

Costruire una cultura condivisa nella relazione insegnamento-apprendimento. Il caso di un progetto LLP

Building a shared culture of the teaching-learning relationship. The case study of a *LLP* project

EZIO DEL GOTTARDO, SALVATORE PATERA

The education and the educational training have a fundamental role in the framework of the European 2020 Strategies. This paper comes out at the end of the “ValeRIA PLUS” Project, whose purpose was to “Evaluate the relationship between Teaching and Learning by promoting and working on the unity of the system”. The Project was funded by the European Lifelong Learning Program and carried out in two years (2013 and 2014). ValeRIA PLUS consolidated and extended both the reference target and territory of the ValeRIA Project, with the intent of providing schools and Vocational Training Centres with a series of criteria and evaluation tools to assess the teaching-learning relationship. It was aimed at promoting the involvement of students and teachers in a dynamic self/hetero/co-evaluation process within the international school systems of project’s partners. The project has built a shared “culture of evaluation” and a set of tools to evaluate the teaching-learning relationship. Its two goals were: on the one hand, promoting autonomy and the educational success of the students, and, on the other hand, strengthening the awareness of professionalism in teachers.

KEYWORDS: EMPOWERMENT EVALUATION, SELF-DIRECTED LEARNING, CULTURE OF EVALUATION, LIFELONG LEARNING, LEARNER CENTRED MODEL

The ValeRIA Plus Project

This paper¹ comes out at the end of the Project LLP-LDV-TOI-2012-1-IT1-LEO05-02485 “ValeRIA PLUS” to “Evaluate the relationship between Teaching and Learning by promoting and working on the unity of the system”. An integrated toolkit, already tested in the ValeRIA Project LLP-LDV-TOI-09-IT-0448 (and revised in ValeRIA PLUS), was adopted in schools and professional centres that were part of the European network. The project was carried out in 2013 and 2014. The ValeRIA PLUS Project confirmed and expanded the ValeRIA Project’s reference target and areas in order to deliver assessment criteria and tools of the teaching-learning relationship in schools and in Vocational Training Centres (CFP). ValeRIA PLUS came from the critical issues of the previous ValeRIA Project and from the concerns of the INVALSI² reports. In this perspective,

the project has aimed at promoting the involvement of students and teachers in the school system, in a dynamic self/hetero/co-evaluation process³. The project was focused on building both a shared evaluation culture among teachers and a set of several tools to assess the teaching-learning relationship. The objectives of the project were: promoting autonomy and the educational success of the students and strengthening the awareness of professionalism in teachers.

The definition of a shared “evaluation culture” among partners was based on the comparison of their educational practices in teaching-learning relationship for the purpose to create a set of evaluation criteria and tools, and then to improve the teaching-learning relationship. The purpose was to reduce/prevent, in the target school-contexts of ValeRIA Plus, the critical issues on which the European Union was focused on:

- Prevention-reduction of early school leaving

- Lifelong learning and strategies to improve the link school-labour market
- Planning/assessment based on skills and learning outcomes
- Transition from teacher-centred model to learner-centred model
- Development of an evaluation culture as a training and summative evaluation process

Starting from the different partners' experiences and theoretical/methodological approaches relating their teaching-learning relationship, the ValeRIA PLUS project focused on the following elements:

- Attain a shared "culture of evaluation", with both a common model and evaluation tools to guarantee the high quality of the teaching-learning relationship as well as the supervision and the continuous development of high standards of training within the different countries' systems.
- Build with partners an assessment language and common frameworks to allow the comparison of qualifications, degrees and evaluation from different countries;
- Shift the focus from the teaching process to the learning process (*unit of learning outcomes*);

Activities per year and macro-phases

The project was carried out into 2 years and divided into Macro-phases.

