PPMI

STUDY ON TOOLS AND POLICY POINTERS FOR MAINSTREAMING INNOVATIVE PEDAGOGIES AND SCHOOL ORGANISATION PRACTICES: BARRIERS AND SOLUTIONS

WORKSHOP SUMMARY REPORT: ESTONIA

1. Introduction: description of the workshop's main principles, format and participants (1 p. max)

1.1. Principles and format of the Workshop (0.5 p. max)

The Estonian workshop on mainstreaming innovation in schools took place on March 23 from 2-5pm at Tallinn University. It was organised as part of a larger conference on Universal Design of Learning. Following the morning presentations, the participants had the chance to choose different afternoon workshops. In addition to the specifically invited people from the two innovative schools, the teacher organization, the town counsel representatives of Tartu, the representatives of the Ministry of Education and Research and the Educational Innovation Centre of Tallinn University who had participated in the field study, the access was free to anyone interested. Among the participants were different NGOs that work on issues related to school development, the representatives of the foundation Innove and Archimedes who are responsible for distributing European Union money for various educational programmes and projects, the representative of the educational board of the city of Tallinn and the district of Lääne-Nigula, researchers from the Universities of Tallinn and Tartu along with various school teachers and head teachers from all over Estonia. Together, there were 43 participants.

The structure of the workshop was as follows:

1. Introduction to the workshop and a quick overview of the two case studies and the main findings by the national expert, Maria Erss;
2. presentations of the two case study schools about their innovations, followed by a question round;
3. division of the participants in two groups based on their interest in discussing educational innovations on school level or regional/state level;
4. forming of heterogeneous groups (approx. 6-8 participants per group) and the first group discussion on gathering the past experiences of educational innovation and the main supporters and obstacles to innovation;
5. presenting the findings of the first group discussion as posters to all participants;
6. second group discussion in relatively homogenous groups on how to mainstream innovation in the future;
7. presenting the results in a plenary session with posters;
8. closing.

The entire workshop was video recorded. There were two people leading the group sessions parallelly in different rooms to avoid distractions by the noise and to allow more room to spread out. During the group sessions participants were given handouts with guiding questions and topics on which to focus. For example, the regional and state level innovation group was asked to focus on "tuning" the existing educational programmes, discussing new initiatives, support and coordination of networks, sharing of information and noting and rewarding success stories. The schools were asked to analyse the existing innovations as to their sustainability and evidence-based decision making while taking into account factors such as the teaching and learning paradigm, changes in school leadership, in content, assessment and organisation of learning, teachers' work and the physical environment.

1.2. Description of participants (0.5 p. max)

The participating organisations were named above. Among the participating schools were besides the two case study schools also Lasnamäe Basic School (located in Tallinn), Peetri Kindergarten and Basic School (located in a suburb of Tallinn), Leisi Secondary School (located on Estonia's biggest island Saaremaa), Kõpu Basic School (located in Viljandi county, in the South of Estonia), Väike-Maarja Gymnasium (located in the county of Lääne-Virumaa, in the North of Estonia), Konstantin Päts Open Air School (located in Tallinn and specialises on children with behavioural and emotional issues), Lilleküla Gymnasium (located in Tallinn), Tallinn Technology Gymnasium and Tallinn Pae Gymnasium.
A new school, "Open School" that starts in autumn 2017, was among the participants. This school aims at becoming a community school for children with different ethnic backgrounds in the centre of Tallinn, focusing on foreign languages, mathematics, scientific approach to sciences and social studies and project based learning.
As can be deducted, there was a great variety of schools from all over Estonia that also represent different profiles. Basic schools cover the years 1-9, Secondary schools and gymnasiums usually years 1-12 or in the case of gymnasiums sometimes just the upper secondary school, years 10-12. Among the schools were some who are quite well known innovators, for example Peetri Kindergarten and Basic school while others are still in the beginning of the journey to innovation. Kõpu Basic School is located in a unique environment, situated in a Baltic German manor house which has

been beautifully restored. Inspired by the Italian style architecture and the Pompeii style dining room the school has launched a project of restoring an Italian herb and flower garden and opening a museum. Further, the school is combining art, history, art history and cooking lessons in a project focused on Italian and Antique heritage offering educational programmes for students, visitors and community members.

