

## Proteach consortium's responses to the questions included in the assessment of the project's Progress Report received on 20.6.18.

Following are our answers to each question (shown in boxes, directly quoted from pages 5-6 of the report assessment file).

- We would like greater clarification on what is the difference between the Greenhouse initiative and the Multi-teacher Induction Teams funded by this project? We would also be most grateful if you could provide information on the Hammemot initiative mentioned in your report, which started creating MITs.

In general terms, the following are the main elements that differentiate between the two models:

- **The centrality of schools** in the effort: The MIT model assigns great importance to what is done at schools, for the induction of the beginning teachers, seeing the HEI's as symmetric partners (in addition to other stakeholders) supporting this process. Building HEI's capacity to fulfill this role is a fundamental goal of Proteach.
- **Involvement of key stakeholders:** In the MIT model more attention is paid to involving persons and institutions holding relevant positions and responsibilities – mentor teachers, subject matter coordinators, vice-principals, school principals, school superintendent, etc., in addition to local and national, educational and other authorities – that become embedded in the MIT work, and not only teachers and guides as it is usually the case in the Greenhouses (Hamamot).
- A more definite focus on **school as an organization**, to which the new teacher is expected (and should accordingly be given the tools, and encouraged) to adapt – professionally and socially – and see in it his/her desired workplace. In other words, the (new) teacher's continuation in his/her profession is not only a matter of loving the profession and perseverance but – not less importantly – of interweaving with and assimilating into “the system”, a socio-economic setting with different conditions, rules and traditions, and people with difference skills, behaviors and attitudes, which often entail challenges that need to be overcome. “Amplifying the new teacher's voice”, put by Proteach at the basis of the MIT vision, is a short (and rather partial) way to describe this complex concept. To be sure, the process necessarily involves the preparation of the school side in this equation – school principals and other school staff – to facilitate and make more effective their contribution to a successful assimilation of new teachers at school. One example of achieving this goal in the MIT model is a request raised to the Ministry of Education by some school principals (which participated in MITs) to allocate resources for paying the schools' coordinators assigned to take care of the trainees and the new teachers in school. The fact that the schools' principals found the need to intervene in this sense in their school shows the shift they underwent, assuming more responsibility toward the new members in their organizations.

More in detail, the difference between the two models can be shown in the way certain things take place

1. MITs build on the coordinated cooperation of a pedagogical guide from the college and a representative from the school and or the municipality/Ministry of Education, while Greenhouses - Hamamot - are guided almost exclusively by the pedagogical guide from the college
2. The MIT syllabi are flexible and determined in accordance with the evolving needs of the interns, the new teachers and the school authorities. The Hamamot syllabi are usually determined exclusively by the pedagogical guide from the college.
3. Participants in the MIT have many chances to meet and interact with the school's staff and municipal authorities (school principals, veteran teachers in charge of specific issues in schools, representatives

from the Ministry of Education and the municipalities) as some of the workshops are done together with them. These opportunities are rare in the Hamamot routine.

4. In MITs there is a connection with 3rd year students who are participating in the Academy-Classroom partnership (an initiative of the MoE), namely, intensive 2-3 days of practicum while in their 3rd year training program. Connection with mentor workshop in the college. The MIT is regularly supervised/regulated by different professionals in and out of the college.
5. The interaction between the MITs, the college and its staff is multi-faceted, goes both ways and is evident in many ways, for example:
  - In the establishment of a course for mentors - the school is actively involved in designing the syllabus to address the needs.
  - Change in the existing models of mentors in elementary and pre-schools.
  - Including interns in the steering committees in schools.
6. The role of the pedagogical guides in the MITs has changed from dealing only with pedagogical issues toward guiding an organizational intervention in school. To this end the pedagogical guides need to bridge between interns and new teachers and the school authorities. This new role is twofold: on the one hand they have to represent the school interests among interns, while on the other hand they also have to represent the interns' interests at the school. The changing role of the pedagogical guide resulted in the need to create and launch a new course of 60 hours to train new guides for the MIT/Hamamot.

#### Information about the Hamamot:

The Hamamot – Incubators – is an initiative started in 2011- based on the PDS (Professional Development in Schools) approach as a joint work of P3 and the Ministry of Education. To date there are 56 functioning Hamamot carried out by 9 colleges and one university. The core idea of the Hamamot is to support beginning teachers' work in their first two years of work in schools and not through the "usual 60-hour course" in the college. In this Model, academic teaching staffs come to schools and work together with beginning teachers and their school-assigned mentors. The "incubators" foster both mentoring and peer support, and showcase dilemmas and ideas, ranging from the individual classroom and students' problems and challenges, to parents and the wider school community. In this model the pedagogical guide from the academy plays a central and inclusive role as the one that guides the whole process and contacts with the teachers' students the schools' crew, the municipality and the Ministry of Education.

- The field monitoring feedback given on 9 March 2018 concerning the request to change the indicator on school drop-outs was that ' *The project is invited to revise this indicator if necessary in discussion with the EACEA Project Officer*'. The report states that the project consortium will decide what this indicator will be at final report stage! Project indicators are set before the project begins. It is not possible to decide them at final report stage as indicators cannot be adapted to fit results. They are used to measure results and so much be decided before the project begins. By 30 July, please provide a suggestion for this indicator to be discussed with the Project Officer in EACEA. It will not be possible to change this indicator for the rest of the project.

