



CoTIC – COLLABORATIVE TEACHING IN THE INCLUSIVE CLASSROOM

/2021-1-BG01-KA220-SCH-000031633/



Results of the Screening (PR1:A2) National Report - Latvia

2022

1/ Preparation

At the beginning of the project, one school agreed to take part in the project activities – Rezekne Polish State Gymnasium. The screening was organized by two teachers working with the 1st graders. The idea and goals of the project were presented to the parents of children learning in these classes to receive their written permission.

After the worksheet was developed and translated/adapted by the project team, it was applied to the respective pupils.

2/ How was the Screening organized?

The screening was organized in two groups (2 classes) by the two involved class teachers. It was a group screening, so all the children in each group were tested simultaneously. Before starting the test, the children were explained the rules and requirements, paying particular interest to time limitations.

The screening was organized in May 2022.

3/ To how many children the Screening Test was applied?

The screening test was applied to 44 children.

4/ Results

14 children showed results below 50% (less than 15 points), which is 31.82 % of all the tested children. The big amount of children with low results can be explained by the fact that many children studying in the respective school (Rezekne Polish State Gymnasium) primarily speak other language than Latvian, therefore some of the exercises required extra effort. Given this fact, the teachers involved in the screening decided to select only 5 children (11.36 %) to be further tested with individual tests, because their difficulties are more likely related to the problems addressed by the project “CoTIC”, not by some other factors.

5/ Any feedback from teachers who participated in the Screening

The type of exercises that the children had seen and worked with before did not cause any difficulties, while some exercises that were different and new to these children seemed harder. The teachers involved in the Screening would suggest extending the time allowed for doing the tasks, as children in the group are different and have some individual characteristics, and the time allocated to each exercise should be more flexible.

Otherwise, the feedback from the teachers is positive. They consider this tool to be useful and easy to be applied.

ANNEX Screening results

COTIC																
PR1-A2 - Scores																
Points' allocation	Max. points	Andrejs	Madara	Nikola	Maksims	Lorēna	Angelika	Arvīds	Emilija	Annika	Milana	Ērika	Ilja	Keitija	Evelīna	Jegors
x 0,5 p for each correctly numbered sentence	2 points	0	0	0	0,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0,5	0	0	0	1
x 1 p for spelling; x 1 p for handwriting (cursive)	2 points	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
x 1 p for each correct answer	2 points	1	2	0	2	0	1	1	1	2	2	2	0	0	1	0
x 1 p for each correct answer	2 points	2	2	0	1	0	2	2	2	1	2	2	0	0	1	0
x 1 p for each correctly divided chain	3 points	3	0	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	3	3	3	2
x 1 p for each correctly "arranged" word	2 points	2	0	0	1	0	2	2	0	2	0	2	2	2	0	2
x 1 p for each correctly "arranged" sentence; x 1 p for respecting punctuation, capital letter	2 points	2	1	0	1	0	2	1	1	1	2	2	0	2	1,5	0
x 1 p for each correct numerical row	2 points	2	0	2	2	2	2	2	2	0	2	2	1	2	2	2
x 0,5 p for each correct calculation	4,5 points	4	2,5	2	3,5	3,5	4	4	4,5	4,5	4	3,5	4,5	4,5	3,5	4
x 1 p for correctly composed solution (correctly chosen arithmetic operation; logic); x 1 p for correct calculation	2 points	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	1	2	2	0	2	2	1
x 1 in case of correct answer	1 point	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0
Total max. score	24,5 points	18	7,5	4	15	5,5	15	15	13,5	11,5	14	20	12,5	15,5	15	12

Yellow - selected for individual testing
Grey - low results due to different native language

Polina	Alīna	Nikita	Ermīna	Jānis	Nikola	Elīza	Aleksand	Rinalds	Jana	Milāna	Liāna	Damirs	Gabriela	Elizabete	Ilja	Artjoms	Veronika	Ksenija	Liāna
0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0,5	1
0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	1,5
2	0	0	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	2	1	1	2	0	0	1	1	2
2	0	2	2	1	2	2	0	2	2	0	0	1	2	0	0	2	0	0	2
3	0	0	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	1	2	0	0	0	3	0	0	3
1	0	2	2	2	2	1,5	1	1	2	2	1	2	0	2	2	1	2	2	0
1,5	0	1,5	0,5	1	2	2	0	0	2	0	2	1,5	0	2	1	0	2	2	0
2	0	2	2	2	3	3	3	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2
4	4	4,5	4,5	4,5	4	1,5	1,5	4,5	4,5	3	3	4,5	3,5	4,5	4,5	3	2,5	4	4,5
0	0	1	0	1	2	1	0	2	2	2	0	1	0	2	1,5	0	2	1	1
1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
16,5	4	14	20	17,5	21	17	9,5	13,5	21,5	15	12	14	9,5	15,5	14	6	14,5	19,5	15



Edvards	Demids	Vadims	Nikolas	Olivers	Alans	Millija	Roberts	Kira K.
0	0,5	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
0	0,5	0,5	0	0	0	0	0	2
2	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	2
0	1	0	1	0	0	1	2	1
1,5	2,5	1	3	0	0	1	0	3
1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	2
1,5	0	0	1,5	0	0	0	0	2
2	2	2	2	2	0	1	0	2
4	4	2,5	3,5	4	1	3	1,5	4,5
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
12	11,5	8	14	6	1	11	3,5	22,5

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.

