



Lifelong Learning Programme
Leonardo da Vinci



Education and Culture DG



Listening to young children

Users' manual for the e-course



CONTENTS

1	PRESENTATION OF EADAP	4
2	INTRODUCTION TO THE MANUAL	5
3	SYNERGY TRAINING PRINCIPLES	6
3.1	Adult Learning-Education	6
3.1.1	How do adults learn?	6
3.1.1.1	<i>Factors that influence learning</i>	6
3.1.1.2	<i>Obstacles-Difficulties</i>	6
3.1.1.3	<i>Requirements for the successful conclusion of the learning process</i>	7
3.1.2	The role of the trainer	8
3.1.3	In-service training	9
3.2	The Synergy Programme	14
3.2.1	Introduction	14
3.2.2	Objectives	15
3.2.3	Form and structure	15
3.2.4	Methodology	16
3.2.5	Techniques	17
3.2.5.1	Establishing the team and group dynamics	17
3.2.5.2	Pedagogical projects	18
3.2.5.3	Formative self-evaluation	19
3.2.5.4	Pedagogical aids	20
3.2.6	The trainer-facilitator	21
3.3	Evaluation of the Programme	22
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	24
	APPENDICES	29
	Appendix I: Examples of formative self-evaluation of pedagogues	29
	Appendix II: Example of a formative self-evaluation guide for	33

trainers-facilitators

Appendix III: Trainees' questionnaire **34**

Appendix IV: Trainers-facilitators' questionnaire **42**

1 PRESENTATION OF EADAP

The **Society for the Development and Creative Occupation of Children (EADAP)** is a non-profit organisation founded in 1992 by a team of preschool education experts, funded by the Bernard van Leer Foundation, an international charitable organisation.

Its aim is the study, promotion and dissemination of educational innovations which contribute to the development of the potential of ALL children from preschool age to their first years at school.

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES

- To design training programmes and implement ongoing training of pedagogues and educational institution coordinators.
- To develop partnerships between parents, educators and stakeholders, as well as to involve them in renewing educational institutions.
- To promote the action research method within preschool and school institutions.
- To conduct research on intercultural education issues.
- To produce educational material.
- To provide information and to exchange opinions on educational subjects, with the view to establishing an educational network.
- To disseminate and utilise educational innovations through partnerships with Greek and international networks.

To achieve these objectives, EADAP has conducted various scientific studies in Greece and in Europe; it has implemented training seminars for preschool education pedagogues, preschool institution coordinators and parents; and it has created educational material, handouts, pedagogical kits, books, as well as records of activities.

2 INTRODUCTION TO THE MANUAL

This manual is addressed to users of the e-course, namely:

- to trainers,
- to trainees who are going to be trainers,
- to academics who are educating/training students,
- to nurseries', day care centres' and kindergartens' officials (managers, department managers, other officials, etc.) and
- to pedagogues/educators involved in informal trainings (informal training of each other and networking).

3 SYNERGY TRAINING PRINCIPLES

3.1 Adult Learning-Education

3.1.1 How do adults learn?

It is possible for learning to take place in an unplanned and unintentional way. However, in an organised educational context, learning refers to the changes stemming from voluntary participation of trainees in deliberate and planned learning activities, which aim at knowledge acquisition. A common conclusion of all learning theories is that learning is an active process. Trainees do not face stimuli passively. Instead, they are consciously involved in the learning process, mobilised both by internal needs and external stimuli (Rogers 1999).

3.1.1.1 *Factors that influence learning*

- Experience: the trainee is called upon to process new material and interpret it based on previous knowledge (Piaget 1975).
- Establishment of the appropriate climate (one of acceptance, respect, dialogue, exchange of experiences, equal treatment, etc.) (CRESAS 1991; Sheckley 1988).
- The personality traits of each trainee (Kokkos 1999).
- The trainers: regular and often detailed references in relevant literature concerning the personality, attitude, behaviour and training of the trainers highlight the importance of their role¹ (Sheckley 1988; Schelfhout et al. 2002; Noyé & Piveteau 1999; Rogers 1999; Torkington & Landers 1995; Kokkos 1999).

3.1.1.2 *Obstacles-Difficulties*²

- Existing experiences: adults have a great deal of previous experiences upon which they are going to build new knowledge. However, some experiences are likely to prove a hindrance, and the trainer may need to engage trainees in the process of unlearning³.

¹ For detailed information pertaining to the role of the trainer, please see chapter 1.2 “The role of the trainer”.

² See, for example, McGivney (1996), Rogers (1999) and Kokkos (1999).

³ The term is mentioned and explained in Rogers (1999: 279-280).

- Expectations: adults have expectations from the educational programmes they participate in, and these expectations largely determine their attitude. Expectations may not be common to the whole group, which further complicates the learning process.
- External difficulties: adult education needs to take into account the many duties and commitments of the trainees in other parts of their lives, as well as any possible negative psychological states (e.g. excessive stress).
- Fear of educational programmes: this may stem either from past negative experiences or from the fact that there is still a lack of familiarity with the concept of lifelong education.
- Poor programme organisation: it may be due, among other things, to the inappropriate choice of trainers, to pressures possibly exerted by the inspection body towards guided learning and immediate results, to difficulties of access of trainees to the training facilities, etc.

