The aim of the national workshops was to discuss and interpret at country level the results and data analysis from the MENTEP field trials with National Public Authorities. In particular, the objectives were for national stakeholders to get acquainted with the results at national and European level, to interpret them within the national policy and practice context, but also to develop the implications and next steps for teacher training and the adaptation and sustainability of the technology enhanced self-assessment tool TET-SAT.

Each MENTEP partner that participated to the field trials organised a workshop in its own country (Cyprus, Czech Republic, Finland, France, Greece, Estonia, Italy, Lithuania, Spain, Portugal, Slovenia). MENTEP partners were asked to invite between six and fifteen participants with a core interest in the project: policy makers, researchers, teachers, representatives from teacher training organisations, teacher training curriculum authorities and inspectorates.

The Greek national workshop took place on 23 January 2018 in Patras. 15 participants attended the workshop, including representatives from European Schoolnet (2), the research institute for the evaluation of public policies IRVAPP (1), the MENTEP partner organization CTI Diophantus (4), the President of the Greek National Organisation for the Certification of Qualifications & Vocational Guidance (1), a lecturer from the University of Athens (1), a Professor from the University of Patras (1), a school councilor and also Director of the Western Greece’s Regional Teacher Training Center (1), and non-MENTEP school teachers from lower and upper secondary education (2).

Nena Karagianni, MENTEP national partner, CTI, chaired the workshop.
Presentations & Discussion

This national Discussion Workshop Report summarises the conclusions reached in the national workshop in Greece. It consists of the following sections, each time summarising the key points of the presentation and the discussion afterwards, both with a particular focus on the most striking findings evolving from the data analysis within the context of Greece and the impact of the TET-SAT.

1. About the MENTEP project
2. The new self-assessment tool TET-SAT
3. The research design of the policy experimentation
4. Results of the experimentation - national descriptors
   • The response rates to the Follow-Up Survey (FUS)
   • The characteristics of the MENTEP teachers
   • Teachers’ use of the TET-SAT: Numbers, satisfaction & feedback score
5. Results of the experimentation - the impact of the TET-SAT
6. National and international developments in relation to the TET-SAT, competence assessment and certification
7. Conclusions & next steps in Greece

In the morning, European Schoolnet set the scene with two presentations on the rationale of the MENTEP project and the newly developed self-assessment tool TET-SAT, which was tested during the field trials.

1. Presentation: About the MENTEP project
Anja Balanskat, European Schoolnet, presented the rationale of the MENTEP project: As a policy experimentation, it is not “just” a project but the aim is to test an intervention resulting in reliable evidence based on a strong methodology. European Schoolnet coordinates the project, with 15 partners from 13 countries. There were no particular comments on this presentation.

Find out more here:
Presentation available here
2.a Presentation: The new self-assessment tool TET-SAT

Katja Engelhardt, European Schoolnet, introduced workshop participants to the new self-assessment tool TET-SAT that the MENTEP consortium developed, with the help of experts, on the basis of existing tools and frameworks. The TET-SAT aims to trigger teachers’ self-reflection, identify learning needs and initiate actions to further develop their competences. The tool assesses four dimensions of digital competence: digital pedagogy, digital content use and production, digital communication and collaboration and digital citizenship. Teachers are invited to position themselves for each competence choosing the one of 5 statements that most closely describes their practice. After answering the 30 questions, teachers receive personalised feedback, including links to national and European ecosystems of training resources mapped against the competence areas of the tool.

Try out the TET-SAT here; Presentation available here
For further information: MENTEP Brochure 2017

2.b Discussion: The new self-assessment tool TET-SAT

All the participants were requested, by the national partner, to explore and familiarize with the Greek version of the TET-SAT tool prior to the workshop. After the presentation, workshop participants generally welcomed the TET-SAT, and suggested some concrete improvements, based on their personal experience with the online tool. Other issues discussed were data privacy and the question which teachers might benefit the most from the use of the TET-SAT.