2. Discussion of the field study results: participants' feedback on the findings

Summary of the participants' feedback (1 p. max)

The participants agreed with most barriers and enablers for mainstreaming innovation in schools found during the field study, **except with the opinion of one of the case study schools that schools needed more autonomy**. Estonian schools already have, in international comparison, a higher degree of autonomy which is expressed in school based curriculum development, the right to allocate the resources as school leaders see fit, the right of schools to choose their own staff and a high degree of teacher autonomy. The problem with autonomy is, as explained by representatives of municipalities, that it depends on the school leadership whether they use it for developing innovative practices or maintaining the status quo. Greater autonomy results in eclectic developments: where there is a strong school leadership things are well but where not, there are problems. Therefore, more autonomy does not necessarily lead to innovations although it can be a motivating factor. There is a need for more capable and innovation oriented school leaders. At the moment, school leaders do not have concretely phrased competence requirements. On the other hand, it was also considered as enriching for the educational landscape if parents had the choice between more traditional and innovative schools. Yet, the view of some schools was that there is still an overregulation of subject syllabi in the national curriculum. This is in contradiction with the modern general part of the curriculum that emphasises general competences.

As **existing positive factors on mainstreaming innovation** on regional or state level the participants mentioned **conferences** organised by universities and NGOs and the national **"Strategy of Lifelong Learning 2020"** along with other framework documents describing the direction of development that schools should aim. A positive development is that the ministry is monitoring the implementation of this strategy yearly while getting input from the studies for policy developments and adaptations. Also the **funding of educational projects from EU** was regarded as positive along with the **initiatives and in-service training offered by educational innovation centres** at the universities which can inspire teachers to try out new practices. It was considered very important that all three sectors, the public sector, business sector and the third sector were involved in developing the national educational strategy document. The **initiative of the ministry, "Interesting school", and the initiatives of the third sector such as "Young people to school" and "Back to school"** were mentioned as good examples of mainstreaming innovation. The participants mentioned additionally the **founding of small innovative community schools**, the **existence of teacher networks** and **functioning information flow through school home pages and social media** as enablers. In addition, larger municipalities in Tallinn and Tartu have launched **support programmes for school leaders**. Another enabler of innovation was, according to one group, the **critical mind set of Estonian educators**. Despite the outstanding results of the PISA tests there is no general sentiment of holding on to the status quo. Instead, education is criticised daily and suggestions are made how to improve it. Another positive is that there is **more public acknowledgement for successful innovators**, both teachers and school leaders now than there used to be.

One group generalised the concrete examples of innovation enablers as follows: **leadership** (school and teacher leadership)**, evidence based decision making, analysis**, teachers as educational engineers and leaders, **teacher education** (both initial and in-service education), purposeful teaching and **cooperation between formal, non-formal and informal education**. The latter includes for example the cooperation between hobby education such as music schools, art schools, sport clubs and general education schools.

On the negative side, the participants mentioned the **fragmentation of networks, conferences and communities**: "Too many, so the focus is lost." There are parallel competing initiatives and events but no coordinated information flow. The **European projects involve too much bureaucracy** whereas the content and form are not in balance. Furthermore, **the projects funded by EU are not sustainable** because they are short-lived: "When the money runs out we'll start the next project," said one school leader. Currently, the money is used in order to spend money without having any long-time strategic developments in mind. Related to innovations, some participants mentioned that the current **underfunding of research** is in contradiction with the goals stated in the lifelong learning document. In addition, the different ministries, notably the ministry of Education and Research and the Ministry of Culture are not fully cooperating. **The lack of cooperation** also concerns the municipalities. The problem is that we live in a competition-based society that does not encourage cooperation. Most innovations happen by accident and last until there are passionate people around but as the **innovations are rarely evidence based or sustainable** they can quickly disappear. Other barriers for innovation are the **insufficient professional competence of teachers** (pedagogy, teaching methods and ICT skills and with the younger generation even subject knowledge) and **fear of failure** as well as **lack of previous experience.**

One concern was expressed regarding the growing number of private schools which are usually established as elementary schools and grow, over the years, to higher levels. The state too easily issues permits for opening new private schools when it is not clear whether these schools are able to function well on higher levels. To sum up, **there is a problem with**

the sustainability of private schools.