First year:

1. VALeRIA's toolkit improvement and adaptation to the new project VALeRIA PLUS;

- 3 Online Forums and 1 Web-Meeting (Consultation Workshops) with the partners in order both to compare the evaluation practices adopted into each partner's schools and to share an evaluation culture aimed at defining the following 3 Deliverables:
 - *Evaluation criteria for Educational Innovation,*
 - *Map of "Indicators of Educational Innovation"*
 - *Tools of self/hetero/co-evaluation for the teaching-learning relationship*

- Collection and negotiation of feedbacks and proposals elaborated by international partners in the Consultation Workshop and first draft of the 3 Deliverables;
- 1 Meeting (Deliberative Workshop) with the partners in order to discuss, negotiate, share and approve the 3 Deliverables;
- Building and Testing the *evaluation tools for the teaching-learning relationship* in the classroom contexts of the Project's partners;
- Teachers and students' training activities for bettering and empowering the teaching-learning relationship's evaluation process and the use of self/hetero/co-evaluation tools;
- Collection of feedbacks of the Testing phase by each partner and adaptation of the evaluation tools in their local context.

2. First transfer of the Evaluation Model and the evaluation toolkit in 3rd and 4th year classes for the international schools involved;

3. Monitoring and training of the Project's stakeholders (teachers, students, external experts);

4. Organization of the 1st Audit with the international schools involved;

- First Transfer (Data collection, Data Analysis, Reports writing, Feedbacks collection by the schools);

5. Timeline review and improvement of the operational strategy and of the *Instruments to assess the teaching-learning relationship*;

Second year:

1. Second transfer of the Evaluation Model and the evaluation toolkit to 4th and 5th year classes involved into the project;
2. SWOT-r Analysis of the project's first year with all partners involved;
3. Organization of the 2nd Audit with the schools involved;
Second Transfer;
4. Timeline review and improvement of the operational strategy and of the *tools to evaluate the teaching-learning relationship*;
5. Final evaluation in partners' schools, Reporting, Guidelines and Dissemination of the results.

Building a shared evaluation culture: theoretical-methodological framework.

Based on the experience of “VALERIA” Project (ValeRIA LLP-LDV-TOI-09-IT-O448), during the development of VALERIA PLUS Project in the following 2 years, the 2 authors arranged some participatory workshops⁴:

- 4 “Consultation Workshops” with the partners in order to engage them through mutual knowledge of their different educational practices for joining a shared evaluation culture⁵.
- Starting from the 4 Consultation Workshops’ results, setting up 1 Deliberative Workshop for carrying out a shared vision on:
 - Glossary about the evaluation of the teaching-learning relationship;
 - Map of “Indicators of educational innovation”;
 - Criteria/dimensions/indicators for setting up the tools to evaluate the teaching-learning relationship.

Despite the cultural differences in the educational enterprises of each country some factors brought partners to move from a “pragmatic” evaluation approach (adopted during the VALERIA Project) to a “tempered constructivism”⁶ approach in the VALERIA PLUS.

This cultural reorientation towards this second approach to evaluation can be considered the main precious result of the sharing and comparison among partners of their epistemologies, methodologies and practices about teaching and learning relationship through the participatory workshop aimed at Consultation.

During the Consultation Workshops, partners shared their contextualized “culture and practices of education” taking into account some emerging factors: Results of the Consultation/Deliberative Workshops hold during the web-meetings, the commitments shared during the national/international meetings as well as the evaluation reports about an International Audit carried out in the partners’ schools.

These Workshops have had a “formative value” as they allow a shared vision throughout participatory evaluation/planning activities⁷.

The result of these Workshops can therefore be summarized with the convergence of partners on a “constructivist” approach instead of the “pragmatic” one.

In this constructivist approach, the quality standards acquire more importance if, in addition to a *merit* dimension (intrinsic value of an asset), we take into account also the *worth* dimension (extrinsic value of an asset), which is more oriented to meet the needs, the representations, the actors’ expectations/motivations in the cultural context in which the activities takes place⁸.

