**Training Report**

**Training on Quality Assurance of Integration of Key Competences, 15 and 16 January 2020**

**Location: Podgorica, conference room A Bureau of Education Services**

**Participants:** Pedagogic advisors from the Bureau for Education Services and VET Centre, responsible for external quality assurance of primary and secondary (general and VET) education institutions (schools).

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Institution** | **15/01/2020** | **16/01/2020** |
| Džoana Perkaj | Bureau for Education Services | Ö | Ö |
| Dragana Bušković | Bureau for Education Services | Ö | Ö |
| Ana Stanišljević | Bureau for Education Services | Ö |  |
| Fran Vuljaj | Bureau for Education Services | Ö | Ö |
| Raba Hodžić | Bureau for Education Services | Ö | Ö |
| Rabija Šarkinović | Bureau for Education Services | Ö | Ö |
| Ivan Marković | VET Centre | Ö | Ö |
| Naser Gargović | VET Centre | Ö | Ö |
| Vladislav Koprivica | VET Centre | Ö | Ö |
| Branislav Knežević | VET Centre | Ö | Ö |
| Željko Korać | Bureau for Education Services | Ö | Ö |
| Bojana Nenezić | Bureau for Education Services | Ö | Ö |
| Nataša Rašović | Bureau for Education Services | Ö | Ö |
| Dragan Berilažić | Bureau for Education Services | Ö | Ö |
| Nermin Hajdarpašić | Bureau for Education Services | Ö |  |
| Fadila Kajević | Bureau for Education Services | Ö | Ö |
| Vesna Babović | Bureau for Education Services | Ö | Ö |
| Duško Lučić | VET Centre | Ö | Ö |
| Radoje Radunović | VET Centre | Ö | Ö |
| Gordana Tmušić Radulović | Bureau for Education Services | Ö | Ö |
| Ana Janković | Bureau for Education Services | Ö | Ö |
| Irena Ivanović | Bureau for Education Services | Ö | Ö |
| Danilo Bošković | Bureau for Education Services | Ö | Ö |
| Miodrag Vučeljić | Bureau for Education Services | Ö | Ö |
| Ana Vučinić Gujić | Bureau for Education Services | Ö | Ö |
| Nada Maraš | Bureau for Education Services | Ö | Ö |
| Anton Gojčaj | Bureau for Education Services | Ö | Ö |
| Nebojša Bakočević | Bureau for Education Services | Ö | Ö |
| Milica Vušurović | Bureau for Education Services |  |  |
| Aleksandra Vučeljić | Bureau for Education Services |  |  |
| Blaga Žurić | Bureau for Education Services |  |  |
| Radovan Ognjanović | Bureau for Education Services | Ö |  |
| Nataša Tomović | Bureau for Education Services |  |  |
|  | **Total** | **29** | **26** |

**Facilitators:** Ian Morris (KE 3 for QA), Boris Curkovic (Team Leader), Maja Jukić (KE 2 for teacher Training), Rajko Kosovic (Junior Expert for QA and assessment mechanisms), Bojana Živković (Project office manager)

**Aims of the training**

1. Present the project concept of key competences according to EU referencing framework
2. Discuss the main concept of quality assurance in education
3. Present the new methodology of external evaluation of schools in Montenegro
4. Consider drafting a methodology for monitoring evaluating the integration of key competences in primary and secondary education
5. Consider how effectively the key competences have been integrated into the school curriculum to date.
   1. Consider how teachers are promoting the development of key competences in the classroom to pupils/students
   2. Review student achievement of key competences
   3. Review how institutions ensure the continuous improvement of key competence teaching and learning

**Learning Outcomes**

1. Recognise EU recommendations on QA at all levels of education
2. Recognise the value of Key Competence and how they might be included within the curriculum, be assessed and evaluated
3. Consider the existing Montenegrin QA system of internal and external evaluation and the changes made in the recent law and methodology.

**Note:** the project team were informed immediately before the training that L.O.3 ‘the new Montenegrin law and methodology on the evaluation of education and training’ would not now be presented at this event.

Inputs were provided by Consultants and included:

1. Introduction. Broad outline of EU 8 key competences
2. Presentation of PISA achievement in Montenegro and comparisons with EU average.
3. Introduction to Quality Assurance and consideration on how we might evaluate.
4. Introduction to EU Key documentation and recommendations on Key Competences, Assuring Quality in Education, Better learning for Europe’s young people
5. Values of human resource development
6. Definitions of competence and the need for encouraging excellence
7. Quality Systems, internal, external evaluation.
8. Examples of possible competence indicators
9. Tasks to consider evaluation progression, self-evaluation, existing application of key competences and what needs to be done to ensure the development of key competences. Note: due to time constraints a number of these tasks were not attempted.
10. Task 7 A draft evaluation methodology was presented, and suggestions and amendments made. (See outcome)

**Evaluation:** Disappointingly due to time constraints only 20 evaluation sheets were completed.

How would you grade this session training (Please complete by ticking boxes (MCj04347130000[1]) and leave with the workshop facilitator. Your opinion will help us to prepare for the next event).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Strongly Agree | Agree | Uncertain | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Explanation of outcomes for this workshop was clear | 12 | 8 |  |  |  |
| The content was relevant to my needs | 9 | 10 | 1 |  |  |
| Presentation(s) was (were) helpful | 9 | 10 | 1 |  |  |
| The materials were useful | 9 | 11 |  |  |  |
| The workshop was paced just right | 7 | 10 | 2 | 1 |  |
| The information in the workshop will help my future work in working | 11 | 9 |  |  |  |
| The workshop was well organised and coordinated | 10 | 9 | 1 |  |  |

**Participant Comments:**

1. The most useful part of the workshop considered by five participants was considering the indicators and protocols for monitoring (x5) One person thought the most useful part of the workshop was the discussions (x1).
2. The first day was considered the least useful part of the workshop by two participants. One person thought there was unnecessary dialogues that wasted time and were not related to the seminar (x1).
3. More time was requested to consider the Indicators and protocol for monitoring (x2) One person requested more time on quality assurance (x1)
4. Less time was required on the introductory part of the workshop (x1) Too many comments from some participants that were not necessary (x1) was also cited.

The Report made by Ian David Morris, key expert for quality assurance