PRIME PETE

PRIMARY EDUCATION PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEACHER EDUCATION

Method and tool to evaluate the PETE course modules and micro-modules

Manolis Adamakis, Claude Scheuer, Attilio Carraro and Giampaolo Santi

Technical sheet

Title: Method and tool to evaluate the PETE course modules and micro-modules

Authors: Manolis Adamakis, Claude Scheuer, Attilio Carraro and Giampaolo Santi

Number of pages: 30

Year: 2023

Cite as: Adamakis, M., Scheuer, C., Carraro, A., & Santi, G. (2023). *Method and tool to evaluate the PETE course modules and micro-modules*. [PRIME PETE Project - Report Intellectual Output #6].

https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10031285

Project: Primary Education Physical Education Teacher Education

Project Coordinator: Claude Scheuer (until February 2023), Alina Lemling (from February 2023)

Funder: European Commission

Programme: Erasmus+ Key Action 2: Cooperation for innovation and the exchange of good practices 2020

Action Type: Strategic Partnerships for Higher Education

Reference: 2020-1-LU01-KA203-063257

Timeline: December 2020 – August 2023

Project Sheet: https://ec.europa.eu/programmes/erasmus-plus/projects/eplus-project-details/#project/2020-1-LU01-KA203-063257

For further information on the PRIME PETE Project please follow the link:

Website: https://www.primepete.com/

Project partners:

The authors wish to acknowledge the contribution of the Primary Education Physical Education Teacher Education (PRIME PETE) project team for the development of the outputs here referenced for PRIME PETE (2023).

No.	Institution	Involved researchers
1	University of Luxembourg, Luxembourg	Claude Scheuer (until February 23), Alina Lemling (from Feb 23), Manolis Adamakis (from June 21), Richard Bailey (May-December 21), Sandra Heck (until June 22)
2	Libera Universita di Bolzano, Italy	Attilio Carraro, Partizia Tortella (until March 21), Giampaolo Santi (from December 21)
3	Universidad de Sevilla	Francis Ries, Matilde Mora Fernández (until March 22)
4	Faculdade de Motricidade Humana (FMH), Universidade de Lisboa, Portugal	Marcos Onofre, Nuno Ferro, António Rodrigues, João Martins
5	Dublin City University, Ireland	Susan Marron, Frances Murphy
6	Trnavska Univerzita v Trnave, Slovakia	Dana Masarykova, Jana Labudova
7	European Physical Education Association [EUPEA], Luxembourg	Tamas Csanyi, Yiannis Gryparis (until September 21), Martin Holzweg, Rose-Marie Repond

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

Table of contents

Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

1. Introduction

The Primary Physical Education Teacher Education in Europe (PRIME PETE) programme has developed thus far important Intellectual Outputs (IO). The main IO are:

- IO#1 - overview on PRIME PETE in Europe, which includes a review of the literature and a Delphi consensus study;

- IO#2 - recommendations on PRIME PETE, that have resulted from the integration work of the recommendations arising from three main programme resources (i.e., output of the literature review, Professional Development Event[1] output, and output of the Delphi consensus study);

- IO#3 - definition and development of the primary physical education (PE) teacher profile (both generalist and specialist, including subject-related knowledge, skills, competencies, etc.);

- IO#4 - theoretical and methodological framework for PRIME PETE;

- IO#5 - development of a modular PRIME PETE programme consisting of course modules and micro-modules based on the theoretical and methodological framework for PRIME PETE.

Following the previously developed outputs, the aim of this IO#6 is to develop a method and tool(s) to evaluate the PRIME PETE course modules and micro-modules. The modules and micro-modules were developed by the partner experts, were informed by their work at the respective Universities and the outcomes of IO#1 - IO#5. All micro-modules were open to an evaluation process at the Professional Development Events in Brixen, Italy, and Lisbon, Portugal (which were incorporated in the Learning and Teaching Training events).[2] Table 1 presents the modules and micro-modules which were evaluated during the Professional Development Events. This IO consists of two different systematic evaluation tools assessing the quality of the course modules and micro-modules developed in IO#5 from two different perspectives: (1) teacher educators, as experts; (2) student-teachers; and (3) in-service teachers as target groups.

