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I. Introduction

Our research aimed a) to identify the perceptions of continuous professional development (CPD) providers about what counts as good practice in blended learning and b) to make recommendations concerning the essential features of effective blended learning in CPD that will be transferred to the results of the Blended Learning in Teachers’ Professional Development (BleTeach) project. The leading question of our research is, therefore, “What is CPD training providers’ perception about good practice in blended learning?” and, more specifically,

- What are some highly effective combinations of face-to-face and e-learning components within a CPD for learners’ (i.e. teachers’) motivation, interaction and learning outcomes?
- What are the instructional design patterns (learning/teaching scenarios) are used in blended learning courses?
- What are the major success factors in implementing blended learning within CPD?
- What are the major obstacles/ threats and ways of overcoming them in implementing blended learning within CPD?
- In courses that are considered good practice (in terms of blended learning CPD) what kind of evaluation was used?

II. Methodology related information (description of how data was collected)

We applied a four-stage methodology, which gradually provided the data that allowed us to provide answers to the specific research questions.

In stage 1, the purpose was to contact tertiary education institutions that provide CPD-courses for in-service teachers. In order to get in contact with these institutions we used the phone/mailing list of teacher training colleges and universities. The Administration Office of PAE provided us the names and availabilities of administration office heads and/or deans of these higher education institutions. As we already used this tool to promote ISIT project at these institutions when recruiting participants for that project, and it was very efficient, therefore this tool seemed to be reliable again, this time with BleTeach project. We also contacted two CPD provider institutions that are not higher education institutions. We contacted 28 higher education institutions and conducted 17 interviews by telephone either with the head of the administration office or the head of the institution (see Anex 1). We prepared an official letter containing the leading questions of our research (see Anex 2) in case the institution has any experience in the field of blended courses, we could send it to them.

In stage 2 we used the online source containing all accredited in-service teacher training courses. We were searching for blended courses on the official website of accredited courses (www.oktatas.hu/tovabbkepeses/pedakkred). There are blended courses offered here, most of them run by HIERD. They are as follows:

- Preparing education advisors for supporting institutions in interprofessional groups
- Training education advisors to advise principals
- Supportive assessment in practice
- Teaching learning to learn in secondary schools
In stage 3 we interviewed two lecturers at the Pedagogical Faculty of our university (back then Kecskemét College Teacher Training Faculty) about whom we knew had either taken part in a blended course or was a member of an EU project designing one.

In stage 4 we collected information based on articles and publications in the field of blended courses. There is a good example in pre-service teacher training at Esterházy Károly College, Eger. We analysed this good practice using the article describing it. The other source that we found relevant was written as a thorough guideline for providers of CPD blended courses on how to design a blended course for a successful accreditation. This document gives recommendations on several aspects of in-service teacher training blended courses based on experiences of experts of distant courses. The document was funded and published by the Educational Authority, the body responsible for all teacher training courses in Hungary.

III. Findings

III.1. Blended courses in CPD in tertiary education

We interviewed representatives (heads of the administration office, vice deans) of 15 higher education institutions offering in-service teacher training courses. Only one from the respondents answered positively when we asked about the existence of blended learning courses. We sent an e-mail to the person who said to us during the interview on the phone they had a blended course. The letter contained all our questions, but we did not receive any further response. All the others (14) answered that their institutions do not offer blended courses. Although they offer distant courses, it means that participants of the courses have to appear in person on a regular basis (most often every second week) for certain number of hours. In between they have to prepare at home using course materials the course provides for them. However, it is not online.

We also contacted two institutions that are not higher education ones. One of them, the Catholic Pedagogical Institute (offering its advisory, training etc. services for all Catholic schools all over the country) was just planning to introduce such a course. They were considering designing a blended learning course, therefore we sent our letter to them, however, no response was received afterwards.

