



Teachers' upskilling aiming at a holistic inclusivity in learning

## D4.1 Finalized Training Curricula through feedback provided



Project Number: 101056515

Agreement Number: 101056515 — TUTOR — ERASMUS-EDU-2021-PEX-TEACH-ACA

<b>Work Package:</b>	4
<b>Type:</b>	R
<b>Dissemination level:</b>	Public
<b>Version:</b>	V1.0
<b>Delivery date:</b>	30.11.2025
<b>Keywords:</b>	Pilot implementation, Curriculum development, Curriculum revision, peer review, internal platform testing, stakeholders' feedback
<b>Abstract:</b>	This document describes the methodological approach for the fine-tuning of the TUTOR Curriculum, upon partners' peer review and participants' feedback.
<b>Authors:</b>	Victoria Topalidi, AKMI Sinead Matson, MU Franziska Steffen, Die Berater Aria Askari and Anna Eisenberger, OJAB Hulusi Karatas, SERGED, Nora Giannakaki, Symplexis
<b>Contact Persons:</b>	Victoria Topalidi, <a href="mailto:topalidi@akmi-international.com">topalidi@akmi-international.com</a> , Thanos Koulos, <a href="mailto:koulos@akmi-international.com">koulos@akmi-international.com</a>

## Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	4
Introduction & Objectives of the Deliverable.....	4
1. Methodological approach for Curriculum Finalization.....	4
Internal Testing & Feedback analysis.....	5
1.4. Participants' Feedback during Pilot Implementation.....	8
3.4.1 : Training Course (synchronous and asynchronous activities).....	8
3.4.2 : Train-the-Trainers.....	10
3.4.3 : Mobility flows.....	11
2. Fine-tuning of TUTOR Course.....	12
2.1. Overview of Initial Training Curricula.....	12
2.2. Finalized Curricula.....	13
3. Lessons learnt.....	14
4. Conclusions and Next Steps.....	16

## Executive Summary

This document outlines the methodology which was designed for the review, digital integration, and pilot testing of the TUTOR Joint Curriculum and the three Specialization Courses. Structured around the partners' collaboration, a systematic peer review process and the collection of participants' feedback in all parts of the pilot implementation, the partnership was able to finetune the TUTOR Course in a way that is truly responsive to the teachers and trainers' needs across the participating countries.

During the development of the training material, a specific focus was granted on their adaptation to the local context which resulted in high-quality training resources, suitable for both local and transnational implementation, which can be now found in the TUTOR e-learning platform.

The refined material will be used for the capitalization phase of the project – as all the material is integrated into the e-learning platform, which will be maintained for at least 5 years after the project end date, the version that is now available on the platform is the final content, approved upon the participants' feedback in the 4 implementing countries.

## Introduction & Objectives of the Deliverable

This deliverable describes the methodological approach which was applied during the development and throughout the implementation of the TUTOR Course, which enabled the finalization of the Curriculum according to partners' peer review findings, the platform tests, local adaptations and, above all, the participants' feedback. Specifically, the analysis of learners' feedback collected during pilot implementation in Ireland, Greece, Austria and Turkey, played a critical role in formulating the final version of the TUTOR Course, modified and enhanced as compared to the initial Curriculum.

Another important element of this deliverable is the analysis of the key lessons learned and recommendations for future application of the TUTOR Course and its transferability to other local or educational settings or future projects on a similar thematic area. As such, the document entails the next steps for sustainability of the Course, including its potential accreditation.

Thus, the main objective of this deliverable is to present the concrete methodology applied by the TUTOR partners for the revision of the TUTOR Curriculum and summarize the feedback collected by the participants in the pilot implementation, which informed the fine-tuning process of the project. The finalized material is the one currently embedded into the MOOC platform, which can be accessed via the link: [\(https://tutor-project.eu/\)](https://tutor-project.eu/).

### 1. Methodological approach for Curriculum Finalization

The methodology applied in the development of the TUTOR Joint Curriculum and the three Specialization Courses followed a structured and collaborative process designed to ensure pedagogical quality, technical consistency, and transnational relevance. The approach was grounded in coordinated planning, systematic peer review, multilingual adaptation, digital integration, and pilot-based refinement and is thoroughly described in the subsequent sections.

For the development phase of the Curriculum, the partnership established a clear framework for collaboration among all organisations involved, focusing on the division of tasks and responsibilities and supported by a peer review process. Reviewers examined both the technical accuracy and pedagogical

quality of the material, using consortium-designed templates to ensure consistency. Revisions were discussed collectively, and final content was approved through consensus. This process has been central to material development and aligned with the overall Quality Assurance strategy of the project.

