



Quality-Certified Training of Farmers on Organic Agriculture

504387-LLP-1-2009-1-GR-LEONARDO-LMP

www.cerorganic.eu

Integrated Validation Report & Recommendations

Deliverable number	<i>D4.6</i>
Dissemination level	<i>Public</i>
Status	<i>Final</i>
Author(s)	<i>Marie Bijmens</i>
Contact	marie.bijmens@efquel.org



With the support of the Lifelong Learning Programme of the European Union. This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

Version

Version	Date	Contributor(s)	Summary of Changes
0.1	31/12/2011	Marie Bijmens	First draft
1.0	05/01/2012	Carolyn Owen	Review and augmentation



List of Definitions, Acronyms and Abbreviations:

Term/Acronym/Abbreviation	Description

Table of Contents

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	7
2. INTRODUCTION	8
2.1 SCOPE.....	8
2.2 AUDIENCE.....	8
2.3 ABOUT THE EVALUATION SYSTEM.....	8
2.4 SUBJECT OF EVALUATION	8
2.5 RESULTS OF EVALUATION	8
3. INTRODUCTION TO THE PILOT TOT PROGRAMME.....	9
4. INTRODUCTION TO THE VALIDATION TRAININGS.....	10
4.1 VALIDATION TRAINING IN AUSTRIA (BM:UKK).....	10
4.2 VALIDATION TRAINING IN CYPRUS (MOA).....	10
4.3 VALIDATION TRAINING IN THE CZECH REPUBLIC (UZEI)	10
4.4 VALIDATION TRAINING IN GREECE (DIO).....	10
4.5 VALIDATION TRAINING IN HUNGARY (MÖGERT)	10
5. FEEDBACK PER ASPECT	12
5.1 CONTENT	12
5.2 TRAINERS	12
5.3 USEFULNESS AND TRANSFERABILITY.....	12
5.4 TOOLS AND APPROACH.....	12
6. STRENGTHS	15
7. IMPROVEMENTS.....	16
8. RECOMMENDATIONS.....	17
9. FUTURE PERSPECTIVES: CREATING A CULTURE OF CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT ...	20
PROJECT INFORMATION.....	22

List of Figures

1. Executive Summary

This report provides an evaluation analysis of all the training phases used to pilot and validate the CerOrganic training approach, indicating points where attention should be paid in future trainings, and recommendations. The evaluation will also address whether the blended learning approach was appropriate for this type of training and whether the trainings could be easily repeated in the future.

Two training session phases were evaluated:

The Pilot CerOrganic Training of Trainers (ToT) was offered as a blended learning programme consisting of 3 phases, the first being online, the second a face-to-face training event (the Summer School), and the third a follow-up period in which the participants were requested to consult with local farmers and to develop strategies and solutions to address real needs identified in their operations, while receiving support of the programme tutors, online.

Subsequently, agricultural experts that had been trained during the CerOrganic Pilot ToT organized national training seminars for validation, providing informative seminars for a group of farmers with particular professional needs in organic agriculture in their countries.

Additionally, a second type of validation training was also held by one of the project user partners (the Austrian Federal Ministry for Education, the Arts and Culture, BM:UKK). For this horizontal approach CerOrganic graduate trainees participated in the training of qualified Austrian OA advisors in key topics from one of the CerOrganic ToT modules. This training was prepared according to the CerOrganic Quality Assurance Procedure and the training was subsequently peer-reviewed and quality-certified, as had been the Pilot ToT.

The validation trainings were held according to guidelines developed by the CerOrganic consortium and used resources developed by the project, including the CerOrganic MOLE training platform and the Web portal. The seminars allowed CerOrganic ToT-trained trainer/advisors to refine their specific trainings.

More importantly, they also represented an additional source of feedback on training content and methodology for the project consortium to allow for further improvement of both the training and the QA procedure.