TET-SAT improvements

• The TET-SAT is an interesting tool because it helps teachers to reflect. However, it is a bit too long. Stating that “I know how to do something” is not the same as “I am actually doing this” (University of Athens).

• It is good that filling in the TET-SAT takes time and that not all answer options are immediately entirely clear - It takes more time to reflect. The Feedback page could still be structured more clearly, also to make it easier to find the option to compare with others (Patras Regional Training Centre).

• The self-assessment tool is designed to allow for teachers to self-reflect at their own pace. We never thought that filling in the tool should be a quick exercise (MENTEP national partner Greece).
• It took me a long time to fill in the TET-SAT. It is good that it is possible to fill in the TET-SAT several times. In some of the areas, there is a big gap between the two levels “proficient” and “expert” and some of the wording used for these levels is slightly confusing. Some factors that influence the TET-SAT results such as the internet connection at school do not depend on my ability. It would be easier to ask whether students did something or not (teacher).

• In reply to several workshop participants’ concerns about the TET-SAT being too time-consuming, Enrico Rettore (IRVAPP) replied that it took MENTEP teachers on average 25 to 50 minutes to fill in the TET-SAT.

• Teachers should be able to compare their own results, after they filled in the TET-SAT several times. They could also be invited to join a teacher community, possibly together with those teachers with a similar level of digital competence.

Data privacy

• If a teacher has to provide his email address, he can be identified (Patras Regional Training Centre). The fact that all data will be treated anonymously will be stated still more clearly, Anja Balanskat (EUN) replied. Perhaps some teacher do not want to give their email addresses and be completely anonymous (teacher). A free demo version of the tool could be offered, where teachers do not need to give any credentials.

TET-SAT users:

• Did many teachers get low scores? Some of our teachers did not even try the TET-SAT because they were afraid (CTI). Most teachers got the feedback that they were capable, replied Enrico Rettore (IRVAPP). One of the MENTEP teacher that described himself as a beginner reported that teachers helped each other to fill in the tool (Katja Engelhardt, EUN). These kinds of tools will mainly help those teachers “in the middle” (CTI).

3.a Presentation: The Research design of the policy experimentation

Enrico Rettore (IRVAPP, responsible for the MENTEP evaluation) presented first the evaluation question, the counterfactual approach, the experimental design and the data collection plan. The evaluation question of the policy experimentation was: What is the impact of the Technology-Enhanced Teaching Self-Assessment Tool (TET-SAT) on teachers’ TET competences?

More information about the research methodology here; Presentation available here
3.b Discussion: The research design of the policy experimentation

Workshop participants discussed in groups, and then presented the results of the discussion.

• Overall, the views on the tool were very positive.

• However, there are some reservations/ concerns regarding the hypothesis that a self-assessment tool will enhance teachers’ digital competence.

• An objective test instead of another self-assessment, as done via the BS, should be considered, in order to have a more objective way to compare the TET-SAT results.

• It is suggested to add some qualitative characteristics to the methodological approach of the experimentation. This suggestion relates to the fact that some results were questioned as not really reflecting the reality. Some of the teachers’ answers appear not to be quite honest.

• It would be interesting to see the TET-SAT results compared to participation of Greek teachers to B-level training.

• MENTEP teachers’ digital competence was above average. How can the TET-SAT support teachers with a very low level of digital competence?

4.1 Presentation: Results of the experimentation – national descriptors

Enrico Rettore (IRVAPP) then presented first results: in particular the context of the experimentation:

a. The response rates to the Follow-UP Survey (FUS)
b. The characteristics of the MENTEP teachers
c. Teachers’ use of the TET-SAT: Numbers, satisfaction & feedback score

Presentation available here
4.1.a Presentation: Response rates to the Follow-Up Survey (FUS)

In Greece, 50 schools participated in MENTEP. 393 teachers from those schools were invited to fill in the Benchmark Survey. The 326 teachers that accepted this invitation are our sample. The response rates to the MENTEP Follow-Up survey is with 80.4% above the overall response rate of 76.5%.

