

EXTERNAL EVALUATION OF THE PROJECT «STRATEGIES FOR INCLUSION - MAKING HISTORY AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION MORE INCLUSIVE AND ACCESSIBLE» AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT TRAINING

The project 'Strategies for Inclusion - Making history and citizenship education more inclusive and accessible' has been led by EUROCLIO in partnership with Armenian Center for Democratic Education-CIVITAS (Armenian-CIVITAS), Zavod za gluhe in naglusne Ljubljana (Slovenia), Norges Teknisk- Naturvitenskapelige Universitet NTNU (Norway), Stichting Hogeschool van Amsterdam (the Netherlands), and School Cluster Montemor-o-Velho (Portugal).

The aim of the project is to contribute to making the teaching and learning of history and citizenship more inclusive and accessible for all types of learners, including students that are deaf or hard-of-hearing and/or blind or partially sighted. Inclusive education is intended to increase the capacity of education systems and schools to meet the needs of all learners and raise their achievement. The challenge of achieving quality basic education remains a reality in many countries. Besides, there are inequities and gaps in provision at school level including: exclusion; violence; discrimination; lack of children's participation; low parental engagement and poor infrastructure.

This project was implemented at international level, connecting professionals from different countries, with their national context of Inclusive education, specific gaps, successes, issues, difficulties and practices. By joining the efforts, the project has collected existing resources related to History and Citizenship Education and inclusion (including research, teacher guides and policy recommendations), documented inclusive practices coming from project-partners countries for history and citizenship education, and developed ready to use educational resources for history and citizenship educators. Two special interest groups (SIG) were formed in the frames of the project: the first group focusing on 'Students that Are Partially- Sighted or Blind, and/or Hard-of-Hearing or Deaf' and the second one on 'Learner Variability and Motivation.' The result of the intensive work of the two SIGs is the collection of ready-to-use educational resources that History and

Citizenship educators can try and use in their classrooms. Another important value of the [Project a](#) mixed consortium of partners, practitioners and theorists from all across Europe.

I would make a detailed analysis of two questions, based on my observations: L
SEP

How far has the project reached the aims that it set out to do?	What went well, what could have been done better? L SEP
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The awareness of participants regarding Inclusive education, and approaches to making classes more inclusive was increased. 2. The attitude regarding the presence of diverse students in the classroom was changed. 3. The awareness of the right for education was increased. 4. Best practices were collected and reviewed. 5. Tested and recommended teaching strategies for most vulnerable groups (students that are partially sighted or blind, and/or hard-of-hearing or deaf) were introduced in case studies. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Project was successfully organized and managed. 2. Participants were fully engaged. 3. <i>It would be better to have parents and students with disabilities included in the project («Nothing for us, without us» approach).</i>
How far did the training reach the aims that it set out to do?	What went well, what could have been done better? L SEP
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Training aims were logically set up. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Topics of lectures and workshops were very

<p>2. Workshops were related either to History, or to Citizenship education.</p> <p>3. Theoretical parts were related to teaching strategies, up-to-date approaches.</p> <p>4. Cultural program including on-sight visits were in the scope of the project and participants' professional interest.</p>	<p>interesting, useful and related to the aims of the project.</p> <p>2. Workshops were provided in an interactive manner, the use of handouts, other printed materials and ITC was logically organized.</p> <p>3. Group works were provided, which that added up to the inclusive setting while having colleagues working together coming from different professional and language backgrounds.</p> <p>4. In some workshops co-teaching was demonstrated, as a good way of effective teaching in inclusive classroom.</p> <p>5. For some workshops trainers were prepared to work with diverse students, for example adapted/simplified text was provided.</p> <p>6. It would be better to have workshops more concentrated on teaching in classrooms having children with disabilities.</p>
---	---

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Having students with disabilities, and their parents within such projects and trainings could make it even more productive.
2. It would be good to increase acknowledging diversity within participants of training and promoting equity of opportunity.
3. To organize regular summer schools for specialists, inviting the representatives of teacher training universities, improving pre-service education for future teachers of history and citizenship education
4. Include more teachers with experience of work in inclusive education, for making

discussions more related to children's individual needs and disabilities.

5. Have regular online meetings, discussions and exchanges of experience for project's and professional development training's participants.
6. Come up with a database of project and professional development training participants, using their potential in future projects and further cooperation. Share the data with all the participants. Establish an alumni association.

External Evaluator, Associate Professor at Armenian State Pedagogical University

Armenuhi Avagyan