3. Success factors and barriers to mainstreaming innovative practices in the national context. Policy recommendations from group discussions (2 p. max)

Designing change in key thematic areas

There were two big thematic groups: 1)Mainstreaming innovation on school level and 2) Mainstreaming innovation on regional/state level. Within each group several thematic subthemes were discussed by different groups. Below, they have been divided into 4 areas.

I. Thematic area – school level: school leadership and teacher leadership

School teachers emphasised as enabling factors mainly the need for support from school leaders as well as the readiness of teachers to leave their comfort zone and plan school work collaboratively. Another important factor for every innovation is, according to the school teams, a common understanding among the staff why anything needs to be changed and how. Vice versa, if teachers do not understand the reasons for change or for whom it is necessary, then no change is possible. Sometimes teachers do not feel the support of the head teacher, therefore they do not see any need for change. Additionally, if there are no examples of new practices it is impossible to mainstream innovation. This finding suggests that new practices need to be modelled first to the staff. A concrete policy suggestion on the school level is that **each innovation should have a core team of teachers or development group who are leading the change and sharing their experiences with others**. Forming these teams is the responsibility of school leaders.

As could be gathered from the group session where school teams shared their experiences with existing innovations, such as integrated subject teaching, many teachers had not thoroughly reflected on the reasons why they were doing it and what should be the result. So the activities were not systematic and the school leader had not freed up any time for development work as part of the regular work time. As a result, these innovations only last as long as the teachers run out of enthusiasm and energy, while doing it on top of their regular work. From this observation can be derived the next policy suggestion: **Developing and planning innovative practices and changes in the instructional system or school culture is a time consuming activity and therefore, the school leaders need to find ways to free up teachers' time for it and reward additionally the efforts of the teacher leaders who do most of the development work. Particularly teacher leaders, also known as master teachers in Estonia, should be given more time for development work** because they also teach other teachers what they know. This is the government's task to guarantee the funding accordingly, for instance that **master teachers can take one year off from regular teaching for development work** which benefits the teacher, the school and maybe the community as well. Currently, Estonian principals have the autonomy to pay bonuses based on merit although the leeway is quite small.
Other suggestions from teachers and school leaders included **exchange programmes and mentoring programmes for school leaders and teachers** to give them external motivation to innovate their practices. Currently, there is a programme "Veni, vidi, vici" (see: http://vvvopilasvahetus.ee/) sponsored by public and private sector which allows students to spend a week or two in another school in Estonia. Yet nothing like that exists for head teachers and teaching staff.

II. Thematic area – teacher education

Schools offered that **teacher educators and student teachers should swap places with experienced teachers during the pedagogical practice of teacher students:** the student teachers and their didactics instructors would spend three months teaching at school and the teachers would spend this time refreshing their knowledge and skills at the university. Futhermore, the concern was expressed that, since Estonia is using the European 3+2 system of teacher education instead of the old 5 years bachelor degrees **the subject knowledge of new teachers has worsened compared to their older colleagues**. Where formerly teachers studied for five years their subject then now it is three years and then they continue with teacher training. A new trend is to become a multiple subject teacher which also limits how deep the subject knowledge can be. "It is the problem of minor subjects and it concerns both, the subject knowledge and didactics," said one teacher educator. The teachers' association representative added that in some foreign languages students are starting their studies from zero level and have to acquire during the two years master's programme a new language which they must be able to teach. The problem lies with teacher education curricula, which have during the last 10 years, reduced the amount of subject knowledge required.
The group that consisted mainly of higher education professionals and municipality and state level education specialists emphasised **the need of looking at teacher education and education as such more broadly than just with a narrow focus on methods and child development**. The recent trend at universities has been towards a "vocationalisation" of teacher education. Whereas, **education and educational innovation should be reflected and interpreted in the**

context of societal and global developments.
The communication on teachers' continuous development programmes should be more effective. Currently teachers think that most programmes are organised as **workshops where they are being lectured to with PowerPoint slides**. Actually, universities are already offering much more varied learning opportunities such as coaching of school development teams. The state should also order from universities more development activities, not just teacher training which is limited in its impact. This is a matter of communication.