4.2.a Presentation: Characteristics of MENTEP teachers

General characteristics
In Greece, teachers are slightly older than the overall average, with only 13% of Greek teachers being younger than 40 years old (25% overall), 40% between 40 and 50 (36% overall), and 47% over 50 years old (39% overall).

Teachers’ self-assessed TET-ability, use of ICT and attitudes
The sampled teachers participating in the Benchmark Survey showed a good familiarity with ICT, self-assessed their TET ability as very high and had very positive views about ICT in teaching & learning.

Teachers’ self-assessed TET-ability
Teachers’ self-assessed ability in Greece is generally quite high, above the overall average for all items, e.g. 98% of Greek teachers (90% overall) state that they are able to “stimulate students to use ICT in a critical manner”. Further, 99% of Greek teachers (95% overall) state to be able to “support students in searching information by means of ICT”. Finally, 89% of Greek teachers (77% overall) agree that they are able to “select ICT applications effectively in creating a learning environment”.

Teachers’ self-assessed TET-ability. Percentage of teachers that agree with the proposed statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I am able to...</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulate students to use ICT in a critical manner</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support students in searching information by means of ICT</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support students to communicate with ICT in a safe, responsible and effective way</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Re)design ICT applications in view of a specific educational setting</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select ICT applications effectively in creating a learning environment</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* “Agreement”: percentage of teachers who slightly agree, agree, totally agree
Teachers’ views on ICT in teaching
Teachers’ views on the use of ICT in teaching in Greece are generally quite positive, above the overall average for all items, e.g. 97% of Greek teachers (94% overall) agree that using ICT at school “enables students to access better sources of information”. Further, 88% of Greek teachers (76% overall) agree that using ICT at school “helps students to develop greater interest in learning”. Moreover, 87% of Greek teachers (65% overall) agree that using ICT at school “helps students develop skills in planning and self-regulation of work” and 70% of Greek teachers (60% overall) that using ICT at school “improves academic performance of students”.

Teachers attitudes towards ICT in teaching and learning. Percentage of teachers that agree with the proposed statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Using ICT at school</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enables students to access better sources of information</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps students to consolidate and process information more effectively</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps students learn to collaborate with other students</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enables students to communicate more effectively with others</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps students develop greater interest in learning</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps students work at a level appropriate to their learning skills</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps students develop skills in planning and self-regulation of their work</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improves academic performance of students</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*“Agreement”: percentage of teachers who agree and strongly agree

Teachers’ actual use of ICT
On the actual use of ICT, e.g. 95% of teachers in Greece (95% overall) used ICT “to present information through direct class instruction”. Further, 94% of Greek teachers (76% overall) used ICT to support inquiry learning and 87% of Greek teachers (76% overall) use ICT to provide feedback to students. However, with 43% (56% overall), Greek teachers used ICT slightly less to collaborate with parents or guardians in supporting students’ learning.
Teachers’ actual use of ICT in teaching and learning. Percentage of teachers that agree with the proposed statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I used ICT to support this activity</th>
<th>At least in some lessons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenting information through direct class instruction</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing remedial or enrichment support to individual students or small groups of students</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling student-led whole-class discussions and presentations</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing students’ learning through written tests</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing feedback to students</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinforcing learning of skills through repetition of examples</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting collaboration among students</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediating communication between students and experts or external mentors</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling students to collaborate with other students (within or outside school)</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborating with parents or guardians in supporting students’ learning</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting inquiry learning</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assigning written task/exercises/homework to students</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating/supporting individual or collaborative oral presentation by students</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating with students out of the classroom</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teacher collaboration on the use of ICT in teaching

Overall, teachers’ collaboration on the use of ICT is moderate. However, 70% of Greek teachers (56% overall) “work with other teachers on improving the use of ICT in classroom teaching”, 58% of Greek teachers (48% overall) “observe how other teachers use ICT in teaching” and 51% of Greek teachers (38% overall) “work with other teachers on cross-curricula projects involving ICT”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I work together with other teachers on improving the use of ICT in classroom teaching</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I collaborate with colleagues to develop ICT based lessons based on the curriculum</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I observe how other teachers use ICT in teaching</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I work with other teachers on cross-curricula projects involving ICT</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.b Discussion: Characteristics of MENTEP teachers

General characteristics:
• We, secondary education teachers, are quite old on average (teacher). The last call to recruit teachers was 10 years ago (CTI).

