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1. FOREWORD

During a formal meeting in Amsterdam in 2009, EXARC, an international organization of open air museums and other facilities involved in experimental archaeology, realized the potential of the Grundtvig LLP programme for its members. This EU cooperation programme was created to facilitate meetings and exchanges between professionals involved in formal or informal adult education.

The EU Grundtvig programme has two key objectives: to respond to the challenges of an aging population in Europe and to help provide adults with pathways to improve their knowledge and competences.

Several EXARC members from different countries were interested, so this project, called Didarchtik (combining the words “didactic” and “archaeology”) was followed up in 2010.

The aim of ‘Didarchtik’ is to improve adult education experiences in archaeological open air museums and to understand the mechanisms and dynamics behind it.

Our experience is valuable because it is the first time that Grundtvig has involved a system of open air museums, as it usually reflects the interests of schools and other structures involved in adult education.

The type of education that open air museums can offer to adults is very much concerned with hands-on experience and a multisensory approach, because one of our main tools is experimental archaeology and reconstructions of ancient artefacts. This involves people in a very direct manner, showing ancient crafts or letting people do things themselves. This approach is hard work for the staff, but it is highly appreciated and offers good quality. This particular situation deserves to be observed and regulated, and the staff involved needs to meet European colleagues to exchange points of view, ideas and good practices to implement our programmes of activities.

This motivation manual, which was planned and desired from the beginning of the Project, has been drawn up for the present and future promoters of the project, such as other members of EXARC or similar organizations that work in structures like museums and open air museums.

Just because our project is so special, we would like to share methods, ideas, difficulties and solutions with European colleagues who want to repeat this successful experience.

Parco Archeologico Didattico del Livelet was invested of this task, and it has been helped by all the other Didarchtik partners.

This product is integrated by a glossary of terms connected with everyday work in an open air museum, a handbook, a website, an online network and other products. It also follows the structure that can be found in the Grundtvig Navigator, the guide to European cooperation in adult learning, so the instrument is simple to use by those who want to create new activities or re-orient old ones.

We hope that this manual will be a good support for future projects and wish a happy working experience to anyone who wants to explore new ways of learning for adults.

We would like to thank the European Commission, all the Grundtvig-Didarchtik partners and the National Agencies for their support and suggestions.

Maura Stefani
Parco Archeologico Didattico del Livelet
2. INTRODUCTION

In a Europe that is growing and evolving day by day, with a rapidly changing society producing new demands and a growing interest in cultural heritage, but still presenting rich cultural diversity, there is a clear need for a new variety of opportunities for learning and exchange.

The EU offers different Life Learning Projects to satisfy the requirements of different types of citizens and professionals.

In particular, since 2000 the Grundtvig Programme has offered financial support and a framework for European cooperation in the field of lifelong learning and adult education, with the specific objectives of responding to the educational challenge of an aging population in Europe and to help adults improve their knowledge and competences in a quality way.

According to the official definition of the programme, adult learning includes formal and non-formal learning experiences but also non-formal learning activities and even completely informal learning environments such as museums, libraries and NGOs. In this way Grundtvig activities and projects can be joined by all organizations working in the field of adult education in the EU and to help adults improve their knowledge and competences in a quality way.

Grundtvig supports different kind of actions, promoted by the subject involved in formal and non-formal adult education and adult learning:

- Mobility of individuals, which may include visits, assistantships and exchanges for the participants involved;
- Grundtvig Learning Partnership, focusing on themes of mutual interest to the participating organizations;
- Multilateral projects, aimed at improving adult education systems through the development and transfer of innovation and good practice;
- “Grundtvig Networks”, developing adult education in different subject areas, formulating and disseminating good practices, supporting projects and partnerships and analysing needs and quality assurance;
- Preparatory visits, to attend a contact seminar or a meeting with prospective partners;
- “Accompanying Measures”, such as other actions aimed at promoting the objectives of the Programme.

In this manual, we focus on the Grundtvig Learning Partnership, because we have chosen these actions, even if other kinds of actions were also included in the project (e.g. mobilities and networks).

A Grundtvig Learning Partnership “is a framework for small-scale co-operation activities between organizations working in the field of adult education in the broadest sense”. It can be started when at least three organizations of at least three different European countries work together on one or more topics of common interest concerning adult education. The aim of these activities is the exchange of experiences, practices and methods to contribute to their increased quality. Partners are also encouraged to disseminate their results.

The main activities supported are: meetings and seminars between all institutions involved, exchanges of staff and adult learners - because learners should also be actively involved in exchanges of experience and good practice - by different means and in particular using information and communication technology, the production of technical objects, fieldwork and research, performances, linguistic preparation for persons involved in the partnership, co-operation with other projects in related subject areas, activities of self-evaluation, dissemination of information material and experiences.

The aim of our ‘Didarchtik’ Grundtvig project is to improve the adult education experience in archaeological open air museums and to understand the mechanisms and dynamics behind it. This project is a chance to share best practices and implement some good activities in our programmes. We have tried to benchmark our own achievements and raise our standards.

2.1. Advantages offered to organizations like open air museums

As Archaeological open air museums, we are no school, university or old fashioned museum but, as we want to demonstrate, in Grundtvig we can find a wonderful instrument to improve the quality of our work. Our adult learners are our adult visitors, so adult education actually takes place in these structures, but we need to understand the mechanisms behind it if we want to make it more successful. We are a particular kind of museum, because our main didactic tools are experimental and imitative archaeology and reconstructions of ancient craftworks.