Future needs and proposed improvements included in this report were extracted from the evaluation reports of the pilot trainings. This report summarizes the outcomes so that they can feed into the organization of for future organic agriculture trainings to be held by the consortium partners or other stakeholders in the sector.

For a fuller understanding of the justification for the conclusions drawn in this report, we strongly advise that the evaluation reports from the Pilot ToT (D4.3) and the Validation Trainings (D4.5) be read first.

2. Introduction

2.1 Scope

This report represents an overview of the evaluations conducted for the CerOrganic pilot ToT training and the validation training events, together with the recommendations arising from the conclusions drawn in these reports, for future trainings and for the ongoing development of the trainings and the quality assurance procedure.

2.2 Audience

The evaluation was carried out according to the plan defined in Deliverable 4.1 "Evaluation Plan and Pilot Design". The report is addressed to all CerOrganic consortium partners, all parties interested in organizing trainings for trainers/advisors of farmers, and for potential participants in CerOrganic trainings, either tutors or trainees.

2.3 About the evaluation system

In the questionnaires the German scaling system was applied on a scale from 1 to 6: in which 1 represents the most positive evaluation (very good / very satisfactory / very high quality) and 6 represents the worst evaluation (very bad / very unsatisfactory / very poor quality).

2.4 Subject of evaluation

The evaluation focused on different aspects of the training (the content, the tools, the trainers and pedagogy used, the usability, applicability and transferability), examined from different perspectives (considering the objectives of the pilot training or validation seminars) and angles (from the point of view of either the trainees, the trainers, the project partners and/or training organizers).

2.5 Results of evaluation

The extensive results of the evaluation process are described in deliverable 4.3: the Evaluation Report: Pilot CerOrganic ToT and the evaluation reports for each of the respective countries that organized a validation training:

- D4.5 Evaluation Report: User Country Trainings: Austria
- D4 5 Evaluation Report: User Country Trainings: Cyprus
- D4 5 Evaluation Report: User Country Trainings: Czech Republic
- D4.5 Evaluation Report: User Country Trainings: Greece
- D4 5 Evaluation Report: User Country Trainings: Hungary

We can conclude from all the above reports that the overall evaluation of both pilot trainings as well the validation trainings was very positive, with many aspects of each training being awarded a high number of maximum scores by the participants.

3. Introduction to the Pilot ToT Programme

The training was targeted at young and unemployed experts in agriculture, aiming to provide them with the knowledge skills and competences necessary for them to function as effective trainers / advisors of organic farmers. The training was designed to enable the trainees to consult organic farmers, to identify problems or knowledge deficits disadvantageous to the farmers and to propose effective solutions or strategies to improve the situation. The training would thus enhance the employment prospects of the trainees, while at the same time contributing to development of the local organic agriculture sector.

The training consisted of three parts and used a blended learning approach. Online self-paced training that included interactive modules, operated via a web platform (as supported distance learning), was combined with a face-to-face period of training incorporating lectures, workshops, field visits and consultation exercises:

- Phase I: An initial 2-week preparatory period (8 – 21 May 2011) supported through the CerOrganic MOLE Platform (<http://cerorganic.moleportal.eu>), in which trainees created their profile, received information concerning the training programme for self-study, and initiated a virtual interaction with the ToT tutors and other trainees.
- Phase II: The presential training (22 – 28 May 2011) comprised the 1-week face-to-face Summer School, held at MAICh. The programme for this week consisted of lectures, seminars, workshops and site visits to organic agriculture farms and enterprises.
- Phase III: Main assignment period (30 May – 13 June 2011) consisted of a 2-week period following Phase 2. The students visited local organic cultivation sites, consulted with the OA farmers, identified problems and proposed specific strategies to address these problems. Assignments submitted at the end of this period were evaluated by the CerOrganic tutors.

