

Trans e-facilitator

Report on 2nd tier training in countries



Report on 2nd tier training in countries (WP6)

Result number 9

Delivery date: 30.09.2014

Author(s): Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia, I.P. (FCT)



This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication [communication] 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.



Index

Executive Summary	3
Introduction.....	4
Piloting modules.....	5
Selecting the trainers.....	8
The Pilot process.....	11
Feedback from the Pilot	18
Recommendations.....	21

Executive Summary

- The Trans e-Facilitator curriculum is based on a set of learning modules which were adapted to the needs of the staff in the telecenters of the three consortium partners (Germany, Latvia, and Portugal). These needs were identified in previous national surveys (see WP3 Context Analysis).
- Based on the conclusions of WP3, **different modules were adapted and tested** by the three partners' countries.
- In total, 112 people participated in the Pilot phase as 2st or 2nd tier trainers, **exceeding the initial target number of 60** described in the project application by far. These people represent the first “specialists” of the adapted curriculum, and with their expertise we obtained a valuable set of information about the needs and expectations of “e-facilitators”.
- The partners had the **freedom to organize the pilot according to national needs**, as long as they comply with a basic framework of requirements agreed by the consortium.
- Participating **trainers received a certificate** after successfully passing the final exam.
- The pilot process ended with highly satisfying results, taking into account the project partners' and the 1st and 2nd tier trainers' feedback. **Positively evaluated accomplishments** include the flexibility through different approaches allowed to organize the learning process, the flexibility regarding the pace of learning, and the assessment approach.
- The evaluation procedure accompanying the whole pilot process allowed to draw conclusions and point out **recommendations for future users** of the curriculum. These are presented at the end of this report.

Introduction

The last Digital Agenda scoreboard (2014 – Digital Inclusion and skills) showed some accomplishments achieved by the EU28. Among these, we can highlight the growth on use of the internet (every day and weekly uses – with 62% and 72% of EU28 population respectively), and a decrease in percentage of people who never used it.

Although these accomplishments should be commemorated, an average in EU28 one in five people never ever used the internet and fifteen out of twenty eight countries have higher rates of “never ever” usage. For those people who don’t use the internet, two of the three most important reasons to not having internet access are: lack of skills and equipment/access cost are too high.

Telecenters, with their characteristics of proximity¹, are able to offer internet access without major costs and training in basic skills to a large audience. Among this audience there are two groups of special importance, disadvantage people and the group of vulnerables. Nonetheless, to successfully reach those people, telecenters must to have a staff capable to work with those societal groups and more. To fulfil that necessity, the Project Trans e-Facilitator aims to offer a curriculum for e-facilitators (people who work in the Telecenters and are a facilitator of digital competence), in order to promote their qualification and professionalization.

Therefore, the curriculum offer by the Trans e-Facilitator project is based on a set of learning modules which were adapted to the needs of the staff in the telecenters of the three consortium’s partners (Germany, Latvia, and Portugal). These needs were identified in previous national surveys (see WP3 Context Analysis). From the conclusions of that Work Package and corresponding “Result No. 5”, different modules were adapted and tested by the three partners’ countries.

This report describes the realization of this piloting process in Germany, Latvia and Portugal within WP6. The Deliverable 11 is directly related to Work Package 6 “Pilot Implementation and testing”, which is one of the core activities of the Project (Milestone 3). With the delivery of this report the WP6 activities are closed.

¹ Computers helping People with Special Needs 14th International Conference ICCHP 2014 (pg 20)

Piloting modules

The Project Trans e-Facilitator aims to offer a curriculum for e-facilitators, in order to promote their qualification and professionalization, by developing competences in three dimensions – technical, pedagogical, and social. These three dimensions reveal the core of the work in telecenters, and are necessary for those who already work or want to work in that place.

The choice and adaptation of a modular curriculum in the countries Portugal, Latvia and Germany are Milestone 1 of the project. The curriculum connects the theoretical project description with the practical implementation of a training for e-facilitators. The curriculum is modular so that the learning contents can be chosen regarding the needs of the implementation context.