These practices make it possible for our public to observe structures and tools similar to those made in the past, integrated in a context similar to the one in which they were originally produced. This involves the public in a very direct manner, showing ancient crafts or letting people try them out and in this way history reaches all senses, creating an ideal starting point for informal learning. Moreover, staff working with adults in these structures form a bridge between science and the public, but also between generations and cultural backgrounds, because a group of adults is never as homogeneous as a children’s group can be. In fact, we do not attract only typical age groups for museums, but the profile of our visitors is much more general.

Adult audiences have different needs that deserve to be investigated, and open air museums have particular media to work with them, so we find a common interest in seeking the best way to approach our adult visitors.
Didarchtik is backed by EXARC, an international network of archaeological open-air museums set up in 2001, with about 68 members in 20 countries. From its beginning in 2001, EXARC made the effort to be an international network in Europe, encouraging informal contacts between colleagues and several other kinds of cooperation. EXARC often supports its members by organizing small-scale collaborations and international partnerships, sometimes with the help of the EU (like Delphi and liveARCH and the most recent and broader OpenArch). Every project raises the profile of the participants and allows other members to benefit from the experiences.

3.1. Building up the idea and involving the partners

In autumn 2009, during a formal EU meeting in Amsterdam, some EXARC members noted the need to meet to exchange ideas about the common challenges that emerge in our everyday experience, in particular our approach to adult visitors, their needs and their peculiarity. Professionals who want to meet each other for a common interest and improve the quality of their work are a perfect scenario for the beginning of a European cooperation programme!

Grundtvig was the most suitable LLP programme for us because it concerns one of our common interests, adult education, is simple to activate, is a small project that requires a small investment of human and financial resources and provides the possibility to travel, meet others and produce tools also useful for other colleagues.

EXARC asked all its members if they were interested in starting a Grundtvig project and some of them greeted this idea with enthusiasm, also because several partners had already had experience with EU cooperation. Over the next months they were engaged in the first stages of the work, such as getting permission, signatures and collecting exact details about their own organization. The contacts of every interested member also had the task of involving their organization in arranging internal meetings in which they explained the potential of the project for all the staff and learners.

Once all the data was collected, 18 members of EXARC met on 11th-12th February 2010 for a workshop in Oerlinghausen (DE), to start the creative part of the work. There were a lot of ideas but it was necessary to identify what was actually fitting for a Grundtvig Learning Partnership. One of the tasks of this meeting was to fill in the application form to present to the National Agency of each partner. It was a very busy meeting because there was a lot of work to do and the deadline was only 8 days away. The participants were divided in 2 groups, each of which prepared a Grundtvig application. The “Zeitgeist” group had eight participants and the “Didarchtik” group nine.

In August 2010 the Didarchtik project was accepted in all the countries involved: Great Britain, Spain, the Netherlands, Sweden, Germany and Italy. All national agencies liked our idea and the Dutch agency told us that it was one of the best EU projects in the Netherlands and one of the largest Grundtvig Learning Partnerships in 2010.
3.2. The learning partnership

All participants in Didarchtik are members of EXARC. The group consists of different organizations that deal transversally with adult education.

EXARC proposed itself as coordinator, and the other partners who have joined the project are:

- Vereniging voor Archeologische Experimenten en Educatie - VAAE (NL), a network with over 200 members involved in archaeological experimentations and education.
- Archäologisches Zentrum Hitzacker (DE), open air museum
- ArcheoParc im Schnalstal (IT), open air museum
- Ciutadella Iberica de Calafell (CAT), open air museum
- Dartmouth College (EN), open air museum
- Butser Ancient Farm (EN), open air museum
- Archäologisches Zentrum Hitzacker (DE), adult education institute in ancient crafts (literally, a “folk high school”)
- Parco Archeologico Didattico del Livelet (IT), open air museum
- ArcheoParc im Schnalstal (IT), open air museum
- Bäckedals Folkhögskola (SE), has 70 students yearly
- EXARC has 80 members
- VAAE has 234 members

We chose this programme because it was simple to activate; it is a long-term programme that can evolve over time (2 years), it offers financial support for mobility and dissemination activities and does not require a large input of human and financial resources. This project was created to involve the institution’s staff working in adult education, improve their professionalism and facilitate cooperation with European colleagues, but it also promotes adult education, because every time people meet to exchange ideas and experience they learn from each other. So, if by definition the learners in a learning partnership are participants in courses for adults, the members of staff also become learners themselves.

According to the Grundtvig Navigator and the guidelines of the Grundtvig Programme, “a learning partnership is an educational exchange between institutions in adult education from different European countries which participate in the Lifelong Learning Programme (LLP)”. It has to involve at least three institutions from different countries, and the different backgrounds of the partners are considered a benefit. Structures allowed to participate are all organisations, institutions and associations which offer formal or non-formal education for adults and can include smaller organisations which deal with educational issues that usually have few resources and find it difficult to join cooperation programmes. The project has a duration of two years and it promotes active involvement of learners (the persons who benefit from educational programmes in all project aspects).

Our group fits the profile of a learning partnership from different points of view:

- most of the partners operate in the field of non-formal adult education, having adult visitors (open air museums) or learners (associations), and in the particular case of Bäckedals Folkhögskola, there is formal education;
- there are eight of us from six different countries;
- we are not only open air museums but also other facilities, like a school and two associations, so the group has partners with different backgrounds;
- we usually do not have the resources to use a lot of mobilities that allow us to meet.