Teacher collaboration on the use of ICT
• Whether or not teachers state that they collaborate with others also depends on their own definition of collaboration (Patras Regional Training Centre).
4.3.a Presentation: Teachers’ use of the TET-SAT: Numbers, satisfaction & feedback score

Number of teachers using the TET-SAT

1 in 2 (50.7%) Greek teachers used TET-SAT, compared to 1 in 3 (33.8%) of teachers overall. With this figure, Greece is the country with the second highest take up rate of the TET-SAT (after Slovenia with 61%). Most teachers that started using the TET-SAT also completed it (68 out of 77 Greek teachers; 734 out of 930 teachers overall). Encouraged teachers that did not use the TET-SAT were asked for their reasons at the FUS: Overall, 32% (1.7% in Greece) stated that they were unaware of it, followed by time constraints (30% overall, 47% in Greece). In Greece, only 2% of teachers (compared to 10%), stated as a reason that the tool was “not interesting”.

Teachers’ satisfaction with the TET-SAT

On average, Greek teachers have graded the TET-SAT 8.0 (7.5 overall) on a scale from 1 (low) to 10 (high). A large share of teachers finds the TET-SAT useful, e.g. 84% of Greek teachers agree that the “TET-SAT helped me to assess my competence” (64.4% overall). In Greece, 75% of those teachers that used TET-SAT agreed that it helped them to re-think the use of ICT in their teaching (62% overall).

Teachers’ feedback score

Observed score ranges between 25% and 95%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Greece</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall score TET-SAT</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>51.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Score by area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital pedagogy</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital content use and production</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital communication and collaboration</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>45.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital citizenship</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>52.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.b Discussion: Presentation: Teachers’ use of the TET-SAT: Numbers, satisfaction & feedback score

Feedback Score
• How is the TET-SAT score calculated (Patras Regional Training Centre)? This score is calculated as the average of all 30 answers. The score for each of the 4 areas is calculated as the average of the answers for this area (EUN).

Take-up rate of TET-SAT
• In some other MENTEP countries, it was the Ministry that invited teachers to use the TET-SAT. However, the result in Greece is still good. Perhaps, the positive result is precisely due to the fact that it was not the Ministry that contacted teachers (MENTEP national coordinator).
• Some invitation emails were considered as spam.
• Another issue were time constraints.

5.a Presentation: Results of the experimentation - The impact of the TET-SAT
The effects of the TET-SAT are reported on the overall sample. It was not possible to estimate the impact of the tool at the country level but only at the aggregate level. The impact evaluation results show that using the TET-SAT leads teachers to develop more informed and critical assessments of their TET competence. After using the TET-SAT, teachers tend to have a more critical perception of their level of TET competences. Their self-assessed ICT ability decreases (especially among older teachers and women). Moreover, teachers who used the TET-SAT showed slightly more critical views on ICT in teaching and learning, especially those who started with a very high self-assessed TET competence. The data suggests that the feedback score is really crucial. The feedback score only partly explains why teachers revise their views on ICT after using the TET-SAT. Another possible explanation is that the use of the TET-SAT made teachers more critical and aware of the role of ICT in teaching and learning; their revised view could be a more informed one.

Presentation available here; More information available here
5.b Discussion: Results of the experimentation - The impact of TET-SAT

After the presentation, workshop participants had several questions for clarification.

• Does a high score mean that the teachers were at the expert level? It seems to be logical that those teachers with a low feedback score have more critical views on the ICT in teaching (University of Athens).

• We agree with your explanation that teachers have a more informed view about their own competence after using the TET-SAT. However, why is there also a negative effect on views about ICT in teaching (CTI)? There are several possible explanations. Teachers might have had a somewhat naive view on ICT as a magical solution, and now have a more informed view. Some teachers might have also been disappointed (“If you tell me that I cannot do it, then I do not want it”).