III.2. Accredited courses

- In-service teacher training is centralised in Hungary. It is centrally organised, controlled and financed. According to 2011 year CXC Act on School Education 62 § (1) paragraph in every 7 years further training is compulsory for teachers. There is a list of trainings which can be used for this purpose. The list of accredited trainings is available on www.oktatas.hu/tovabbkepzes/pedakkred website, where the tuition fee for each training is published. Trainings are compulsory. The Educational Authority (OH) supervises the list of teacher in-service courses continuously updating it via the PedAkkred online system.
Registration is based on application, which means providing certain data on the course and paying an application fee. The above described situation is the reason why this list of trainings is the most reliable collection of CPD courses. Any course that teachers can apply for should be included in this list; all the courses have to provide a description about their content including the proportion of face-to-face or online lessons. We searched for the key word “literacy” and “content area literacy” on this list of trainings, then we read thoroughly the descriptions of those courses that are offered in this field. We found 7 courses meeting the requirements. Their blended elements are the following:
- some materials are offered on Moodle platform
- the (final) assignment has to be handed in through Moodle platform.
- We think these courses do not really match the definition of a blended learning course. Although there are certain online elements throughout the course, we do not think they can be regarded as blended courses.

III.3. Success factors

III.3.1 Good practice example at Károly Esterházy College, Eger

In 2002 Károly Esterházy College initiated an accredited e-learning/blended BA course, the Librarian and Information Scientist BA. A year before, in 2001 the college started to run a Virtual Centre for Individual Learning; lecturers and teachers adapted their course books into web-based learning tools. In 2004 a survey was conducted among all the students (78 students) about the course\(^1\). Based on this survey, a SWOT-analysis was done about the course. In the followings we summarise the outcomes of this survey.

Strengths:
- learning on an on-line platform takes much less time than learning from printed materials
- students appreciated the learning materials available on the website
- the most popular service was the mock tests (not chats, forums or consultation)
- interactive tests, distant learning course materials were very popular
- students had a very positive overall impression about the course

Weaknesses:
- two-thirds of the students used the printed learning materials
- students do not learn at a balanced pace, but they rather tend to have dense learning periods
- they do not take the advantage of on-line consultation
- students expect to be provided with all course materials; they do not search for any sources

Opportunities
- blended learning is an effective learning environment in the 21\(^{st}\) century
- new e-learning learning tools and materials should be developed

\(^1\) http://epa.oszk.hu/00000/00011/00088/pdf/iskolakultura_EPA00011_2004_12_123-139.pdf
students’ all activities can be followed and documented; not only their exams but even lessons they skipped

the system is flexible, multifunctional, easy to transform

The authors of the study emphasise the importance of the trainers/tutors: on the one hand, they have to be very good experts of their fields; on the other, they have to be open-minded and innovative people. Having an IT-expert available all the time is also crucially important.

Regarding the content and time management of the course, the authors emphasize that teaching materials are designed to have lessons short enough to be comprehended at one sit. The learning materials contain self-check sections, answer key and practical assignments. The style is informal with lot of dialogues.

The structure of this course has 6 phases.

1. Preparatory consultation: at the beginning of each term there is a face-to-face 3-day consultation, when students receive the learning materials for the term and access to the website.

2. Group meeting: introduction into the subjects students learn in the term, meeting with trainers, discussing the requirements of the term

3. Learning to learn support

4. Individual consultation: asking for help from the tutor (optional); Support by the tutor: evaluation and formative assessment of the assignments

5. Fulfilling the tasks of the term, completing the assignments

6. Exams: face-to-face phase at the college (summative assessment)

At the end of the term students fill in an evaluation questionnaire about the course.

III.3.2 Guidelines for blended course designers and providers

In 2015 the Educational Authority published a list of guidelines of blended CPD courses for providers in-services teacher training courses. This study contains recommendations of dos and don’ts for designing a successful blended learning course. The authors make a suggestion for a pattern of a 30-hour blended course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st phase</th>
<th>2nd phase</th>
<th>3rd phase</th>
<th>4th phase</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Starting with on-line part</td>
<td>6 lessons on-line</td>
<td>18 lessons face-to-face</td>
<td>6 lessons on-line</td>
<td>30 lessons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 week</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>1 week</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting with 6 lessons</td>
<td>9 lessons</td>
<td>6 lessons</td>
<td>9 lessons</td>
<td>30 lessons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### III.3.2.1 Recommendations

The guidelines for designing a successful blended learning CPD course give instructions on what to consider when planning such a course. The following items are listed in these guidelines:

- **ICT background:**
  - the target group, the participants should have basic ICT skills,
  - participants have a positive attitude towards digital tools or there is an optional ICT training before the blended course
  - their internet access should be fast enough;

