

2018

**Report on SUP4PCL/ ERASMUS+
Extraordinary Meeting 27th of August
2018 at Steigenberger Hotel,
Alexandria, Egypt**

Project name:

School and University Partnership for Peer Communities of learners

Project number:

573660-EPP-1-2016-1-EG-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP (2016-2516/001-001)



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



Table of Contents:

Page

<i>Acronyms and Abbreviations</i>	3
<i>Welcome Note and Agenda Overview</i>	4
<i>I. The Objective of the Extraordinary Meeting</i>	5
<i>II. Discussion on Project Templates</i>	10
<i>III. Quality Plan</i>	21
<i>IV. The Website</i>	25
<i>V. The Way Forward</i>	26

List of Acronyms and Abbreviations:

Partners Acronyms	
AUC	American University in Cairo
ANSU	Ain Shams University
AU	Alexandria University
HU	Helwan University
ULEIC	University of Leicester
UON	University of Northampton
UL	University of Limerick
MLU	Martin-Luther University
Other acronyms and abbreviations	
SUP4PCL	School University Partnership for Peer Communities of Learners (Title of this ERASMUS+ Project)
MEIHE	Middle East Institute for Higher Education
CDFE/ TEMPUS	Capacity Development of Faculties of Education in International Approaches to Teacher Education (Title of the TEMPUS project)
FOE	Faculties of Education
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
WP	Work package
PD	Professional Development
CPD	Continuous Professional Development
PCL	Peer Communities of Learners
QA	Quality Assurance
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
STEAM	Science, Technology, Art, Engineering and Mathematics
SEN	Special Educational Needs
IRB	Institutional Review Board
CAPMAS	Central Agency for Public Mobilization and Statistics

SUP4PCL/ERASMUS+ Extraordinary Meeting Report

27th of August, 2018

Alexandria, Egypt

Monday 27th of August, 2018

Welcome Note and Agenda Overview:

Prof. Malak Zaalouk, Founding Director, Middle East Institute for Higher Education (MEIHE), AUC:



Prof. Zaalouk welcomed the participants and Dean Mohamed Farrag from Alexandria University and thanked him for his attendance and support to the SUP4PCL project. Prof. Zaalouk added that Dean Farrag was able to bring in funds for the SUP4PCL project to create a space for equipment and labs. The purpose of this step was to provide more space for hosting schools and conducting workshops for school teachers in Alexandria University as a way of strengthening PCLs. The floor was given to Dean Farrag who welcomed all the partners from the Egyptian and European Universities and hoped that this project would lead to stronger partnerships between universities and schools. Dean Farrag wished the participants a fruitful meeting and a pleasant stay in Alexandria.

An overview of the agenda was given by Prof. Zaalouk. The first session started with the main objective of the extraordinary meeting. Detailed presentation on the ERASMUS+ headquarters assessment report along with the AUC response and action plan were delivered. The agenda of the meeting was shaped by the issues highlighted by the assessment report most prominent amongst which were the tools and templates for data collection, and hence the quality of reporting, the online presence and finally the methods of monitoring and evaluation as reflected in the quality plan. Hence after presenting the comments of the Headquarters report along with the response from AUC, the following session focused

on the overarching research questions and templates. The third session covered the revised M&E and quality plan. An overview of the website was the fourth item in the agenda while the way forward was the last session of the meeting.

Session One: The Objective of the Extraordinary Meeting

Prof. Malak Zaalouk, Founding Director, Middle East Institute for Higher Education (MEIHE), AUC:



Prof. Zaalouk clarified that this meeting was requested by the ERASMUS+ headquarters. The main objective of this meeting is to share the ERASMUS+ headquarters assessment report with the partners. In addition, the meeting aimed at sharing the response sent by AUC and the action plan prepared.

Based on the overall assessment of the ERASMUS+ Headquarters in Brussels, the project was classified as “weak”. The delay in publishing the website and the lack of visibility were main reasons for the weak rating and were critical points for the EU. The AUC in their response clarified that there were other online forms used such as the Dropbox, google drive and Edmodo. Yet, this was not a sufficient justification for the ERASMUS+ headquarters. A second reason for the “weak” rating was the poor quality of the baseline and school visits reports. After the intermediate report, a Preventive Monitoring Meeting was conducted at AUC by the National Erasmus Office (NEO). In this meeting, the NEO requested to have copies from the schools’ reports in addition to some other material. The management meeting reports were not included. Prof. Zaalouk clarified that the management meeting reports would have provided a clearer insight about the project’s progress, the richness of the work and processes as well as the context and the obstacles encountered.