III. Thematic area –state level: legislation and national curriculum

At the moment, one obstacle for innovation is too rigid legislation when it comes to innovative assessment practices. For example, the changing learning paradigm described in the life-long learning document requires more individualised and flexible assessment practices including formative assessment. However, the current legislation demands that every school subject should be assessed summatively on the report card by the end of the basic school. In conclusion, **the legislation should support the goals expressed in the long-term strategy for education, not contradict them.**
Regarding the national curriculum the schools suggested that it could include already examples or a model on how to integrate the knowledge of different subjects. At the moment integration of subjects is a requirement stated in the national curriculum but there are no guidelines how to do it or what parts of the curriculum are best suited for it. It is left entirely for teachers to do. **It should be the task of the state to analyse the national curriculum as to the areas of overlap between the subjects.** Teachers should not have to constantly reinvent the wheel.
The task of the state is moreover the communication of an educational vision and values through the curriculum and strategic documents. The vision should also take into account recent global developments, for example reflections on what does it mean for education that we now live in a "post-truth" society? Estonian state should be seen in a broader context regarding the content and goals.
The schools agreed that the national curriculum should prescribe the big goals and learning outcomes but **the content of subject syllabi should be left to schools to decide**. "Half of the content of the current subject syllabi should be removed," summarised one representor of a NGO, so that teacher autonomy would not be stifled by subject programmes.

IV. Thematic area – state and regional level: support, assessment, research and materials

Teachers need some help with **developing assessment tools, in order to make the assessment of learning outcomes more transparent.** The current 5-point assessment system that only offers three positive grades is not adequate. One idea offered by the schools was **to develop on national level for each subject an assessment framework of competences similar to the European Common Framework for Languages**, where each of the six levels (or it could also be more or less) is well defined. This would make grouping of students easier and independent of their age or grade level while offering to students more informative feedback regarding their development needs. This kind of assessment by competence level would give teachers the necessary tools for a proper assessment. Additionally, it can be connected to learning materials. **The state should be responsible for developing learning materials that support student development and measure what needs to be taught.** Specifically, this task of developing a common framework of competence levels could be given to master teachers who should be paid for working half time at school and the other half in the development project during the project. **It should be compensated time, not simply additional work for teachers.**

The need for educational change has to be well-communicated with parents. Furthermore, parents need to be involved with these **educational change projects**. For example municipalities could be helpful as was the case in Tartu with the project "TULUKE" which aimed at improving school culture by engaging the community.
Research institutions and universities should continue to study innovative practices in terms of what exists, what works and who will initiate them. Their input could be used by the government for developing long-term implementation programmes for innovation. Ideally, **every school would have a "critical friend",** an advisor who helps schools with assessing the needs and developing interventions for improvement.
The most important task regionally and on the state level is, according to researchers, municipalities and the representatives of the ministry, teachers' association and other government agencies, that **development work, research and education and training programmes should be combined in a holistic way,** "so the left hand knows what the right hand is doing." **Also the workshops, conferences and events that promote school innovation** organised by universities, the ministry, NGOs or other institutions **could be better coordinated. There should be a centrally coordinated list for this information.** For a while the ministry collected this information, however, they have stopped

doing this collection.
A policy suggestion for funding of innovative projects by the government involved **aiming at more systemic and focused long-term projects which have a clearly stated goal,** for example innovating the concept of mathematics teaching.
Beyond that, **the successful innovation stories should be better communicated in the media**. So far, only a few success stories have reached the public.

