

Evaluation of the FEIGHT project

Final report

Lieke Dreijerink
Jan Uitzinger

Amsterdam, 17 November 2014



IVAM

research and consultancy on sustainability

Plantage Muidersgracht 14 - 1018 TV Amsterdam - Postbus 18180 - 1001 ZB Amsterdam

Tel. +31 20 525 5080, www.ivam.uva.nl, e-mail: office@ivam.uva.nl



Colophon

ISO Doc. nr.	O-1428
Title	Evaluation of the FEIGHT project. Final report
Authors	Lieke Dreijerink, Jan Uitzinger
Internal review	Laura van der Noort

This evaluation was commissioned by IVN. Contact at IVN: Mr. Kees Siderius

For more information on this report, please contact Mrs. Lieke Dreijerink, ldreijerink@ivam.uva.nl

Data from this report may be reproduced under explicit acknowledgements. IVAM UvA accepts no liability for any damage arising from the use of the results of this study and the implementation of the recommendations.

Summary

The project “FEIGHT - The 8 solutions for fighting early school leaving in vocational education and training (VET)” - ran from 2012 until 2014 in four different countries (Italy, the Netherlands, Turkey, and the United Kingdom). The main aim of the FEIGHT project was to identify the main factors of early school leaving in VET, in order to reduce drop-outs by increasing motivation of VET students and helping them to adapt to the Lifelong Learning Society.

In order to determine the effects of FEIGHT, IVAM externally monitored and evaluated the project among project partners and schools and teachers involved, using questionnaires and interviews. There were two evaluation moments: in the summer of 2013 and at the beginning of 2014. All five project partners filled in the two questionnaires on their own expectations and experiences. Furthermore they interviewed in total 11 teachers, teacher partners and managers, who could evaluate 15 groups of students, representing 313 students in total.

Positive experiences

Both evaluations of the FEIGHT project showed mainly a positive picture; partners and schools have had high expectations and good experiences working with the methods. The eight methods were combined in multiple ways. These combinations depended on expectations how the methods would fit the specific group of students and on how the method itself was expected to work best. Some of the eight methods seemed to have worked better than others. In the second evaluation partners were especially positive about a focus on soft skills (M7), working with real assignments (M1), and peer training (M4). The schools and teachers were especially positive about peer training (M4), learning by doing in a real life situation (M8), and focusing on soft skills (M7).

High expectations of effects

Partners’ estimations on the potential of the chosen combination of methods on reducing early school leaving were quite positive and increased from the first to the second evaluation. Schools’ and teachers’ estimations were also positive but remained alike during the first and second evaluation.

Beforehand personal development of students was defined as an important factor in early school leaving, assuming that methods aimed at personal development would add to less early school leaving. Partners and schools and teachers assessed the effects on personal development as (very) positive, including improvements of interrogative skills (i.e. asking questions to find solutions) and discussion techniques, increased self-confidence, better team work, and an improvement of problem-solving. Whether this actually led to less early school leaving, cannot be concluded from this evaluation.

Both the partners and the teachers spoke about a better motivation of students, social effects (team work, cohesion), the positive effects of real life experiences, and positive effects like instructive effects and personal development due to the FEIGHT methods. The methods seem to have had the most effect on team work and on self-confidence of students. Partners seem to be somewhat more optimistic about this than the teachers. They additionally indicated that the FEIGHT project was also instructive for themselves.

Some critical remarks

Critical remarks by both partners and teachers were mostly on the organisation of the project in the various classes: time pressure due to a lack of time, the available resources and group sizes. For some this discounted the value of the whole project. Furthermore some teachers mentioned that in some cases it was hard to involve the students in the lessons.

Contents

- Summary.....1
- Contents.....2
- 1. Introduction.....3
- 2. Method.....5
 - 2.1 Questionnaire.....5
 - 2.2 Response and respondents.....5
- 3. Results.....7
 - 3.1 First evaluation project partners.....7
 - 3.2 First evaluation schools and teachers.....12
 - 3.3 Second evaluation project partners.....14
 - 3.4 Second evaluation results schools and teachers.....19
- 4. Overall conclusions.....22
 - Process.....22
 - Impact.....24
- 5. Some points of discussion.....24
- Annex A. Evaluation methodology.....25
- Annex B. Questionnaire Project partner (QP).....26
- Annex C: Questionnaire Schools (QS).....30

1. Introduction

A high percentage of European vocational education training (VET) students leave school before finishing their education. The main aim of the project “FEIGHT - The 8 solutions for fighting early school leaving in VET” was to identify the main factors of the early school leaving in VET, in order to reduce drop-outs by increasing motivation of the VET students and helping them to adapt to the Lifelong Learning Society. The corresponding operational aims for the project were: to develop innovative materials for VET teachers and quality procedures for reducing drop-outs in VET schools, as well as a collection of innovative teaching and training approaches and methods for reducing early school leaving in VET. The FEIGHT project ran for two years: from the end of 2012 until the end of 2014.

FEIGHT focused on teachers working with groups at increased risk of early school leaving, such as children with a socio-economically disadvantaged, migrant background, or with special educational needs; this because being a teacher of the mentioned group of students requires many soft skills in order to support, understand and motivate the students to continue their compulsory education and to be able to obtain a diploma/qualification/certification. In addition it is considered necessary to increase awareness of the school managers and the decision makers in the field of education regarding the existing problem of early school leaving.

FEIGHT outcomes

The FEIGHT project has various outcomes, as described in table 1.1. On the project website (www.ldvfeight.eu) all outcomes can be viewed, downloaded and used by interested schools, teachers and others.

Table 1.1. FEIGHT outcomes and partners involved

Outcome	Partners involved
1. Multilingual project website	Effective web design
2. Coaching guide for VET school teachers	Quarter Mediation (QMED), Adastra Cymru, DIMEM, NIMEM, Shalom
3. Quality procedures for reducing drop-outs in VET schools	QMED, DIMEM, NIMEM, Shalom,
4. Collection of innovative teaching and training approaches and methods for reducing early school leaving in VET	QMED Adastra Cymru, DIMEM, NIMEM, Shalom
5. Guidelines app for teachers working with VET students in risk of drop-out (for IPAD/ IPHONE/ computer/smart board)	QMED, Adastra Cymru, Effective web design
6. Kit for VET schools for identifying the students in risk of drop-out	QMED, Adastra Cymru, DIMEM, NIMEM, Shalom
7. Training package for peer training for teachers and trainers	Adastra Cymru
8. Quality assurance committees in schools, focused on drop-out procedures	DIMEM, NIMEM, Shalom

One of FEIGHT’s main aims (outcome 4) was to transfer two innovative approaches and methods developed in the Netherlands (Schools for Sustainability) and in Wales, UK (Peer learning). In practice these two innovative approaches were split up into eight different methods:

- Working with real assignments (M1)
- Using outdoor activities and training in the nature (M2)

- Extracurricular activities (e.g. music, dance, crafts, arts) (M3)
- Peer training (M4)
- E-learning (M5)
- Using music, art, play, drama as teaching methods (M6)
- Soft skills (team building, team working, communication) (M7)
- Learning by doing in VET, in a real life situation (M8)

Six partners in four countries (Italy - SHALOM, the Netherlands – IVN, QMED, Turkey – DIMEM, NIMEM and the UK-ADASTRA) tested whether these eight methods are suitable and usable in their country. The main goal was to build and pilot new methods of teaching in order to reduce early school leaving in VET.

In Italy and Turkey the schools involved in the project (both as FEIGHT partners and as local/regional/national partners of the organizations involved in the project) created School committee quality assurance teams, at the decision of the school manager or school board (outcome 8). These teams piloted the quality procedures created in the consortium (outcome 3) and adapted them to the national system of education and to the local situation, needs and objectives. In the Netherlands QMED created quality procedures, which were piloted in Italy and Turkey.