Based on that, the assessment report dated 14th June 2018 was summarized by Prof. Zaalouk as in the below table:

Positive Results (+)	Areas needing improvement (-)
1. The MOU that was signed between AUC and two ministries to foster the sustainability of the school university partnership	1. School visit reports and baseline reports are of poor quality and do not follow a common structure and template. While some replies include valuable information others do not provide any information to be usable in the context of the project. The reports need to be redone.
2. Respecting the work plan and timelines	2. Online presence is absent
3. Teams established and partnership well-functioning	3. The quality report needs improvement
4. Management structure in place with prominent role of women	4. The dissemination plan needs to be redone (although it was not mandatory)
5. Cooperation with schools established	

On 27th June 2018, the AUC responded on the points mentioned in the assessment report. Prof. Zaalouk explained that the AUC had provided a rebuttal of the rating of the project namely that it was “WEAK” since the ERASMUS+ headquarters listed five positive points against four weaknesses. The AUC argued that the overall rating should not have been less than “fair”. The AUC also responded to each point mentioned in the ERASMUS+ assessment report and offered an action plan to rectify the weaknesses. The ERASMUS+ headquarters asked for two things: Conducting the extraordinary meeting in August 2018 and a meeting with Prof. Zaalouk as the principle investigator of the SUP4PCL project in Brussels. On the 9th and 10th July 2018, Prof. Zaalouk had a policy dialogue meeting in Brussels which allowed her to meet with Mr. Burgio, the Program Manager of the SUP4PCL project on the evening of 8th July 2018. The meeting was fruitful as described by Prof. Zaalouk. Mr. Burgio and Prof. Zaalouk discussed the AUC response in length. Prof. Zaalouk clarified that the material and reports that were requested from the ERASMUS+ Headquarters did not have enough substance to assess the work. Based on that, and along with the response sent by AUC, Prof. Zaalouk submitted the reports of both the local as well as the international management meetings. The reports provided the ERASMUS+ headquarters with a clearer vision of the project’s progress and processes. An example of how the Management meeting reports provided the EU with clarity was given by Prof. Zaalouk. The ERASMUS+ headquarters believed that the EU partners had not been sufficiently involved in the project. They also asked to have the latter involved in validating the tools. The AUC clarified that the EU partners have been highly involved in the project activities and that a twinning process with the Egyptian partners in which the twin partners work hand in hand and in which the tools are created collaboratively has been taking place. Prof. Zaalouk clarified that this process was documented clearly in the management meeting reports.

As a result for the clarification and communication occurring between the AUC and the ERASMUS+ headquarters, a better understanding was reached by Mr. Burgio.

In the AUC response, the political context, hardships and obstacles were explained. Major obstacles were represented in the delay of getting the security clearances and permits everytime a visit is planned which delayed the process and the actual start of visiting schools for the Egyptian FOEs. Prof. Zaalouk elaborated that the political context and security issues were clearly stated in the SUP4PCL's original proposal as risk factors. The other aspect that was raised by Prof. Zaalouk in her response and clarification was the bureaucracy that takes place in different levels including the AUC administration in addition to the other Egyptian universities and the Egyptian systems in general. The long time (seven months) needed to sign the MOUs was an example of the bureaucratic context. The website was another example. Prof. Zaalouk clarified that the process of sub-contracting with a website production company took months due to the bureaucratic processes and the permissions and clearances required from different departments at AUC. Nevertheless, progress is taking place regarding the website. Prof. Zaalouk announced that the website would be launched by the end of the month and that it was at the final stages of the testing at the time of this event. In addition, a SUP4PCL logo was created. The logo took into account the EU countries as well as Egypt to represent the partners in the project. Prof. Zaalouk stressed the importance of using the logo in all the project documents and clarified that the visibility tools are now ready to be used. Prof. Zaalouk also mentioned that Mr. Burgio would like to visit Egypt in October 2018 in a monitoring supportive visit.

Prof. Zaalouk elaborated on the action plan prepared to rectify the weaknesses reported in the ERASMUS+ headquarters assessment. The action plan was summarized in the below table:

Area of Intervention	Action	Timeline
1) Informing partners about the recent EU assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The agenda of the fifth local management meeting had a slot to discuss the issue. - The agenda for the extraordinary international management meeting had an agenda item to discuss 	<p>June 26, 2018</p> <p>End August , 2018 (Depending on the consent and availability of Partners. Another option might be on Video conference)</p>
2) Harmonizing data collection and adding rigor to the methodology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Baseline reports repeated in accordance to the existing templates. -Case studies with twinning arrangements observe the templates. 	<p>October/November 2018</p> <p>Ongoing</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Quality plan reviewed and improved. -Leicester required to present some more templates around institutional reform at FOE -Leicester to validate methodology and templates 	<p>September</p> <p>August and October</p>
) Consolidating on line presence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Training on the website operation. -Formal launch of website -Migrating all materials from other media to website. 	<p>June 28, 2018</p> <p>Mid July, 2018</p> <p>End August, 2018</p>
4) Visibility and dissemination	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Visibility plan revised -Project logo produced (attached). -Three related articles produced in the press 	<p>September</p> <p>June 20, 2018</p> <p>June 2018</p>
5) AUC intensified coordination	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Schedule for AUC presence agreed upon. -AUC intensive presence in schools and FOEs. -Involving graduate students from AUC in the field. Course release obtained for the PI through a professional leave to focus on the project 	<p>June 26, 2018</p> <p>July----</p> <p>September -----</p> <p>January 2019 -----</p>
6) EU partner's greater involvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - EU partners are closely engaged in a twinning process with Egyptian Universities which should continue beyond the life of the project. -Agenda item in the forthcoming management meetings 	<p>February 2018 -----</p> <p>June - August</p>

Elaborating on some of the points above, Prof. Zaalouk clarified that Prof. Wilkins has shared different tools in different events and meetings with partners and requested their feedback. Yet, no responses were received. The following sessions of the meeting, Prof. Wilkins presented a modified quality plan and Prof. Zaalouk requested the partners send their feedback by 10th Sept, 2018. This would allow time for ULEIC team to finalize the quality plan by the fourth International management meeting.