A specific tailor-made PRIME PETE evaluation method and tool(s) for the purpose of this project does not exist thus far.

Table 1. Modules and micro-modules under evaluation during the Professional Development Event events

Modules	Micro-modules

---

[1] A **Professional Development Event** is an organized activity or programme that is designed to assist individuals improve their skills, knowledge, and abilities in their chosen profession (see also Glossary PRIME PETE).

[2] A **Learning and Teaching Training** event typically focuses on enhancing PE teachers' instructional skills and pedagogical strategies. It aims to provide them with new insights, techniques, and approaches to improve their teaching effectiveness and student engagement. On the other hand, a Professional Development Event has a broader scope and encompasses various aspects beyond teaching techniques, as it aims to enhance teachers' overall professional competence and growth.

Planning and implementation of Physical Education	Planning and Implementation of Physical Education: Child-appropriate Physical Education Active School Models: Active School
Understanding Physical Education	Understanding Physical Education: Cooperative Challenges Outdoors Understanding Physical Education: Creative Dance Understanding Physical Education: Fundamental Movement Skills
Foundations of Physical Education	Foundations of Physical Education: Knowledge and Understanding of Physical Activity Recommendations Foundations of Physical Education: Motivation, Motivational Climate and Enjoyment in Physical Education Foundations of Physical Education: Values-based Education through Sport and Physical Education
Didactics of Physical Education	Didactics of Physical Education: Communication and Interaction Didactics of Physical Education: Organisation and Classroom Management
School Physical and Health Education	School Physical and Health Education: Inclusive Primary Physical Education School Physical and Health Education: Swimming as a Tool to Support Lifelong Physical Activity
Teaching Physical Education	Teaching Physical Education: Motor Development, Learning and Implications for Teaching Teaching Physical Education: Classroom Management

2. Theoretical background

Developing a tool in the form of a questionnaire to evaluate modules and micro-modules requires a systematic approach that takes into account the specific learning outcomes of the micro-modules. The steps that can be followed to develop an effective questionnaire are:

- Identify the learning outcomes of the micro-module(s). Before developing a questionnaire, it is important to clearly define the learning outcomes of the module(s). This can be done by reviewing the module indicative content, and any other relevant materials.

- Choose a relevant evaluation framework or model. There are several evaluation frameworks and models available that can be used to guide the development of an evaluation questionnaire, such as the Kirkpatrick Model, the Learning Transfer Evaluation Model, Brinkerhoff's Success Case Method, Anderson Model of Learning Evaluation, the CIRO Model, the Phillips ROI Model, Kaufman's Model of

Learning Evaluation, etc. Out of these models, the Kirkpatrick Model (Kirkpatrick & Kirkpatrick, 2006), was selected, which is a widely used framework that includes four levels of evaluation: reaction, learning, behavior, and results.

- Determine the type of questions to ask. Depending on the evaluation framework or model chosen, the types of questions to be included in the questionnaire will vary. For example, if using the Kirkpatrick Model, questions related to most evaluation levels should be included.

- Use specific references to inform the questions. To ensure that the questions are relevant and aligned with the learning outcomes of the module(s), it can be helpful to use specific references such as the module indicative content or learning materials. These references can inform the development of questions related to the content, instructional strategies, and assessment methods used in the module(s).

- Pilot test the questionnaire. Before administering the tool to all participants, it is important to pilot test it with a small group to identify any issues or areas for improvement.

By following these steps, a tool in the form of a questionnaire can be developed that effectively evaluates the modules and provides valuable insights into the effectiveness of the learning experience.

Kirkpatrick and Kirkpatrick (2006) proposed a widely used framework for evaluating the effectiveness of training programmes. The Kirkpatrick Model consists of four levels of evaluation: reaction, learning, behavior, and results. The first level focuses on the participants' initial reactions to the training programme, while the second level examines how much knowledge and skills they have acquired during the training. The third level evaluates the extent to which participants have applied what they learned to their job performance, and the fourth level measures the impact of the training programme on the organization's overall goals and objectives.

