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Foundation Course, Didactic Manual

This manual is a part of the Comenius project "OUTLiNES – Outdoor Learning in Elementary Schools – from Grassroot to Curriculum in Teacher Education” as granted by the European commission.

The purpose of this manual is to be an inspiration and an aid for those lecturers around the world that will integrate and use outdoor learning as a part of their teacher education programme.

Recent investigations show that teachers use the same methods and tasks in their daily work as they themselves encountered during their teacher training programmes. This emphasises the importance of not only words and theories, but also practical tasks and hands on experiences during the teacher training programme. In this manual, you will find both theoretical evidence and practical descriptions on how outdoor learning can be a part of your teacher training programme.

Supplementary to this Foundation manual, six manuals have been published which focus especially on subject related matters and theories. They can be downloaded free at www.outdooreducation.dk

This manual is written by the participants of the project in six different countries, that is PhD ass. professor Arne Nikolajsen Jordet and lecturer Morten Bjørnebye, Norway; Dr. Dusan Bartunek and Dr. Marie Hronzova, Czech Republic; lecturer Eva Kätting and teacher Carina Brage, Sweden; Senior lecturer Kirsten Bak Andersen and senior lecturer Karen Barfod, Denmark; lecturer Sanita Madalane and lecturer Inga Bērzina, Latvia; and PhD Leida Talts and Teacher Eha Jakobsen, Estonia, and collected and edited by senior lecturer Karen Barfod, Denmark.

We hope that this will encourage lecturers around the world to raise and open the door of learning wide into the landscape – and show our students how to use the real world and landscape as a learning resource for the young children in elementary schools.

February 2008, the authors
Chapter 1: Project Rationale, OUTLiNES

Outdoor Learning in Elementary Schools – from Grassroot to Curriculum in Teacher Education
Karen Barfod, Senior lecturer and vocational project coordinator, DK

The aim of this project is to introduce a subject-oriented methodology in teachers’ basic education, to increase the students’ – future teachers – basic competences in outdoor learning methodology, that is, to transfer the traditional teacher training practise from in-service training to systemic basic education.

Outdoor learning is not a permanent curricular component in basic training of elementary school teachers, but is learned through sporadic in-service training or just by practice by teachers in Europe. The ongoing practice in outdoor learning tends to focus on environmental, personal, social and health aspects in the pupils general education. The academic dimension is often lacking, and outdoor learning is often used in subjects logically related to the outdoor space, e.g. science, woodwork, physical education.

In this project we widen the perspective of outdoor learning in elementary schools to the following subjects: music, mathematics, science, art and handcraft, physical education and language.

Subject-oriented methodology
Education defined by the location of the education not only specifies where the learning should take place, but also its theme. The physical natural and cultural landscape provides the contents of learning¹ and has an effect on the teacher’s choice of methods². But in connection to this, tendencies in modern testing of knowledge in elementary school focus on subjects and factual forms of knowledge.

We do work now as teacher trainers in the exciting field between subject-focused, testable knowledge and the obvious learning advantage in outdoor learning.

This project tries to combine subjects, outdoor learning methodologies and the structural everyday life at the teachers training education.

The partnership
The partnership of the six teacher training institutions involved in this project reflects in itself the reality of outdoor education at the teacher training institutions. The criteria for the partnership composition have been to involve all levels of institutional rooting of the outdoor learning practise among the partners and countries. From the most advanced institutions in Europe, with long and continuing traditions for outdoor learning and even some subject oriented activities, over institutions with less but expanding traditions to institutions where outdoor learning is almost or completely absent but with expressions of interest for integrating the area in their curriculum.

¹ Lars Owe Dahlgren & Anders Szczepanski: Outdoor Education – literary education and sensory experience, Linköping University, Kinda Education Centre, no 1, 1998
² Erik Mygind et al: Udeundervisning i folkeskolen, Museum Tusculanum 2005
One very central project goal is to demonstrate how institutions with almost no experiences and institutions with heavy experiences both can participate in the development and test stages and integrate the new courses in their study programmes.

In short the aims of the project will point in two directions. The development and dissemination of intensive courses in general outdoor learning methodology and subject oriented intensive courses for teacher students, and the cross-national exchange and development of the partner institutions. This network should be extended beyond the partner institutions.

**Project aims**

- To increase teachers’ basic competences in outdoor learning methodology
- To transfer the traditional teacher training practice in outdoor learning from in-service training to systematic basic teacher education
- To expand the outdoor learning focus from environmental, personal and health perspectives toward curricular perspectives by introducing a *subject-oriented* methodology in teachers’ basic education

**Project outputs and perspectives**

- One intensive foundation course in general outdoor learning methodology
- Six subject-oriented intensive courses representing the main areas in the elementary school curriculum
- Course manuals, handbooks and project website

**Long-term perspectives**

- Courses and methodologies in study programmes
- In-service training of teachers
- Widen the cooperation with universities in Europe
- Widen the cooperation with universities outside Europe

**Target groups**

- Teacher students and lecturers in participating institutions
- Potentially all teacher students and lecturers in European teacher training institutions

**Main activities**

- Establishing development groups of lecturers and experts
- Development, test-runs, evaluations, refinements and dissemination of innovative standard courses
- Test runs in cross-national and national groups of teacher students
- Final open conference as input for final evaluation and launch of dissemination plan

In this manual, you will find a didactic introduction to the field of outdoor learning, and after that examples and tools to use in the teacher trainer education. A common PowerPoint presentation to use for the theoretical introduction in outdoor learning can be downloaded free from www.outdooreducation.dk
Chapter 2: What is Outdoor Learning?
PhD Arne N. Jordet (Hedmark University College, Norway)

2.1. Introduction
In recent years outdoor learning has been a common concept, especially in primary school in Scandinavia in general and in Norway in particular. In this article I will present some of the basic ideas of outdoor learning as it has developed in Norway.

2.2. Definition
Jordet (1998) has defined the concept like this:
Outdoor learning is a working method where parts of the everyday life in school is moved out of the classroom – into the local environment. Outdoor learning implies frequent and purpose-driven activities outside the classroom.

The working method gives the pupils the opportunity to use their bodies and senses in learning activities in the real world in order to obtain personal and concrete experiences. Outdoor learning allows room for academic activities, communication, social interaction, experience, spontaneity, play, curiosity and fantasy.

Outdoor learning is about activating all the school subjects in an integrated training where activities out-of-doors and indoors are closely linked together. The pupils learn in an authentic context: that is, they learn about nature in nature, about society in the society and about the local environment in the local environment. (Jordet 1998:24)

This means that outdoor learning is a way of working with the subjects where some of the everyday life in school regularly is moved out-of-doors into the local environment. As such, outdoor learning gives the pupils the opportunity to use their bodies and senses in the learning process. Consequently, they get personal and concrete experiences based upon authentic real-life-situations. Outdoor learning implies that pupils and teachers sometimes have to leave the classroom and the textbooks in their search for knowledge. They have to walk to the forest to learn about plants, animals and the interaction in nature, they visit art galleries and handicraftsmen to learn about and be inspired to work with arts and crafts, they move out and make observations and surveys in order to have information which they can use in the social sciences and maths lessons, in projects etc. They seek out the sources in their local environment and community and bring this knowledge back to school for further preparation: for reflection, communication, reading, writing, making, dramatizing, presentation etc. In this way theoretical, practical and aesthetic approaches walk hand in hand in the training process. There are few limitations concerning what arenas the pupils and teachers can use in outdoor learning. Almost all parts of the school’s surroundings can be made use of - the natural, the cultural as well as the urban environments. In this way theoretical, practical and aesthetic approaches walk hand in hand in the educational work (Jordet 2007).

This understanding of outdoor learning is often referred to in educational literature in Norway, in different pupil works, and not least in practice by many schools that focus on outdoor learning. A search on the Internet will confirm this. Consequently, this understanding of outdoor learning has gained widespread support in Norwegian school and has laid an important foundation for the philosophy concerning this phenomenon in our country.

2.3. The extent of outdoor learning in Norwegian schools
Some years ago (2000) the Norwegian Council for Nutrition and Physical Activity carried out a national survey where the expansion of outdoor learning on different levels in primary school
(grades 1–7) was surveyed. The survey indicates that outdoor learning has gained broad acceptance in Norwegian schools. The result is shown in the figure below:

![Graph showing the extent of outdoor learning in Norwegian primary school.](image)

*Figure: The extent of outdoor learning in Norwegian primary school. (Source: Mjaavatn 2004).*

Even though the survey was carried out eight years ago, I believe it gives a reasonably good picture of the situation in schools today. According to the survey outdoor learning is most common in first grade where more than 90% of the pupils had outdoor learning half a day or more per week. The time spent outdoors decreases gradually during primary school to about 10% in seventh grade. So, outdoor learning appears as relatively extensive in grades 1–4, while it seems to be of less importance in grades 5–7. A large number of studies confirm this impression (Limstrand 2001, Tønnessen & Valvik 2002, Vestøl 2003, Solstad 2003, Vatne 2006).

Outdoor learning half a day to one day per week, which seems to be relatively common in Norwegian schools, corresponds to approximately 10–20% of the total education. In itself this gives no grounds for any assumption whether outdoor learning is an important working method in school or not. It can be both relevant and reasonable to use 10–20% of the time on outdoor learning. The main question, however, is what pupils and teachers actually do when they are out-of-doors and how they spend the time. It can be a waste of time if the activities aren’t in accordance with the curriculum or if the pupils neither gain any benefit from what is going on nor enjoy it.

### 2.4. A retrospective glance

How can we understand outdoor learning? What are the historical roots of this pedagogic approach? The last century theory of education has emphasized the importance of creating a connection between school and the everyday life of the child. According to what we in Norway call ‘progressive pedagogy’ or ‘progressive educational theory’, *activity* is regarded as a methodical principle in education and as a condition for all learning. One hundred years ago John Dewey (1859–1952), one of the pioneers of progressive pedagogy, pointed out the gap between the life of the child and the training in school, and he criticized a training where pupils to a great extent related to abstract and text-based knowledge, with the written and spoken word, the symbolic manifestation of knowledge as the main road to knowledge. He described the main problem of the school like this: “That is the isolation of the school – its isolation from life” (Dewey 1915:75). The painter Gustav Igler (1881) illustrates this criticism of schools clearly in his magnificent painting “In detention.”
Telhaug and Mediås has described the problem of the so-called “old school” like this:

The old school suffered from an overdone confidence in the word and the oral presentation. It was spoken too much, told too much, asked too much and explained too much. In short: Too many words came from the teacher’s desk. (Telhaug & Mediås 2003:114)

This knowledge achieved a breakthrough in the Norwegian curriculum of 1939 (“Normalplanen of 1939”), and this philosophy has had a great impact on Norwegian curricula ever since. The curriculum has tried to connect two apparent contradictions, between on the one hand an more individualized and activity-oriented teaching based upon the qualification of the individual person, and on the other hand a subject-oriented teaching with an emphasis on the school subjects. In the educational debate of the last century it has generated an artificial contradiction between these two positions (Dale 2005:22; Telhaug & Mediås 2003:294). Internationally, Cuban (2003:30) has described a corresponding struggle between these polarized positions.

2.5. The decontextualisation of knowledge and learning in school

Educational research shows that both teachers and pupils fail in transforming the ideas of progressive pedagogy such as outdoor learning into a suitable practice. The school is still dominated by a theoretical and text-based tradition with the textbook as the main road to knowledge and learning, while the everyday experience of the pupil has a far weaker position than the progressive intentions should indicate. The educational practice can be summarized like this: In their daily work pupils and teachers to a great extent relate to paper-based versions of reality, and far from the contexts in which the pupils normally operate. We talk about decontextualised learning (Säljö 2001). The parallel to the school Dewey criticized a hundred years earlier is striking. This is confirmed by international research. In his large educational investigation Goodlad (1984)³ described a school characterized by “…lectures, quizzes, textbooks, workbooks, and written exercises”, and consequently with a lack of:

… observations of things outside of schools, projects requiring small group collaboration, and primary documents – with the reading, writing, and dialogue emerging out of such activities. (Goodlad 1984:265)

More activity in the learning process does not imply that text should be given less priority as a way to knowledge. In a modern society the requirements for children’s ability to handle written and symbolic knowledge are rising (Säljö 2001). It is therefore important for children to be familiar with the ways of knowledge that is generated by science and mediated through the school subjects. Without such knowledge the individual will be left out of society and reduced to being a spectator.

Consequently, the purpose of outdoor learning is not to neglect the importance of theoretical knowledge. The purpose is the opposite. A school that stimulates pupils and teachers to use books and the classroom in combination with outdoor learning in order to find knowledge will contribute to a better school. This will not only have the potential to strengthen the pupils’ learning outcome, but will also activate the pupils’ bodies and senses as a natural part of the educational process. This will probably improve the pupil’s well-being and health. The challenge we face in school is to combine experience-based (practice) and text-based (theory) learning processes. This should be a natural approach for all kinds of learning.

But is this how outdoor learning works in school today? Does it contribute to the personal and social development of the individual pupil as well as to academic knowledge? Or does outdoor learning end up as a pupil-centred “laissez-faire” pedagogy dominated by play and non-committal relationships with hardly any focus on the subject matters in school? Research indicates that schools find it difficult to unite these considerations in practice. Schools seem to have problems in handling especially the academic dimension and thus fail to give the pupil a deeper understanding of the subjects. The findings in later research indicate that activity-oriented pedagogy is rather shallow and with a weak emphasis on learning (Imsen 2003, Haug 2003, 2006, 2007, Klette 2003, 2007). It has been pointed out that there is a lot of activity in Norwegian schools, but the learning outcome for the pupils is not in proportion to the activity level. Thus it is that the teachers obviously try to carry out an activity-oriented training, but they do not quite succeed. This is substantiated through international comparative investigations into pupils’ competence in mathematics, science and reading (PISA, TIMSS and PIRLS), where the results for the Norwegian schools are discouraging. This has led to increased questioning concerning the very foundation of progressive pedagogy, and everything which does not support academic standards in schools consequently becomes vulnerable to criticism. If outdoor learning cannot be justified as promoting academic standards in the school system, it will come to lose its legitimacy.

2.6. Outdoor learning – a contribution to the contextualization of knowledge and learning

We have little science-based knowledge about outdoor learning and how it works in practice in school. The reason is probably that this educational approach has not been so common in schools, in spite of all its theoretical arguments. The research has therefore had limited possibilities to investigate this kind of practice. Nevertheless, there are reasons to believe that outdoor learning, in combination with a more traditional classroom teaching has a great potential, and can have a significant impact on the individual pupil’s learning as a whole human being. In the following I will present the major findings of my PhD thesis on outdoor learning which points in this direction (Jordet 2007).

2.7. Major findings

Major parts of the content in school can be moved out of the classroom (Jordet 2007). Outdoor learning gives teachers and pupils a wealth of opportunities to work with and have experiences with central topics in all school subjects. They can seek concrete objects of knowledge in the local
surroundings of the school, and here they relate to different objects found in nature, artefacts, phenomena and processes in their surroundings. Moreover, in nature and the urban environment outside school the teachers and the pupils find alternative “classrooms” which provide opportunities to stage the teaching in quite different ways than the text-based teaching in the classroom. The pupils experience the topics via their bodies and senses, cooperation and communication. In this way the pupils’ individual and social development as well as their cognitive, physical, motor and practical skills is stimulated. Consequently, outdoor learning can give the pupil possibilities to work with the topics as a whole human being, using their “head, heart and hand”. Thus the school subjects can be related to outdoor learning in different ways. This will be illuminated in the following.

2.7.1. Mathematics
Pupils and teachers use concrete natural and cultural objects and phenomena as teaching aids (cones, sticks, stones, cars, architecture etc.). The surroundings act as an alternative classroom which gives the pupils the possibility to cope with the symbolic and abstract aspects of maths in a concrete way by using their body and senses.

2.7.2. Social subjects
The pupils learn about society by meeting society in real life. In this way the pupils get firsthand experiences with important topics in history, geography and other social sciences. This means that they encounter the subject matters in an authentic context.

2.7.3. Science
The pupils go to different natural environments in the surrounding of the school. Consequently, the pupils learn about nature and ecology in an authentic context in nature, especially the subjects biology, astronomy and geology. They also work with subject areas in physics and chemistry, but in these subjects there seems to be less experience of how to handle the topics appropriately.

2.7.4. Language
Outdoor learning gives pupils and teachers opportunities to work with and gain experience of central aspects of their language such as verbal communication, writing and literature. Firstly, verbal communication is necessary in order to carry out all the activities. Consequently, the pupils’ use of language seems to be more exploring and free in outdoor activities than in the classroom. Secondly, writing based upon first-hand experiences seems to have an important position in the pupils’ learning process. Thus there is much to indicate that outdoor learning can stimulate the pupils’ writing skills. Thirdly, dramatization, reading aloud and storytelling seem to be an important approach when working with literary subject matters in outdoor learning.

2.7.5. Physical education
Outdoor learning gives the pupils different physical stimuli as a part of the transport to and from the outdoor classroom, and as a part of play, dancing and more athletic activities. In addition, physical activity as a part of outdoor life plays an important role in outdoor learning. Moreover, many academic, subject-oriented activities have a physical educational function in themselves. Varied nature seems to activate children physically quite spontaneously and in an authentic way.