3.1.1.3 *Requirements for the successful conclusion of the learning process*

- Trainees always need to know the objectives, so as to be able to engage in an individualised process and monitor their own progress (Noyé & Piveteau 1999).
- At the same time, feedback from the trainer is needed with regards to comparing objectives and performance. In this way, trainees are offered the possibility to adjust their efforts accordingly. Feedback to trainees can also come from their peers (Shelfhout et al. 2002).
- Each kind of feedback and, in general, of exchange is more constructive when it takes place within a group and when it offers the possibility for “symmetrical” relationships. That is, when each member of the group feels they have the right to express their opinions and, through exchange and interaction, “co-construct” knowledge along with the rest of the group’s members (CRESAS 1987).
- Motivation⁴ is important throughout the learning process, provided that the trainer tries to keep it at high levels and use it so that trainees can

⁴ “Motivation indicates those factors which activate and direct behavioural models organised around a certain objective... Motivation in learning is the push which holds one within the learning condition and encourages one to learn” (Rogers 1999: 125)

gradually reach the objectives (Kokkos 1999; Schelfhout et al. 2002; Noyé & Piveteau 1999).

- In order to steadily maintain motivation at high levels, the educational programme needs to leave room for initiative, so that trainees participate in:
 - *“Setting the programme’s objectives.*
 - *Preparing the detailed content of the programme (if this is defined, they can at least participate in the processes of clarification of certain points or the decision to focus on some of them).*
 - *Developing the educational material and possibly how the educational means are used.*
 - *Making decisions pertaining to the conditions and the spaces where the learning takes place.*
 - *Formulating the evaluation methods.*
 - *Probing into the content of the programme, to make sure it is more connected to existing knowledge and experiences of the trainees, as well as to issues related to their social-professional roles” (Kokkos 1999: 71-72).*

3.1.2 The role of the trainer

Within the contemporary educational context, trainers no longer have the traditional role of instructors and bearers of authentic knowledge; rather, they are called upon to be coordinators, to support the gradual approach towards knowledge and to be in a constant, constructive interaction with trainees. Trainers on the one hand need to leave enough freedom to the trainees, so that the latter can make decisions for themselves and on the other hand guide them discreetly, in order to avoid mistakes which could jeopardise the continuation of the learning process. Furthermore, trainers need to always attempt to make the direct educational objectives clear and encourage the trainees to reach them through their personal learning style (Schelfhout et al. 2002; Kokkos 1999; Rogers 1999; Noyé & Piveteau 1999; Burguière 1987).

To achieve the above, trainers need to adopt a wide range of learning-educational activities and create a positive climate, which will boost the trainees' confidence. Equally essential is the need to offer a lot of opportunities for trainees to explore, experiment with and discover knowledge through their own practice on the one hand, and on the other hand to help them analyse their practices and reactions.

Trainers also need to constantly increase motivation levels, not by resorting to tests and other similar educational methods, but through practice, case studies, discussion, pedagogical projects and teamwork. Finally, trainers need to assess and give feedback to trainees in such a way so as to improve the latter's performance.

As is evident from the above, trainers, need not only in-depth knowledge of their subjects, but also have to have a great number of abilities and characteristics. It is important that trainers:

- Respect the individual characteristics of trainees,
- recognise the importance of their knowledge and experiences,
- take into account their individual rhythms and potential,
- understand their weaknesses and help them correct any misconceptions,
- coordinate without manipulating,
- demonstrate self-awareness, know their own abilities, their strong and weak points, their limits as personalities as well as the limits of their interventions in the group of trainees and
- evaluate and advance themselves; in other words, review the quality and efficiency of their work, be open to criticism, as well as identify where they need to develop.

3.1.3 In-service training

Adult education occurs in many forms, such as vocational training, training in political, social or cultural issues, as well as on activities pertaining to making the best use of leisure time. The term 'training' is used in the sense of further

training⁵ and concerns all those who have completed their education in the past. Vocational training, as indicated by its name, aims at the professional advancement of the trainees.

The most common kind of vocational training is training programmes not held at the workplace during working hours, which are usually run by specialists. In these programmes, knowledge has moved from the natural working environment -to which it is addressed- and is transmitted through academic processes. Such programmes have repeatedly been characterised as inefficient (Garet et al. 2001; Taylor 1999).

For that reason, the need has arisen to find a new kind of training, such as in-service training programmes, which differ greatly from traditional ones. A key difference is that the former are carried out in the workplace and during working hours. Thus, trainees are given the opportunity to combine things learned with their everyday practice and at a later stage adjust their practices when deemed desirable. At the same time, however, the entity hosting the training is given the chance to proceed with structural changes in order to adopt the trainees' new practices (Xochellis & Papanoum 2000). Moreover, it has been shown that reformed training programmes better respond to the way adult learners learn, which, of course, leads to them changing their practices (Xochellis & Papanoum 2000; Garet et al. 2001).

In-service programmes aimed at improving the educational process implemented within the school are also called in-school programmes.