The Kirkpatrick Model has become a popular and effective way for organizations to assess the success of their training programmes, as it provides a comprehensive approach to evaluation that takes into account both immediate and long-term outcomes. By using this model, organizations can identify areas for improvement, make evidence-based decisions about future training initiatives, and demonstrate the value of their training investments to stakeholders.

The Kirkpatrick Model includes the first level of evaluation, which assesses participants' reactions to the training programme. This level aims to measure satisfaction and acceptance of the programme among the participants. It evaluates participants' feelings about the training experience, including the relevance of the training content, the quality of the instruction, and the overall training environment. The satisfaction and acceptance level is important because it provides organizations with valuable feedback on the quality of the programmes and helps them understand how well the programme meets

participants' expectations. Additionally, it can impact participants' motivation to engage in future training and can also influence their attitudes towards the organization and their job. Overall, the satisfaction and acceptance level of the Kirkpatrick Model is an essential aspect of evaluating the effectiveness of training programmes, as it helps organizations to identify areas for improvement and to ensure that their training programmes are meeting the needs of their participants.

Self-assessed learning progress is not explicitly included in the Kirkpatrick Model (Kirkpatrick & Kirkpatrick, 2006). However, it can be considered as part of the second level of evaluation, which measures the extent to which participants have acquired knowledge and skills during the training programme. In this level, participants are assessed on their ability to apply what they have learned through tests, exams, or other assessments. Self-assessment can also be used as a tool to measure learning progress, as it allows participants to reflect on their own learning and identify areas where they need further development. Self-assessment can be a valuable tool for both participants and organizations. For participants, it can promote self-reflection and encourage them to take ownership of their own learning. For organizations, it can provide additional data to evaluate the effectiveness of their training programmes and identify areas for improvement. As a result, this evaluation process including a second level of evaluation is considered an adequate fit for the PRIME PETE programme.

The assessment of behavioral change is included as the third level of evaluation in the Kirkpatrick Model (Kirkpatrick & Kirkpatrick, 2006). This level aims to measure the extent to which participants have applied what they learned during the training programme to their individual performance. For example, in the context of teacher training, the assessment of behavioral change may involve observing teachers in the classroom and evaluating whether they are implementing new instructional strategies that they learned during the training program. It could also involve collecting data on student outcomes to determine whether the new instructional strategies are having a positive impact on learning. The assessment of behavioral change is an important aspect of evaluating the effectiveness of training programmes, as it helps organizations to determine whether participants are able to apply what they have learned in real-world settings. It can also provide insights into the factors that may facilitate or hinder the transfer of learning from the training programme to the workplace. Overall, the assessment of behavioral change is a key component of the Kirkpatrick Model and is essential for evaluating the effectiveness of teacher training programmes, as it provides valuable information on whether the training is leading to meaningful changes in teacher behavior and ultimately improving student learning outcomes. Therefore, the selection of the Kirkpatrick Model as a suitable model to inform the development of the PRIME PETE evaluations tools can be considered appropriate.

The development of the PRIME PETE questionnaire for the participants was based on three of the four levels of evaluation proposed by Kirkpatrick and Kirkpatrick (2006). These three levels included

"satisfaction and acceptance", "self-assessed learning progress", and "assessment of behavioural change through the teacher training". The category "satisfaction and acceptance" was divided into two subcategories: "satisfaction and acceptance regarding the content" and "satisfaction and acceptance regarding the teacher training".

3. Development procedure and evidence of validity

In addition to the implementation of Kirkpatrick's Model, a review process of previously developed questionnaires that evaluate University modules in the PRIME PETE partner institutions was implemented. The Universities' administrations responsible for PRIME PETE module evaluations were contacted, and the respective websites and online learning platforms were checked. All project partners and fellow colleagues were reached out to provide their insights based on their own experiences with previous questionnaires. This was an adequate procedure to gain insights into what has worked well and what needs improvement in past module evaluation questionnaires.