CerOrganic trainees were involved into the following learning methods:

- lectures and presentations,
- participatory group discussions with farmers,
- on-site computer training,
- practical demonstrations and field excursions,
- best-practice and case study learning scenarios,
- self-study and assignment work

A full description of the Pilot training is presented in deliverable 4.2. An extensive evaluation report indicating evaluation results per course, method and trainer is available as deliverable 4.3. To avoid duplications, the results will not be repeated here, but rather the main conclusions drawn and points for attention will be discussed further down this document.

4. Introduction to the Validation Trainings

4.1 Validation training in Austria (BM:UKK)

Two validation seminars were conducted in Austria, with the first being operated as a horizontal training and the second as a vertical training. In the first (horizontal) validation training (VS) the CerOrganic graduate trainees acted as multipliers by training other Austrian OA-advisers in the CerOrganic blended learning methodology. In the second Austrian VS, a mixture of CerOrganic graduate trainees and VS graduates tested their competence as trainers in practice by incorporating the methodologies taught in the ToT into their advisory work with farmers. To date evaluation data are available only for the first (horizontal) validation training.

4.2 Validation training in Cyprus (MoA)

The Cypriot Validation Training was a vertical training conducted by three graduate trainees from the Pilot ToT. The audience consisted of 21 organic olive cultivators invited by the Ministry of Agriculture. The topics covered in the 3 seminars that formed this training were on the use of the logbook required for organic farmers to maintain certification, the biological control of pest and diseases in olive plantations, and the EU legislation relating to organic olive cultivation and processing.

4.3 Validation training in the Czech Republic (UZEI)

The Czech validation seminars included a vertical training event in which 22 organic and conventional farmers attended informative seminars presented by two Czech Pilot ToT graduates, of Marketing and e-sales of Organic Produce. Twenty farmers provided feedback on the training. The seminars had been prepared in accordance with the guidelines and methodologies taught in the ToT programme.

During both Czech validation events dissemination of the CerOrganic project and the ToT Programme was made to a wide range of stakeholders including many pedagogists and VET providers, to allow examination and discussion of the form and content of the CerOrganic training. A great deal of feedback from these groups was collected concerning the training and materials and their possible uses in the Czech republic.

4.4 Validation training in Greece (DIO)

The Greek validation training was organized by two CerOrganic graduate trainees, and attended by 38 participants, of which 23 were farmers. The event comprised a vertical training: two seminars were presented on the process of conversion to organic farming and organic soil fertilization techniques. Following each seminar a discussion period was held and the session was concluded with a presentation by a local organic farmer on composting techniques.

4.5 Validation training in Hungary (Mögert)

Two validation events were held in Hungary. Both events involved dissemination of the project in which the CerOrganic ToT and related products were presented to stakeholders

ranging from organic product consumers, farmers, academics and administrators responsible for VET and higher education in organic agriculture. Both events also involved presentation of a informative seminars by CerOrganic ToT graduates. The second event included a vertical training of organic farmers using these seminars: “Tomato landraces in organic farming”, “The importance of livestock in organic agriculture” and “Weed management in organic production”, after which the farmers were asked to evaluate the quality and usefulness of the seminars. The dissemination events also included examination and discussion of the CerOrganic teaching materials by educationalists and VET providers (both Hungarian and invited experts from abroad), who provided their opinions as to the CerOrganic training materials, but who did not provide evaluation in the form of questionnaire responses.

The questionnaires used to request feedback from the participants in the validation trainings have been included as an annex to D4.1. A summary of the responses to each of the trainings has been presented in D4.5.

5 . Feedback per aspect

5.1 Content

The quality of the content of the validation trainings was rated very highly for the various national trainings, indicating that the content created for the Pilot ToT was useful, and most importantly that it would be usable for subsequent trainings. The almost uniformly positive rating of the content for the ToT is remarkable when the heterogeneity of the participants is considered in terms of their backgrounds interests and occupations. The short duration of the Pilot ToT meant that all aspects of OA could not be covered: a decision was taken early on in the planning that animal husbandry could not be realistically covered – except for in the case study units, but even those participants who came from regions such as the Tyrol where farming is almost exclusively centered on dairy and meat production found aspects of the programme that were both interesting and relevant to their work. The MOLE platform (www.cerorganc.moleportal.eu) proved useful for the trainees to collect and manage their training resources, and this was reflected in the validation trainings.