There may be some misunderstanding here and we would like to clarify the matter: We have not asked the Project Officer (or commented with the representatives of the Erasmus+ Office in Israel in opportunity of their Field Monitoring regarding the need) to revise our LFM in general or the specific point on assessing changes in dropout rates in particular. Although some of the targets included in the LFM do pose challenges, the consortium has discussed these issues and has not found it necessary to

elevate such request of revision, as it has deemed the targets achievable given the way the project has progressed.

There is however a subtle issue: We may not have enough time, during the project's life, to measure the dropout reduction from solid ground data (i.e., actually *counting* teachers that abandoned the profession), as these data might not exist or be ready to use, or may be, but only partially, because "dropping-out" may not be necessarily manifested in the first year of a teacher's carrier. It is a long-enough project's horizon what we may be lacking, not the confidence of achieving our goals. So we do not propose "to change the indicator" but to use alternative means to approximate an estimation of the dropout rates which would not involve (only) counting actual drop-outs and rely only on these numbers. We are already advancing in this sense, and certainly we have not proposed to leave to the "final report stage" a decision on the particulars of the estimation plan. What we meant was that *the results* would be presented by project's end.

The plan we are considering builds on three elements: (1) Use data that the Ministry of Education gathers and processes on a regular basis. These data, however, show a considerable delay in reaching their elaborated form – e.g., we know that the number of beginning teachers that left the education system after one year and have not undergone the internship process (for the most part, via Greenhouses/Hamamot) is almost three times higher than the number of BTs who left the system and passed the internship process (23% vs. 8%). The whole processing time has been long, but some rough data may be available earlier and these are in principle usable in our project. (2) Building on own efforts, try to obtain a more immediate measurement of dropout rates directly from our experience in MITs and ongoing related courses. If we understood it correctly, this means implementing to the extent possible one of the recommendations received in the assessment report (p. 4): "... track the drop-out rate of beginning teachers on teacher training courses starting with students completing the new courses this year and provide it for each year in your final report." Again, expected findings will cover time windows of one year (1<sup>st</sup>-year-as-teacher), or slightly more in very best cases. Finally, (3) Broaden the scope of our current project evaluation work to contemplate the dropout issue. In fact, the questionnaires extended to the new teachers and interviews carried out with them already touch aspects that hint on dropout (or other dis/satisfaction) measurements, and those tools can be further focused to ensure a better capture of these aspects.

The third approach above considers a proxy, an alternative estimation that does not build on pure counting to yield a valid answer to the question in case. To some extent we will be "measuring" feelings and intentions of teachers rather than "seeing" what they actually do (or did), which with a longer horizon could be done better. We believe that this will not necessarily entail a loss; indeed, "feelings and intentions" can potentially shed more light on ways to further reduce drop-outs in the future. In any case, as the three approaches are not exclusive and could profitably complement each other, we foresee using all of them in proportions to be determined.

-The mentors questionnaires and training units for mentors seem to have been delayed. Why is this the case?
---

Mentors' role in the MITs calls for a profound change in their traditional role in Israel, namely, giving individual guidance to the interns and new teachers together with evaluating their teaching. Being part of the MIT community opens new perspectives in their work as representatives of the schools' community and strengthening the new teachers' voices. The consortium developed a questionnaire for defining the new role of the mentors within the MIT. This questionnaire was assessed by the consortium during its international seminar in last November and as a consequence it was revised by the evaluation

team. A new questionnaire was written and assessed in January-March and was distributed and filled by the mentors during May-June. Results are currently being analyzed.

- We note that many stakeholders are involved in the activities of the MITs, which is positive. However, only those from partner institutions can be funded from the project grant. Please confirm that this is the case.

Yes, this is the case. All partners have been made aware of the terms that rule the use of the project's budget.

- For each of the six new courses, please provide us with the following information;

Name of the course  
Level (Professional certificate, Bachelor, Master, Doctorate)  
Type of degree (from 1 HEI, Multiple degree, joint degree)  
Number of ECTS credits  
Have learning outcomes been used in the course design?  
Which universities have been involved in designing this course?  
Is it a new course?  
Is it an updated course?  
Is it a course that has been simply translated from an existing course at a European partner university?  
Recognised by the HEI?  
Accredited by the national authorities?  
When did the teaching start?  
Number of students enrolled per year  
Does the course include internships  
Does the course include a career orientation service  
Does the course include any other career development measures

For the sake of clarity and order, this information is provided in a separate file – *File B - Academic courses in HEIs* – attached to the same mail carrying the present file. The format used there is the requested one, but sum additional information, deemed relevant by the Consortium, was added by the partners to their respective parts.

- Your report mentions that a total of 123 dissemination events have taken place since the start of the project. We remind you that only dissemination events mentioned in your proposal can be funded by the grant. We ask you to confirm that none of the grant has been used to fund events not mentioned in the project proposal.

Dissemination events referred in the proposal indicate workshops held in schools where the MITs take place, and dedicated workshops in the HEIs, apart from press releases and other dissemination actions.

In many cases partners held more than 1 workshop per school/year as the workshops served also as a good arena for the beginning teachers to become an inherent part of the schools' community. Moreover, the Ministry of Education and various municipalities initiated workshops and talks related to Proteach as the project's agenda fits their interests with supporting BTs in their premises. In all of these occasions Proteach members were invited to present the Proteach ideas in workshops and events that were fully funded by those organizations. We can therefore confirm that the grant has only been used to fund activities that were foreseen in the project's proposal, which stated the main events and types of activities/actions that would compose our dissemination basket. However, dissemination naturally includes actions that the proposal could only refer to in general terms (without fully specifying their essence, number, place, participants), as they sometimes build on occasional, unexpected opportunities to meet people with occupations/positions that make them relevant targets for dissemination and/or could be important for exploitation planning.