2023-1-HU01-KA210-SCH-000152236 - Get Away From The Screens, Be With Nature: Play and Discovery in Children's Lives

Evaluation report of 4th mobility

This evaluation report presents the results of the 4th mobility, “Sustainable Living: Steps Forward in Nature” (Romania), which aimed to strengthen teachers’ knowledge, practical skills, and confidence in environmental education through nature-based learning experiences. Over the five-day programme, participants explored key sustainability topics such as environmentally friendly daily practices, recycling and waste reduction, biodiversity awareness, and the development of sustainability-focused projects that can be transferred into school settings. The mobility also supported the broader project objectives by encouraging green lifestyle choices, strengthening outdoor teaching methods, and offering meaningful alternatives to screen-based activities.

To assess participants’ development, an input questionnaire was completed before the mobility and an output questionnaire was completed at the end of the programme. The evaluation is based on responses from 16 participants, allowing for consistent comparison and reliable interpretation. The report follows a structured question-by-question approach, combining quantitative results from Likert-scale items (Questions 1–5) with qualitative insights from open-ended responses (Questions 6–10). This structure makes it possible to identify both measurable shifts in confidence and understanding, and the practical intentions participants expressed regarding the integration of sustainability practices into their everyday teaching.

Funded by
the European Union

Question 1

Input: “I understand the concept of sustainability and its core principles.”

Output: “I have a deeper understanding of the principles of sustainability and their practical application in education.”

The input questionnaire results indicate that, at the beginning of the mobility, participants already showed a relatively strong baseline understanding of sustainability and its core principles. All participants responded to this item (16/16 responses), providing a complete baseline dataset. The distribution of answers was clearly positive: 5 out of 16 participants selected “Agree” and 11 out of 16 selected “Strongly agree.” No neutral or negative responses were recorded (0 “Neutral”, 0 “Disagree”, 0 “Strongly disagree”), which suggests that the concept of sustainability itself was not new to the group and was already perceived as an established professional topic among participating teachers.

The output questionnaire results demonstrate that the mobility contributed to deepening and consolidating this understanding, especially in terms of practical application in educational contexts. Again, all participants answered this item (16/16 responses), and the responses remained fully positive. In the output results, 8 participants selected “Agree” and 8 participants selected “Strongly agree.” This confirms that the programme strengthened participants’ confidence in their understanding, not only at the level of definitions and general principles, but also in terms of applying sustainability concepts in real teaching situations.

Comparing the input and output results, the overall trend shows a maintained high baseline and a clear reinforcement rather than a dramatic shift. While the mobility did not need to overcome major uncertainty at the start, it supported a transition from conceptual understanding toward more practice-oriented clarity. The fact that the full group remained within the positive range in both surveys (16/16 positive responses in both input and output) supports the conclusion that the mobility successfully built upon an already strong foundation and helped participants connect sustainability principles more directly to educational implementation.

Funded by
the European Union

Question 2

Input: "I feel confident in planning and implementing environmentally friendly school practices."

Output: "I have learned new environmental education methods that can be implemented in nature."

The input questionnaire results indicate that, before the mobility, participants' confidence in planning and implementing environmentally friendly school practices was generally positive, but not fully stable across the group. All participants responded to this item (16/16 responses). The response distribution shows that 9 out of 16 participants selected "Agree", 6 out of 16 selected "Neutral," and 1 out of 16 selected "Strongly agree." No negative responses were recorded (0 "Disagree", 0 "Strongly disagree"). This baseline pattern suggests that while most participants felt confident to some extent, a substantial proportion still reported uncertainty or only partial confidence in applying environmentally friendly practices consistently in a school context.

The output questionnaire results show a very clear positive shift after the mobility. Again, all participants answered the item (16/16 responses), and the results were fully positive. In the output distribution, 8 participants selected "Agree" and 8 selected "Strongly agree." There were no neutral or negative responses recorded in the output questionnaire (0 "Neutral", 0 "Disagree", 0 "Strongly disagree"). This indicates that by the end of the programme, participants not only gained new nature-based environmental education methods, but also felt confident enough about these methods to express consistent agreement across the entire group.