Concerning the website and as mentioned earlier, Prof. Zaalouk announced that the AUC conducted a planned detailed testing that included the testing of the different roles. For that reason, the AUC invited the partners to be part of the testing process. Prof. Zaalouk added that several glitches were still pending in addition to another issue regarding the size of the storage that required additional negotiations. The website was expected to be launched by end July, 2018. Yet, due to the issues explained, a slight delay occurred.

As an answer to a question raised by Prof. Heggi from HU regarding having a separate website for HU, Prof. Zaalouk clarified that having one collective website is more powerful than having different ones with scattered material. She added that the material that was shared earlier in Edmodo, the Google drive and the Dropbox will all be need to migrate to the SUP4PCL website. Prof. Zaalouk also reminded HU that support should be given to the AUC team from their end during the migration stage since HU is assigned to be a lead with the AUC in the Dissemination Workpackage. Prof. Zaalouk elaborated that in the website, the AUC took into consideration the privacy and protection policy. For this reason, emails were sent to all partners asking for their consent to publish bios and photos of the core teams.

Prof. Zaalouk stressed the importance of respecting the website privacy policy and clarified that this involves material, photos and videos that require having the consent of the people involved in such material including the parents of the children. Hence, publishing requires prior approval and consent. This includes any photos in the reports. A brief description of the website structure was given by Prof. Zaalouk. The website is divided into two sections, the first section is open for public while the second section is closed to the partners and their teams only. The forth session in the meeting was dedicated to introducing the partners to the website in more detail.

Dr. Kamal inquired about the possibility of having the whole community and the teachers involved and linked to the website. Prof. Zaalouk clarified that including the big community might invite academic integrity issues. Prof. Zaalouk elaborated that even if linking the website to social media was possible, all users would still have to function under the regulations of the copyrights and the privacy policy. Any material should not be shared without prior consent. For that reason, including teachers and wider communities would entail a lot of precautions.

Dr. ElHawary asked about the language of the website given that some of the team members would have difficulty in understanding the English language. Prof. Zaalouk clarified that eventhough the main feature of the website is English since it is part of an international project, the Arabic material can be posted and uploaded on the website.

The dissemination plan is another element that should be revisited. Related to the visibility of the project and partially fulfilling the dissemination plan was the production of the SUP4PCL logo.

Furthermore, articles with a clear reference to the SUP4PCL project were written by Prof. Zaalouk in Arabic. The articles will be translated and posted in both Arabic and English on the website. The final products of the case studies will also be published on the website and disseminated. Finally, the project outcomes, processes and best practices should be disseminated in the final conference at the end of the project. A revised dissemination plan will be prepared.

As for the intensified coordination and presence of AUC, Prof. Zaalouk reminded the three Egyptian partners (ANSU,AU & HU) to send their school visits schedules as well as the schedules of their FOE PCL meetings for the months of Sept, Oct and Nov 2018 to the AUC team to plan their visits to schools and FOEs accordingly. In addition, an AUC meeting with the graduates and faculty will take place in September, 2018 to start engaging students. Prof. Zaalouk also mentioned that getting a release in the next Spring Semester is another point in her agenda to allow more time for the project.

Lastly, the EU partners' engagement was another aspect of the action plan. Prof. Zaalouk clarified that the twining processes among partners should go beyond the lifetime of the project. Prof. Zaalouk stressed on the importance of working on MOUs among partners and added that it is an aspect that the government of Egypt is keen on. An agreement between the AUC and ULEIC was signed earlier and should be activated. More MOUs among partners are expected. HU and MLU reported that an MOU between the two universities should be finalized and signed the week that followed the event. Prof. Zaalouk expressed her pleasure to this step and stressed on the importance of announcing it on media, but more importantly to share this kind of news and share a copy of the draft MOU.

Session Two: Discussion on the Project Templates

Prof. Malak Zaalouk, Founding Director, Middle East Institute for Higher Education (MEIHE), AUC:

In this session, Prof. Zaalouk remarked that tools and templates were well-developed, comprehensive guiding research questions needed to be further refined. Hence, she presented overarching research questions to be used for the case studies and the agreed upon templates. A discussion on the research questions took place among partners. Some suggestions were made and added to the originally presented ones.

A policy dialogue meeting outside the frame of the project and organized by the EU in Brussels was held in July 2018. This meeting covered many of the concepts of the SUP4PCL project such as PCLs, reflection and school university partnership. The documents that were distributed in the meeting inspired some of the research questions presented by Prof. Zaalouk in this session. One particular document was extremely useful according to Prof. Zaalouk. The title of the document is the "National Professional Development Framework" for all staff who teach in higher education. Prof. Zaalouk added that the documents were referenced in the presentation and would be shared with the partners.