2.7.6. Arts and crafts
The pupils design pictures (drawing, painting) and sculptures in nature or the town or they use these impressions as inspiration for activities back in school. They also make Land Art out of different objects in nature. In addition the pupils have personal encounters with arts and crafts in the local
environment when they visit galleries, museums, exhibitions and through meetings with artists and craftsmen.

2.7.7. Music
Music, song and dance seem to play an important role in outdoor learning, as natural activities in many situations, and quite spontaneously in appropriate moments. A lot of music activities are often related to drama and role-play. Outdoor learning also gives the pupils opportunities to present music, song and dance for people in the local community and to listen to music when they visit concerts or other arrangements in the local community.

2.7.8. Food and health
The pupils work with and get personal experiences with food, nutrition and food culture in outdoor learning. First and foremost they harvest resources from nature, such as berries, plants, mushrooms and fish, and they learn how to cultivate and cook in different ways, often as a part of outdoor life. They also buy raw materials from local stores and markets which are used for cooking back at school. The meal, often around the campfire, seems to have an important social function in outdoor learning.

2.7.9. Religion
Dialogue and communication about moral and ethical questions have a natural place in outdoor learning, often related to authentic situations, for instance in connection with conflicts arising between the pupils. During pilgrimages the pupils get experiences with an old Christian tradition and they encounter historical places in the cultural landscape. They also visit sanctuaries such as churches, synagogues, mosques and temples in urban areas. In this way they see the world religions in real life and representatives of these religions.

2.7.10. Foreign languages
The pupils use foreign languages such as English in verbal communication when they are out of doors carrying out different activities. In addition, as in language, outdoor learning can play an important role in their work with writing and literature.

2.8. Other content
My research points towards three important aspects concerning outdoor learning. Firstly: The pupils use their bodies and senses as they investigate different objects and phenomena outdoors. As a result, the pupils are in physical activity while they work with the subject matter. Secondly: The different exercises in outdoor learning imply communication and cooperation. It is simply a necessity to carry them out. Thirdly: The conditions seem favourable for building social relations in learning environments outside school, especially between the teacher and the pupils. I will go into more detail below.

Physical, motor and practical skills
In outdoor learning the pupils get varied physical, motor and practical challenges while they are working with the different professional tasks. Consequently, learning and physical activity go hand in hand. Outdoor learning thus seems to open new possibilities to integrate theoretical and practical approaches in the educational process. Practice should not be left to so-called practical subjects in school and theory should not be left to so-called theoretical subjects. Both perspectives should be integrated in the educational process in all subjects to a greater or lesser degree. Thus there is strong evidence to suggest that outdoor learning can promote the pupils’ motor skills, physical strength,
practical and manual skills as well as their learning outcome. As a consequence, outdoor learning can probably contribute to a more healthy school.

**Verbal skills**

In outdoor learning the pupils work with their tasks at the same time as they cooperate with other pupils or the teacher. Outdoor learning is to a great extent based upon cooperation and teamwork. For instance, pupils who are classifying collected plants in a forest environment, studying tadpoles in fresh water, working with space and form in nature or in the urban architecture, or visiting a carpenter’s workshop operate in a context where communication and interaction take place – quite different from the classroom setting, where communication is more based upon a referring language. Outdoor learning thus gives the pupil a lot of opportunities to use their language to communicate more freely and spontaneously with the other pupils and the teacher than in the classroom context. Consequently, there is reason to believe that outdoor learning can stimulate the pupil’s verbal skills.

**Writing skills**

In addition, outdoor learning gives the pupils opportunities to reflect upon their experiences and to articulate and conceptualize their experiences and thoughts in writing, as part of the preparation. Thus the pupils are learning by writing. A lot of teachers claim that the pupils’ written work improves when the texts are based upon their own experiences. Writing texts related to outdoor learning seems to be an important method to stimulate the pupils’ basic skills in writing.

**Social skills**

As I pointed out above, outdoor learning is based upon cooperation and teamwork. This implies that the pupils have to communicate and negotiate about meaning; it is simply necessary in order to carry out the activities or tasks. At the same time, authentic situations demanding social interaction often arise spontaneously. Therefore, the potential for social learning is huge in outdoor learning. Outdoor learning also seems to result in good relations between the individual pupil and the teacher. The warm, personal and confidential conversation between teacher and pupil seems to flourish out-of-doors. This is a very important consequence of outdoor learning which seems to influence the learning environment in a positive way.

**Summary**

As such, there is reason to believe that outdoor learning can promote the pupils’ learning outcome as well as their health. Nevertheless, research has still not been carried out that can verify these kinds of effects, though theory and research so far point in this direction. There is a huge need for further research.

**2.9. Why should we use outdoor learning?**

Outdoor learning is based upon the theoretical knowledge that learning is an activity which demands that the inner motivation and creativity of the pupil in one way or another have to be mobilized. Outdoor learning implies that the pupils must be in activity using their minds, body and senses, and they have to cooperate and communicate in order to solve the different tasks. Consequently, physical action, social interaction and learning walk hand in hand in outdoor learning. The individual pupil is given the opportunity to work with the subjects as a whole human being. They are allowed to use “head, heart and hand” in the learning process, as Pestalozzi expressed it 200 years ago. Outdoor learning implies a break with the dualistic tradition in school since cognitive, physical, practical, aesthetic and ethical perspectives are united in the educational process, far from the theoretical and text-based approaches which have traditionally dominated in
the classroom. Outdoor learning thus has the potential to be an important contribution to a more holistic education. This implies that more pupils can have the opportunity to master different tasks in school. All pupils will benefit from this.

Outdoor learning is far more than a sporadic occurrence in the teaching. The goal is not only to create a welcome variation from traditional classroom teaching where the textbook is more or less in focus. We talk about a more far-reaching change of the educational work in school where activities out-of-doors and indoors are interwoven into a whole. Outdoor learning must therefore be seen as an integral part of the total education. The result will probably be a better school with increased learning outcome, better well-being and better physical and mental health. However this will require competent teachers. Consequently, training in outdoor learning should be a natural part of the teacher training programme and should also be offered as further training for all teachers who wish for it.

2.10. Outdoor learning – an educational journey

The question why pupils and teachers should sometimes leave the classroom and the textbooks and get inspiration for the educational process in the physical and social reality outside school could be illustrated through “the journey”, an old metaphor in the description of the nature of education (Gustavsson 1996). The following description is based on the experiences from the schools I have investigated.

The pupils have outdoor learning one day every week, 35–40 times a year. On these days the pupils go thorough a voyage of discovery in the surroundings. In this way teachers and pupils move the educational work into the local environment. Most of the trips have taken place in the local environment, but they have also been far away from school. We sense the outlines of a long journey. After seven years in primary school the pupils have carried out a nine month long journey in time and space, and they have moved more than one thousand kilometres. It has not only been an external journey, but also an internal journey, an educational journey or a pilgrimage from Oslo to Trondheim – the modern Nidaros – and back again.

On this journey the pupils have spent a lot of time in nature. They have sensed the elements of nature and they have met, experienced and studied plants, animals and life processes in an
authentic context in the landscape. They have visited several places and they have experienced each other in new ways and in different situations. The teachers have spoken about the simple life in nature, about the community, social relationships and all the good conversations. I have heard about days with different learning activities, physical education, pupils playing and expressing themselves, laughter and joy, conflicts and tensions, experiences and incidents summer, autumn, winter and spring, and all the changes in nature they have experienced. There have been days with physical hard work, toil and struggle with the forces of nature.

But the teachers have not only spoken about life in nature. They have also spoken about meetings with culture and society and all the other people they have met. They have wandered back in time and space to different time eras. Through dramatization in natural environments they have staged the Stone Age, the Viking Age and Amundsen’s polar expedition, they have visited places from the Middle Ages, and they have walked along the Aker River in Oslo and seen how industrialization came to Norway early in the nineteenth century. They have met people at different workplaces in our own time. They have visited farms, factories and offices. They have been at post offices, hydroelectric power plants, and they have been in churches, shops and marketplaces. They have travelled by bus, streetcar and subway visiting concerts, art exhibitions and museums. They have met people in hospitals, in old people’s homes and other institutions. On their journey the pupils have also faced our multicultural society during visits to mosques, Buddhist and Hindu temples, and they have walked around in immigrant districts in Oslo and bought fruit and vegetables in ethnic food stores from Pakistan, Turkey, Morocco and China. On their journey they have also faced different challenges. The journey has given the pupils a lot of incentives which have been building blocks in their educational process.

Thus pupils and teachers have been together on a long journey in the real world. And all this comes in addition to what they have done in the classroom. The journey has given the pupils experiences and impressions that surpass what traditional classroom teaching alone can bring. The pupils have had experiences the teachers believe will make a permanent impression and change the pupils’ lives. The journey has also influenced the days in the classroom. Outdoor and indoor activities have melted together as parts of a whole. The pupils have been given the opportunity to use “head, heart and hand”. The teachers believe the children have received a mental ballast they wouldn’t be close to having without outdoor learning. They believe the children have learned for life.

Outdoor learning must be seen as an attempt to make a better connection between the lives of the pupils and the school. In school the children encounter reality in a paper-based symbolic version through textbooks, media and information technology. Outdoor learning represents an important and necessary complement. I think there is no reason for discussing the relevance of outdoor learning in the educational work in school either today or tomorrow. The challenge in school is to combine theoretical and practical approaches in the educational work.

2.11. Conclusion
My research has shown that the school is not solely reliant on paper-based and symbolic versions of reality as presented in the textbooks and in classroom work, but can add inspiration from the real world outside the school. This gives the pupils and teachers a host of opportunities to deal with the subjects in a concrete and practical way as an integral part of the pupils learning process.

This should be a common way of working in school for both teachers and pupils. Even though outdoor learning is deeply rooted in theory, amongst others in John Dewey’s experience-based philosophy of education, and in Norwegian curricula ever since 1939, it is still not fully accepted in practice neither in Norway nor internationally. Consequently, I believe the school still has a long way to go before this philosophy of education will be fully accepted and converted into general
practice in school. But in spite of some opposition in school and society to outdoor learning, there is no way back. We have to continue this important educational work.

**Literature**


In this chapter you will find some of the materials that were developed during this project. These materials can be an aid and an inspiration for all of you who want to work with outdoor education and learning as a part of teacher education.
3.1. Syllabus
Lecturer Eva Kätting, National Centre for Outdoor Education (NCU), Linköping University,
FACULTY OF ARTS AND SCIENCE, LINKÖPING UNIVERSITY

Outdoor Environmental Education, Foundation course.
3 university points

Course category: International students

Aim
After completing the course student should have:

- Insight in and knowledge about using the landscape as a resource in the educational process.
- Basic knowledge about the philosophical and pedagogical traditions which are the theoretical foundations of Outdoor Education.
- Developed the ability to reflect over leadership in an outdoor educational context.

Contents
Children and young people’s learning is put into an Outdoor Educational perspective. Through their own experiences, the student will acquire knowledge of the opportunities for children and young people to develop their learning by meeting the landscape and it’s cultural dimensions. By considering the best place for teaching the student will learn how to increase the possibilities for children and young people’s learning in all subjects in school.

The importance of leadership for learning outdoors is illustrated.

Forms of instruction
Instruction is given in the form of lectures, seminars and study visits. The major part of the education is located in different outdoor settings. We make use of countryside as well as rural areas. The course assignments are carried out as group or individual work.

Examination
Examination takes place throughout by a reflective, written assignment connected to the activity of each course meeting and the course literature. A final assignment must be completed to pass the course.

Students who have twice failed the course or a part thereof have the right to request a different examiner for a renewed examination.

It is not permitted for a student who has achieved a pass mark to retake the examination for a higher grade.

Eligibility
The course is primarily intended for student teachers who are participating in an international Socrates project.
Admission to the course requires that the candidate be enrolled as a student at a university or college that is a participant member of the project in question.

**Grades**
The course is graded according to the ECTS scale, that is 3 ECTS.

**Course literature**
A list of course literature is established by the responsible department or equivalent.
3.2. Reflected log/diary/journal

*Head teacher Eha Jakobson, Unipiha Primary School, Estonia*

**Theory**

The use of reflected log emerges from a “constructivist” philosophy of science education. In its most basic form, human constructivists (Mintzes, Wandersee and Novak, Eds., 1998) reject the view that knowledge is a product that can be faithfully conveyed by teachers. Knowledge is an idiosyncratic, dynamic construction of human beings, and that teachers are mediators or negotiators of meaning. Taken to an extreme, this philosophy suggests:

> You cannot teach anybody anything. All you can do as a teacher is to make it easier for your students to learn. (Redish, 1994, p. 798)

Perhaps the most important implication is that without knowing what students are thinking, a teacher can offer only limited assistance in helping them learn. Metacognition is crucial for implementing a constructivist approach to teaching and assessment. Metacognition refers to knowledge, awareness and control of one's own learning (Baird, 1990, p.184).

If we want our students to construct their own understanding, reflect on their knowledge, ask questions and plan their own learning, we need to devise assessment methods that assess these aspects of learning.

> Writing is more than just a mean of expressing what we think – a means of shaping, clarifying and discovering our ideas (p. 660).

Journal writing is one of the least used forms of alternative assessment (Lester, et al, 1997). This may be due, at least in part, to the time consuming qualities of writing and assessing this writing. However, Bagle and Gallenberger (1992) suggest that,

Reflected logs are not just journals – they are structured journals, and have other purposes. In the beginning, students usually express negative feelings towards them, but very soon they start appreciating the help that it can provide.

**Pros and cons**

Reflected logs
- Help students reflect on their own knowledge and learning.
- Help students learn to express their thoughts coherently in writing.
- Help students learn to formulate good questions.
- Help students focus on the most important issues.
- Foster communication between professors and students.
- Provide continuous feedback for both sides.

However,
- It may be frustrating to students because they are rarely asked to write in science courses or to reflect on their knowledge.
- May require training of students.
- Take a great deal of teachers’ time (answering questions, assessing).
- Reliable scoring requires knowledge of rubrics.
Teaching goals

Student:
- Understands the difference between observational facts, concepts, principles and theories.
- Communicates in writing effectively.
- Asks important questions.
- Reflects on own knowledge and learning.

Teacher:
- Answers student questions on a regular basis.
- Bridges gap between learning and assessment.
- Communicates desire for student success.
- Develops and refines instruction based on student feedback.
- Receives regular feedback from students.
- Tracks typical questions.

How to do a reflected log

A Reflected Log is a paper that students write analyzing and reflecting on what they have learned. It consists of six questions that students answer:

1. What did I learn today?
2. What was the most important experience I had learnt today?
3. How did I experience the relation between theory and practice?
4. What do I want to learn more about?
5. If I were the elementary teacher and taught this material to children, what ……..
6. How are the activities related to the national curriculum?

Limitations

When done well, Reflective Log may provide a useful and easily accessible way of probing three aspects of students’ knowledge:

- **Cognitive Aspects.**
  Responses to questions 1 & 2 offer insight into students’ conceptual understanding. However, to be useful, students must provide a well-structured, in-depth exposition of the concepts, principles and theories they have studied, trying to explain how they learned what they think they did. A topical list of course content does not provide the teacher with much valuable information.

- **Affective Aspects.**
  Responses to question 3 may reveal some well-entrenched misconceptions, but ideally they also provide evidence of students’ feelings, attitudes and beliefs about the content, the course and the teacher. The most useful responses do more than list course content; they provide the teacher with a glimpse of students’ views and feelings about lectures, laboratories, recitations, textbooks, teaching assistants, and other aspects of the course.

- **Metacognitive Aspects.**
  Responses to all questions provide information about students’ understanding of their own learning. This kind of “self-reflective” and “self-monitoring” knowledge is essential to conceptual understanding in science and other disciplines.
Literature
3.3. Small written task

*Senior lecturer Karen Barfod, VIA University College, Denmark*

In the beginning of the course the student should be introduced to this task. At the end of the Foundation course in Outdoor Learning the students should make a short written task. This task has the extent of about five normal pages, A4, 12 pt Times New Roman, single spacing. The task can be done individually or in small groups of up to three participants.

The task is a part of the course, as it should increase the students’ ability to reflect upon the pedagogical value of outdoor learning and in a written form to reflect upon the relation between theory and practice of this course.

The task can take earlier tasks as starting point, either at this course or from other subjects.

**The task must include:**

- A theoretical introduction – with considerations connected to the literature about the legitimacy of outdoor learning and its possibilities in the elementary school from the point of view of the current national curriculum.
- A short description of an outdoor lesson and its relation to the annual plan for the classes. If you have tried some of it in practice, you can bring in your experiences and your reflections about it.
- A part with considerations of why you planned the outdoor lesson as you did, referring to relevant literature and theories.
- Discussion of your role as a teacher during this lesson.
- A list of literature and links.