3.3. Content and topics

We started this project because we wanted to learn more about adult learning processes and how an archaeological open air museum could approach an adult public in the best way. We also had to focus the needs and interests of these kinds of visitors that in many different ways are not homogeneous (age, interests, cultural background, social class). We wished to understand what visitors expect from our structure in order to experience a successful visit and develop an approach to satisfy returning visitors. We also wanted to learn from each other how to transmit history and science in the best way with our usual methods (experimental and imitative archaeology, living history, reconstructions, ancient technology), but we also wish to explore new ways of educating an adult public.

With Didarchtik we developed all these themes and tried to establish general best practices to realize them, in order to build useful products for us and other European colleagues and create a network to exchange experiences and knowledge.

Some of the concrete results are articles in several journals, a visitor survey that partners can choose to use in their own museum, a dictionary of common terms used in archaeological open air museums in several languages, an online network on ancient technology, a motivation manual and a handbook about our project in general, which also deals with the main subjects explored during our meetings. All these tools are available on request or on the official website http://didarchtik.exarc.net, so anyone interested can ask for them and use them to develop activities in adult education or start another EU project, in addition to the common instruments provided by the EU.
Which is the best approach with an adult public? How can we educate adult visitors to think about the past? How can we become a good bridge between past and present? How can we use some of our usual didactic tools - like reconstructions, ancient technology or experimental archaeology - with adults? How does a good educator interact with various adult target groups to achieve not only entertainment but also teach something?

As professionals working in open air museums (and in other facilities in the field of archaeological education) these are some of the questions that were in our minds when we started the Didarchtk project. With this programme we exchanged ideas and best practices, trying to find the answer to our questions so that we can offer top quality to our visitors. The principal medium we used to reach this aim was meetings between the partners, in which we had the opportunity to exchange our experience in our own museums and associations but also be trained by experts in the subject we were interested in improving, like adult education, visitor surveys, living history, returning visitors and so on.

We had the opportunity to understand our adult visitors through exchanges with colleagues abroad whom we usually do not come into daily contact with and with whom we are not in direct competition, in a friendly atmosphere.

If an evaluation system is too laborious for a single organization to develop, it becomes more simple working all together, and in the end we produced tools that will be beneficial to all participating organizations as well as their colleagues throughout Europe.

4. THE PROJECT

4.1. Meetings

The “heart” of our projects was the meetings. Everyone was concerned with different themes and the meetings became an occasion to explore together different aspects of adult audiences, so in learning more about adult discerners, we became discerners too.

Every meeting was organized in a different place and by different partners. Since our work is often seasonal, out of season meetings were preferred, but when possible they were combined with in-season visits to see the daily practice of our colleagues. Most of the partners independently organized visits to the partners where no meetings were planned and it also became possible to make extra visits to places where a meeting had already begun, in order to move as many of the staff as possible.

At the beginning of the project we established we would have regular telephone meetings by Skype, at intervals of 2 months, but in practice this happened only if really needed: we mostly communicated by e-mail and without monthly regularity.

However, we produced a mailing list and a Skype list, not just for the managers of each organization but also for staff and trainees.

In accordance with the educational aims of Didarchtk, we opened up our workshops to all interested as observers, so we always published programs on the EXARC website before and after meetings.

Practical organization of the meetings:
We established some general guidelines during the first kick-off meeting, which took place in Reusel in September 2010.

Decisions regarding the meeting:
• it was established that meetings would last 4 days;
• programme to start on day 2 and end on day 3 of every meeting; days 1 and 4 dedicated to arrivals and departures and sometimes optional activities were proposed for these days;
• each workshop should end on a Thursday whenever possible;
• accommodation, restaurant and workshop venues should be near each other in order to spend as much time as possible together.
Decisions regarding coordinators of meetings:
- costs for the meeting itself were covered by the local partner;
- the coordinators of each workshop could give the others some homework to do before the meeting, if well in time;
- at the end of every meeting, the next one would be presented by the coordinators;
- the programme of each meeting would have to be ready 6 weeks before;
- each coordinator of meetings would expand the introductory text about their meeting presented on the application form, so it could be published online.

Decisions regarding incoming partners:
- costs for travel, accommodation and subsistence were covered by the incoming partners (these are mobilities);
- decision takers (see Chapter 4.6) would be obliged to attend the kick-off meeting, mid-way evaluation and the end meeting.

Decisions regarding dissemination of meetings:
- every workshop would be followed by a press release;
- anything published about Didarchtik and the meetings would also be sent to the coordinator;
- local communities would be informed through messages in the press calling for their involvement in upcoming activities as well as showing positive results at the end of an activity, while stakeholders (politicians, companies, foundations) would be informed in a more privileged way;
- the LLP community and our more than 20 colleagues members of EXARC would be kept informed by EXARC itself, through its website, newsletters and a journal;
- all publications would have to state explicitly: “This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.” and carry the logos of the EU and of LLP (available in different language versions at http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/education_culture/publ/graphics/identity_en.html).

Decisions about how to use mobilities:
- in order to let many different people travel and learn, each partner was required not to send the same people every time, if possible;
- partners were encouraged to send members of staff involved daily in working with the public, such as guides, teachers and so on;
- the number of mobilities for teachers (staff) and learners was planned at the application stage and the dates were to be respected.