An observation was made by Prof. Zaalouk regarding the templates created by the different partners. The templates were mindful of the processes and themes and look into the details of developing PCLs, yet, there is less data on mentorship, reflection and learning. Capturing the learning in the different project aspects (e.g. the learning emerging from PCLs) is essential in the case studies since the SUP4PCL project is mainly about the learning. Regarding this point, Prof. Linder from MLU believed that the data can not be predicted since the beginning. Accordingly, creating pre-set detailed tools might be difficult. As an answer to this comment, Prof. Zaalouk clarified that during the management meetings, we already managed to capture the change in some faculty practices. The tools that were already created are of good quality, yet some gaps still exist according to Prof. Zaalouk. Reflection and mentorship need to be highlighted. Prof. Zaalouk thanked the MLU team for preparing initial tools for PCLs in the kick off meeting. Having strong and structured tools would help having more profound case studies. Prof. Zaalouk added that all the SUP4PCL partners need to be reflective and clear about their own shortcomings. The shortcomings do not merely involve the security issues and bureaucracy, but also the cultural resistance as well as other professional commitments such as the times blocked for exams. All these shortcomings delayed the process of constructing PCLs.

The underlying assumptions, the suggested research questions and the templates were the following aspects presented by Prof. Zaalouk. Below are the final underlying assumptions and research questions reached after the discussions with partners. Few more points were added by Prof. Zaalouk after the meeting and shared in a circular with the partners. The pages that follow capture the final assumptions and questions that emerged after a presentation, lengthy discussions and group work.

The final underlying assumptions :

- Learning is intimate and personal. It is largely a dialogue between the mentor and the mentee, the learner.
- Learning is done through experience followed by reflection on the experience
- Learning happens through social interaction

The final main questions agreed upon and the institutions responsible for conducting the research appear in the table below:

Research Questions	Roles
RQ 1: What is the nature of the partnership in the project?	AUC
RQ 2: How does the SUP enhance the development of PCLs at university level?	Twinning FoEs

RQ 2: How does the SUP enhance the development of PCLs at school level?	EG FoEs
RQ 3: How has the PCL impacted on the transformation of professional learning practice at the university level?	Twinning FoEs
RQ 3: How has the PCL impacted on the transformation of professional learning practice at the school level?	EG FoEs
RQ 4: How does the SUP impact on beliefs, values and attitudes?	AUC
RQ 5: What are some of the tensions between beliefs/values and practice?	All

The fifth question (RQ5) in the table was suggested during the discussion by Dr. McCormack. Dr. McCormack believed that it is an important question as the faculty and teachers might adopt certain philosophies if they were asked to, yet, they might not put them into practice. A point that Prof. Zaalouk and the participants agreed upon. Prof. Zaalouk added that the observations of PCLs can be a useful tool for this question.

The domains of learning in both FOE and school covering personal, professional and technical aspects were summarized in the following points:

- The self in teaching and learning.
- Professional identity, values and development in teaching and learning.
- Professional communication and dialogue in teaching and learning.
- Professional knowledge and skills in teaching and learning.
- Personal and professional digital capacity in teaching and learning.

Inspired by: National Professional Development Framework for all Staff who Teach in Higher Education

The sub-questions of each domain were summarized as follows:

The Self in Teaching and Learning:

- Please write an essay on your teaching and learning philosophy every 3 months. (and track the evolution).
- Please identify the underlying values for your teaching and learning philosophy such as belief in rights, equity, democracy, and participation.
- Please identify the underlying assumptions and perceptions of learners. For example: learners learn at their own pace, learners learn through emotions, it is possible to learn from learners and learners have capacities.
- Please specify what kind of assessment you use to ensure students are learning (e.g. on exam level, projects, ...etc)
- What are your favourite modes of reflection?
- How has reflection during your partnership experience impacted your learning?

Professional identity, values and development in teaching and learning:

Prof. Zaalouk mentioned that Dr. Underwood from UON has sent a useful article to AU regarding the different types of professional identities. The article will be shared with partners. Below are the questions related to the professional identity, values and development in teaching and learning:

- To what extent do you identify with the community of professionals at your workplace and how is this manifested?
- To what extent do you identify with the community of professionals beyond your workplace and how is this manifested?

Prof. Zaalouk clarified that one of the ways we can identify with the PCL tools we are using and how to go beyond our workplace will appear once we have school clustering. School clusters might have stronger and deeper identities. For example, we might find out a formation of a PCL that was based on specific areas of interest such as social studies in school clusters, while the PCL in one school might include teachers from different interests and backgrounds. The professional identity might be deeper in the PCLs that emerge among clusters as they would be sharing common interests.

- To what extent do you identify with the community of professionals across borders (nationally and internationally) and how is this manifested?

An example of this case was given by Prof. Zaalouk. In some cases, we might find out that some Egyptian FOE participants would have a stronger link ,connection and a closer way of thinking with a European partner than with others from their own university. This can also be tracked in the case studies.

- To what extent do you contribute to the scholarship of teaching and learning? Are the faculty and teachers more motivated to share their learning internationally?
- How deep is your commitment to support others (students and peers)? How does this reflect on your mentorship style? (e.g. are you patient? Is the bigger team more open to be mentored?)

Inspired by : Lorch, OTD, OTR/L, CHES, Arlene. (2013). The Teaching Self-Reflection Tool and Skills Checklist. *Department of Occupational Therapy Faculty Papers. Paper 59.*

<https://jdc.jefferson.edu/otfp/59>

Professional communication and dialogue in teaching and learning:

- To what extent are you comfortable in team teaching?

On this point, Dr. Morsy from HU said that they had a team teaching experience in the engineering department at HU. A team member was responsible for the implementation of the teaching and others were responsible for the audio-visual documentation. The class was followed by a collective reflection. This was an excellent example reported by HU about a university wide practice that should be documented in the case studies as Prof. Zaalouk emphasized.

