**Critical friend workshop PLAN**

**Name of the WORKSHOP /TOOL session: Critical Friend approach**

**Learning outcomes:**

**After workshop participants:**

* Can recognize the importance of Critical Friend Approach as a formative assessment tool
* Can use Critical Friend Approach in their teaching context

**Target group: (E.G. faculty members, PhD students, MA students, student teachers, etc.).**

**Number of participants:** up to 12

**WORKSHOP PLAN for the TOOL**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Stages or Steps of the Activity** | **Short description** | **Time slot** | **Resources or equipment needed** | **Comments by the trainer** |
| 1 | Introduction  Ice-breaker | Aim of the activity: To introduce participants to one another.  Trainees are paired up and given a psychological questionnaire: ” How do I perceive myself and how do others perceive me?” First trainees answer the questions about themselves in written form. Next, they answer the same questions but this time about their partners. After this they compare the answers and talk to each other about similarities and differences. | 10 minutes | **Worksheet # 1** | Note.  1. Trainer should try to pair trainees in such a way that they don’t know each other very well.  2. The Hidden purpose is to lead us to the second stage. |
| 2 | The Johari Window model for self-awareness | Aim of the activity: To raise awareness of the role of the positive environment in learning/teaching process.  Step 1. Group discussion – The trainees discuss the results of the questionnaire which they have already talked about in stage 1-namely if self and peer characterization matched or didn’t match and why. The discussion is facilitated by the trainer.  Step 2. The trainer gives a mini-lecture about the Johari Window. The trainer explains what kind of model Johari window is. S/he talks about the fact that blind spot and hidden area decreases while public region widens with the help of collaboration among group members. Collaboration and formative feedback are one of the most important pre-requisites for self-awareness and professional development. | 15 minutes | Manual “Critical Friend approach” p. 2-4  PPT |  |
| 3 | Critical Friend Approach | Aim of the activity: To introduce the essence of critical friend and to realize that this approach supports both collaborative working environment and professional development.  Step 1. Brainstorming  Trainer asks participants what they do when they face any problem in life. (family, school, work, etc.).  The trainees name the ways of solving the problems and the trainer writes these ways on the board. Trainees hold a small discussion (approximately 3 minutes) the advantages of each way of solving problems.  Step 2. The trainer gives a mini-lecture about the Critical Friend. The trainer explains what the critical friend is; what is the purpose of using it and how it can be used as a model for establishing trust and mutual understanding which is essential for collaboration.  Critical Friend can be considered to be one of the effective approaches for formative assessment which supports to create a positive learning environment. | 15 minutes | PPT  Sticky notes  Markers  Board | Note. The trainer emphasizes the generic nature of the critical friend approach and its efficiency for XBL environment  \*This step will emphasize that using friends as resources of knowledge can help us solve problems. |
| 4 | Tuning Protocol  Formative Assessment Tool for the Critical Friend Approach | Aim of the activity: To develop participants’ practical skills of using Tuning Protocol  Step 1. The trainer names the discussion topic “Problems with classroom management”.  The trainees are divided into groups (See the trainer note). The trainer asks participants who would like to share his or her problem connected with the topic: classroom management and get recommendations from critical friends. The roles are distributed this way: One facilitator, one presenter and all the rest are discussants.  Facilitator opens the session by presenting the problem to the audience. Then the presenter talks about his or her problem. After his or her talk the discussants ask clarifying questions to get more information. The colleagues- discussants- examine a presenter’s problem and work out recommendations individually (see note 4). A presenter makes notes of the recommendations and decides which recommendations will be useful for him or her. Shares his or her new thinking about what she/he learned from the participants’ feedback. There is no more feedback offered.  Facilitator summarizes the discussion.  Step 2. At the end of the activity the trainer summarizes this tool and stresses its importance for helping colleagues with finding the solution to the problem. The trainer once again stresses the importance of Tuning protocol as formative assessment tool. (See Note 5.) | 30 min | Worksheet # 2  Description of the Tuning Protocol | Note.  1. The trainer can give other topics for discussion, such as “formative assessment”, “differentiated learning”, etc.  2. If there are more than 10 trainees in the group. It’s not divided. If there are more than 10 trainees, the group is divided into two.  3.Discussants need 5 min to formulate recommendations. They will need guidelines for a good recommendation: See Worksheet # 2(solutions should be ethical, feasible, practical etc.)  4. As an option, recommendations can be shared with other group members and presented if time permits.  5. The trainer should draw trainees’ attention to the fact that a lecturer can be in any role: Facilitator, Presenter, Discussant, or a lecturer may not take part in the tuning protocol according to the needs. It should also be considered that in the initial stage a lecturer takes an active part to model tuning protocol for the students. |
| 5 | **Synergy Analysis** | Aim of the activity: To identify each other’s strong and weak points.  Step 1: The trainees are given the worksheet to evaluate their contribution to the Tuning Protocol individually. The worksheet has the following questions:   * What assists me in working as a critical friend? * What prevents me from being a good critical friend? * What is needed for my active participation? * What else can I say?   Next, members of the group unite and they compare their self-evaluations with each other. Here, they are assisted by the following questions:   * What strengths do we have in common? * What are the differences? * What are the opportunities of addressing difficulties in working as critical friends?   Step 2: To conclude, the trainer collects and puts beneficial and hindering aspects of working collaboratively as critical friends on a flipchart. Finally, a joint discussion is held about what can be done for enhancing beneficial power and for mitigating hindering forces in order to enable the participants to contribute to this process of solving problems.  The trainer summarizes the usefulness of synergy analysis as one of the efficient strategies of the Critical Friend Approach which enables group members to become aware of each other’s strong points to benefit their own work. | 20 min | Worksheet #3  Description of the Synergy Analysis |  |
| 6 | **Self-assessment and peer-assessment fan** | Aim of the activity: To evaluate each other’s contributions as critical friends  Step 1:  The trainer distributes the worksheets: “self and peer assessment fan” with the help of which they evaluate their contribution to the tuning protocol to what extent each member contributed to group work.  The trainer gives the group members the following instructions: they fill in the table given on the worksheet in the following order:   1. The trainer hands out the tables to each trainee. Initially, in the right-hand column trainees give a score- 1 to 5 to their own contributions to the tuning protocol (5- is the maximum and 1 is the minimum). They fold the column so that others cannot see it. 2. The trainees hand over the folded table to the group member sitting next to them, who gives a score in the last right-hand column and then they also fold the column and hands the table to the next member until all the members assess the colleague’s contribution to the tuning protocol. 3. This way the table will be passed over to all members of the group. 4. After all group members have assessed each other, they should reflect to what extent their self-assessment corresponds with peer assessment. 5. The group discusses what caused the differences between their self-and peer evaluation if there were any of them.   Step 2. The trainer summarizes the activity by stressing the fact that peer and self- evaluation as the tools for the Critical Friend Approach are extremely important to improve one’s own contribution as a critical friend. | 15 min | Worksheet # 4 - **Self-assessment and peer-assessment fan** | Note. The trainer stresses the fact that this additional instrument helps the participants to reflect on their own and others’ roles as critical friends. The reflection will contribute to improving their performance as critical friends |
| 7 | **Summarizing the session by the questionnaire**  ”How do I perceive myself and how do others perceive me?” | Aim of the activity: To realize the role of critical friends for creating collaborative environment  Trainer gives the trainees the questionnaire about professional matters similar to the one they did at stage 1.  Trainees get in initial pairs from stage 1. They  are given a questionnaire: ” How do I perceive myself and how do others perceive me?” First trainees answer the questions about themselves in written form. Next, they answer the same questions but this time about their partners. Next, this they compare the answers and talk to each other about similarities and differences.  Lastly, the final discussion is held about how important it is to know each other well to use Critical Friend Approach efficiently. | 15 minutes | Worksheet # 5 | Note. |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Worksheet # 1**