With reference to the scientific literature about the evaluation issue, the assessment system, proposed by the team of the University of Salento and implemented into the project was consistent with the *Fourth Generation Evaluation approach*⁹. Moreover, it met the needs both to adapt the evaluation criteria of the European quality standards/benchmarks (pragmatic approach) and to contextualize them depending of the cultural contexts involved into the project (costruttivismo temperato¹⁰). This approach highlighted also the need to contextualize the European framework and standards thanks to web-meetings, Participatory workshops with the schools involved into the programme.

The constructivist approach opens to innovative viewpoints for planning/evaluation of the educational interventions, where the focus moves from the final learning process outcome to the process itself, and, therefore, to the motivational, cognitive and metacognitive strategies that students and teacher activate to learn. In a learner-centred approach,¹¹ the authentic evaluation aims at producing knowledge about the working of an intervention using proper formulated methodological criteria. Moreover, it also provides feedbacks to modify (if necessary) this intervention in collaboration with teachers, students, etc.

Becoming a community of practice¹² able to reflect/act as a learning organization it’s a slow and long process of self/co-directed learning involving the restructuring of beliefs and practices tied up to these beliefs. Following the learning organization approach¹³ the different levels of complexity of the organization of the project (classroom-schools-international partnership) the feedbacks among those levels and inside those levels are useful to self-co modify an organizational culture and the teaching-learning relationship too thanks to a “reflection” process

that involves both students and teachers and brings them to reflect on the planning/building/evaluation of the educational activity and the educational theories/methods adopted to achieve it¹⁴.

In this sense, evaluation objective is meant to improve the assessed reality, and the evaluation process can occur only with the participation of teachers, students, families, headmasters and school staff for reflecting on the educational outcomes and impacts.

Within this approach, the evaluation process has a learning function for partnership, school, classrooms, teachers and students. In fact, they become aware of the need to refer to shared assessment principles and practices. Furthermore, they could be able to formulate their own objectives and intentionally pursue them. Therefore, the learning function of evaluation is relevant for them because it help them to reflect on “what they do”, “why they do it”, “how to do it” and “would like to do it”

The learning function of evaluation involves at least two training effects:

- Firstly, it promotes reflection both on actions and “deutero-learning” practices for future strategies directed towards the improvement of the teaching-learning relationship;
- Secondly, the reflection on their teaching-learning practices can develop an evaluative, planning, didactic awareness.

With regard to this, the *empowerment evaluation*¹⁵ has a clear educational objective: it aims at training the subjects involved in a programme or in an educational intervention to empowering their evaluation practices. These practices are considered as tools to identify problems, find solutions and define objectives in order to evaluate, improve, review the project. From this perspective, the *empowerment evaluation* supports and promotes the consciousness of what has been achieved by the different organizational level of the projects.

It is useful to highlight some of the consequences of this focus shift in evaluation research and in educational contexts:

- It is not enough to check the outcome, as it is necessary, instead, to understand if the subject has acquired some competencies taking into

account his/her cultural contexts and motivation to learn;

- Those who are asked to evaluate won't have the need to control, but they will be able to use the evaluation in a diagnostic sense, in order to positively activate the emotional - motivational, cognitive and meta-cognitive aspects of the learning process;
- The assessment enables to collect any useful information necessary to “adjust” the interventions gradually making them more well adapted and accustomed to the needs of the students and the context, and, consequently, to consider feedbacks for modifying the training action;
- The evaluation allows to put in place actions that are *relevant*, according to the needs; *efficient*, consistent with the defined objectives; *effective*, likely to produce the desired effects; *successful* with reference to the needs of the subjects who evaluate.
- Teachers and students become more aware of the assessment process (they learn to evaluate) and of the project/implementation/evaluation strategies adopted to reach a learning outcome.

