Evaluation of the Tutors‘ Training in Stuttgart
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## Schedule of the Tutors' Training (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity Area of a Tutor</th>
<th>Trainer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, 4th November</td>
<td>Opening, introduction and organisational issues</td>
<td>Prof. Dr. Nickolaus/Stephan Abele</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum designing and development of the study programme</td>
<td>Dr. Odeta Gurskiene (Kaunas, Lithuania)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, 5th November</td>
<td>Opening</td>
<td>Stephan Abele</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vocational teacher education</td>
<td>Mr. Well/Mr. Beutenmüller (Stuttgart, Germany)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>Dr. Odeta Gurskiene (Kaunas, Lithuania)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Schedule of the Tutors' Training (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity Area of a Tutor</th>
<th>Trainer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, 6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; November</td>
<td>Opening</td>
<td>Stephan Abele</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management of curriculum implementation</td>
<td>Dr. Riitta Metsänen (Hämeenlinna, Finland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, 7&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; November</td>
<td>Opening</td>
<td>Stephan Abele</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality assurance of the study programme</td>
<td>Mr. Well/Mr. Beutenmüller (Stuttgart, Germany)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Final discussion/ Evaluation of the training and the training programme</td>
<td>Dr. Odeta Gurskiene (Kaunas, Lithuania)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questionnaire – Feedback on the Tutors‘ Training

• Part 1:
  closed questions covering predictors of successful learning (based on empirical findings of teaching/learning research)
  → quality indicators

• Part 2:
  Participants‘ feedback on training and training programme
Questionnaire – Part 1: Evaluation

- Training atmosphere: 4.8
- Trainers' expertise: 4.5
- Appropriate support: 4.5
- Link between training and prior knowledge/experience: 4.3
- Methods: 4.25
- Clarity of illustrations and explanations: 4.2
- Adaptivity: 4.17
- Clarity of expectations: 3.9
Questionnaire – Part 1: Evaluation

- Possibilities of exchange between participants: 4.7
- Sufficient opportunities for discussions: 4.6
- Sufficient amount of exercises and examples: 4.2
- Possibility to discuss personal professional concerns: 4.1
- Good balance of theory and practice: 4.0
- Relation to practical problems: 4.0
- Topic relevance was made clear: 3.8
Questionnaire – Part 2: Evaluation

“To what extent did the training meet your expectations?”

- Overall the training has met the expectations (2x)
- Objectives of the whole training was not clear, a continuous thread was missing (2x)
- Some parts were too theoretical (3x)
- Differences in the system of the countries poses difficulties to contribute to all topics
Questionnaire – Part 2: Evaluation

“How important was the training for your professional activities?”
• Training was helpful for the tutors’ practical experience and offered new ideas, perspectives and methods for their profession (7x)

“How helpful do you think the training will be for solving the practical problems of a tutor?”
• Training mostly offered helpful solutions (6x)
• Some topics were more helpful than others (4x) → different opinions
Questionnaire – Part 2: Evaluation

“Which topics that have been discussed in the training do you consider especially important for the activity areas of a tutor?”

• No particular topic – all are related and important (3x)
• Counselling of trainee teachers/ students (3x)
• Analysis of evaluation procedures and its practical conclusions

“In your opinion, which topics were missing in the training or should be strengthened?”

• Issues that were discussed were covered sufficient – no more space for further topics (3x)
• Counselling (subject-related aspects and career planning)
Questionnaire – Part 2: Evaluation

“Which topics do you think could be left out in the training?”
• None of the topics should have been left out (7x)
• Competencies
  – too difficult to find a common European definition
  – too theoretical

“Where do you see the greatest challenges in your country regarding your activities as a tutor?”
• Challenges are very diverse (e.g. curriculum design, quality assurance, counselling, building up networks)
Questionnaire – Part 2: Evaluation

“What did you consider to be particularly positive in the training?”

• Positive atmosphere (7x)
• Training was a good chance to exchange ideas and experiences (5x)
• Training gave a better insight into the educational system of the partner countries (4x)
• Expertise and skills of the trainers (5x)
Role of a Tutor from the Participants‘ Point of View

Point of view – related to participants’ country of origin/ daily activities?

1 Participants’ daily activities

• Most participants engage in teaching (8x)
  – students in vocational schools and/or
  – trainee teachers or
  – VET students in university
• Counselling of students or trainee teachers (5x)
• Counselling of tutors, coordination of training courses for tutors (2x)
→ Other activities are mostly not shared – heterogeneity (even among the participants of the same country)
Role of a Tutor from the Participants‘ Point of View

2 Role of a tutor – participants’ point of view
• Tutor is a counsellor and guide for students or trainee teachers (9x)
• Tutor is involved in curriculum design, evaluation of study programme, quality assurance (3x)
→ Other views are shared by minority of participants – heterogeneity

→ Strong link between participants’ own tasks and their view on a tutor’s role
Thank you very much for your attention
Questionnaire – Part 1: Expectations

Expectations

• Mean value of “clarity of expectations” lower than those of other indicators
• In particular:
  item “I had clear expectations of the objectives of the training”
  mean = 3.4
• Heterogeneity of group members (range between “rather unclear” and “very clear”)
Questionnaire – Part 1: Evaluation

- Possibility to follow structure of content: 4.1
- Appropriateness of topic selection: 4.0
- Interconnection of training components: 3.7
- Objectives were clarified beforehand: 3.4