



TEMPUS IV MASTS 511170
MASTER CURRICULLUM DESIGN
WORKSHOP REPORT

November 30th – December 1st 2011

Day 1: Program framework and individual programs revisited

After presentation on Common Framework for Subject Teacher Master Curriculum and a critical friend approach to it (lecture by F. Buchberger), individual universities programs presentations followed by a discussion about them.

Discussion results:

Following comments and suggestions were made considering presented STE programs:

- It was agreed that a wide understanding was achieved on what an area of Teacher Education consists of, and what are issues of concern for new student teacher generations.
- An urgent need for development of specific subject didactics was recognized together with a need to think of a way to recruit and ensure support for development of subject didactics teachers (some of solutions were suggested: joint syllabi composing, joint classes, cooperation between universities, support from experienced teachers in schools and better cooperation between universities and mentors in schools which could be engaged and developed as a resourceful pool of future subject didactics teachers etc.)

Other ideas heard:

- It was suggested that universities should not reduce some of the competencies, they are all a must. Courses aimed at development of teacher competencies (stated in Standards document) shouldn't be offered as elective, which is now a case in most programs considering a third and fourth group of competencies (3. Support for students' personal development, and 4. Communication and Cooperation). We would have to develop competencies in all our students, and it's not good idea to let it depend on whether students choose those courses or not.
- Generally, an impression is that there are not enough courses dealing with issues of social relations, communication, cooperation with all relevant actors (students, colleagues, family, etc.), which are really important for teacher work
- It was suggested that course(s) dealing with research methodology should be there and should not be elective, because it's expected for MA level studies
- The stronger emphasis on the role and significance of teaching practice should be put. There should be more than 6 ECTS (as required minimum by Law) for practice. In Finland, for example, Practice weights one third from total number of program's

ECTS. Coordinator of the project suggested that we could try to compensate small number of credits for practice through some tasks given throughout other courses

- It seems that there is no agreement on numbers of credits for similar courses (modules) in different programs, which calls for a reconsideration of a Common Framework and again individual programs since such a situation could be a problem for student's mobility etc. The ECTS assigned to corresponding courses offered by different universities should be aligned so to provide student mobility throughout national universities.
- Quality assurance mechanisms were not presented as incorporated into programs. It was mentioned that external agencies and internal QA systems exist (there are 7 areas to cover), but we should not be too intrusive, rather try to keep it simple and effective at the same time. Learning outcomes oriented approach and portfolio assessment were suggested as systems which enable continuous evaluation, together with observation of our students' lesson plans, performance...

Later on, presentations followed on work done so far in assuring quality practice and mentorship for future teachers (by Dragica Trivic from NEC and Mirjana Trkulja from ZUOV), as well as inputs on the quality assurance mechanisms (by Susanne Gottlieb from MUC and Micksei Karoly from UNIDEB and Gordana apri, IEQUE).

Day 2: Syllabi designing workshops

The second day of the workshop started with the group work on composing syllabi for subject teacher education programs considering Pedagogical and Psychological courses (group 1, moderated by Hannele Cantell from HYOKL), Subject Didactics (group 2, moderated by Susanne Gottlieb from MUC) and School practice (group 3, moderated by Micskei Karoly and Maria Csubak from UNIDEB).

Workgroups presentations and discussion afterwards had following key findings:

- Reference to the possibility to use course programs which were provided by colleagues from Finland (document was given to all participants among materials for the workshop)
- Didactics of vocational subjects should be conceptualized as professional didactics, rather than classical subject didactics.

It was proposed and agreed that another **workshop with representatives from all project partners from Serbia** should be organized as soon as possible. It was agreed that workshop will be on **December 15 in Belgrade**. The workshop will have the following goals: reconsideration of the Framework and individual universities programs tuning according to QA and EU partners comments and suggestions, clarification on criteria for students admission for the programs, planning recruitment of subject didactics teachers and ensuring support for the development of subject didactics, making agreements on who will go for a retraining mission to EU partner institutions.

A group for working on inputs for relevant institutions and bodies considering proposal for changes in accreditation standards, list of titles and by-law on position advancement for teachers was formed: Isidora Korac (MOE), Srecko Trifunovic (UK), Zorana Luzanin (UNS), Sinisa Djurasevic (UB) and Dragica Trivic (NEC).