- They vary in their objectives, which may involve:
 - improving pedagogical practices in specific circumstances,
 - enhancing the educators' use of certain materials or pre-designed strategies,
 - designing new curricula and educational methods,

⁵ Training according to Rogers (1999: 74) is defined as *“education which has limited, particular objectives and aims mainly to teach ‘correct’ ways of learning which lead to skills’ development.”*

- developing the educator's capacity to comprehend the way children learn, etc. (Garet et al. 2001).
- In-service programmes also vary in their techniques of knowledge transmission and implementation of new practices, which may appear individually or combined (EADAP 2003; Fennessy 1998; Garet et al. 2001; Schelfhout et al. 2002; Sheckley 1998; Sparks 1986; Torkington & Landers 1995) and are the following:
 - **Presentation of information**
 - Essential knowledge and skills are presented.
 - A model teaching procedure is presented, either through attendance at a school or through videos, etc.
 - **Practice and feedback**
 - Meetings are held in order to link new knowledge with pedagogical practice.
 - Sufficient opportunities are given to practice newly acquired knowledge and skills.
 - The person responsible for the training programme gives feedback to the trainees, so that the latter can improve their performance as much as possible.
 - **Supervision**
 - The person responsible for the training programme observes trainees while they are implementing new pedagogical practices proposed by the programme.
 - Constructive criticism follows.
 - **Assistance**
 - The person responsible for the training programme enables trainees to choose the topics covered by the programme. Then he/she gets involved in their choices and monitors their actions.
 - Dilemmas concerning pedagogical practices are identified and analysed and, following continuous negotiations, new adjustments are made.
 - **Support**

- Trainees are able to select both the content of the actions and the knowledge they wish to attain. However, specific directions as well as fixed intervals for actions and reflection are foreseen.
- Negotiations and adjustments throughout the programme are key aspects of the support provided.
- **Guiding intervention**
 - The person responsible for the programme works directly with the trainees in order to solve any problems arising in the classroom when the latter are attempting to implement new educational practices.
- **Discussions between colleagues**
 - Pedagogues are encouraged to discuss and collaborate on professional matters.
 - Discussions are made in small groups –in the presence of the trainer or not- giving pedagogues the opportunity to analyse their new practices and share their specific concerns.
- **Administrative support**
 - Both the head of the school and the other administrative officers are informed about the objectives of the training programme and are called to support implementation of those objectives.

Despite the fact that in-service training programmes push pedagogues towards improving their pedagogical practices, they often do not produce the desired outcomes. A few possible reasons for that are the following (Noyé & Piveteau 1999; Ingvarson 1988; Sparks 1986):

- Fear for the unknown, fear of supervision and of failure.
- The weight of habit and inertia.
- Insufficient time.
- Lack of support from other agents in the school system.

In order for an in-service programme to ensure its success as far as possible, it needs to fulfil certain requirements (Kokkos 1999; Xochellis & Papanaooum 2000; Noyé & Piveteau 1999; Rogers 1999; Fennessy 1998; Garet et al.

2001; Schelfhout et al. 2002; Sheckley 1988; Sparks 1986). In particular, it should:

- **Concern and involve the entire staff of the school:** Collective vocational training may help create a common professional culture, which then forms a shared understanding of things, as well as common pedagogical objectives and problem-solving methods. In such a climate, consolidating a change of pedagogical practices is clearly easier.
- **Create a two-way, continuous information flow between the administrative officers of the school and the trainees:** The in-service training programme can be effective when it constitutes an integrated part of the general school policy. The progress of the trainees depends on the relevance between the programme and the support provided to it by their school. For that reason, the head of the school needs to have a clear idea of the programme (objectives, philosophy, etc.), support it and communicate any concerns to senior administration, where the latter's contribution is deemed necessary.
- **Ensure consistency with previous experiences:** Activities associated with past professional experience of trainees are more likely to increase their knowledge and skills and lead them to adopt new pedagogical practices.
- **Act in a supportive way:** Maintaining motivation at high levels and familiarising trainers with the concept of change are both elements that need to be taken into account in order to reach the new objectives.
- **Be performed by a qualified trainer:** As with any form of education, so in in-service training the trainer plays an important part. His attitude and conduct should embrace everything mentioned in the relevant chapter.⁶
- **Have a long duration:** Most research has shown that long-term in-service training programmes provide the opportunity for analysis pertaining to the content of actions, trainee perceptions, as well as the effectiveness of pedagogical practices. They also give trainee pedagogues the chance to try out new pedagogical practices and engage in constructive evaluation of them.

⁶ See chapter 1.2 "The role of the trainer".

3.2 The Synergy Programme

3.2.1 Introduction

Synergy is an in-service training programme, which derived from a longstanding collaboration of EADAP with research teams from a number of European countries (France, Ireland, Italy, Portugal, Spain, etc.). It has been implemented since 1994 mainly in preschool education settings and it targets pedagogues, directors of educational institutions and administrative officers. The programme has been both academically and financially supported by the Bernard van Leer Foundation and EADAP, while it runs under the aegis of the entity commissioning the training for its personnel.

The main principles of in-service adult training⁷ form the foundation of the programme. Special emphasis is given to:

- connection of training to the everyday professional practice of trainees,
- development of the training content according to the trainees' concerns, needs and interests,
- teamwork,
- creation of symmetrical relationships among group members,
- social interactions and
- provision of theoretical and methodological support.

Over the last decade, laws, demands and pressures exerted by “European directives” created a new framework within Greece regarding the structure and function of preschool institutions. The most important change is responsibility for nurseries and day-care centres having been transferred to local government.

The Synergy programme is trying to cover the basic training needs imposed by the new conditions, taking due account of the history, possibilities and institutional constraints in the field.

⁷See chapter 1.1. “How do adults learn?”

3.2.2 Objectives

The objectives of Synergy are:

- improvement of the educational work provided by nurseries and day-care centres,
- strengthening of the professional role of pedagogues through enriching and renewing their knowledge of pedagogical issues,
- making the best of children's and pedagogues' potential,
- active participation of parents in school life,
- mobilisation of social partners to support renewal of educational institutions and
- recognition of the day-care centres' educational work by the social environment.