The task must use correct academic terminology, technical terms, correct citations, statements of the students’ names and numbers etc.
## Chapter 4: Examples and materials for Foundation Course in Outdoor learning

### 4.1 Example of week schedule, Foundation Course

This schedule shows how we in Denmark made a schedule for the foundation course. On page 61 of this manual you will find our “ideal schedule”, based on conclusions drawn from all the test runs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09:00–10:30 Welcome</td>
<td>Reflection Sheet, Lunch</td>
<td>Problem based (“open”) tasks versus recipe based (“closed”) approaches.</td>
<td>Morning trip. Rangers visit (use of resource persons)</td>
<td>09:00–12:00 Outdoor learning in urban environments, walk and talk, visiting the church and the playground.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme and tasks during the course</td>
<td></td>
<td>Drama and role playing as pedagogical method</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• School visit</td>
<td></td>
<td>Practical tasks outside, language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Diary</td>
<td></td>
<td>09:00–12:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Small written task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sleepover in nature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Names, plays, games, icebreakers (practice, get-together)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30–11:00 pause</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is Outdoor Learning? (Common ppt)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00–12:15 Learning theory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical Lecture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical tasks in the nearby environment – the use of body and senses in Outdoor learning (Cooking for lunch using bonfire) 12:15–14:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:30–15:00 Theory about leadership and the role of the teacher.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to plan an Outdoor day in elementary School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students tells about their experiences (dialog)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00–15:40 Reflection Sheet (upon the School visit)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students tasks for the sleep over in nature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to Reflection Sheet and personal diary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:30–15:40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:30–15:30 “Rooms of Outdoor learning”:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Culture landscapes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Nature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Industrial landscapes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory and subsequent visit to a industry (tractor repair shop)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:00 Sleep over in nature – on bicycle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic outdoor life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Storytelling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reading aloud</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Night as environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Leadership in outdoor learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pause, students rests and reflections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:15–15:40 Reflection Sheets – summing up.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Sheet (evaluating the Foundation Course as a part of the project OUTLiNES)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking on bonfire – deer and wine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be read:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lars Owe Dahlgren &amp; Anders Szczepanski, Utomhuspedagogik – boklig bilning och sinnlig erfarenhet, Linköping University, ”Skapande Vetende” nr 31, 1997 ISBN 91-7871-979-8 (you can get it in English, too)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articles from <a href="http://www.udeskole.dk">www.udeskole.dk</a> (this is a problem in the international part)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small written task: is delivered after approx. 2 weeks, together with the second evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2. Best Practise examples

By Senior lecturer Karen Barfod, DK

These examples are well-tested activities for teacher students in the project “OUTLiNES”, and can be used in their form here or changed to fit into local plans. They correspond to different subjects that are a part of the curriculum in teacher education.

These examples are written to illustrate some important aspects of outdoor learning.

For comparison they are written in this form, well tested and used for years by the homepage www.skoven-i-skolen.dk.

- Headline
- Short description of the activity, and other subjects involved (interdisciplinarity)
- Subject aims, or aims of this activity
- How do you prepare the students and yourself (what activities do you have to do before this, if any)
- What will you need (things to remember)
- Time (how long time does this activity take)
- Description (what to do), this is the main part of the description
- Background (good to know) and the context this activity are in
- Suggestions of other activities
- Writer’s name, institution and e-mail
- Keywords (subjects and methodological keyword)

Further examples can be found in the “Subject manual”, which can be downloaded free from www.outdoorlearning.dk
4.2.1. Icebreakers – ideas for quick start with new group of people
Dusan Bartunek – Charles University in Prague

3-way Thumb Wrestle
In threes, each puts in one hand. Join hands with grip as per a 2-way thumb wrestle. Try to pin the other two members’ thumbs for victory. Victors can then go into competition etc. if you want a grand winner.

Trains, Fox & Hunter
Groups of three. Two are free – fox and hunter. If fox gets on end of train, train becomes fox. If hunter catches fox, they swap.

Hobby by Pantomime
In a circle, each person says own name & shows his/her hobby by pantomime.

Circle Dance
In a circle, everybody swaps to opposite side – return to old place backwards – go to opposite side blind.

Mini-Chasey
1. In pairs in a small space (e.g., rope circle) – try to catch partner – if caught, switch chaser. 2. Catch partner by sight – using binoculars made from hands.

Vampires
Everybody is blind & normal – if normal people meet each other they have to make a sound – but one person will be a vampire (chosen by leader) who doesn’t speak. If you meet a vampire, become a vampire. If two vampires meet, they become normal.

1–2–3
In pairs, face to face. Alternate counting 1–2–3 (keep going) then replace saying...1 with a clap...2 with clapping legs...3 with a jump.

Dragons
Groups of 5 to 8 players – the ending player has scarf like tail – the head of dragon has to catch tail of the other dragon – the dragons can’t break.

Group Rock-Paper-Scissors
Two lines – play rock-paper-scissors – if person wins, moves up line, if person loses, swap into opposite line (remember some winners in that line will be moving up). The line will keep moving.
4.2.2. Teaching basic motor skills by means of natural exercises

*By Marie Hronzova, Charles University in Prague, the Czech Republic*

**Short description**

This activity illustrates and teaches how to use natural exercises outdoors and how to use them for the development of basic motor abilities.

**Subject aims**

The main aim is development of basic motor abilities of children, such as speed and quickness, power and strength, mobility and dexterity, endurance and persistence in an outdoor environment.

These activities and exercises use sensory perception and proprioception in a natural environment. The exercise uses natural devices, tools and requisites (grass, trees, stones, logs) for body exercise and activities.

The task is to build up a large store of outdoor locomotor activities and manipulative skills and teach children to utilize them quite naturally.

**Preparations**

Students: should wear suitable dress and shoes for safe and comfortable movement

Teacher: should choose and get acquainted with the place (safe and stimulating)

**Time**

About 1.5 hours

**Description**

Children are encouraged to explore the surroundings – counting and touching trees, pace measuring and estimating of distances, looking for stones and collecting them, picking up interesting leaves and branches.

**Running** – various types of running or gait, running between trees and around them, along the paths.

- as fast as possible
- as far as possible

**Jumping** – jumping, hopping or skipping over stones and logs, brooks or streams, among them, around them, in created pictures.

- long jump
- high jump
- multiple jumps

**Throwing** - throwing various objects (cones, stones, branches) long throw, target throw.

**Climbing** - overcoming low and high vertical and horizontal barriers – logs, beams, big stones, benches, guard stones, fences, hedges, walls, rocks, and trees.
Background
Children can choose their own objective or way according to their abilities. They learn to estimate their potential and capacity.
Children develop their motor abilities:
*Speed* and *endurance* in running
*Bounce power* and *elasticity* in jumping
*Whip power* and *strength in throwing*
*Mobility, dexterity* and *elasticity* in climbing

Written by
Marie Hronzova
Charles University in Prague, the Czech Republic
E-mail: hronzova@volny.cz

Keywords
Basic motor abilities, natural exercises, locomotor activities
4.2.3. **Awakening – yoga and breathing exercises as a part of physical and mental balance**  
*By Marie Hronzova, Charles University of Prague, the Czech Republic*

**Short description**  
This lesson involves some examples of yoga exercises convenient for children in the open air. It uses nature for performing these activities.

**Subject aims**  
The main aim is to achieve stronger body and mind and make the mind and body relax by means of physical and breathing exercises.

This exercise takes advantage of basic principles of yoga exercises for strengthening and stretching of the body.

It involves sensory perception and physical exercises, as well as self-control and body awareness.

**Preparation**  
Students: should wear suitable loose dress for safe and comfortable movement.  
Teacher: should plan with regard to daylight hours, weather conditions and surrounding activities or lessons.

**Time**  
About 1.5 hours

**Description**  
Choose a suitable place to exercise together with the children. The place should inspire them and enable them to relax. To aid concentration, the children should have a good view of the landscape.

*Breathing exercises* – three-part breathing, belly breathing, breathing positions, body posture.  
*Imitating exercises* – imitating animals and nature – expression, games, storytelling.  
*Simple yoga poses* – cat and cow, rabbit, surfer, rainbow, tree, etc. – combined with simple songs and rhymes  
*Fun postures* - exercising children’s imagination, group games.  
*Balance exercises* – focusing on concentration.  
*Postures and sequences* – building strength and flexibility.  
*Sun salutation (Moon salutation)* – and their variations.  
*Relaxation* – connected with visualization, listening to sounds of nature, smelling the fresh air.
Background
Improve health, mental, emotional and physical well-being.
Increase focus, concentration, memory and learning.
Help to reduce stress and anxiety.
Increase motivation and confidence.
Help the hyperactive and attention-deficit children.

Written by
Marie Hronzova
Charles University of Prague, the Czech Republic
E-mail: hronzova@volny.cz

Keywords
Yoga, breathing exercises, postures, asanas, sequences
4.2.4. Working with literature and drama, Language

Ronia, the robber’s daughter
By Eva Kätting, lecturer in Outdoor Education, National centre for Outdoor Education (NCU), Linköping University, Sweden

Short description
In this exercise we analyse literature by using drama. We also make connections between the literature and the children’s own experiences.

Subject aims
This exercise is a way of working with literature that includes reading and discussing. It is also a way to use literary conflict situations to better understand conflicts around us, by using drama. It includes training in expressing yourself verbally and dramatically and developing social skills and cooperation.

According to theories about literature acquisition (Thomson, J. 1987) the first level in understanding literature is to find the story exciting. The next level is to feel empathy with the characters in the book and after that the child/student is supposed to reflect over the significance of the story and to be able to relate what happens in the book to his or her own thoughts and problems. On the fifth level we find “the insight that a book is a literary product, created by an author”. These five levels are well covered in this exercise and with older students you have the possibility to cover even the highest level: “…understanding of the relation between author and reader and the ideology of the text…”.

Preparations
Read the book, Ronia, the robber’s daughter. Divide the group into small group of 4–5 children. Find a place that corresponds to the book in some way and where you can find a suitable “scene” for each group.

Remember
Bring the book.

Time
At least 1.5 hours

What to do
Bring the book and read together chapter sixteen, where Ronia lives in the cave with Birk and her father want her to come home with him. (This can be done indoors if the weather is bad).

Ask the children if Ronia’s decision was the right one. Could she have done something else? Have they ever been in a situation where they have had to make a choice like this?

After this discussion every group has to decide what they would have done, is there an alternative solution? Who can make the decisions? When the group has decided what solution they want, they have to find a suitable scene where they can act.

After a short rehearsal and time for preparation it is time to see what different solutions there can be.
Each group visits the others’ scenes and takes part of the different presentations and solutions.

Finally the whole group discusses what happens when you see a problem from different perspectives. Is there always a right decision? What do you think Astrid Lindgren thought when she wrote the book?

Evaluation: What did we learn from today’s exercise? Did you understand the book better? Can you see similarities between Ronia’s dilemma and relations around us today and here? Can you express your feelings by drama? Can you understand what others feel when the act? Can you see that a problem can bee very different according to what perspective you have? Ronia lives in another time and another place, is it still possible to learn something from this story?

Background
This exercise can of course be used with other books than Ronia, the Robber’s daughter. If you have the possibility to use the authentic milieu when you work with a book it gives reading and the understanding a new dimension. Ronia is fiction; there is no place to go to see the castle or the cave, so every forest is the authentic place to work with it. The forest is central in the book, when people asked Astrid Lindgren why she wrote a book like this she answered: I wanted to be in the forest. She was seventy years old when she wrote it and for her it was a way to make her childhood’s forest some alive.

Other books have other places to make them come alive and there will be other problems and dilemmas to discuss, but finding the right place will always add an extra dimension and a better and deeper understanding when you work with literature.

References
Lindgren, A. (1980) *Ronia, the Robber’s Daughter*

Written by
Eva Kätting
Linköping University
E-mail: eva.katting@liu.se
4.2.5: Rhythm, creation and embodiment – substantives, language in outdoor education
Karen Barfod, Senior lecturer in Teacher Education in Nørre Nissum, DK

**Short description**
Working with bodily expressions of verbs, and producing rhythmic verses together – being creative with the language.

**Subject aims**
To work exploratively with problem solving and through dialogue, promoting social relationships and the topic of word classes, by bodily experienced tasks.

**Preparations**
The students must have a brief introduction to the curriculum in mother tongue.

**Time**
About 2 lessons

**Description**
Showing parts of the Danish curriculum for elementary school in Danish for the students – telling them how these subjects can be successfully worked with outside the Classroom.

Then we work with verbs:
What is a verb?
What is a noun?

Then we go out and work. Everybody learns the following rhythmic poem (in Danish), while we walk:

\[
\text{Left, left, left} \\
\text{The left foot is very good} \\
\text{It goes and hops in socks and shoes} \\
\text{But what about the right, the right, the right foot will fight}
\]

We discuss which words are verbs. (To be, to go, to hop etc.)

When everybody has learned this poem, they have to make their own, working in pairs. They have to move their bodies to demonstrate the verbs.

The pairs then form groups of four to learn each other’s poems and the accompanying actions.

Finally, each group presents its poems to the whole class, and they are all joined together into a very long, moving snake of homemade poems and movements.

Time to reflect, and to talk about the poems – what are the verbs?

Discussions with the students:
Who works here (the pupils), who talks (the pupils), who are creative?
What organization must be made?
What do the children learn this way?

To the next day, the students must write down their poems and put them on the outdoor learning web site (Sharing knowledge, writing a journal, and using the computer in their study).

**Background**
You must know the national curriculum in mother tongue.

**Suggestions of other activities**

The students work in pairs to think of verbs with two meanings.
With their bodies, they express the verb.
The other students stand around them in a circle and try to guess the verbs.
They work with homophones, and active usage of language in a game-like form.

**Written by**
Karen Barfod, University College VIA, ksba@viauc.dk

**Keywords**
Mother tongue, language, verbs, rhythm, creativity, group work, embodiment.
4.2.6. Aesthetical experience and learning through the creation process and hands on activities in outdoor learning – of fairy tales in language education
By Karen Barfod, Senior lecturer in Teachers Education, University College VIA, Denmark

Description
In this activity we work with mother tongue, by reading and analysing folktales and creating pictures from them.

Subject aims
This exercise builds on an interdisciplinary, aesthetical approach to traditional tales as a part of literature education. It is a part of mother tongue education, which includes reading, writing, talking, listening and literature.

It combines sensory activities with storytelling and group work and has successfully been done with children in third grade (10 years old).

The text is the tale, the context is the forest.

We work with stimulating practical hands-on approaches, developing social competences, explorative, problem solving and dialogical communication, group activities, problem based task and reading aloud.

Preparations
Working with tales, reading them and analyzing them.
The teacher must have chosen a folktale, copied it and cut into suitable parts.

Remember
The Big Story Book
Sitting devices
Copies of parts of the tale
Digital cameras
The children’s notebooks and pencils

Time
About 2 hours

What to do
Start with a well-known traditional tale. Tell the children what the aim of the day is: to work with illustration as a language.

- In Denmark, we start with the well-known story of Hansel and Gretel, who are left by their evil stepmother deep in the woods, and hungry, tired and exhausted finds the pancake house and the evil witch. Telling stories, even well known, ones sitting around the bonfire, is a way to develop attention and learn to listen.
- The children sit together in groups of 2–3 pupils. Each group gets a small copy of a written part of the story. They read it.
- The task is to make a picture on the ground, that tells about the most important impression of their part of the tale using materials from nature.
• When all children have finished their pictures, we go for a walk from picture to picture, and the children tell each other about their work. This gives us a “storytelling snake”, a picturesque walk through a tale about experiences in nature.
• The children get the chance to take pictures of their work, to keep in their logs, writing a summary of the story as homework.
• Evaluation: How did we work today? What picture was most illustrative? (method)
  What was important in the tale? What makes a good picture? (subject)
  Short reflection by dialogue.

**Background**

In this activity, the children:
• Listen to a story
• Read
• Analyse the text
• Make internal pictures
• Communicate and work together
• Produce an aesthetical and meaningful product together
• Evaluate through their logs

That is, we work connecting aesthetical and analysing competences in the frame of mother tongue education and traditional literature as a part of the elementary school curriculum.

**Written by**
Karen Barfod
Nørre Nissum Seminarium og HF, Denmark
E-mail: ksba@viauc.dk

**Keywords**
Mother tongue, folktales, aesthetical work

**4.2.7. Outdoor education, language and landscape**

*Carina Brage, Linköping University*

Outdoor education, language and landscape is a course where the landscape and environs are used to teach language. In outdoor educational work the whole body and all senses are used to gain a better understanding and, it is hoped, sustainable knowledge. Language can be taught in many ways and in various locations. We wish to present it out of doors, near the school; outdoor education does not require a forest.

None of the activities requires a lot of material. They can all easily be carried out during a lesson or part of a lesson. The students get to move around, which provides a benefit to physical health as a bonus. The exercises below also cover other school subjects.

**Weight and Size**

*Elements:* comparison – light/heavy, long/short, large/small, thin/thick
*Environment:* forest or other place with materials
*Materials:* stones, pine cones, sticks, leaves etc.
*Time:* ten minutes
Introduction
This exercise can be used to divide a class into smaller groups, while also focusing on language and grammar. It can also be done as a stand-alone exercise. In that case, more time can be spent reflecting over the chosen categories or how one sees colour, shape size etc.

Instructions
Each participant fetches an object, for instance a leaf. When they have returned, a theme is selected. It could be the weight, length, shape or colour of the objects.

The participants should ask questions in order to compare the objects and form a line based on the selected theme.

Keep in mind
Practise questions and comparative forms of adjectives before carrying out this exercise. It is also possible to do it in the native language first, which can be hard enough. This way, the pupils know what to do when it’s time to try it in the language being taught.