Therefore, evaluation is useful, to *learn*; to *understand*; to *change*; to *improve* and *innovate*. Indeed, the focus is on the process of *innovation* and *improvement* that is part of the evaluation process itself. Students and teachers who learn to evaluate, also learn to formulate their goals in a more self-conscious way, to pursue them with a intentional and cooperative approach and to periodically review their work. The evaluation process improves teaching/learning strategies because it provides tools to get awareness, self-determination, and responsibility. In this perspective, the evaluation of competences connects into recognized qualifications: educational activities (formal and informal) job, biographical and training experiences¹⁶.

In the case of teachers, the project has been an opportunity to reflect both on their own educational practices and on the implicit aspects of these practices in order to become aware of how to behave the teaching-learning relationship¹⁷.

Evaluation criteria and tools adopted

In line with the scientific literature¹⁸, the European legislation¹⁹ and the evaluation criteria/dimensions/indicators of reference, a set of shared evaluation criteria have been defined in order to build the tools to evaluate the teaching/learning relationship.

In this perspective and in accordance with the Fourth Generation Evaluation²⁰, the evaluation approach of “costruttivismo temperato”²¹ allows comparing different points of view in order to outline the fundamental project deliverables: The assessment criteria, The Map of indicators, The tools of self/hetero/co-evaluation.

These deliverables are, therefore, the result of the following points of view:

- Point of view of project funded by LLP Programme (objectives);
- Point of view of researchers (standards);
- Point of view of teachers/students (needs).

This triangulation of points of view, in the Fourth Generation evaluation and participatory evaluation, represents the intercultural terrain of comparison to build a shared culture of evaluation the teaching-learning relationship (in the points of contact and divergences) useful for agreeing and explaining the criteria for the subsequent planning and evaluation phase. In this way, it was possible to build a culture of evaluation where skills and decision-making power are improved among the participants²².

Evaluation of the project's outcomes and educational effects

No one is able to make significant changes without favourable social conditions. Consequently, also the effects of the educational processes don't relate only to the individual, but they have social consequences, as within community the different subjects are asked to cooperate. Furthermore, learning does not automatically generate specific effects. In order to transform the learning outcomes in concrete observable changes, it would be necessary to activate an analytical re-elaboration process connected to the will and motivation of the students.

We need also to look at the impact that these changes, induced by the learning process, have on the environment where the subject interacts. However, it is very difficult to outline and distinguish them from the outcomes due to other subjective (character, motivation, commitment) or objective (favourable conditions in the environment) factors that had influenced the individual and bring him/her to change. For these reasons, the impacts can be only monitored and not exactly evaluated. It would be ideologically wrong (and unproductive) to pretend to have such a great control over the learning effects, as they are part of and included in a variety of human situations. The impacts should not be confused with the training outcomes, because they cannot be observable in short time (and therefore they are not even measurable with the typical assessment tools), either because they do not relate only to the learning process, and it would be difficult to isolate them²³.

In order to evaluate the results it is necessary to answer this question: *have the participants (in this case the teachers and students) changed their evaluative culture and their practices about teaching-learning relationship at the end of the project?*

5.1 Evaluation of the results coming out from this study

The survey was carried out in two school years: 2012/2013 and 2013/2014; the students involved in the first year were those of 3rd and 4th classes, while the students who participated in the second year attended 4th and 5th classes. They all came from heterogeneous network of schools, of different area and level/type classification.

The “Classroom Observation” included almost all of the class teachers, analysing both the common area subjects (Italian, Mathematics and Foreign Language) and the vocational area subjects, paying attention to at least two specific aspects identified in relation to the school course. Gender difference, type of school and nationality.

The survey involved the countries participating into the project, at the same time, ensuring ongoing monitoring through the platform of the project.