In a nutshell, we would say that Synergy's ultimate aim is to improve the quality of education provided by preschool institutions by fostering joint action – namely, synergy- of everyone involved in the operation of preschool education institutions.

3.2.3 Form and structure

The Synergy in-service training programme can be performed via the internet and put to use within the trainees' workplace during working hours. It is an ongoing adult training programme, based on real problems and classroom examples. The programme is flexible and can be modified depending each time on the educational needs of the participants. The Synergy training model is based on teamwork at all levels, exchange of ideas and opinions and interactions between all participants. A fundamental requirement for its successful outcome is the long duration of the training (more than three months and up to three years), so that the staff can gradually embrace a scientific working method, which they can also use after the programme is over.

The programme's activities are supported by:

- the scientific team of EADAP, which has overall responsibility for implementation, coordination, monitoring and evaluation of the programme both on a scientific and on a methodological level,
- the trainers-facilitators, trained and appointed by EADAP⁸ and
- the representative of the entity where the training will be performed. This person represents the programme in relation to the entity's bodies, ensuring the flow of information between participants and facilitating the smooth implementation of the training programme.

3.2.4 Methodology

The Synergy programme methodology is founded on the principles of action research⁹ and interactive pedagogy (CRESAS 1992).

More specifically, Synergy encourages interaction between:

- Theory and practice: it helps trainees to revisit their theoretical positions by juxtaposing them with their everyday pedagogical practices. This drives them to make new working hypotheses, which they then verify through applying them. Action analysis leads trainees to build new knowledge, reconsider existing knowledge and theorise their own practice.
- Participants in the programme: it promotes the exchange of opinions between members of the group, thus creating "symmetrical relationships" (Schwartz 1973; Schwartz: 1977). The term 'symmetrical' denotes relationships in which each partner feels they have the right to support their opinions and participate in the common venture (Chretiennot et al. 1989). In this way, everyone is contributing to the realisation of a common project. Everyone is involved in a dynamic process of co-construction of knowledge at their own pace and according to their own abilities (Anagnostopoulou 2003a).

⁸ See chapter 2.6 "The trainer-facilitator".

⁹ Action research in education endeavours to improve the quality of teaching and learning by exploring the factors affecting them. It aims to support educators in addressing the problems of educational practice and in implementing innovations following reflection and discussion (Altrichter et al. 2001).

3.2.5 Techniques

3.2.5.1 *Establishing the team and group dynamics*

The main feature of the training programme is teamwork. Thus, during the training there are:

- Contacts between the trainer-facilitator and the trainees, during which the time and form of communication with the pedagogical team¹⁰ is determined. In case there is no pedagogical team, the trainer negotiates with the trainees so that one is established. The pedagogical team:
 - identifies difficult situations,
 - raises concerns,
 - records and analyses children's behaviours,
 - makes decisions about pedagogical projects,
 - sets the objectives of the actions, the methods of intervention and the evaluation criteria,
 - validates pedagogical contracts and
 - uses "observation tools" such as cameras, video cameras and observation grids.
- Meetings of the "extended pedagogical team", which includes all employees of nurseries and day-care centres, representatives of the entity, administrative staff, parents' representatives, the trainer-facilitator and the Scientific Committee of EADAP and is another objective of the programme, wherever possible. During these meetings, which take place once every two months in a central hall granted each time by the entity having commissioned the training:
 - pedagogical projects implemented in the classrooms are presented,
 - experimental applications are announced,
 - the objectives, the context of the actions and the criteria of their evaluation are scrutinised,

¹⁰ By the term 'pedagogical team' we mean the transformation of the working group of a school unit, which now decides to adopt new pedagogical objectives, as well as adjust and evaluate the implementation of common actions (Papaprokopiou 1999). When the team is extended through the involvement of other people who are not educators, then it is called an extended pedagogical team (EADAP 2003).

- interim and final evaluations are completed with the aid of questionnaires, observation protocols, etc.,
 - new practices are institutionalised such as, for example, the organisation of a children's festival,
 - the application of innovative practices such as, for example, making educational visits, as well as the contribution of the entity's representatives and competent administrative staff in the programme is decided and
 - actions for the "opening up" of schools to the local community through workshops, events, handouts, posters, etc. are planned.
- Meetings of the "trainers-facilitators' team", which is comprised of all trainers in the Synergy programme and the Scientific Committee of EADAP. During those meetings, the trainers-facilitators inform the other members about the progress of their programme and jointly plan the further implementation of their interventions. More specifically, trainers and the Scientific Committee:
 - analyse the progress of the programmes,
 - identify difficulties,
 - voice concerns, anxieties, insecurities,
 - together seek both practical solutions and theoretical support,
 - evaluate the results and
 - prepare activities for further development of the programme.

3.2.5.2 *Pedagogical projects*¹¹

Pedagogical projects are Synergy's basic technique, as they allow the programme's objectives to be achieved. More specifically, they:

- activate the trainee pedagogues, leading them to adopt an inquiring attitude,
- make the most of children's potential, as they do not focus on the content of learning quite as much as on the ways and processes children use to learn,
- necessitate the exchange of opinions and teamwork,

¹¹ See for example Frey (1998) and Helm & Katz (2002).

- encourage the opening up of the classroom and the school, as pedagogical projects can involve:
 - all or some of the school's pedagogues,
 - all or some of the schools in a district,
 - external collaborators and
 - schools that are geographically remote, but regularly communicate with each other.