Variations
- Everyone fetches an arbitrary number of stones. Form a line ordered by the number of stones each pupil picked up. If some pupils have the same number of stones, order them by the estimated total size or mass of the stones.
- If everyone fetches an arbitrary object, they can try forming groups based on which objects they have. Old/new, small/large, hard/soft, dark/light etc.
- If the exercise is not used to divide the pupils into groups it can be a good idea to have a notebook handy and write down some of the comparative forms and words used.

Word Relay

Elements: practicing words and names  
Materials: optionally a list of words or word cards  
Time: ten minutes

Introduction
This is a good exercise for a new group, as it can be used to practice names and vocabulary simultaneously.

Instructions
Stand in a ring. Select a “catcher”, who stands in the middle. The teacher begins by saying a word and a name in one language. The person named must say the word in the other language before the catcher reaches them, otherwise they become the catcher. If they succeed in translating the word, they are given a new word by the teacher, and must then say the word out loud and choose a name.

Variations
- Hand out word cards, at least two per pupil, each containing a word in both languages.
- The pupils can choose their own words, preferably words that are topical or have been used recently.
- To reduce the time spent thinking up a new word, the group can count down from five. A pupil who is caught, or can’t think of a word to pass on, changes places with the catcher.
Word Chain

**Elements:** practicing spelling and exercising vocabulary  
**Materials:** possibly notebooks  
**Time:** five minutes  

**Introduction**  
A classic word chain which requires quite a lot of attention, and also requires thinking about how words are spelled!  

**Instructions**  
Stand in a ring. The teacher begins by saying a word, any word. The next person in the ring must think of a word which begins with the same letter the first word ended in, and so on.  

**Keep in mind**  
Decide in advance how picky to be about spelling. How should spelling mistakes be pointed out?  

**Variations**  
When everyone has said a word, bring out notebooks and write down the whole chain. Everyone should stay in the same place so it’s easier to remember all the words. Then compare your results and see if you all remembered the same words. If so, why? What strategies do we use to remember words?  

Draw and Tell

**Elements:** describing and understanding  
**Materials:** pen, notebook, drawing paper, writing surface  
**Time:** twenty minutes  

**Introduction**  
A much-appreciated exercise which demonstrates the importance of communicating clearly.  

**Instructions**  
Sit back to back and draw something you see. Describe the picture in as much detail as possible while your partner draws what you describe. Then compare the pictures. What similarities and differences are there, and what caused them?  

**Keep in mind**  
You don’t have to be good at drawing! The important thing is to express and describe what you’ve done as well as possible.  

**Variations**  
It is of course possible to simply describe what you see for the other to draw. However, the discussion of interpretations and communication benefits if both draw.
4.2.8. The language of music as a game of rhythm improvisation for the development of students’ creativity
*Inga Berzina, Teacher Training and Educational Management Academy*

**Description**
Vocal imitation of percussion instruments and improvisation.

**Target group**
Students aged 14–16. The activity takes place in a room big enough to stand in a circle and see another student doing a solo in the middle.

**Subject aims**
To develop the feel of rhythm and improvisational skills as a means of promoting creativity.

**Integrated subjects**
Music, rhythm.

**Necessary materials**
- Whiteboard
- Percussion instruments (various)

**Time**
1 hour

**Preparation and description of the activity**
The activity begins with a discussion about the meaning of rhythm in music and its many manifestations. Then follows a description of percussion instruments – the drum set, in which each component plays its particular role. The teacher draws a drum set on the board, explaining each component’s name and assigning to each a mnemonic which imitates the percussion instrument’s characteristic sound.

*Example:*
The bass drum is imitated by the mnemonic DN, the hi-hat with the mnemonic T, the snare drum with KA, and the cymbals with TSH (see Figure 1).
Figure 1. Drum rhythm etude

The teacher gives a simple example, showing how a series of syllables forms a rhythmic phrase.

To make the sequence of syllables easier to remember, each syllable is associated with a hand or foot movement.

**Example:**
DN (bass drum) – a tap of the left foot on the floor,
T (hi-hat) – the right hand taps the right leg,
TSH (cymbals) – a movement of the right hand away from oneself, etc.

When the students have learned the example rhythms, some students are selected to be soloists and are asked to stand in the centre of the circle. Each soloist is allowed to choose a simple, previously prepared percussion instrument and to perform a rhythm solo accompanied by the other students. To reduce confusion, at first all of the students may try a solo together with the soloists. The soloists are changed from time to time, so that all of the students can test their improvisational skills.

During the next part of the activity, the students are divided into two groups, and the teacher invents mnemonic games, in which each group is “given” a rhythmical phrase, where each phrase complements the other. At first the tempo is slow, but gradually it is made faster. The phrases are changed from simple ones at first to increasingly complicated ones.

Afterwards, the students are divided into pairs, and each pair tries to perform a rhythmic dialogue according to the principle – each person performs 2 measures, alternating, trying to complete astute rhythmic phrases and to improvise (see Fig. 2).
Keywords
Contemporary rhythmic music, rhythm etude, individual and group improvisation.

Author
Inga Berzina
Institution: Inga Berzina, Riga Teacher Training and Educational Management Academy

E-mail: berzinga@gmail.com
4.2.8. Practical examples in science, grades 1 to 3 (age 7–10)
Head teacher Eha Jakobson, Unipiha Primary School, Estonia and Professor Leida Talts, Tallinn University, Estonia

Observing and identifying trees

Short description
During the Outdoor Education lesson different trees are observed and pupils learn to identify them more specifically by applying different activities (observation, comparing, presentation, discussion, etc.).

Subject aims
- To learn to notice, observe, identify and compare the leaves of trees
- To learn to describe and to write down the collected objects
- To collect material for art lessons

Preparation
The teacher prepares worksheets and goes through the place where the lesson will be held and prepares labels for the trees. Pupils recall the names of the trees and bushes.

Remember
Means needed for the lesson: pencils, writing pad, file for collected leaves, magnifying glass.

Time
45–50 minutes

Description
The teacher announces the aim of the lessons and hands out the worksheets. Forming pairs that work together, asking questions after reading the work sheet (if there are any questions). Dealing with trees and taking notes, discussing. Presenting, reflecting and asking questions. Encouragement and summarising. Game: train and trees.

Background
In this lesson pupils learn:
- to observe and to identify different trees
- to mark down and to describe different objects
- to cooperate with peers
- to give feedback on their activity
- to value nature
The collected leaves can be used as a material for an art lesson.

Written by
Eha Jakobson, Unipiha Primary School, Estonia
Leida Talts, Tallinn University, Estonia

Key words
- Nature, leaves, co-operation, preservation of natural beauty
4.3. Reflection sheet for leaders – a developing tool

Dr Dusan Bartunek, Charles University in Prague, CZ

This material is intended to help teachers or leaders develop their own leadership skills. It is good idea to fill it out after each lesson.

“I never teach my pupils, I only attempt to provide the conditions in which they can learn best.”
Albert Einstein

The basic idea is to reflect on one's own leadership in connection to the aims of the current programme with a specific group and environment.

Measuring for leadership

1: well done – 5: not good

- Achievement of aims
  Aim: ..................................................... Achievement: 1 2 3 4 5
  Aim: ..................................................... Achievement: 1 2 3 4 5
  Aim: ..................................................... Achievement: 1 2 3 4 5

- Description of leadership methods and their effectiveness:
  Method: ............................................... Effectiveness: 1 2 3 4 5
  Method: ............................................... Effectiveness: 1 2 3 4 5
  Method: ............................................... Effectiveness: 1 2 3 4 5

- Description of each step of the leadership process – visible results
  Step 1: ............................................................ Result: ...........................................................
  Step 2: ............................................................ Result: ...........................................................
  Step 3: ............................................................ Result: ...........................................................

- Critical events/safety/incidents + comments
  WHY
  ...............................................................................................................................................
  ...............................................................................................................................................
  ...............................................................................................................................................

- RED line
  o Structure of whole programme – scenario
  o Preparation of participants, acceptance, voluntary
  o Reasons for using selected parts of programme
  o Programme dramaturgy
  o Attribute of using different types of programmes

  Following the red line: .............................................. 1 2 3 4 5

- Interest of participants /in the start, whole time, sometime etc. - question if it was more asset or survival for participants
  Level of their interest 1 2 3 4 5
  ...............................................................................................................................................
  ...............................................................................................................................................
• What did I, as leader, do differently in my leadership than I planned?

• What I would like to improve in my leadership in future?

• Did I notice any feedback from participants regarding my leadership – positive or negative?

• What I, as a leader, would like to concentrate on in my own leadership next time
4.4. Reflection sheet for students

Arne N. Jordet, Associate professor, Hedmark University College

The students are to write their own reflected log about:

- What did I learn today?
- How did I experience the relation between theory and practice?
- What do I want to learn more about?
- If I were the elementary teacher and taught this material to children, what ……..
- How are the activities related to the national curriculum?

To qualify this process, the student has to reflect upon the day’s activities, using this reflection paper:

What are we doing (4 main dimensions of content)?

1. Subject related content
To what extent is the activity related to school subjects?
- What subjects are involved?
- What subject matter?
- Interdisciplinarity?

2. Comprehensiveness
To what extent does the activity involve the whole human being?
- Head (cognition)
- Heart (aesthetics, feelings, ethics)
- Hand (practical, hands-on, physical)

3. Individuality
To what extent does the activity promote the freedom and independence of each individual?

4. Sociality
To what extent does the activity promote interaction and each pupil’s ability to cooperate?

How are we working with the content (methods)?

1. Use of body and senses
To what extent is the activity practical and hands-on related and so gives the student opportunity to use body and senses?
- Does the use of body and senses stimulate the students’ learning process and learning outcome?
- Does the activity stimulate to physical activity?
- Does the activity stimulate the students’ motor skills and coordination?

2. Communication and social interaction
- Does the activity give the students opportunities to verbal communication?
- Does the activity give the students opportunities to cooperate?
3. Organization
How are the activities organized?

- Do the students work individually?
- Do the students work in groups?
- Do the students work plenary?

4. To what extent are the activities related to in-door activities in the classroom?
4.5. Evaluation form

Students’ 1st Evaluation of the 1st Test run - Foundation Course
Project OUTLiNES -
Outdoor Learning in Elementary School –
from Grass root to Curriculum in Teacher Education

The Aim of the evaluation is to develop and refine the Foundation Course in Outdoor Learning as a part of the European project “OUTLiNES”.

Several steps of evaluation and refinement of the Course will be taken during and after the 1st test run:

First Test run:
- Foundation Course, 1st test run, daily reflections
- First test run, students’ first evaluation (immediately after the Course)
- First test run, lecturers’ evaluation
- First test run, students’ second evaluation (after 6–8 weeks)
- Refining the Foundation Course

Second test run
- Foundation Course, second test run, daily reflections
- Second test run, students’ first evaluation
- Second test run, lecturers’ evaluation
- Second test run, students’ second evaluation (after 6–8 weeks)
- Second refinement of the Foundation Course

The students will participate in the following parts of the evaluation:
- Daily reflections
- Filling out an evaluation form immediately after the test run
- Filling out an evaluation form 4 weeks after the test run (by e-mail). This will be sent together with a “short written task”.

The Aims of the Foundation Course are:
“The Foundation Course gives the students experience with, knowledge of and insight in using the landscape as a learning resource in the educational process”

Please answer the evaluation form keeping the following in your mind:
Did you get experience…?
Did you get knowledge of…?
Did you get insight in…?
Evaluation Form
Student evaluation of the 1st Test run of the Foundation Course
Project OUTLiNES

Please keep in mind that YOUR opinion and recommendations are essential to this project and its development, so please take your time to think it through and answer all the questions carefully. We need your help to make the course even better.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>School visit</td>
<td>Drama, Storytelling, Open/closed tasks</td>
<td>Sleep over in nature (bicycle)</td>
<td>OL in Urban Surroundings, churchyard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory about Outdoor learning</td>
<td>School visit, reflection and sharing experiences</td>
<td>Rooms of outdoor learning: Factories (visit)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical tasks,</td>
<td>Teachers role, Theory</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reflection</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection</td>
<td>Reflection</td>
<td>Sleep over in nature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instructions to filling out the form:
Please answer every question with a written answer and also with a cross in the box with numbers. The scale goes from 1–5 where:
A number 5 means: Very well
A number 1 means: Very bad

Have your expectations been met?

No ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Yes ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

1 2 3 4 5

Why?

2. How did you experience the workload of the Course as a whole?
Too less ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Appropriate ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Too much ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- Literature?
- Practice?
- Enough time for reflection / absorption?
- Enough discussions?

Timetable – see the timetable above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bad Good

1 2 3 4 5

- Which session(s) did you find **most** useful? Why?

- Which session(s) did you find **least** useful? Why?

- Were any elements missing from the course?

4. Learning effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

high

What did you learn during the course? Keeping the 3 criteria from “Aims” in mind: experience, knowledge of, insight in?

Do you now feel more comfortable using the landscape as a learning environment?

6. Please add any other comments here

Thank you for helping us developing an even better course
4.6. Practical advice for Foundation Course  
*By Karen Barfod, Senior lecturer and vocational project coordinator, DK*

During the test period of the courses, some common advices for running the courses was shared and implemented in the courses. Here you will find a list of “good advice” in planning your Foundation Course:

1. The use of a booklet for daily reflections for the students is very useful. Buy a cheap booklet, that is personal to each student, and copy your models and relevant figures in a size such that the students can glue them into the booklet.

2. The students should be given time to write in their reflection booklet during the course, it is useful to “force” the students to use the booklet, and do their daily reflections.

3. For international courses, it is a good idea to have some kind of programme in the evenings too, eventually arranged by national students.

4. Be sure, that the students bring proper clothes and proper rain clothes. Our experience is that a very few students are prepared for rainy weather situations. Emphasizing this is important.

5. At least one sleepover in nature gives the students both a lot of experience in the methodology of outdoor learning, and a lot of subject related and social experience and learning.

Let the students bring a snack, a history or a song from their own country, this will contribute to the cross-national experience and gives the students an opportunity to tell about their country.

6. The students must visit a school with outdoor learning. In the test runs, this point had always a very high and popular “score”.
Chapter 5: Compiled evaluation report of the test runs – Foundation Course

Project OUTLiNES – Outdoor Learning in Elementary School – from Grass root to Curriculum in Teacher Education

February 2009
Compiled evaluation report of the Test runs – Foundation Course
Project OUTLiNES –
Outdoor Learning in Elementary School –
from Grass root to Curriculum in Teacher Education

Introduction
In this report, the results from evaluations of 6 national and 6 international test runs of the Foundation Course in Outdoor learning in the project OUTLiNES are compiled. The 6 national test runs were carried on during the spring of 2008 (one in August/September 2008), where they were evaluated by both the students and the lecturers. The course was refined according to this, and the international test runs took their course in the autumn of 2008.

The aims of the foundation course are:
“The Foundation Course gives the students experience with, knowledge of and insight in using the landscape as a learning resource in the educational process”

Working progress
Several steps and refinements have been done during the evolution of the Foundation Course during the project period:

First Test run:
• Foundation Course, 1st test run, daily reflections
• First test run, students’ first evaluation (immediately after the Course)
• First test run, lecturers’ evaluation
• First test run, students’ second evaluation (after 6–8 weeks)
• Refining the Foundation Course

Second test run:
• Foundation Course, second test run, daily reflections
• Second test run, students’ first evaluation
• Second test run, lecturers’ evaluation
• Second test run, students’ second evaluation (after 6–8 weeks)
• Second refinement of the Foundation Course

Some of the original working papers for this report are attached as examples. In this first part, you will find the main conclusions of all of the evaluations.
Contents

Main Conclusions according to project Aims
Quantitative and qualitative data in the form of the evaluation form
Further remarks and things to be developed
Ideal Schedule for Foundation Course

Attachments:

- Students evaluation forms
  - Written form, first and second test runs (almost equal)
  - Group evaluations, oral form
- Examples on compiled evaluations from first test run (EE)
- Results from sharing experiences on the first test runs at the meeting in Norway
- Results from sharing experiences on the second test runs at the sixth meeting in Tallinn
- Examples of compiled evaluation sheets (DK, first test run)
- Example of original evaluation from ONE student, international (second test run) in Denmark (Swedish student)
- Examples of compiled evaluation sheets, second test run (LV)
Main conclusions on all evaluations (summary)
According to the aims of the course we have developed a Foundation Course, that, within its
duration, gives the students both theoretical insight in and practical experience with outdoor
learning in elementary school.

This course can be used as a useful introduction to the field of outdoor learning for teacher students,
as evaluated both by lecturers, experts and students.

In the following a summary is presented of the quantitative and qualitative data collected from
students’, experts’ and lecturers’ evaluations after the two test runs of the Foundation Course.

Quantitative data
The test runs were carried out in six different countries. Six test runs for national students in the
language of the country, and six test runs for groups of international students, with the course
language being English.
In all international courses, at least four nations were represented. Different numbers of students
attended the courses as shown in this table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>First test run, national students</th>
<th>Second test run, international students</th>
<th>Nationality of international students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>DK, NO, SE, EE, CZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>DK, SE, EE, CZ, NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>SE, DK, EE, CZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>DK, CZ, EE, SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>DK, EE, CZ, SE,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>SE, DK, NO, LV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>6 different countries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because of the national agencies of Latvia didn’t have the possibility to find extra financing for this
project as Latvia joined the project later, no students could attend the test runs in foreign countries.

