessment, were rated by 92% as either very good or good.

The live webinars, of which there were 5 in total which took place in accordance with the activity’s various milestones were rated by 91% of participants as either very good or good. Interestingly, after the forum discussions with fellow teachers, the webinars had the lowest percentage of participants giving it the top rating (54%), even if this still represents more than half of all participants. This can be explained as during and after the webinars a limited number of participants complained either that they had technical difficulties preventing them from having a high quality experience, or that the level of English was too advanced for them and they had difficulty understanding the coordinators and participants’ speed or accents. Moreover, as we know, listening to a foreign language via a video conference is never easy. Encouragingly we see a slight improvement in terms of participants’ rating for the recorded webinars they were able to access after the live event, as well as for the webinar presentations, providing a written and visual support to facilitate participants’ understanding.
6.5 Difficulties and challenges faced by MeTP participants

The following table shows the options participants could select (multiple choices possible) to indicate the type of problems they faced during their MeTP experience in the evaluation survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer choices (multiple choices possible)</th>
<th>Percentage of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time issues</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties in contacting and exchanging with my partner</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical issues</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language issues</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have not experienced any significant problems</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have not experienced any problems at all</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of information and clear instructions</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from the MeTP coordinators</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The top challenge faced by participants was finding the time to be able to fully participate to the MeTP activity, in addition to working on their eTwinning project, and juggling their daily teaching jobs in parallel. Participants mentioned in the open comments to the evaluation survey as well as during the debriefing webinar, that any teacher participating in the MeTP activity quickly understands that they will only be able to get as much out of the activity as they are able to put in, particularly time wise. They also mentioned that they didn’t think the activity necessarily demanded too much time per se, but that they personally didn’t always have the time to engage with it as much as they would have liked to.

In second position (with 26%), are the challenges participants faced in working with their partners, already commented on earlier in this report, and further analysed in section 6.4. 23% of participants highlighted technical issues faced which covered their participation to webinars as well as their access to the MeTP TwinSpace. 14% commented on experiencing English language issues in not being able to communicate as well as possible with the coordinators and their partners and fellow participants in the activity.

It is encouraging to observe that around one third of participants stated that either they did not experience any problems at all, or any significant ones. No participants experienced lack of information or clear instructions, nor lack of support from the MeTP coordinators.
In addition to rating their top challenges in the evaluation survey, this question was explored through an open question, as well as in the in-depth interviews. Some other noteworthy challenges for teachers emerged through this qualitative exercise.

Some participants noted that they found it frustrating not to be partnered with a teacher from the same subject and educational level, as they think this would have enabled them to receive more relevant peer reviews and advice from their partner. Moreover, some participants did not feel competent to review the work of a teacher from a different subject or of a teacher working with students of a different age group. What came out of the in-depth interviews was that some participants felt that it was already a considerable challenge to be working closely with a teacher from a different country and education system, and that there was already ground work to be done for them to explain their respective systems before they could have constructive exchanges about their pedagogical and digital practices within their specific school contexts. Adding then the extra complications of coming from a different subject background and educational level necessitated further explanations, and this sometimes acted as a barrier to a smooth mutual understanding.

The peer review process was highlighted as particularly challenging by some participants. Participants indicated that it was often their first time to be involved in such a process, and in addition to being unsure of having the necessary knowledge and skills to review the content of their partners’ work, they sometimes also felt they uncertain of the etiquette to use while peer reviewing.

Providing evidence of one’s teaching practices was also found to be challenging by some participants. They originally thought this would be difficult but once they started to survey the work they had done or were doing, using the competence statements, they soon realized that they were in fact doing various action statements mentioned, at least to some degree, and were able to prove this.

A few participants commented that they found it difficult to be available to participate in all five webinars. While most of these participants appreciated the webinar recordings and PowerPoint presentations allowing them to catch-up afterwards, a few commented that they nevertheless missed the group dynamic by not being able to participate in the live sessions.
6.6 Evaluation of the partner work featured in the MeTP activity

Participants were asked to rate their overall collaboration with their partner (including ease and frequency of practice as well as useful exchanges which helped them improve their own practice) on a scale from very good to poor. The results can be seen visually in the pie chart below. **63% in total rated their experience of partner collaboration within the MeTP activity as either very good or good.** 23% found it to be average, and 14% rated it as poor.