**Self-perception**

**Name:**

How I can perceive myself

If I were an animal, I would be…………..

If I were a plant, I would be ------------------------------------------------

If I were an object, I would be -----------------------------------------------------

In the future, I can see myself ---------------------------------------------

**Name:**

Person A:

How I can perceive Person A

If Person A were an animal, he or she would be………………………

If Person A were a plant, he or she would be………………………

If person A were an object, he or she would be………………………

In the future, I can see Person A ………………………………

**Worksheet # 2**

**Group Tuning Protocol**

Group Tuning Protocol is the best tool for group critical friend approach

**Detailed Description of Consultancy Process**

There are three roles in the Group Critical Friends process: facilitator, presenter, and discussants. The group can vary in size from four to seven people.

The basic format for collegial dialogue is the same for each protocol: facilitator overview; presentation of work or issue by feedback seeker; clarification questions; feedback/discussion by participants (discussants); presenter reflection; debriefing of process. The questions and issues that presenters offer typically spring from feelings of concern, from moments in work without closure, and from issues they have not been able to find a solution through solitary thinking.

**Group Member Roles**

**Facilitator:**

Facilitator can be selected either from the student group or a lecturer can serve this role.

Reviews the process at the outset, even if everyone is familiar with it. Sets time limits and keeps time carefully. Participates in discussions but is on the lookout for others who want to get in conversations. Adjusts time slightly depending on participation. May end one part early or extend another, but is aware of the need to keep time. Reminds discussants of roles, warm and cool feedback, and keeping on topic that the presenter designated. Leads debriefing process and is careful about not “shorting” this part. Is careful during the debriefing not to slip back into discussion.