Students’ evaluations of the Foundation Course
The course was evaluated both quantitatively and qualitatively, according to the attached evaluation
form (attachment nr 1).

The students were asked to evaluate the test runs both with a written form (attachment nr 1), and by
oral group evaluation. Examples of their original comments are attached to this report, but here we
compile the evaluations from all test runs and illustrate them with examples.

1. The students’ expectations
The students were asked to what extent their expectations had been met during the course, and
asked to rate it from 1 (lowest) to 5 (highest) score.
Have your expectations been met?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>1st test run 1st evaluation</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>1st test run 2nd evaluation</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>2nd test run 1st evaluation</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>2nd test run 2nd evaluation</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.17*</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>4.2*</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>4.04*</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.85*</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Weighted mean: \((3.8 \times 13) + (4.0 \times 18)\)…etc/n total

In general, the students gave this point very high scores, as illustrated by remarks such as “to a large extent” and “In my opinion this course should be compulsory” (Students evaluation, DK, first test run), and by high numbers like average 4.9 (DK).

As the students had widely varying qualifications, their expectations also went in different directions, gathering around two items, “How to work in practice” and ”Outdoor learning theory”.

“What is outdoor learning?”, “How to use outdoor learning as a teacher” and” How to integrate outdoor learning as a part of teacher education” were major points for the students’ expectations for the course in Estonia.

Only minor and local changes were made based on the evaluations in this point.

“We spent a lot of time outdoors and practically did the exercises, which has been very useful. We got really basic useful knowledge.” (Students’ evaluation, first test run, SE)

2. The workload of the Course as a whole
The workload as a whole was in general regarded as appropriate by the students, but with some fluctuations.

Some students had a hard time with a lot of physical work (LV, SE), and some students found it difficult to read in English.

These fluctuations were represented in the same courses, and are not regarded as a result of different planning of the courses. That is – it’s a personal evaluation and opinion from the students.

The use of booklets and reflection sheets (used as a result of the evaluations of first test runs) helped the reflection process and qualified this.

In the international courses, due to language problems, some students felt that there was a lack of group reflections and discussions.

Some students wanted more, and some less, preflection (introduction to tasks) and reflection time.
How did you experience the workload of the course as a whole?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>1st test run 1st evaluation</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>1st test run 2nd evaluation</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>2nd test run 1st evaluation</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>2nd test run 2nd evaluation</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean*</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Weighted mean: \((4.4 \times 13) + (4.2 \times 18)\) etc/n total
** As the students in Norway didn’t answer this question in this form, it is left out.

**Experts’ comments**

The use of a lot of practice illustrating major methods and ways of teaching is without a doubt a great way to carry out this course – that is “To learn about outdoor learning by doing outdoor learning” is a successful and relevant way to teach this topic.

At the evaluations after the test runs, the expert agreed on the use of some more literature for the course. The theoretical background has not been satisfyingly documented in written sources, and the partners still ask for literature at a proper level on e.g. teachers’ role in the outdoors.

Common literature could be:
- Lars Owe Dahlgren and Anders Szczepanski: “Outdoor Education – literary education and sensory experience”, Linköping University, 1998
- Article written by Arne N. Jordet in the Manual for the Foundation Course (www.outdooreducation.dk)
- 3 first chapters from “Teaching in the Outdoors” by Hammermann et al.

**3. Timetable**

The timetable contained common elements in all countries and common ways of working. As the experts agreed in these common elements, these were a part of all test runs. In the last part of this report you will find our “Ideal Schedule for the Foundation Course”.

The timetables contained the following common elements:
- School visit
- Practice with children
- Short written task
- Sleepover in nature
- International evening, planned by the students
- Reflection time with use of reflection sheets, and reflection booklets
- Theory lesson indoor on outdoor learning
- Using the nearby environment as learning place
- Using nature as a learning place
- Using the city/urban areas as learning place
- Using cultural places, museums, churches and so on
Students evaluations of the timetable (scale 1–5, 5 best):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>1st test run 1st evaluation</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>1st test run 2nd evaluation</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>2nd test run 1st evaluation</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>2nd test run 2nd evaluation</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean*</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Weighted mean: \((3.7 \times 13) + (2.8 \times 18)\) etc/n total

Most students were satisfied with the timetables. What caused some frustration was if the schedule changed too much after the arrival of the students. The course leadership should be aware of the importance of making and following their own schedules and timetables.

As seen by the numbers of the first test runs, the impression of the schedule improved after six weeks (going from mean 3.79 to 4.22). That is, when the students look back at their experiences as a whole, maybe they better see the red lines and the connections between the lessons.

In the international test runs, we see the opposite tendencies.

**Experts’ comments**

The most useful sessions, as selected by the students, are connected to the many practical tasks in the course. The students point to the school visits and the sleepover in nature as some of the best parts – according to their own experience and their own learning process.

In Estonia, the students met local green politicians, and gave this activity a high score, and the Norwegian students rated the use of drama very high.

The “Most useful sessions” point both to the students’ own experiences and the sessions with learning effects. Some students also just look on themselves, e.g. “I know that in my country religion lessons are not popular and those are not written in the curriculum” (Church visits, DK) and not on the learning possibilities in visiting a cultural place as an example.

Some students didn’t come to learn about teaching skills, but only subjects, but some of these students moved, according to their daily reflections, towards a greater focus on their own development as teachers.

The least useful sessions according to the students varied a lot, and did not show any common pattern. Some local changes have to be made, but the common impression is that they are only minor changes. The relation and ratio between indoor and outdoor lessons varied from course to course, as illustrated by the different comments from students.

On the question “Elements missing from the course?” some students needed more activities for the older pupils, and the experts agreed to be better at asking the students how activities can be developed to be used by older pupils too.
4. Learning effects

The students had to express their opinion of the learning effects according to the project aims, and rated from 1 (lowest) to 5 (highest). Most of the students express that the learning effect is high, as seen by the ratings, for example Denmark’s average of 4.4.

Learning effects:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>1st test run 1st evaluation</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>1st test run 2nd evaluation</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>2nd test run 1st evaluation</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>2nd test run 2nd evaluation</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean*</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Weighted mean: \[(3.9 \times 13) + (4.7 \times 10) \ldots \text{etc/total} \ n\]

All students from the test runs now feel more comfortable using the landscape as a learning environment, as asked in the evaluation form.

“Yes, and I think it will be hard for me NOT to use it!” (International test run, LV)

“Absolutely, partly because we got a good basic knowledge and partly because I understood that you do not have to be in the forest all the time.” (International test run, SE)

The low learning effect score in Estonia, international test run, is probably due to the fact that a lot of the students attending this course already had some experience with Outdoor Learning. The Foundation course is a basic course, and if you already know a lot about the topic, your learning effects will be regarded as lower than if you are all “green”.

As can been seen from the numbers, the learning effects of the international courses are all lower than the national courses. As we haven’t asked, we don’t know what the reason for this is, but a good guess, consistent with the comments from the students, would be the language problem. Attending a course in a second language, both for students and lecturers, will give another learning effect than if they both were native speakers.

Other comments added (students evaluations):

Most students were very satisfied with the course, as they describe it:

“I love this project and I am sad it’s over.” (International test run, LV)

“It was a very good course and I hope others will get the same chance to participate.” (International test run, LV)

“This course should be compulsory for all teacher students. It would be an “eye opener” for everybody” (First test run, national students, DK)

“Learn new ways about teaching new ideas.” (International test run, CZ)

Some students also experienced the importance of the methods as examples, and crossed the boundaries of their own subject-oriented thinking:
“Students taking part in this course should be with at least some pedagogical experience.”, “This is the necessary experience for every teacher.” (International test run, LV)
“Got to learn myself a lot of more, challenged myself, more self-confident and got another perspective on learning and teaching.” (International test run, CZ)
“I learned/saw a lot of activities that I will bring to school when I start working.” (International test run, CZ)
“I took really good advice what I can use my future job with kids and teaching them.” (International test run, CZ)

For the international part, the exchange of experiences from different countries and being together was high rated for most students. But some students found that the course was to “tight” and didn’t give room enough for reflections and for being alone.

“The idea about international test runs was good we gained good experience with international cooperation.” (International test run, EE)
“You learn much things from yourself and from other people.” (International test run, CZ)

Experts’ comments on some students’ comments:
Experts: “Some students were not oriented to work with small children (EE comment) and in bigger groups (LV comment)”
Student: “At many cases the language barrier between lecturers and students was too big”
(International test run, EE)
Expert: “It is a problem, if the students and the lecturers do not speak a proper English.”
Conclusions on this report and remarks for further development

The main conclusion is that we have developed a great Foundation Course in Outdoor Learning with major learning effects.

Some local changes must be made, but as we have evaluated and developed this in common, it seems only minor changes are needed. This is about:

- It's important to emphasize that this is a course for beginners
- Having enough, but not too difficult reading material
- More activities for older children
- Not changing the approved schedule and being aware of the students’ backgrounds and expectations
- Being aware of language problems
- Not making the schedule too tight, more time for reflections
Ideal schedule for Foundation Course

During this project, we discussed and tested some different forms of week schedules. Based on this work, we can make an “ideal” schedule for the six day long Foundation Course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start Plans</td>
<td>Outdoor learning in urban environments</td>
<td>School visit</td>
<td>Sleepover in nature</td>
<td>Early morning activities</td>
<td>Cooperative learning – the students teach each others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Icebreakers</td>
<td>Visit a church or museum, using cultural places</td>
<td>Reflections on school visit, and responses on experiences</td>
<td>Basic outdoor life, making a camp, things to be aware of with children, handicraft</td>
<td>Getting back from nature</td>
<td>Reflections and responses on students’ work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lunch</th>
<th>Lunch</th>
<th>Lunch</th>
<th>Lunch</th>
<th>Lunch</th>
<th>Lunch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practice tasks on outdoor education in nearby environment</td>
<td>Time off for the students to experience the country for themselves</td>
<td>Reflections on school visit, and responses on experiences</td>
<td>Activities in nature, could be connected to a resource person – a ranger, a teacher, a birdwatcher, a scout, etc.</td>
<td>Time off as the students will be very tired</td>
<td>Evaluations on the course</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Teambuilding games | Theory about teachers’ role and pupils’ learning process | Activities connected to aesthetical approaches to learning (practice, outside) | International evening, everybody contribute with something from their country | Students prepare their cooperative learning lesson for tomorrow | Goodbye evening |

| Introduction to reflection sheets and reflection booklets (logs, diaries) | Preparing for school visit and eventually activities with children | Reflections and logs | |

| Welcome evening | Reflections and logs | Cultural activities, e.g. concert, theatre or something | | | |

| Welcome evening | Reflections and logs | Cultural activities, e.g. concert, theatre or something | | | |
Attachment:

- Students’ evaluation forms
  - Written form, first and second test runs (almost equal)
  - Group evaluations, oral form
- Examples on compiled evaluations from first test run (EE)
- Results from sharing experiences on the first test runs at the meeting in Norway
- Results from sharing experiences on the second test runs at the sixth meeting in Tallinn
- Examples of compiled evaluation sheets (DK, first test run)
- Examples of compiled evaluation sheets, second test run (LV)
The Aim of the evaluation is to develop and refine the Foundation Course in Outdoor Learning as a part of the European project “OUTLiNES”.

Several steps of evaluation and refinement of the Course will be taken during and after the 1st test run:

**First Test run:**
- Foundation Course, 1st test run, daily reflections
- First test run, students’ first evaluation (immediately after the Course)
- First test run, lecturers’ evaluation
- First test run, students’ second evaluation (after 6-8 weeks)
- Refining the Foundation Course

**Second test run**
- Foundation Course, second test run, daily reflections
- Second test run, students’ first evaluation
- Second test run, lecturers’ evaluation
- Second test run, students’ second evaluation (after 6-8 weeks)
- Second refinement of the Foundation Course

The students’ will participate in the following parts of the evaluation:

- Daily reflections
- Filling out an evaluation form immediately after the test run
- Filling out an evaluation form app 4 weeks after the test run (by e-mail). This will be sent together with a “short written task”.

The Aims of the Foundation Course are:

>“The Foundation Course gives the students experience with, knowledge of and insight in using the landscape as a learning resource in the educational process”

Please answer the evaluation form keeping the following in your mind:
Did you get experience…?
Did you get knowledge of…?
Did you get insight in…?
Evaluation Form
Student evaluation of the 1st Test run of the Foundation Course
Project OUTLiNES

Please keep in mind that YOUR opinion and recommendations are essential to this project and its development, so please take your time to think it through and answer all the questions carefully. We need your help to make the course even better.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>School visit</td>
<td>Drama, Storytelling, Open/closed tasks</td>
<td>Sleep over in nature (bicycle) Ranger visit</td>
<td>OL in Urban Surroundings, churchyard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory about Outdoor learning</td>
<td>School visit, reflection and sharing experiences</td>
<td>Rooms of outdoor learning: Factories (visit)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Students trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical tasks,</td>
<td>Teachers role, Theory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection</td>
<td>Reflection</td>
<td>Sleep over in nature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instructions to filling out the form:
Please answer every question with a written answer and also with a cross in the box with numbers. The scale goes from 1 – 5 where:

A number 5 means:       Very well
A number 1 means:       Very bad

1. Have your expectations been met?  no □ □ □ □ □ yes □ □ □ □ □
Why?

2. How did you experience the workload of the Course as a whole?
   Too less □ □ □ □ □
   Appropriate □ □ □ □ □
   Too much □ □ □ □ □
   - Literature?
   - Practice?
   - Enough time for reflection / absorption?
   - Enough discussions?
   -
3. **Timetable** – see the timetable above.  

- Which session(s) did you find **most** useful?  

  Why?  

- Which session(s) did you find **least** useful?  

  Why?  

- Were any elements missing from the course?  

4. **Learning effects**  

4 of 5  

- What did you learn during the course? Keeping 3 criteria from “Aims” in mind: experience, knowledge of, insight in?  

- Do you now feel more comfortable using the landscape as a learning environment?  

6. Please add any other comments here  

Thank you for helping us developing an even better course
The Aim of the evaluation is to develop and refine the Foundation Course in Outdoor Learning as a part of the European project “OUTLiNES”.

Several steps of evaluation and refinement of the Course will be taken during and after the 2. test run:

- Foundation Course, second test run, daily reflections
- Second test run, students’ first evaluation
- Second test run, lecturers’ evaluation
- Second test run, students’ second evaluation (after 6-8 weeks)
- Second refinement of the Foundation Course

The students’ will participate in the following parts of the evaluation:

- Daily reflections
- Filling out an evaluation form immediately after the test run
- Filling out an evaluation form app 4 weeks after the test run (by e-mail). This will be sent together with a “short written task”.

The Aims of the Foundation Course are:

“The Foundation Course gives the students experience with, knowledge of and insight in using the landscape as a learning resource in the educational process”

Please answer the evaluation form keeping the following in your mind:

Did you get experience…?
Did you get knowledge of…?
Did you get insight in…?
**Evaluation Form**  
*Student evaluation of the 2nd Test run of the Foundation Course Project OUTLiNES*

Please keep in mind that YOUR opinion and recommendations are essential to this project and its development, so please take your time to think it through and answer all the questions carefully. We need your help to make the course even better.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KSBA all day</td>
<td>JHG, DSK, KSBA</td>
<td>KSBA, TOL, KSBA</td>
<td>Schoolvisit – we visit a School with outdoor education 8.00 - 11.40 (12.00) Departure 7.20 on bicycles from Nørre Nissum to Fabjerg udefriskole, <a href="http://www.udefriskole.n.dk">www.udefriskole.n.dk</a></td>
<td>KSBA, JPE</td>
<td>KSBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before arrival:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read: L. O. Dahlgren and A. Sczespanski: <em>Outdoor education – literacy education and sensory experience</em>, Kinda Education centre, No 1</td>
<td>9.00 – 10.00 Introduction to the course Icebreakers Name- games</td>
<td>8.00-11.30 Swimming possible Schoolyard and learning through practical tasks. Math and outdoor learning, practical tasks</td>
<td>Schoolvisit – we visit a School with outdoor education 8.00 - 11.40 (12.00) Departure 7.20 on bicycles from Nørre Nissum to Fabjerg udefriskole, <a href="http://www.udefriskole.n.dk">www.udefriskole.n.dk</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read: “What is Outdoor Learning” by Arne Jordet, unpublished (attached)</td>
<td>10.00 – 10.30 Practical informations: Sleep over Short written task Reflection everyday Bicycles 10.30 – 12.00 Learning through activity and body - language in outdoor learning, practical tasks, outdoors</td>
<td>11.00 – 11.30 Reflections and logs</td>
<td>Lunchpacket</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunch can be bought in the “Kantine”</td>
<td>Lunch can be bought UC 12.00 – 13.00</td>
<td>Lunch can be bought UC 11.30 – 12.30</td>
<td>Lunchpacket</td>
<td>Fish at 18.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrivals Accomodation at the students house</td>
<td>13.00 – 15.00 Indoor lesson: “What is outdoor learning” ppt</td>
<td>12.30 – 15.15 Nearby environmen t – the Church.</td>
<td>12.30 – 14.00 Outdoor learning in urban areas – Physics in the outdoor, stars and planets Torben Lisbye.</td>
<td>Sleep over in nature Outdoor life and skills Nature by night Hear the</td>
<td>Afternoon off for rest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.00 – 16.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

OUTLiNES –Outdoor Learning in Elementary Schools – from Grassroot to Curriculum in Teacher Education
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15.15 – 15.45</td>
<td><strong>Religious education and Outdoor learning – ethics and visiting the local church.</strong> Dorete Kallesøe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Theory lesson KSBA:</strong> “Teacher types”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At you own:</td>
<td>Reflections and logs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00 – 15.30</td>
<td><strong>Planet trail/museum</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.00</td>
<td><strong>Time to shop in Lemvig, shopping for the trip tomorrow. “Lidenlunddage” historical city</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Dancing and eating at “Kirketorvet” (church)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dears growl</td>
<td>Reflections and logs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each country</td>
<td>brings some special food, a song, a snack, a history for everybody at the evening.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinner</td>
<td>together at the UC (Pizzas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinner at</td>
<td>your own</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinner at</td>
<td>your own Students bar “Degnen” open 14-18 19-20 Swimming possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>dinner in town (pay yourself) Reflections and logs – what teacher types did you experience today ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinner at</td>
<td>the Bonfire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinner at</td>
<td>your own, reflections and logs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructions to filling out the form:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please answer every question with a written answer and also with a cross in the box with numbers. The scale goes from 1 – 5 where:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A number 5 means: Very well</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A number 1 means: Very bad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Have your expectations been met?**
2. How did you experience the workload of the Course as a whole?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Too less</th>
<th>Appropriate</th>
<th>Too much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Why?