![Participants’ overall rating of partners collaboration within the MeTP Activity](chart.png)

Earlier in section 6 as well as in section 5 of this report, we have already explored the reasons provided by teachers concerning their mixed experiences of partner collaboration, including positive aspects as well as barriers and challenges they faced. It is interesting however, to go one step further by analysing participants’ responses to a set of statements concerning the profile of participants in each pair. Participants were asked to which extent they agreed with a series of 6 statements (listed in the following table) concerning being paired with a partner of the same or different country, age, subject background, teaching experience, mother tongue and level of pedagogical and digital competence.
**Statements concerning the profile of MeTP participants partnered with one another**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I think it is necessary to be paired with a teacher who has roughly the same number of years of teaching experience.</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think it is possible for me to have a good collaboration and to learn something from a teacher who teaches a different subject.</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think it is possible for me to have a good collaboration and to learn something from a teacher who teaches students of a different age group.</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think it is useful to be paired with a teacher from the same country who speaks your mother tongue to facilitate communication and to have the same contextual and cultural references when speaking about working within a specific national education system.</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think it is useful to be paired with a teacher from a different country to learn about common as well as different challenges we face and to see what this new perspective can bring to my teaching.</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think it would be useful to be paired with a teacher who has identified themselves at a higher level of pedagogical and digital competence than myself.</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The statement which had the most unanimous response was ‘I think it is useful to be paired with a teacher from a different country’, which 94% of participants either strongly agreed or agreed to. This approach was clearly considered by participants to give them an opportunity they otherwise seldom have, to learn about common and different challenges they and their counterparts abroad face, and new solutions they might come to together starting from different perspectives. **86% of participants**
also strongly agreed or agreed that it is possible to have a good collaboration and to learn something from a teacher who teaches a different subject. This demonstrates that while some of the in-depth interviews revealed that some teachers felt this was an unhelpful additional complication, the vast majority of MeTP participants in fact do believe that they can learn something and effectively collaborate on this type of reflective activity with a teacher of a different subject. This being said, it is interesting to note one concrete example of a Slovenian and Danish teacher who were both German teachers and paired together. They chose to provide their evidence in German and exchange with one another in German in order to carry out their partner reviews, using the MeTP activity as an opportunity to also improve their German skills. While they personally found this convenient and useful, the downside was that other MeTP participants were unable to fully benefit from their MeTP work as some of this was presented in German only.

Interestingly, some other items did not arouse the same extent of high agreement across the large majority of participants. For example, only 60% strongly disagreed or disagreed that they think it is necessary to be paired with a teacher of roughly the same number of years of teaching experience. This means that 40% either strongly agreed or agreed with this statement, illustrating that teachers feel quite differently about this aspect. The same can be said concerning being able to have good collaboration with a teacher who teaches a different age group, as again only 60% strongly agreed or agreed with this, and 37% strongly disagreed or disagreed. Similarly, 68% either strongly agreed or agreed that it would be useful to be paired with a teacher who identified themselves at a higher level of pedagogical or digital competence, while around one third of participants did not agree. These latter participants commented that it would not make sense to pair teachers on this basis because the self-assessment of teachers might not be so accurate at first (hence why the peer assessment later in the activity is so important), meaning that in any case teachers might not actually be paired with a partner of a higher level of competence.

A specific question in the MeTP evaluation survey was dedicated to partner reviews. Participants were asked to rate to what extent they agreed with a list of statements listed in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements concerning MeTP partner reviews</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I found the process of reviewing my partner’s work useful for my own learning.</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I found it difficult to review my partner’s work.</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Statements concerning MeTP partner reviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I would have appreciated more guidance on how to carry out a constructive and useful partner review.</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I did not value my partner’s review of my work.</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As is clearly illustrated by the results in the table, there is strong agreement that the partner reviews were considered useful for participants’ learning, with 86% of participants strongly agreeing or agreeing with this. In accordance with this, the large majority of participants (83%) also strongly disagreed or disagreed that they did not find their partner’s review of their work valuable.