4. Steps forward: reflections from participants and the national expert's closing remarks (1 p. max)

Closing remarks: plans for the future

The groups were discussing innovation on different levels. School people (leadership and teachers) along with NGOs tended to reflect on mainstreaming innovation on a more concrete level than representatives of universities and the state. The policy suggestions of schools concerned more often funding of development work, developing assessment tools and learning materials and peer learning between school leaders and teachers. The researchers and policy makers were looking at innovation at a larger scale, being more concerned about global developments, the need for coordination between different institutions and initiatives and the evidence-based decision making regarding development and implementation. However, referring to the experience of one of the case study schools, the university researchers concluded that the nature of true innovation is its surprising character. It may occur in unexpected ways and therefore, innovation can't be standardised as to expected learning outcomes. Moreover, innovation is a process where risks are taken, results are analysed and corrections in the action are taken, if necessary. All people present summarised that Estonian education is actually very good and many positive initiatives have already been started.
Concrete steps of action for universities include a better communication of their school development offers, for schools more evidence-based decision making and better reflection on the goals, and for the state constant monitoring of the processes along with adaption of policies and legislation to the needs. The role of municipalities was not much discussed as their capacities depend on their size and resources, yet larger municipalities have launched several support programmes for school leaders, teachers, parents and the community.
In my view, schools in Estonia represent, along with their leaders and staff, different views on pedagogy and learning. In a democratic society this is normal, as is normal that there are different political parties and different ideologies. There are some schools that insist on continuing using traditional methods with varying success rate. Some have been very successful in doing it since they have managed to attract the best students and teachers. As long as parents and students are satisfied they will not change. There is nothing wrong with keeping the best of the old practices. However, I believe that the majority of schools see the need to develop and adjust their practices to the changing needs and expectations of the students, parents and society. But, innovation takes time and needs support and resources. Many schools are already experimenting with new forms of teaching and learning. Yet, there is a lot of uncertainty regarding which innovations are most useful and how to make them sustainable. And this is where research institutions have to step in. Currently, the Educational Innovation Centres of Tallinn University and of the University of Tartu have started collecting, evaluating and mainstreaming the best pedagogical and organisational practices.

5. Annexes

Annex 1. Photos/visuals/PPT/ Discussion Paper/Agenda/Participants' List/Other documents

Annex 1: Photos from the workshop

Annex 2: Discussion paper in Estonian

Lühikokkuvõte juhtumiuuringutest

(Maria Erss, Tallinna Ülikooli Haridusinnovatsiooni Keskuse uurija ja kasvatusteaduste lektor)

Oktoobris ja novembris 2016 viidi Euroopa Komisjoni kooliuuenduse levitamise projekti raames (Study on Tools and Policy Pointers for Mainstreaming Innovative Pedagogies and School Organizational Practices) läbi juhtumiuuring kahes innovaatilises Eesti koolis: Jõgevamaa Gümnaasiumis ja Kiviõli I Keskkoolis. Eelnevalt intervjueeriti innovatsioonipoliitika

kujundajaid ministeeriumi, omavalitsuse, Õpetajate Liidu ja Tallinna Ülikooli Haridusinnovatsioonikeskuse tasemel, et saada sisendit sobivate koolide leidmiseks. Koolid pidid vastavalt ettantud kriteeriumitele asuma sotsiaalselt keerulise taustaga regioonis ja rakendama uudseid praktikaid süstemaatiliselt kogu kooli tasandil.

Juhtumiuuring keskendus uudsete praktikate juurutamisele järgmiste küsimuste vaatevinklist:

- Milliseid uudseid praktikaid kasutatakse nendes koolides ja miks?
- Millised faktorid toetasid uuenduste läbiviimist?
- Millised faktorid takistasid uuendusi?
- Kuivõrd jätkusuutlikud on need uuendused?
- Millised on peamised saavutused uuenduste tagajärjel?
- Kuivõrd tõenduspõhine on uuenduste planeerimis- ja läbiviimisprotsess?
- Missuguseid poliitikasoovitusi võib teha juhtumiuuringute põhjal, kuidas paremini levitada häid praktikaid?