4.2. Products

One of the goals of our project was the creation of some products that will remain for the future, in order to encourage the planning of other similar activities, disseminate the results of Didarchtik and have permanent tools after the end of the project. We called our products tools, because they should have a longer lasting life. Our target group is adult educators of adult learners. The aim was to exchange ideas and collect the ones we could learn by. We have decided to keep the material unpublished and unshared until we are happy with the results, and most of the products will be available on demand from September 2012.

EXARC set up and ran an online help desk for all Didarchtik participants, which, like the website, will continue also after the project is over, for all members of organizations that were not included in the 9 that formed the partnership.

The organization also coordinated an online network on ancient technology, articles and reports about our work and the creation of a visitor survey. It is also managing the continuation of Didarchtik as a network on adult education in archaeological open air museums. ArcheoParc im Schnalstal (IT) managed the creation of a dictionary of common terms, which will be an on-going project.

Parco Archeologico Didattico del Livelet managed the creation of this motivation manual, which can help us (and others) in the creation of new activities and the re-orientation of old ones.

Archäologisches Zentrum Hitzacker (DE), was charged with the task of producing a “handbook” of the project, while Bachrittenburg Kanzach (DE) produced the chapter dedicated to live interpretation.

Evaluation of the entire project was managed by VAEE.
Public relations and dissemination were managed by all the partners, with the coordination of EXARC.

4.3. Finances

This was a field that involved us in several discussions. We decided that every partner would be free to manage its money independently, depending on how accounting is organized in each organization, the tasks assigned to the partner (creation of a product, organization of a meeting, coordination and so on) and the amount of the EU contribution.

We noticed that every National Agency adopted a different policy about the money left over at the end of the project.
It is very important to check this point when there is an idea to start a new Grundtvig project. However, the best practice is to spend all the money.

Coordination costs
Coordination costs were managed by the coordinator, since all the other partners were responsible for their own funding.

Costs of the products
One of the most difficult things was to foresee the costs of products before their creation, after they had been discussed. It was necessary to reserve money for later, since most of the products had to be finished only at the end of the project and after the last meeting. The costs of these products refer only to their creation, such as research, collection of information, potential translation, printing for the partners and dissemination, since they are published as an online tool or on request. But it was clear that not everybody was able or willing to work online, so EXARC used a ‘content management system’ (CMS), making everybody able to add their own material without coordination or help (and so without other costs). This is called Drupal and is freeware; the only money needed was for programming.

EXARC proposed combining putting Didarchtik tools online with the creation of a new EXARC website, to which were added the products of other EU projects that involved the organization (like OpenArch and Zeitgeist).
Costs for travel, accommodation and subsistence were covered by the incoming partners, while costs for the meeting itself, venue, programme, external speakers, language and excursions were covered by the coordinator of the meeting.

Contribution from other partners
We decided to give partners the possibility to help each other out in the event of financial problems during the project. This was possible in three cases: if a partner did not have enough money to effect all the mobilities included in the application form, or to realize the product for which it was responsible, or to organize a planned meeting. In all such cases the aim of helping other partners was to realize the project successfully, meeting all the commitments involved so as to assure a good conclusion for all. Help could be given in different ways, for example partners not hosting a meeting could help the ones who did host one, for example by sponsoring the costs of an external speaker.

We decided that if partners needed money from the others, they would let them know before starting to spend money, making clear the total amount needed and what exactly it was for. It was also useful to establish a definite date before which such a request could be made. For example, we decided that the meeting in Bäckedal was the last chance to ask partners for financial help.

4.4. Relations with National Agencies
Fortunately none of us had particular problems during the realization of the project, so we contacted National Agencies only at the start of the project to present it, when it was approved, to sign the contract and ask how to manage any possible left over money, in the middle of the project for mid-way evaluation and at the end for the final report.

It is important to maintain an open dialogue with one’s own national agency during the project because it has to guarantee that the project rules are observed, but is also there to help if necessary.

4.5. Decision of the language
We decided that the language used for communication and during meetings between ourselves and the lecturers would be English.

There were some language difficulties during the first meetings, and this problem emerged through regular evaluation after every meeting. Thanks to this tool we identified the problem and solved it by discussion. It was noticed that sometimes partners whose languages were similar tended to talk more between themselves, but this point did not need discussion because it is what normally happens in a group of persons with different languages and backgrounds. Anyway, once it was noticed, everyone tried to be more open to the others.

4.6. Definition of tasks and roles

The role of the coordinator
The coordinator’s role was to maintain contact between partners and assure there were no problems regarding the products and the meetings. It also had the task of managing some products (see Chapter 5.2).

The role of the partners
Each partner was responsible for managing its money and mobilities. Everyone also had some specific tasks, like the organization of a meeting and/or the realization of a product. In the event of problems in realizing them, every partner had to discuss them with the coordinator and find a solution in order to guarantee the success of the project.

The role of the decision takers
Sometimes our project suffered from the inability of the partners to take decisions. So from the start we established how decisions should be made:

- each partner elected a decision taker;
- decisions were taken during meetings;
- the decision takers had to be present during meetings where it was planned to make decisions;
- decision takers not present at a meeting would receive an e-mail about the decision. They would reply with their vote within two weeks and if they did not answer in time, it would be considered they agreed with the majority;
- when a 2/3 majority of the partners (represented by one person) agreed (6 partners out of 9), the decision would be approved;
- if 6 out of 9 decision takers were present at a meeting and agreed about a decision, it would not be necessary for the others to vote.