Concerning the same point, Prof. Heggi from HU questioned whether the context in Egypt encourages the teamwork. Prof. Zaalouk answered that there are always pioneers and that it is the way the change starts to happen, similar to the change that happened in the CDFE/TEMPUS project. Along the same lines Dr. Morsy stated that the HU team in the SUP4PCL project work together in a better way than they used to do in the CDFE/TEMPUS project, the change happens gradually. Another point that should be documented according to Prof. Zaalouk.

- To what extent are you able to lead collaborative initiatives among students
- To what extent are you able to be part of collaborative projects with peers?

Conducting a collaborative research was an example given on possible collaboration. Some concerns were raised about this specific example by Dr. Morsy. Dr. Morsy said that conducting collective research receives less points than the individual one in their institution. Therefore, the faculty would prefer to work on individual researches rather than collaborative ones. Working on two or three different research papers was a suggestion made by Dr. McCormack to overcome this issue. Hence, points would be made up for by having more articles.

- Please describe the various peer communities of learners that you belong to.

Professional knowledge and skills in teaching and learning:

- How do you organize your teaching?
- How do you present your content? Is there a digital way or other methods of presenting the content?
- How do you perform your classroom instruction?
- How do you interact with students in the classroom?
- How do you conduct verbal and nonverbal communication in the classroom?

Prof. Zaalouk provided an example of one of Prof. Linder's classes in MLU. The classroom was large in number, yet, Prof. Linder managed to have an interactive class and activities with his students.

- What are most recent readings in your domain? For example, there has been a google drive with shared materials. Have people been using that?
- What theories have you found relevant to your teaching and learning?

Personal and professional digital capacity in teaching and learning.

- To what extent are you aware of recent digital applications and tools in teaching and learning?
- To what extent do you use these in your teaching and learning?
- What are identified gaps and what more would you like to learn?
- What challenges do you meet when trying to apply your digital capacities in teaching and learning?

On several occasions in the meeting, Prof. Zaalouk stressed on the importance of documenting concrete and tangible examples in the case studies.

Prof. Zaalouk also underscored that it is a good time now for the FOEs to start working on the questions, collecting data and tracking the development. Concerning the above questions, Dr. McCormack asked whether the questions would be closed. Prof. Zaalouk suggested focusing on the qualitative tools such as interviews and focus groups discussions. Observations is another important tool to use. Yet, it will be difficult for EU partners to use it given the time and the security limitations. Prof. Zaalouk added that observations can be done locally. EU partners can support their twin Egyptian teams to build their observation tools and to decide on the aspects to be observed to get similar type of observations among all case studies and allow for comparison. On the other hand, the quantitative tools can be used for the descriptive part of the case study at the beginning.

Concerning using the observation as a tool, Dr. ElShamy from AU believed that it can be applied on the school level, yet, he raised concerns about the possibility of its application at the FOEs. There were two reasons behind Dr. ElShamy's concerns. The first reason is the time limitation and the second reason is the sensitivity of the observation practice for the faculty as some faculty will not be welcoming an observer to their classes. As an answer to this concern, Prof. Zaalouk clarified that to overcome trust issues, it would be essential to work on deepening the impact of PCL to serve peer observations and learning.

Regarding the time limitation of conducting observations, Dr. McCormack suggested considering recording and reporting of the class to overcome this issue through technology.

After the presentation and the discussions on the research questions and domains, Prof. Zaalouk presented the collective set of templates created by different partners. The purpose of presenting the templates was to get validation and also to be alert to the gaps. The templates were sent earlier in a circular to allow partners to reflect on them.

Prof. Zaalouk classified the templates based on what these tools serve (what tools are used for what and when?) and asked the partners for their validation.

1-Baseline Reports templates:

- School Profile templates:

- School profile template were originally designed in Arabic, created by AUC peer reviewed and translated. The school profile template is a structured quantifiable tool that includes aspects such as demography, structure and school units. It was used at the very early stage of the project.

- Needs assessment and ethnography template designed by HU.

Prof. Zaalouk clarified that some of the items included in the templates were captured and covered in the baseline reports, yet others were missing. She reminded the Egyptian partners to include the missing points in the revised reports. As reported by Dr. Kamal, ANSU has added a question to the template on whether the school has been involved in other projects. An important question to avoid duplication as Prof. Zaalouk believed and also to determine what can be attributed to the SUP4PCL project in terms of transformation and change.

2-The habits of Heart and Mind tools:

This set of templates are related to the habits of heart and mind. The focus of the templates is on the evolution of quality assurance units, evolution of PCLs and their impact of attitudes, beliefs, values and behaviors. As explained previously and in several occasions of this event, the data on mentorship as well as on the evolution of the school-based research is still missing.

-PCL templates (quantitative and qualitative)

This set of templates on PCLs includes both quantitative and qualitative tools. Below are the set of templates:

- Existence of PCLs (Arabic and English)
- Monitoring Survey (Arabic & English)
- PCL indicators (English and Arabic)
- PCL meetings and how to report them. This should be filled in each PCL meeting. A very important document for evidence.
- Reflective journals (Arabic & English) developed by AU &UON
- M&E schools visits

The PCL indicators were firstly created by Dr. Cuomo from MLU. These tools were adjusted and reduced by AUC by taking away the redundancies.