Following this procedure, two initial draft questionnaires were developed (one for students and one for educators) by the main project team to assess the modules and micro-modules, as well as the Professional Development Events. These initial questionnaires and respective items went through three feedback rounds, where all project partners participated. The questionnaires were adapted and improved based on feedback from reports, subsequent group discussions and through expert meetings. The final questionnaires were based on a larger pool of test items developed and discussed in several expert discussions. This process of developing the various items may be understood as a design step for maintaining face and content validity.

To ensure the face and content validity of the items and questionnaires, all project partners, who are experts in PRIME PETE since they hold high academic positions in their respective Universities, participated in the discussion and feedback process. Face validity is an informal review of a questionnaire by experts, who assess its clarity, comprehensibility, and appropriateness for the target-group, whilst content validity involves a formal assessment by subject experts, to determine appropriateness of content and identify any misunderstandings or omissions (Tanner, 2018; Thomas, Martin, Etnier, & Silverman, 2023). Also, Nunnally and Bernstein (1994) defined content validity as the degree to which a measure's items represent a proper sample of the theoretical content domain of a construct. For the criterion of content validity to be met by the initial pool of items, these items need to be face valid. Face validity has been defined as reflecting the extent to which a measure reflects what it is intended to measure (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). Furthermore, expert judging was not used as a substitute for the scale development

process. Rather, expert judging was used, as stated by Hardesty and Bearden (2004), to obtain some justification for the face validity of items when those items are not the focal point of the research. Moreover, project partners evaluated the appearance of the questionnaires in terms of feasibility, readability, consistency of style and formatting, and the clarity of the language used. During the final feedback round, all project partners agreed that the questionnaires measure what they have been designed to measure, as well as the questionnaires include items that assess every domain of the construct, thus face and construct validity were established.

4. Questionnaires

The final version of the questionnaires (one for students and one for educators) was divided in three main sections.

- Demographic information: respondents were required to provide their socio-demographic details such as age, gender, country of residence, year of studies (for students), years of teaching experience (for educators), etc.

- Evaluation of the Professional Development Event: this section contained items regarding the organizational aspects (5 items), teaching and content (14 items for students and 16 items for educators), implementation and feasibility of the event (5 items), and one item about recommending the event to peers. For all items a five-point Likert-type scale was used, ranging from disagree (1) to agree (5), and a not applicable (N/A) answer was also available. Additionally, to gain a deeper insight and understanding in what the participants thought about the event, four open-ended questions were included regarding the best features of the event, things the participants did not like, potential changes that could be implemented, and specific comments about the Professional Development Event.

- Evaluation of the module and/or micro-module:[3] this section contained items regarding the learning, teaching, assessment, feedback, workload, skills development, management, learning environment and overall satisfaction with the module and/or micro-module (24 items). For all items a five-point Likert-type scale was used, ranging from very dissatisfied (1) to very satisfied (5), and a not applicable (N/A) answer was also available. Furthermore, one additional question was used about

---

[3] In the questionnaires only "modules" are mentioned because at the time of questionnaire development the project partners had not agreed yet whether "micro-modules" should be included in the Modular PRIME PETE programme. Now, following a consensus among project partners, the same questionnaires can be used to evaluate both modules and micro-modules, as these include similar elements.

recommending the module to peers, with possible answers ranging from disagree (1) to agree (5). Similar to the previous section, four open-ended questions were included regarding the best features of the module, things the participants did not like, potential changes that could be implemented, and specific comments about the micro-module. Both questionnaires and all items are presented in detail in the Appendix.

The participants were provided with detailed information and instruction about the completion of the questionnaires. In addition, they were informed that the questionnaire completion was voluntary, all information provided would be confidential and participants' anonymity would be protected throughout the entire procedure. Furthermore, all collected data would be stored securely in accordance with current data protection regulations (European General Data Protection Regulation 2016/679 of 27/4/2016) and only project partners would have access to this data stored in DropIt cloud (a cloud system used by the University of Luxembourg based on the university servers). The results of the evaluation process will be published without sharing any information about the respondents in an open access publication in the frame of the PRIME PETE programme. Finally, all data will be retained for a minimum period of 5 years following the completion of the project. Following this period, all data will be destroyed.