The role of the moderator

By Annemieke Verbaas
During our first meeting in Reusel it was decided that the VAEE would take up the role of moderator. As during this meeting we were having heated discussions that sometimes risked getting out of hand, the people of the VAEE tried to step in and smooth things out. This was appreciated by the other partners and together we decided to introduce the role of moderator. In general everything went smoothly, but it is good to have an appointed group of people that can step in during discussions and guide them. Of course there will always be somebody who will eventually take this role naturally, but appointing somebody to do this facilitates matters.

We also had to step in as some problems arose between the coordinator and the rest of the partners after the first meetings. The VAEE took the role of spokesperson for all the partners towards the coordination institution. Again a role that would be picked up by a partner if necessary, but easier if somebody is appointed for the task.

Monitoring the project

By Annemieke Verbaas
Another role of VAEE was monitoring of the project. It was agreed we would step in if things were not going as planned and problems arose. VAEE tried to continue this task not only during the meetings, but also in between.

The media used by VAEE to collect information were the Evaluation (see above, in the chapter 5.2), and direct communication with the partners.
5. REALIZATION OF THE PROJECT

5.1. Workshops

We put our decisions into practice and planned six meetings, organized by six different partners in six different countries.

On these occasions we had the possibility to see other open air museums, see how other colleagues work in their structures, be trained by experts in adult visitors or learners and exchange ideas and experience with others.

The first meeting was the Kick-off meeting organized on 21-24 September 2010 in Reusel (NL). Its aim was to fix some rules for the project, in particular time schedules, tasks of the coordinator and the other partners, finances, comparisons of programme ideas, and development of the programme activities. Over a period of two days, the 9 partners discussed all the guidelines of the Grundtvig Learning Partnerships and were involved in writing them.

This first meeting became an opportunity for training the participants because a ‘lesson’ was also given by an archaeo-technician.

The second meeting was a workshop on learning and teaching adults, managing different pedagogical and social backgrounds or physical and psychological developments. It took place on 15-18 November 2010, less than two months after the start of Didarchtik, in the Ciutadella Iberica de Calafell (CAT). This occasion involved 23 participants from all the partner institutions. The workshop was attended by a representative of the National Agency in Catalonia, who talked about the European perspective of Adult Learning and the Grundtvig programme, professor Esther Luna from the Universitat de Barcelona, who presented some examples of a programme for adults called ‘service learning’, as applied to cultural heritage, and we had a brief workshop on how to formulate a visitor survey.

We spent the rest of the time on presentation of some of the activities and strategies of adult learning used in each partner museum, but we also found time to visit The Ciutadella, the Museu Casa Barral (where the workshop took place), a typical cellar and meet Mr. Jordi Sánchez Solsona, the mayor, and Maria Teresa Cumplido Mancebo, councillor of Culture and Education.

The third meeting was a workshop on living history and live interpretation. The aims were to measure quality and define good practices. It took place on 7-10 April 2011 in Bachritterburg Kanzach (DE), a reconstructed early 14th century castle tower. More than 20 people from 4 countries attended this meeting. Most of the lecturers were part of the VAEE, an association of professionals in the field of archaeological didactic and experimental archaeology, such as Eugene Bakker, with a presentation about the different types of live interpretation, and Annemarie Pothaar, who described how adults learn and what the difference is between education and learning. On the second day she gave a talk about the theoretic backgrounds of living history as a tool for museums. We also listened to Werner Schiefer, who explained how the Bachritterburg Kanzach deploys living history as an educational tool, Suzanne Wiermann (Bachritterburg Kanzach) who explained how living history is more than mere entertainment and some good practices, and Sara Fruchtmann, about the Bremer Geschichtenhaus, a “House of History / Stories” where the staff are reintegrated into society and develop themselves. During this meeting we also had a guided tour of the nearby prehistoric archaeological open-air museum Federseemuseum and a guided tour through the Bachritterburg itself, followed by a ‘Knight’s dinner’ where we tasted medieval dishes. During our free time and discussions with the participants we also learned how differently European archaeological open-air museums handle ‘live interpretation.’

According to the evaluations collected by VAEE after every meeting, this was the first one where most participants felt the atmosphere was more relaxed and friendly.

The fourth meeting was also a “Mid-way evaluation”. It was organized in Backedals Folkhögskola, Sveg (SE) on 14-17 June 2011. In this place the participants had the opportunity to be involved in the educational style of a typical Swedish Folkhögskola with long experien-
ce in adult education. Craft workshops and other activities were organized to keep these methods alive and show them to the other partners. In fact the title of the meeting was “Adult learning the Bäckedal way”. One of the keys of the method is to make everyone feel that they are each an important part of the larger group, like a piece of a puzzle. During the days of the meetings the groups were involved in a tour of the school district that also included reconstructed ancient buildings and different workshops: we worked linen and wool, but also wood, iron and leather, where the constant theme was the thread. The group was also involved in playful competitions like whipping cream with instruments made of different materials and building a fire. This meeting was also dedicated to the Project Mid-way evaluation, which involved the decision makers. At the end we discussed what we had worked with and what issues are important when working with adults.