To support transnational applicability, the entire Curriculum was initially developed in English. This served as a common working basis, facilitating cooperation and enabling a unified quality review. Once the English version was finalised, the material was translated into partner languages and contextualised to national educational realities.

Pilot implementation constituted the final methodological component. In Ireland, one pilot round was conducted, while Greece and Austria implemented two rounds each. These pilots assessed the effectiveness, clarity, and applicability of both the content and the digital learning environment. Feedback from Austria's first pilot led to targeted improvements in course presentation, activities, and user engagement strategies, which were incorporated before the second pilot. In Greece, translation accuracy and language clarity were continuously refined throughout pilot delivery.

The development of the TUTOR Curriculum is aligned with EQAVET. The quality assurance circle for the development of VET Curricula, entails 4 stages: **planning, implementation, evaluation and review.**

- **Planning;** which is applicable to the design process. The coordination of the Curriculum development by WP3 Leader (ASPAITE) and the designation of Specialization Course Leaders, as well as the development of common templates for uniformity reasons among the partnership, corresponds to EQAVET emphasis on defined responsibilities. Also, the co-development of the training material under a joint English version and their subsequent adaptation to the local context considering also the most appropriate training methodologies, provides strong evidence on careful planning of teaching and learning processes, resource allocation and stakeholder involvement
- **Implementation;** which entails the review process and the Course pilot implementation with the participation of the teachers. The distribution of review tasks across partners, the configuration of the e-learning platform and the delivery of the Course at local level aligns with EQAVET's transparent implementation and stakeholders' engagement;
- **Evaluation;** the peer review and internal testing process as well as the collection of participants' feedback align with EQAVET's emphasis on systematic, evidence-based, internal evaluation mechanisms. Also, the pilot implementation in Ireland, Greece, Turkey and Austria, as a form of formative evaluation, allows the consortium to gather data on learner experience, responding to EQAVET's indicators relating to learner feedback, completion and satisfaction.
- **Review;** the adjustments to course content demonstrate the improvement phase of the EQAVET cycle, where evaluation results are used for redesigning or upgrading the quality, responsiveness and user friendliness of the Course

Revising a newly developed Curriculum has a significant impact on teaching and learning methods, and these reforms can be approached through two perspectives: implementation and curriculum reception. The implementation perspective primarily considers whether the educators are capable of developing "high-quality" learning programs that effectively translate the core concepts of the Curricula into practical classroom lessons. This perspective emphasizes the importance of comprehensive and concise Curricula for maintaining consistent standards nationwide.

## Internal Testing & Feedback analysis

### 1.1. Peer review

Under the coordination of ASPAITE, the partners developed the structure and the training material of the Joint Curriculum and the 3 Specialization Courses. ASPAITE conducted a series of bilateral calls with Maynooth

University (lead contributor in the development of the Joint Curriculum) and the 3 Specialization Course Leaders (Sp. Course 1: Die Berater, Sp. Course 2: IGLYO, Sp. Course 3: Symplexis) to ensure that the content of the Introductory Course will be reflected also in the content of the 3 Specialization Courses. The development of the training material took place between May and October 2024.

The Specialization Course Leaders were responsible for coordinating the complete development process of the respective Course, including timeline management, content alignment, and the integration of feedback received. This ensured that comments were systematically collected, consolidated and returned to the lead developer in structured versions.

The entire TUTOR Course Programme was initially developed in English. This ensured a uniformed working basis for all partners and facilitated cooperation across the transnational consortium. On the basis of this shared English version, the material was then translated into the partner languages and contextualised to reflect national requirements.

Following the preparation of the material, the partners conducted a very detailed review process for an additional period of 3 months. The peer review process in the TUTOR project followed a clearly structured, collaborative and division-of-labour approach, ensuring that all course content was reviewed both technically and pedagogically and subsequently finalised by consensus among all partners. Each unit had been assigned to a different organization from the one that developed the material, considering the reviewers' expertise and maintaining the intra-partnership balance.

The review process addressed both **technical** and **pedagogical** dimensions, including:

- accuracy and clarity of content,
- alignment with learning objectives,
- consistency with the Introductory Course,
- adherence to adult learning principles,
- inclusiveness and accessibility considerations,
- terminological and structural coherence

Upon preparation of the initial draft, the designated reviewer provided comments based on a common review template. Revisions were discussed in joint meetings, and the final content was validated through consensus across the consortium. Finally, the lead developer adapted the content as per the reviewer's comments and determined when a unit was ready for release and subsequent translation.

## 1.2. Platform tests

Once the material were finalized at the partnership level, ASPAITE, WP3 Leader, started uploading them into the e-learning platform and conducted a series of internal tests to ensure that the material is properly launched and displayed. These tests were carried out throughout the preparation of the MOOC to ensure technical functionality, usability and coherence across all language versions.