5.2 Trainers

In this category we can differentiate between two types of trainers, those from the ToT who did not directly train farmers, but who trained the candidate trainers, and secondly the trainers who graduated from the Pilot ToT and who functioned as trainers during the validation trainings. For both categories the evaluations were generally positive. For the validation trainings, the overall quality of the interventions was rated everywhere above 6 points (on a 7 point scale) in all cases except one. This indicates that the Pilot ToT would appear to have provided the graduates with the skills and competences that enabled them to function as effective trainers/advisors. In the Pilot training the scores were also very high, though slightly more diverse. This variation may reflect the diversity of the trainers and the subjects taught.

5.3 Usefulness and transferability

At various points in the evaluation the participants of the sessions were requested to indicate the usefulness and transferability of the content, skills and methodologies acquired. On a score of 1 to 7 the evaluations were mostly have mostly higher then 6, and if not between 5 and 6.

5.4 Tools and approach

The blended learning approach is quite innovative for the OA sector, but this was not a cause of resistance from participants: on the contrary, the approach was very well received. Participants were also enthusiastic about receiving tutoring through the online platform before and after the face-to-face component of the training. Many participants appreciated the value of this approach as it allows for a fuller engagement with trainers to take place in the context of a flexible schedule, allowing full participation in trainings by users who may have not otherwise be able to attend longer classroom-based trainings with a fixed schedule.

It is of high importance, however, that this approach is accompanied by solid tutoring. It is very important that tutors be familiar with this type of tutoring: it became obvious that many of the Pilot ToT tutors had no prior experience of this type of tutoring and did not embrace the approach and make full use of its possibilities. Training in blended learning techniques had been offered to all Pilot ToT trainers during the preparation phase, but none took advantage of this offer. For future trainings it is strongly recommended that tutors with no prior experience of blended learning trainings be obliged to undergo training in the use of these techniques. Despite having signed a contract to this effect, not all tutors made themselves available in a regular way during the online phases of the training, a fact commented upon by some respondents. It is recommended that for future trainings that tutors be made more fully aware of the commitment that is required of them during all phases of the training, and especially during the distance-learning components. This is an important aspect to be taken into account during the planning phase for future courses.

In the instance of the Pilot ToT, it appears that after this deficiency had been noted during the face-to-face component of the training compensatory measures were taken, and offers of additional help were made by many of those tutors absent during the first on-line period. In overall, at the end of the training, the participants were very satisfied with the approach.

There was a perceived lack of cohesion in the planning and execution of the assignments. The first assignment, consisted of a seminar outline was to be completed during the presential training, and presented on the final day of the summer school. The first taught modules on blended and e-learning design, and the use of ICT for OA content adaptation were anticipated to serve as a foundation by providing the participants of the training with the necessary tools and skills to plan, structure, research and present their seminars, while the subsequent module on current key OA topics, and interaction with the tutors, would provide opportunities for the selection of a relevant and interesting topic. Better coordination between the tutors would have facilitated this exercise. It was an oversight that during the preparation for the ToT that the tutors did not receive explicit instructions as to the form that the assignments would take, and their envisioned role in this action. This matter has also been noted as requiring attention for future trainings.

It had been originally planned that the first assignments would be commented upon by the tutors and fellow trainees during the presentation session. However due to the numbers of trainees participating there was insufficient time for discussion of each presentation, and each trainee subsequently received a written assessment by a tutor some days later.

As it was recognized that this practice was to the detriment of the training. Effective communication and presentation of information is a key competence for OA trainers/advisors. The opportunity to receive immediate feedback on presentation content and style from expert tutors and fellow trainees would have been extremely valuable. It is strongly recommended that this exercise be incorporated into all future trainings.