**Presenter:**

Prepares an issue for consultancy. Is clear about the specific questions that should be addressed. Unlike most discussions of this nature, the presenter does not participate in the group discussion. Sits outside the group and does not maintain eye contact during the discussion but rather takes notes and gauges what is helpful and what is not. Later, is specific about the feedback that was helpful.

**Discussants (critical friends):**

Address the issue brought by the presenter and give feedback that is both warm (positive) and cool (critical). The feedback should be given in a supportive tone and discussants should provide practical suggestions.

**The “Consultancy” Process**

The consultancy process allows colleagues to share issues confidentially and seek suggestions for positively overcoming or managing them. Consultancy creates opportunities for colleagues to find ways collaboratively around the obstacles and barriers that often limit or stifle effective action.

The process works best in smaller groups (4-7 people) where colleagues can feel comfortable sharing complex issues. Presenters share an issue, and members of the Critical Friends group offer “warm” and “cool” feedback, talking to each other not to the person who presented the issue. The presenter sits out of the group, listening, taking notes, and deciding what has been useful. The actual process (with maximum time allotted) follows.

|  |
| --- |
| **Procedure of Group Tuning protocol**  **Step 1.** Introduction where Facilitator briefly introduces protocol goals, guidelines  **Step 2.** Presentation-when the presenter has the opportunity to share both the context for her work and any supporting documents as warranted, while the participants are silent.  **Step 3.** Clarifying Questions-Discussants have an opportunity to ask clarifying questions in order to get information that may have been omitted during the presentation and would help them to better understand the work.  **Step 4.** Examining the work-Students look closely at the work, making notes on where it seems to be “in tune” or aligned with the stated goals and guided by the presenter’s focusing question and goals, where there might be a potential disconnect.  **Step 5** Pause to silently reflect on warm and cold feedback.-Discussants individually review their notes and decide what they would like to contribute to the feedback session.  **Step 6**. Warm and cold feedback-Students-Discussants share feedback with each other while the presenter is silent and takes notes. The feedback generally begins with a few minutes of warm feedback, moves on to a few minutes of cool feedback and then moves back and forth between warm and cool feedback.  **Step 7.** Reflection-Presenter rejoins the group and shares his or her new thinking about what she/he learned from the participants’ feedback. There is no more feedback offered.  **Step 8.** Debrief-Facilitator leads discussion about this tuning experience |

**Worksheet #3**

**SYNERGY ANALYSIS**

In order to evaluate the effectiveness of the joint as well as individual contribution to tuning protocol meetings, students express their personal attitude – hindering/obstructing and assisting/supporting factors. E.g.:

- What assists me in getting/giving feedback?

- What prevents me from getting/giving feedback?

- What prevents me from active participation in tuning protocol process?

- What is needed for my active participation?

- What else can i say?

Next students each member of the group unite where they compare results of their individual work. Here, they are assisted by the following questions:

- What do our power have in common?

- What is the difference?

- What are the opportunities of addressing difficulties in learning process?

At the lecture a lecturer leads the session acting as a facilitator where separate critical friends groups make presentations. The lecturer/or a student/s facilitator/s collect and put beneficial and hindering aspects of working collaboratively as critical friends on a flipchart. Finally, there is held a joint discussion, where it is determined how the situation can be improved. What can be done for enhancing “beneficial power” and for mitigating “hindering forces”. How should a lecturer and students contribute to this process?”

**Worksheet # 4**

**Self- assessment and peer- assessment fan**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name and surname | Group friend  5 | Group friend  4 | Group friend  3 | Group friend  2 | Group friend  1 | Self-assessment |
| What was my/his/her contribution to group work?  (max. 5 scores) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| How many good ideas did he/she/I contribute to group?  (max. 5 scores) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| How positively and beneficially for group did he/She/I listen, accept and take into consideration ideas and proposals of other group members  (max. 5 scores) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| How responsibly and conscientiously did he/she/I fulfill assigned tasks?  (max. 5 scores)  what was his contribution to producing group’s joint product?  (max. 5 scores) |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Worksheet # 5**

**Self-perception**

**Name:**

**How do I perceive myself as a critical friend?**

I, as a critical friend, find it easy…………….

I, as a critical friend, find it difficult………………………

In nearest future, I will use critical friend institution

In nearest future, I will use critical

**Name:**

**How do I perceive my partner as a critical friend?**

I assume that my partner, as a critical friend, will find it easy…

I assume that my partner, as a critical friend, will find it difficult….