The platform layout was being designed in parallel with the development of the training material. During this initial stage, bilateral calls between AKMI and ASPAITE and several rounds of feedback and reflections among the partnership during the SC meetings, led to the current set-up of the platform, paying particular attention to EU visibility requirements, the open licence and the privacy policy.

Following the completion of the original English version, separate Moodle course copies were created for each partner's language. The partners subsequently provided the translated and contextualised content in their respective languages. ASPAITE then replaced the English material in these copied course shells with the local language content, ensuring consistency in structure, activity formats and technical settings across all

versions.

Before the official launch of the courses in their local context, and with the aim to enhance the course visibility and efficient pilot implementation, Ireland and Austria, while integrating the translated content in the TUTOR common platform, replicated the course to other MOOC platforms. In Ireland, the Maynooth University Moodle Page was used to roll out the programme with the course code OIEOO, supported by the university Moodle services and the TUTOR team. The students who were enrolled onto the Maynooth University Moodle platform, had access to materials, quiz bank and feedback questionnaires as well as to upload spaces, forums, and links to the online classes.

In addition to the project e-learning platform, the Austrian partners established a collaboration with 3 Austrian Universities (University of Graz, University of Salzburg and University of Klagenfurt), embedding the TUTOR Course through their e-learning platform to enhance visibility and outreach to other local audiences (HEI students). The Austrian partners demonstrated a high level of autonomy, proceeding to adaptations in their layout of their course version within the e-learning platform in order to optimize clarity and learner orientation.

For example, the Austrian partners added key introductory and instructional texts directly on the course pages instead of embedding them in downloadable files. Throughout this process, the Austrian partners ensured that these enhancements remained fully coherent with the structure of the original Curriculum version, thereby maintaining alignment across all language variants. In parallel, they conducted technical tests to verify that all activities, media elements and navigation paths functioned correctly in preparation for the pilot phase.

Several platform tests were also conducted upon feedback gathered by the participants during the pilot phase, along with recommendations for content adaptation. These combined efforts ensured that all language versions of the MOOC were technically stable, accessible and aligned with the overall course design. All the above steps have formed the basis for the finalisation of the Curricula.

### 1.3. Local adaptations

One of the most important preparatory phases for efficient pilot implementation in the partner countries, which display great cultural and social diversity and have different educational systems and structures in place, was the adaptation of the Course content and the training process in the local context. The successful adaptation is one of the most decisive factors when it comes to the development of a Curriculum by a transnational team.

As such, the terminology, legal or statistical information, references and examples were adapted to reflect each country's educational system (in the context of teachers' continuous development). Relevant practical scenarios, materials, sources and case studies available in each language were also incorporated. This contextualisation applied to all four language versions.

In Ireland, the research team consulted the university Quality Committee representative and proceeded to additional adaptations to the ones already implemented in the 4 countries. To be more exact, the readings were further adapted to reflect the Irish context and culture. Specialization One (Migrants and Ethnic Minorities) and Specialization Two (LGBTQI+) were not changed substantially other than Irish legislation, policies, and historical context being inserted. However, the Introduction Course and Specialization Three had more adaptations and additional content written in to the existing readings. These adaptations reflect the current context of Irish education in relation to inclusive practice – to provide readings with more depth and specificity for their learning – particularly in reflecting Irish contexts and educational settings in case studies and examples.

The orientation of Specialization Three (Socio-economic Disadvantage) was also adopted to fit current Irish policy and discourse, shifting from a deficit lens to reframe and build on the content (drawing on intersectional and critical disability orientations), while staying true to the programme and course learning outcomes to ensure that the barriers – systems and structures – were highlighted as the challenges for the perceived lack of engagement or regulation on a student's part. This is based on current best practice when teaching about socioeconomic status and disadvantage in Ireland. More theory was inserted to support the practical tools given to the learners as well as localising case studies, legislation, policies, and current provision in Ireland.

#### 1.4. Participants' Feedback during Pilot Implementation

##### 1.4.1: Training Course (synchronous and asynchronous activities)

While in Ireland and Turkey, the partners carried out one pilot round, collecting participants' feedback and adjusting the material accordingly throughout the delivery of the course, the Greek and Austrian partners organized two separate pilot rounds. Feedback from the first pilot round in Austria led to targeted adjustments of the course content, presentation and activities, and these improvements were already implemented for the second round. In

Greece, the material was constantly updated to address grammatical or syntax errors and inconsistencies in the translation process.