5. Conclusion

The aim of the present IO#6 was to develop PRIME PETE evaluation tools for the Professional Development Events and the respective modules and micro-modules of the PRIME PETE programme. A well-designed evaluation tool can help educators to assess the effectiveness of their teaching methods, identify areas of improvement, and provide valuable feedback to students. The process of developing an evaluation tool should involve careful consideration of the learning outcomes, the content of the module, and the assessment criteria.

The PRIME PETE evaluation tools are designed in a way that aligns with the outcomes of the events and the modules and micro-modules, and the desired learning outcomes. In addition, it was ensured that the PRIME PETE evaluation tools are user-friendly and accessible to all students, regardless of their background or abilities, and they were tested for face and content validity, meaning that they consistently measure what they are supposed to measure. To ensure the effectiveness of the PRIME PETE evaluation tools, they should undergo thorough testing and further validation. This will help to identify any potential issues or areas for improvement and refine the tools to make them more effective.

Overall, the development of effective evaluation tools for modules and micro-modules is essential for enhancing the quality of teaching and learning. It provides valuable feedback to both educators and

students, helps to identify areas for improvement, and supports the development of effective teaching strategies. Therefore, it is crucial to invest time and resources in developing specific evaluation tools that meet the needs of students and educators alike.

6. References

Hardesty, D. M., & Bearden, W. O. (2004). The use of expert judges in scale development: Implications for improving face validity of measures of unobservable constructs. *Journal of Business Research, 57*, 98-107. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963(01)00295-8

Kirkpatrick, J. D., & Kirkpatrick, D. L. (2006). *Evaluating training programs. The four levels* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Berret-Koehler.

Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (Eds.) (1994). *Psychometric theory.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Tanner, K. (2018). Survey designs. In K. Williamson and G. Johanson (Eds.), *Research methods: Information, systems, and contexts* (1st ed.) (pp. 159-192). Cambridgeshire: Chandos Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-102220-7.00006-6

Thomas, J. R., Martin, P. E., Etnier, J. L., & Silverman, S. J. (Eds.) (2023). *Research methods in physical activity* (8th ed.). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics, Inc. ISBN: 9781718201026

Appendix

PRIME PETE Professional Development Event and Module Evaluation tool for <u>Students</u>

Please help enhance the quality of the Professional Development Event and our modules by spending a few minutes completing this questionnaire.

Part 1: General Information

Method and tool to evaluate the PETE course modules and micro-modules

1.1. Country

_____

1.2. University / Faculty

_____

1.3. Are you: Student   Educator

1.4. If you are a student, your Study program is: Bachelor   Master

1.5. If you are a student, your Teacher program: Specialist PE   Generalist   Generalist with PE
                                                                                                        Specialism

1.6. If you are a student: Year of studies

_____

1.7. Age

_____

1.8. Gender

_____

1.9. Educator: Years of teaching experience at Third level Initial Teacher Education

_____

1.10.   Educator: Years of teaching experience at Primary and Secondary level

_____

Part 2: Professional Development Event

To ensure the quality of the event as well as improving the training, we kindly ask you to answer the following questions. Please select the most relevant answer.