In the three countries, the context analysis showed slight differences. For example, in Latvia and Portugal libraries are common places for eInclusion, and some of them are spaces which can be considered telecenters. However, in Germany libraries are not used as telecenters. Consequently in Latvia and Portugal the libraries can be a workplace for e-facilitators, so their employees must have the necessary skills to work as e-facilitators. With regard to learning gaps, the context analysis showed that in Germany and Latvia generally e-facilitators need to update their knowledge in software programs and technologies, but in Portugal these needs are not essential because the people who work in telecenters have a background on technological fields.

To more explicitly show the differences between the three countries, and to show how modules were adapted by each country, we describe the choices made:

- **Building a network culture (M1):** in Germany this module was considered important but wasn't seen as the most important task for e-facilitators; in Latvia some learning methodological approach already exists in this field; in order to develop and foster a sense of sharing knowledge about social and cultural responsibility as well as digital resources Portugal chose this module for adaptation and piloting.
- **Auxiliary resources to optimize activities in telecenters (M2):** in Germany this module isn't relevant, most of all because the task already belongs to the daily work in the telecenter; in Latvia and Portugal this module was chosen for adaptation.
- **Telecenter sustainability (M3):** was the only topic where no country has analysed any needs neither for translation nor adaptation.

- **Promoting ICT for the elderly at the telecenter (M4):** in Germany this target group is becoming more important every day and e-facilitators need to have special didactical skills to teach elderly people in an adequate way; in Latvia and Portugal this module was not very important because there are already a large number of programs related to this issue. Only Germany chose to adapt and pilot this module.
- **Promoting ICT with migrants at the ICT centre (M5)** in Germany the e-facilitators need further skills to address these matter adequately, so the module was chosen for adaptation; both in Latvia and Portugal the module was considered not relevant, because in Latvia this target group barely exist and in Portugal there are another programs which address this matter.
- **Getting familiar with MS Office tools for developing digital literacy workshops (M6):** both in Germany and Latvia the module was considered an important subject for the e-facilitator's work, but only Latvia chose to adapt this module with emphasis on cloud and mobile applications; in Portugal this content is a general precondition for people who work in telecenters, consequently it was not considered relevant for adaptation.
- **Developing a digital photography workshop in the telecenter (M7):** both in Germany and Latvia the module was considered important but was not chosen for adaptation; in Portugal the module was chosen for adaptation because was considered an important support to improve creativity in teaching ICT for a large target group.
- **Facilitating job seeking in the telecenter (M8):** both in Germany and in Latvia the topic is highly requested and therefore was chosen for adaptation; in Portugal job seeking facilities are an existing part of informal training sessions offered by a wide range of public and NGO telecenters, consequently the module was not chosen for adaptation.
- **Planning a digital literacy workshop (M9):** in Germany this module was seen as an introductory part to convey a key concept for the job of the e-facilitator, and was consequently chosen for adaptation; in Latvia this module was considered important but not chosen for adaptation; in Portugal the main reason for selecting this module for adaptation was to stress the concept of digital literacy in the telecenter context.
- **Telematics Procedures – facilitating access to e-services (M10):** in Germany this module was considered important but not chosen for adaptation; in Latvia the e-facilitators have requested training in this area, and the module was chosen for adaptation; in Portugal this module don't have major importance in the context of the e-facilitator's work because there are an another programs which are responsible for this matter.

- **E-safety and e-security (M11):** all countries agreed on the topic of e-safety and e-security and all declared a lack of awareness about these issue and a growing importance. In Germany, Latvia, and Portugal this topic was stated as necessary and chosen for to adapt. In addition to the transfer ambitions of Trans e-facilitator, this module has been developed anew and represents an enlargement of the initial training curriculum.

To summarize we present the frame below:

Module	Germany	Latvia	Portugal
1. Network			Adapt and pilot
2. Resources		Adapt and pilot	Adapt and pilot
3. Sustainability			
4. Elderly people	Adapt and pilot		
5. Migrants	Adapt and pilot		
6. Office tools		Adapt and pilot	
7. Digital photo			Adapt and pilot
8. Job seeking	Adapt and pilot	Adapt and pilot	
9. Digital literacy	Adapt and pilot		Adapt and pilot
10. E-services		Adapt and pilot	
11. E-safety and e-security	Adapt and pilot	Adapt and pilot	Adapt and pilot

Selecting the trainers

In the preliminary meetings of the project it was decided which approach to adopt for the selection of the participants in the pilot phase. The decision was that the selection should promote a spread of the curriculum among various networks of telecenters.

This approach drives the process of diversification and the choice of 1st tier and 2nd tier trainers.² To highlight the importance of the participants in the pilot phase, the label chosen for them reflects that all the participants are trainers more than trainees. This designation was linked with the purpose of disseminating of the project among the several networks of telecenters in each country.

A set of characteristics was defined to guide the selection of 1st tier trainers, also referred to as “supertrainers”. Below we list these characteristics:

- Active ICT trainers (with relevant experience),
- e-learning skills,
- mobilizing capacity,
- Network type - libraries, NGO, municipalities, centres of digital inclusion, social welfare institutions,
- Good English knowledge, and
- Contracted.

From that start point each partner involved in the pilot phase (Germany – SDC, Latvia – LITKA, Portugal – FCT) chose the best strategy to select the trainers. Below we summarize that choice in each country.

Germany:

The selection of the 1st tier trainers made by SDC was derived from their relationship with trainers involved in national eInclusion networks. Therefore, four of five 1st tier trainers were well-known by SDC and had a long time of work together.

The choice of the 2nd tier trainers had another approach. Knowing about the 1st tier trainer’s work in their networks, SDC asked for them to invite people who worked in the same networks. SDC additionally presented the eTrans e-Facilitator project in

² 1st tier trainers were already involved in WP5 „Train the Trainer“ and then piloted the modules with 2nd tier trainers in WP6.

advisory board and network meetings with e-facilitators which might fit in the 2nd tier trainers group.

The pilot process counted 32 trainers in Germany. The five 1st tier trainers plus 27 people selected as 2nd tier trainers which had a background as follows:

- 8 people who were ICT's professional trainers;
- 7 people who were from volunteering field;
- 2 people who were from the libraries field;
- 2 people from public sector (civil servant), and;
- 8 people – one of each area: teacher, IT freelancer; social worker, internet moderator, online trainer, pedagogue, adult education student, and youth center worker.

Latvia:

The approach taken by LIKTA was focused on the spread of the Trans e-facilitator project among several networks who work on digital inclusion. These networks were identified at the phase of the Context Analysis (WP3).

For the group of 1st tier trainers, LIKTA chose 5 people who work with ICT training and had proven experience. To compose the group of 2nd tier trainers, LIKTA used another approach. Before the Pilot phase, LIKTA started a campaign to promote the Trans e-facilitator among the previous identified networks. An information advertisement with the learning opportunities offer by the project was developed and sent to different institutions and organizations. An online application form was made available and individual communication with potential participants and their supervisors was done in order to provide further specifics information.

After receiving the online applications, a careful selection was done. That selection was necessary to verify which profiles fit better with the required characteristics. At the end of the selection 38 people were chosen to join the 2nd tier trainers group. The people from that group came from several networks as follows:

- 17 people were from libraries sector;
- 9 people were from school sector;
- 8 people were from NGO sector;
- 2 people were from ICT's learning center, and;
- 2 people were from – one of each area: telecenter worker and civil servant worker.

Portugal:

The approach taken by FCT had some similarities with the approach adopted by SDC in Germany. The first task was to spread the outcomes of the project among several institutions and organizations who worked with digital inclusion. From that first task the group of 1st tier trainers was chosen.

After that first task FCT asked each 1st tier trainer to invite 3 2nd tier trainers. Those people could be people who worked in the same networks or people, known by them, who would be interested in take the training to another networks. From this approach the 2nd tier trainer group was composed, with 15 people, who took part in the *first round* of the Pilot in Portugal.

Portugal organised an additional second round of piloting (the procedures of the Pilot will be explained further in the section “The Pilot’s procedure”) with the same approach to invite the people for the 2nd tier trainers. For the second round, the 1st tier trainers group invited 17 people more. In total the Pilot phase in Portugal had 32 people in the group of 2nd tier trainers. Those people came from several different networks as follows:

- 10 people from ICT’s professional trainer field;
- 7 people from university courses (social education and communication and multimedia students);
- 5 people from libraries sector;
- 3 people from sociocultural sectors;
- 2 people from public sector (civil servant), and;
- 2 people from volunteering field.

In total, 112 people participated in the Pilot phase as 2st or 2nd tier trainers, exceeding the initial target number of 60 by far. These people represent the first “specialists” of the adapted curriculum, and with their expertise we obtained a valuable set of information about the needs and expectations of “e-facilitators”.

The Pilot process

The procedures adopted for the Pilot phase were developed by the consortium partners before and during the Barcelona meeting. During the meeting in Barcelona, the partners systematized the core procedures that should be used for the Pilot phase.

With the agreement of all partners a large amount of time was defined for the pilot phase. The partners had the liberty to choose how to do the pilot as long as they comply with the agreed basic framework of requirements, as described below:

- The partners must pilot all five adapted modules chosen before;
- The partners must meet a minimum number of three 2nd tier trainers per module and at least 15 2nd tier trainers in total per country;
- During the training time, a designated 1st tier trainer has to be the main responsible for a specific module;
- Each module must have a minimum workload of 22 hours – with reference to the ancestor project VET4e-I – with a recommended division as follows: 1 hour for the first unit (presentation unit), 5 hours for each learning unit (units 2 to 5), and 1 hour for the final unit (exam unit);
- It was recommended that partners adopt a period of one week for each unit, i.e., each unit will have one week to be developed by 2nd tier trainers (for all units, included the presentation and final exam units);
- It was recommended that partners only issue certificates for successfully completing a module when certain exam requirements are met:
 - Accomplish all activities assigned in each unit, and
 - achieve at least 75% correct answers in the final exam.

The timeline for the pilot phase was established between February, 2014 and July, 2014. In Portugal, with the last round of the pilot finished in early August.

After defining the pilot procedures, the pilot started in all countries as described below:

Germany:

The pilot process adopted in Germany was a little different and had a unique characteristic. After defining the 1st tier trainers group, each 1st tier trainer chose how many 2nd tier trainers he will be working with. After that choice a group of 1st tier trainer and 2nd tier trainers was defined and this group would go through all the training together. To better understand this model we made the table below:

	1 st tier trainer	2 nd tier trainer	modules
Group 1	1	5	M004 – M011
Group 2	1	4	M005 – M011
Group 3	1	5	M008 – M004
Group 4	1	3	M009 - M011 - M004
Group 5	1	3	M011 – M004

The national coordinator (SDC) organized a meeting with all people who would do the training. The purpose of that introductory meeting was to foster a better knowledge about each other, learn more about the project and the training, and answer questions and doubts which would arise from the people involved. Since the participants live in all parts of Germany it was not possible for everyone to attend the meeting. At least 13 2nd tier trainers were able to make it. Together with five 1st tier trainers and two representatives from SDC, the future 2nd tier trainers learned more about Moodle and decided in their groups about the time division of the first module.

The activities in all the modules began on 10th February 2014. We summarize the pilot process:

- The Group 1: began the Pilot process with the module - Promoting ICT for the elderly at the telecenter (M4). From February 10th till April 9th the group did a first round of the module. At the end of the first round the group could choose another module to test. The choice was made for the module - E-safety and e-security (M11). The second round began at the second half of April and ended on July. In total seven people were enrolled for this group. Two of them did not participated for private reasons, three of them participated of the first round with the module **M4**, and four of them participated of the second round with the module **M11**. In the end one person completed the training with the module **M4**, two people completed the training with the module **M11**, and two people completed both modules (**M4**, **M11**).
- The Group 2: began the Pilot process with the module - Promoting ICT with migrants at the ICT centre (M5). From February 10th till April 9th the group did a first round with the module. At the end of the first round the group can choose another module to test. The choice was made for the module - E-safety and e-security (M11). The second round began at the second half of April and ended on July. In total seven people were enrolled for this group. Two of them did not participated for private reasons, and one of them give up at the middle of the first round. Three of them participated of the first round with the module **M5**,

and four of them participated at the second round with the module **M11**. In the end three people completed the training with both modules (**M5, M11**) and one person completed only the module **M11**.

- The Group 3: began the Pilot process with the module - Facilitating job seeking in the telecenter (M8). From February 10th till April 9th the group did a first round with the module. At the end of the first round the group can choose another module to test. The choice was made for the module - Promoting ICT for the elderly at the telecenter (M4). The second round began at the second half of April and ended on July. In total five people were enrolled for this group. All of them completed the training with both modules (**M8, M4**).
- The Group 4: began the Pilot process with the module - Planning a digital literacy workshop (M9). From February 10th till April 9th the group did a first round with the module. At the end of the first round all the three people enrolled in this module completed the training, so the group can choose another module to test. This group can do another two rounds and completed, in total, three rounds between February and July. For the second round the module chosen was - E-safety and e-security (M11) and all the three people enrolled completed this module. For the third round the module chosen was - Promoting ICT for the elderly at the telecenter (M4) and all the three people enrolled completed this module.
- The Group 5: began the Pilot process with the module - E-safety and e-security (M11). From February 10th till April 9th the group did a first round with the module. At the end of the first round the group can choose another module to test. The choice was made for the module - Promoting ICT for the elderly at the telecenter (M4). The second round began at the second half of April and ended on July. In total five people were enrolled for this group. Three of them completed the training with both modules (**M11, M4**), and two of them did not participated for private reasons.

In Germany at the end of July, the result of the Pilot process was:

- **Promoting ICT for the elderly at the telecenter (M4):** the module was piloted for three different 1st tier trainers and, in total, the module was concluded by eleven 2nd tier trainers.
- **Promoting ICT with migrants at the ICT centre (M5):** the module was piloted by one 1st tier trainer and, in total, the module was concluded by three 2nd tier trainers.
- **Facilitating job seeking in the telecenter (M8):** the module was piloted by one 1st tier trainer and, in total, the module was concluded by five 2nd tier trainers.

- **Planning a digital literacy workshop (M9):** the module was piloted by one 1st tier trainer and, in total, the module was concluded by three 2nd tier trainers.
- **E-safety and e-security (M11):** the module was piloted for four different 1st tier trainers and, in total, the module was concluded by fourteen 2nd tier trainers.

Latvia:

In Latvia the Pilot process had a special component, face-to-face training. With two meetings, one at the beginning and another at the end of training, the training could be considered as a b-learning training. To better understanding about this process, we will describe below by modules:

- The module Auxiliary resources to optimize activities in telecenters (**M2**) began with an introductory seminar on March 12th. During this seminar the 1st tier trainer introduced the 2nd tier trainers with information about the project goals and achievable results, the planned learning process, and Moodle environment. Information on the assignments and tests was given. The 2nd tier trainers signed in the e-learning environment and tried out the discussion forum. The 1st tier trainer gave insight about the modern tools for creating learning materials – online crosswords, quizzes, infographics tools etc. The 2nd tier trainers tried them out during the introductory lesson and received feedback from the 1st tier trainer. During the study process all the 2nd tier trainers took part in discussion forums, did weekly assignments – created them and uploaded for grading - and answered questions of a self-evaluation test. The final exam consisted of 20 questions. From 2nd till 10th of April students created videos and uploaded them on the Internet, and then published the link to their video in the forum. In total, ten 2nd tier trainers participated in the final unit which took place at “Datorzinibu centrs” locations on April 10th. Each of them shared their experience and gave feedback about the learning process, their progress and assignments.
- The module Getting familiar with MS Office tools for developing digital literacy workshops (**M6**) began with an introductory seminar on February 21th. During the introductory seminar information about the project goals, achievable results and participating countries was given. The 2nd tier trainers were introduced to the 1st tier trainer, the planned learning process, the e-learning environment and the tools available in it were presented. Information on the final tasks was given. The 2nd tier trainers tried out the discussions forum, uploaded documents to the e-learning environment and tried out the test. During the study process the 2nd tier trainers took part in discussion forums, did weekly independent assignments and answered questions of a self-evaluation

test. From 24th till 30th March the 2nd tier trainers prepared the final task in groups of 2 or 3. At the end of the training module the 2nd tier trainers presented their final task to a wider audience. In total seven 2nd tier trainers participated in developing the final tasks.

- The module Facilitating job seeking in the telecenter (**M8**) began with an introductory seminar on February 21th. During this seminar all 2nd tier trainers were introduced to the study environment, the study process and the content and execution of the final test. They tried out the discussions forum, uploaded documents to the study environment and tried out the test. During the study process the 2nd tier trainers took part in discussion forums, did weekly independent assignments, answered questions of a self-evaluation test and gathered resources from a Wiki site. The final seminar on March 31st was organized for participants of three modules – (M6, M8, and M10). At the end of the module the 2nd tier trainers took a final exam. After the test participants watched the presentations prepared by the participants of M6 module.
- The module Telematics Procedures – facilitating access to e-services (**M10**) began with an introductory seminar on February 21th. During the introductory seminar information about the project goals, achievable results and participating countries was given. The 2nd tier trainers were introduced to the planned learning process, the e-learning environment and the tools available in it. Information on the final tasks was given. The 2nd tier trainers tried out the discussions forum, uploaded documents to the study environment and tried out the test. During the study process the 2nd tier trainers took part in discussion forums, did weekly independent assignments and answered questions of a self-evaluation test. From 24th till 30th March participants prepared a final task. The final seminar on March 31st was organized for participants of three modules – (M6, M8, and M10).
- The module E-safety and e-security (**M11**) began with an introductory seminar on February 17th. During the introductory seminar information about the project goals, achievable results and participating countries was given. The 2nd tier trainers were self-evaluated with eGuardian barometer on eSafety and eSecurity. The 2nd tier trainers were introduced to the 1st tier trainer, the planned learning process, the e-learning environment and the tools available in it. Information on the final tasks was given. Introductory seminar had a practical part, where the 2nd tier trainers tried out Moodle platform, set up their profiles, tested the platform, tried out the discussions forum, and uploaded documents to the study. During the study process the 2nd tier trainers took part in discussion forums, did weekly independent assignments. At the end of the training module the final seminar was organized and the 2nd tier

trainers took the eGuardian exam. After the final exam the 2nd tier trainers participated in round table discussions about the questions based on the study material and test.

In Latvia at the end of April, the result of the Pilot process was five modules piloted, and in total five 1st tier trainers and thirty eight 2nd tier trainers concluded the modules.

Portugal:

In Portugal the Pilot process was made only by e-learning. Each of the modules had an initial online meeting and three of five modules had two distinct rounds. To describe the pilot process, we will summarize below:

- The module Building a network culture (**M1**) began on February 24th with three 2nd tier trainers. The first round of this module ended on April 6th. During these weeks the 2nd tier trainers participated in discussion forums, did weekly independent assignments and answered questions of a self-evaluation test. At the end of this round all the 2nd tier trainers did the final exam and concluded the module. A second round was established for this module. Five new 2nd tier trainers were enrolled. The activities began on June 30th and ended on August 3rd. All the group of five 2nd tier trainers were academic students and the activities of the module and the academic activities, such as the final exams, happened at the same time. Such coincidence was at the origin of the dropout that occurred in this round.
- The module Auxiliary resources to optimize activities in telecenters (**M2**) began on February 24th with three 2nd tier trainers. The first round of this module ended on March 30th. During this weeks the 2nd tier trainers took part in discussion forums, did weekly independent assignments and answered questions of a self-evaluation test. At the end of this round only two of the three 2nd tier trainers did the final exam and concluded the module. A second round was established for this module. Eight new 2nd tier trainers were enrolled. The activities began on June 30th and ended on August 11th. During these weeks the 2nd tier trainers took part in discussion forums, did weekly independent assignments and answered questions of a self-evaluation test. At the end of this second round only three of the eight 2nd tier trainers did the final exam and concluded the module.
- The module Developing a digital photography workshop in the telecenter (**M7**) began on February 24th with three 2nd tier trainers. The first round of this module ended on April 8th. During these weeks the 2nd tier trainers took part in discussion forums, did weekly independent assignments and answered



questions of a self-evaluation test. At the end of the module only two of the three 2nd tier trainers did the final exam and concluded the module. This module had only one round.

- The module Planning a digital literacy workshop (**M9**) began on February 24th with three 2nd tier trainers. The first round of this module ended on April 6th. During these weeks the 2nd tier trainers took part in discussion forums, did weekly independent assignments and answered questions of a self-evaluation test. At the end the module all the three 2nd tier trainers did the final exam and concluded the module. This module had only one round.
- The module E-safety and e-security (**M11**) began on February 21st with three 2nd tier trainers. The first round of this module ended on April 6th. During these weeks the 2nd tier trainers took part in discussion forums, did weekly independent assignments and answered questions of a self-evaluation test. At the end round all the three 2nd tier trainers did the final exam and concluded the module. A second round was established for this module. Seven new 2nd tier trainers were enrolled. The activities began on June 30th and ended on August 11th. During these weeks the 2nd tier trainers took part in discussion forums, did weekly independent assignments and answered questions of a self-evaluation test. At the end of this second round all the seven 2nd tier trainers did the final exam and concluded the second round of this module.

In Portugal at the end the first half of August, the result of the pilot process was five modules piloted, and in total five 1st tier trainers and 24 2nd tier trainers involved in the modules testing.

Feedback from the Pilot

During the pilot phase feedback from the participants was collected systematically. We categorized that feedback information in five major dimensions which include the whole process of the pilot phase.

The first dimension is related to the content of the modular curriculum. All aspects of the learning content, the additional content, and the assignments/evaluation tests are summarized under the “content” label. The second dimension is related to the structure of the module. Thus all aspects of how the content was divided into units and the use of images and graphical representation of content are summarized under the “structure of module” label. The third dimension is related to the workload established for the learning process of one module and is summarized under the “time and pace of learning” label. The fourth dimension is related to the participation and interactions occurred between the 1st tier trainer and the 2nd tier trainers and are summarized under the “participation” label. The fifth and final dimension is related to the e-learning platform and is summarized under the “moodle” label.

The frame below shows an overview of the findings:

Dimension:	Feedback
Content (learning content, additional content and assignments/evaluation)	The information given by the participants showed some disparities along the Pilot phase. Regarding the learning content, we found information about the gap between the content and the previous knowledge of the 2 nd tier trainers. Some times this gap was related with the fewer knowledge demonstrated by the 2 nd tier trainers about module’s content. By the other side, the content was so easy that the 2 nd tier lost their interest by the module. Between those two extremes, we found some information about the constant actualization needed by the content. Some subjects, included in the curriculum, are so dynamic that will be necessary update with new content regularly. Regarding the evaluation, we found information about the questions made in the tests. The major part of the 2 nd tier trainers found problems with the questions made by the tests. In their perception the questions was too difficult. Also we found some information about misunderstanding in the answers choice – double meaning - and some reports made by the 2 nd tier trainers were related with errors in questions made.

Dimension:	Feedback
<p>Structure of modules (general structure, unit structure, and graphics art)</p>	<p>The module structure not received critical from the 2nd tier trainers. In this dimension the main concern was whether the access to the learning units will be given sequentially or at the same time (give access to unit 1, then give access to unit 2, and so on, or give access to all units at once). The previous experience and the framework designed for the Pilot phase demanded that the access to the units should be sequential. For those partners who made more than one round was possible to give the access with more flexibility. But the general perception was that the access to the unit, or at least to the activities in each unit, should be provided sequentially.</p> <p>Regarding the graphic and images used on the modules, the information showed some critical about images who could pass a stereotypical message. From their point of view the images cannot imply impairment or weakness of any social group.</p>
<p>Time and pace of learning (workload and deadlines)</p>	<p>The workload defined for each module was derived from the previous project the VET4, and account with a total of 22 hours of commitment. However the needs identified on the Context Analysis, both the e-facilitator needs and the content adaptation, pressured the workload. This pressure was easily perceived at the deadline of the assignments. Information reported by the 2nd tier trainers showed that they needed more than 5 hours per week to complete all reads and assignments available in the units. That caused the need to extend the deadlines and consequently the unit for more than one week, affecting the pace of learning. On the other hand, the analysis of the information showed that when the previous knowledge demonstrated by the 2nd tier trainers was superior to the needs for the training module, the workload was considered more than sufficient.</p>

Dimension:	Feedback
<p>Participation (forum participation and overall interest)</p>	<p>During the Pilot phase within the various modules tested there was a great diversity in participation of the 2nd tier trainers. Both in the forums and in the activities related with assignments of the units, participation of the 2nd tier trainers oscillated from the great intensity to an almost dropout. In the forums, the key issue was the number of the 2nd tier trainers taking part in the module. A large number of 2nd tier trainers on the module were related with more intense participation on the forums. In the generally participation in the modules, represented by the participation in the activities related with assignments of the units, the key issue was the correctly matched of needs and the previous knowledge of the 2nd tier trainers. When the subject, and the content, fulfilled the expectations from the 2nd tier trainers, more were the participation in the activities of the module. When the content do not fulfilled their expectations, less participation was made in the activities. In extreme cases, the dropout from the module by the 2nd tier trainers was observed.</p>
<p>Moodle</p>	<p>The information reported by the 2nd tier trainers showed that the moodle environment was easy to use. Some concerns were about the moodle text editor, the impossibility to assign a task to do by workgroups, and the impossibility to create questions with multiple choice answers. Another issue report by the 2nd tier trainer was the bad fit from moodle to mobile platform (for smartphones or tablets). However even with those minor problems, the moodle was considered a robust environment to elearning.</p>

