




|  |   |
|--|---|
|   | <b>REPORT SHEET ON PILOT ACTIVITIES</b> |
| <b>FIELD THEME</b>   |   |
| Identity   |   |
| <b>PLACE, DATE, TIME OF SESSION</b>  |   |
| Gdansk, GCPU, 7.10.2014, 10:00 – 15:30   |   |
| <b>TARGET GROUP, NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS</b>  |   |
| Teachers, 9 participants<br>Adult trainer (GCPU), 1 participant  |   |
| <b>OBJECTIVE OF THE SESSION (WHAT DID WE WANT TO ACHIEVE)</b>  |   |
| (1) Test good practices;<br>(2) Train trainers;<br>(3) Introduce the good practices of the ID-EYE project  |   |
| <b>METHODS USED (ILLUSTRATE WITH IMAGES WHEN POSSIBLE)</b>   |   |
| Tat good practice, C2C (light version) good practice, B.E.L.S. good practice   |   |
| <b>REACTIONS - OBSERVATIONS – EVALUATIONS: WHAT ADVANTAGES AND RISKS OF THE METHOD HAVE WE FOUND?</b>  |   |
| <p>The meeting was structured according to the B.E.L.S. good practice. The Tat good practice was used as a part of the brainstorm session. The C2C (light version) as a support for the interactive didactics during the meeting – and in the ID-EYE project.</p> <p>The three sentences were seen as not too simple to implement because many participants felt they might undermine their authority as teachers. Nevertheless all were open to try them out.</p> <p>Many teachers were already employing a kind of interactive didactics and the full attention good practice was seen as a logical addition to their activities, although one that would be</p> |   |



difficult to sustain in a class with over 25 students.

During the evaluation (step 5) it was reported by all teachers that the didactics had resulted in enthusiastic students.

**ANY FURTHER OBSERVATIONS**