The surveyed sample of 86 teachers, analysed through the focus group method, interviews and the platform www.valeriplusproject.eu, was observed according to:

- Geographic area: teachers of different schools of the North, Centre, South of Italy, and teachers of foreign schools located in Turkey, Poland, Hungary were investigated;
- Type of School: High Schools, Vocational schools, Technical schools, Vocational Training Centres were investigated

The sample of 2.247 students was observed according to:

- Geographical area: students attending Italian schools of Northern, Central and Southern areas, and students of foreign schools located in Turkey, Poland and Hungary were investigated;
- Type of school: students attending High Schools, Vocational schools, Technical schools, Vocational Training Centres were investigated;
- Gender: there were 1431 males and 816 females.

The Map of criteria/dimensions/indicators developed by partners in order to set up the evaluation tools in a triangulated evaluation typology:

- Hetero-Evaluation:
 - HETS - Teacher/students evaluate teaching-learning relationship in the classroom (Classroom observation)
- Self-evaluation:
 - SET- Teachers (Self-evaluation questionnaire)
 - SES - Students (Self-evaluation questionnaire)
- Co-Evaluation:
 - CET - Teacher/students (focus group)

The data exposed (tab 3) show the percentages obtained from the average among the indicators part of each dimension.

Tab 1: Dimensions and percentage* of accordance by country and typology of evaluation

Dimension	Countries					
	Italy (macro areas)			Hungary	Poland	Turkey
	North	Center	South			
Facing difficult situations	HETS (33%)	HETS (36%)	HETS (41%)	HETS (40%)	HETS (32%)	HETS (31%)
	SET (36%)	SET (37%)	SET (41%)	SET (40%)	SET (32%)	SET (32%)
	SES (32%)	SES (35%)	SES (38%)	SES (40%)	SES (33%)	SES (32%)
	CET (34%)	CET (35%)	CET (39%)	CET (39%)	CET (33%)	CET (32%)
Managing different resources	HETS (42%)	HETS (41%)	HETS (42%)	HETS (43%)	HETS (42%)	HETS (42%)
	SET (44%)	SET (42%)	SET (42%)	SET (42%)	SET (41%)	SET (42%)
	SES (45%)	SES (44%)	SES (44%)	SES (43%)	SES (43%)	SES (41%)
	CET (44%)	CET (44%)	CET (43%)	CET (43%)	CET (43%)	CET (42%)
Increasing the usability of the educational setting	HETS (49%)	HETS (47%)	HETS (47%)	HETS (49%)	HETS (48%)	HETS (48%)
	SET (52%)	SET (48%)	SET (46%)	SET (50%)	SET (47%)	SET (48%)
	SES (48%)	SES (49%)	SES (48%)	SES (48%)	SES (47%)	SES (49%)
	CET (49%)	CET (48%)	CET (47%)	CET (49%)	CET (48%)	CET (48%)
Promoting efficiency	HETS (52%)	HETS (52%)	HETS (51%)	HETS (53%)	HETS (54%)	HETS (50%)
	SET (55%)	SET (54%)	SET (52%)	SET (53%)	SET (52%)	SET (50%)
	SES (54%)	SES (53%)	SES (53%)	SES (52%)	SES (53%)	SES (51%)
	CET (55%)	CET (53%)	CET (53%)	CET (52%)	CET (53%)	CET (51%)
Promoting communication	HETS (55%)	HETS (55%)	HETS (57%)	HETS (54%)	HETS (56%)	HETS (52%)
	SET (57%)	SET (56%)	SET (55%)	SET (55%)	SET (56%)	SET (52%)
	SES (57%)	SES (56%)	SES (56%)	SES (54%)	SES (55%)	SES (53%)
	CET (56%)	CET (56%)	CET (57%)	CET (55%)	CET (55%)	CET (52%)
Helping reflection and development of metacognitive process	HETS (61%)	HETS (61%)	HETS (62%)	HETS (64%)	HETS (61%)	HETS (61%)
	SET (62%)	SET (61%)	SET (63%)	SET (63%)	SET (62%)	SET (61%)
	SES (62%)	SES (62%)	SES (63%)	SES (62%)	SES (63%)	SES (62%)
	CET (62%)	CET (62%)	CET (62%)	CET (63%)	CET (62%)	CET (62%)