The Dutch partner IVN started the FEIGHT project with a VET school in Friesland: AOC Nordwin College, Buitenpost location. From February to June 2013 a school project was successfully carried out with 70 students with a real assignment. This project included a teacher training about the Schools for Sustainability method and the FEIGHT project. However, due to several management changes the school decided not to carry on with the FEIGHT project. Therefore it was not possible for IVN to do school and teacher interviews, to test the FEIGHT materials and to create a quality assurance team. Recently, contact with the school was re-established: IVN and AOC Nordwin agreed to start a new project on all its five locations, where FEIGHT information and outcomes will be tested. This project will start in December 2014.

FEIGHT Evaluation

In this evaluation we focused mainly on the collection of innovative teaching and training approaches and methods for reducing early school leaving in VET (outcome 4). In order to determine effects of FEIGHT, IVAM externally monitored and evaluated the project. At the end of the first school year, in the summer of 2013, IVAM did a first evaluation of the project among the project partners and among teachers involved. At the beginning of 2014, during the second school year, IVAM did a second evaluation among the partners and teachers involved.

Reader's guide

In this report the results of both evaluations are described. First, we start in Chapter 2 with a short description of the evaluation method we used. The more extensive version of the methodology can be found in Annex A. In Chapter 3 the results of the two evaluations among project partners and schools/teachers are described. In Chapter 4 we go into the overall conclusions.

2. Method

The project evaluation is divided into two parts: the process evaluation and the impact evaluation. The process evaluation focused on how the FEIGHT project functioned according to the partners and the schools. The transfer of the eight methods and approaches were analysed. The combinations of approaches and methods as used in the schools were assessed on two indicators (see Annex A). Partners' and schools' satisfaction with the various approaches and methods were measured. Furthermore, partners and schools were asked if they would choose for the same methods in hindsight.

The impact evaluation focused on the effects the project had on the students, since FEIGHT aimed at reducing early school leaving and to identify the main explaining factors. Both the partners and the schools were questioned on the impacts of the eight methods and approaches: are they useful in fighting early school leaving? The impact of the combinations of the eight approaches and methods was assessed on two main indicators (see Annex A). Impacts were measured using questions on expected and experienced effects on personal development of the students: communications (interrogative skills, discussion techniques), self-confidence /self-esteem, team building, problem solving, time keeping. Furthermore, impacts were measured by questions on expected potential for reducing the percentage of drop outs.

2.1 Questionnaire

IVAM developed two questionnaires, using structured questions and open answer questions. One questionnaire was aimed at the project partners (QP); the other was aimed at the participating school teams or teachers (QS). The questionnaires are added in Annex B and Annex C.

2.2 Response and respondents

As described in the introduction there were two evaluation moments: in the summer of 2013 (just after the first school year ended) and at the beginning of 2014 (during the second school year). Both evaluations took place when the project was ongoing in order to learn as much from the results during the project as possible. At the end of the project some final remarks were gathered from all project partners.

Partner evaluation

At both evaluation moments five project partners filled in the questionnaire on their own expectations and experiences.

School and teacher evaluation

For the first evaluation, two of the five project partners (DIMEM and Shalom) and associate partner Adastra Cymru Ltd organized interviews with members of the school teams involved. As an adult education provider organizing courses at European level Quarter Mediation (QMED) does not come into contact with school teachers from the Netherlands (this being the task of IVN) and therefore they did no interviews with Dutch teachers. As explained before it was not possible for IVN to carry out the school and teacher evaluations as planned. Also the Turkish partner NIMEM did not interview teachers because of time or planning issues. In total four people were interviewed in the first evaluation, with whom six classes could be evaluated (see Table 2.3). Three teachers and a manager of an organization aimed at preventing offending by children and young people (Swansea Youth Offending Service) were interviewed. At C.F.G. Zanardelli two different teachers were interviewed.

In total the effects of the FEIGHT methods on 108 students were evaluated¹. The percentage of students at risk of leaving early was not totally clear, but seemed to vary between 5% and 60% (see Table 2.1).

Table 2.1. Overview of interviewed schools and number of students involved and at risk of leaving school early

Interviewed school or organisation	Interviewed by	Number of students involved	Percentage at risk of leaving school early
Arslan Çimento teknik ve endüstri meslek lisesi	DIMEM	20 students	Unknown
C.F.G. Zanardelli	Shalom	44 students	5%
Swansea Youth Offending Service	Adastra Cymru	44 students	60% (about 28)

For the second evaluation three of the four project partners having this task (DIMEM, NIMEM and Shalom) organized seven interviews with members of the school teams involved. As described before, no teachers could be interviewed by IVN. In total seven teachers and teacher partners were interviewed, with whom nine classes could be evaluated. Interviews were held with teachers and teacher partners (see Table 2.4). In Italy and Turkey project partners were also teachers, so they could fill in the interview questionnaire themselves. Two Turkish teachers could assess two classes. In total, the effects of the FEIGHT methods on 205 students were evaluated. The percentage of students at risk of leaving early varied between 3 and 17%, but was unknown for three schools (see Table 2.2).

Table 2.2. Overview of interviewed schools and number of students involved and at risk of leaving school early

Interviewed school or organisation	Country, partner	Number of students involved	Percentage at risk of leaving school early
Aslan Çimento Teknik ve Endüstri Meslek Lisesi	Turkey, DIMEM	11 students	Unknown
Centro Formativo G. Zanardelli	Italy, Shalom	46 students	14%
Deniz Yıldızları Teknik ve Endüstri Meslek Lisesi	Turkey, DIMEM	12 students	Unknown
IMKB Ticaret Meslek Lisesi	Turkey, DIMEM	34 students	Unknown
Nahit Mentşe Girl's Vocational Technical High School	Turkey, DIMEM	60 students	17%
Nazilli Industrial Vocational High School	Turkey, NIMEM	12 students	3%
Nazilli Vocational Religious High School	Turkey, NIMEM	30 students	10%

It should be noted that the group of interviewed teachers differed between the first evaluation moment and the second evaluation moment. Comparisons between the results of the first and second evaluation should therefore be viewed from that perspective.

¹Possibly there is some overlap in students of the Italian organization.

3. Results

This chapter is divided in the result of the first evaluation and the results of the second evaluation, for both the project partners and the schools and teachers. Since the number of participating partners and interviewed people involved in FEIGHT is limited, the results are presented in a descriptive and not in a quantitative way.

3.1 First evaluation project partners

Participation of schools and students in FEIGHT

At the moment of the first evaluation (summer 2013), the number of schools or training activities in which the methods were used varied per partner from 110 to one, and the number of groups of students or learners in which the methods were used varied from 131 to five (see Table 3.1). Since QMED organizes training activities for mixed groups of professionals, including a five day course in which participants attend multiple workshops, they have a somewhat different approach than the other partners in the project. These workshops were counted as a training activity.

Table 3.1. Number of school/training activities and groups per partner²

Partner	Country	Number of schools	Number of training activities	Number of student groups	Number of learner groups
DIMEM	Turkey	3 ³		5	
IVN	The Netherlands	1		5	
NIMEM	Turkey	5		9	
QMED	The Netherlands		110		131
Shalom	Italy	2		10	
Total		121		160	

Choices in combining the eight methods

All five partners indicated having used or using the FEIGHT methods at schools or in training activities. The partners were asked which of the eight methods they used in one specific class or group. They were asked to describe a maximum of three groups; we assumed they would choose the most striking or typical examples. They mentioned various combinations of methods; see Table 3.2.

² Partners were asked to fill in the number of schools/activities and students that were involved in their own 'FEIGHT projects'. It is possible and probable that at the time of the survey this amount was lower than the final amount of included schools/activities and students.

³The Turkish partner DIMEM added that in total 15 teachers and almost 80 students were involved in the activities of FEIGHT. The classes varied from 9th to 11th grades.