The fifth meeting was organized by Archeoparc im Schnaittal (IT) at Madonna del Senales on 20-24 September 2011. It was dedicated to long stay and returning visitors in order to balance our facilities and the needs of all target groups. Different speakers from very different fields, like museum educators, publishers, and the brand manager of new Balance shoes in Italy, shared their thoughts about the theme of the returning customer, giving us the possibility to observe from very different points of view. There was also a workshop led by Ilse Prüstl, exhibition organizer and museum employee trainer in the Museum der Moderne in Salzburg. We also visited the Archeoparc, where the theme is ‘discovering Ötzi’s world’ and had some free time to try rope climbing and visit a local farm, concluding the workshop with a dinner in a real Tyrolean mountain hut.

The sixth meeting was also our “End Evaluation”. The main theme was how to teach adults through themed products and reconstruction of ancient artefacts, but we were also engaged in the presentation and discussion of the products and results of our project. It took place on 11-15 June 2012 at the Butser Ancient Farm (EN). The partners had the opportunity to visit this reconstructed Iron Age farm and a Roman villa, and try some of the workshops proposed to the public, like spinning, fresco, Roman cuisine and metalworking and building a round house. The guests included the staff of the South Downs National Park, which hosts Butser, who talked about what attracts visitors and what does not, and John Evans who involved the partners in a discussion about visitors with special needs and disabilities. As this was the last meeting, we used the occasion to talk for the last time about the project and products and decide the last details and deadlines, but we also found time to celebrate together, with a Roman feast in the villa and a final folk party in the farm’s main round house.

In addition, several staff meetings were arranged in every organization. We decided to fix them twice per year, but the partners would be free to manage them on their own.

5.2. Products

We consolidated our experience with the production of some tools that record our experience and will be helpful to others who want to organize a similar project or to ourselves, to repeat the experience and improve it.

Motivation manual - coordinated by Parco Archeologico Didattico del Livelet

Initially the manual was planned as a sort of diary of our experience, work in progress showing best experiences and a kind of review of what we are doing and discussing. Its aim should be to motivate people to work with adult education in Archaeological Open Air Museums. During the project it became shorter than planned and it was decided to use an index similar to that of the Grundtvig Navigator in order to make it simple to combine these two instruments, one general and one about a specific project, for those who wish to repeat the experience. This variation was presented and approved during the second meeting in Kanzach. As established in the kick-off meeting, a draft of the Motivation Manual was prepared for the last meeting in Butser, followed by the final writing up, with the additions and amendments suggested by the other partners, the final translation and graphic works. Some of the partners also collaborated in translating, correcting and enriching the texts. This product is available on request, and has been printed out for partners.

Handbook - coordinated by Archäologisches Zentrum Hitzacker

This product is similar to the motivation manual, but goes into more detail about the partners’ backgrounds, themes and meetings. Each chapter of the handbook covers a theme that was discussed during the workshops and is a sort of abstract of the presentations with links to the documents presented by the speakers, extra literature and other useful links and was developed with the help of other partners.

Online help desk - coordinated by EXARC

The Online Helpdesk is a mailing list of partners in Didarchtik. The aim is to create a network and open dialogue between the partners, even without coordination.

Glossary - coordinated by Archeoparc im Schnaittal

The idea of this product came out of the necessity, emphasized over the years, to find an instrument which enhances the communication skills used in a museum like ours, a primary need of which is to educate using terminology that is clear to all visitors, even those with a different native tongue. The meeting of different partners at the “Didarchtik” project was a good occasion to elaborate and upgrade a product like this because it made it possible to gather needs, terms and translations.

One of the main aims of the product is to find a solution for non-specialized staff with difficulties in mastering the specific archaeological terminology on the one hand, and a lack of a practical and manual vocabulary for “specialized staff” on the other. The Glossary includes not only “archaeological expressions”, but even modern concepts useful for us to explain the past by means of examples and comparisons.

The product become at the same time a “glossary” (due to the descriptive aspect of the vocabulary) and a “dictionary” for its multilingual purpose.

This product is structured like an Excel schedule of
translated words and sentences in English, German, Italian, Catalan, Spanish, English, and Dutch. There are two types of searches:
- A specific word (for example the translation of the word “einkorn wheat”)
- A category (for example the translation of all words which are related to the class “bread baking”)

The user can select the language of interest and print. Thus the rows of the Excel document show a list of expressions, but the columns show “category” as the menu item, followed by the column “W/S”, where it is specified whether we have to deal with a single word or a sentence. Next there is the “priority” of the word (for example: 1 = courtesy expressions, 2 = basic expressions, 3 = technical terms) and at the end there are the columns in the different languages. The translation has been completed with the help of some of the other partners.

Website - coordinated by EXARC
The website dedicated to the project is part of the new EXARC site. It is a Content Management System, which means that everybody with a password can contribute text and pictures to the website. The site has room for news (short articles, upcoming meetings and events), blogs (longer pieces of text), books (printable texts with chapters, pages and pictures), forums, all the lectures (in pdf, ppt or Word) presented during the meetings and links. The website will stay online also after the project, as a source of information and inspiration for anyone working with adult education in archaeological open air museums.

Evaluation - coordinated by VAEE
All people travelling had to answer the same set of questions, which were simple and straightforward. Some of these needed to be answered in advance in order to formulate goals better, others needed to be answered afterwards as an individual evaluation. The evaluation is not available on the Didarchtik website as it is not public.