3.2.5.3 *Formative self-evaluation*

This is an invaluable tool, which concerns systematic evaluation of pedagogical practices and aims to improve those practices. This type of evaluation is far from external evaluation imposed from the outside or the simplistic yet distressing supervision and grading. Formative self-evaluation is an ongoing process, designed by the pedagogues themselves (Solomon 1999), which involves whoever takes part in the pedagogical project. More specifically, the team sets objectives, implements them and systematically monitors both actions and results, which are linked to the objectives. Then it evaluates them against already defined criteria and makes new adjustments, which it then re-evaluates.¹²

Self-evaluation and adjustments are made at two levels¹³:

1. Pedagogues with the children in their class, having defined the actions, evaluate what was achieved and what was not, the reasons for success or failure, the new knowledge attained and also delineate further knowledge content they wish to acquire and, finally, make new adjustments. This process, which is repeated at regular intervals, boosts children's initiative and self-actualisation and gives the pedagogue the possibility to better comprehend how children operate and their achievements.
2. All pedagogues of a school systematically observe and record the impact the new conditions and activities have on children's behaviour using their medium of choice -video camera, camera, observation grids, protocols,

¹² For an example of formative self-evaluation please see appendices 2 and 3.

¹³ This is about the evaluation made in the classroom. Regarding the overall evaluation of the programme see chapter 3 "Evaluation of the programme", 3.1 "Types of evaluation".

etc. They exchange opinions, analysing the results of the recordings, which leads to readjustments related to the impact detected on children's behaviour (Anagnostopoulou & Papaprokopiou 2001).

3.2.5.4 *Pedagogical aids*¹⁴

The term 'pedagogical aids' indicates those 'tools' used as supportive means in education that allow the trainer to be more efficient (Noye & Pivetau 1999). The Synergy training programme employs (individually or combined) the following pedagogical aids:

- The dossier, the trainee's theoretical and methodological support tool, a "space" to store and retrieve data and information. It also serves as a point of interface between colleagues, as well as a synopsis of the work of the team.

The dossier includes:

- references (for adults and children),
- articles, mainly from pedagogical journals,
- trainees' notes,
- events on relevant topics such as, for example, workshops, conferences, children's festivals, etc.,
- pedagogical material (handouts, posters, stickers, sketches, games) and
- data on competent bodies relevant to the subject (addresses, phone numbers, concise information).
- The lending library set up by the group of trainees, which includes books relevant to the content of the training.
- The tools: the trainer and the Scientific Committee provide plans, questionnaires, etc.
- The posters, with photos of everyday activities and projects organised, accompanied by brief captions.
- The micro tape recorder, used to record selected dialogues of children and/or trainees.

¹⁴ For more detailed information see Zerva (2003).

- The video: the trainees film scenes from their everyday practice, which are then played back and analysed by the pedagogical team.

3.2.6 The trainer-facilitator

Experience has shown and research has validated (Anagnostopoulos & Papaprokopiou 1992) that the need for mediation arises during a long-term action or a coherent action plan when different partners are involved with different roles, responsibilities, knowledge, perceptions etc. This is why trainers-facilitators in the Synergy programme are called upon to play the following two-fold role:

- The role of mediators between the different partners involved in the programme and
- The role of mediators between the trainees and the knowledge to be acquired by them.

Due to the fact that the trainers-facilitators are key to the Synergy programme, they are selected and trained in a systematic way, with special care. The qualifications required are:

- a higher education degree,
- very good knowledge of the field of education and training and
- professional experience as educators.

However, the essential qualifications for this job have more to do with the personality and ideology of the trainers-facilitators, which have already been mentioned in the relevant chapter¹⁵.

Trainers-facilitators have the following forms of support available to them in their taxing and complex task:

- The initial and, above all, continuous training provided by EADAP, which lasts as long as their involvement in the programme lasts, as well as the support of the scientific team of EADAP (their trainer-facilitator colleagues and the scientists in charge).

¹⁵ See chapter 1.2 “The role of the trainer”.

- The methodological framework of the programme which, by providing guidelines, facilitates their work and, to some extent, ensures their efficiency.
- Experience combined with systematic analysis performed within the context of the scientific team of EADAP, allowing trainers to manage the resistance of both professionals and managers of the entities, to deal with it as inevitable and to identify ways to reduce, bypass or control it. Similarly, trainers identify, analyse and control their own attitudes and what they say and do.
- Establishment or recognition of the role of the trainer-facilitator by the entity responsible for paying them.

Evaluation of the trainers-facilitators' work is accomplished on many levels:

- Indirectly, through progress in implementing the pedagogical projects which develop during the training and are evaluated by the group of trainees.
- Directly by themselves (self-evaluation), with the collaboration of their group of colleagues and of the Scientific Committee of EADAP¹⁶.

3.3 Evaluation of the programme

Internal¹⁷ evaluation of the effectiveness of the Synergy programme and investigation of ways to improve it, have accompanied its implementation since the very beginning and continue to do so.

Long-term applications and the breadth of interventions at different levels (groups of managers, pedagogical teams, extended teams, administrators, pedagogues, assistants, social partners) required: i. ongoing formative evaluation¹⁸ during the course of the programme and ii. overall, summative¹⁹ evaluation.

¹⁶ For more information concerning the overall evaluation of the programme, see chapter 3 "Evaluation of the programme".

¹⁷ According to Vergidis & Karalis (1999: 133) "Evaluation is characterised as 'internal' when the evaluator comes from the organisation implementing the programme."

¹⁸ According to Dimitropoulos (1999: 37) the term 'formative evaluation' refers to "evaluation performed in parallel with an educational-learning process, thus facilitating the continuous shaping of this process."