Innovatsiooni definitsioon:

Innovatsioon on süsteemne tegevus, mis on uudne antud kontekstis, kus seda luuakse. See võib hõlmata erinevaid valdkondi, näiteks: õppekava, õpetamis-ja õppimispraktikaid, õppeprotsesside korraldust, enesehindamisvahendite loomist, koolikogukonna loomist jm. Selleks, et saavutada süsteemne muutus, on vajalik samal ajal läbi viia muutused erinevates valdkondades nagu kooli juhtimises, õppe sisus ja õpikäsituses, õppe korralduses, õpetajate töös ja ettevalmistuses ning õppetöö füüsilises keskkonnas.

1. juhtum: Jõgevamaa Gümnaasium

Jõgevamaa Gümnaasium on 2013. aastal loodud riigigümnaasium, kus uue koolina oli võimalik juurutada uut õppesüsteemi. See sisaldab trimestreid, 75-minutilisi tunde, hästi palju vailikaineid, valikainete nädalat, hommikusi konsultatsiooniaegu, iseseisva õppimise päevi, huvihariduse arvestamist formaalhariduse osana, osaliselt lõimitud aineõpet ning üldpädevuste mõõtmist arenguvestlustega. Uuenduste läbiviimist soodustas asjaolu, et tegemist oli uue kooli ja uue juhtkonnaga ning õpetajad olid motiveeritud katsetama uusi asju. Kuna uus kool tekkis gümnaasiumireformi tagajärjel, tekitas see algul linnas pingeid ning kool pidi ennast kahtlejatele tõestama. Uuenduste positiivne tagajärg on õpilaste mõistlik õppekoormus, mis ei koorma neid üle liigsete kodutöödega ning lubab valikainete rohkuse tõttu igal õpilasel areneda ennast huvitaval alal. Seetõttu on õpilaste rahulolu kooliga kõrge. Süsteem on kindlalt paigas ja üldjoontes jätkusuutlik, kuigi valikainete rohkus sõltub ka juhtkonna isiklikest kontaktidest ja läbirääkimisoskustest. Koolis kogutakse regulaarselt tagasisidet õpilastelt ja lapsevanematelt ning kool on osalenud ka mitmetes suuremates rahuloluuuringutes, kus on saavutanud silmapaistvalt häid tulemusi.

2. juhtum: Kiviõli I Keskkool

Kiviõli I Keskkool kujunes keskkooliks 1950. aastal ja on praegu eesti õppekeelega kool, kus on aga ka mõned keelekümblusklassid ja gümnaasiumis õpib osa vene taustaga õpilasi mõningaid aineid vene keeles 60% - 40% süsteemis. Kiviõli Keskkool on juba üle 10 aasta tegelenud ettevõtlikkuse arendamisega ja kuulub ettevõtlike koolide võrgustikku. Ettevõtlikkus koolis väljendub eelkõige aktiivõppe- ja projekõppe meetodites ning lõimitud, elulähedases aineõppes, kus palju pööratakse tähelepanu õpilaste enda initsiatiivi ning vastutuse arendamisele. Õpetajad teevad omavahel tihedat koostööd ja mõned neist õpetavad igapäevaselt tandemis või tiimis. On püütud kaasata ka kogukonda kooli üritustesse ning tulevikus kavandatakse veelgi tihedamat koostööd kohalike ettevõtjate, kultuuriasutuste ja lapsevanematega. Uuenduste läbiviimist toetasid Ida-Viru Ettevõtluskeskuse koolitused ja linnavalitsuse toetus ning õppimine Šotimaa ettevõtlikelt koolidelt. Samuti on olnud tuge Noored Kooli programmi õpetajatest ning Tagasi kooli vabatahtlikest. Loomulikult on olnud oluliseks tõukejõuks juhtkonna soov kujundada erinäoline ja õpilaskeskne kool. Raskusi tekitasid algul uuenduste põhjendamine ja kommunikeerimine kõigile õpetajatele ja erinevad arusaamad ettevõtlikkusest. Muutunud mõtlemisviisi omaksvõtt õpetaja ja õpilase rollist on võtnud osadel õpetajatel ligi 10 aastat aega. Uuenenud koolikultuuri positiivseks mõjuks võib lugeda õpilaste suurenenud koostööoskusi, enesejuhitud õppimist ning ettevõtlikkust ürituste korraldamisel ning probleemide lahendamisel. Samuti puudub hetkel põhikoolist väljalangevus. Kõigi osapoolte hinnangul on muutused jätkusuutlikud, sest õpilased ei oleks enam nõus vanaviisi jätkama. Kool on kogunud tagasisidet õpilastelt ja vanematelt, kuid hetkel töötatakse tõhusamate tagasisidevormide väljatöötamise kallal,