The process of evaluation
By Annemieke Verbaas
During the project the VAEE was assigned the process of evaluation, monitoring and moderating. There are of course different ways to fulfill this task. For the evaluation we decided to do not only midway evaluation and end-evaluations, but one after every scheduled meeting. This way we could keep an eye on the general course of the project and make adjustments if necessary. For the evaluation of the meetings we created a form that every participant of a meeting had to fill out. Part of it before the meeting, with their expectations of what to learn and teach during the meeting and their general expectations of the meeting. The second part had to be filled out after every meeting and reported how their expectations of the content of the meeting had been fulfilled, but also asked about the practical arrangements and facilities during the meeting. The questionnaire was created after the meeting in Reusel and also filled out for the meeting in Reusel. For the Questionnaire see Appendix 1. In Appendix 2 it is also possible to see the final one, sent after the last meeting in Butser. The Questionnaire had both rating questions (like “How do you rate the content of the discussion; rate with 1-4”) and ‘open questions’ (where people could express their opinions in words). Of course, the last kind of question involves more work to summarize and are hard to analyse, but they give a better explanation of people’s opinions. After every meeting all participants were supposed to send their filled out questionnaires to the VAEE. Most participants did this, but generally we did not get them all back, even after a reminder email. After we received (most of) the evaluations we combined the answers on the forms to an evaluation of max. 1.5 pages. It would have been easier to make a longer evaluation, but we made an effort to keep it short. With 1.5 pages we hoped all the decision takers and other interested employees of the partners would read the report. We expected that they would not do so if it were much longer.

Ciutadella Iberica de Calafell (CAT)

ArcheoParc im Schnalstal (IT)

Workshop in Sveg (IT)
The results
From these evaluations it turned out that everybody valued the exchange of ideas with other partners and the social aspects of the meetings. Also the possibilities to visit other open air museums was generally valued highly. But of course the contents of the meeting were also highly rated. It also turned out that facilities were thought to be really important. But as all our partners went through a lot of effort to organize these meetings, there was not very much to complain about.

Of course, the evaluation also indicated parts of the project that were liked less. This is maybe the most important task of the evaluation, because it will provide the opportunity to change the project and make it a better experience for everybody. Some of these are outlined below, in random order.

Even though the discussion with the other partners was rated highly and we realized we were generally having the same problems, we did not really get further than indicating these problems. We realized that we would need outside help to solve them, but by then the project was already almost finished. However, it would be a good starting point for a further project, as the common problems are already indicated.

It is really good to be able to do this project with partners from all over Europe. However, we soon realized that two groups formed: people from the North of Europe (Sweden, Germany, the Netherlands and England) and people from the South (Spain and Italy). This has partly to do with language, but not entirely, as some of the Italian partners also spoke fluent German. So it has probably to do with cultural differences as well. This did not happen only during breaks, where it is to be expected that people sometimes want to talk in their own language to relax, but also when we were having discussions in smaller groups, etc. This problem was of course easy to solve by deliberately mixing the people in discussion groups and other activities that were done in smaller groups. The VAEE also made an effort to mingle with all the partners during breaks etc. It must be said this was not always successful, but in general it worked well.

 Soon after the first meeting it turned out to be quite difficult to stay in touch and work on the partnership in between the meetings. Where it is possible to stay away from work for four days, as soon as you are back in your working environment the day to day routine takes up all your time again. This also had its effect on the products. It was planned to work on the products in between the meetings, but it soon turned out that this was not done. The VAEE tried to motivate people to work on the products even in between the meetings, and during the meeting in Kanazach we scheduled some time to discuss the progress of the products. During this meeting we realized that for the most partners it was not possible to work on the products between the meetings. People did expect to have time to work on the products towards the end of the partnership with a pressing deadline. It was then decided that if any help with products was wanted from the other partners, they had to ask for help and input well in time. When the deadline, i.e. the end of the project was coming nearer, less help was to be expected of the other partners.

We therefore organized a short meeting with the representatives of all the partners during every meeting. During one of these meetings we also decided how to take decisions - for a description of this see Chapter 4.6.

5.3. Monitoring the project
By Annemieke Veerbaas

6. CONCLUSIONS AND EXPECTATIONS FOR THE FUTURE

Often we do not look at adult visitors as a public to educate, because it is easier to recognize children as a target for education. Thanks to these projects we have rebalanced this tendency. We discussed among ourselves and with experts in adult education how to connect past and present for this particular kind of public, how to arouse the personal resources of each different person, how to make a successful exchange between visitors and staff, how to use active or interactive involvement, how to explain crafts as part of the common heritage, and how to exhibit and animate history to the public...

We arrived at the conclusion that in the last 20 years museums have changed, as have visitors' needs and expectations, but also education methods have developed and museums organize more activities which are focused on what the public wants. Visitors become more demanding and their expectations grow more and more complex according to their background. Didarchtik's aim was to give the organizations involved some instruments to meet their demands.

Projects like this make it easier to know and apply best practices, taking inspiration from other countries. It is also a way to feel Europe more closely and share activities and experiences with other colleagues. Exchange is always an important moment for the growth of people and organizations, and it also creates better language abilities as people will be motivated to train in languages. Persons involved also get a broader perspective for their work: usually there are not many colleagues in the same country doing exactly the same kind of work (there are only 300 museums like ours in Europe) so it is useful to go abroad to see good or bad examples which can be used in daily practice. Another important impact that comes from projects like this is motivation. Many of the participants have never visited other archaeological open air museums before. Sometimes the life of those who attempt to interpret history can be quite lonely and difficult, and it is good to know that there are other people out there that everyday battle with the same problems, even in other countries. We can all learn from each other, so we can avoid making the same mistakes and apply the same successful ideas.