2.1. To what extent do you agree with the following statements about the student Professional Development Event?

		Disagree	Rather disagree	Neutral	Rather agree	Agree	N/A
Organizational aspects							
2.1.1	The event was adequately and logically structured.	○	○	○	○	○	○
2.1.2	The event was well designed.	○	○	○	○	○	○
2.1.3	The time frame of the event was appropriate.	○	○	○	○	○	○
2.1.4	The event was delivered at an appropriate pace/rhythm.	○	○	○	○	○	○
2.1.5	The materials and resources were well prepared.	○	○	○	○	○	○
Teaching and content							
2.1.6	The presentation of the contents was clearly designed and developed.	○	○	○	○	○	○
2.1.7	The presentation of the contents was easily understood.	○	○	○	○	○	○
2.1.8	The teaching enabled me to attain the learning outcomes.	○	○	○	○	○	○
2.1.9	The overall topic of the event was relevant for my practice.	○	○	○	○	○	○
2.1.10	The specific content of the event was relevant to my practice.	○	○	○	○	○	○
2.1.11	The topics were discussed sufficiently.	○	○	○	○	○	○
2.1.12	I was able to improve my knowledge and skills related to the topic.	○	○	○	○	○	○
2.1.13	I was able to learn something for my teaching.	○	○	○	○	○	○
2.1.14	The content will be helpful to me as a teacher.	○	○	○	○	○	○
2.1.15	The contents of the event are compatible with the university's curriculum.	○	○	○	○	○	○

PRIME PETE

Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

		Disagree	Rather disagree	Neutral	Rather agree	Agree	N/A
2.1.16	I gained new knowledge and information from the event.	○	○	○	○	○	○
2.1.17	I was never taught before the contents presented in the event.	○	○	○	○	○	○
2.1.18	The topic presented was new to me.	○	○	○	○	○	○
2.1.19	I enjoyed the event.	○	○	○	○	○	○

2.2. To what extent do you agree with the following statements about the implementation and feasibility of the Professional Development Event?

		Disagree	Rather disagree	Neutral	Rather agree	Agree	N/A
2.2.1	The event motivated me to consider implementing the contents in my teaching.	○	○	○	○	○	○

		Disagree	Rather disagree	Neutral	Rather agree	Agree	N/A
2.2.2	I will use the materials and resources which I received in the event in my lessons and future career.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
2.2.3	I can imagine myself implementing PRIME PETE resources in my future teaching career.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
2.2.4	I believe that the university environment will be supportive for the implementation of the PRIME PETE resources.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
2.2.5	I consider the PRIME PETE resources useful as they can be easily implemented in the university setting.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

		Disagree	Rather disagree	Neutral	Rather agree	Agree
2.3.	I would recommend this Professional Development Event to my peers.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

Comments about the Professional Development Event

Method and tool to evaluate the PETE course modules and micro-modules

To help improve the quality of the learning experience it is very helpful to receive feedback. The following questions will help staff and future students. Please attempt to answer as many questions as you can. You can include anything about the Professional Development Event that you think is relevant.

I found the BEST features of the Professional Development Event to be:

I did NOT like the following:

I would like to see the following CHANGES:

I have specific comments for this Professional Development Event:

Module Title:	Module Code:

Date:

Part 3: Module content[4]

3.1. Indicate your level of satisfaction with each of the following items by selecting the most relevant answer.

RATING: 1 = Very Dissatisfied 2 = Dissatisfied 3 = Neutral 4 = Satisfied 5 = Very Satisfied	1 ☹	2	3	4	5 ☺	N/A
3.1.1 The teaching on the module.	○	○	○	○	○	○
3.1.2 The delivery of the module (theory and practice).	○	○	○	○	○	○
3.1.3 The description of the module.	○	○	○	○	○	○
3.1.4 The content of the module.	○	○	○	○	○	○
3.1.5 The clarity of the module content.	○	○	○	○	○	○
3.1.6 The defined learning outcomes and/or objectives were adequately explained.	○	○	○	○	○	○
3.1.7 The learning materials (e.g., handouts, workshop material, case studies, websites, etc.).	○	○	○	○	○	○
3.1.8 The match of the content to the University curriculum.	○	○	○	○	○	○
3.1.9 The appropriateness of the assignments.	○	○	○	○	○	○
3.1.10 The explanation of the assessment criteria.	○	○	○	○	○	○
3.1.11 The assessment methods effectiveness in identifying my strengths and areas for future development.	○	○	○	○	○	○
3.1.12 The communication of the learning outcomes and assessment model.	○	○	○	○	○	○
3.1.13 The overall workload.	○	○	○	○	○	○
3.1.14 The ECTS relevance to the workload.	○	○	○	○	○	○
3.1.15 The effectiveness of the module in raising my professional development.	○	○	○	○	○	○
3.1.16 The quality of the support given by staff on assignments.	○	○	○	○	○	○
3.1.17 The preparation of teaching staff.	○	○	○	○	○	○
3.1.18 The approachability of teaching staff (i.e., instructive, inspiring, encouraging, and motivating).	○	○	○	○	○	○
3.1.19 The organisational arrangements for the module.	○	○	○	○	○	○

---

[4] See Footnote 3 for more information regarding the use of the words "module" and "micro-module.