Table 3.2. Methods used in one specific group (G) or class, per partner

	Group or class	M1: working with real assignments	M2: using outdoor activities and nature	M3: extracurricular activities (e.g. music, dance, crafts, arts)	M4: peer training	M5: e-learning	M6: using music, art, play, drama as teaching methods	M7: soft skills (team building, team working, communication)	M8: learning by doing in VET, in a real life situation
QMED	G1		x	x				x	
	G2		x	x				x	x
	G3		x	x				x	x
DIMEM	G1			x	x		x	x	
	G2	x	x						x
Shalom	G1	x		x	x			x	
	G2	x	x					x	
	G3			x	x			x	x
IVN	G1	x	x	x		x	x	x	x
	G2	x	x	x		x		x	
	G3	x	x			x		x	
NIMEM	G1			x		x	x	x	
	G2			x		x	x	x	
	G3			x		x	x	x	
Total	14	6	8	11	3	6	5	13	5

It shows that in many groups of students or learners a different combination of methods was used. According to this data, Quarter Mediation (QMED) used a combination of methods 2, 3, 7, 8 twice and NIMEM used the combination of methods 3, 5, 6, 7 three times. Each partner furthermore explained why they chose the specific combinations. The combination of methods depends on various aspects:

Characteristics of the group

- “The idea is that the methods we use in FEIGHT are not new [...] but to use a different approach for the already known methods. We based the eight methods on the eight multiple intelligences, so - depending on the training activity we organize and on the target group we have to decide what combination of the eight methods is the most appropriate.”
- “This is a class of 9th grade students. They learn best by music, art and drama that's why we chose activities including these in our lessons. To improve their communication skills, we formed groups during the lessons. This helped them to develop working in a team and teach each other.”
- “[...] abilities are used to propose different activities to the different groups.”
- “Each student must find something interesting in teaching material and process.”

Characteristics of the methods

- “The students of printing department visited the zoo. [...]. Each student created at least one card [which] they presented [...] to the general director of the zoo. This is a real life situation and the students learned by doing themselves. That's why we chose to use these methods.”

- “One of the objectives is to let the students know the places and the material and spiritual civilization of their region. All the activities organized with a real assignment grow the sense of responsibility of the future cooks or waiters. The group activities reinforce the relationships among students and with their teachers and trainers during the first and second school year.”
- “During the Arts and Craft activities the girls are allowed to talk, laugh, help each other, and take their time to finish the work. The final result, the accuracy of the final product is important as it can help the girls to discover their talents. [...] the combination gives a strong rational motivation but also a continuous help from competent young trainers. Finally better and long lasting friendly relations become possible.”
- “All the extracurricular activities are thought to help the [students] to become more self-confident and more competent. All the results of their activities have a customer that can express his satisfaction.”
- “the boys [...] learn to cook, grow animals, work the land, and make bread. They are going on building houses and different spaces [...] The reasons for whom the mix of method works with the group are: M3 and M8 Concrete realization of useful objects (doors, windows...), M4: all the new guests learn from the old guests. M7: The relationship between the members of the group is growing during the months.”
- “We use [the Schools for Sustainability method] and we add various FEIGHT-methods to the project”
- “These methods could be used best for this class, the other three did not fit in the project”
- “The project was only in one week. It was a short period.”
- “Because an effective education must comprise the different types of intelligence and must not be monotonous and use various kinds of materials, techniques and; physical, mental and social activities.”

The eight methods separately

One partner mentioned that although different combinations of the eight methods were used, assessing them separately would not make much sense since in practice they are viewed as one method. However, we wanted to get some insight in how specific parts or combinations could lead to positive effects, by asking the partners to indicate which of the methods being part of their approach worked best, second best and third best. We then added scores: 10 points when a method was assessed as working best, 8 points when working second best and 6 points when working third best (see Table 3.3). The scores indicate that the five partners assessed M7 as best. M2 and M3 were also in the overall top three. This does of course not mean that the other methods have less value or do not work; it simply gives an indication of which methods are ranked best.

Table 3.3. Ranking of top three methods used

	1: worked best	2: worked second best	3: worked third best	total
M1: working with real assignments	40	0	12	52
M2: using outdoor activities and training in the nature	30	8	24	62
M3: extracurricular activities (e.g. music, dance, crafts, arts)	30	24	12	66
M4: peer training	0	16	0	16
M5: e-learning	0	0	0	0
M6: using music, art, play, drama as teaching methods	30	8	0	38
M7: soft skills (team building, team working, communication)	30	56	18	104
M8: learning by doing in VET, in a real life situation	20	8	6	34

Replication

Three partners stated they would use the same combination if they had to start over again with these groups of students or learners. One partner mentioned to include some additional methods, since “... FEIGHT intends to bring that the conservative methods are not good enough anymore for the 21st

century students. Therefore, we have to think out of the box and to adapt to the topic, target group, their mood at a certain moment and their particular needs in that day. Therefore, we never used the same combination of methods for the same target group, neither for different target groups. The idea is to improve, adapt and be creative for a better motivation for both trainees and trainers.” Another partner mentioned different additional methods for each of the three evaluated groups. In the one group working with real assignments and using outdoor activities, while in the other group working with real assignments and extracurricular activities would be added. In the third group he would add real assignments and more outdoor activities and learning by doing in real situations.

Positive and critical remarks on the methods

Partners were positive about how the combination of these specific methods worked in the classes or groups. A general answer was that “It gives students possibilities to develop different skills” and that the “combination of those specific methods worked very well in teaching.” The other answers can be clustered in the following three categories.

Cooperation and team work

- “Before starting such a training activity we prepare the group for this. The first step is the team building, so there are a lot of ice-breaking activities to be used. In this way people are more relaxed and confident on their own competencies and skills and the tasks are distributed between the team members. The most important is "any idea, how crazy we think it is, is very welcome". These because, sometimes, from the ideas people think are crazy, the innovation born. Therefore, this method is very good in the development of the creativity and open mindedness, in helping teachers and trainers, as well as decision makers in the field of education, to think out of the box.”
- “I noticed that the girls were glad and motivated to work together and also that they paid attention to their work and tried to do it as well as possible.”
- “The students were put into groups which led them improve their communication skills both with their friends and in the target language. The groups were formed according to the students' intelligence types and the activities were organized taking this into account so that each student was able to contribute to the activity. For example, the student who has more dominant musical intelligence type was able to help more using the music in the activity or the student with a dominant visual intelligence type was able to contribute to the team by drawing the poster and so on.”
- “[...] using art and drama and team building helped students to be active and learn the things by doing and constructing themselves in a social environment.”

Real life experiences

- “The students were out of the classroom to observe the zoo. The cards they created for the zoo were presented to the director and [...] were going to be used by the zoo. So, they were able to see the results of what they did.” “It was a real life situation which made the students work more enthusiastically. Working with real assignments made the students take their work more seriously.”
- “The students realized a well-documented research about one of the traditional products in Brescia county: olive oil. They were very proud about their work they presented during a big local fair. During the following years the school will go on proposing this kind of activities to its students.”
- “This method is very good in the development of the awareness of the importance of the safety in our daily activities, not depending if it is about the way from our home to the school/company and back, or about the safety and health regulation we have to follow in the school, in a trip, in the working place, both for protecting us and the people around us.”
- “The students realize [there are] objects of direct utility [they] can see and use every day.”

Instructive effects

- “This method is very good in the development of the tolerance, creativity and open mindedness, in helping making people better understand the equal opportunities and rights are for everybody, for all human beings.”

- “We noticed that - if the training methods are adapted to the target group and topic, as well as to the cultural specificity - the method is successful. We received good and very good feedback from our participants. Some of them found the [...] combination of methods new and interesting, but the big part of the participants was very enthusiastic and willing to try it with their students, colleagues, peers, as soon as the course finished.”

One critical remark was that in schools and in projects there is sometimes not enough time to use all different methods. Furthermore, another partner mentioned that crowded classrooms and extensive preparation are the basic negative points. No further critical remarks were given. One partner mentioned that the activities were chosen in order to be constructive and motivating both for trainers and trainees. Another mentioned: “The activity was held in a very positive way and it was so helpful.”

Expectations on effects on personal development and leaving school early

Partners had in general positive expectations of their method on personal development of students. In our evaluation plan we defined that personal development of students consisted of six aspects, namely improvements of interrogative skills (i.e. asking questions to find solutions) and discussion techniques, increased self-confidence, better team work, and an improvement of problem-solving and time keeping. On all these six aspects partners expected the used FEIGHT methods to have a positive or very positive effect (see Figure 3.1). For some methods used some aspects were not applicable and a partner indicated once that a method would have no positive effect on team work.