- Literature?
- Practice?
- Enough time for reflection / absorption?
- Enough discussions?

Timetable – see the timetable above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Which session(s) did you find **most** useful?
  Why?

- Which session(s) did you find **least** useful?
  Why?

- Were any elements missing from the course?

4. Learning effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>low</th>
<th>high</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- What did you learn during the course? Keeping the 3 criteria from “Aims” in mind: experience, knowledge of, insight in?
Do you now feel more comfortable using the landscape as a learning environment?

5. Accommodation

How is your rooms?

Are the possibilities to get food etc good enough?

Any comments?

6. Please add any other comments here

Thank you for helping us developing an even better course
Students’ group Evaluation of the 1st Test run – Foundation and Subject Course

Project OUTLiNES –
Outdoor Learning in Elementary School –
from Grassroot to Curriculum in Teacher Education

The Aim of the evaluation is to develop and refine the Foundation Course in Outdoor Learning as a part of the European project “OUTLiNES”.

The group evaluation will be verbally, and evaluate BOTH testruns in one evaluation.

How to do:

- Each student writes for themselves the 3 best things of the course, and the 3 worst things.
- The lecturer writes on the blackboard two columns, one with the headline “best” and one with the headline “worst”.
- The students fill their words in the columns.
- These two columns is the base of the verbal discussion.
- Finally, the lecturer writes down the columns, and comments them shortly (written). These comments and the column is, together with the individual written evaluation the base for the evaluation of the course structure and form.

We suggest that you plan about 45 min to this evaluation.

These evaluations will be send to the working platform (www.cvumidtvest.dk) when the courses are finished.

All these evaluations will be discussed at our meeting in Norway in May 2008.
Attachment 2: examples on conclusions from Foundation course, Estonia, first test run

A Short Report of the Foundation Course of Outdoor Education

Time of the event: October 22–26, 2007

Place of the event: Matsalu National Park

Participators: Students from Class Teacher specialty and from the field of Natural Sciences (14 students all together)

Coordinators of the course: Leida Talts and Mikk Sarv

Expert: Eva Kätting

Lecturers: Kristel Vilbaste, Eha Jakobson, Mart Laanpere, Tõnu Ots, Marek Stranberg

Outdoor classes were conducted by: the teachers of Kasari Basic School

Bird watching was conducted by Eve Mägi

The aims of the foundation course are: *The foundation course gives the students experience with, knowledge of and insight in using the landscape as a learning resource in the educational process.*

1. Preparatory process for organizing the Outdoor Education course

We started to prepare for the Foundation Course of Outdoor Education in the beginning of September, when we compiled the activity plan for the course, introduced its content to the students, agreed on the place of organizing the course and the means necessary for carrying out the course. The preparatory process consisted in the following activities:

- introducing the objectives and content of the course to the students (presentation made by Mikk and Leida)
- additional information aimed at involving students
- newsletter and briefing a week before departure to Matsalu
- agreements on organizing transport, catering, and accommodation
- acquiring study materials

1.1. Introducing the objectives and content of the course to the students

Mikk Sarv presented the objectives of Outside Education and the partner countries participating in the project. A few weeks later Leida Talts made the same presentation to those students of the Class Teacher specialty, who were not present the first time the presentation was made. Content of the presentation.

1.3. Newsletter and briefing

While the group was not fully assembled as a result of introducing the course program by Mikk Sarv and Leida Talts, an additional newsletter was drawn up, where students were invited to participate in the course of Outdoor Education. As a result of this additional advertisement a 14-member group was formed, which was entirely sufficient.
10 days prior to the beginning of the course we sent a *short explanatory notice* to the students and invited them to join our briefing to discuss the details of the course.

*Short explanatory notice*

**Outdoor Education week in Penijõe/Matsalu Nature Park, October 22–26**

**Departure**
October 22 at 9 am, gathering in front of TLU building at Uus-Sadama 5

**Back to Tallinn**
October 26, afternoon.

**Clothing**
Watertight and warm outerwear (watertight jacket and trousers, jersey, hat, scarf, gloves, warm socks – several pairs of socks and gloves), comfortable footwear, desirably also rubber boots, footwear and clothes for inner use. If possible, take along a sleeping bag, although these will also be provided by the accommodation provider.

**Work equipments**
Stationery, if possible, also personal laptop and digital camera; interesting games to play in the evening.

**Other**
Hopefully we will be fed well during the study week, but every once in a while we have a wish to nibble on something. Since there isn’t a store nearby, take along some snacks.

**1.4. Transport, catering, and accommodation**
We used the transport and catering service offered by Matsalu Natural Park. We were not charged for accommodation.

**1.5. Acquiring study materials**
Each student was given a copy of the book “Outdoor Education” by L. O. Dahlgren and A. Szczepanski, a notebook for taking notes and equipment for group work.

**2. Reflection**

**2.1. Daily reflection**
During the whole study week we regarded versatile reflections highly important. One type of reflection was group reflection. Kristel Vilbaste recommended students to divide into four groups and every group was instructed to perceive the experiences of each day through one of the senses: hearing, sight, taste/smell, touch. Additionally a summary of the day’s activities was made in the end of each day.

Students were able to point out games that allow perceiving with different senses – getting-to-know games, trust games, moving games, etc. For example, students from the “sight” group pointed out that *we learned to be attentive, we had emotional experiences through seeing, we learned to memorize the faces of our partners* (most students did not know each other before), *our spatial perception improved, we trained our visual memory, etc.*
Students were active and creative in group reflections, illustrating the day’s activities on big paper boards and reporting the results by active participation of each group member.

2.2. Students’ first evaluation (immediately after the Course)
In the end of the last day of the course students filled in an evaluation questionnaire, which had been compiled at earlier meetings (in Tallinn and Linköping) and complemented with suggestions (from Karen).

Positive evaluations
In brief it can be said that students’ evaluation was very high. Due to lack of previous knowledge and practical experience in the pedagogy of Outdoor Education many students noted that the course exceeded their expectations. Students marked that they got an idea of the nature and possibilities of Outdoor Education and that they would definitely like to participate in a follow-up course.

Positive evaluation was given to the content of the course throughout the whole week. Practical activities received the highest evaluations, especially the outdoor classes observed in Kasari Basic School. Students were also grateful for the games they had learned and which they took part in with great enthusiasm. Taking into account the weather conditions in late autumn, spending the night in tents was a great challenge, but it received extremely positive feedback.

Associating theoretical studies with practical activities was also positive. For example, the lecture from Mart Laanpere followed by practical exercises on locating on landscape by IT devices inspired students. The same can be said also about the presentation by Eha Jakobson, which was illustrated with edifying slides of her pupils in a small county school demonstrating outdoor education. Note from one of the students: They are like Bullerby children.

Critical evaluations varied from student to student. For example, evaluations on the intensiveness of work were not very unanimous. Most students regarded intensive working days necessary and were not in favour of a longer pause in the afternoon the day after spending the night in tents. But 2 or 3 students would have wished to have a longer time for relaxing after lunch.

Students were the least inspired by bird watching, which directly followed the night in tents and breakfast after it. Although the ornithologist’s talk was interesting and the possibility of watching birds with binoculars was exciting, certain tension after sleeping in tents carried considerable importance. Some students felt cold after leaving the heated tents and it withheld them from properly focusing on observing the nature.

Some students were not completely satisfied with accommodation: one of the bedrooms was cold the first night and the washing facilities could have been better.

2.3 Reflected log
Five weeks later each student presented a thorough reflection of the course. Unanimously, introducing the principles of Outdoor Education and learning about the possibilities of teaching Outdoor Education in open air were regarded very important. While the main subject of the Estonian group was Natural Sciences, Matsalu Natural Park offered versatile possibilities to perceive natural environment with different senses and to analyze, how the obtained experiences could be applied in teaching. Students liked the idea of dividing into different “sense” groups –
hearing, sight, taste/smell, touch – and they gladly gave feedback on what they perceived by different senses, using educational games and orientating in nature.

Students gave positive feedback on general organization of the study week, the choice of lecturers and their own participation in different activities. Although students liked practical activities (games, assignments, participating in Outdoor Education lessons, etc.) more than theoretical studies, their in-depth analyses show that they were highly motivated by presentations from enthusiastic lecturers on different teaching approaches and teachers’ possibility of getting to know their pupils better within Outdoor Education lessons.

Students noted that they felt as equal partners to teachers and the study week offered many occasions for dialogues, discussions, talking, and social activities (bonfire night, preparing food, telling stories of one’s home, etc.)

As teacher training students, young people analyzed everything they learned and experienced from the point of view of future teachers. They were impressed by Outdoor Education lessons in Kasari Basic School and in Lihula. The greatest wish the students had were to apply their new knowledge as soon as possible and to help teachers in carrying out the Outdoor Education lessons in the next stage of the project.

2.4. Feedback from teachers

The evaluations by teachers revealed the following positions: students’ attitude towards Outdoor Education course was positive, which was asserted by their active participation in both lectures and practical activities. The wish to take part in the next courses was solid proof of students’ positive evaluations.

It is likely that in the future more effort should be made in the preparatory stage of the course. Not all students had made the importance of having suitable clothing and footwear clear for themselves (some students occasionally complained about being cold). Likewise, students should be encouraged in advance to ask for help in case of problems or offer solutions and help. Instead of feeling cold, asking for warmer clothing from a fellow student or helping someone else with an extra jersey would make a difference. Working as a teacher knowing such things is essential.

All teachers acknowledged students’ good skills of discussion and their creativity in summing up the day’s activities, as well as giving feedback on completing individual assignments.

The students registered in the Foundation Course of Outdoor Education get an assessment of 3.0 ECTS for participating in the course and submitting their reflection and final report.
Attachment 3: compiled conclusions from the first test runs in all countries

Remarks from “Minutes of the meeting in Norway”: first test runs

Sweden, Latvia, the Czech Republic and Tallinn University made presentations on their first test runs of the courses. Experiences were shared, commented and discussed. The conclusions and good ideas were:

- Overall a good planning as it is now. None of the evaluations have been really negative. On the contrary we have had very positive response on most aspects.
- Good idea to give students a small notebook to write their daily reflections in. Made a big difference to them. They used them.
- In Estonia groups were created. Every group had to pay specific attention to one of the senses: seeing, hearing, smelling etc. They made group reflections every night.
- Daily reflections upon the experience in the light of one sense, e.g. taste.
- Important to be very explicit when explaining to the students before they arrive to the course what they need to bring. For example it is necessary to explain in details what clothes etc. they will need.
- Important to be very explicit in the purpose of the activities before the activity and during the reflections (WHY and also HOW to use this in practise).
- Important with time enough for reflections (for example to relate the experiences to the curriculum).
- A good idea to use language students from your own institution for translating whenever there is a problem in understanding.
- Latvian evaluation method or help to the form – to let the students make a poster of every day and start the evaluation from these posters.
- Good idea to invite ”green” politician as a lecturer.
- The sleepover should not be placed to early or to late in the course. The best days are: day 2, 3 or 4. Each student could bring a particular snack from their country to share. This gives an opportunity to discuss different cultures.
- The students had some difficulties understanding and filling out the evaluation forms. They have however already been changed and the group decided that it is now okay. This will be discussed after the international test runs again.
- The Swedish test run did not show great difference in the students 1st and the 2nd evaluation whereas the Danish one had a lot of differences.
- The students need quite a lot of time to reflect and to evaluate.
- Both Denmark and Sweden experienced that students remarked that the best practise examples seems to be more directed towards young pupils and not the older classes. Maybe we should use more time explaining how to use the examples for younger and elder pupils. Be expressive about how the exercises can be changed and then used in other contexts.
- Reflected log is a good idea – everybody agreed on this.
- Latvia did not have problems recruiting students like the rest of the countries have had. One of the reasons might be that they placed the course as part of the students practise (3 ECTS).
- We need to spend more time explaining what the purpose of the exercise is.
- Discussion of how to do the courses without spending too much money. The budget is so limited for this. Use the nearby environment, the landscape around you. Walk instead of spending money on renting bicycles or a bus.
Sixth meeting in Estonia,
Compilation of evaluations and sharing experiences of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} test runs

Participants:
Mikk Sarv, EE
Leida Talts, EE
Arne Jordet, NO
Dusan Bartunek, CZ
Eva Kätting, SE
Sanita Magdalena, LV
Jannie Hesselbjerg, DK
Karen Barfod, DK

1. \textbf{The 2\textsuperscript{nd} test runs}

We carefully went through all test runs one by one, discussing common and local problems as they showed up. There were some main comments to all of the courses, as described beneath.

Conclusions of Latvian international test run:
- Have one day free between the foundation course and the subject course. Program was too intense! This were mentioned several times by several students
- Not really any language problems, students and teachers were good in English. Only one teacher was not very good in English and she brought her son to translate and Sanita was also there to assist.
- Latvia used a whole day for reflection. Very good idea! They really liked it.

Conclusions of Estonian test run:
- Information about the demands of the course (clothes, English) must be send to the students before the course so they are prepared
- Lecturers and to some extend students must speak proper English
- Information and intentions of the Course and activities must be very clear beforehand
- Only minor changes in the program after arrival can be accepted
- There must be a clear red thread and a clear leader or two teachers following the course

The criticism can be because:
Different school traditions – the Scandinavian students are used to be very critical
Changing the program during the course make the students frustrated and gives problems according to their expectations.
Students have to learn that cityscape is also a place to learn
The student’s willingness to learn can be less when the programs change and not understanding what is happening
Arne: What is the reason for the student criticism?:
Norwegian student said: to many experts involved in teaching – difficult for the students to discover the red thread in the course.
They also needed explanation: Why do we do what we are doing – e.g. the students miss the red line in the course. Maybe they should know before what the aims are (Mikk called this “preflections” which is a new and very useful word in the English vocabulary).
The course became to fragmented – ideal: one or two persons all day

Sweden: Somebody has to be there all of the time.

Conclusions of Danish test run:
- Good Courses with a lot of content
- Accommodation was good
- More theory (for instance more reading stuff)
- More other subjects in subject course (art as a tool)
- Necessary with BOTH a course leader that follows the group the whole time and the specific lecturers

Things to be developed:
- More activities for older children (14+)
- Language problems – some students had difficulties with the English language: “English test? Before the trip” (students suggested in their evaluation)
- Proper clothing: students did not bring wet weather gear
- Social activities and activities in the evenings is very important – not least when it is students of different nationalities
- Student tasks – they could have more to do during the course (same expressed in Norway)
- More theory (the same in Norway)

Eva from Sweden recommended using the Hammermann book, first 3 chapters. She did and the students were satisfied with the level of theory.

Conclusions on Swedish test run:
The book “Ronja, the Robber’s Daughter” was used in class – students would have liked to have the option to read it before they came to the course. Some of them did not have time enough to read it.

Evaluation:
Students were very content with the course
But many of the students didn’t learn a lot of new things, as they already had taken the Foundation course at home. E.g.: They misunderstood their task as evaluators of a TEST RUN; they were more concerned with their own learning process. You need to make sure that they understand this point well before they participate. The most useful sessions evaluated by the students were the school visits and the practical lessons.

Conclusions on Norwegian test run:
- Very important point for the test runs: A discussion about if experts in different subjects and outdoor learning should be taken in for the foundation course. But there was
agreement that the main purpose of the foundation course is a general understanding of outdoor learning. They learn the principles in outdoor learning: Communication, cooperation, using their body. It is in the subject course that they need to have specific subject experts. In foundation course they need to be experts in outdoor learning. NOT in a specific subject.