Promoting evaluation	HETS (59%) SET (60%) SES (59%) CET (59%)	HETS (59%) SET (58%) SES (59%) CET (58%)	HETS (58%) SET (59%) SES (59%) CET (58%)	HETS (57%) SET (58%) SES (57%) CET (57%)	HETS (56%) SET (57%) SES (58%) CET (57%)	HETS (57%) SET (57%) SES (55%) CET (56%)
Promoting knowledge Organization	HETS (56%) SET (56%) SES (57%) CET (57%)	HETS (55%) SET (56%) SES (57%) CET (57%)	HETS (55%) SET (57%) SES (56%) CET (56%)	HETS (56%) SET (53%) SES (55%) CET (55%)	HETS (55%) SET (56%) SES (55%) CET (55%)	HETS (56%) SET (54%) SES (54%) CET (55%)
Promoting integration among disciplines	HETS (53%) SET (56%) SES (55%) CET (54%)	HETS (53%) SET (53%) SES (54%) CET (54%)	HETS (52%) SET (55%) SES (55%) CET (54%)	HETS (52%) SET (54%) SES (53%) CET (53%)	HETS (53%) SET (52%) SES (54%) CET (53%)	HETS (52%) SET (54%) SES (53%) CET (53%)
Promoting the construction of meanings	HETS (53%) SET (54%) SES (54%) CET (54%)	HETS (54%) SET (53%) SES (53%) CET (53%)	HETS (53%) SET (54%) SES (53%) CET (53%)	HETS (55%) SET (56%) SES (55%) CET (55%)	HETS (54%) SET (55%) SES (56%) CET (54%)	HETS (56%) SET (55%) SES (54%) CET (54%)
To transfer knowledge within different sectors	HETS (67%) SET (68%) SES (67%) CET (68%)	HETS (66%) SET (66%) SES (66%) CET (68%)	HETS (66%) SET (67%) SES (66%) CET (67%)	HETS (67%) SET (68%) SES (66%) CET (67%)	HETS (67%) SET (68%) SES (66%) CET (66%)	HETS (65%) SET (67%) SES (66%) CET (67%)
Increasing autonomy	HETS (65%) SET (64%) SES (66%) CET (65%)	HETS (65%) SET (66%) SES (65%) CET (65%)	HETS (67%) SET (66%) SES (66%) CET (66%)	HETS (66%) SET (65%) SES (64%) CET (65%)	HETS (65%) SET (66%) SES (65%) CET (65%)	HETS (66%) SET (65%) SES (65%) CET (65%)
Promoting action	HETS (62%) SET (64%) SES (65%) CET (64%)	HETS (62%) SET (63%) SES (62%) CET (63%)	HETS (62%) SET (64%) SES (64%) CET (63%)	HETS (63%) SET (63%) SES (65%) CET (64%)	HETS (61%) SET (62%) SES (61%) CET (62%)	HETS (61%) SET (60%) SES (60%) CET (61%)

* Percentages can exceed 100%.

For each indicator, respondents (teachers and / or students) had been identified the “presence” ($v = 1$) or the “absence” ($v = 0$) of the affirmation described for each indicator. Moreover, the dimensions that have obtained the most consensus in terms of presence highlighted in the various schools - although with minimal differences compared to other dimensions - turn out to be: “To transfer knowledge within different sectors” (65% -67%), “Increasing autonomy” (65% -67%). “Helping reflection and development of metacognitive process” (61% -64%).

In this regard, two main interesting considerations can be made with respect to what emerged through this triangulated evaluation process.

With reference to the first consideration, it is possible to notice that the percentages detected *among* different contexts and *within* different contexts result to have a minimum difference in terms of percentage assigned. As shown by the data, the aim of the project was precisely to

build a culture of common and shared evaluation among the participating partners.