Figure 3.1. Assessment of effects FEIGHT methods per evaluated group, on six aspects of personal development of students, in %.

When asked about the potential of their chosen combination of methods for reducing the percentage of drop outs in this specific class or group, on a scale of one tot ten scores varied from six to ten. The average score was 7.8 (based on fourteen different groups), so partners view the potential of the FEIGHT methods fairly high.

3.2 First evaluation schools and teachers

Choices in combinations of the eight methods

The interviewees were asked which of the eight methods they used in one of their classes or groups. They were asked to describe a maximum of three groups. We assumed they would choose the most striking or typical examples. They mentioned various combinations of methods; see Table 3.4. Method 5 (e-learning) was not mentioned.

Table 3.4. Methods used per specific class or group (G)

	Group or class	M1: working with real assignments	M2: using outdoor activities and training in the nature	M3: extracurricular activities (e.g. music, dance, crafts, arts)	M4: peer training	M5: e-learning	M6: using music, art, play, drama as teaching methods	M7: soft skills (team building, team working, communication)	M8: learning by doing in VET, in a real life situation
DIMEM	G1	x	x						x
Shalom	G1	x	x		x		x	x	x
	G2	x	x		x			x	x
	G3	x	x		x		x	x	x
	G4	x	x		x			x	x
Adastra Cymru	G1	x		x	x			x	
Total		6	5	1	5	-	2	5	5

The Italian teachers (Shalom) used a combination of methods four times; two times with and two without the sixth method (using music, art, play and drama). In the other two groups, different combinations of methods were used. Each interviewee furthermore explained why a specific combination of methods was chosen for this class or group. This depended on various aspects:

Characteristics of the method

- “Because the students enjoyed experiencing different role playing activities”
- “Provides a variety of learning styles. Ensures a fit of activities tailored to the varied individual needs of a group of young people.”

General remarks on the necessity

- “Because the risk was quite high and we wanted to reduce it and re motivate the students.”
- “The motivation of the students was very poor.”

The eight methods separately

In the interviews the respondent were asked to indicate which of the methods being part of their approach worked best, second best and third best in order to try and find out if specific methods worked better than others. We then added scores: 10 points when a method was assessed as working best, 8 points when working second best and 6 points when working third best (see Table 3.5). These scores indicate that the three partners assessed M1 as best. M4 and M8 were also in the overall top three.

Table 3.5. Ranking of top three methods used

	1: worked best	2: worked second best	3: worked third best	total
M1: working with real assignments	50	0	0	50
M2: using outdoor activities and training in the nature	0	40	0	40
M3: extracurricular activities (e.g. music, dance, crafts, arts)	0	8	24	32
M4: peer training	30	16	0	46
M5: e-learning	0	0	24	24
M6: using music, art, play, drama as teaching methods	0	24	6	30
M7: soft skills (team building, team working, communication)	0	40	0	40
M8: learning by doing in VET, in a real life situation	40	0	6	46

Although M5 (e-learning) was previously not mentioned as being used, some interviewees were able to assess this method. Possibly they were taking their expectations into account.

Replication

All interviewed people stated that if they would have to start over again with this group of students, they would use the same combination of methods. Two persons did not apply it to another class or group. The other two did. Assessing this second group, one interviewee mentioned he or she would include some additional methods if starting over with this group, namely e-learning due to the increase of technological tools.

Positive and critical remarks on the methods

Interviewees had various positive remarks on how the combination of these specific methods worked in their classes or groups. Their answers can be clustered in the following three categories.

Cooperation and team work

- “The students felt much better involved in their process of learning improving their motivation and self-confidence. The class atmosphere turned out to be more active and alive, friendly and relaxing”
- “Improvement of team working, better skills,”
- “The students enjoyed working together in the class and the different role playing activities”

Individual effects

- “Improved motivation”
- “Enables participation by all. Offers access opportunities to young people who feel themselves to be disadvantaged. Provides bespoke activities to match varied individual needs.”

Real life experiences

- “The students met a real life situation which made them work more enthusiastically. Working with real assignments made students take their work seriously.”

The interviewees had also various critical remarks. They mentioned a lack of available resources. Moreover, they mentioned on the one hand that the amount of students involved was sometimes too large, and on the other hand that smaller groups sometimes make it difficult to spread this range of activities across the varied individual needs of young people. One interviewee mentioned: “It is important to assess the needs of each individual young person to determine which method(s) will best suit their specific situation and learning style. Then you have to try and place them in a viably sized group! Taking

account of any drop-outs or other changes to the programme...” A final critical remark was that at the beginning the students did not understand the reason and purpose of the different learning methods.

Expectations on effects on personal development and leaving school early

The interviewees had in general positive expectations of their method on personal development of students. In our evaluation plan we defined that personal development of students consisted of six aspects, namely improvements of interrogative skills (i.e. asking questions to find solutions) and discussion techniques, increased self-confidence, better team work, and an improvement of problem-solving and time keeping. On all these six aspects interviewees expected the used FEIGHT methods to have a positive or very positive effect (see Figure 3.2). For one method used it was mentioned that the aspect self-confidence was not applicable.




Figure 3.2. Assessment of effects FEIGHT methods per evaluated group, on six aspects of personal development of students, in %.

When asked about the potential of their chosen combination of methods for reducing the percentage of drop outs in this specific class or group, on a scale of one tot ten scores varied from six to nine. The average score was 8 (based on six different groups).

3.3 Second evaluation project partners

As described the second evaluation took place at the beginning of 2014, during the second school year in which FEIGHT activities took place. All project partners were still involved, although the Dutch participating VET school withdraw from the project.

Participation of schools and students in FEIGHT

At the moment of the second evaluation, the number of schools or training activities in which the FEIGHT methods were used varied per partner from three to 248⁴, and the number of groups of students or learners in which the methods were used varied from seven to 83 (see Table 3.6). Among other things the project partners organized training activities to inform teachers or other interested parties

⁴As described before, QMED organizes training activities for mixed groups of professionals, including a five day course in which participants attend multiple workshops. These workshops were counted as a training activity.

about the methods. Furthermore they assisted and guided teachers while implementing the methods in their schools or classes.

Table 3.6. Number of school/activities and groups per partner

Partner	Country	Number of schools	Number of training activities	Number of student groups	Number of learner groups
DIMEM	Turkey	3		10	
IVN	The Netherlands	0 ⁵		0	
NIMEM	Turkey	5		7	
QMED	The Netherlands		248		83 groups (around 350 people)
Shalom	Italy	6		62	
Total		262		145	

Choices in combining the eight methods

The partners were asked which of the eight methods they used in one specific class or group. They were asked to describe a maximum of three groups. We assumed they would choose the most striking or typical examples. They mentioned various combinations of methods; see Table 3.5 below.

It shows that in many groups of students or learners a different combination of methods is used. Each partner furthermore explained why the specific combinations are chosen. The combination of methods depends on various aspects:

Characteristics of the students in the group

One partner mentioned that the methods are combined in different ways depending on the target group, the level of education, the local situation, the subject taught etc.

The Italian students can for example choose two extracurricular activities from a long list of options (M3). They can choose which activities they want to do. For example, a group of girls really liked modern dance. The “most important thing is that they choose these activities to express themselves and they consider this opportunity as very important for them”.

Table 3.5. Methods used in one specific group (G) or class, per partner

	Group or class	M1: working with real assignments	M2: using outdoor activities and training in the nature	M3: extracurricular activities (e.g. music, dance, crafts, arts)	M4: peer training	M5: e-learning	M6: using music, art, play, drama as teaching methods	M7: soft skills (team building, team working, communication)	M8: learning by doing in VET, in a real life situation
DIMEM	G1							x	x
	G2	x	x						x
NIMEM	G1	x		x	x			x	x
QMED	G1	x	x	x	x		x	x	x
	G2	x	x		x			x	x

⁵ As described before, the participating Dutch school withdrew from the FEIGHT project. However, the general expectations of the Dutch partner were included in the partner evaluation.