##### Greece

In Greece, the pilot implementation was quite successful, with 98,4% of the participants stating they would recommend the Course to others. 90.5% (115 out of 127 who filled in the evaluation questionnaire) reported that the Course improved their ability to implement inclusive teaching practices at their school (scores of 4 or 5). The participants praised the theory-practice connection, with the integration of **self-directed activities, reflective journalling and the Work-Based Learning (WBL) activities**, as, according to their opinions, the program moved beyond abstract concepts to provide usable tools for the classroom.

- **Self-Reflection and Personal Growth:** Many described the program as a "transformative experience" that fostered deep self-reflection on their unconscious biases, teaching practices, and overall educational mindset. This led to a shift from "tolerance" to "active respect and inclusion."
- **Peer Interaction and Community:** The opportunity to exchange experiences, ideas, and best practices with other educators during online synchronous sessions was highlighted as incredibly valuable. This created a supportive professional learning community.
- **Rich and Structured Material:** The training content was consistently described as well-organized, modern, comprehensive, and directly applicable. Specific modules on LGBTQI+ inclusion and Universal Design for Learning (UDL) were mentioned as particularly enlightening.
- **Quality of Trainers and Sessions:** The trainers and the organization of the synchronous online sessions received specific praise for their expertise and effectiveness.

The above results, nonetheless, point to a tangible learning effect and a growing awareness of inclusive pedagogical approaches which is further evident through the comparison between the pre- and post-course evaluation questionnaires.

Participants offered constructive suggestions:

- **Increased Flexibility & Duration:** Many found the schedule intense, requesting a longer program duration or more flexible deadlines to manage the workload alongside professional and personal commitments.
- **More Practical, Greek Context Examples:** A common suggestion was to include more case studies,

videos, and examples directly from the Greek educational reality to make the application even more straightforward.

- **Enhanced Interaction:** Some suggested more structured opportunities for interaction among participants (e.g., smaller group discussions, forums) to further enrich the exchange of experiences.

### *Turkey*

In Turkey, the participants illustrated not only the high quality of the training material but also an increased understanding of Erasmus+ context, requirements and opportunities. As in

Greece, the participants also emphasized the opportunity for self-reflection offered through the Course and the enhanced understanding of inclusive concepts, such as intersectionality, Universal Design for Learning (UDL) and the effects of biases in the teaching process.

On the less favourable elements, some participants suggested that the structure of the Course in the platform and the assignments could have been presented in a way that enhances clarity and consistency. They also mentioned their preference over more interactive learning activities or integrating further perspectives where appropriate. It should be noted that the Specialization Course 2 for the LGBTQI+ learners was not actually implemented in Turkey as the respective topics constitute a very controversial issue -in education or beyond- for the local population.

### *Austria*

In Austria, a significant shift has been noticed between the pre- and post-course questionnaires. After attending the course, the participants reported that they had gained a better understanding of key inclusion concepts — particularly intersectionality, socio- economic factors and their impact to students' performance, and discrimination in educational contexts. The responses provided had shifted from uncertainty to higher levels of confidence, indicating that the course had effectively strengthened teachers' self-perceived competences in dealing with diversity.

Optional forms of learner support, such as mentoring, coaching, or access to digital toolkits, had been mentioned as potentially helpful in facilitating the long-term transfer of course content into teaching practice.

On the other hand, the structure of the course was criticized several times, in particular the clarity of Moodle and the different requirements and coordination between tutors. This feedback must, however, be interpreted considering the technical set-up used by the University of Graz: unlike the TUTOR learning platform, where each course is hosted separately, all Specialisation Courses had been merged into one Moodle course.

Upon the feedback received both in relation to the TUTOR platform and the Moodle platforms of the collaborating universities, targeted improvements were implemented between the first and second pilot rounds. In response to participant feedback:

- additional real-life scenarios drawn from schools and teaching practice were integrated to strengthen the practical relevance of the materials and support the application of inclusive strategies in authentic educational contexts. Some of the existing exercises have also been refined and were made more practice-oriented.
- The three Specialisation Courses were re-examined to ensure that they required a comparable overall workload. This review confirmed that the learning volume across the Specialisation tracks was broadly balanced, and no substantial discrepancies were identified; consequently, no adjustments to the workload distribution were deemed necessary.

- To improve navigation and enhance clarity in the University of Graz Moodle environment, the course structure was further optimised by introducing collapsible sections and a colour-based signposting system, with each Specialisation marked in a distinct colour. This helped reduce scrolling effort and supported better orientation within the unified course shell. This approach was also adopted for the Greek version of the Course.

On both platforms used in Austria, a technical feature for tracking attendance during the webinars was integrated to facilitate more efficient monitoring.