Interestingly, participants’ opinions are more split concerning the other two items. Just over half of all participants strongly disagreed or disagreed that they had difficulties to review their partner’s work, while just under half stated that they either strongly agreed or agreed that they did indeed find this difficult. This result is mirrored in relation to the statement about participants’ appreciation for more guidance to carry out a constructive and useful partner review, with more or less half strongly agreeing or agreeing, and the other half strongly disagreeing or disagreeing with this statement. This indicates, in coherence with the other results and comments analysed earlier in this report, that some teachers were less experienced in peer reviewing, others were paired with teachers who had less time to dedicate to the partner work making the experience more difficult, and so this resulted in some teachers finding the peer review work particularly challenging.

Finally, participants were also asked to select all the types of contact they had with their MeTP partner. The results are shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer choices (multiple choices possible)</th>
<th>Percentage of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written emails</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchanging on the MeTP TwinSpace forum</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skype or other video-conferencing tools</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchanging on the MeTP TwinSpace messaging tool</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchanging on the MeTP TwinSpace chat tool</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As illustrated in the results in the table, the most popular type of contact was written contact which was usually premeditated and thought out either in the form of
email communication (91%) or a contribution to a forum discussion within the MeTP TwinSpace (71%). Interestingly, the more immediate and spontaneous ways of written contact using the MeTP Twinspace messaging and chat tools were used to a much lesser extent by participants (20% and 17% respectively). Finally, worthy of note is the fact that only around a third of MeTP participants stated that they had vocal contact with their partners through some sort of video-conferencing tool. In a new edition of this activity now that the eTwinning Live video-conferencing tool is available, it is hoped more participants could be encouraged to foster this more personalized type of contact with their partner, allowing for in-depth discussion via this new user-friendly tool.

6.7 Reflections from participants on how the MeTP activity should be conducted in the future

Participants were asked in the MeTP evaluation survey to reflect on a possible future edition of the MeTP activity, by answering to what extent they agreed with a series of statements presented in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements concerning running the MeTP activity in the future</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I think the MeTP activity should be run again in the future.</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would participate again in another MeTP activity.</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would recommend the MeTP project to a colleague or friend.</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think the MeTP project should be run again in a similar way in the future with some minor modifications.</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think the MeTP project should be run again in a similar way in the future with some major modifications.</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think the MeTP project should be run again in a similar way, but this time including four competences (pedagogical, digital, collaborative, and project-based teaching competences) which all teachers have to work on and review simultaneously while carrying out their eTwinning project/s.</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Statements concerning running the MeTP activity in the future

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I think the MeTP project should be run again in a similar way, but this time including more competences (i.e. pedagogical, digital, collaborative, and project-based teaching competences) allowing teachers to choose which competence/s to focus on.</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the table results indicate, **there is a strong agreement amongst MeTP participants that this was a worthwhile activity which should be run again in some format in the future, with 94% strongly agreeing or agreeing with this statement.** 88% stated strongly agreed or agreed that they would recommend the MeTP activity to a colleague, while 80% stated they would participate in another MeTP activity in the future. These are very encouraging results. 63% either strongly agreed or agreed that the MeTP activity should be run again with some minor modifications (and the 37% who either strongly disagreed or disagreed mostly mentioned in the open comment box that this was because they thought it should be replicated exactly in the same way), while only 14% strongly agreed or agreed that it should be run again with some major modifications.

Finally, participants were asked to reflect on whether it would be of value to add more competences to the MeTP model in a potential future edition, including for example teachers’ collaborative and project-based teaching competences. Interestingly, only 51% strongly agreed or agreed that it would be a good idea to include four instead of the current two competences in the model and ask teachers to work on and review these while carrying out their eTwinning projects. In the open comments various participants commented that it was already demanding and challenging to focus on the development of various aspects of two competences, and it would be overwhelming and counterproductive to ask teachers to focus on more than this. However, **when asked about making more competences available and allowing teachers to choose which one/s to focus on we see a lot more agreement amongst participants** with 71% strongly agreeing or agreeing that this would be beneficial and interesting for their development. **Making the number of competences teachers focus on optional in any future edition of the MeTP activity is therefore something to keep in mind.**

All MeTP Participants were asked through an open question in the evaluation survey as well as in an interview question to the MeTP steering group, whether they had any suggestions on the MeTP could be improved in the future. Some interesting suggestions were made, including **the need to spread the MeTP activity over a longer period of time,** which was commented on by several participants. This would allow participants...
more time to become familiar with the MeTP model and to identify and work on their
target codes. Another suggestion made by more than one participant was to provide
more examples of activities that teachers could carry out to achieve their target
codes in relation to improving their pedagogical and digital competences. This is a
good idea, and now that the pilot has taken place, we have a wealth of evidence to
draw upon as samples of the type of activities teachers have carried out in the past
to achieve their target codes.