	G3	x	x	x	x		x	x	x
Shalom⁶	G1	x			x			x	x
	G2	x			x			x	x
	G3	x	x	x	x			x	x
	G4			x	x		x	x	
	G5			x	x			x	
Total	11	8	5	6	9	3	3	10	9

Characteristics of the methods

One of the Turkish partners described how the methods were combined: groups of students worked on a project on designing a mosque and its facilities. This was an actual plan of the authority institution of all religious institutions and mosques in Nazilli (M1). As potential employees of these institutions, the students worked on their own workplace (M2). The students designed a model of their ideas and research with papers, clipboards etc. (M3). The students, who were good at handcraft, helped the others (M4, M7).

Some of the methods are assessed as being more useful and effective than others. Teachers and learners for example learn better from experience and by using a hands-on approach (M8). One partner mentioned that learning by doing was the best way to learn about in their case piston systems. Another mentioned that it proves to be easier to communicate and make friends working with real assignments in a real life situation (M1). Furthermore students take the work seriously when it is a real situation, like designing business cards for the director of the zoo in Darica.

Moreover, working in small groups improves communication and team working skills among the students. Small groups of three to four students learn for a week from another student (M4). Students see that a student their age can do it, so they “think it is not difficult to learn and do the same”.

Including methods that aim at team building and strengthening the relationship with the trainer (M7) were also mentioned as reasons for choosing the combination of methods. Team building and ice breaking activities are important and must be part of the daily teaching and training methods and activities.

Finally, it was described that “working in, for and with nature improves the results and the motivation and has a high potential to reduce early school leaving” (M2). For example permaculture is a concept linking people, nature and tools for a sustainable development and a healthier life.

The eight methods separately

In the beginning of the FEIGHT project it was mentioned that although different combinations of the eight methods were used, assessing them separately would not make much sense since in practice they are viewed as one method. However, we wanted to get some insight in how specific parts or combinations could lead to positive effects, by asking the partners to indicate which of the methods being part of their approach worked best, second best and third best. We then added scores: 10 points when a method was assessed as working best, 8 points when working second best and 6 points when working third best (see Table 3.6).

⁶Possibly there is some overlap between the assessed Italian groups, since two teachers filled in the questionnaire separately.

Table 3.6. Ranking of top three methods used

	1: worked best	2: worked second best	3: worked third best	Total
M1: working with real assignments	90	16		106
M2: using outdoor activities and training in the nature	30	24	18	72
M3: extracurricular activities (e.g. music, dance, crafts, arts)	40		12	52
M4: peer training	70	8	6	84
M5: e-learning			24	24
M6: using music, art, play, drama as teaching methods		24	12	36
M7: soft skills (team building, team working, communication)	90	24	6	120
M8: learning by doing in VET, in a real life situation	40	32		72

The scores indicate that the five partners assessed M7 as best. M1 and M4 were also in the overall top three. This does of course not mean that the other methods have less value or do not work; it simply gives an indication of which methods are ranked best for these specific groups of students. One partner for example ranked a number of methods as best, since they all have equal importance.

Replication

Four of the five partners stated they would use the same combination if they had to start over again with these groups of students or learners. One partner, who provides adult education for (head) teachers, trainers, school inspectors, and educational decision makers, mentioned they would include some additional methods. In practice they would never work with the same group of people, but if so they would create, use and apply new methods because “the teaching process has to grow and improve day by day and also the (head) teachers, trainers, inspectors, decision makers must adapt to the new generation of students and to the local and cultural specificity”. Moreover, when teachers or trainers learn about different methods their motivation will be higher. “If a teacher or trainer is not enough motivated, he or she doesn't have the power to motivate students or learners.”

Positive and critical remarks on the methods

Partners were positive about how the combination of these specific methods worked in the classes or groups. A general remark was that teachers were very positive about the range of methods they could use in the different classes. The partners' answers can be clustered in the following four categories.

Motivational effects

It was mentioned that the motivation of the students improved: students for example acted very professional and made sure they were not late. The real assignment method was described as “essential for student motivation”. Teachers were just observers during the process.

Also the teachers and other learners who received professional training gave positive feedback: “the course is like a vitamin injection in my job. I am full of energy and ideas that I want to try when I'm back home”. The FEIGHT methods encouraged teachers to take initiatives in their schools. The participants got a lot of ideas how to develop an interesting learning process. “Courses like these make people more aware of what they are doing well and create openness of mind to adapt other methods and strategies”.

Social effects: cooperation and team work

The team building activities helped students to work more effectively. The students learned from each other during the process. The general atmosphere in class improved because of the used methods. One partner mentioned team work was a “crucial learning point for the students”.

Real life experiences

Girls who chose the extracurricular modern dance course experienced that in the beginning they seemed not able to perform, but after a lot of practice, patience and repetition their results were much better. Moreover it made them think of their own health and why they could not do certain movements. Other students for example visited a future building site and had fun working together. Because there was no competition, they worked in peace without stress.

Instructive effects

By repeating a specific task over and over again, students learned that they were able to do things. The information received on the course for teachers and other learners was useful for their future professional development: it helped them to better communicate with colleagues and students, and to be more tolerant towards their students.

Most partners did not have critical or negative remarks on how the combination of these specific methods worked in this class or group. The lessons went well. Three critical remarks were made on organization aspects: organizing the activities took a lot of time and some sometimes it was difficult to organize the activities within the scheduled school timetable.

Expectations on effects on personal development and leaving school early

Partners had in general positive expectations of their method on personal development of students. In our evaluation plan we defined that personal development of students consisted of six aspects, namely improvements of interrogative skills (i.e. asking questions to find solutions) and discussion techniques, increased self-confidence, better team work, and an improvement of problem-solving and time keeping. On almost all of these six aspects partners assessed the FEIGHT methods as having had a (very) positive effect (see Figure 3.3).

Especially on the effects on self-confidence and on team work the partners were very positive. For one group of students a partner mentioned there were no positive effects on time keeping.




Figure 3.3. Assessment of effects FEIGHT methods per evaluated group, on six aspects of personal development of students, in %.

Partners were asked about the potential of their chosen combination of methods for reducing the percentage of drop outs in this specific class or group. They had to assess this potential on a scale of one

tot ten. Scores varied from 7 to 10. The average score was 8.7 (based on 11 different groups), so partners view the potential of the FEIGHT methods fairly high. This was a bit higher than their score of 7.8 in the first interim evaluation.

Remarks

The partners remarked that the FEIGHT methods work very well at the schools: the students are more interested in the lessons, they like school more and they want to take responsibilities. Furthermore one partner mentioned that the FEIGHT methods were a useful extension to their own ‘common’ methods.

3.4 Second evaluation results schools and teachers

Choices in combinations of the eight methods

The interviewees were asked which of the eight methods they used in one of their classes or groups. They were asked to describe a maximum of three groups. We assumed they would choose the most striking or typical examples. They mentioned various combinations of methods; see Table 3.7. Method 5 (e-learning) was not mentioned. This was also the case in the first interim evaluation.

Table 3.7. Methods used per specific class or group (G)

	Group or class	M1: working with real assignments	M2: using outdoor activities and training in the nature	M3: extracurricular activities (e.g. music, dance, crafts, arts)	M4: peer training	M5: e-learning	M6: using music, art, play, drama as teaching methods	M7: soft skills (team building, team working, communication)	M8: learning by doing in VET, in a real life situation
DIMEM	G1			x				x	x
	G2			x				x	x
	G3						x	x	x
	G4				x			x	x
	G5	x		x	x		x	x	
	G6	x	x	x	x		x	x	
NIMEM	G1	x			x				
	G2	x		x	x		x	x	
Shalom	G1	x			x				x
Total	9	5	1	5	6		4	7	5

There were multiple different combinations of methods used by the interviewed teachers and teacher partners. Each interviewee explained why a specific combination of methods was chosen for this class or group. A general remark by one teacher was that ‘combining the methods was considered effective and applicable.’ Other remarks on the chosen combinations of methods could be sorted on characteristics of the methods and of the students.