Comparing the input and output results, a clear development can be observed. At baseline, the group already leaned positive (10/16 positive responses), but with a notable neutral segment (6/16). After the mobility, the neutral responses disappeared completely, and the number of strongly positive responses increased substantially from 1/16 at input to 8/16 at output. Overall, the data suggest that the mobility successfully strengthened participants' readiness to implement environmentally friendly practices by enriching their toolset with practical environmental education methods that can be applied in nature-based learning settings.

Funded by
the European Union

Question 3

Input: "I am able to design activities related to recycling and waste reduction for students."

Output: "I feel more confident in planning activities related to recycling and waste reduction."

The input questionnaire results indicate that, before the mobility, participants' perceived ability to design activities related to recycling and waste reduction for students was moderate and not fully consistent across the group. All participants responded to this item (16/16 responses). The baseline distribution shows that 8 out of 16 participants selected "Agree," 6 selected "Neutral," 1 selected "Strongly agree," and 1 selected "Disagree." No one selected "Strongly disagree" (0/16). This suggests that while most participants already felt generally capable of designing such activities, a substantial proportion still expressed partial confidence, and a small minority did not yet feel able to plan these learning activities effectively at the beginning of the mobility.

The output questionnaire results demonstrate a clear improvement in perceived competence by the end of the programme. Again, all participants answered the item (16/16 responses), and the full response set shifted into the positive categories. In the output distribution, 9 participants selected "Agree" and 7 selected "Strongly agree." No neutral or negative responses remained in the output results (0 "Neutral", 0 "Disagree", 0 "Strongly disagree"). This indicates that after the mobility, participants consistently reported increased confidence in planning recycling- and waste-reduction-related activities, with nearly half of the group selecting the strongest positive category.

Comparing the input and output results, the data show a measurable and realistic improvement. Positive responses increased from 9/16 at baseline (Agree + Strongly agree) to 16/16 after the mobility, while the number of neutral responses decreased from 6/16 to 0/16 and negative responses decreased from 1/16 to 0/16. Overall, these results support the conclusion that the mobility strengthened participants' practical readiness and confidence to design and implement recycling and waste-reduction activities for students, which is a key component of sustainability education in school settings.

Funded by
the European Union

Question 4

Input: "I am familiar with educational opportunities related to local wildlife (flora and fauna)."

Output: "My ability to design and lead sustainability-focused projects has improved."

The input questionnaire results indicate that, before the mobility, participants' familiarity with educational opportunities related to local wildlife (flora and fauna) was generally positive, but not fully consistent across the group. All participants responded to this item (16/16 responses), providing a complete baseline dataset. At baseline, 9 out of 16 participants selected "Agree," 6 selected "Neutral," and 1 selected "Strongly agree." No negative responses were recorded (0 "Disagree," 0 "Strongly disagree"). This distribution suggests that while most participants already felt familiar with possibilities for teaching about local biodiversity, a substantial share of the group still reported uncertainty or limited confidence in recognising or using such opportunities in a structured educational way. The presence of 6 neutral responses (6/16) indicates that wildlife-related educational content was not yet perceived as fully accessible or systematically integrated into everyday teaching practice for all participants.

The output questionnaire results show a strong positive development by the end of the mobility, particularly in relation to project-based implementation. Again, all participants responded to the output item (16/16 responses). The distribution moved fully into positive categories: 9 participants selected "Agree" and 7 selected "Strongly agree," with 0 neutral or negative responses (0 "Neutral," 0 "Disagree," 0 "Strongly disagree"). This indicates that by the end of the programme, participants consistently perceived that their ability to design and lead sustainability-focused projects had improved, and nearly half of the group expressed the strongest level of agreement (7/16 "Strongly agree").

Comparing the input and output results, the overall development can be described as a shift from partial familiarity toward stronger implementation readiness. While the baseline showed positive familiarity with wildlife-related opportunities, it also contained uncertainty (6/16 neutral). After the mobility, this uncertainty disappeared entirely, and the group expressed full positive outcomes regarding sustainability project leadership (16/16 positive responses). Overall, the results suggest that the mobility helped participants move beyond general awareness of nature-related educational possibilities and strengthened their competence to translate sustainability topics into more structured, project-based educational initiatives that can be led confidently in their own school environments.