#### *Ireland*

In Ireland, the pilot implementation was carried out for a 10-week period, between May and July 2025. The 128 students were enrolled for a 10-week period onto the platform to allow them access to feedback, materials, quiz bank, upload spaces, forums, and links to the online classes. At the end of the 10 weeks the journals were uploaded and looked over. At the beginning of the new academic year 2025-26, as per university policy, the users were deleted off the system, but the Moodle page remains populated.

#### *1.4.2: Train-the-Trainers*

The Train-the-Trainers (ToT) programme was designed to equip trainers with a comprehensive understanding of the TUTOR course structure, content and pedagogical approach, enabling them to deliver both the Introductory Course and the three Specialisation Courses independently and to a consistently high standard.

In Greece and Turkey, a group of 12 and 10 teachers of secondary level education expressed their interest to participate in the ToT activities, aiming to enhance their mentoring skills and their competence in adult training methodologies, in addition to their attendance of the core course on inclusive education. The main purpose of the ToT was to train this selected group of participants in order to assist their peers throughout the pilot implementation of the TUTOR Course, assume the role of TUTOR Ambassadors or further transmit the knowledge acquired through the attendance of the course in their colleagues or other educators who have not attended the TUTOR Course.

In Austria, the nationally implemented ToT, which brought together 12 teachers, aimed to develop the pedagogical, methodological and technical competences required for effective facilitation, including confident management of webinars and asynchronous tasks, competent use of the Moodle-based learning environment, and the ability to guide diverse learner groups through complex and sensitive topics.

As part of the project's Internationalization Box, the Austrian and Irish partners agreed on a mutual exchange, organizing a transnational ToT in the sidelines of the activity. The bilateral ToT consisted of online preparation, a two-day visit in Austria, and a final two-day visit in Ireland.

Although no formal evaluation was conducted for the bilateral Train-the-Trainers Workshops, the reflections collected after the final two training days in Maynooth provide valuable insights into participants' experiences. Overall, the feedback was very positive, highlighting a strong sense of empowerment, professional growth and international connectedness.

Participants described the in-person visits as intellectually stimulating and personally meaningful, emphasizing that the sessions, particularly those on Universal Design for Learning and anti-bias approaches, deepened their understanding and prompted critical reflection on

their own teaching practice. Several participants noted that, while the density of input was demanding and occasionally overwhelming, the learning environment created by the facilitators was characterized by warmth, expertise and openness, allowing space for both comfort and productive discomfort.

A recurring theme was the appreciation for the cross-country exchange, which helped participants situate their work within a broader European perspective and fostered a strong sense of community among the group. Many described feeling newly motivated and confident to take the TUTOR spirit into their own training work and institutions, viewing the training not as an endpoint but as the beginning of an ongoing professional journey.

A central focus lay in fostering pedagogical coherence through a shared understanding of intersectionality, inclusive language and microaggressions, while simultaneously strengthening self-awareness, reflective practice and critical self-questioning as core professional dispositions. The programme further sought to enhance trainers' capacity to make diversity visible, to represent different lived realities within educational contexts, and to promote inclusion, belonging and wellbeing for learners and teachers alike. In doing so, the ToT ensured role clarity and professional alignment, enabling trainers to act as confident multipliers who are fully familiar with TUTOR's materials, didactic design and quality standards, and who can effectively support their own learners in navigating the programme.

### *1.4.3: Mobility flows*

Across all mobility activities in the TUTOR project, the respondents testified a strong positive learning experience, characterised by increased intercultural awareness, deeper understanding of diversity and inclusion, and valuable professional exchange across national and institutional contexts. In other mobilities participants felt that activities sometimes focused more on conceptual problem descriptions than on practical, directly applicable solutions for everyday teaching. Organisational aspects such as accommodation being spread across different hotels, limited time for breaks and reflection, or inconsistent prior information were highlighted as challenges across several mobility settings. Participants also pointed out occasional language barriers, intercultural misunderstandings, and differing expectations regarding interaction, punctuality, and gender roles.

#### *Greece*

The participants in the Mobility Week in Greece (24-28.06.2025) expressed their satisfaction about the experience that focused on knowledge-sharing and a mix of different activities. One participant congratulated both the sending and hosting organization for the delivery of this activity, underscoring that both organizations ***“did an amazing job and are obviously experts in their field”***.

The less favorable feedback referred to the location of the hotel and some logistical issues experienced by some of the partners. Also, the participants stressed that prior arrangements (agenda, info pack, learning agreements etc) should have been circulated in a more timely manner.

#### *Turkey*

The feedback from the Mobility Week in Turkey (28.06-04.07) was **highly successful**, delivering strong educational, cultural, and professional value. Participants gained practical tools for inclusive teaching, deepened intercultural understanding, and built meaningful connections with peers across Europe. The trainers' competence was rated high (between 4- 5 on a Likert scale) as well as the hosting organization's support and professionalism.