A second aspect to be developed in subsequent studies and analyzes concerns the importance of describing, interpreting and deepening the data obtained from the project through a qualitative study aimed at considering the “cultural factors” present in each context. These cultural factors guide teaching and student practices towards structuring a “particular type” of teaching-learning relationship.

After the project: *Follow up* in Valeria-Plus network.

From a first analysis of the educational activities impacts, the evaluation process involves a transformation of the “educational culture” that modify the relationships, communication networks and the “aggregation” process.

Indeed, innovation requires teachers to change their traditional role and to call into question their stability and expertise.

In the following table 4, the training effects observed in the *Follow up* phase are listed:

Table 2: Follow up of the project

Follow up (effects observed)	Description
Implementing of lifelong learning into collegial teaching practices	One year later, in 11 Italian secondary schools teachers still meet together to debate, co-plan and co-evaluate the didactic activities.
Tools of self/hetero/co-evaluation for the teaching-learning relationship.	All schools (project's partners) have implemented the toolkit of self/hetero/co-evaluation in their educational practices.
Dissemination of the evaluation model	From the results of the VALERIA and VALERIA PLUS, thanks to the collaboration of the Regional School Departments, it has been proposed to disseminate the toolkit not only at national level (Turkey, Poland, Hungary).

To conclude, through a swot-r, developed with the partner referents at the end of the project, it emerges that strengths and weaknesses of the project can be prioritized for bettering foster the impact of the project for the future.

In spite of the attempts to improve the classic Swot²⁴, the evaluative literature refers to Dynamic Swot and Relational Swot (Dynamic Swot, Swot-d, Swot-r) because it allows a cross-reading of the results in order both to analyze the risks associated with the adoption of specific choices and to identify the impacts linked to certain risks²⁵.

Partners reach a consensus (shared judgment) about the factors (variables) useful to understand:

- *Analysis by raw: Dependent Variables (from the most important).*

Difficulty to continue the activities carried out at the end of the funding foreseen for the project (Weakness);

Deepen the cultural aspects that characterize the different contexts through a more in-depth research work (Strengthens);

Organizational difficulties due to critical bureaucratic and administrative aspects found among the partners' countries (Weakness).

- *Analysis by column: Independent Variables (from the most influent).*

Sharing an evaluative culture and some common tools (Strengthens)

Possibility to submit new proposals to calls for funding with the project network (Strengthens)

Moderators: Using the expression of Dahler-Larsen²⁶, these are the elements that with more frequency and more strongly impact (positively or negatively) on the others. In this case, it's "Stability and strengthening of relationships among some project partners also on a transnational scale (Strengthens)".

EZIO DEL GOTTARDO

Università degli Studi Internazionali di Roma

SALVATORE PATERA

Invalsi

- ¹ Authors, responsible for field research for the project, have jointly drawn up this document with the following authorship: § 1, 2, 5, 6, by Ezio Del Gottardo; § 1, 3, 4, 6 by Salvatore Patera.
- ² Istituto Nazionale per la Valutazione del Sistema Educativo di Istruzione e Formazione (INVALSI).
- ³ Cfr. E. G. Guba, Y. S. Lincoln, *Fourth Generation Evaluation*, Sage, Newbury P. 1989.
- ⁴ Cfr. E. Whitmore, (eds). *Understanding and Practicing Participatory Evaluation*, «New Directions for Evaluation», n. 80. Jossey-Bass, S. Francisco 1998.
- ⁵ Cfr. E. House, K. Howe, *Values in evaluation and social research*. Sage, Th.Oaks 1999.
- ⁶ Cfr. N. Stame, *Tre approcci principali alla valutazione: distinguere e combinare*, in M. Palumbo (ed.), *Il processo di valutazione. Decidere, programmare, valutare*, Franco Angeli, Milano 2001.
- ⁷ Cfr. M. Q. Patton, *Developmental Evaluation Applying Complexity Concepts to Enhance Innovation and Use*, Guilford Press, New York 2010.
- ⁸ M. Scriven, *Duty-based teacher evaluation*, «Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education», 1, 4, 1988, pp. 319-334.
- ⁹ Cfr. E. G. Guba, Y. S. Lincoln, *Fourth Generation Evaluation*, Sage, Newbury P. 1989.
- ¹⁰ Cfr. M. Palumbo, *Il processo di valutazione. Decidere, programmare, valutare*, F. Angeli, Milano 2001.
- ¹¹ Cfr. K. L. Brown, *From teacher-centered to learner-centered curriculum: Improving learning in diverse classrooms*, Education, 124, 2003, pp. 49–54, also D. H. Jonassen, *Designing constructivist learning environments*. In C. M. Reigeluth (Eds.), *Instructional design theories and models: A new paradigm of instructional theory*, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Volume II, Mahwah 1999, pp. 215-239.
- ¹² Cfr. E. Wenger, R. McDermott, W. M. Snyder, *Cultivating Communities of Practice. A Guide to Managing Knowledge*. Harvard Business School Press, Boston 2002.
- ¹³ Cfr. C. Argyris, D. Schon, *Organizational Learning: A Theory of Action Perspective*, Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley 1978.
- ¹⁴ Cfr. L. Fabbri, *Comunità di pratiche e apprendimento riflessivo*, Carocci, Roma 2007.
- ¹⁵ D. M. Fetterman, *Empowerment Evaluation*, Evaluation Practice, 15 (1), 1994, pp. 1-15.
- ¹⁶ Cfr. J.A. Banks, J. Brandsford, Y. Lee, *Learning in and out of school in diverse environment*, Center for ME, Seattle 2007.
- ¹⁷ Cfr. G. Biesta, *Values and ideals in teachers' professional judgement*, in S. Gewirtz, P. Mahony, I. Hextall & A. Cribb (Eds.), *Changing teacher professionalism*, Routledge, London 2009.
- ¹⁸ Among others: P. Winograd, & F.D. Perkins, *Authentic assessment in the classroom: Principles and practices*, in Blum, R.E. & Arter, J.A. (Eds.). *A handbook for student performance assessment in an era of restructuring*. Alexandria, VA, 1996; Glatthorn, A.A. *Performance standards and authentic learning*, Larchmont: EoE, 1999; Darling-Hammond, L. *Authentic assessment in action: studies of schools and students at work*, Teachers college, New York 1995.
- ¹⁹ European Communities, *Recommendation of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 December 2006 on key competences for lifelong learning*, in Official Journal of the European Union, 2006
- ²⁰ Cfr. E. G. Guba, Y. S. Lincoln, *Fourth Generation Evaluation*, cit.
- ²¹ Cfr. M. Palumbo, *Il processo di valutazione*, cit.
- ²² Cfr. R. E. Stake, *Evaluating Educational Programmes: The Need and the Response*, Organization for Economic and Cooperation and Development Publications Center, Washington 2006.
- ²³ Cfr. E. Del Gottardo, *Empowerment evaluation e cultura della valutazione. Attività di monitoraggio e valutazione del Progetto Bilingue Asilo nido di Saint-Christophe/Quart/Brissogne*, in T. Grange Sergi, (Ed.), *Qualità dell'educazione e nuove specializzazioni negli asili nido*, Edizioni ETS, Pisa 2013.
- ²⁴ A. Marradi, *Metodo come arte*, in «Quaderni di sociologia», vol. 10, n. 83, 1996.
- ²⁵ C. Bezzi, *La SWOT 'dinamica' o 'relazionale'*, in «Rassegna Italiana di Valutazione», vol. 31, n. 3, 2005.
- ²⁶ Cfr. P. Dahler-Larsen, *La costruzione sociale delle teorie del programma. Multifunzionalità agricola e programmazione integrata nello sviluppo rurale*, Regione Piemonte Ed., Torino 2005.