- **requirements for the trainer and/or tutor:**
  - ideally, the trainer and the tutor is the same person; if not, their training, preparation for the course should happen simultaneously; the trainer should support the tutor and his/her authenticity by introducing his/her career, professional experience to the participants (who do not meet the tutor personally, just virtually); if it is possible, the participants should meet both the trainer and the tutor personally at a face-to-face meeting at the beginning of the course
  - both the trainer and the tutor should have previous experiences as animators
  - both the trainer and the tutor should have pedagogical qualifications and experiences as they have to motivate the participants to work at a high standard without any real power to punish for not doing so
  - the trainer and the tutor should have meetings on a regular basis
  - the tutor is mainly responsible for supporting the participants, the trainer is responsible for evaluating and assessing the participants
  - the tutor should feel personal responsibility for the participants’ success or failures; should do all the best to avoid any drop-out from the course

- **recommendations for the content of the course**
  - it is highly recommended to start a blended learning course with a face-to-face phase; it serves as a meeting where the participants can verbalise their doubts, anxieties; usually they do not expect an immediate response because they need the chance to talk about these issues
  - it is very important to inform the participants about the availability of the tutor and the dates of on-line forums, lessons
it is important to include forums, debates, chats in the content of the course so that interactivity and continuous work could be guaranteed

too many on-line tasks should be avoided

time management is highly important: during designing a course time allocation to each task is a crucial issue (including time for self-reflection/self-assessment); planning real time for each assignment is necessary to avoid demotivation

progress tests, progress assignments throughout the course are needed to maintain continuous learning process

using sources that are available on the internet guarantees that we use current sources and can spare time for the participants

pair work and group work should appear both in face-to-face and on-line phases

III.3. Success factors

Analysing the data we have gathered the following features can be identified as success factors.

The content of the blended course should be interesting, motivating, up-to-date and current. As there is a wide range of CPD courses, these courses literally compete for the participants. Teachers are obliged to take part in in-service teacher training, therefore they want to learn something that is really innovative and applicable in their practice.

The trainees’ motivation and commitment also counts a lot. It seems there are two extremes of the scale of participants who are interested in blended courses. It is either the young, freshly graduated teachers with little practical experience but good ICT skills, or the well-experienced, highly committed and motivated teachers who feel like taking the challenge of entering blended courses.

The trainers’/tutors’ or the provider’s professional background, authenticity, reputation is also an important factor. As there is less personal contact with the trainers/tutors in a blended course, their reliability, expertise should be well and widely known among the participants. There is less opportunity for the participants to be convinced about the trainers’/tutors’ expertise by themselves, involving experts of the field in the blended course can compensate for the lack of the personal conviction.

The teaching and learning resources of the course also have to be taken into consideration as a success factor. They should be designed so that they would be difficult to comprehend without any help, explanation; moreover, at certain points self-check parts or mock tests/exams are appreciated by participants. Extra materials should be offered and made available for the participants in case they would like to read or learn more about certain aspects of the training topics.

Time management and time frame of the blended course is also an important factor. Time and deadline related issues: a) blended learning courses save time otherwise spent away from home; b) the fact that the task can be set a firm deadline, after which there is no possibility to upload work helped the learners to submit their work in a timely manner. On the other hand, this type of training allows more flexibility regarding deadlines. Tutors may set up new deadlines if the participant misses to hand in an assignment.

The tutor or the trainer should be really available all the time, and an ICT expert should also be involved throughout the training to give technical support.
Interactivity in the whole group and in subgroups of the participants is of key importance. It is what designers and providers of blended courses highly emphasize, however, participants are not very keen on. They feel that it is not very real-life like that they comment on everything they “hear” or read.

The opportunity of choosing from different kinds of assignments and/or selecting certain assignments the participants want to do research about is a success factor. The individualised/personalised nature of assignments is appreciated by the participants.

The fee of the training is also an issue. Financial aspects of participation in the course, while pointed out by the trainers as strong motivators, do not relate directly to the blended learning nature of the course, and should be interpreted in the socio-cultural context of the country.

III.4. Major obstacles

The perceived obstacles, as expected, are relative to ICT skill mastery of the learners and the technical aspects of accessibility of the e-platforms.