mis oleksid abiks tõenduspõhisel otsustamisel. Toimib õpetajate töövarju süsteem ja kolleegide tundide vaatlus.

Poliitikakujundajate hinnangute ning juhtumiuuringute põhjal leiti järgmised innovatsiooni takistavad ning soodustavad faktorid.

Innovatsiooni takistavad faktorid:

- Hirm tundmatu ees – inimeste soovimatus mugavustsoonist väljuda
- Inimeste hoiakud, väärtused ja harjumused
- Nõrk kommunikatsioon
- Raha puudus
- Ülekoormatud õppekava
- Keskendumine riigieksamitele
- Liigne bürokraatia

Innovatsiooni soodustavad faktorid:

- Õpetajate ja juhtkonna motiveeritus
- Tugi: koolitus, rahaline tugi
- Noored, uutmoodi mõtlevad õpetajad
- Abi kolmandalt sektorilt, näit. „Noored kooli“ õpetajad
- Ühiskonna surve ja muutunud ootused
- Kooli ja õpetaja autonoomia
- Paindlik seadusandlus
- Rõhk kooliarendusele

Poliitikakujundajate ja juhtumiuuringus osalenud koolijuhtide, õpetajate, lapsevanemate ja õpilaste intervjuude põhjal on töötatud välja järgmised **poliitikasoovitused innovatsiooni levitamiseks.** Töötoas palume eespool nimetatud innovatsiooni soodustavatele ja takistavatele faktoritele ning antud poliitikasoovitustele tagasisidet.

1. Rohkem autonoomiat koolidele (ettepanek Jõgevamaa Gümnaasiumilt)

2. Paindlik seadusandlus (ettepanek ministeeriumilt)

3. Vabatahtlikud uuenduslikud algatused, mida toetab ministeerium, näit. „Huvitav kool“ (ettepanek ministeeriumilt)

4. Parimate praktikate levitamine meedias (ettepanek TLÜ Haridusinnovatsioonikeskuselt)

5. Õpetajate ja koolide võrgustike toetamine (ettepanek ministeeriumilt)

6. Meisterõpetajate süsteemi arendamine, kes oleksid uuenduste eestvedajaks (ettepanek Õpetajate Liidult)

7. Õpetajate professionaalse arengu toetamine vastavalt vajadustele (ettepanek Õpetajate Liidult)

8. Stabiilne poliitiline keskkond (ettepanek Tartu Haridusosakonnalt)

9. Bürokraatliku aruandluse vähendamine n. EL rahastatud projektides (ettepanek Tartu Haridusosakonnalt)

Annex 3: List of participants in the workshop "Mainstreaming innovation in schools" at Tallinn University, March 23, 2017