The second assignment to be conducted by the trainees on return to their local area was also problematic: At the planning stage this had been foreseen as a full presentation – including a Powerpoint presentation and script, however when from discussions held during the school it became clear that some consultation exercises could not be effectively presented in this manner, it was decided that a report detailing the consultation and recommendations of the advisor would also be acceptable. However this last-minute change to the assignment was not well explained and caused some confusion amongst trainees. It is

recommended that prior to future trainings, a consensus is arrived upon among the organizing body as to the exact form of the assignments, and how assessment will be made. It is essential that clear instructions be issued to the tutors as the roles that they will be expected to play in this aspect of the training. Care must also be taken to explain in details to trainees the form that each assignment will take, what help they may expect to receive from the tutors, and how each assignment will be assessed, prior to the start of training.

6. Strengths

The recommendations are based on the greatest strength and weaknesses indicated by the trainees and team members in their respective questionnaires, from the ToT trainings and from the validation exercises. Both the trainees and the team members agreed to a great extent regarding the greatest strengths of the programme and the areas where improvement was necessary, and for this reason they have been compiled into a single chapter in this report.

The main strengths of CerOrganic training were found to be:

- **European/international context:** One of the points that appeared regularly as a positive factor in the qualitative feedback from the participants was the contact with the people from other European countries and the cultural exchange that took place through this training. The participants felt that they had gained interesting insights through the international contacts established, and many expressed a desire to maintain their newly developed contacts network via the online training platform.
- **Blended learning approach:** Most respondents also gave a positive feedback on the learning approach, the combination of the distance learning with face-to-face training, and the incorporation of practical exercises and field visits.
- **The tutors/experts:** The respondents would also like to see the experts returning; they were very positive about many of the tutors and the insights they had provided to the trainees. Some even mentioned that some tutors were perhaps overqualified (according to the team members) to teach certain units.

7. Improvements

Because of the set up of the two training phases, questions regarding improvements were only provided with regards to the pilot training of trainers. The background of these statements and exact data regarding the responses are available in report D4.3 and to a smaller extent in the reports D4.5 from each respective user country.

- **Timing and balancing of courses:** not all aspects of the course were well balanced, for some courses too much time was spent, and on others too little. The fact that some courses started late was also not perceived positively. Some lectures were too long and too much time was spent on communication technologies, instead of focusing on pedagogy. According to some respondents there should have been more interactive group work, however others thought that the group work was less useful.
- **Content:** Some of the trainees expressed reservation concerning some of the provided content. Some presentations focused on OA aspects that were irrelevant to the Northern European situation and *vice versa*. According to another respondent, not enough time was allocated to issues and problems caused by organic agriculture. The trainees and the team members all concluded that there need to be more time for discussion.
- **Assignments:** Both the trainees and the team members made comments regarding the assignments. The structure and expectations was often unclear and there were last minute changes that didn't allow the participants to organize themselves well. The feedback didn't come in time and wasn't sufficiently justified. One trainee did not receive any feedback for one of his/her assignments.
- **Coordination:** according to the team members, the coordination could be improved. A major problem was coordination with the tutors who didn't always deliver their units within the allocated time frame.
- **Logistical problems:** internet access and ICT equipment did not always function well. There were also a few negative comments about the accommodation facilities and the food.
- **Preparation and follow up:** some respondents suggested including more preparation and follow-up time before and after the summer school because it's not easy to work and undertake a training at the same time.

8. Recommendations

Since the evaluation reports of the validation trainings were limited on content especially when it came to recommendations and suggestions, these recommendations mainly come out of the report of the training of trainers.

These recommendations are the most important part of the report in the sense that it can help future initiatives in setting up similar trainings, replying to the needs of the organic agriculture training market.