Some comments coming out of the open question in the evaluation survey and the
in-depth interviews with MeTP steering group members were related to the partner
work involved in the MeTP activity. One suggestion was to ask each MeTP participant
after the introductory webinar to complete an online form committing to take part in
the activity until its completion, in order to guarantee (as much as possible) that each
participant will have a partner to work with and that they will not be let down by
a non-responsive partner preventing them from completing the activity successfully.
Two participants also commented that it would be beneficial to partner teachers
with teachers of the same subject, teaching level and competence levels. As noted
already earlier in this report, while this comment was made by a small number of
individual teachers, the majority considered it not to be necessary or particularly
beneficial. It may well however be a good idea to provide teachers with the option of
being paired with another teacher of a similar profile, for those who think they could
personally benefit from such a partnership.

One participant made the interesting suggestion to partner two teachers within
the same eTwinning project to take part in the MeTP activity. This would allow the
participating teachers to together design the involvement of the target codes in their
ongoing eTwinning project work, and to continuously peer review one another during
the process. This potentially could be a powerful and efficient way of introducing
a peer review element to teachers’ professional development while carrying out
eTwinning projects.

Some additional suggestions were provided during the interviews with members
of the MeTP steering group. The majority of the interviews revealed an agreement
among members of the steering group that it would be beneficial to integrate
teachers’ collaborative and/or project-based teaching competences into the MeTP
model. eTwinning projects provide an ideal environment for teachers to experiment
and develop their collaborative competence, and as noted earlier, we know from
research that teachers are in need of more opportunities and guidance in this regard.
It would therefore seem relevant and appropriate for the MeTP model to feature
collaborative competence as one of the areas for teachers to focus on improving
while carrying out their eTwinning project.
Two steering group members also mentioned that it would be better for any future edition of the MeTP activity to devise a way to **make the evidence uploaded by each participant more immediately and visually accessible** (such as on a public wall rather than having it stored in folders categorized by participant on the MeTP TwinSpace) so that teachers would be more easily encouraged to view and engage with the work of others in addition to that of their own partner.

Finally, another steering group member advised that should the MeTP model be revised in the future, **it could be worth investigating the possibility of making a correspondence between the code number in each level of every competence.** This would limit any potential confusion concerning the code numbers on the part of participants and would also reinforce the message that the codes are organized in a way that reflects an increasing degree of complexity.
7. CONCLUSIONS AND THE WAY FORWARD

7.1 The added value of the MeTP activity

The MeTP pilot activity was an experiment in the use of reflection tools and processes, facilitating self- and peer assessment, as a way of tracking the progress of teachers’ competence development while carrying out eTwinning projects. The results presented in this report illustrate that by using the MeTP model all participating teachers were able to make progress and track their competence development which took place during the implementation of eTwinning projects. This positive result confirms the usefulness of the model and the interest to deploy it again in some format in the future.

As evidenced by the 2015 monitoring report, surveying the opinions of 6,000 teachers across Europe, eTwinners report a high level of competence development as a direct result of their involvement in eTwinning projects and related professional development activities. However, this data is only based on self-reporting. The added-value of the small scale qualitative MeTP activity is that it provided us with actual evidence of the self-reported competence development of a group of eTwinners. By requiring MeTP participants to justify how they were developing specific aspects of pedagogical and digital competence, according to the MeTP model specifically designed for this purpose, we now have sample evidence of a group of 35 eTwinners’ work, which illustrates how they improved their competences over time through working on eTwinning projects.

Another clear benefit of the MeTP activity is that it provided eTwinners for the first time with a set of reflective tools and processes that not only guided and encouraged their competence development, but also tracked their progress. As is clear from the results and the evaluation of this activity presented in this report, the majority of participating teachers found the MeTP activity a really valuable reflective experience which enhanced their competence development while working on eTwinning projects. For
this reason, it may be wise for the eTwinning management to consider how such an activity might be made available to all interested eTwinners on a much larger scale. Before this possibility is discussed briefly below, some recommendations are given on the basis of the very concrete and pragmatic points raised by the evaluation, should the activity be repeated again on a similar small scale.