The *ongoing formative evaluation* of the programme is a collective endeavour. It is based on procedures suggested by the Scientific Committee, but organised and implemented by the trainers-facilitators themselves. This type of evaluation:

- is instrumental in the ongoing redefinition of objectives and the adjustment of training techniques,
- enables training agents to systematically monitor the special circumstances under which the programme is being implemented,
- allows the development of a spirit of collectivity and the balancing of relationships between the trainers-facilitators and the scientific team,
- promotes training of each other,
- fosters a climate of joint responsibility of trainers-facilitators in relation to the programme's procedures,
- boosts the confidence and ability of the whole training team to be reflective,
- secures self-commitment on the part of the trainers-facilitators for constant improvement of their work and
- validates the appropriateness of the "*formative self-evaluation guides*"²⁰.

The *overall summative evaluation* is deemed necessary:

- to assess the degree to which the programme's objectives were achieved and formulate the final conclusions and
- to confirm the crucial factors shaping the final result in different educational settings.

¹⁹ The term 'summative', according to Vergidis & Karalis (1999: 128-129) refers to "the evaluation carried out in order to draw conclusions and make documented judgments pertaining to the value of a programme, which is usually combined with its continuation or expansion."

²⁰ See appendices 1 and 2.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Greek

Altrichter, H., P. Posch & B. Somekh (2001). *The educators investigate their work* [in Greek]. Athens: Metaichmio Press.

Anagnostopoulou, L. (2003a). "Teamwork at all levels". In EADAP (eds) *Towards collaborative and participatory training in preschool education* [in Greek]. Athens: Typothito – Giorgos Dardanos Press.

Anagnostopoulou, L. (2003b). "Theoretical approaches and practical extensions". In EADAP (eds) *Towards collaborative and participatory training in preschool education* [in Greek]. Athens: Typothito – Giorgos Dardanos Press.

Anagnostopoulou, L. & N. Papaprokopiou (2001). "Formative self-evaluation: Theoretical and methodological approaches". In G. Bagakis (ed.) *Evaluation of educational programmes and of the school* [in Greek]. Athens: Metaichmio Press.

Dimitropoulos, E. G. (1994). *Introduction in the methodology of scientific research* [in Greek]. Athens: "Ellin" Press.

Dimitropoulos, E. G. (1999). *Evaluation of Educational and Training Programmes: The Evaluator's Guide* [in Greek]. Athens: Grigoris Press.

EADAP (eds) (2003). *Towards collaborative and participatory training in preschool education* [in Greek]. Athens: Typothito – Giorgos Dardanos Press.

Frey, K. (1998). *The project method. A form of collaborative work in school as a theory and practice* [in Greek]. Thessaloniki: Kyriakidis Bros.

Helm J.H. & L. Katz. (2002). *The Project Method and Preschool Education* [in Greek]. Athens: Metaichmio Press.

Kokkos, A. (1999). *Adult Education: The Field, The Learning Principles, The Agents* [in Greek]. Patras: Greek Open University Press.

Noyé, D. & J. Piveteau (1999). *Practical Guide for the Trainer* [in Greek]. Athens: Metaichmio Press.

Papaprokopiou, N. (1989). "Social partners and their role in preschool education". *Modern Education* [in Greek], 50, pp. 66-71.

Rogers, A. (1999). *Adult Training* [in Greek]. Athens: Metaichmio Press.

Solomon, I. (1991). *Internal evaluation and planning of educational work in the school unit* [in Greek]. 2ND COMMUNITY SUPPORT FRAMEWORK, Ministry of Education, Lifelong Learning and Religious Affairs.

Vergidis, D. & Th. Karalis (1999). *Adult education: Planning, Organisation and Evaluation of the Programmes* (vol. 3) [in Greek]. Patras: Greek Open University Press.

Xochellis, P. & Z. Papanoum (2000). *In-service Training of Educators: Greek experiences 1997-2000* [in Greek]. Thessaloniki: Ministry of Education, Lifelong Learning and Religious Affairs / Operational Programme for Education and Initial Vocational Training, Action 1.3.a (2), Subproject 4.

Zerva, M. (2003). "Pedagogical aids". In EADAP (eds) *Towards collaborative and participatory training in preschool education* [in Greek]. Athens: Typothito – Giorgos Dardanos Press.

Foreign

Anagnostopoulos, H. & N. Papaprokopiou (1992). "Le rôle de l'enseignant formateur." A three-poster presentation in *Journées ouvertes de l'IEDPE*. Barcelona, September 3-5, 1992.

Burquière, E. (1987). *Contrats et éducation: La pédagogie du contrat, le contrat en éducation*. Paris: INRP/l'Harmattan.

Chretiennot, C., M. Hardy & F. Platone (1989). "L'auto évaluation pédagogique: une méthode pour travailler en équipe" [translated by EADAP]. In *Les cahiers pédagogiques*. Paris, October 1989.

CRESAS (1987). *On n'apprend pas tout seul. Interactions sociales et constructions de savoirs*. Paris: ESF

CRESAS (1991). *Naissance d'une pédagogie interactive*. Paris: ESF/INRP

CRESAS (1992). *Vers une pédagogie interactive. On n'apprend pas tout seul*. Paris: INRP.

Elliott, J. (1991). *Action research for educational change*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Fennessy, D. (1998). "Teacher's perception of the effects of in-service education and school based support on their teaching." Paper presented at the *British Research Association Annual Conference*, The Queen's University of Belfast, August 27-30, 1998.