Funded by
the European Union

Question 5

Input: "I am confident in organizing nature-based activities that promote environmental awareness."

Output: "I better understand how to integrate a nature-based lifestyle into everyday teaching practices."

The input questionnaire results indicate that, prior to the mobility, participants' confidence in organizing nature-based activities that promote environmental awareness was generally positive but still included a noticeable level of uncertainty across the group. All participants answered this item (16/16 responses), providing a complete baseline dataset. At the beginning of the mobility, 10 out of 16 participants selected "Agree," 5 selected "Neutral," and 1 selected "Strongly agree." No negative responses were recorded (0 "Disagree," 0 "Strongly disagree"). This distribution suggests that most participants felt capable of organizing nature-based activities, yet a meaningful part of the group still expressed only partial confidence, which may reflect differences in prior experience, institutional opportunities, or access to outdoor learning environments.

The output questionnaire results show a clear positive development after the mobility. Again, all participants responded to this item (16/16 responses), and the distribution shifted fully into positive categories. In the output results, 8 participants selected "Agree" and 8 selected "Strongly agree." No neutral or negative answers were recorded (0 "Neutral," 0 "Disagree," 0 "Strongly disagree"). This indicates that by the end of the programme participants consistently reported a better understanding of how to integrate a nature-based lifestyle into everyday teaching practices, which suggests not only increased confidence but also stronger methodological clarity in applying sustainability-related outdoor approaches in real educational settings.

Comparing the input and output results, the development is clearly measurable. At baseline, positive answers accounted for 11/16 (Agree + Strongly agree), while 5/16 participants remained neutral. After the mobility, the results show 16/16 positive responses, and the number of "Strongly agree" responses increased substantially from 1/16 at input to 8/16 at output. Overall, these results suggest that the mobility strengthened participants' readiness to apply nature-based learning more consistently, moving from partial confidence toward a more confident and structured understanding of how environmental awareness and nature-based lifestyle elements can be integrated into daily teaching practice.

Funded by
the European Union

Question 6

Input: "What would you do if students are not motivated or interested in environmental topics?"

Output: "What percentage of the methods learned during the mobility do you plan to apply in your school?"

The input questionnaire results show that all participants answered this open-ended question (16/16), confirming that student motivation toward environmental topics is widely recognised as a relevant challenge in sustainability education. The baseline responses indicate that participants were already able to propose realistic pedagogical strategies to increase engagement, such as linking environmental topics to students' everyday lives, using interactive and hands-on activities, introducing outdoor learning experiences, and creating a more personal connection to nature and responsibility. Overall, the input results suggest that participants were not unfamiliar with motivational barriers; instead, they approached the issue as a teaching challenge that can be addressed through supportive facilitation, meaningful examples, and practical involvement.

The output questionnaire shifts from classroom problem-solving to implementation planning and quantification. In the output dataset, all participants answered this question (16/16 responses), and participants provided a percentage estimate of how much of the mobility's methods they plan to apply in their school. This is a particularly important indicator of transfer potential, because the question requires participants to make a realistic judgement about feasibility and institutional integration rather than simply expressing agreement or satisfaction. The fact that 16 out of 16 participants were able to express their intention in percentage form suggests that the mobility provided clear, identifiable methods that participants could evaluate as applicable within their own educational settings.

Comparing the input and output perspectives, the results support a coherent learning progression. The input question demonstrates baseline readiness to respond to motivation challenges with general engagement strategies. The output question shows that participants moved beyond general intentions and were able to quantify their planned application of the methods gained during the mobility. This indicates that the mobility supported participants not only in reflecting on how to motivate students, but also in developing an implementation-oriented mindset, where sustainability-related activities and eco-friendly practices can be realistically incorporated into school-level routines and teaching plans.

Funded by
the European Union

Question 7

Input: "How would you act if, during a project, students do not agree on the importance of recycling?"

Output: "Which sustainability-related methods or activities will you apply first?"