We hope that this adventure will continue with other EU projects that can help us to provide more quality in our job, a job we love and want to do better every single day, and we hope our experience can be useful to others who want to make a similar journey.

Break in Bachritterburg Kanzach (DE)

Meeting in Butser Ancient Farm (EN)
Appendix 1

Didarchtik Evaluation-report for exchanges 2010-1-NL1-GRU06-02917
Vereniging voor Archeologische Experimenten en Educatie

To be completed after every mobility for Didarchtik exchanges and participation in Didarchtik events in your own country. Please adapt list to your own situation/needs.

General information

Name: .......................................................... Date: ..........................................................

Name of your institution (museum/school/organization): Grundtvig Registration number:

- Archäologisches Zentrum Hitzacker 2010-1-NL1-GRU06-02917-8
- ArcheoParc im Schnalstal 2010-1-NL1-GRU06-02917-5
- Bachritterburg Kanzach im ArchäoPark Federsee 2010-1-NL1-GRU06-02917-6
- Bäckedals Folkhögskola 2010-1-NL1-GRU06-02917-3
- Butser Ancient Farm 2010-1-NL1-GRU06-02917-9
- C.I. de Calafell 2010-1-NL1-GRU06-02917-2
- EXARC 2010-1-NL1-GRU06-02917-1
- Parco Archeologico Didattico del Livelet 2010-1-NL1-GRU06-02917-7
- VAEE 2010-1-NL1-GRU06-02917-4

What is your role within the institution? ..........................................................

For this visit, are you a teacher or a learner? (teacher / learner) ..........................................................

Travel destination: ..........................................................

Contact/organizer at destination: ..........................................................

Grundtvig registration number of host institution 2010-1-NL1-GRU06-02917: ..........................................................

Dates visited: ..........................................................

What is the goal of this staff exchange? ..........................................................

What is the programme of this staff exchange? ..........................................................

Questions to answer before the actual programme starts

What do you hope to learn during this exchange? ..........................................................

What do you want to teach the other participants during this exchange? ..........................................................

What are your expectations in general of this exchange? ..........................................................

How will your activities contribute to achieving this goal? ..........................................................

Description of your activities during the staff exchange: (in words or if it is not possible/too difficult to explain, in a series of photographs) ..........................................................

Questions to answer after the programme is finished

Personal

How did you experience the learning/teaching environment, what was the atmosphere like (please rate on a scale from 0-10)? Explain. ..........................................................

How did you experience the different cultures and backgrounds of the participants? Explain. ..........................................................

Were your general expectations met during this exchange (please rate on a scale from 0-10)? Explain. ..........................................................

Did you do all the activities planned? Please name the activities you didn’t do (or extra activities you did do) and explain. ..........................................................

Did you learn what you wanted to learn? ..........................................................

Did you teach what you wanted to teach? ..........................................................

General

Did the staff exchange achieve the goal as stated above? Explain. ..........................................................

In what way does this relate to the Didarchtik goals? ..........................................................

How are you planning on using/spreading your knowledge in your own institution? Explain. ..........................................................

Do you have any organizational remarks to improve cooperation? ..........................................................

Other comments and or feedback
Appendix 2

End evaluation Didarchtik in Butser
Questions for the decision takers of all partner institutions

Name: ..........................................................................................................................................
Institution/Museum: ..................................................................................................................

Evaluation of the project process

1. Rate the following aspects of Didarchtik on a scale from 1-4 (4 = best) and explain your rating:
   • communication .......................................................... ............................................................
   • coordination .............................................................. ............................................................
   • content of the meetings .......................................................... ................................................
   • working on products .......................................................... .....................................................
   • social aspects of Didarchtik .......................................................... ....................................

2. Do you feel you and your institution could contribute to the project? If not, why not?
   What should we have changed? ............................................................................................

3. Have you and others of your institution learned something new during the project? If so, what?
   If not, why not and what should we have changed? ............................................................

4. Have all partners done their agreed share of the work? If not, why not and what should we have changed?

5. Was it necessary to adjust the process during the project? Were all activities executed as planned?

Evaluation of the project outcome

6. Has Didarchtik influenced or changed the way you teach adults in your institution?
   If so, in what way? If not, why not? ........................................................................................

7. Have we reached any of the goals of Didarchtik? Please rate each objective on a scale from 1-4 (4 = best) and explain.
   Our concrete objectives were:
   • To create a network to exchange experiences and knowledge of ancient technology.
   • To learn to connect better with our adult public.
   • To understand the diversity of our public in age/generation range and backgrounds.
   • To learn from each other how to exhibit and animate history for the public.
   • To fulfil the need to know more about adult learning processes.
   • To explore new ways of educating the adult public (cross media, new media and ‘unusual’ methods).

8. Have the directly involved staff and participants developed skills and increased their motivation to learn from the project theme? If not, why not, what should we have changed?

9. Did the project achieve a greater awareness of the European dimension in adult education? If not, why not, what should we have changed?

10. Did the project achieve a greater awareness of a multicultural and intercultural dimensions? If not, why not, what should we have changed?

General questions

11. What expectations did you have of Didarchtik before it started? ............................................

12. Did Didarchtik meet the expectations you had? If not, why not and what should we have changed?

13. Do you have recommendations/tips/ideas for future European projects? ............................

14. Below is a space for any other comments, tips or thoughts about Didarchtik you may want to share: