

**Minutes from
TRAINING OF TRAINERS (2.part)
with evaluation**

–

Modra, 14. - 16.May 2012

Facilitators:

- Ankie van den Broek
- Margret Steixner

Participants:

- Juraj Jančovič
- Monica O'Mullane
- Alexandra Bražinová
- Marek Majdan
- Adriana Ondrušová
- Zuzana Fialová
- Ondrej Botek
- Kristína Grendová
- Ladislav Bučko
- Alena Uričková
- Eva Nemčovská
- Mária Kvaková
- Adéla Novotná
- Ján Bodo

Day 1: 14.05.2012

- **Opening:** welcoming trainers and participants (Juraj Jančovič)

- **Introduction:** all members introduced themselves by thing what they found in their pockets

- **Important objectives of the course:**
 - Having the knowledge, skills, attitude of effective training methods
 - Using effective ways to reflect on training sessions
 - To pay attention to cross cutting themes in training sessions and the entire course

- **Focus of the training:** MICROTECHING

- **Ground rules:** the rules from last training were used
- **Activity 1: “World cafe”** - Sparring partner teaching
 - Giving the reflection to the partner and group; sharing the opinions and methods, members were encouraged to put the ideas on the table
 - Members were divided into three groups and three key table keepers were specified
 - Groups changed all tables in some time and answered special questions regarding following main topics:
 1. **Methods** – group found out the use of new methods
 2. **Learners** – students in the class were surprised about supervision, most of them acted normally but some enjoyed the new methods
 3. **Collaboration** – trainers learn a lot when they were with new partner (not those who used to work together), they did not feel the support in sparring partner because it was not co-teaching and some of trainers felt fear and responsibility of their performance

- **Activity 2: “Self- assessment benchmark – using a SWOT analysis”**

Inside:	Strength	Weakness
Outside:	Opportunities	Threats

- All members of the group needed to write down their personal SWOT analysis in 5 minutes to answer three key questions (Where am I now? Where do I want to be? How do I get there?) which are important for any planned change process
- Group members build their two own expectation to the course based on the analysis and set criteria for evaluation of these expectations
- Each member shared one expectation+criteria with his sparring partner
- **Levels of impact of training** (short lecture)
 - There are different levels of outcome (personal, from others, society,...)
 - For this course two levels of impacts were determined:
 1. Straight after the course
 2. After returning to work
- **Activity 3: “Objectives”**
 - Each member of the group wrote down the personal objectives (what members want to learn during this course) which were formulate on their expectation built in the previous activity (activity 2)
 - Members put their objectives together and grouped them; the main objectives were: motivation, listening, timing, using new methods
 - Personal learning objectives were linked to ToT objectives

- Point for future work: participants need to reflect after the course their objectives according to levels of impact of training!

- **Activity 4: “Rules for Microteaching”**

- The ground rules were set down for learning environment:

- Be open
 - Encourage each other
 - Be focused
 - Be curious
 - Be courageous
 - Be respectful
- } Respect our learning environment
↓
Framework for feedback

- There were two observers in the group who created the observation list and gave the written feedback to the trainer leading the microteaching

- **Microteaching session - Prof. Ladislav Bučko – Inter-religious dialog**

- Aim: to know about other religions, identify similarities among them in order to develop a dialog as a partners

1. Hinduism, 2. Buddhism, 3. Judaism, 4. Islam, 5. Christianity – key words finding

- play – finding similar features and differences among randomly chosen religions – group work

- pointing out the core leaders, literature, sources, Gods, goals, ways of living.

- conclusion, self-evaluation by Laco – he expressed dissatisfaction with his class for lack of experience (1st or 2nd time he did this only)

- students feedback –

- Adéla – interesting, brainstorming made us think, inspiring,
- Ondro – surprised how little information he knew about religions,
- Marek – very nice lecture, was not bored, kept his attention high,
- Jano – interesting, 3 parts lecture each one completing the previous one.

- observers –

- Monica - positive feeling, felt a bit Lacos beginning nervousness, advised Laco to keep the time better for the sake of the students, sequence of the methods was perfect, to prepare the rules of the game on the board at the beginning.
- Ankie – facilitator – student interaction was balanced, safe atmosphere, no arrogance at all, positive teaching methods, advised to shorten the game span (the space for writing down the answers)

- **Energizer**

- **Activity “River of development”**
 - emphasising on cross-cutting issues – gender, human rights, rights based approach, cultural sensitivity.
 - mainstreaming – river of development – along with development “stream”, gender, rights based approach, cultural sensitivity “streams” are forming one “multicoloured river“..
 - every session of the training should include these crosscutting issues
- **Activity “Reviewing topic sheets”** for inclusion of crosscutting issues
 - groupwork – identifying these issues in all 7 modules of the Training – results presentation
 - discussion - to implement more crosscutting issues in the modules + accessibility, equity and human rights.
 - Juraj inform that the students won't receive the topic sheets of the modules – discussion
 - Recommendation – to personalize with the crosscutting issues and include them visibly and clearly in the program / topic sheets.

Day 2: 15.05.2012

- Opening of the morning session
- Energizer – throwing a red ball from one to another to wake up

Quality assurance session

- **Activity - Work with the: „*The role of formative assessment in effective learning environments*“**, (article, pieces of paper, markers; individual work)
 - Facilitator: Margret
 - Reverse emphasizing of the text:
 - Fast reading of 1 – 2 page/s per participant,
 - Blacking out not important parts of the text,
 - Presenting the most important phrases (what was not blacked out from the text),
 - Rewriting the phrases on separate pieces of paper,
 - Discussion on the brief.
- **Activity – “Basic criteria of quality assurance of the training”**
(flipchart, markers; brainstorming)
 - Facilitator: Ankie

- Question: *“What are the basic criteria of quality assurance?”*,
 - Group brainstorming: technical professionals, trained teachers, adult learning, updated materials, assessment included (during + after), entrance criteria, venue/learning environment, certificates (accreditation).
- **Activity – “Training quality assurance system”**
 - how and when to assess/evaluate during the training, (Flipchart)
 - Juraj Jančovič and Alexandra Bražinová were presenting the system which will be used for the quality assessment of the training. (see photo-documentation).
- **Activity – “Micro-teaching”**
 - Juraj Jančovic – Directive and Supportive Approach
 - Brainstorming
 - Scaling - The most and the least directive approaches to facilitation such as lecture, coaching or guidance
 - Mária Kvaková – Determinants of Health
 - Lecture
 - Story
 - Brainstorming
 - Alena Uríčková – Prejudices
 - Lecture
 - Balloon exercise
 - Eva Nemčovská - Introduction to epidemiology
 - Lecture lasted 20 minutes and then
 - test with clickers to verify the lecture - 15 minutes. After each question was evaluation as well as throughout the test. At the end of the microteaching each of participants gave Eva feedback and Margaret also gave Eva feedback to her microteaching.
 - Marek Majdan - facilitated discussion on the topic: Environmental factors of health.
 - Participants had to write first three things that they have in mind when they hear topic.
 - Than they had to determine whether is it a source of infection or vector of disease.
 - Than participants had to determine which component of environment (water, air, soil) it is associated.
 - At the end of the microteaching each of participants gave Marek feedback and Ankie also gave Marek feedback to her microteaching.
 - Monica O’Mullane - Main principles of Community development.
 - Monika began with ice-breaker when everyone had to say the first letter of his name and some characteristic.

- Than Monika showed short video to participants, then brainstorming and presentation associated with discussion.
- Tasks for the discussion in couple were:
 - 1) think of one example of a community
 - 2) please describe it (geographical, cultural, etc.).
 - 3) name two needs that your group may have
 - 4) how your group would take action to respect this need.

The conclusion was again ice-breaker with letters. At the end of the microteaching each of participants gave Monica feedback and Ankie and Margaret also gave Monica feedback to her microteaching.

- **Activity “Daily reflection”** (Margret)
 - What participants LIKE and DISLIKE, what are HIGH LIGHTS and about GROUP DYNAMICS and SHORTCOMMINGS of the training.

Day 3: 16.05.2012

- **Activity “Facilitator versus Teacher”**
 - When? What? How?
- **Activity “Adult Learning”**
 - Important is that participants should learn from each other and from you
 - Important is that you are able to switch from teacher to facilitator
- **Activity “Round of: Remind Blooms Taxonomy”**
 - somebody has still missing the message of topic
- **Activity “Round Table”**
 - When I was teacher/ facilitator I did this (every participants comment) ;
- **Activity “Micro-teaching”**
 - Jan Bodo: First Aid (interactive lecture)
 - Adriana Ondrušová: Malnutrition (lecture)
 - Zuzana Fialová: Development effectiveness (group presentation + exercise)
- **Activity “Rounding up of Micro-teaching”** (evaluation)
 - ... what do NGO want to learn from us ...
 - ... discussion about curriculum development ...
 - ... feedback by modeling clay – how was a challenging from the past ...

Training of trainers workshop (2.part) was subjected to evaluation by attendants. The evaluation was divided into 3 parts:

- the first two with items scored from 1 (excellent) to 6 (not relevant),
- the last part provided a space for free text to note comments, suggestions, etc.

Results

The first part, focused on formal attributes:

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Presentations skills of the speakers	6	4	1	0	0	0
Used materials - review, handout, slides	3	5	2	0	0	0
Organization of the event	10	1	0	0	0	0
Relevance of the event to participants profession	6	2	3	0	0	0

Second part, focused on contents:

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Sparring partnership / SWOT analysis	2	7	1	0	0	0
Cross-cutting issues in the training	4	4	2	0	0	0
Micro teaching	8	3	0	0	0	0
Quality assurance	5	4	1	0	0	0

Third part collected comments and suggestions regarding the event or the project.

Here are some comments & suggestions from participants:

- Micro teaching was great, it was very good for me to get feedback on my performance and to get inspiration from other 's sessions.

- What I really enjoyed is the way you have stressed out the importance of cross-cutting issues.

- Well organized and useful training with inspiring sessions.

- There is a need to follow up and build up on achieved experience. I would welcome another training like this one to take place in close future.

- Sustainability of the project would be great, warm rooms as well.

Minutes written by:

Mária Kvaková, Ján Bodo, Adéla Novotná, Kristína Grendová, Eva Nemčovská

Workshop has been part of the project funded
with support from the European Commission.