- Discussion about the age group. Are the exercises too difficult for young pupils? Actually it is a very large group to make exercises for but a good idea would be to write in the exercises how you can adapt them to different age groups.
- National test runs: Main impression: All participants were very satisfied with the course.
- Next meeting: who should actually use the manual? Is it for the students? Or for who?
- International test run: they did not like the indoor lesson at all. (Eva said it was the same for the international students in Sweden). It was mostly because of the language problem - not really able to do the dialogical approach. The national students were very satisfied with the indoor lesson.
- The students think that there is a good balance between theory and practice. But all of the experts agree that there is not enough theory in the course. A theoretical text should be connected to the best practise examples. SO WE NEED MORE THEORY IN THE MANUAL!!!
- Interesting experience for both teachers and students. General impression is that. Morten needs a critical voice, another person nearby to be critical towards his lesson.
- One problem: not enough time to talk through what they have done. TOO MANY ACTIVITIES!!!! The day was too intense! So less activities and more time to reflect! Maybe a good idea to meet at night so they can talk informally during the night: But what about economy? And can we make the teachers come back at night: Dusan: solution: you need a course leader that follows you all during the course. Is this possible economically??

Student evaluation - the international test run, Norway:
Most of the students had experience with outdoor learning before they came, so for them the level of the Foundation Course was too low.
Expectations: the students want to learn and have practical experience
These expectations has been met to some extent
Maybe too much running from one activity to another and not enough time for reflection

Conclusions on Czech test run:
- Two of the students that attended courses in the other countries helped Dusan with the course.
- Some students from Spain attended the subject course too – it was a good experience teaching a bigger group
- Good: going by bike through the city,
- A whole day in the city (Prague), Made a game: history and geography. Visited places, transportation, orienteering with maps, like a relay/, Very good experience.
- We have to think about: the courses are held in different places. Here you have the big city, in Nr. Nissum and Elverum it is more difficult to do exactly this way. This was a good exercise in the city! Maybe you can work with it and change it a bit for the countryside?
- The slide show from CZ – nice for the web site and for the platform. Dusan said okay.
- Fairytales and legends from CZ. They made drama showing these at night.
• Good to visit the Pottery factory
• Health information from students is needed: one of the students had asthma – quite important to know (for the biking for instance).

2. General information and conclusions
• Remember to ask the students for health information before attending the courses.
• Foundation Course – the intention is to focus on principles, not on subjects. The challenge on the Foundation course is to find the right activities to illustrate the PRINCIPLES of Outdoor learning (using their bodies, communication, drama, etc)
• We need also activities for older children as examples
• Subject Course: Some analyzes of the activities from the National Curriculum would be a good idea. That the students analyze the activities relating to their OWN national Curriculum.
• Doing this as a summer course would mean that it is not possible to make a school visit. This was a very highly rated activity by the students so that would be a shame to exclude. The lessons with children would also be difficult.
• Evaluation shows, that many students have different opinions about what is good and what is least useful. It is connected very much to their former experience in the field. They misunderstood their task as evaluators of the Course – they only evaluate their OWN experience, not the course as a whole.
• The indoor lessons at the international course were low rated (maybe language problems? Maybe the time of the course?)
• Maybe too much running from one activity to another in some of the courses, and not enough time for reflection – having a course leader following the students all the time would give room for this.
• A booklet for all students - for instance with reflection tools glued inside could be helpful.
• Best practice – we have so many best practises, but please: WRITE THEM DOWN! Also small activities
• There must be a Course Leader that is visible and have to be there most of the time (was missing in Estonia). Sweden: problem with rules and “rest time”. So: we start together, we finish together and we obey the rules.
• Reflection models must be the same
• The lecturers and the teachers of the courses MUST be good in English, things get “lost in translation”. This must be a demand for the Courses

Texts and literature:
More texts could make a better link between theory and practise, we propose:
• Dahlgren book
• Arne’s article from the manual
• First 3 chapters of the Hammermann book

International evening:
International evening, were all the students bring something from their homeland is a very good idea. That is: Before they come, the students should know that they should bring something from their own country to an “International evening”.
Tiredness:
The students get very tired during the week, they fell asleep early and were too tired to really profit from the last days of the course. Maybe the Comenius Course should have one day off in the middle of the course – eventually spending the time preparing themselves for the next day. One way of doing it could be to arrange a day with a lighter program. Or maybe a day in between the first and the second week.

Time of the year:
September is the best month because of the weather.

Conclusions

- Information about the demands of the course (proper clothes, English language) must be send to the students before the course
- Lecturers and to some extend students must speak proper English
- Information and intentions of the Course and activities must be very clear before starting the course
- More literature should be used
- Only minor changes in the program after arrival can be accepted
- There must be a clear red thread and a clear leader or two teachers following the course
Students’ 1st Evaluation of the 1st Test run – Foundation Course
Project OUTLiNES –
Outdoor Learning in Elementary School –
from Grass root to Curriculum in Teacher Education

**Experts’ remarks:**

The students generally feel and explain a great satisfaction with this course. They especially points towards:

- The connection between theory and practise, that they actually DO things themselves
- The sleep over in nature
- They now all feel comfortable in using the landscape as a learning environment
- The intensity

What could be developed is:

- More time for reflection

This course would, as is the intention, be enriched by students actually living together during the course.

**Evaluation Form**

Student evaluation of the 1st Test run of the Foundation Course
Project OUTLiNES

Please keep in mind that YOUR opinion and recommendations are essential to this project and its development, so please take your time to think it through and answer all the questions carefully. We need your help to make the course even better.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>School visit</td>
<td>Drama, Storytelling, Open/closed tasks</td>
<td>Sleep over in nature</td>
<td>OL in Urban Surroundings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory about Outdoor learning</td>
<td>Visiting factory</td>
<td>Visit of ranger Trip to the lake</td>
<td>Students trail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical tasks, Teachers role, Theory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

82
### Instructions to filling out the form:
Please answer every question with a written answer and also with a cross in the box with numbers.
The scale goes from 1 – 5 where:
A number 5 means: Very well
A number 1 means: Very bad

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reflection</th>
<th>Reflection</th>
<th>Sleep over in nature</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. Have your expectations been met?  

- It has been a super educational course, but different (in a positive way) of what I expected  
- Yes, indeed. Many good experiences and a lot of learning  
- Open mind so expectations is goos and instructive  
- My expectations to the course was to get knowledge that could be used in my new subject “Science”. As Im not started yet, I don’t know if this is realised, but I learned SO much about nature and myself. I learned a way to educate, that I didn’t knew. Things, that I for sure will have great use of as teacher. In my opinion this course should be compulsory.

2. How did you experience the workload of the Course?

   - To less
   - Literature?
     - Fine
     - Not time enough to read it
   - Practice?
     - Nice to try it by yourself, maybe more theory
     - A educational day at the folk-school
   - Enough time for reflection / absorption?
     - Very intensive, some days I didn’t get to write reflected log, and I think that is very important when its so intensive. Maybe bringing a log around all of the time ?
     - There was not enough time for reflection during the course – it has been homework
     - Ys – but not too much
   - Enough discussions?
     - OK
     - Everything has been good, but I missed the debate. To get people to get an attitude to and reflect upon what they have read or been told
     - It has been difficult to get to the log every day
     - I did not read everything, but I could hadle it. The practical work has been introduced as “games” and has not been a burden. I missed some discussion about “Outdoor learning” – it could be nice if some were negative about it.
     - No, but I was away for a couple of hours, maybe

3. Timetable – see the timetable above.
• Good change between theory and practise
• Eventually could the raku lesson been moved, we were very tired
• Maybe too much. Missed time to absorption and reflection
• An intensive course, without any waste of time. Very good put together

• Which session(s) did you find most useful?
• The sleep-over in nature
• Sleep over in nature. It was good to meet the nature “face to face”. Good thread (connection)
• Our trip to “Moselyst” (Sleep over) was very fruitful and contained many exciting elements
• Theory about outdoor learning, because my picture of Outdoor learning didn’t have so many dimensions (others than education in nature)
• The connection between theory and practis
• Its has been very useful were you saw/experienced the subjects by yourself in outdoor school – what activities you can do with the pupils
• Most. It has been a good combination of theory and practise, and to explore ones own learning processes in the different initiatives.
• The sleep-over and the things connected to it, the fish farming, to kill fish, the ranger visit, to fish in the pond and plants at the shore was some of the most profitable. Because these things have my interest, and I (we9 were in a good flow

Why?

• Which session(s) did you find least useful?
• Why?
• Everything has been important in this connection (coherence ?)
• Very subjective (personal)
• None
• The connections (coherence) in the course has been so important, so it is difficult to take something out.
• ?
• Raku work Tuesday afternoon was hard, that was a bad place. Tuesday morning, investigating the pond was ill-timed, no real introduction .. but of course we were tired….
• Rakusession – missed motivation after the sleepover trip, was filled up with impressions (poor teacher)
• Visiting factory was the less profitable for me, but anyway relevant – because I have been in crafts apprenticeship

• Were any elements missing from the course?
• Time !
• Debate, fantasy, more facts about nature, eventually in paper form.
• It is a good idea if you hand copies of the overheads out, because you have to write down so much during the lessons – gives more attention in the learning situation
• Nothing
• I missed things for the pupils in older grades – it can’t be impossible to make outdoor education with them.
• Time to absorption, but I have felt “High” after every day and my motivation for the next day has been in top
• No, nothing of the scheduled missed. Urban surroundings was only in theory, but nothing else missed

4. Learning effects

I didn’t get to read so much as I intended to do

• What did you learn during the course? Keeping 3 criteria from “Aims” in mind: experience, knowledge of, insight in?
• That children learn by many ways. That the cross-curricular component is important. That you learn better if you can see things in their context
• That nature is a good frame for education. Knowledge builds on action – not to be scared to DO it
• The importance of a coherently education. Got my “Outdoor learning” concept extended.
• To feel the meaning of movement in the learning process by yourself
• As teacher I have learned how important outdoor learning is, in relation to the pupils different learning styles and movement/exercise in the subjects. It is an exciting thought that a school had all lessons outside, if they were not better inside. “Better less than more” and “present things nice”
• Many ways of learning – the use of all senses as tool in the learning process
• I got insight in principles of outdoor learning and working methods (theory). Trying the different things (killing fish, be alone in the dark) I got experience

• Do you now feel more comfortable using the landscape as a learning environment?
  • YES!
  • Yes
  • The course has given me “blood on the teeth” and I have got courage and desire to work more in this field.
  • Yes!
  • Yes
  • Yes, sure
  • Yes, indeed
  • Yes, I have found many possibilities that I wouldn’t even dream of using before the course.

6. Please add any other comments here
• This Course should be compulsory for all teacher students. It would be an “eyeopener” for everybody
A little tired of all the foreign literature. Would like if all participants were living at the place. Use of ressourcepersons is genius.

It has been a very inspiring course with high level. The planning has been in top and there has been many exciting angles in the programme..

That Karen has been around, also when other teachers had lessons, has meant a lot for the coherence and our learning process.

Good to go by bicycle, to walk, to feel, to listen, to try. Its hard to explain, but I feel enriched. It has given me inclination to change and develop ... yes, it has been SO good.

Good course, which should be compulsory. All teachers could use elements from it.

Always good to get into nature for strengthens and train the motor coordination.

It is a very intensive course, and there misses time to do the tasks. Many has a long transportation, so time for tasks is missing.

Thank you for helping us developing an even better course
Students’ 3+delta Evaluation of the 1st Test run – Foundation Course and Subject Course

Denmark, 2007

Project OUTLiNES – Outdoor Learning in Elementary School – from Grass root to Curriculum in Teacher Education

This evaluation was carried out at the last day of the subject course, and evaluated both testrun weeks.

Each student wrote 3 things that was good with the course, and one that needs refinement, on yellow “post it” slips.

After that, there was a brief common discussion.

3 good things:

- Learning to use the outdoor room in education with concrete examples
- Community and co-operation
- Theory and practise
- To have many different teachers with different competences
- Intensivity instead of divided
- That the participants (students) have many different competences
- Challenge
- Co-operation
- Content
- That the course was so intense
- That theory and practise was so nice fittet together
- That we were challenged
- That children learn in many ways
- Nice to learn things the same way as we have to educate
- GENERALLY GOOD
- The importance of excursions and use of resource persons
• More education methods
• Focus on the “different”
• To go beyond own borders
• To be in a good team
• Learnt a lot – theory – practical – subject oriented

Deltas (what could be refined):

• To less time, the course needs time for gather together
• That the course should be placed a week before (eg in the summer holiday) so that it wont collide with other activities
• To get time for everything in a good way
• TIME to less time for reflection
• Some places there was to less connection between theory and practise
• Better coordination – get the students together

Common discussion:

After the discussion with the students, we agreed in these most important conclusions:

There was to less time for reflection – the reflection scheme should be used more together in the group and together with the lecturer.

But – it was also very nice and good with the intense course.

Could it be a Summer Course?

Important is:

• The intense course
• Many resource persons
• Co-operation
• Nice with one experts following the whole course (red line)
• challenges
The second test where done 6 weeks after the course finished. The students had the scheme send by mail, with a letter, saying thank you for the course and reminding them, that they wouldn’t get the course certificate unless they delivered the scheme. All students answered.

There were several interesting point differing from the first evaluation:

1. The answers was much longer, they did write a lot more words than the first evaluation.
2. The students didn’t complain as much as before about to less time to reflect in
3. The answers was generally more positive than in the first evaluation

Trying to analyze this, it could be:

1. Sitting home, writing at your own pc and whenever you like it meens that you write more. Maybe the students was also less tired.
2. The students have had time to let all the impressions “settle”, and the after-course reflection time has meant a lot for them. They have also done the “small written task” in between, and maybe these reflections, connected to the written task, has meant something for their reflection process.
3. Even than the answers in the first evaluation was very positive, they were even happier with the course after 6 weeks. Maybe returning to regular “Chair-based” education at the university makes the activity during the outdoor learning course stand in a bright light for the students.

Concluding in this:

1. The evalutions should be filled out at home
2. The “short written task” provides better reflections
3. This course really makes a difference for the students

January 2008, Karen Barfod
Attachment 6: example of original evaluation from one student, international (second) test run in Denmark (Swedish student)

Students’ 2nd Evaluation of the 2nd Test run

Project OUTLiNES –
Outdoor Learning in Elementary School –
from Grass root to Curriculum in Teacher Education

The Aim of the evaluation is to develop and refine the Foundation Course in Outdoor Learning as a part of the European project “OUTLiNES”.

Several steps of evaluation and refinement of the Course will be taken during and after the 2. test run:

- Foundation Course, second test run, daily reflections
- Second test run, students’ first evaluation
- Second test run, lecturers’ evaluation
- Second test run, students’ second evaluation (after 6-8 weeks)
- Second refinement of the Foundation Course

The students’ will participate in the following parts of the evaluation:

- Daily reflections
- Filling out an evaluation form immediately after the test run
- Filling out an evaluation form app 4 weeks after the test run (by e-mail). This will be sent together with a “short written task”.

Please answer the evaluation form keeping the following in your mind:
Did you get experience…?
Did you get knowledge of…?
Did you get insight in…?
### Evaluation Form

**Students 2\textsuperscript{nd} evaluation of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} Test run**

**Project OUTLiNES**

Please keep in mind that YOUR opinion and recommendations are essential to this project and its development, so please take your time to think it through and answer all the questions carefully. We need your help to make the course even better.

### Instructions to filling out the form:

Please answer every question with a written answer and also with a cross in the box with numbers. The scale goes from 1 – 5 where:

- A number 5 means: Very well
- A number 1 means: Very bad

#### 2. Have your expectations been met?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>X</th>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Why ?**

At first, I didn’t quite know what to expect. After the first week, I did have expectations for the subject course. I think I thought that the art would be more combined with reflections in group about how to use it in daily work, and also how to combine art with other school subjects as language or maths.

#### 2. How did you experience the workload of the Course as a whole?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Too less</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>X</th>
<th></th>
<th>Too much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was a lot to do, in little time. But it was good! We got a lot of experiences. Important to get the time between the different things and projects, to be able to go into the classroom, in group go through what we had done, and write in the logbooks. Cooking mushrooms session should have been in the morning instead of in the afternoon, and maybe not the same day as city excursion. It could have been nice to get some more time in the afternoon after visiting the town, to be able to discover another town in Denmark as part of the trip was visiting another country and culture, which could be seen as outdoor learning.

- Literature?
- Practice?
- Enough time for reflection / absorption?
- Enough discussions?

Timetable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Which session(s) did you find most useful?

Why?
The visit to the school the first week, when we could see teachers working outdoors and seeing different teacher styles. Also interesting to see a small Danish school!

Trying language and maths outdoors was also good, plus to write about it in the log book. I got very fond of the A B C-practise where we had to find items to match each letter in the alphabet. It’s interesting how that got us to work, think and be creative. It’s also nice that yo can use it to discover grammar etc.

Visiting a town and an art museum was good, but I would have liked to make the visit longer, so that we could have gotten more time to walk around in the town, drawing and discovering the architecture, maybe it would have been good to walk around in group, to stop at certain places and draw together.

- Which session(s) did you find least useful?

Why?

