



CoTIC – COLLABORATIVE TEACHING IN THE INCLUSIVE CLASSROOM

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



Results of the Screening (PR1:A2) International Report

2022

Implementation of the first component of the Screening tool (Screening Worksheet) was a first stage of the planned assessment activities. The decision on the structure and content of this Worksheet was based on the research done by partners during the preparation stage of the Proposal, and the experience they have in the field of education in general and special education in particular. The content of the Screening Worksheet was proposed by Asociacia Dyslexia – Bulgaria (DABG), discussed and agreed by all partners. It was translated and adapted in all partner languages and implemented with children at the end of the 1st grade.

1/ Preparation (what activities did you organise before starting the Screening?)

Each partner made efforts to organize the Screening the best possible way. Preparatory steps in different countries were different and described in details in their national reports.

BULGARIA

In order to organise the Screening, DABG took the following steps:

- At the beginning of the project were selected three schools (Fr.Schiller Secondary school - Ruse; N.Obretenov Primary school – Ruse, and O.Paisii Primary school – Marten) where all the project activities would be implemented;
- In each of these schools was formed a project team, consisting of three class teachers (1-4th grade), a SEN teacher and a school psychologist/pedagogical counsellor;
- The project idea, planned activities and expected results were presented to parents of 1st graders during the teacher-parents meetings;
- After the Screening worksheet was developed a workshop was organised for members of all three school teams – the Screening Worksheet was presented; was explained how to organise the screening and to implement the Screening worksheet and to calculate the results (scoring system);
- A member from DABG project team was allocated to each of the school teams – to provide support when needed.

TURKEY

Before the screening process: - Two schools were selected for the screening process:

- Aslan Çimento Primary School from Darıca and İshakçılar Primary School from Derince in Kocaeli district.
- A project team made up of three class teachers (each teaching students in grades 1–4), a special education teacher, and a school psychologist/pedagogical counselor was established at each of these schools.
- During the teacher-parent conferences, the project concept, the schedule of events, and the anticipated outcomes were shared with parents of first graders.
- Screening worksheets have been translated and adapted in Turkish.
- The worksheets and implementation procedures were discussed at a workshop for project teams.
- In each school, a member of KPDoNE were allocated for guidance in the implementation process

LATVIA

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.

CZECH REPUBLIC

ZŠ Poznávání took the following steps to organize the screening:

- We translated and adapted all the screening tests in Czech language.
- The team of teachers from ZŠ Poznávání involved in the project was asked to do proof-reading of all the subtests involved in the screening tool. Afterwards more adjustments were done to adapt the materials into Czech language and in accordance with the Czech Curriculum
- The screening was planned at two Czech laboratory schools – i.e., ZŠ Poznávání (Prague), ZŠ Labyrinth (Brno). Two teachers from ZŠ Labyrinth were trained to apply the assessment. They both participated in the project joint staff training and were informed about the aims of the project
- When Czech version of the screening was finalized, we conducted an individual pilot testing with two children from the first grade. The aim of the pilot testing was to make sure that all the instructions are clear to children, and they would comprehend the activity. Furthermore, we also wanted to verify the timing of each task

PORTUGAL

- At the beginning of the project, in order to get a sample of the reality of the whole school grouping, classes were selected from all primary schools (1^oA from E.B.n^o1, 1^oC and 1^oD from E.B.n^o2, 1^oG from E.B.n^o3 and PC1 from E.B. of Porto Côvo) where the project activities will be implemented.
- In this school Cluster, three teams were formed with primary teachers. Each team, includes three teachers (from 1st to 4th grade), a SEN teacher, and a psychologist/ pedagogical counsellor.
- The project idea, planned activities and the expected results were presented to parents of 1st graders in parents-teacher meetings.
- After the Screening worksheet was developed, a workshop was organized for the team members of all four schools – it was explained how to organise the screening and to implement the Screening Worksheet, correction criteria and the calculation of the results.
- Each team integrates a member of the A.E.S. project, to provide the support when needed

ITALY

Since our school is a comprehensive institution that accompanies pupils from the first year of primary school up to the third year of lower secondary school, we decided, in agreement with the other project partners, to administer the screening test to pupils in the first year of primary school (1st grade) and, at the same time, we involved pupils who are preparing to start the first year of a new cycle of education, in the first year of lower secondary school (6th grade), designing a screening test for them too. Before starting the actual administration of the screening tests, we involved the teachers of the students involved to present the project to them.