Garet, M. S., A. C. Porter, L. Desimone, B. F. Birman & K. S. Yoon (2001). "What Makes Professional Development Effective? Results from a National Sample of Teachers." *American Educational Research Journal*, 38 (4), pp. 915-945.

Ingvarson, L. (1988). "Factors affecting the impact of in-service courses for teachers: Implications for policy." *Teaching and teacher education*, 4 (2), pp.139-155.

Miles, M. B. & A. M. Huberman (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook*, 2nd edn. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.

McGivney, V. (1996). "Adult participation in learning: can we change the pattern?" Paper presented at *EU conference* at Newcastle University, November 1996.

Piaget, J. (1975). *La naissance de l'intelligence chez l'enfant*. Neuchâtel and Paris: Delachaux & Niestle.

Schelfhout, W., F. Dochy, S. Janssens & K. Struyven (2002). "The use of self-peer- and teacher-assessment as feedback system in a learning environment aimed at fostering skills of cooperation, organizing and putting entrepreneurial knowledge into practice." Paper presented at the *Learning Communities and Assessment Cultures Conference* organised by the EARLI Special Interest Group on Assessment and Evaluation, University of Northumbria, August 28-30, 2002.

Schwartz, B. (1973). *L'éducation demain*. Paris: Aubier-Montaigne.

Schwartz, B. (1977). *Une autre école*. Paris: Flammarion.

Sheckley, B. G. (1988). "The best and worst learning experience of adult learners." Paper presented at the *Annual SCUTREA Conference*, 1988.

Sparks, G. M. (1986). "The effectiveness of alternative training activities in changing teaching practices." *American Educational Research Journal*, 23 (2), pp. 217-225.

Taylor, R. (1999). "Adult Education goes back to the future: history meets high-tech in the workplace." Paper presented at *SCUTREA 29th Annual Conference*, July 5-7, 1999, University of Warwick.

Torkington, K. & C. Landers (1995). *Enhancing the skills of early childhood trainers: Training pack*. Bernard van Leer Foundation/UNESCO

APPENDICES

Appendix I: Examples of formative self-evaluation of pedagogues

1st Example

SYNERGY PROGRAMME

Daily Record

Dates:

- What activities did you propose and which ones did the children propose (not necessarily within the teaching hour)?

Activities proposed by the adult	Activities proposed by children (verbal or non-verbal)

- How were some of the children's suggestions used?
 - We implemented them immediately?
 - We recorded them?
 - We pledged to implement them within the next few days?

The second example is about a more elaborate recording of an activity in order to evaluate more complicated data. It has been used by teams which are more familiar with the training process.

2nd Example

SYNERGY PROGRAMME

Recording of an Activity

- Does the proposal come from the children or from the adult? (brief description).

- How was the command given? What exactly did we say?

- Which were the adult's interventions?

- What did the children suggest?

- Were there interactions (among children, between children and adults)?
Has anything changed in arrangement of space and time, in the approach taken, in proposals?

- How were some of our own initial objectives achieved?
(e.g. I observe progress in speech)

- Did parents get involved? In which way?

The third and fourth examples are intended for pedagogical teams with greater training experience. As we can see, these are tools concerning planning and evaluation, namely processes related to each other. Indeed, it has been observed that the more a project or an action has clear objectives and are well planned, the easier and more painless is to find criteria and evaluate them.

3rd Example

SYNERGY PROGRAMME

Planning

1. Content of the pedagogical project

Title:

Start date:

Planned actions:

2. Reasons this particular project was chosen:

E.g. problem-solving, space, difficult moments, personal motives, children's needs, etc.

3. Priorities. Short-term – Long-term objectives:

4. Organisational suggestions:

Ways to arrange space and time (workshops, corners, visits, etc.)

4th Example

Pedagogical actions report²¹ for the year 2000-2001

1. Description of your class (age, number of children).

2. Description of the project selected and implemented this year.

²¹ In this case, the evaluation is called a report, as this is a term which does not provoke as negative a response as evaluation does, which is associated with school or administrative tests.

three times a year: at the beginning of the facilitators' intervention, in the middle and at the end of the year.

1. Intervention priorities-Objectives

- Planned interventions:
- Start date of interventions:
- Reasons for choosing these interventions:

2. Course of interventions

- Pedagogues' support techniques:
- Negotiation techniques:
- Pedagogical team establishment and support techniques:

3. Intervention implications

- at the level of pedagogues (involvement, commitment, activation, etc.):
- at the level of the pedagogical team (team of the centre, extended team):
- at the level of partners (managers, elected officers, parents, community, etc.)
- at the level of the facilitator (modification of techniques and tactics):
- at the level of the programme (implications, deviations, innovations, stagnation, etc.):

4. Intervention adjustments

Suggestions for future adjustments in the intervention and progress of the pedagogues' training programme.

Appendix III: Trainees' questionnaire

PART ONE (GENERAL DATA)

- **Age:**
 - **22-30**
 - **31-40**
 - **41-50**
 - **51 and above**

- **School / Department you graduated from:**

.....

- **Years of experience as a pedagogue:**

.....

- **You are now working in a:**

- Temporary position**
- Permanent position**

- **In which municipality / entity did you attend the Synergy training programme?**

.....

- **Attendance period:**

from...../...../.... to/...../.....

- **In which municipality / entity are you now working?**

.....

- **Have you participated in any training programmes or seminars before Synergy?**

- Yes**
- No**

If yes, which one?