Strengths to keep	Extra tips and recommendation for future trainings
EU dimension and exchanges	<p>Integrating a EU dimension in future national and international seminars (by inviting experts, some participants or trainers from other countries) may provide some interesting insights and exchanges among the participants.</p> <p>Furthermore the discussion between trainees should be promoted by providing them a space for this (for example an online platform) which is regularly updated with new topics for discussions.</p>
Blended learning	<p>Combine different learning methodologies online with presential aspect. The integration of field visits that are well organized with clear objectives.</p> <p>Make also sure that the online platform is user friendly and intuitive. Regular updates of online platforms are required to maintain the attention of the participants.</p> <p>Better preparation of tutors unfamiliar with this medium</p>
Expert knowledge – maximization of impact using the right approach.	<p>Choose experts with the appropriate knowledge and didactical skills. Not all experts have the necessary didactical skills to make a course attractive: Pay attention to this when assigning roles to each of the different experts in the training programme to exploit the personal strengths of each.</p> <p>Experts that are less confident/less effective at speaking, can take part in expert panels and provide input in other ways than through a slide show presentation; they could also moderate an online discussion forum or develop research assignments for the participants.</p> <p>The advantage of a blended learning approach is that there are many alternative learning methodologies that can be used instead of classical class room presentations.</p>

Weakness to improve	Tips and recommendations for avoiding these traps for future trainings
Timing and balancing of the courses	<p>Make sure that every course gets the time it deserves and that the balance between the different topics is in agreement with the final objective of the course.</p> <p>For each day or each course, a timekeeper should be appointed to ensure that the programme is followed and that no delays occur. Furthermore foresee enough time during the breaks for the trainers to get organized and for the participants to have enough networking and exchange opportunities.</p>
Content of the courses	<p>Not all participants have the same learning needs and preliminary knowledge. In order to identify learning priorities of the participants, a pre-assessment could be made. This input can then be used to see what aspects are important for the participants, what aspects they are already familiar with and which therefore need less time in a programme.</p> <p>Consider holding more focused trainings dealing with a narrower range of topics. This would allow selection of a more closely matched participant group, and permit more in-depth treatment of the subject matter, as happened in the Austrian horizontal validation training.</p> <p>Another solution would be to provide an <i>à la carte</i> menu of courses for the topics in which the participants have already a different knowledge or competency level (these could be identified in a pre-assessment questionnaire). This way the participants can pick from the topics they find most relevant and that correspond to their learning needs.</p>
Assignments	<p>When assignments are given to the participants, they should have a clear objective and learning result. For each assignment a follow-up and feedback mechanism should be put in place.</p> <p>The tutors should receive detailed instructions as to the role that they will be expected to play in the development, supervision and assessment of the assignments.</p>
Coordination	<p>Clear instructions need to be provided to the tutors in all phases of the training, and also regarding the final phase. The importance of their participation in all stages of the training and their provision of qualitative, timely feedback, should be emphasized and closely followed up on.</p>
Logistics	<p>Check beforehand whether all equipment that needs to be used during the course functions well and replace if necessary or find an alternative solution before the course start.</p> <p>Back-up systems should be made available wherever possible.</p>

Preparation time and follow up time	Check with the participants whether they require additional need more time to prepare or the study afterwards and maintain the support for those who requested extra time.
-------------------------------------	--

9. Future perspectives: creating a culture of continuous improvement

The CerOrganic approach was perceived as being a very innovative and effective approach. The concept is good and should therefore be promoted for future initiatives.

Nevertheless there are always things that can be improved for future trainings. A policy and mentality of continuous improvement in response to stakeholder feedback has been foreseen as an integral component of the CerOrganic approach, and is integral to the QA process. This policy has proven useful and therefore the CerOrganic partners should engage strongly to continue using the identified strengths and to improve or change the negative aspects by applying different approaches where necessary.

Promoting a culture of continuous improvement, innovation and evaluation is the best means to achieve high quality effective courses. Analysis of the questionnaire results for both the pilot and the validation trainings revealed that all generated extremely positive feedback.