3-Case study templates:

For the school case studies and in addition to the school profile and needs assessment ethnographies, the teams need to focus on the quality assurance units. In addition, the evolution of PCLs, mentorship and school-based research for professional development need to be captured.

On the FOE case study, the twin partners should be looking at the history and the context of the FOE and the PCL evolution. This should be followed by collecting data around the overarching research questions such as the new teaching styles, the new courses, the new policies, engagement of the students, human relationships and the personal impact.

The AUC case study will focus on defining the partnership. This includes: the nature of the partnership, intensity of communication and hierarchy. Furthermore, the AUC will also be looking at the impact of the partnership on the values and domains of leadership as in the overarching questions, the kind of power relationship, self-efficacy and empowerment. A tool is already prepared for that.

Prof. Zaalouk clarified that the tool is still in Arabic and was peer reviewed by six professors. This tool will be translated and shared with the partners in English. The IRB acceptance and the CAPMAS approval are obtained. Prof. Zaalouk added that obtaining the IRB approval and the CAPMAS is a must for all the

tools to be used. She also stated that the AUC could share the requirements of the IRB with all partners to make sure of the compatibility with other processes for research ethics.

4-Material Development templates:

- Two templates in Arabic and English were designed by HU. The template is about how to store the material developed, how to have records of the workshops, mentorship...etc. The material developed covers the main topics of Global citizenship. Sustainable development and mentorship.

Regarding SEN, Prof. Zaalouk explained that the AUC and ANSU reached a different understanding during a meeting that took place in ANSU and through a discussion with their special needs specialist. The concept of SEN should not be addressed in the exclusive traditional way. The SEN concept should focus on having a culture of teaching and learning that includes special needs. In other words, to have a culture of caring and empathy. Prof. Zaalouk added that the culture of special needs would include children who come to school after a death in the family or after divorce in the family as examples. Considering such cases as special need that requires special attention is important. This concept should inform the empathetic and caring methods of teaching and learning.

Along the same lines, Dr. Shehab reported that there is a case of inclusive education teacher who is herself differently abled and challenged. in HU. This teacher expressed her interest in the PCL as a concept and would like to join the PCL. Dr. Shehab described her inclusion in the PCL as a breakthrough.

Prof. Zaalouk agreed and added that the openness of teachers in having peers visiting eachother's classes is another breakthrough. She added that there is only one ethnography in Egypt done by a team around ten years ago. It was in Arabic and it was translated. There was one international person in the team, her name is Linda Harrare .Prof. Zaalouk promised the partners to send them the reference to the mentioned ethnography. She added that it would be useful to keep the reference as a baseline and show what schools were like from ethnographic perspective at the time of the research.

After presenting the tools, a general and important comment was made by Prof. Wilkins. Prof. Wilkins believed that the tools are very useful and that they complement eachother. Yet, the language needs more editing and alignment. Prof. Zaalouk asked whether Prof. Wilkins would be able to assure the right language and alignment since ULEIC are responsible for the quality assurance in the project. Prof. Wilkins agreed to review the tools, add his suggestions and share it with all partners.

Prof. Zaalouk also requested the partners put the SUP4PCL logo on the templates without adding the individual university logos as the templates reflect the SUP4PCL's collective production.

Dr. Shehab from HU reported that Dr. Cuomo from MLU has started developing a questionnaire to assess the impact of PCLs on faculty at HU. Prof. Linder clarified that the questionnaire is a structured interview that is mostly qualitative and it is anonymous. Focus group discussion will also be conducted.

Dr. McCormack also commented that all partners need to use the same tools. Prof. Zaalouk strongly agreed and clarified that any tools developed by partners should be shared and validated. The language and the alignment of the tools should also be reviewed by ULEIC.

Based on that, Prof. Linder clarified that the tool is online and promised to send the link for all partners for their feedback. Prof. Zaalouk stressed on the importance of keeping both AUC and ULEIC onboard in all details and steps that take place with the twin partners. She reminded the partners that the ERASMUS+ headquarters stressed on the importance of uniformity and on a rigorous methodology. Prof. Zaalouk suggested having a depository for the tools and templates similar to what was created earlier for the materials developed. The tools need to be owned by all partners and validated.

Prof. Zaalouk summarized the overall framework. She said that the project activities should result in learning in both school and university levels. She added that the questions, domains and templates are ways to help the teams capture the learning and the change happening in different domains such as in the teaching styles, practices and philosophies. Hence, in the case studies, we should highlight the learning and transformations happening in the lifetime of the project including the change and learning captured in the EU partners, philosophies, attitudes, values and practices.

Prof. Wilkins raised a point regarding the research questions. Prof. Wilkins believes that since cultural transformations is an essential concept in the project, the research questions should cover this aspect clearly. Based on that comment, Prof. Zaalouk asked the participants to discuss this issue in 5 minutes in mixed groups.

The following reflects the discussions and group work took place to reach the final research questions mentioned in Page 11

Group 1: Dr. Kamal, Dr. Heggi, Dr. ElHawary and Dr. McCormack:



This group suggested adding the following points in addition to the overarching research questions originally presented:

1-Tracing the impact of professional practice in terms of learning and teaching process, research and joint research between the staff members and teachers in schools.