MALTA

Before the screening was to take place, the project manager and the project co-ordinator held a meeting with the relevant school staff. The people present from the school were the head of primary school, the early years teacher assistant, the year 1 and year 2 teachers and two learning support assistants – one who assists in year 1 and the other who assists in year 2. The school staff present at this meeting, were given a full update of the screening that was to take place. It was explained that the screening was to be timed and that the pupils were expected to work on their own. The test sheets were explained to the teachers, who were informed of the rationale of the test. The manner in which the test was to take place was also explained, where the teachers were told that they would need to explain to their class that the test consisted of a set of tasks that needed to be completed on their own.

2/ How the Screening was organised (in one school, in several schools, teachers involved, period, etc.)

BULGARIA

In Bulgaria the Screening process was organised in three different schools – two of them in the city of Ruse, and one – in a nearby town of Marten.

The Screening worksheet was applied by the class teachers /members of the school teams/ with all pupils who are at the end of 1st grade.

As the classes are big (up to 26 pupils), some teachers decided to divide them into two groups, and apply the Worksheet in two separate sessions (one per group).

All sessions were organised in the period 2 – 13 May 2022.

TURKEY

- In Türkiye, implementation was held in two different schools of two different zones in Kocaeli district. In Darıca: Aslan Çimento Primary School and in Derince: İshakçılar Primary School.
- The class teachers, who are also members of the school teams, administered the screening worksheet to all the first graders in a randomly chosen classroom in each school.
- The screening worksheet was applied to the students (at the end of the first grade) by their classroom teachers and by the members of school teams.
- Screening took place during a session in both schools. Not simultaneously, but between May 2 and May 13, 2022, the sessions were organized.

LATVIA

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

CZECH REPUBLIC

The screening was held in May and June 2022 at the above mentioned two elementary schools, in the first grades of both schools. The screening was administered by teachers involved in the project and/or trained to do the screening assessment – they were instructed by a school psychologist from ZŠ Poznáváníí. All the results from children at both schools were processed by the project manager at ZŠ Poznáváníí, who is a school psychologist.

PORTUGAL

In Portugal the Screening process was organized in four different schools - three of them in the city of Sines, and the other in the nearby area of Sines – Porto Côvo, a rural school. The Screening Worksheet was applied by the class teachers/ members of the school teams, or by a member of the A.E.S. project, with all pupils of 1st grade, about one month before the end of the 1st grade (end of the school year). All sessions were organized in the period from 11th to 20th of May 2022, except the 1ªA Class of the E.B.nº1 who only did the screening worksheet at the end of the 1st grade. Since the 1st grade classes involved in the screening process did not exceed 20 students, the worksheet was applied in one session.

ITALY

The tests were administered in our comprehensive institute in the month of May, both in the first part of the month and in the final part. A total of 3 class teachers and 3 support teachers were involved.

MALTA

The screening took place at Newark School Malta. Newark hosts children from pre-grade (3yrs) up to the last year of compulsory school age in Malta (16yrs). It is split into primary, middle and senior school departments. Newark is a private school with very small classes since it focuses on individual attention therefore numbers within a classroom are kept to a maximum of 15 pupils. Newark is an inclusive school that values diversity and inclusion. It was decided that the screening will take place with the year 1 and the year 2 pupils. This decision was taken, because although the project indicated year 1 pupils, in Malta, children who are in year 1 are actually a year younger than those in schools of the project partners. Therefore, it was felt that the sample would not yield the desired results. As such, the screening was done again a second time round, where the sample consisted of pupils from year 2.

The staff involved in the screening included the year 1 and year 2 teachers, the year 1 and 2 learning support assistant, the head of primary and the head of school. All these persons were present at a meeting that took place at the school for the purpose of coordination and team

work.

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

According to the Proposal, the plan was to apply the Screening Worksheet with 350 within the partnership (50 per country in average). Because of the COVID restrictions that were still on place in some of the partner countries, it was difficult for them to achieve these numbers, while in other countries (Bulgaria and Portugal) much more children were assessed.

As whole, in the seven partner countries the Screening Worksheet was applied to 437 children altogether:

- 142 children – in Bulgaria;
- 51 children – in Turkey;
- 44 children – in Latvia;
- 47 children – in the Czech Republic;
- 86 children – in Portugal;
- 37 children – in Italy;
- 30 children – in Malta.

4/ Results: How many children showed low results /less than 50%/ and were recommended to be tested with Individual tests at the nextstage?

In average 14.42% of tested children showed results less than 50%, which puts them in the group of children at risk and were recommended for further testing. Results (percentage) differs from country to country and from school to school.