Like in Greece, the primary area needing attention for future implementation is the **quality of accommodation** (some participants reported fly infestation and low hygiene in the rooms), which affected participants' comfort but did not overshadow the overwhelmingly positive experience. Other participants highlighted the need for broader coverage of inclusion topics, such as LGBTQI+ integration in the classroom which remains a challenging topic of discussion in the local context.

### *Austria*

The Austrian Mobility Week (14-18.07.2025) in Vienna was perceived as well organised in terms of training quality and facilitator competence, offering a varied programme that combined workshops with experiential, museum-based and outdoor learning formats. Participants highlighted the rich content, the opportunity to learn from best practices in different countries, and the strong group cohesion that developed during the week.

Similarly, Austrian participants who joined the Austrian mobility from other partner countries described international exchange, exposure to different educational systems, and the reflection on their own teaching practices as highly beneficial. Many emphasised that participation allowed them to broaden their pedagogical perspectives and strengthen their confidence in dealing with diversity in the classroom.

At the same time, feedback revealed recurring areas for improvement. In Vienna, several participants perceived the programme as overly dense and noted that the thematic balance leaned a bit more strongly towards LGBTQI+ topics, with comparatively less focus on migrant learners and socioeconomically disadvantaged students.

### *Ireland*

In Ireland, the mobility activities were held between 28.07-01.08.2025, where the participants highly appreciated the positive attitude, the teamwork and the respect and empathy displayed by the hosting organization and the foreign participants as well.

They admitted having developed an enhanced understanding of cultural diversity (91%), improved language proficiency (82%), gained practical skills (73%) and increased self-confidence (73%). They particularly benefitted from the reflection, critical thinking and anti-bias training approaches in which they were engaged. Among the most positive elements of the mobility, the participants mentioned the visit to a local secondary school as well as the interactive workshops.

Lower satisfaction rates were reported in terms of the available accommodation in the Maynooth University campus and the balance between trainings and leisure time, indicating similar trends with all the previous mobility flows and illustrating the density of the activities.

### *Conclusions*

Through the feedback collected by the participants in the 4 mobility flows, the experience underlines the value of combining experiential learning, intercultural encounters, and reflective practice. Participants across all settings reported an increase in intercultural competence, greater awareness of hidden biases, and strengthened ability to navigate diversity in educational contexts. However, the feedback also indicates that future iterations would benefit from a more balanced and needs-oriented programme design, ensuring that all marginalised student groups topics are represented equally theoretical framing is consistently complemented by practice-oriented strategies. Clearer logistical planning improved preparatory information, and more coherent accommodation and scheduling can further enhance the overall quality of mobility experiences.

Overall, the lessons learnt demonstrate that mobilities are a powerful instrument for professional development in inclusive education. They not only deepen participants' understanding of inclusion and cultural diversity but also foster personal growth, professional networks and long-term motivation to integrate inclusive approaches into teaching practice. At the same time, they highlight the need for continuous refinement in programme design, communication and practical organisation to ensure that learning gains can be fully realised and sustainably transferred into educational contexts.

## 2. Fine-tuning of TUTOR Course

### 2.1. Overview of Initial Training Curricula

The Introductory Course provides general information about the principles of inclusive education (structures and systems, the use of language and its importance, etc.), the impact of values, beliefs, stereotypes and prejudices on the educational process and the inclusion of students from vulnerable groups, reflective thinking as a process of analyzing and evaluating the teacher's thoughts, experiences and actions in order to improve elements of the educational process, etc.

The Specialization Course One elaborates concepts such as ethnicity, race, minority through an interdisciplinary approach and with the aim of intercultural awareness. It dives into intercultural dynamics, language diversity, and the challenges of mobility, integration, and identity. Key topics include:

- Hostile environments and barriers to access.
- Culturally responsive pedagogy.
- Multilingualism, heritage languages, and educational policy.
- Anti-racism education, de-colonial pedagogies, and migrant narratives.

Specialization Course Two focuses on the needs of LGBTQI+ (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans, Queer and Intersex) students, redefining the concepts of sexual orientation, gender identity and expression to reflect the experiential experiences of all individuals. This Course promotes the critical evaluation of school practices, the classroom environment, the educational material and the teaching methods regarding the adequate representation of all gender identities and seeks to raise awareness among teachers about the discriminatory treatment of students due to sexual orientation, gender identity and expression and to train them in effective ways to manage and intervene against school bullying.