Characteristics of the method

By combining the different methods students were made to work as a team and were actively involved in the lesson. This way for example a topic as geometry that is perceived as “boring and hard to understand” was made more appealing. Students both learned and enjoyed the lesson.

By choosing peer training, “students’ sympathy towards the lesson subject can be raised”. One teacher stated that since a teacher does not understand problems as clear as a peer, it can be more satisfying for a student to work with a peer. By working together in groups in combination with learning by doing, students learned about wiring electric cables or about making their own piston system. In the piston making class presenting their work at the end was part of the project. Finally, the combination of school life with the real world was assessed as a positive aspect, since students learn school subjects and love school more using their own skills.

Characteristics of the students

It was mentioned that these methods are suitable for the specific group of students. One teacher added: “Especially for the shy students I have chosen the real assignment method to awaken them for the world around.” And according to another the “peer training method can be satisfying for my students especially for those who care about friendship a lot”. Finally one teacher mentioned that “all these methods are inseparable parts of teaching as the levels and capacity of students are different from one another”.

The eight methods separately

In the interviews the respondent were asked to indicate which of the methods being part of their approach worked best, second best and third best in order to try and find out if specific methods worked better than others. We then added scores: 10 points when a method was assessed as working best, 8 points when working second best and 6 points when working third best (see Table 3.8). These scores indicate that the teachers assessed M4 as best, followed by M8, M7 and M1. M5 (e-learning) was not used in the groups and therefore also not assessed.

Table 3.8. Ranking of top three methods used

	1: worked best	2: worked second best	3: worked third best	Total
M1: working with real assignments	10	24	6	40
M2: using outdoor activities and training in the nature			12	12
M3: extracurricular activities (e.g. music, dance, crafts, arts)			12	12
M4: peer training	40	8	6	54
M5: e-learning				0
M6: using music, art, play, drama as teaching methods		8		8
M7: soft skills (team building, team working, communication)	20	16	6	42
M8: learning by doing in VET, in a real life situation	20	24		44

Replication

All interviewed teachers and teacher partners stated that if they would have to start over again with this group of students, they would use the same combination of methods.

Positive and critical remarks on the methods

Interviewees had various positive remarks on how the combination of these specific methods worked in their classes or groups. Their answers can be clustered in the following two categories.

Instructive effects

-“It was good for students to divide them in groups and work as a team. At the end, the students solved a puzzle which helped them both enjoy and understand the topic.”

- “The students learn best when they do the work themselves so this lesson was very useful for them as they were active during the process. They were in contact with their friends. They created their own products which meant that art was also included in the lesson.”
- “... in real assignment method I have seen my students’ accomplishment feelings in preparation of mosque complex for the religious staff in our town. They felt important for the society they belong to.”
- “The methods worked well. We had a successful process. The students were able to answer all the questions at the end. The goal was achieved.”
- “When we have a look at the comments of the students we understand that they like working together as a team and practicing geometry without getting bored.”
- “Most of the students liked team works and learning something new with funny ways as their academic success are low.”

Motivational effects

- “They helped the students to improve their motivation and confidence. The general feeling of the class became better.”
- “Nearly all students were involved in the activities. They really enjoyed doing something new, funny and informative.”
- “These methods offer a chance to consider the school in a positive way.”
- “In peer training they have gained more sympathy towards lessons because they have seen the simplicity of the lessons programmes by the help of their peer’s eyes.”

Three teachers did not have critical remarks, but four had. Some were about the organisation of the activities: “Sometimes we had to face practical organization problems that weakened the value of the combination.” The “scheduled timetable of the school (both of the students and teachers) is sometimes a weak point.” And “in real assignment method it can sometimes be difficult to find the subject to work in because we don’t have enough experience and for bureaucratic reasons.”

And others were about difficulties involving the students: “Some of the students didn’t feel themselves free to involve especially in extra-curricular activities at first.” and “Some students who have low self-esteem first were unwilling to take part in some activities.” Finally one teacher mentioned that these “methods are not much more effective for some students who decide leaving the school strictly.”

Effects of FEIGHT methods on personal development and leaving school early

The interviewed teachers and teacher partners were in general positive about the effects on personal development of students of the methods they used. In our evaluation plan we defined that personal development of students consisted of six aspects, namely improvements of interrogative skills (i.e. asking questions to find solutions), discussion techniques, increased self-confidence, better team work, and an improvement of problem-solving and time keeping. On these six aspects most interviewees mentioned that the used FEIGHT methods have had a positive or very positive effect (see Figure 3.4).




Figure 3.4. Assessment of effects FEIGHT methods per evaluated group, on six aspects of personal development of students, in %.

Effects of the FEIGHT methods on team work were assessed as very positive for all nine groups of students. Regarding the effects on self-confidence of students, the teachers and teacher partners were very positive or positive. The effects on the other aspects were mostly assessed as positive. Only regarding time keeping, one teacher mentioned the used methods had no positive effect.

When asked about the potential of their chosen combination of methods for reducing the percentage of drop outs in this specific class or group, on a scale of one tot ten scores varied from five to nine. The average score was 7.8 (based on nine different groups). This was similar to the score the interviewed teachers in the first evaluation round gave.

Remarks

One teacher remarked that the FEIGHT methods really help to get the interest of the students in the lessons. In this way, they like lessons and school more. Another added that “it is a good way for my students to practise and they learn better when they do the work themselves”.

4. Overall conclusions

Both evaluations of the FEIGHT project showed mainly a positive picture; partners and schools have had high expectations and good experiences working with the various combinations of methods. Compared to the first evaluation partners seemed somewhat more positive and teachers reacted similar in their second assessment.

Process

The eight methods were combined in multiple ways. These combinations depended on expectations how the methods would fit the specific group of students and on how it was expected the method itself would work best. One interviewee summed it up: “It is important to assess the needs of each individual young person to determine which method(s) will best suit their specific situation and learning style.”

Some of the eight methods seemed to have worked better than others. At the second evaluation partners were especially positive about a focus on soft skills (M7), working with real assignments (M1), and peer

training (M4); see Figure 4.1. During the project their opinions on which method worked best changed somewhat. E-learning (M5) was not used much and therefore ended up on the bottom of the lists.




Figure 4.1. Ranking of the eight methods on how they worked by partners at first and second evaluation (a higher score means a better ranking)

At the second evaluation the schools and teachers were especially positive about peer training (M4), learning by doing in a real life situation (M8), and focus on soft skills (M7); see Figure 4.2. Their preferences also underwent some change during the project, but this could of course also be due to the fact that other teachers were interviewed the first and second time. Again, e-learning (M5) was not used much and therefore ended up on the bottom of the lists.




Figure 4.2. Ranking of the eight methods on how they worked by schools and teachers at first and second evaluation (a higher score means a better ranking)

Critical remarks by both partners and teachers were mostly on the organisation of the project in the various classes: time pressure due to a lack of time, the available resources and group sizes. For some this discounted the value of the whole project. Furthermore some teachers mentioned that in some cases it was hard to involve the students in the lessons.

Impact

Partners' estimations on the potential of the chosen combination of methods on reducing early school leaving were quite positive and increased from the first to the second evaluation. Schools' and teachers' estimations were also positive but remained alike.

Beforehand personal development of students was defined as an important factor in early school leaving, assuming that methods aimed at personal development would add to less early school leaving. Partners and teachers assessed the effects on personal development as (very) positive, including improvements of interrogative skills (i.e. asking questions to find solutions) and discussion techniques, increased self-confidence, better team work, and an improvement of problem-solving. Time keeping was in some way the odd one out. Whether this actually led to less early school leaving, cannot be concluded from this evaluation.

Both the partners and the teachers spoke about a better motivation of students, social effects (team work, cohesion), the positive effects of real life experiences, and the positive effects on the individual students (including instructive effects and personal development) due to the FEIGHT methods. The methods seem to have had the most effect on team work and on self-confidence of students. Partners seem to be somewhat more optimistic about this than the teachers. They indicated that the FEIGHT project was also instructive for themselves: "I've learned and tried many different activities and techniques in my lessons which made them more enjoyable, helpful and like in real life."