2- Communication and relationships. How it become different and how sustainable it is.

3 –The personal change that occurred.

Group 2: Dr. Shehab, Dr.ELSHamy and Prof. Wilkins



This group focused in their discussion on the conceptual framework which is the school university partnership and the theoretical and practical coherence. The following questions were suggested:

1- How can university school partnership contribute to the development of PCLs?

2- To what extent does the development of PCLs help in the cultural transformation of schools and FOEs?

Group 3 (Prof. Zaalouk, Dr. ELDeghaidy, Prof. Linder)



Commenting on the groups' suggestions, Prof. Zaalouk explained that she tends to agree on the questions linked to the title of the project as one of the overarching questions such as: how the school university partnership supports the formation of PCLs. This question was added to the overarching questions (Please refer to the table in Page 11) and should feature in all case studies.

Yet, Prof. Zaalouk clarified that the cultural transformation is similar to learning. It is something that we need to break down since such concepts are part of the metacognition. They are also part of the findings

that would be pulled out analytically. Hence, the concept of cultural transformation can not be a research question as such but can be a finding as Prof. Zaalouk believed. Prof. Zaalouk elaborated by giving examples on the side range of elements that would be included in this concept. The cultural transformation includes in its meaning openness, more participatory methods, leadership, more communication, more research...etc. In other words, the domains presented are all components of cultural transformation.

Dr. McCormack suggested to have only two overarching research questions :

- How/does the SUP enhance the development of PCLs?
- How has the PCL impacted on the transformation of professional learning and practice at the university and school level?

while the others can be sub-questions. A suggestion that Prof. Zaalouk supported.

Prof. Zaalouk asked the partners to share via email any additional domains that might emerge during the process. In brief, the domains covered so far were about the self, communication, teaching and learning, and collaboration.

At the end of the session, Prof. Zaalouk asked the partners to send their comments to AUC upon reflection if they feel there are any gaps on the domains.

Session Three: Quality Plan

Prof. Chris Wilkins, University of Leicester (ULEIC)



As an introduction to this session, Prof. Zaalouk highlighted the importance of sharing any tools used by the partners with ULEIC and AUC. For example, ANSU used electronic evaluations on some of their workshops. Such evaluations and tools should be shared with ULEIC and AUC. Prof. Zaalouk continued that a feedback on the revised quality plan presented by Prof. Wilkins in this session is required from all partners on the deadlines that were mentioned in the final session of the meeting. In addition, Prof. Zaalouk also reminded the partners with the dates set during the fifth local management meeting as

dates of the data collection phases, and that this meeting was the time to agree on these dates. Hence the AUC team expect to receive the data in the dates mentioned below:

- The dates as specified in the fifth local management meeting:
 - **Mid Sept – Oct 2018:** deliver the rewritten baseline reports based on the situation at the beginning of the project (Sept 17 – Sept 18)-The preparatory & exploratory phase.
 - **Starting sept – Dec 2018:** Half to 3 quarters of the project. (1st & 2nd implementation phases).
 - **Jan 2019- June 2019 :**The 3rd implementation
 - **June 2019 - Oct 2019:** End of the project. But we might ask for extension till March 2020.

The floor was given to Prof. Wilkins to present a reviewed quality plan. Prof. Wilkins suggested to have four data gathering points instead of three. Yet, if there was no consensus on that, having three data gathering points would be acceptable.

Prof. Wilkins clarified that there are three key elements for the project's monitoring and valuation. These were summarized in the following:

- **Activity evaluations**

- Taking place after each workpackage activity (training workshops, etc)

- Individual surveys*

- Focus group/individual interviews*

- **PCL development in FoEs**

- (1) Community Member reflections

- (2) Individual Improvement Plans [*or possibly Development Plans?*]

- x 4 per year?**

- Individual reflections collated by FoE leads to inform IIP (supplemented by Case Study M&E reporting)*

Prof. Wilkins clarified that he proposed a four formal gathering points for the PCL development instead of three be able to track how the change happens. This change will be reflected on the institutional plan.

- **Case Study M&E**

The timing of the M&E visits will be decided once the case study design is set. The timing of the visits should be driven from the methodology. Prof. Wilkins asked the partners to start the process of developing a case study timeline on monthly basis including the EU partners visits with the key milestones and a map. Prof. Wilkins asked the partners to have the timeline ready by the forth International management meeting in Limerick this coming October 2018. Based on the timelines, ULEIC will schedule their M&E visits and will create their M&E templates.

The progress should be reported constantly to both ULEIC and AUC.

PLC Community Member Questionnaire

- Enables FoE team members to reflect on perceptions of their PCL
 - *(derived from the work of Stoll, Hord etc.)*
- Tracking ‘the journey’ from “emergent”, to “established” and then “mature” PCL
- Focuses on key dimensions of PCLs *shared values/vision and objectives*
 - *collaborative practice*
 - *professional learning*
- Enables team leaders to fully incorporate members’ perceptions in Institutional Improvement Plans
- Potentially supporting case studies for schools?