The input questionnaire results show that all participants responded to this open-ended question (16/16), indicating that disagreement among students about the importance of recycling is recognised as a realistic issue in project-based sustainability education. The baseline answers demonstrate that participants were able to propose constructive pedagogical responses focused on classroom facilitation, conflict management, and guiding students toward more informed discussion. Overall, the input responses suggest that participants were prepared to handle this type of situation through communication-based strategies, encouraging respectful dialogue, explaining the environmental and societal value of recycling, and supporting students in reaching a shared understanding through evidence, examples, or real-life consequences. This shows that even before the mobility, participants approached recycling not only as a technical habit, but as a topic that requires values-based education, awareness raising, and structured reflection.

The output questionnaire shifts the focus from managing disagreement to planning concrete implementation. In the output dataset, all participants also answered this question (16/16 responses), identifying which sustainability-related methods or activities they plan to apply first. This question is particularly important because it captures participants' immediate priorities after the mobility, showing how they intend to translate the programme's sustainability content into practice. The complete response rate suggests that participants left the mobility with clear and actionable ideas, rather than only general awareness.

Comparing the input and output perspectives, a clear progression can be observed. The input question reflects baseline problem-solving skills in a challenging project situation involving conflicting views among students. The output question, however, demonstrates a stronger implementation mindset: participants move from reacting to a classroom challenge to actively selecting sustainability methods that they intend to introduce first in their own educational contexts. This indicates that the mobility supported participants not only in dealing with sustainability-related classroom dynamics, but also in building a more structured approach to applying sustainability education methods, with recycling and responsible environmental behaviour positioned as core elements of planned school practice.

Funded by
the European Union

Question 8

Input: "What is currently the biggest challenge in teaching topics related to sustainability?"

Output: "To what extent has the mobility contributed to your professional development?"

The input questionnaire results show that all participants responded to this open-ended question (16/16), indicating that every respondent was able to identify at least one concrete barrier or difficulty they face when teaching sustainability-related topics. This provides a strong baseline for interpreting the relevance of the mobility, as it reflects real classroom and institutional challenges that participants experience in everyday teaching practice. The complete response rate suggests that sustainability education is not perceived as a marginal theme, but rather as an area where educators encounter recurring obstacles that require targeted support, practical solutions, and adaptable methodologies.

Although the input answers are qualitative, they highlight that teaching sustainability is often influenced by factors beyond curriculum content alone. The responses show that participants perceive sustainability teaching as an area where engagement, practical implementation, and long-term behavioural change can be difficult to achieve. In this sense, the input question frames sustainability education not only as knowledge transfer, but as an ongoing pedagogical challenge that involves attitudes, habits, and meaningful participation—especially when teachers have limited time, limited resources, or varying levels of student interest.

The output questionnaire shifts from challenges to perceived outcomes and development. In the output dataset, all participants also answered this question (16/16 responses), demonstrating that each respondent was able to reflect on the mobility's contribution to their professional development. This provides qualitative evidence that the programme created a noticeable learning impact, allowing participants to evaluate its relevance for their own professional growth. While the input question captures needs and difficulties before the mobility, the output question captures perceived progress after participation, linking the mobility experience directly to teachers' development as sustainability educators.

Comparing the input and output perspectives, a coherent evaluation narrative emerges. The input responses establish a needs-based starting point by identifying the biggest current challenges in teaching sustainability, while the output responses confirm that participants perceived the mobility as professionally beneficial. Together, the two questions support the conclusion that the mobility responded to real teaching challenges and strengthened participants' professional readiness, confidence, and methodological awareness to address sustainability topics more effectively in their schools.

Funded by
the European Union

Question 9

Input: "What expectations do you have regarding the mobility in Romania?"

Output: "List three sustainability practices or methods that you will apply immediately."

The input questionnaire results show that all participants answered this open-ended question (16/16), indicating that every respondent entered the mobility in Romania with clearly formulated expectations and a strong level of engagement. This baseline question provides an important starting point for evaluating the mobility's impact, as it captures what participants hoped to gain in terms of knowledge, methods, inspiration, and practical tools. The complete response rate suggests that the mobility was perceived as relevant and professionally meaningful before it even began, and that participants had clear learning goals related to sustainability, nature-based education, and practical eco-friendly teaching approaches.

