

Scientify Final evaluation – remarks on the results

1. The sample and evaluation tool

The evaluation took place during December 22 – January 23 and was made via a Google-Form sent to the participants of the project in each country of the partnership. Results were then collected and treated as a whole.

The Google-Form had 11 questions, divided in 3 sections – **before joining the project** (the initial situation of respondents); **while taking part in the project** (activities and experiences in which respondents took part) and **after finishing the project** (the effect of joining the project on the participants according to the aims of the project itself). The questionnaire was practically the same for teachers and students, asking the same issues, just from a different perspective, such as teaching/learning.

The **students' sample included 38 respondents**, despite more students had participated in a broader or more sporadic way in the activities of the project. For some schools, due to the extension of the project beyond its predicted time (the extension was due to the pandemic ban on travelling, which made impossible to carry out mobility events) part of the initial participating students were no longer in school to be part of the sample.

The **teachers' sample included 16 Science teachers' respondents** – for whom the questions were aimed – but other participating teachers, such as coordinators and accompanying persons weren't part of the sample.

2. Results

2.1. Students

Part of the students state they already had former experiences on the several dimensions of the project: whereas 60% already had worked on short term Science projects, and 50% were involved in interdisciplinary Science tasks, only 24% had worked as a student in an international environment. That may indicate that despite partner schools already carried out the forementioned tasks locally, it was a new experience for 66% of the students to do it internationally.

While taking part of the project, 81-89% of students claim they took active part on project activities such as short-term projects, interdisciplinary tasks and working internationally. This last dimension is the less mentioned by students (81%), maybe due to the fact they may have perceived less the international dimension if they didn't take part in physical international events, namely short-term students exchanges in another partner school.

Nevertheless, in all the dimensions, especially the international one, the range of experiences raised significantly from an average of 44% (before the project) to an average of 86% (during the project).

When asked if joining the project had increased their motivation to learn Sciences, 79% of the students answered yes. The source of that motivation came mainly from "learning in an international" environment (90%), still, 71% mentioned "learning based on projects", whereas only 50% referred "interdisciplinary Science tasks".

According to these results, the international dimension seems to have been the most attractive one, fact which may be partially connected to having also been, as mentioned before, the one which was less experienced by students before joining the project.

It seems also important to emphasize that, despite for 60% of the students “learning based on projects” not being something new, these new short-term projects provided by Scientify, were still an extra source of motivation to learn Sciences for 71% of the students.

Finally, when asked about their skills in English, around 90% claimed they had improved by participating in the project, mainly due to working and talking to foreign colleagues (92%), a bit less (71%) from having to prepare all their tasks in English.

Again, this result confirms the importance of the physical meeting and the international dimension, the curiosity about the other, his/her culture, how he/she does things in another school/country, seems to have triggered the most the motivation in students.

2.2. Teachers

According to the answers, around 75% of the teachers were already experienced on the several dimensions of the project. This initial situation may be due to the fact that 3 of the 4 partner schools had already previous partnerships where they worked on those dimensions.

All the respondent teachers (100% of the sample) have participated in activities that were foreseen to be carried away on the frame of the project -short-term projects, interdisciplinary tasks – except for one who didn't perceive those tasks within an international dimension.

For 78%, carrying out the project have improved their teaching skills in science, being the source of that improvement almost equally divided (81% average) by all the factors: exchanging ideas with colleagues during short-term joint staff events, working in an interdisciplinary way, teaching in an international environment and project-based teaching. Differently from students' answers, the international dimension didn't overcome the other factors.

The same number of teachers (78%), claimed to have improved their skills in English, again from almost equally valued factors (81% average): exchanging ideas with colleagues during short-term joint staff events, having to prepare tasks in English and working and talking with foreign colleagues-

It may be also interesting to remark that despite 75% of the teachers claimed to have had experienced all the dimensions of the project beforehand, for 78%, having joined it was taken as an added value on improving both their teaching and language skills.

2.3. Overall experience

Finally, despite the difficulties created by the pandemic circumstances - travel bans, long periods of online teaching - on the implementation of the project, it seemed to have been a positive experience for all the participants, even better for the student sample.

97% of students stated it has been Excellent, Very Good or Good, whereas 89% classified the experience as Excellent or Very Good.

For 100% of teachers the experience was Excellent, Very Good or Good, whereas 67% classified the experience as Excellent or Very Good.

Not a single respondent, from both samples, claimed the experience of having joined the project was Bad or even Average.