Name	Institution	Email
1. Anneli Luik	SA Innove	anneli.luik@innove.ee
2. Anti Alasi	Jõgevamaa Gümnaasium	antialasi@gmail.com
3. Anu Freimann	Lasnamäe Põhikool	oppealajuhataja@lpk.tln.edu.ee
4. Anu Moosel	SA Innove	anu.moosel@innove.ee
5. Eili Laas	Peetri Lasteaed-Põhikool	eili.laas@peetri.edu.ee
6. Elle Rajandu	Tallinna Ülikool	elle.rajandu@tlu.ee
7. Helen Sabrak	Avatud Kool	helen.sabrak@avatudkool.ee
8. Heli Aru Chabilan	HTM	heli.aru-chabilan@hm.ee
9. Imbi Henno	TLÜ	ihenno@tlu.ss
10. Kadri Kanemägi	Leisi Keskkool	kadri.kanemagi@gmail.com
11. Kairi Märk	Tallinna Ülikooli Haapsalu Kolledž	kairi.mark@tlu.ee
12. Kati Vinter	Tallinna Ülikool	kati.vinter@gmail.com
13. Katrin Aava	Tallinna Ülikool	aava@tlu.ee
14. Kerttu Sepp	SA Archimedes	kerttu.sepp@archimedes.ee
15. Kreeta Arusaar	MTÜ Õpideemia	kreeeta@gmail.com
16. Kristi Kivipuur	Lääne-Nigula vald	kristi.kivipuur@laanenigula.ee
17. Kristi Vinter	Tallinna Ülikool	kristi.vinter@tlu.ee
18. Kätlin Kink	Kõpu Põhikool	katlinkink@gmail.com
19. Liis Proos	MTÜ Võti Tulevikku	liisproos@gmail.com
20. Linda Helene Sillat	Tallinna Ülikool	sillat@tlu.ee
21. Maarja Hallik	Haridusinnovatsiooni keskus, Tallinna Ülikool	maarjah@tlu.ee
22. Mare Tamm	Tallinna Ülikool	mare.tamm@elva.ee
23. Margus Saks	MTÜ Tulevikuhariduse PIRN	margus.saks@tulevikuharidus.ee
24. Maria Erss	Tallinna Ülikool	itaalia@tlu.ee
25. Marika Pettai	Tallinna Haridusamet	marika.pettai@tallinnlv.ee
26. Marit Sukk	Tallinna Ülikool	msukk@tlu.ee
27. Marje Eelmaa	Väike-Maarja Gümnaasium	marje.eelmaa@vmg.v.maarja.ee

28. Mati Heidmets	Tallinna Ülikool	hei@tlu.ee
29. Meidi Sirk	TLÜ	meidi@tlu.ee
30. Nelli Leosk	Konstantin Pätsi Vabaõhukool	nelli.leosk@mail.ee
31. Piret Järvela	Lilleküla Gümnaasium	piret.jarvela@lillekyla.edu.ee
32. Priit Põdra	Jõgevamaa Gümnaasium	priit.podra@gymnaasium.ee
33. Reet Sillavee	Tallinna Ülikool	reet2@tlu.ee
34. Sandra Saks	-	sandra.saks@gmail.com
35. Silver Sillak	Tartu Ülikooli Haridusuuenduskeskus	silver.sillak@ut.ee
36. Tanel Sauna	Tallinna Tehnikagümnaasium	tanel.sauna@ttg.edu.ee
37. Tiia Lister	Tulevikuhariduse PIRN	tiia.lister@tulevikuharidus.ee
38. Tiia Õun	Haridusteaduste instituut	tiia.oun@tlu.ee
39. Urve Rannaääre	SA Innove	urve.rannaaare@innove.ee
40. Viivi Lokk	Tallinna haridusamet	viivi.lokk@tallinnlv.ee
41. Viktoria Rudenko	Tallinna Pae Gümnaasium	viktoria.rudenko@hotmail.com
42. Triin Lõbu	Tartu Haridusosakond	kristi.aavakivi@raad.tartu.ee
43. Kristi Aavakivi	Tartu Haridusosakond	triin.lobu@raad.tartu.ee

Annex 2. References

Student exchange programme “Veni, vidi, vici” Retrieved from: http://vvvopilasvahetus.ee/
TULUKE – Tõenduspõhine Uus Lähenemine – Uus Koolikultuur Eestis (Evidence-Based Approach, New School Culture in Estonia). Retrieved from: http://www.tartu.ee/et/projekt-tuluke. See the summary in English at: http://www.tartu.ee/sites/default/files/uploads/Haridus/Results.pdf