3.1.20	The relevance of the module to raising my professional development.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯ ◯
3.1.21	The estimated workload is achievable, realistic, and adequate.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯ ◯
3.1.22	The transferability of the lessons learnt in the module to other settings.	◯	◯	◯	◯ ◯	◯
3.1.23	The development of new skills and/or techniques due to this module.	◯	◯	◯	◯ ◯	◯
3.1.24	My overall satisfaction with the module.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯ ◯

	Disagree	Rather disagree	Neutral	Rather agree	Agree
3.2. I would recommend this module to my peers.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

Comments about the module

To help improve the quality of the learning experience it is very helpful to receive feedback. The following questions will help staff and future students. Please attempt to answer as many questions as you can. You can include anything about the module that you think is relevant.

I found the <u>BEST</u> features of the module to be:

I did <u>NOT</u> like the following:

I would like to see the following CHANGES:

I have specific comments for this module:

PRIME PETE Professional Development Event and Module Evaluation tool for <u>Educators</u>

Please help enhance the quality of the Professional Development Event and our modules by spending a few minutes completing this questionnaire.

Part 1: General Information

1.11.   Country

_____

1.12.   University / Faculty / Organization

_____

1.13.   Are you: Student   Educator

1.14.   If you are a student, your Study program is: Bachelor   Master

1.15.   If you are a student, your Teacher program: Specialist PE   Generalist   Generalist with PE
                                                                                                                                   Specialism

1.16.   If you are a student: Year of studies

_____

1.17.   Age

_____

1.18.   Gender

_____

1.19.   Educator: Years of teaching experience at Third level Initial Teacher Education

_____

1.20.   Educator: Years of teaching experience at Primary and Secondary level

_____

Part 2: Professional Development Event

To ensure the quality of the event as well as improving it, we kindly ask you to answer the following questions. Please select the most relevant answer.

2.3. To what extent do you agree with the following statements about the student Professional Development Event?

		Disagree	Rather disagree	Neutral	Rather agree	Agree	N/A
	Organizational aspects						
2.1.1	The event was adequately and logically structured.	○	○	○	○	○	○
2.1.2	The event was well designed.	○	○	○	○	○	○
2.1.3	The time frame of the event was appropriate.	○	○	○	○	○	○
2.1.4	The event was delivered at an appropriate pace/rhythm.	○	○	○	○	○	○
2.1.5	The materials and resources were well prepared.	○	○	○	○	○	○
	Teaching and content						
2.1.6	The presentation of the contents was clearly designed and developed.	○	○	○	○	○	○
2.1.7	The presentation of the contents was easily understood.	○	○	○	○	○	○
2.1.8	The teaching enabled the students to attain the learning outcomes.	○	○	○	○	○	○
2.1.9	The students seemed to enjoy the event.	○	○	○	○	○	○
2.1.10	The students engaged and actively participated during the event.	○	○	○	○	○	○
2.1.11	The overall topic of the event referred well to the practice.	○	○	○	○	○	○
2.1.12	The specific content of the event referred well to the practice.	○	○	○	○	○	○

PRIME PETE

		Disagree	Rather disagree	Neutral	Rather agree	Agree	N/A
2.1.13	The topics were discussed sufficiently.	○	○	○	○	○	○
2.1.14	I was able to improve my knowledge and skills related to the topic.	○	○	○	○	○	○
2.1.15	I was able to learn something new for my teaching.	○	○	○	○	○	○
2.1.16	The content will be helpful to me as a teacher.	○	○	○	○	○	○
2.1.17	The contents of the event are compatible with my university's curriculum.	○	○	○	○	○	○
2.1.18	I gained new knowledge and information from the event.	○	○	○	○	○	○
2.1.19	I had never taught the topics presented in the event before.	○	○	○	○	○	○
2.1.20	The topic presented was new to me.	○	○	○	○	○	○
2.1.21	I enjoyed the event.	○	○	○	○	○	○

2.4. To what extent do you agree with the following statements about the implementation and feasibility of the Professional Development Event?