For example, in Bulgaria in one of the schools only 6.06% of 1st graders have lower results, which can be explained with the fact that children in this school are accepted after interview/test. While in the other two schools there are many students from some disadvantaged families or from minority groups.

In Latvia, a big percentage of the tested children have a mother tongue different from Latvian, and some of the difficulties they demonstrated are due to the fact that they don't speak Latvian very well.

All the results are shown in the Tables in the Annex 1.

5/ Any feedback from teachers who participated in the Screening.

Teachers from the teams who conducted the Screening in partner countries were asked to share their observations, opinion and recommendations after applying the test. Below are some of their feedback:

- Most of them agree that the tool is clear, understandable and easy to be applied in the classroom setting.
- Results are reliable and can be used for identifying the difficulties and advise the children who showed lower results for further assessment and intervention;
- the screening process was successful for diagnosing the students and working as a team to help their development;
- The screening worksheet is not time-consuming;
- Children understood the tasks and worked rather independently;
- Teachers had no difficulty to administer the screening within the whole class.

Most of the teachers shared their wish this tool to be applied to all 1st grade students every schoolyear in order to identify possible deficits as earlier as possible. They also asserted that they would recommend this to their colleagues.

There were some concerns, mainly based on the specifics of the educational system in different

partner countries and the specific situation.

In Italy and Malta, children start school earlier and at the end of the first school year the process of reading acquisition is not completed. This made some of the tasks difficult for children to work independently – they needed more explanations and in many cases the allocated time was not enough for them.

Based on the teachers' observations, partners decided when applying the Screening Worksheet in future, to recommend it to be applied to children who have completed the process of reading acquisition (for some countries it may mean – the mid or the end of the second school year).

Another question to discuss is how to proceed with children who show borderline results (50-60%) – some of them appear borderline in all observed areas while some others show rather diverse results, i.e., some assessed areas are well-developed but others are under average. Children from this “borderline” group should probably be directed for further assessment and receive further intervention as well.

As whole the feedback received from all team-members who applied the Screening Worksheet in all partner countries is very positive and the evaluation of the quality of the tool is high.

1st Stage Results /by country/BULGARIA

O.Paisii Primary School - Marten													
Име	зад.1	зад.2	зад.3	зад.4	зад.5	зад.6	зад.7	зад.8	зад.9-а	зад.9-б	зад.10	зад.11	Общо
А.Т.	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	1.5	0	0	1	9
А.Д.	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	1.5	2	1	24.5
А.Г.	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	1.5	2	1	24.5
Б.Г.	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	1.5	1	0	1	6.5
В.Й.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	3
Д.Х.	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	1.5	2	1	24.5
Д.Б.	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	1.5	1.5	0	1	8
Е.Г.	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	2	1.5	1.5	0	1	12
З.К.	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	1.5	2	1	24.5
З.М.	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	1.5	2	1	24.5
И.И.	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	1.5	2	1	24.5
Л.К.	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	1	0.5	0	1	6.5
М.Х.	1	1	2	0	3	0	0	2	2	0	0	1	12
М.Р.	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	1.5	2	1	24.5
М.А.	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	1.5	2	1	24.5
П.К.	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	1.5	2	1	24.5
Р.Г.	1	1	2	2	2	1	1	2	3	1.5	1	1	18.5
С.П.	2	2	2	1	3	2	1	2	3	1.5	2	1	22.5
С.К.	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	1.5	2	1	24.5
С.Г.	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	1.5	2	1	24.5
Т.Г.	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	1.5	2	1	24.5
Т.Л.	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	1.5	2	1	24.5