.....

PART TWO (PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION)

1. Did the Synergy programme meet your expectations?

- Very much
- Quite a lot
- Somewhat
- Not at all
- No answer

Please justify your reply briefly

.....

.....

.....

.....

2. How much did the programme help you to:

	Very much	Quite a lot	Some-what	Not at all	No answer
Renew pedagogical practices					
Enrich knowledge					
Evaluate your pedagogical work					
Connect theory to practice					
Approach your pedagogical practices in an investigative way					

3. How much did the programme help you to collaborate with:

	Very much	Quite a lot	Some-what	Not at all	No answer
Other colleagues of your day-care centre					
Colleagues of other day-care centres					
The manager of the day-care centre					
The administration					
The parents					

4. Did you implement pedagogical projects?

- Yes
 No

If yes, which do you consider as your most successful one?

.....

5. For what reasons did you chose to implement the above pedagogical project?

.....

6. Did implementation of the above pedagogical project influence the rest of the classroom's activities?

- Very much
 Quite a lot

- Somewhat
- Not at all
- No answer

Please justify your reply briefly

.....

.....

.....

.....

7. Do you believe that Synergy helped you differentiate your attitude towards children in your everyday pedagogical practice?

- Very much
- Quite a lot
- Somewhat
- Not at all
- No answer

Please justify your reply briefly

.....

.....

.....

.....

8. How much did the pedagogical team help you to:

	Very much	Quite a lot	Somewhat	Not at all	No answer
Exchange opinions with colleagues					
Plan common actions					
Implement personal suggestions					
Evaluate common actions					

9. How much did the administration of the legal entity contribute to the implementation of Synergy in relation to:

	Very much	Quite a lot	Some-what	Not at all	No answer
Equipment provision					
Their active participation in events of the day-care centre (children's festivals, one-day conferences, open workshops)					
Moral support / encouragement					
Their active participation in the meetings of the pedagogical team					

10. How satisfied are you by your trainer in relation to:

	Very much	Quite a lot	Some-what	Not at all	No answer
Educational level					
Character					
Coordination abilities					

11. In what way did the presence of the trainer help you?

.....

.....

.....

.....

12. Please mention a positive aspect of the Synergy training programme:

.....

13. Please mention a negative aspect:

.....

PART THREE (FOLLOWING THE END OF THE PROGRAMME)

14. Which of the “tools” provided by the programme do you continue to use in your everyday practice? (please mention the ones you use the most)

- Video camera
- Tape recorder
- Posters
- Albums
- Observation grids
- Written notes
- Camera
- Other.....

15. Do you still participate in a pedagogical team?

- Yes
- No
- No answer

For what reason?

.....

.....
.....

16. Do you still participate in common actions with colleagues from day-care centres of either your or another municipality / entity?

- Yes
- No
- No answer

For what reason?

.....
.....
.....
.....

17. Did you attend any training programmes or seminars after the end of Synergy?

- Yes
- No
- No answer

If yes, which one?

.....
.....
.....
.....

18. To what extent do you use a self-training means, independently of training programmes (e.g. books)?

- Very much
- Quite a lot
- Somewhat
- Not at all
- No answer

19. If you were given again the opportunity to participate in a new Synergy training programme, what new one would you suggest?

.....

.....

.....

.....

Thank you

Appendix IV: Trainers-facilitators' questionnaire

PART ONE (Data gathered per nursery/day-care centre)

Municipality:.....

Nursery/Day-care centre:.....

1. The programme helped trainees to:

	Very much	Quite a lot	Some-what	Not at all	No answer
Renew their pedagogical practices					
Enrich their knowledge					
Evaluate their pedagogical work					
Connect theory to practice					
Approach their pedagogical practices in an investigative way					

2. The programme helped trainees collaborate with:

	Very much	Quite a lot	Somewhat	Not at all	No answer
Other colleagues of the day-care centre					
Colleagues of other day-care centres					
The manager of the day-care centre					
The administration					
The parents					

3. The trainees made the pedagogical projects method their own:

- Very much
- Quite a lot
- Somewhat
- Not at all
- No answer

4. The programme helped trainees differentiate their attitude towards children in their everyday pedagogical practice:

- Very much
- Quite a lot
- Somewhat
- Not at all
- No answer

5. The pedagogical team benefited trainees in that they:

	Very much	Quite a lot	Some-what	Not at all	No answer
Exchanged opinions with colleagues					
Planned common actions					
Implemented personal suggestions					
Evaluated common actions					

PART TWO (Data gathered per municipality)

Municipality:.....

6. The administration of the legal entity contributed to the implementation of Synergy in relation to:

	Very much	Quite a lot	Some-what	Not at all	No answer
Equipment provision					
Their active participation in events of the day-care centre (children's festivals, one-day conferences, open workshops)					
Moral support / encouragement					
Their active participation in the meetings of the pedagogical team					

PART THREE (General information)

7. Please mention three techniques you believe are more efficient for the coordination of the pedagogical team:

i/.....
.....

ii/.....
.....

iii/.....
.....

8. To what extent was your professional development influenced by your participation in the Synergy programme?

- Very much
- Quite a lot
- Somewhat
- Not at all
- No answer

Please justify your reply briefly

.....
.....
.....
.....

9. During the programme, the Scientific Committee of EADAP supported you:

- Very much
- Quite a lot
- Somewhat
- Not at all
- No answer

10. What would you suggest to improve the Synergy programme?

i/.....

.....

ii/.....

.....

iii/.....

.....

Thank you