Recommendations

The Pilot process ended with great results. The adaptation of the previous curriculum (from VET4 project) and the procedures taken in the Pilot phase showed some remarkable accomplishments.

The adaptation of the curriculum and the previous delimitation of procedures used on the Pilot phase exhibited a great performance. The first point to highlight was the flexibility presented by the several approaches possible to organize the learning. We used a full e-learning approach, a semi b-learning approach (with as initial meeting among several participants), and a b-learning approach with two face-a-face units. The second point to highlight was the flexibility achieved at the pace of learning. That flexibility, was gained in part by the learning environment (the moodle), which can be easily altered. The third, and last point to be highlighted was the assessment approach. The adopted model had different tools for assessment as practical tasks, forum debate, work presentation, self-assessment tests, and final exam. These multiplicity of different tools allowed supervise the entire process of learning, identify where the main difficulties attempted by the 2nd tier trainers are, and identify whether those difficulties was caused by the gap between the previous knowledge and need imposed by the content or by the pace adopt on the training.

After highlight those three points, we would like to provide some recommendations for future trainings:

- **meet the expectations:** this recommendation is related to how to do the publication of the curriculum and the training. Is important that people who will actually do this learning know clearly what will be the content, the previous knowledge required, and the level of commitment recommended for all participants.
- **foster commitment:** this recommendation is related to the model of the training. Good results were accomplished with the b-learning model. This recommendation does not invalidate the e-learning model, which can reach a large audience, and can increase the flexibility of the training. However, the e-learning model is facing a higher rate of dropout and a high pressure on the 1st tier trainer (the trainers or tutors) and the 2nd tier trainers (the trainees) who need more discipline and commitment than in other model of training.
- **correct the flow:** this recommendation is related with the pace of training. Sometimes it is necessary to adjust the pace of the process regarding the 2nd tier trainers' needs. Those needs can be related with keeping the deadlines of assessments or more time to review all the content. Change of the pace can be

the difference between everyone concluding the module and a high rate of failure/dropout.

- **a fair workload:** this recommendation is related to the total of hours that will be necessary to implement the training. The workload from the previous curriculum (VET4 curriculum) proved not to be adequate for the transfer in our project. The major part of the 2nd tier trainers reported to have spent more than five hours on each learning unit. Another issue is the recognition process. These modules, as part of the VET curriculum, need to respect the mandatory workload described in the VET catalogue of the respective countries. Thus it is important to align the workload to the needs of the 2nd tier trainers plus the VET catalogue. We recommend approximately 50 hours for each module.
- **granted certification:** this recommendations is related to the certification received after the conclusion of the modules. The higher-ranking the certification, the higher is the desire demonstrated by all participants to successfully finish the training. The opportunity to participate in certificated trainings, without or at low cost, could reduce the rate of dropout.

Last but not least, some advice for future training. The first advice is related to the content and the workload. Having a lot of content does not necessarily imply providing a good training. The second advice is that the content available online through links must be revised from time to time. The third advice is to spend efforts on erasing mistakes in the module content. The spelling, grammar, and semantics have to be correct, and the content must be truthful, to show respect to the learner and not to ask him/her to complete a deficient curriculum. The fourth advice is that the assessments must be fair. Auxiliary content is auxiliary and optional for the 2nd tier trainers, therefore this content cannot be included in the assessment. At the end be aware of all matters brought up by the 2nd tier trainers. The 2nd tier trainers are e-facilitators and their experience are important to improve our curriculum with new approach and content. These set of knowledge, embedded on this tools of e-inclusion and e-literacy, will be responsible to a great number of new citizens. The true citizens from the twenty first century.