5. Some points of discussion

As one partner remarked, quantifying the results of the teaching process is a difficult task: "All different methods and combination of methods, as well as different approaches in different contexts and cultural environments, make the comparison very difficult." We totally agree with that, but think it could be possible if there would have been very large numbers of participating schools in all participating countries that would have used all different methods in all possible combinations. That way the effects of the different combinations could have been compared; ideally contrasted to control groups and in relation to actual drop-out figures. But that was not the case in FEIGHT and it was never the intention.

With this evaluation we simply wanted to give some insight in the expectations and first hand experiences using the various combinations methods. Not so much by quantifying, but by describing them in a descriptive way. As we described at the beginning of Chapter 3, it is not possible to quantify with these kinds of numbers.

Furthermore, we did not aim at drawing conclusions on some optimal combination of methods, but try and show combinations have worked thus far in various countries and schools, with various students and on various topics. Hopefully, this way lessons can be learned by the involved partners and schools, but also by others. The fact that project partners might be somewhat more positive about implementing their own project than others, takes nothing away from the experiences of the teachers with their students.

We would like to thank the partners for their time and effort of providing us with the data.

Annex A. Evaluation methodology

The project evaluation is divided into two parts: the process evaluation and the impact evaluation. In the process evaluation it is investigated whether the FEIGHT project as a whole functioned well. In the impact evaluation it is investigated to what extent both the partners and schools expect the educational methods to help solve the problem of early school leaving.

The evaluations are carried out by means of written surveys for which questionnaires are developed (see Annex B and C). The questionnaires are used two times during the project: at the start of the project and two months before the end meeting in Turkey. During the mid-term meeting in Turkey, the results of the first surveys, as reported in the mid-term report, are presented by IVAM.

Process evaluation

The process evaluation focuses on how the project functioned according to the partners and the schools. Both the transfer of SfS (WP2) and Peer (WP3) methods and approaches are analysed. The process evaluation is about the experiences of working with combinations of the eight innovative teaching and training approaches and methods.

The combinations of approaches and methods as used in the schools are assessed on various indicators; see Table A1. Partners' and schools' satisfaction with the various approaches and methods are measured using open questions on experiences and expectations. Furthermore, partners and schools are asked if they would chose for the same methods in hindsight.

Table A1. Process indicators – approaches and methods (partners and schools)

1.) Satisfaction with combinations of eight methods
1.) Satisfaction with eight individual methods

Impact evaluation

The impact evaluation focuses on the effects the project had on the students. FEIGHT aims at reducing early school leaving and to identify the main explaining factors. Both the partners and the schools are questioned on the impacts of the new methods and approaches created based on the innovation transferred (SfS and Peer Training): are they useful in fighting early school leaving?

Impact of the (combinations of the) eight approaches and methods is assessed on two main indicators; see Table A2. Impacts are measured using questions on expected and experienced effects on personal development of the students: communications (interrogative skills, discussion techniques), self-confidence /self-esteem, team building, problem solving, time keeping. Furthermore, impacts are measured by questions on expected potential for reducing the percentage of drop outs.

Table A2. Impact indicators (partners and schools)

1.) Expected personal development of students due to the (combinations of the) approaches and methods
2.) Expected potential for reducing the percentage of drop outs due to the (combinations of the) approaches and methods

Annex B. Questionnaire Project partner (QP)

Introduction

This questionnaire is about the eight methods and approaches used in the FEIGHT project and about your experiences as a project partner in implementing or starting to implement these methods at schools.

- Filling in the questionnaire will take ... minutes of your time.
- You can go back and forth in the questionnaire
- At the end of the questionnaire you can add remarks or suggestions about the questionnaire itself.

Thank you for participating!

Please do not hesitate to contact us if you have any questions.

Q1. What is your name?

Q2. What is the name of your organization?

Q3. Are you already using one or more of the eight FEIGHT methods at schools?

Yes → Q4

No → Q6P

Q4. In how many schools are you using the various FEIGHT methods?

Q5. In how many classes or groups of students are you using the various FEIGHT methods?

The next questions are about your opinions and experiences of using the various FEIGHT methods in the participating school(s).

Please think of one class or of one group of students at one school in which you use a combination of the FEIGHT methods.

Q6. What is the name of the school you are thinking of?

Q7. What is the name of the class you are thinking of? *(You can skip this question if you cannot answer it)*

Q8. Which of the following methods do you use in this specific class or group? *You can give multiple answers.*

- working with real assignments (M1)
- using outdoor activities and training in the nature (M2)
- extracurricular activities (e.g. music, dance, crafts, arts) (M3)
- peer training (M4)
- e-learning (M5)
- using music, art, play, drama as teaching methods (M6)
- soft skills (team building, team working, communication) (M7)
- learning by doing in VET, in a real life situation (e.g. in a company on the labour market or in a virtual situation simulated in the school) (M8).

Q9. Please specify why the combination of these specific methods was chosen for this class or group?

Q10. Could you describe your positive remarks about how the combination of these specific methods worked in this class or group? *(If you have no positive remarks, you can write down 'no remarks')*

Q11. Could you describe your negative remarks about how the combination of these specific methods worked in this class or group? *(If you have no negative remarks, you can write down 'no remarks')*

Q12. Do you think this combination of methods has or will have a positive effect on the following aspects of personal development of students?

	No positive effect	Positive effect	Very positive effect	Not applicable / Do not know
Interrogative skills (i.e. asking questions to find solutions)				
Discussion techniques				
Self-confidence				
Team work				
Problem solving				
Time keeping				

Q13. What do you expect to be the potential of this combination of methods for reducing the percentage of drop outs in this class or group? *On a scale from 1 (totally no potential) to 10 (very much potential).*

Totally no potential										Very much potential	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		

Q14. Can you order the individual methods you used according to which worked best, second best and third best, for this specific group or class?

You can cross multiple number 1, number 2 or number 3 methods. If it is impossible to rank the various methods you can skip this question.

	1: worked best	2: worked second best	3: worked third best
working with real assignments (M1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
using outdoor activities and training in the nature (M2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
extracurricular activities (e.g. music, dance, crafts, arts) (M3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
peer training (M4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
e-learning (M5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
using music, art, play, drama as teaching methods (M6)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
soft skills (team building, team working, communication) (M7)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
learning by doing in VET, in a real life situation (M8).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q15. If you would have to start over again with this group of students, would you use the same combination of methods?

Yes

→ Q16

No, I would exclude some of the chosen methods → Q15b

No, I would include some additional methods → Q15b

Q15b. Please specify

Q16. Did you use a combination of the FEIGHT methods in another, different class or group of students?

Yes → Q6

No → Q17

*We limited this questionnaire to the evaluation of a maximum of three groups or classes.
Please think of the most striking or informative classes or groups.*

Q16b. Did you use a combination of the FEIGHT methods in another, different class or group of students? In how many other classes or groups did you use the methods?

No

Yes, in one other class or group

Yes, in two to five other groups or classes

Yes, in more than five other groups or classes

Q17. Do you have any final remarks on the FEIGHT methods or on the questionnaire?

Thank you!

(These questions are for partners who plan to use the methods; see Q3)

Q4P. In how many schools are you planning to use the various FEIGHT methods?

Q5P. In how many classes or groups of students are you planning to use the various FEIGHT methods?

The next questions are about your opinions and expectations of using the various FEIGHT methods in the participating school(s).

Please think of one class or of one group of students at one school in which you will implement a combination of the FEIGHT methods.

Q6P. What is the name of the school you are thinking of?

Q7P. What is the name of the class you are thinking of? *(You can skip this question if you cannot answer it)*

Q8P. Which of the following methods will you use in this class or group? *You can give multiple answers.*

- working with real assignments (M1)
- using outdoor activities and training in the nature (M2)
- extracurricular activities (e.g. music, dance, crafts, arts) (M3)
- peer training (M4)
- e-learning (M5)
- using music, art, play, drama as teaching methods (M6)
- soft skills (team building, team working, communication) (M7)
- learning by doing in VET, in a real life situation (e.g. in a company on the labour market or in a virtual situation simulated in the school) (M8).