A table with tasks and deadlines was presented by Prof. Wilkins as shown below:

Immediate key tasks/deadlines: Pre-Management Meeting

Task	Completion Date	Completed by	Responsibility
FoE PCL development CMQ + IIP	1 st submission October 2018 <i>then 3 or 4 monthly intervals?</i>	CMQ - FoE team members (Eg) IIP – FoE team Leads (Eg) Overview by ULEIC	ULEIC
PD School Case Studies (1) Revised baseline assessments	September 2018	FoE teams (Eg/EU)	AUC/ULEIC

2) Finalise common CS instruments	October 2018	FoE teams (Eg/EU)	AUC/ULEIC
(3) Finalise CS timeline/schedule <u>± agree M&E timetable</u>	October 2018	FoE teams (Eg/EU) + ULEIC	AUC/ULEIC

Prof. Wilkins then moved to the draft revised Quality plan and asked the partners to send their feedback on the plan by 10th September, 2018. Their feedback includes the content and the formatting.

An initial discussion took place among partners regarding the formatting and they were asked to share their comments.

Prof. Linder from MLU thanked Prof. Wilkins and his team for the plan describing it as very organized one. Yet, he believes it is too detailed and repetitive. Prof. Linder asked about the consequences if any of the partners could not fill all the points and whether it is violating the research.

Prof. Wilkins clarified that filling out all the points is important to unify all the outputs. He added that having a proper detailed research plan is important to trace the improvement and analyze the data.

Prof. Zaalouk also highlighted that ULEIC is the lead in the quality assurance workpackage in this project. This includes the functions as well as the processes. It is important to secure the good analysis as Prof. Zaalouk mentioned. Hence, when the twinning partners have a draft of their case studies ready, ULEIC will be a fundamental reviewer of the first draft to ensure that the data that was collected leads to this type of analysis and results in solid evidence and research.

Prof. Wilkins agreed but clarified that ULEIC will not reanalyze the data but review the rationality of the analysis. He also asked about the analytical methods to be used.

Prof. Zaalouk clarified that the partners will use mixed methods. For example, in the case of quantitative data, the analytical methods will be the regular validation and reliability tools (e.g. SPSS). While in the case of the qualitative data, the rigor and triangulation are important.

Prof. Wilkins agreed and suggested to take it a step further by including a coding framework. A point that Prof. Zaalouk agreed upon in addition to the thematic analysis. Prof. Wilkins added that we need to make sure that these themes come together in the three case studies which requires sharing the findings as they are emerging.

Prof. Zaalouk elaborated that we need to set dates for the implementation phases and dates for the first and second drafts.

Along with the dates mentioned earlier in the fifth local meeting for the data collection, two dates for the drafts are required. Prof. Zaalouk suggested January 2019 for the first draft.

The partners agreed to have the dates finalized by the coming International management meeting and the timelines for the following should be set:

School clustering, case studies, quality plan, monitoring visits, drafts of the case studies. In addition, the coding and themes of the case studies should be discussed in the management meeting.

Dr. ELHawary from AU suggested to circulate a draft of the coding and themes before the coming management meeting since AU started the data collection and they would start analysis as they move on. An excellent point that was mentioned by Dr. ELHawary and agreed upon by Prof. Zaalouk.

After the discussion, Prof. Linder agreed to the quality plan and the detailed timetable and topics as that will help the teams to commit to the plan and the timeline. Dr. McCormack asked whether there is a possibility of creating a system for reminders of the deadlines (e.g. a week notice), Prof. Zaalouk responded that we will try to think of a reminder system.

Session Four: The Website

Ms Dana Sabbah and Ms. Lujain Ramadan , The American University in Cairo (AUC)

An overview of the website was given to the partners. The website constitutes of two sections, one is open for public and the other is closed for the SUP4PCL teams. It was clarified that a registration link will be sent to the teams once the website goes live. The link should not be sent to individuals outside the teams. Also, the privacy policy and having a written consent on the photos and videos before publishing on the website was another point highlighted. In addition, it was clarified to partners that reporting on plagiarism if detected is their responsibility. Prof. Zaalouk clarified that the AUC is working on a summary manual that will be sent to partners when it is finalized.

The overview was followed by an orientation and explanation of the website pages, the privacy policy, the registration process, the roles , the groups and group discussions ,the posts and the size of attachments allowed.

Dr. Kamal from ANSU suggested to add with the bios four links/ addresses for each team member : (LinkedIn, Instagram, twitter and Facebook).

Prof. Heggi suggested to add all the partner logos on the front page.

Regarding the teams, Prof. Linder from MLU announced that the team of MLU has changed. Currently only himself and Alexander finger are in the team. He added that he is working to get new team members.

Session Five: The Way Foreword

Prof. Malak Zaalouk, Founding Director, Middle East Institute for Higher Education (MEIHE), AUC:

In this last session of the meeting, Prof. Zaalouk reminded the participants with important dates and deadlines:

1st Sept, 2018 AUC should receive the schools visits schedule for Sept, Oct & Nov, 2018 from the three Egyptian FOEs (ANSU,AU & HU), in addition to the schedules of the PCLs at the FOE level. AUC will inform the FOEs ahead of time with the dates of their visits.

10th Sept, 2018 All partners should send their feedback to ULEIC on the M&E and quality plan framework.

15th Sept, 2018 AUC should receive the revised baseline reports from the three Egyptian FOEs (ANSU,AU & HU)

At the end of the meeting, Prof. Zaalouk thanked all the participants for attending and for their hardwork despite all the challenges and expressed her belief that the coming stages in the project will be highly successful.