To compensate for modest ICT skills, guidelines for providing blended courses offer to have preparatory course to introduce the platform for the participants and give them a chance to familiarise themselves with it. It is also an occasion to ask questions about the technological/technical aspect of the training. According to experienced trainers, it is very important for participants of blended courses to have a chance to verbalise their worries, anxiety about the technical aspects of the training.

Prompt, even around-the-clock technical assistance can be of help in case of technical glitches (e.g. when the platform does not operate properly).

III.5. Evaluation

In terms of evaluation, good practice seems to imply good formative assessment, ample monitoring and of constructive/corrective feedback.

IV. Conclusions and recommendations

In conclusion, for a successful blended learning course, it depends on the topic of the course what ratio of face-to-face vs online time to allocate; the previous experience or lack of such experience of participants is also very important. Another aspect to take into consideration is how important it is to have a personal dimension in the course, if it counts a lot, the course should start with a longer face-to-face section. Time-related factor; obstacles relate to ICT skills and technical aspects of the platform are important; formative assessment during the on-line phase is the most ideal way of evaluation, but summative assessment at the end of the course is advised to be carried out in a face-to-face phase. This way the trainer/tutor gets real and reliable feedback on how deeply the content of the training is interiorised among the participants.

Therefore, for a successful blended learning course, BleTeach course developers should take into account the above findings, and especially the following recommendations:
- for timely completion of the online tasks, time allocation should be considered carefully, not many on-line tasks should be given within a short time;
- ensure prompt technical support;
- invest time in the beginning of the course to make sure that participants can use the platform;
- develop a user-friendly interface, which is not cluttered, and which allows easy orientation;
- have well-known trainers/tutors with high expertise who provide ample, specific constructive feedback; they have to be motivated to feel responsible for the participants and/or any drop-outs;
- use teaching/learning resources that are motivating, interesting, are adjusted to e-learning needs;
- let participants work in pairs, subgroups (not only in the whole group), make the course collaborative;
- let participants have some choice of certain subtopics within the training and provide the extra sources about the topics;
- conduct face-to-face final evaluation for clear communication/observation of learning outcomes.
V. Annexes

V.1. Annex 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution contacted</th>
<th>The person talked to</th>
<th>Blended course</th>
<th>E-mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Széchenyi István Egyetem Apáczai Csere János Kar</td>
<td>Dr. Gróz Andrea</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Sent, no answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Apor Vilmos Katolikus Főiskola</td>
<td>Könnyi Boglárka Márta</td>
<td>No, only face-to-face courses</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Nyugat-magyarországi Egyetem, Művészeti, Nevelés- és Sporttudományi Kar</td>
<td>Heszteráné dr. Ekler Judit Vice Dean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Pécsi Tudományegyetem Illyés Gyula Kar</td>
<td>Müller János</td>
<td>No, only face-to-face courses</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Kaposvári Egyetem, Pedagógiai Kar</td>
<td>Kalló Anikó</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Debreceni Egyetem Gyermeknevelési és Felnőttképzési Kar</td>
<td>Virágné Elek Piroska head of the admin.office</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. ELTE Tanító- és Óvóképző Kar</td>
<td>responsible: Dr. Serfőző Mónika</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes, the answer is: no blended courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. EJF Neveléstudományi Kar Tanulmányi és Felnőttképzési Központ</td>
<td>Letenovicsné Polyák Andrea head of the admin.office</td>
<td>No; distant courses but based on face-to-face meetings</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Károli Gáspár Református Egyetem Tanítóképző Főiskolai Kar</td>
<td>Dr. Méhes Balázs dékánhelyettes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Nyugat-magyarországi Egyetem Benedek Elek Pedagógiai Kar</td>
<td>Dr. Patyi Gábor</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Pázmány Péter Katolikus</td>
<td>head of admin. office</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Institute</td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egyetem Vitéz János Kar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Szegedi Tudományegyetem Juhász Gyula Pedagógusképző Kar</td>
<td>Head of Distant Learning Centre: Döbör András igazgató</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Szent István Egyetem Alkalmazott Bölcsészeti és Pedagógiai Kar Pedagógiai Intézet, Szarvas</td>
<td>Head of Distant Learning Centre: Nagy Jenőné secretary: Varga Erzsébet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Szent István Egyetem Alkalmazott Bölcsészeti és Pedagógiai Kar Jászberény</td>
<td>Head of Admin. Office: Terjék Lászlóné or lecturer responsible for CPD: Dr. Sinka Annamária</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Eszterházy Károly Főiskola Comenius Kar</td>
<td>Vice Dean Dr. Nagy György</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Nyíregyházi Főiskola</td>
<td>Head of the Institute Jenei Teréz (lower primary) Szabó Antal (secondary) Kerülıő Judit (vice dean)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Katolikus Pedagógiai Szervezési és Továbbképzési Intézet</td>
<td>Head: Barcsák Marianna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Eduweb Multimédia Zrt.</td>
<td>Address: Budapest, Galagonya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tisztelt Hölgyem/ Urám!

Egészségedre, hogy a Kecskeméti Főiskola Tanítóképző Főiskolai Karának dekánaként egy kutatásban való közreműködésre kérjem fel Önt!

Karunk egy nemzetközi projektben (BleTeach - Blended Learning, a tanártovábbképzésben) nemzeti jelentést készít jó gyakorlatokról és koncepciókról blended típusú tanártovábbképzési kurzusokban. A blended típusú képzés azt jelenti, hogy részben távoktatással, e-learning képzéssel, részben személyes találkozókkal valósul meg a továbbképzés.

Van-e az Önnek intézményében blended (vegyes típusú) képzés?

☐ van
☐ nincs

Kérem, amennyiben van az Ön intézményében blended (vegyes típusú) képzés, válaszoljon a levél mellettetében található néhány kérdésre!

Válaszai a szintezveronika@tk.kefo.hu vagy a balazsae.lado@tk.kefo.hu e-mail címre legyen szíves visszaküldeni 2016. április 8-ig!

Kecskemét, 2016. március 18.

Közreműködését és segítségét köszönve tisztelettel:

Prof. Dr. Steklacs János
deán
**V.3. Annex 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Blended learning CPD course (title)</th>
<th>Mehr Autonomie für die Lehrer/More Autonomy for the Learner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General information about the course provider</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full name</td>
<td>Goethe Institut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Gauting, Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web address</td>
<td><a href="http://www.goethe.de/lhr/prj/fid/fbp/mdf/de14567873.htm">http://www.goethe.de/lhr/prj/fid/fbp/mdf/de14567873.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee</td>
<td>Norberta Sági, PhD, participant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email address/ phone number</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sagi.norberta@tfk.kefo.hu">sagi.norberta@tfk.kefo.hu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Detailed description of the blended learning CPD course</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Information about the trainees**                     | The trainees are primary/secondary school teachers or college lecturers of German language and literature. They are selected based on their registration for a 1-, 2- or 3-week course. During the registration, applicants have to choose 3 courses, and explain and give reasons why they think those are interesting for them, how they would use the training in their everyday practice, how it would support their professional career. Based on this information, the course providers select those who can participate in each course.

Their teaching experience varies from 1 year till 15 years of practice. They teach a wide range of target groups from elementary school children till adults, from groups of few students to classes of 70 students (e.g. in Ivory Coast that is the min. number of a class). |

| Description of the course (topic, learning objectives, instructional design patterns, ratio face-to-face vs online, methods, etc.) | The course is about learners’ autonomy, supporting individual learning with ICT methods, learners’ types, learning strategies and techniques.

The training has 3 phases: a 2-week online phase, a 2-week summer school (in Germany), a 1-week online phase.

1st phase:

1st week: creating a profile with a photo; introducing themselves (ending if-sentences about themselves); a poll about using formal or informal ways of communication

2nd week: introduction into the topic

- they were put into groups of 6; each group was allocated a topic to; they had to read a study on the topic and make a summary; it was a collaborative writing task
- they had to write a summary about their experiences in the field of the training, including their expectations from the training; the trainees had to comment on 3 summaries, plus answer the comments they received
- they had to write an essay about using Wikipedia in German as a foreign language lessons; whether they have ever used it or not; why. They also had to read a study on the topic.
- making a mind-map about learner’s autonomy was an optional task. All these tasks were public for the whole group.
- organizational tasks: preparation for the summer school (arrival, what to pack, introduction of the venue; assignment: to be prepared to introduce everyone’s home country) |
2\textsuperscript{nd} phase: summer school in Gauting, Germany 3-16, July 2016: face-to-face part of the course; at the moment of writing this report the summer school is on.
3\textsuperscript{rd} phase: will be in October; participants have to apply what they have learnt at the training until then, and then report about the experiences (either a lesson plan or self-reflection).

| Trainees’ motivation | high standard of the trainings of Goethe Institute; the training is funded by the German state; all the participants are dedicated teachers of German as a foreign language |
| Trainees’ interaction (with the content, with their peers, with him/herself) | In the online part, participants could look at what the others uploaded, commented or wrote. The learners were expected to upload tasks assigned, on which the trainers provided feedback, so interaction was primarily with the trainer in written form. |
| Learning outcomes (targeted and achieved) | Still in progress. |
| Evaluation of the participants’ learning (methodology and results) | There was no evaluation in the on-line phase in the original sense of the word. Participants had to complete the tasks, if they were in delay, they were a bit urged. They received a certificate of attendance. |
| Evaluation of the course (methodology and results) | The online phase of the course was evaluated by the participants. The participants filled in a questionnaire, answered 5 questions. They were to rank on a scale from 1 to 6 certain elements of the course. |
| Success factors (perceived) | - highly engaged participants, who worked very hard; - the topic of the course is up-to-date: digital learning is a current issue - the provider has a high reputation (Goethe Institut) - during the online phase the tutors reacted frequently and thoroughly - not very time-consuming - the financial aspect was also a strong motivator; |
| Obstacles/ challenges and ways of overcoming (if that is the case) | Certain tasks were very time consuming. The summer school could have been shorter (7-10 days) ; the online phase a bit longer (one month). |

### V.4. Annex 4

| Blended learning CPD course (title) | INTACT (Interactive teaching materials across culture and technology) |
| General information about the course provider | |
| Full name | EU project |
| Address | - |
| Web address | http://www.intact-comenius.eu/ |
| Interviewee | Sarolta Lipóczi, HU national partner at the project |
| Email address/ phone number | lipoczi.sarolta@tfk.kefo.hu |
### Detailed description of the blended learning CPD course

#### Information about the trainees (e.g. subjects taught, familiarity with ICT, group size)

The INTACT project (Interactive Teaching materials Across Culture and Technology) is a multilateral Comenius project under the Lifelong Learning program of the European Commission which addresses schools’ need to engage with current technological developments in student teaching and learning. The project, which ran from December 2012 to November 2015, aimed to develop adequate teaching and learning materials in the subject areas of mathematics, geography, technology, natural and social sciences, environmental education and second language learning. These materials will be used on a variety of platforms such as whiteboards, tablets, smartphones and other mobile devices in order to promote a culture of interactive, collaborative learning among students.

Interactive materials within the above listed educational areas were developed by experts from six European partner nations - Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Portugal, Romania and Spain and were tested in pilot schools by classroom teachers. In order to facilitate the implementation of the materials in classrooms, they have been developed in accordance with the national curricula of all the partner countries.

So in the first round those experts who developed the materials trained pilot teachers of schools where the resources were implemented. In 6 countries it meant cca. 15 pilot teachers. First there was a face-to-face meeting where the resources and the platform were introduced to them, then they practised using these tools on their own. Finally they had to write an evaluation about the resource.

The Portuguese partner developed a CPD course for teachers to make them familiar with the platform. In the followings I will introduce that training concept.

#### Description of the course (topic, learning objectives, instructional design patterns, ratio face-to-face vs online, methods, etc.)

In recent years, Web 2.0 tools have afforded teachers the opportunity to create, interact and collaborate both locally and across cultures in a virtual community. This has contributed to the increase of online information and virtual learning spaces. INTACT aims to connect schools from all over Europe in real time via an online platform, which supports students in 21st century European education.

Hence, initial training aims to introduce the INTACT platform as a learning environment that complements and transforms conventional educational processes. This training course addresses teacher reflection in the use of this new platform in conjunction with learning how to plan and develop learning units and lessons for a chosen target audience Training content:

1. Presentation of the INTACT project.
2. Presentation of the INTACT platform.
3. Our platform in today’s society.
4. The use of the platform by the partners of the consortium.
5. INTACT from the perspective of teachers, students and managers of each country.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-</td>
<td>Planning of a Learning Unit, Lessons and Learning Objects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-</td>
<td>Development of a Learning Unit, Lessons and Learning Objects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Objectives, content and metadata.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Learning Units:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Create Learning Unit, Lessons and Learning Objects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Add tools to the Learning Unit;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Manage content of Learning Objects;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) Add videos, documents, polls, discussion for audio and videoconferencing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e) Add tests and quizzes;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f) Search Learning Objects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Learning units with bilingual collaboration for cross-cultural settings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Manage users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Administration of courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Other information and administration options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-</td>
<td>Assessment and surveys.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Trainees’ motivation**

The trainees were motivated because the course was closely related to what they have to do in the CEQA; they had to do observations in preparation for ARACIP evaluations (external evaluation). At that time, the topic was new and people did not know how to do internal quality management and evaluation. Many of the trainees, whose ICT skills were good (somewhat over half) were delighted at the opportunity to attend a blended learning course (and save time), but there were also other participants who did not appreciate the blended learning.

**Trainees’ interaction (with the content, with their peers, with him/herself)**

The trainees can interact with each other very well on the platform; there are video conference, chat and forum functions. They can share their resources with each other. Moreover, as being collaborative is a priority in the project, cooperative tasks are appreciated in the resources. Not only teachers, but students (even in different countries) have to carry out tasks together.

**Learning outcomes (targeted and achieved)**

The first part of the training session is concerned with the presentation, characterization and assessment of the project as well as with the presentation of the Learning Units and Lessons created by the consortium.

The second part of the session will be based on the planning process and development of a Learning Unit and respective lessons and metadata.

The third part will address the support necessary for the development of a Learning Unit within the scope of the subject area of the trainer.

Finally, the fourth and last part of the session will address usage of the Learning Unit, Lessons and Learning Objects.

4 sessions X 4 hours

Session 1: Trainees will have the opportunity to ask questions and clarify information on the project.
| Evaluation of the participants’ learning (methodology and results) | The assessment should be continuous, comprising of both formative and summative evaluation. The assessment methodology should focus on the activities proposed in the usage or exploration of the INTACT platform, as well as the presentation of results obtained by the creation of a Learning Unit, Lessons and Learning Objects. The summative assessment of the targeted competences will focus on:
  a) Activities proposed and critical analyses completed by trainees in individual reflections (50%);
  b) Construction of a Learning Unit, Lessons and Learning Objects within the scope of the chosen subject area (50%).

The quantitative assessment of the trainees is to be carried out according to the terms of the circular letter (this should be filled according to each country assessment). |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of the course (methodology and results)</td>
<td>One course was run in Portugal, but no information about the evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success factors (perceived)</td>
<td>- the content of the course was up-to-date and very much appreciated;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obstacles/ challenges and ways of overcoming (if that is the case)</td>
<td>Obstacles pertained to the participants’ ability to use computers and to the availability and quality of the Internet connection.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V.5. Annex 5. Research methodology

Aim of the research

Our research aims to identify CPD providers perceptions about good practice in blended learning and to make recommendations concerning the essential features of effective blended learning in CPD that will transferred to BleTeach.

The main question of the research is:

1. What is the (CPD) training provider’s perception about good practice in blended learning?

More specifically,

- What are some highly effective combinations of face-to-face and e-learning components within a CPD for learners’ (i.e. teachers’) motivation, interaction and learning outcomes?
- What are the instructional design patterns (learning/teaching scenarios) are used in blended learning courses?
- What are the major success factors in implementing blended learning within CPD?
- What are the major obstacles/ threats and ways of overcoming them in implementing blended learning within CPD?
- In courses that are considered good practice (in terms of blended learning CPD) what kind of evaluation was used?

Structure of the national report

1. Methodology related information (description of how data was collected)

2. Findings – answers to the specific research questions: highly effective combinations of face-to-face and e-learning components within a CPD for learners’ (i.e. teachers’) motivation, interaction and learning outcomes, instructional design patterns, success factors, major obstacles, evaluation.

3. Conclusions and recommendations

4. Annexes (stage 2 tables)