Q9P. Please specify the choice of this combination of methods for this class of group.

Q12P. Do you think this combination of methods will have a positive effect on the following aspects of personal development of students?

	No positive effect	Positive effect	Very positive effect	Not applicable / Do not know
Interrogative skills (i.e. asking questions to find solutions)				
Discussion techniques				
Self-confidence				
Team work				
Problem solving				
Time keeping				

Q13P. What do you expect to be the potential of this combination of methods for reducing the percentage of drop outs in this class or group? *On a scale from 1 (totally no potential) to 10 (very much potential).*

Totally no potential										Very much potential	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		

Q14P. Can you order the individual methods you are planning to use, according to your expectations on which will work best, second best and third best, for this specific group or class?

You can cross multiple number 1, number 2 or number 3 methods. If it is impossible to rank the various methods you can skip this question.

	1: worked best	2: worked second best	3: worked third best
working with real assignments (M1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
using outdoor activities and training in the nature (M2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
extracurricular activities (e.g. music, dance, crafts, arts) (M3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
peer training (M4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
e-learning (M5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
using music, art, play, drama as teaching methods (M6)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
soft skills (team building, team working, communication) (M7)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
learning by doing in VET, in a real life situation (M8).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q15P. Will you use a different combination of the methods in another, different class or group of students?
Yes → Q6P
No → Q17

*We limited this questionnaire to the evaluation of a maximum of three groups or classes.
Please think of the most striking or informative examples, classes or groups.*

Q15Pb. Will you use a combination of the FEIGHT methods in another, different class or group of students? In how many other classes or groups will you use the methods?
No
Yes, in one other class or group
Yes, in two to five other groups or classes
Yes, in more than five other groups or classes

Q17. Do you have any final remarks on the FEIGHT methods or on the questionnaire?

Thank you!

Annex C: Questionnaire Schools (QS)

Instruction for FEIGHT partners:

FEIGHT partners will interview schools and teachers involved. Schools/ teachers will not fill in this questionnaire themselves.

Possibly some schools/teachers have not started using the various FEIGHT methods. For schools/teachers that have started ask about their experiences thus far, and for schools/teachers that will start ask about their expectations. You can adjust the questions below according to the phase schools/teachers are in.

Introduction (for example)

This interview is about the eight methods and approaches used in the FEIGHT project and about your experiences at your school using or starting to use these methods.

Interviewer, fill in:

Q1. Name

Q2. Name of the school

Q3. Does this school/teacher already use a combination of the eight FEIGHT methods?

- Yes
- No

Q4. What is your function or job within the school?

Q5. How many students are or will be involved in working with the teaching methods and approaches this interview is about?

Q6. How many of these students would you estimate are at risk of leaving school early?

Please think of one class or of one group of students at your school in which you (will) use a combination of the FEIGHT methods.

Q6. Which of the following methods do you use or will you use in this specific class or group? *You can give multiple answers.*

- working with real assignments (M1)
- using outdoor activities and training in the nature (M2)
- extracurricular activities (e.g. music, dance, crafts, arts) (M3)
- peer training (M4)
- e-learning (M5)
- using music, art, play, drama as teaching methods (M6)
- soft skills (team building, team working, communication) (M7)
- learning by doing in VET, in a real life situation (e.g. in a company on the labour market or in a virtual situation simulated in the school) (M8).

Q7. Please specify why the combination of these specific methods was chosen for this class or group?

Q8. Could you describe your positive remarks about how the combination of these specific methods worked in this class or group? *(If you have no positive remarks, you can write down 'no remarks')*

1)

2)

3)

Q9. Could you describe your negative remarks about how the combination of these specific methods worked in this class or group? *(If you have no negative remarks, you can write down 'no remarks')*

1)

2)

3)

Q10. Do you think this combination of methods has or will have a positive effect on the following aspects of personal development of students?

	No positive effect	Positive effect	Very positive effect	Not applicable / Do not know
Interrogative skills (i.e. asking questions to find solutions)				
Discussion techniques				
Self-confidence				
Team work				
Problem solving				
Time keeping				

Q11. What do you expect to be the potential of this combination of methods for reducing the percentage of drop outs in this class or group? *On a scale from 1 (totally no potential) to 10 (very much potential).*

Totally no potential →				← Very much potential					
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Q12. Can you give a ranking which of the eight individual methods you used works best/ you expect to work best? *Add a 1 to the method that works best, a 2 to the method that works second best, etc. until you included all methods you used or will use.*

If it is impossible to rank the various methods you can skip this question.

	RANK: 1 to 8
working with real assignments (M1)	
using outdoor activities and training in the nature (M2)	
extracurricular activities (e.g. music, dance, crafts, arts) (M3)	
peer training (M4)	
e-learning (M5)	
using music, art, play, drama as teaching methods (M6)	
soft skills (team building, team working, communication) (M7)	
learning by doing in VET, in a real life situation (e.g. in a company on the labour market or in a virtual situation simulated in the school) (M8).	

Q13. In hindsight, would you have used the same combination of methods again for this group of students? *(skip if not applicable)*

- Yes
- No, I would exclude some of the eight methods
- No, I would include some additional methods

Q13b. Please specify. *(skip if not applicable)*

Did you implement a combination of the FEIGHT methods in another, different class or group of students?

Yes → Q6 (below)

No → Q14

Q14. Do you have other remarks?

ADDITIONAL FORM WHEN THERE ARE MORE CLASSES OR GROUPS INVOLVED

Please think of one class or of one group of students at your school in which you (will) use a combination of the FEIGHT methods.

Q6. Which of the following methods do you use or will you use in this specific class or group? *You can give multiple answers.*

- working with real assignments (M1)
- using outdoor activities and training in the nature (M2)
- extracurricular activities (e.g. music, dance, crafts, arts) (M3)
- peer training (M4)
- e-learning (M5)
- using music, art, play, drama as teaching methods (M6)
- soft skills (team building, team working, communication) (M7)
- learning by doing in VET, in a real life situation (e.g. in a company on the labour market or in a virtual situation simulated in the school) (M8).

Q7. Please specify why the combination of these specific methods was chosen for this class or group?

--

Q8. Could you describe your positive remarks about how the combination of these specific methods worked in this class or group? *(If you have no positive remarks, you can write down 'no remarks')*

1)
2)
3)

Q9. Could you describe your negative remarks about how the combination of these specific methods worked in this class or group? *(If you have no negative remarks, you can write down 'no remarks')*

1)
2)
3)

Q10. Do you think this combination of methods has or will have a positive effect on the following aspects of personal development of students?

	No positive effect	Positive effect	Very positive effect	Not applicable / Do not know
Interrogative skills (i.e. asking questions to find solutions)				
Discussion techniques				
Self-confidence				
Team work				
Problem solving				
Time keeping				

Q11. What do you expect to be the potential of this combination of methods for reducing the percentage of drop outs in this class or group? *On a scale from 1 (totally no potential) to 10 (very much potential).*

Totally no potential				→	Very much potential					
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	

Q12. Can you give a ranking which of the eight individual methods you used works best/ you expect to work best? *Add a 1 to the method that works best, a 2 to the method that works second best, etc. until you included all methods you used or will use.*

If it is impossible to rank the various methods you can skip this question.

	RANK: 1 to 8
working with real assignments (M1)	
using outdoor activities and training in the nature (M2)	
extracurricular activities (e.g. music, dance, crafts, arts) (M3)	
peer training (M4)	
e-learning (M5)	
using music, art, play, drama as teaching methods (M6)	
soft skills (team building, team working, communication) (M7)	
learning by doing in VET, in a real life situation (e.g. in a company on the labour market or in a virtual situation simulated in the school) (M8).	

Q13. In hindsight, would you have used the same combination of methods again for this group of students? (*skip if not applicable*)

- Yes
- No, I would exclude some of the eight methods
- No, I would include some additional methods

Q13b. Please specify. (*skip if not applicable*)

Did you implement a combination of the FEIGHT methods in another, different class or group of students?

Yes → Q6

No → Q14