Specialization Course Three focuses on the needs of students facing socio-economic difficulties. It highlights concepts such as social and economic barriers and the impact they have on the educational process and the integration of students in the school environment and brings together case studies to better understand the ways in which socio-economic factors shape the daily life of students. It also provides tools and practical advice for developing students' social skills, dealing with procrastination, enhancing effective monitoring, and cultivating empathy.

In its original form, which is also maintained after the fine-tuning, the TUTOR Curriculum follows a modular approach and combines different learning techniques to increase the trainees' interest, provide a certain degree of self-reflection and contribute to the breadth and wealth of the information provided. The training materials were structured in a way that had encompassed 3 gradual phases:

- **Laying the foundation**; this was established through the core material that could be a lecture, a presentation, a combination of text and audio-visual material etc. This foundation also defined the background that was required to develop a skill.
- **Performing self-assessment**; this was implemented through the pre- and post-course questionnaires.
- **Consolidating the knowledge**; this was achieved through self-reflection activities and Work-Based Learning which aspires to transform the theoretical knowledge gained through the course into practice within an educational or professional setting.

### 2.2. Finalized Curricula

In general, the participants in the 4 implementing countries expressed high rates of satisfaction with the curriculum material and course structure. The Irish participants shared a noteworthy comment, noting that

the material (particularly the readings) were of a master's degree standard (along with their recommendation of a longer duration for the programme). As a result, the thematic areas and titles, as well as the Course structure, remained intact with slight modifications being implemented in the content and the training methodologies used in the synchronous classes.

The higher level of adaptation in the Irish context proved to be a successful choice as the local participants praised the relevance of the material with the educational and social context. They appreciated that the tools, materials and examples reflected their own settings and were contextualised which indicated that the adaptations made to the materials to the Irish context before they were given to the learners were appropriate. On the contrary, the lower extent of local contextualization in the Greek course was illustrated as a point for improvement. Also, as far as the Greek course is concerned, some participants underscored sporadic grammatical and syntax errors or translation failures which were corrected straightaway.

The participants in all countries agree that there were other constraints within the Course that they would like to change, emphasizing primarily on the duration and the density of the Programme, which should have been expanded in a greater timeline. As per the partners' decision, the pilot implementation of the Course at national level (with the exception of the Train-the-Trainers' Workshops and the mobilities) had been set between 2,5 and 3 months but the trainees indicated that they needed the course extended within an academic year or semester (higher education institutes) or comprising more flexible elements (VET schools) in order to combine personal and professional responsibilities with the course.

As highlighted above, several targeted improvements were implemented in Austria. Real-life scenarios drawn from school settings were added to increase the relevance of the material, while existing exercises were refined to ensure a stronger practice orientation and clearer application of inclusive strategies. In parallel, the three Specialisation Courses were reviewed to verify that their respective workloads were balanced; this analysis confirmed comparable learning volumes across all tracks, requiring no changes to workload distribution. Finally, the course structure in the University of Graz Moodle environment was optimised through a colour-based system for each Specialisation Course, significantly enhancing navigation and improving learners' attention. This enhanced structure was also adopted for the Greek version of the Course to ensure consistency across platforms.

The face-to-face sessions were also revised to ensure greater methodological variety. Although these aspects had not been explicitly mentioned in the written participant feedback, the trainers from die Berater® and ÖJAB had identified them as important areas for improvement based on their observations during delivery. Two additional organisational elements were therefore incorporated: first, guidance on the responsible use of AI, including expectations regarding students' own contributions, data protection considerations, transparency and referencing; and second, more explicit explanations and examples for implementing the work-based learning component, as the first pilot round had highlighted uncertainties and repeated requests for clarification in this area.

A similar approach was adopted in Greece; between the first and second round of synchronous courses, the use of digital interactive tools was expanded. The trainers transferred the whole course to Slido, in an attempt to enhance participants' interaction and warm them up for a more vivid discussion.

### 3. Lessons learnt

The implementation, piloting and refinement of the TUTOR programme in the partner countries generated a number of clear lessons with relevance for future roll-outs, national adaptations and transnational cooperation. A wealth of comments by the participants allowed us to collect valuable information about the course success and enhancement in the future.

Apparently, the need for Continuous Professional Development and ongoing support to educators for inclusive education is relevant for all countries and extends to the EU level, judging from the overall positive participation and evaluation of the programme, as well as the requests for the establishment of a Teachers' Community of Practice.