7.2 Recommendations on the process

We learned that one of the major challenges participating teachers faced was non-responsive partners or partners that eventually dropped out, leaving the MeTP participant unable or delayed in conducting the peer review exercises and successfully completing the activity. The reasons for non-responsiveness or dropping out were varied including teachers’ personal overly busy schedules or the eTwinning projects they were involved in not properly taking off or failing completely. Therefore, should the MeTP activity be conducted again, it would be advisable to set-up a reserve list of teachers interested in taking part. This would mean that should any teacher become non-responsive or drop out the MeTP participant could be paired with another teacher from the reserve list, allowing them to successfully continue with the activity. If such a mechanism were to be put in place, it would be important for a catch-up strategy to be planned by the CSS to ensure effected pairs were not disadvantaged.

Also arising as a recommendation from the pilot’s evaluation, is the need for any future edition of the activity to inform teachers in advance concerning the amount of time they should envisage putting aside as well as the precise expectations and requirements in order to be able to fully participate. This was not possible for the pilot as it was the first time we were experimenting with this approach and we did not know how much time teachers would feel they needed and what indeed would be the average amount of time actually spent by teachers on the activity. Moreover, while the design of the MeTP model was fixed in advance, the actual processes involved evolved as the activity was rolled out, adapting to the circumstances and the feedback we were receiving from participants during the activity’s implementation. It was therefore difficult to communicate the precise requirements of the activity in advance of the pilot. However, following the experience of the pilot we would now be in a position to more precisely communicate such expectations and requirements to prospective participants, as well as the time needed. Following the pilot we can state that on average a minimum of 49 hours is needed to successfully complete the activity, and that often teachers dedicated more time if they were able to, and those that did not commented that they would have liked to. Communicating this to prospective MeTP participants would allow them the possibility of planning this time to be dedicated to the activity and ensure they are aware from the start what is
expected and required in order for them to fully benefit from the experience.

Another point illustrated by the evaluation results and raised by various participants is the need to **bolster the online collaborative interaction and exchanges between participants**. This could be effectively achieved by some targeted animation efforts on the part of the CSS. One example would be to fuel the MeTP forum with a ‘**question of the week**’, motivating participants’ interaction and focusing their thoughts on a relevant aspect of competence development which they all have a common interest and stake in.

Another key point emanating from the pilot’s results and evaluation is the **need to better scaffold participants’ peer review work**. While participants found the peer review activities both beneficial and rewarding, they also found them to be the most challenging. In order to better scaffold participants’ peer review experiences, **participants should be provided with more detailed guidelines on how to conduct a constructive peer review**. The guidelines already provided on the Teacher Academy of the School Education Gateway in relation to the peer review work MOOC participants are required to carry out could be used as useful inspiration. Moreover, it might be beneficial for the number of peer review activities to be increased in a future edition of the activity. As we learned from the pilot, participants’ peer review experiences improved the second time they engaged in the process indicating that time is needed to build a constructive relationship between partners and to overcome any initial difficulties before progressing to deep learning. For this reason more exposure to peer review activities over a longer period of time could be considered as beneficial.

Finally, in order **to improve the recognition of teachers’ work on the MeTP activity** it would be advisable to mention the starting level and ultimate level achieved by participants in the various competences, **on their final certificate**. In the pilot version of the activity, only the number of hours spent by teachers working on the activity were mentioned on their final certificate.

### 7.3 Recommendations on the future strategy

Let us now consider some of the key points arising out of the pilot’s evaluation which could also be applicable were the activity to be run again on a larger scale with the opportunity of benefiting more eTwinners. One key point is **the need for the activity to be implemented over a longer period of time**. In the pilot, one month was spent on getting the activity started and establishing which participants were ready to commit to the whole process and pairing up each participant with a partner. Another month was spent on phase 5 of the project, which was the pilot’s evaluation. Therefore, in reality participants only had 6 months to actively work on their competence
development through their eTwinning projects, to reflect on this, undertake the self and peer assessment activities and provide evidence of their work. The majority of participants commented that had they had more time they would expect to be able to further develop their competences and to notice a bigger difference in comparison to their starting levels. Related to this point is the fact that the top challenge faced by participants was finding the time to be able to fully participate and benefit from the activity. Should the activity be spread over a longer period, this would already give participants more of a chance to invest the time needed. Moreover, it would anyway be necessary to simplify the process should the MeTP activity be conducted on a larger scale, and therefore such a version would require less time investment from eTwinners.