- Were any elements missing from the course?
I would have liked to see more about fotography and how to make good documentation for portfolios etc. At the museum we learned a little about how to make “comments about art” with foto. It would have been interesting to make a longer session about this, maybe removing some other element (i’m not sure which).

In the art and handcraft class, it could also have been nice to make a big “collage” about the course. This could have been a way of using art to reflect upon our experiences and present what we learned. For me, the log book became a kind of “art-work”. Maybe it could be a nice idea to use this and make some sort of exposition about the course, this way combining art with outdoor learning. But maybe a project like that would be too much indoor-working.

4. Learning effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- What did you learn during the course? Keeping the 3 criteria from “Aims” in mind: experience, knowledge of, insight in?

I got insight in how you can use all senses and be less abstract in learning.

- Do you now feel more comfortable using the landscape as a learning environment?

yes
6. Please add any other comments here

I heard saying that next year there would be no students from the host country. I think that this would be a pity, because if you visit a country you want to know more about it. Thanks to the Danish students, we could discuss similarities and differences between our country and Denmark. It was important that they were in the group, they gave us deeper insight in what Denmark is like. If we had had only a “Danish evening” for example, I think it would have been hard to enter the same discussions about education and so on. Being members of the same group made it easier to connect, in one night we would not have had time to do that.

Another important thing is that there were difficulties in communication, some of the students seemed to have very poor English understanding and this made it hard to have deep discussions. Of course, it is also interesting to see that you can make friends and have fun even though verbal communication is difficult, but sometimes I think that the problem with the language led to misunderstandings and maybe frustration at occasions.

Thank you for helping us developing an even better course
Compiled Student evaluation of the 2nd Test run of the 
Foundation Course and Subject Course in Latvia 
Project OUTLiNES

The scale goes from 1 – 5 where: 
A number 5 means: Very well 
A number 1 means: Very bad

1. Why did you apply for this Course?
Wanted to learn something else then we do in my country.
To see different cultures, to learn more about music education in Latvia.
Have new friends.
To gain new experience.
To learn some “fresh” ideas how to teach.
To do something interesting.
To learn something more, to get extra knowledge about Outdoor education, music and teaching.
I did not have knowledge and experience with outdoor education and I wanted to get to know it.
I wanted to know how to combine outdoor education and music.

2. Have your expectations been met?  
No | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Yes

Foundation Course

Number 5, 2, 17%
Number 4, 4, 33%

Why?
I thought it would be more music, but I was surprised that we had so much outdoor. I am now positive surprised about that I experienced Latvian music.
I learned many new things and I met interesting people.
I got some new ideas, but not all of them were connected with my speciality, so I could not use all of them.
It was good but maybe something was missing for my heart to be completely happy.
My expectations were met.
I have learned a lot of ideas how to teach in nature.
I have experience with working in outdoor environment so I did not gain very much completely new ideas.

I have seen how pre-school in Latvia use games and music to learn and use it in everyday life.

I would love to have more examples of “small” activities to use in school – more “small” exercises in one day, now it was a little bit more of “big” activities.
2. Have your expectations been met?  
Subject Course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Why?
I learned dances, songs, making instruments. What I miss is - how to use the experience I got from bicycle trip.
I learned many new things and I met interesting people.
I got new interesting ideas how to teach and it’s not just about my speciality.
My expectations were met.
I have experience with working in outdoor environment but I got new ideas (with music).
I was a little surprised because school told me that all of the students will be music students and everything is going to be about music.
Maybe it was too much to concentrate on folklore (dances, masks, instruments). I enjoyed it but still it was too much I think.

Expert and lecturer comment: we have to balance the content for national students and foreign students, because not everything is usable for all of them – folklore etc. We have to work more on concrete examples for different age of pupils.

3. How did you experience:
3.1. the workload of the Course as a whole?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Too less</th>
<th>Appropriate</th>
<th>Too much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It would have been fun to have some more free time to see Latvia on our own.
How did you experience the workload of the Course as a whole?

- Too less: 2, 17%
- Appropriate: 9, 75%
- Too much: 1, 8%

Expert and lecturer comment: It has to be discussed to extend the length of the course to have one extra day free in between the foundation course and subject course. It is too intensive for students to “stay” in that rhythm of the course for 10 days.

3.2. Literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Was not necessary</th>
<th>Too less</th>
<th>Appropriate</th>
<th>Too much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How did you experience the amount of literature of the Course as a whole?

- Too less: 2, 17%
- Appropriate: 9, 75%
- Too much: 1, 8%

Expert and lecturer comment: this is the question where we could find the difference between the 1st evaluation and the 2nd one – when students came home to prepare the short written task where they were asked to base their opinion on some theories – they realised that they miss some information and they need more theoretical materials to complete the task. If we compare to national test-run – there were just few resources available in our library of Academy on subject “outdoor education”, now we have bought more books on this theme.

3.3. Materials and equipment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Was not necessary</th>
<th>Too less</th>
<th>Appropriate</th>
<th>Too much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sleeping bags…
**How did you experience the amount of materials and equipment of the Course as a whole?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Too less</th>
<th>Appropriate</th>
<th>Too much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>1, 8%</td>
<td>9, 75%</td>
<td>2, 17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expert and lecturer comment:** students were asked to bring all the necessary equipment with them (sleeping bags, water-proof clothes etc.), but as some of them received this information too late, they did not have enough time to prepare accordingly. But still – we solved the situation – students were provided with sleeping mattresses.

### 3.4. Practice?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Too less</th>
<th>Appropriate</th>
<th>Too much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expert and lecturer comment:** we think this is a good indicator if most of the students (84 %) think that course was not theoretical and they gained practical experience. For those who had outdoor experience before – it could be more but for some of them (those – without outdoor education experience) it was too much.
3.5. Enough time for reflection / absorption?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time perception</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Too less</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expert and lecturer comment: we agree on that it is always good to spend more time on discussions in pairs and groups, so we are satisfied to spend last day of the course on specifically organised activities to “open up” students for reflection.

3.6. Enough discussions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time perception</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Too less</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Timetable – see the timetable above

Timetable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3, 25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6, 50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3, 25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Expert and lecturer comment: if we compare to national test-run: results are better for international test-run. The reason is – students who were participating in international course were more oriented for this course as some extra-ordinary experience – as a project with its own “life”, but for national test-run the course was included as a part of study process. Students who were having other kind of activities during those 2 weeks and were forced to give –up their everyday’s plans (choir attending, orchestra rehearsal etc.). And the other reason is: we did some good changes for planning after first experience on national test-run.

4.1. Which session(s) did you find most useful (see timetable)?

Foundation Course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday, 27.10.08</th>
<th>Tuesday, 28.10.08</th>
<th>Wednesday, 29.10.08</th>
<th>Thursday, 30.10.08</th>
<th>Friday, 31.10.08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>Rooms in outdoor learning. Visiting a Zoo - 1</td>
<td>School visit*</td>
<td>Morning exercises</td>
<td>Rooms in outdoor learning: cultural institutions. Visiting churches - 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Ice-breakers” - 1</td>
<td>Reflection and logs. Work on Diary</td>
<td>Going on trip by bicycles - 4</td>
<td>Visiting Sigulda. Activities outdoors in nearby environment - 5</td>
<td>Organ music at church festivities. Playing organ - 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor learning. Theory in practice. Indoor lecture + “Building the Team” activities - 1</td>
<td>Folk dance evening. Live folk music. Learning to dance folk dances - 3</td>
<td>Settlement, sleepover Story time, presenting country, songs to get asleep, etc. Exercises to use senses in darkness.</td>
<td>Reflection and logs. Work on Diary</td>
<td>Visiting Mežakaķis Adventure Park. Climbing, creeping, sneaking, balancing etc. - 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection and logs. Work on Diary</td>
<td>Reflection and logs Work on Diary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Work on Diary. Reflection sheets – summing up.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Put into practice on 03.11.2008 because of the holidays at schools in Latvia

Why?

Adventure park – 4 (to use the body)
Ride by bicycle to Sigulda - because we learned how to be a team, I like travelling - 4
National dances, because I could use it in practice - 3,  
Songs, because I could use it in practice.  
Visiting churches - 1  
Playing organ - 2  
Doing activities in nature in Sigulda - 5  
Music sessions, because I am going to be a music teacher.  
“Ice-breakers” and “Building a team” activities – because it was useful to get to know each other.  
It was a good way to do it.  
Visiting Zoo with activities (methodology).

**Expert and lecturer comment:** we think this is a good result to see that all of the most basic activities included in the content of the foundation course were appreciated by students. It is interesting that there are always activities that some of the participants count as the most useful and some students – the least useful – as it is happened with the bicycle trip. But we agree that this is a part that depends so much on the weather that it is better to adapt it for the participants that are not so well prepared physically.

**Subject Course**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Saturday, 01.11.08</th>
<th>Sunday, 02.11.08</th>
<th>Monday, 03.11.08</th>
<th>Tuesday, 04.11.08</th>
<th>Wednesday, 05.11.08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Visiting Museum of Music instruments.  
Watching a video film  - 1 | House for Children. Let’s sing songs and play games for St.Martin’s day Celebration - 1 | Visiting Pre-school education institution - 1 | Playing out St.Martin’s day Celebration, integrating traditional and modern aspects (Plays, games, songs, accompanied with self-made music instruments, food, etc.) - 2 | Organised activities promoting reflection, self-evaluation |
| Traditional folk music as pedagogical instrument in the context of Outdoor Education.  
Theory + doing folk songs and dances - 2 | Making the Scenario for St.Martin’s day Celebration  
Methodology for 6-12 years old pupils - 2 | Preparing masks, costumes for St.Martin’s celebration - 2 | Reflection. Self-Evaluation. Summing-up. Conclusions. Evaluation sheets to evaluate the subject course |  |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional folk music and popular music. Cross-points. Theory + doing jazz improvisations and rhythmical exercises - 3</th>
<th>Making music instruments. Combining experience gained on Saturday with freshly made music instruments - 5</th>
<th>Reflection and logs Work on Diary</th>
<th>Reflection and logs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reflection and logs. Work on Diary</td>
<td>Reflection and logs. Work on Diary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Why?

*Games, dancing, folklore - 2  
Making instruments. It was a really personal exercise which I think is usable to make pupils more interested in music and instruments – 5  
Combining things we learned before – playing out St. Martin’s day - 2  
Doing Jazz improvisation – 3  
Museum of instruments  
“House of children” – because this is something useful for music teacher to know about.  
Making masks, instruments, because I can work individually, groups and pairs - 2  
Visiting school – it is always useful.*
4.2. Which session(s) did you find least useful (see timetable)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday, 27.10.08</th>
<th>Tuesday, 28.10.08</th>
<th>Wednesday, 29.10.08</th>
<th>Thursday, 30.10.08</th>
<th>Friday, 31.10.08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start-up</td>
<td>Rooms in outdoor learning. Visiting a Zoo.</td>
<td>School visit*</td>
<td>Morning exercises</td>
<td>Rooms in outdoor learning; cultural institutions. Visiting churches Work with map - 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“Ice-breakers”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outdoor learning. Theory in practice. Indoor lecture 1 + “Building the Team” activities.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Folk dance evening. Live folk music. Learning to dance folk dances</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reflection and logs. Work on Diary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reflection and logs Work on Diary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Why?**

*Bicycle to Sigulda, too far because we did no have enough time to explore Sigulda – 5
Theory on Outdoor learning
Churches. I learned to use the map but I would like to have a guide to tell about different religions. I have visited those churches before therefore it was a bit boring for me - 4

**Expert and lecturer comment:** And we still see that it is important to spend more time on explaining the purpose and the usefulness of concrete activities. If is not done enough some of very good and useful activities remain misunderstood or undervalued. And we have to take into account that some activities are interesting and “new” for international students but some are too easy or boring for national students. So – we have to differentiate the level of difficulty of the task for each individual.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Saturday, 01.11.08</th>
<th>Sunday, 02.11.08</th>
<th>Monday, 03.11.08</th>
<th>Tuesday, 04.11.08</th>
<th>Wednesday, 05.11.08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visiting Museum of Music instruments. Watching a video film 3</td>
<td>House for Children. Let’s sing songs and play games for St.Martin’s day Celebration</td>
<td>Visiting Pre-school education institution. Rehearsal for St.Martin’s day Celebration 1</td>
<td>Playing out St.Martin’s day Celebration, integrating traditional and modern aspects (Plays, games, songs, accompanied with self-made music instruments, food, etc.)</td>
<td>Organised activities promoting reflection, self-evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional folk music and popular music. Cross-points. Theory + doing jazz</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Making the Scenario for St.Martin’s day Celebration Methodology for 6-12 years old pupils</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional folk music and popular music. Cross-points. Theory + doing jazz</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Making music instruments. Combining experience gained on Saturday with</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Why?
I think that St Martin’s day was little too much. I think it is a good way to learn pupils about their tradition by building up excitement and then playing out the day. I think it was a little bit too much of Latvian folklore. I would have had more information from the other traditions to.
Nothing, this was a good week.
History, because I knew it all (about folklore) – 3
Visiting Museums - 3
Doing Jazz because I can’t sing - 2
Too much rehearsals for St. Martin’s day.
Preparing masks because I don’t see how to use this in Music.
Playing out St. Martin’s day because it was all about to repeat what we did before.

Expert and lecturer comment: that has to be taken into account – not to focus so much on quality of the result (e.g. rehearsals for St. Martin’s day Celebration) but more on process – to introduce them to the principle. For the national test-run pupils were taking part in final Celebration of Easter festivity and students had to be ready to take responsibility to lead the pedagogical process but this was not the case for international test-run, so we could feel more relaxed and to enjoy the activity.

4.3. Were any elements missing from the course?

4.3.1. More practical examples: 6
4.3.2. Better weather: 12
4.3.3. Discussions (reflection) after each activity: 1
4.3.4. More time for activities in pairs / groups: 3
4.3.5. Nothing: 4
4.3.6. Other: more physical activities, more info before we leave, a bit more practice how to make music with instruments made by ourselves

5. Learning effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Learning effects

Low 1 8 3 High

![Foundation Course. Learning Effects]

Number 3, 3, 75%

Number 4, 9, 75%
5.1. What did you learn during the course? Keeping 3 criteria from “Aims” in mind: experience, knowledge of, insight in?

To cooperate and work in international groups.
To dance and use folk music. I learned more about St. Martin’s traditions.
I got to know about my physical abilities (condition).
I learned at Zoo about animal behaviour I did not know before.
I learned that I should take a chance and dare to do things I want to do.
I learned about different cultures and it is important for me.
I learned how to ride a bike.
I gained experience to communicate with people from different countries.
I learned how to integrate content of different kind of subjects.
I learned about new possibilities for learning using outdoor activities.
I learned that I have to study more about traditions and culture of my own country to work with children.
I learned to use theory in practice.
Methodology of Outdoor education.
That music and outdoor learning could be combined.
How to use body and mind.
How to use different study subjects using outdoor.
How to put theory in practice.
What to do in extreme conditions.
How to make a sound out of a wood.
I learned about jazz – sound.
About traditions here in Latvia.
To use more senses when learning, got to know my body by being more active physically.
I got experience with how different things e.g. churches can be useful when you learn your pupils. I have got knowledge of how to use different things in the environment to create a more practical learning. Visits to a church give much more than only read about a church. I have got Insight in how you can work with, and talk about many themes by using the outdoor environment. E.g. When visit a church you can talk about the theme history and of course religion. You can also work with mathematic by let the pupils looking for different shapes in the churches.
I refreshed my English.

5.2. Do you now feel more comfortable using the landscape as a learning environment?
Yes, but still I find it hard to do it as music teacher.
I could use the experience of making music instruments, to use churches and museums for teaching
music theory and practice, so yes, I feel more comfortable.
Yes, but I would not like to do it when it is cold or raining so much.
Yes, and I think it will be hard for me NOT to use it!
Yes, this is a good experience.
Yes and I will use nature more in my teaching.
Yes, a little bit.
Yes and I think that landscape helps to explain some things more easily than during the lessons in
classrooms.
Yes and I think that’s easy way how to teach children something new using his/her head, heart and
hands. 3H!!!
Yes and I will use it my teaching. Besides music also - sports, history etc.
Yes, now I have many examples of how to use different kind of environments in my teaching.
Yes, because I have more theory to rely on and also some practical exercises to use for outdoor
learning.
I feel much more comfortable but I have still more to learn. But I have got a lot of good examples I
am going to use in the future.

6. Please add any other comments here
I love this project and I am sad it’s over.
It was a very good course and I hope others will get the same chance to participate.
We have to think more about safety when cycling.
Students taking part in this course should be with at least some pedagogical experience
Idea about that kind of course is great!
It was a good experience but I also got very tired.
Maybe cycling for such a long way is not necessary.
Although I came to learn more about teaching music, I learned more useful things to do in everyday
life.
I think this was a good course and it was useful for me.
I did not have enough information early enough before I came here so I was not well prepared
(clothes etc.), but still course was very useful for me and I learned a lot.
I liked this course but the communication before this course was not good enough, it came too late.

Expert and lecturer comment: we conclude that students gained experience that develops them as
personalities and also as teachers. They admit that they have obtained new ideas, discovered new
possibilities and options to develop the better non-traditional ways to work with pupils to help them
to become many-sided personalities.
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