For many aspects areas requiring improvement were identified, but this is to be expected from the pilot implementation of novel type of training, and the logistics of the ToT were made more challenging by the ambitious scope and large number of tutors and trainees participating from widely differing backgrounds.

Any development scheme that does not allow for continual assessment and improvement will result in a reduction in the maximum quality attainable. This type of training is not static: audiences change, the trainers change, the content needs to be adapted to reflect new developments, and so continuous assessment of relevancy, applicability and usefulness is not a luxury for a training programme if an acceptable level of quality is to be maintained.

The use of a quality certification scheme like ECBCheck is an effective way to benchmarking the attained level of quality against European and international standards, while at the same time receiving international recognition for the efforts made. ECBCheck has been used throughout the development and implementation of the CerOrganic trainings, and served as a valuable tool, in the first place to define the quality criteria and will be used henceforth to identify potential shortcomings to be tackled during the lifetime of the project, and during the certification process.

Accordingly, the evaluation method itself could also be continually improved. The lack of coordination that could have resulted in requests for improvement suggestions for implementation in the validation trainings, led to a minor shortcoming in this report in the sense that there could be no measure of the suggested improvements after the pilot in comparison to new suggestions that arose during or after after the validation trainings. However as the two types of training (except in the case of the Austrian horizontal training) had different objectives. The Pilot ToT was aimed as a training for trainers, while the validation trainings were, in all except the case mentioned above, far simpler trainings of farmers, and so many of the recommendations arising from the pilot ToT would not apply. Secondly the fact that questionnaires were presented differently for each of the validation trainings resulted in an inability to directly compare the results of each validation training

against each other. This matter must have arisen during translation of the single evaluation questionnaires, or in the translation of the results into English. The choice between a customized/localized feedback mechanism and a standard evaluation approach has strong implications for the final evaluation results. As contexts are different in each of the countries, a localized approach is necessary, but for benchmarking purposes it was not possible to compare the final results of the validation training evaluations. This factor underlined the importance of a certification scheme like ECBCheck to allow for such comparisons while allowing a customized local evaluation to take place.

Because of the positive feedback, in combination with the identified need on the market for this type of courses, we consider the CerOrganic approach and courses developed to be a best practice case that can be promoted throughout Europe. Combining the model of CerOrganic with the quality criteria set by ECBCheck would without any doubt lead to high quality courses in the domain of organic agriculture.

Project Information

CerOrganic is a two year Leonardo da Vinci Multilateral Project financed by the European Commission that aims to develop and test a quality assurance procedure for the vocational education/training of agricultural advisors/trainers in Organic Agriculture, based on the European Quality Assurance Reference Framework (EQARF).

Consortium Members



Coordinator:
Mediterranean Agronomic
Institute of Chania

<http://www.maich.gr>

Alsyllo Agrokepiou, PO Box 85, Chania
73100, GREECE
Telephone: +30 28210 35000
Fax: +30 28210 35001
Dr. I. Livieratos (livieratos@maich.gr)



Agro-Know
Technologies (Greece)

<http://www.agroknow.gr>



Corvinus University
of Budapest (Hungary)

<http://www.uni-corvinus.hu>



Federal Ministry of Edu-
cation, Arts and Culture
(Austria)

<http://www.bmukk.gv.at>



Association for Hungar-
ian Organic Farming
(Hungary)

<http://www.mogert.uni-corvinu.hu>



Institute of Agricultural
Economics and Informa-
tion (Czech Republic)

<http://www.uzei.cz>



European Federation
for Quality in E-Learning
(Belgium)

<http://www.efquel.org>



DIO Inspection
and Certification
Organization (Greece)

<http://www.dionet.gr>



Department of
Agriculture of Cyprus
(Cyprus)

<http://www.moa.gov.cy/da>



Education and Culture DG

Lifelong Learning Programme

With the support of the Lifelong Learning Programme of the European Union. This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.