It was stressed that universities announce students enrollment for all study programs April-May, so our programs must pass the accreditation procedure by then so to provide all programs offered to start with our first year students in October 2012 as it was agreed before. In that sense, work on resolving issues mentioned above should be urgently initiated.

It was agreed that Educational Forum (EF) together with teacher associations (Association of Serbian Gymnasiums and Association of Agricultural Schools) should work on **regulating cooperation with schools and mentors for practice of future subject teachers**. A representative from EF said that more than 20 schools were engaged in Active learning/teaching project so they can be a resource for practice.

State secretary from Ministry of Education and Science Tinde Kovac suggested that it would be useful to schedule a focused discussion meeting to go through different questions regarding school practice. She said that there is a **by-law act on criteria for establishing practice schools** and that an input from this project on that is very welcome and expected. She believes that what Dragica Trivic (from NEC) and Mirjana Trkulja (from ZUOV, sector for mentorship and induction) presented in a workshop session considering Practice is very well developed.

Consortium meeting

Project coordinator Vera Rajovic said that colleagues from UNS announced a **new website for MASTS project** and we hope that it will enable sharing of the resources by all partners (teaching materials, etc) by entering site using username and password and uploading data. Considering graduates and students asking about STE programs, a little **"homework" for all Serbian universities** was given: to put detailed information about programs on universities' websites with a link to a faculty/unit in charge for the realization of programs.

Considering **purchase of equipment** for the universities, the administrative coordinator of the project Milena Dimitrijevic said that procurement will be made jointly on a national level (Tempus Office in Serbia suggested such procedure as an example of good practice in previous projects) and that she will send offers to all universities and will ask them to consider them and give answer on what they decided. She also mentioned that universities can suggest some other equipment to be purchased, but they would have to justify that

suggested equipment is really necessary and useful in achieving this particular project's goals.

December 15 meeting update: draft proposal for the procurement is sent with the deadline for partner universities to send their proposals by December 25.

Considering the **teacher retraining mission** activity ahead, it was suggested and agreed on that on a workshop on December 15 Serbian partners representatives should consider what is needed to be developed and what could Serbian teachers see and learn from EU partners, so that EU partners can plan a retraining program according to our needs and expectations. Visits should last for one week and every EU partner institution should host 4 teachers from Serbia. EU partners will determine dates for the visit having in mind the best conditions for achieving retraining goals.

Update: On 15th December workshop for national universities, it was agreed that national partners should send the list of potential participants across EU host universities according to the area of needs, i.e. professional didactics, teaching practice and general education (pedagogy, general didactic, psychology...) – deadline January 15. These lists could include some of the school teachers – prospective mentors of teaching practice. As to the goals of the retraining, general goal is preparation of teachers to implement new master program. Here, some input by EU colleagues, as to what they can offer, how they see the training and so on, would be appreciated.

All partners were **reminded that Interim report is due by April 15**, which should include two reports: 1) budget realization and 2) Activity report – with deliverables (according to application). Also, the report should include Conventions for staff costs and Individual mobility reports and “supporting documentation” scanned and copied.

It was also stressed that **partners that did not send their previous report (from October 15) should do that as soon as possible**, considering that a next large money transfer to the partners should also be planned soon.

A discussion was initiated about some partners claiming that they did not get any money transferred from the Grant holder (UB) for the staff cost. Project coordinator Vera Rajovic reminded partners that they have to send their payout plan for staff costs for the approval so to provide that 1) costs are eligible, 2) aligned with the project Workplan and revised budget and 3) justified by deliverables, but also 4) to provide a harmonization of labor costs among Serbian institutions participating in the project.

Nina Stojanovic from Tempus Office in Serbia informed all participants present at the consortium meeting that a discussion with representatives from all universities in Serbia was held at their office considering questions of financial management of projects.

Recommendations from that meeting are available but Vera Rajovi said that this document should be connected with other prerequisite activities (i.e. consortium agreement signing, reporting dynamic etc.)

It was said that all partners should calculate the money for mobility already spent and plan travels for the final conference etc., so that they can identify the extra amount that they are not going to be able to spend on eligible activities. This extra amount/s should be re-allocated to those partners who are short in travel costs so to provide them with the opportunity to continue their full active contribution.