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| **Project MOOS - Mutual Open and Online Skills****(Code: 2014-1-IT02-KA201-003651\_1)** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Communication in the partnership** |  | **Feedback FINLAND** |
| How well have you communicated among partners during the project? |  | Communication has worked well among the partners. E-mail, telephone and the “Whats up” app have been used for communication.  |
| How much has your involvement in the project increased your knowledge of other countries values and cultural identities? |  | The knowledge gained about other countries and their school systems has increased though out the project. Students, teachers and project manager in the project have all expressed an increased understanding of different cultures and cultural expressions both inside and outside the school organization.  |
| **Partnership Localactivities** |  |  |
| How did you match pupils during their foreign stay or when hosting partners? |  | Via dialogue with partners and suitable students that were believed to be able to take such a responsibility.  |
| Did all international students participating in the mobilities have the opportunity to learn about the country hosting the meeting and exchange opinions with the local students in the planned activities? |  | Yes, they were eager to participate in different projects and they actively followed the events and tasks planned.  |
| Were the host school' s students actively involved in the activities planned during the mobilities? |  | Yes most of the time, sometimes due to tight schedules they could not follow all the same activities as the guests.  |
| What activities were developed during mobilities and/or partner’shosting? |  | Students gained self confidence and social understanding/skills during the meetings and before/after them when exchanging with their hosts. Confidence to use the other language.  |
| How did the parents/families participate in the mobility activities during all the project? |  | Helped with housing, food and transport as well as social support.  |
| Were the activities respected according to the shared timetable? |  | Yes, everything went smoothly within the timeframe given.  |
| **Project problems and solutions** |  |  |
| Did you encounter any problems/obstacles during the last part of the project?If you did, how did they change the implementation of the original project? |  | The biggest obstacle has been the dissemination of the project and getting more people to be involved in the project due to new national curriculum that took place in 2016 and due to major it-changes (technology) in the area. The interest of stakeholders from other organizations has been hard to initiate. Puolimatka-school initiated a dissemination conference in the City Hall and met all the principals, vice-principals and administrational staff of the education department on the 18.5.2017. Most schools showed interest in the MOOS project.  |
| **Skills and achievements** |  |  |
| What language skills have been developed by the end of the project? |  | Students have had a lot of new words and terms that they can now actively use in English.  |
| What were the benefits of the activities for the pupils? |  | See above (self-confidence, oral skills, vocabulary) |
| Do you think the project helped to raise awareness of other countries culture? |  | Yes! They realized how different countries had different cultures from theirs. |
| Do you think the project has had an impact on your school’s curriculum by the end of it? |  | In Finland we have the national curriculum that everyone follows, then we have a local curriculum that has been established in 2016 and developed during the 2014-2016. At this point it is not possible to implement another IT-based course to the whole system, but MOOS project will be part of the individual courses according to the teacher’s decision.  |
| **Aims and objectives** |  |  |
| How appropriate do you think the goals of the project were? |  | Goals were quite suitable for the project.  |
| Have you carried out a survey of your students and teachers opinions about the digital platform and Open Education for high school? |  | Yes, different surveys throughout the project, we had different survey during every multinational project meeting. We have done a lot of surveys.  |
| Have your plans been followed and if not, why not? |  | Yes they have been followed, with the exception of an adjustment in the phase of dissemination. |
| How easily did the pupils complete the tasks set for them? |  | They easily completed them. Especially their language skills in English has been of great help.  |
| **Performance and result indicators** |  |  |
| How easily have you registered on the MOOS site in order to access the e-learning spaces and utilize its interactive and community functions? |  | Very easily. The platform has been working well in that sense, although in Finland we do not emphasize right/wrong or multiple choice – answer, as we must underline more those skills that develop reasoning, application-skills and reflection.  |
| How many subjects and e-lessons were uploaded onto the MOOS platform by the end of the project? |  | Two courses per country with 5 lessons per course followed by an assessment/exam.  |
| How many of your students participated by accessing the Transnational Digital Classroom? |  | Totally 40 students for the courses created at Puolimatka-school. But many more students are willing to follow the courses. |
| How many participant students who accessed the Transnational Digital Classroom were at risk of early school leaving? |  | None.  |
| How many participant teachers were on the MOOS platform? |  | Six (6).  |
| How much did the project experience make you aware of similarities and differences in social and education systems and didactic approaches in different European countries? |  | We agree with Swedish: When collaborating with other European countries around a common curriculum, assessment criterias, assessment forms and achievement levels both similarities and differences have been detected between the countries. A clear difference has been seen in the emphasis on summative versus formative assessment.  |
| Have your teachers improved their skills in ICT and in the Digital Classroom? |  | The teachers ICT skills have been fairly good from the start of the project and reasonably consistent though out the project. Colleagues have learnt timing and uploading lessons and how to create courses on the platform.  |
| Have you disseminated any of the project outputs around your school ? If you have, how did you do it? |  | Our dissemination has been going on wherever we meet other teacher, we have talked about the platform and our project. The official big dissemination is in May 2017 as the city council has not had time (or interest) before to host us, and this is not the lack of respect or similar but simply due to other national and local demands that they and we have had in order to implement other official programs.  |
| How many other schools and stakeholders were reached in the dissemination of outputs? (Quote numbers and typologies) |  | A group of 14 between stakeholders and local schools . |
| **Budgeting** |  |  |
| Did you keep within your budget limits for all the activities in the project? |  | The costs for travelling has been slightly higher than the budget. We have followed the budget very closely, but due to our administrational difficulties (substitute teachers’ salaries have been paid from this budget) – we could not use the budget as planned in 2014.  |
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