• How many teachers used the ecosystems with training resources? Only few teachers clicked on the training resource pages (EUN).

6.a National and international developments in relation to the TET-SAT, competence assessment and certification

Anja Balanskat, European Schoolnet, gave an overview of international and European initiatives related to the development of competence frameworks and tools for teachers including an update of the work by UNESCO, JRC and ISTE.

6.b National developments in relation to the TET-SAT - The B-level ICT In-Service Teacher Training

George Panopoulos (CTI) presented national developments in relation to the TET-SAT.

The B-level ICT In-Service Teacher Training, in place since 2008, aims to provide teachers with the knowledge and skills they need to use ICT in their teaching in a meaningful way.

A network of almost 700 training centres all over Greece is involved, and 24,000 have been certified so far. The B-level training is now available to all teachers at primary
and secondary level. It is offered either as a face-to-face training or as a blended model. The “in-school application” is an integral part of the training. The training is accompanied by a certification process based on the evaluation of the work done during the training and a final online examination. There is big overlap between the areas of this online examination and the TET-SAT areas. However, some TET-SAT areas such as digital citizenship are less well covered by the online examination.

The B-level certification tool is partially automated. Each test consists of a general part (12 multiple choice questions (from a pool common to all teachers), 24 multiple choice questions (particular to each teacher category), and a free-form, non-automated part where teachers need to describe an educational activity for a specific subject. The pool of automated questions currently contains about 1,100 different questions of various didactic subjects, areas of training, difficulty level etc. Emphasis is put on a holistic approach of assessing the B-level competences. Many questions are complex and the correct answer requires the mastery of several competences from various areas.

**Possible use of the TET-SAT in Greece**

The TET-SAT could be used as it is or be extended/modified. The TET-SAT could be extended beyond the 4 main areas, or more competences could be added to the existing 4 areas (either at European or national level).

The TET-SAT idea could support or improve the B-level training. For example:

- Teachers could first self-assess themselves (select the answer option that they think corresponds the closest to their level), and then be presented with a small set of questions that is linked to this answer option.

- The TET-SAT could be used to get an idea about teachers’ current TET-ability. 4 different training courses corresponding to each level could be offered.

- The TET-SAT could be used on a wide scale, and help to better focus B-level training on areas where there is greater need.

- The tool could be used (before and after) to monitor the actual impact of B-level training and hence contribute to its improvement.
• The TET-SAT (plus ecosystem) could be used to support the ongoing self-training of teachers after the end of B-level training. Further support to teachers after their training is something that is not really provided yet.

• Combining the TET-SAT tool with the B-level training material. It would require an extended TET-SAT tool “pointing” to the B-level training material (plus other resources of a national ecosystem), in a focused way.

7. Discussion: Conclusions & next steps in Greece

“I really like the TET-SAT as a self-assessment tool. If we could convince more teachers to use it, that would be great. The TET-SAT will need to be updated regularly, as the use of ICT changes quickly.” Anastasia Anagnostopoulou, teacher.

• George George Panopoulos (CTI) agreed that regular updates are very important. For instance, fake news were not an issue 5 years ago.

• The minimum EUN can commit to is to update the TET-SAT every year with the help of experts. The tool should also have the capacity to be relevant for the long term, as general competences stay the same, while certain terms change (Anja Balanskat, EUN).

• Nena Karagianni (CTI) added that also the ecosystems need to be updated regularly. Anja Balanskat (EUN) agreed. It should be in the interest of each country to provide up to date training, she added.

• I see the use of the TET-SAT more and more as a first of several steps for teachers. There are several possibilities for teachers how they can use the TET-SAT, either on their own or collaboratively (Anja Balanskat, EUN).

• We could organise to invite the teachers trained by our centre to use the TET-SAT and possibly organise training such as a MOOC, a training program or a small case study according to the training needs identified (Spyros Papadakis, Director of the Patras Regional Training Centre).
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