



	REPORT SHEET ON PILOT ACTIVITIES
FIELD THEME	
Identity	
PLACE, DATE, TIME OF SESSION	
Gdansk, UM: 30.3.2015 13:00 – 15:00	
TARGET GROUP, NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS	
Teachers, 13 participants, Adult trainers (GCPU), 2 participants	
OBJECTIVE OF THE SESSION (WHAT DID WE WANT TO ACHIEVE)	
(1) Test good practices; (2) Train trainers; (3) Evaluate the good practices of the D-ID project.	
METHODS USED (ILLUSTRATE WITH IMAGES WHEN POSSIBLE)	
Tat good practice, Who are you until now good practice, C2C (light version) good practice	
REACTIONS - OBSERVATIONS – EVALUATIONS: WHAT ADVANTAGES AND RISKS OF THE METHOD HAVE WE FOUND?	
<p>The additional good practice, Tat, was received with curiosity. It was seen as a good addition to the good practices that were tested out in the D-ID project by the teachers, including Who are you and a didactics based on the C2C (light version) good practice.</p> <p>The didactics and Who are you until now good practices were very highly rated by the teachers as having made a difference in the contact between teachers and students. Not only was the atmosphere during and after the D-ID implementation better, also teachers and students had shown themselves from a different, far more private side, that ensured more trust.</p>	



On the other hand, two of the students present, felt encouraged by the good practices to state their honest opinion on the good practices and D-ID workshop effects. These opinions were critical of the default atmosphere in the class room. This openness was punished by the teachers present from that school after the meeting. The openness was seen to contradict the role of the students as ambassadors of the school. This triggered an intervention by the trainers present at the March 30 meeting.

ANY FURTHER OBSERVATIONS