The benefits of integrating collaborative competence and/or project-based teaching competence into the MeTP model has emerged as one of the most prominent conclusions from this pilot evaluation. This was agreed by just over 70% of participants in the evaluation survey, and also suggested again by more than half of all MeTP participants, either during the debriefing webinar, the open comments to the evaluation survey or the in-depth interviews with the MeTP steering group. eTwinning projects provide an ideal environment for teachers to experiment and develop their collaborative and project-based teaching competences. Moreover, we know from research mentioned in this report that teachers are particularly in need of guidance in these areas, and they often have few opportunities to explicitly develop these competences in their daily teaching within the constraints of their national curriculum contexts and education systems. eTwinning therefore has a clear role to play here. It would therefore seem relevant and appropriate for the MeTP model to include collaborative and project-based teaching competences as specific areas for teachers to focus on improving while carrying out their eTwinning project.

It is recommended therefore that the CSS invest time in the future in designing new competence descriptors and accompanying self-evaluation statements for collaborative competence and/or project-based teaching competence. It is also advisable that the CSS make use of the valuable material already available in the European Schoolnet Academy online courses on Competences for 21st Century Schools and Collaborative Teaching and Learning to inspire the development of these new competences within the MeTP model. Both these courses are based on the research and evidence built in the European funded projects KeyCoNet (the European Policy Network on Key Competences in School Education) and CO-LAB (Collaborative Education Lab), meaning that the work done on these two competences has been experimented and validated by experts, practitioners and other stakeholders across Europe. It would therefore be a wonderful opportunity for eTwinning to benefit from this work already done to inspire the further development of the MeTP model. Should the activity be repeated once again on a small scale, it would provide the opportunity
to test the integration of one or both of these competences.

As mentioned above, one possibility worthy of serious consideration is whether it would be possible to **design a version of the MeTP model which could be used by any interested eTwinner to reflect on their practice while carrying out an eTwinning project, guiding their competence development and tracking their progress.** Designing a scalable version of the MeTP activity would necessarily involve simplifying the process in order to reduce the time needed by participants to engage in the activity (making it more appealing for a larger eTwinning audience) as well as reducing the need for individual tailored support from the CSS coordination team, which as illustrated by the evaluation was a major element of the pilot’s success. It is the opinion of the coordination team that it is likely to be feasible to simplify the process while maintaining the use of the competence descriptors and self-assessment sheets, with the possibility of adding more competences to the model.

In addition to allowing a greater number of eTwinners to benefit from the self and peer review activities and competence development tracking tools, there is evidence from the pilot that **being involved in this process could potentially help raise the quality of eTwinning projects and the likelihood that they will be successful.** As commented by participants as well as the MeTP steering group, fellow participants became an invaluable ‘help network’ which could be called upon for pedagogical advice to overcome certain obstacles faced when carrying out eTwinning projects. The fact that the activity was based on self-reflection and peer reviews encouraged a culture of improvement and the constructive exchange of advice focused on how teachers as well as students could improve their competences through eTwinning project work. Moreover, if such a reflective culture were to be further endorsed in the entire eTwinning community, this may well help projects that start off as weak to be strengthened by the guidance tools and peer advice provided and therefore increase their chances of being successfully carried out.

Needless to say a deeper reflection is needed on what a scalable version of this activity would look like in practice. What seems certain is that **any such model would need to include a support system for teachers,** which was one of the crucial success factors in the pilot, represented by the Central Support Service coordination team. If the MeTP activity were to be extended to the eTwinning community on a large scale, it could be beneficial to include the National Support Services and eTwinning ambassadors as part of the support network. They would be ideally placed to guide and assist teachers at national and local level in the MeTP reflection activities guiding their eTwinning project work.

The extension of the MeTP model opening up the benefits of self and peer reflection to the whole eTwinning community is therefore certainly worth investigating by
eTwinning’s pedagogical monitoring team. It is hoped that the MeTP pilot activity and this evaluation report will be of use in further shaping the pedagogical direction of eTwinning in the coming years, and in reaching out towards political audiences and other stakeholders with a view to embedding eTwinning in school education systems.
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