		Disagree	Rather disagree	Neutral	Rather agree	Agree	N/A
2.2.1	The event motivated me to consider implementing the contents in my teaching.	○	○	○	○	○	○
2.2.2	I will use the materials and resources which I received in the event in my lessons.	○	○	○	○	○	○
2.2.3	I can imagine myself implementing PRIME PETE resources with my students.	○	○	○	○	○	○
2.2.4	I believe that the school/university environment will be supportive for the implementation of the PRIME PETE resources.	○	○	○	○	○	○
2.2.5	I consider the PRIME PETE resources useful as they can be easily implemented in a school/university setting.	○	○	○	○	○	○

		Disagree	Rather disagree	Neutral	Rather agree	Agree
2.3.	I would recommend this Professional Development Event to my colleagues.	○	○	○	○	○

Comments about the Professional Development Event

To help improve the quality of the learning experience it is very helpful to receive feedback. The following questions will help staff and future students. Please attempt to answer as many questions as you can. You can include anything about the Professional Development Event that you think is relevant.

I found the <u>BEST</u> features of the Professional Development Event to be:

I did <u>NOT</u> like the following:

I would like to see the following CHANGES:

I have specific comments for this Professional Development Event:

Module Title:	Module Code:

	Date:

Part 3: Module content

3.2. Indicate your level of satisfaction with each of the following items by selecting the most relevant answer.

RATING: 1 = Very Dissatisfied 2 = Dissatisfied 3 = Neutral 4 = Satisfied 5 = Very Satisfied	1 ☹	2	3	4	5 ☺	N/A
3.1.1 The teaching on the module.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
3.1.2 The delivery of the module (theory and practice).	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
3.1.3 The description of the module.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
3.1.4 The content of the module.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
3.1.5 The clarity of the module content.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
3.1.6 The defined learning outcomes and/or objectives were adequately explained.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
3.1.7 The learning materials (e.g., handouts, workshop material, case studies, websites, etc.).	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
3.1.8 The match of the content to the University curriculum.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
3.1.9 The appropriateness of the assignments.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
3.1.10 The explanation of the assessment criteria.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
3.1.11 The assessment methods effectiveness in identifying students' strengths and areas for future development.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
3.1.12 The communication of the learning outcomes and assessment model.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
3.1.13 The overall workload.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
3.1.14 The ECTS relevance to the workload.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
3.1.15 The effectiveness of the module in raising students' professional development.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
3.1.16 The quality of the support given by staff on assignments.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
3.1.17 The preparation of teaching staff.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
3.1.18 The approachability of teaching staff (i.e., instructive, inspiring, encouraging, and motivating).	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
3.1.19 The organisational arrangements for the module.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
3.1.20 The relevance of the module in raising students' professional development.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

3.1.21	The estimated workload is achievable, realistic, and adequate.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
3.1.22	The transferability of the lessons learnt in the module to other settings.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
3.1.23	The development of new skills and/or techniques due to this module.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
3.1.24	My overall satisfaction with the module.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

	Disagree	Rather disagree	Neutral	Rather agree	Agree
3.2. I would recommend this module to my peers and colleagues.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

Comments about the module

To help improve the quality of the learning experience it is very helpful to receive feedback. The following questions will help staff and future students. Please attempt to answer as many questions as you can. You can include anything about the module that you think is relevant.

I found the <u>BEST</u> features of the module to be:

I did <u>NOT</u> like the following:

I would like to see the following CHANGES:

I have specific comments for this module:

Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union