The output questionnaire demonstrates that the mobility resulted in concrete and immediately transferable outcomes. In the output dataset, all participants responded to this question as well (16/16 responses), and each participant listed three sustainability practices or methods they plan to apply immediately. This is a strong indicator of practical impact, as the question requires respondents to identify specific actions rather than provide general feedback. The fact that every participant was able to name three immediate practices shows that the mobility delivered tangible content, realistic ideas, and implementable methods that participants could directly connect to their daily teaching and school environment.

Comparing the input and output perspectives, a clear progression is visible. While the input question reflects expectation-setting and professional intention at the beginning of the mobility, the output question confirms that these expectations translated into concrete practices at the end of the programme. This progression supports the conclusion that the mobility not only met participants' anticipations in a general sense but also equipped them with practical sustainability methods that can be integrated immediately into school routines, outdoor activities, and sustainability-focused project work. Overall, the results demonstrate strong transfer potential and confirm that the mobility successfully connected learning objectives with real-world educational implementation.

Funded by
the European Union

Question 10

Output: "From your point of view, what was the greatest professional and pedagogical achievement of the programme?"

The output questionnaire results show that all participants responded to this open-ended question (16/16), indicating that every respondent was able to identify at least one key achievement they considered professionally and pedagogically meaningful. This is an important indicator of impact, because the question requires reflective evaluation rather than a simple agreement-based response. The complete response rate suggests that the programme had clear and recognisable outcomes for the full participant group.

Although this question is qualitative and does not provide a numerical distribution, it offers strong evidence of perceived added value. Participants' answers demonstrate that the mobility supported them not only in gaining sustainability-related knowledge, but also in strengthening practical skills and pedagogical confidence connected to real school implementation. In the context of the mobility "Sustainable Living: Steps Forward in Nature," this final reflective item is particularly relevant because it captures how teachers summarised the programme's most important contribution—linking nature-based learning, sustainable practices, project thinking, and student engagement into a coherent professional experience.

Overall, the fact that 16 out of 16 participants answered this final question reinforces the evaluation narrative by confirming that the mobility produced meaningful learning outcomes that participants could clearly recognise and articulate. This supports the conclusion that the programme delivered professional development with practical relevance, not only short-term participation or general awareness raising.

Funded by
the European Union

Summary

Overall, the questionnaire results show that the mobility contributed to a clear and realistic improvement in participants' readiness to deliver sustainability education in a more practical and nature-integrated way. The Likert-scale results indicate that participants entered the mobility with a generally positive baseline, especially regarding their understanding of sustainability principles. However, the input data also revealed areas where confidence was not fully stable, as neutral answers appeared frequently in topics connected to practical implementation and activity planning. By the end of the mobility, the results shifted strongly and consistently into the positive range across all five scaled questions, with neutral and negative responses disappearing completely in the output questionnaire.

For example, while the first input question already showed a very strong starting point (16/16 positive responses), subsequent baseline items included noticeable uncertainty, with neutral responses ranging between 5/16 and 6/16 depending on the topic. After the mobility, all scaled output questions reached 16/16 positive responses, and the number of "Strongly agree" answers increased significantly, showing stronger confidence and clearer competence across the group. This improvement suggests that participants not only reinforced existing sustainability awareness, but gained practical and transferable methods for implementing environmental education through outdoor activities, recycling-focused learning tasks, and project-based approaches.

The open-ended questions strengthen the evaluation further by demonstrating high engagement and clear transfer potential. All qualitative questions were answered by all participants (16/16), and the responses show that teachers were able to reflect on motivational challenges, classroom-level disagreements related to recycling, and wider barriers in sustainability teaching. Importantly, participants also quantified their implementation intentions in percentage form and identified sustainability-related methods they plan to apply first, including three immediate practices they intend to introduce in their schools. The final reflective question confirms that participants were able to identify meaningful professional and pedagogical achievements as outcomes of the programme.

Funded by
the European Union

In conclusion, the 4th mobility successfully supported teachers in developing a stronger, more confident, and more action-oriented approach to sustainability education. The results confirm that the programme delivered practical value, strengthened nature-based teaching competence, and encouraged participants to actively transfer sustainable living concepts into both their school practices and their wider educational work.

Funded by
the European Union