Across all parts of the pilot implementation - course delivery, Train-the-Trainers' activities and mobility programmes - the participants illustrated that the learning process was most efficient when theory was closely linked to authentic practice, when reflection was embedded in interactive formats, and when participants had opportunities to engage with real-life examples, case studies and practical classroom tools. In Greece,

While the programme was widely regarded as enriching, relevant and professionally meaningful, the participants consistently expressed the wish for even more explicit practice orientation, particularly through concrete strategies, classroom-ready materials, and more opportunities to transfer inclusive teaching approaches into their own educational settings. This was a cross-cutting element in the pilot course evaluations in all 4 countries and the feedback collected from mobility participants, who highlighted that conceptual input needs to be balanced with actionable methods that support implementation in daily teaching.

The adaptation to the local context was a key factor for the project efficient pilot implementation. For instance, in Ireland the adaptation of the material to the specific context of Irish society and education, which was implemented before the Course is rolled out to the participants upon the recommendation of the Quality Committee representative, ensured that the material resonated with participants who appreciated that the tools, materials and examples reflected their own settings. The critical importance of this point is illustrated by the Greek participants' feedback, who, in contrast with their Irish colleagues, would appreciate a higher degree of material adaptation into the Greek school reality.

As per their feedback, the Irish, Greek and Turkish participants agree that duration and the schedule of the overall Programme was too intense and could be expanded to a broader timeline (for instance, within academic year or semester, including the face-to-face classes who could spread apart). The Greek participants, in particular, emphasized on more flexible deadlines to manage the workload alongside professional and personal commitments.

In Austria, the collaboration with 3 national universities (the University of Graz, the University of Salzburg and the University of Klagenfurt) proved successful and allowed for broad learner participation but it also demonstrated that sustainable integration of the TUTOR programme into university Curricula requires significant planning in advance. Embedding the training into formal study programmes, aligning timelines with academic calendars, define ECTS and grading and ensuring institutional commitment requires long-term agreements and preparation in advance. At the same time, this represents an important opportunity for the TUTOR course to be transferred to other educational contexts. Also, the participants see a high value and potential of the TUTOR Course to become an accredited training programme and rolled out across the countries, as many Greek and Irish participants shared with the partners.

Finally, the feedback collected from the mobilities and Train-the-Trainers workshops in all countries illustrated the importance of creating supportive learning environments that allow for openness, intercultural exchange and deep reflection. Participants consistently reported enhanced self-awareness, increased confidence in handling diversity and a strengthened sense of professional solidarity. Another critical element reflected in the feedback was the teachers' preference over face-to-face or, at least, interactive sessions as group activities and



team building encourages collaboration and mutual understanding and allows for genuine exchange of experience and ideas, which, jointly, enhance the teachers' skills.

At the same time, logistical and organisational challenges, such as programme density, accommodation arrangements, or uneven thematic balance, illustrated the need for thoughtful planning and alignment with participant needs. Although these recommendations had little impact on the participants' overwhelmingly positive experience, these are aspects that need to be considered for future mobility projects – in relation to participants' expectations and cultural characteristics which may indicate the need for more thorough pre- departure information before the mobility occurs.

Collectively, the lessons learnt by the TUTOR Course implementation reaffirm that inclusion- oriented training courses benefit from well-paced, clearly structured programmes that balance cognitive, emotional and experiential dimensions. At the same time, they identify concrete areas for optimization: stronger practice focus, earlier institutional coordination and continued emphasis on reflective, supportive and high-quality learning environments. These insights provide a robust basis for refining the programme and ensuring its long-term relevance and applicability across diverse educational contexts.

#### 4. Conclusions and Next Steps

This document has outlined the process and results of how we finalized the Curriculum for the TUTOR Course (Joint Curriculum and 3 Specialisation Courses). It gave an overview of the methodology used, internal testing and feedback analysis, finetuning, lesson learnt and next steps.

In the evaluations, the vast majority of the participants gave positive feedback about their engagement with the TUTOR Programme expressing satisfaction with the curriculum materials and course structure. They expressed an eagerness for further engaging further with the programme, with course participants and Train-the-Trainers all keen to engage in a Community of Practice and use training and mobility outcomes in their future practice, as well as further exploring the TUTOR Internationalization Box and wider Erasmus + networks.

Greater inclusion of TUTOR materials in initial teacher education and Continuous Professional Development was also identified as a potential useful pathway, as well as ongoing research projects. Continual engagement with education policymakers and stakeholders through the networks gathered by TUTOR was also identified as important.

The TUTOR e-learning platform will remain available for at least 5 years after the end of the project. Also, the partners will consider the possibility of submitting the Course for accreditation in their competent national authorities, after proceeding to the necessary adaptations so that they can fully meet the respective standards.

As it has been highlighted already above, the pilot implementation of the TUTOR Course has made clear the necessity for similar initiatives within the educational sector where the lack of Continuous Development Programmes in diversity and inclusion or other areas of soft skills is evident.