Fr.Schiller Secondary School - Ruse

1-A class

Име	зад.1	зад.2	зад.3	зад.4	зад.5	зад.6	зад.7	зад.8	зад.9-а	зад.9-б	зад.10	зад.11	Общо
А.	0.5	1	1	1	2	1	2	2	3	1	0	1	15.5
Б.	2	1	2	2	3	1	1	2	3	1.5	0	1	19.5
Б.	1	1	2	1	3	0	2	2	1.5	1	1	1	16.5
В.	0.5	1	2	1	3	2	1	2	3	1.5	2	1	20
В.	2	2	2	2	2	0	2	2	2.5	1.5	2	1	21
Д.	2	0	1	0	2	1	1	2	3	1	0	0	13
Д.	0	1	2	2	3	1	2	2	2.5	1.5	2	1	20
Д.	2	0	2	1	1	0	2	2	3	1	2	0	16
Д.	1	1	1	2	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	10
Д.	2	2	2	1	3	2	1	2	2.5	1.5	2	1	22
И.	0	1	2	2	3	2	1	2	3	1.5	2	1	20.5
И.	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	0	0	19
К.	2	1	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	1.5	1	1	19.5
К.	2	1	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	1.5	2	1	23.5
К.	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	1.5	2	1	24.5
М.	2	2	2	1	2	1	1	2	2.5	1.5	2	1	20
М.	2	1	2	0	1	1	1	2	1.5	1	1	0	13.5
Н.	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	1.5	2	1	20.5
Н.	2	2	2	2	3	1	1	2	3	1	0	1	20
Н.	2	0	2	1	3	1	2	2	2.5	1.5	2	1	20
П.	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	2.5	1.5	2	1	24
П.	2	1	2	2	3	1	1	2	3	1.5	2	1	21.5
Р.	2	1	0	2	0	0	0	2	0.5	1	0	1	9.5

1-B class

Име	зад.1	зад.2	зад.3	зад.4	зад.5	зад.6	зад.7	зад.8	зад.9-а	зад.9-б	зад.10	зад.11	Общо
Б.	2	2	1	1	2	0	1	2	2	1	2	1	17.5
В.	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	3	1.5	2	1	21.5
Г.	2	2	2	1	3	2	2	2	2.5	1.5	2	1	23
Д.	2	2	2	0	2	2	2	2	3	1	2	1	21
Д.	2	2	2	2	3	2	1	2	2.5	1	2	0	21.5
Е.	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	2.5	1.5	2	1	24
Е.	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	1.5	2	1	24.5
К.	2	2	2	2	1	0	1	2	3	1.5	2	1	19.5
К	2	2	1	2	3	2	2	2	1.5	1.5	2	1	22

1-C class

к	2	2	1	2	2	1	2	2	3	1.5	1	1	20.5
М	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	1.5	2	1	24.5
М	2	2	2	0	3	2	2	2	2.5	1.5	2	1	22
М	2	2	2	2	3	2	1	2	1.5	1	2	1	21.5
Н	2	1	2	2	3	2	1	2	2.5	1.5	2	1	22
Н	2	2	2	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	0	1	16
Р	2	2	2	1	3	2	2	2	3	1.5	2	1	23.5
С	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	2.5	1.5	2	1	24
С	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	1.5	2	1	24.5
С	2	2	2	2	3	1	2	2	2.5	1.5	2	0	22
Т	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	2.5	1.5	2	1	24
Ф	2	1	2	2	2	2	1	2	2.5	1.5	2	1	20.5
Х	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	2.5	1.5	2	1	24
Име	зад.1	зад.2	зад.3	зад.4	зад.5	зад.6	зад.7	зад.8	зад.9-а	зад.9-б	зад.10	зад.11	Общо
А	2	2	1	2	3	2	2	2	3	1.5	2	1	23.5
А	1	1	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	1.5	2	1	22.5
Б	0.5	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	1	2	1	22.5
Б	0	1	2	2	3	2	2	3	2	1.5	2	1	20.5
Б	0.5	1	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	1.5	2	1	21
В	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	1.5	2	1	24.5
Г	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	3,1	1.5	2	1	24.5
Д	0.5	1	2	2	2	1	2	2	3	1.5	2	1	20
Д	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	1.5	2	1	24.5
Е	0	1	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	1.5	2	1	21.5
Е	0.5	1	2	2	3	2	2	2	2.5	1.5	2	0	20.5
И	0	0	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	1.5	2	1	20.5
К	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	1.5	2	1	24.5
К	0	1	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	1.5	2	1	21.5
К	2	1	2	2	3	2	2	2	2.5	1.5	2	1	23
Л	0.5	2	1	2	3	2	2	2	3	1.5	2	1	22
Л	1.5	2	1	1	3	0	2	2	3	1.5	2	1	20
М	0.5	1	2	2	3	1	2	2	3	1.5	2	1	21
П	1	2	2	2	3	1	2	2	2.5	1.5	2	0	21
С	2	2	2	2	2	1	0	2	3	1.5	2	1	20.5
С	0.5	1	2	2	3	1	2	2	2	1	2	1	19.5

N.Obretenov Primary School

Име	зад.1	зад.2	зад.3	зад.4	зад.5	зад.6	зад.7	зад.8	зад.9-а	зад.9-б	зад.10	зад.11	Общо
Д.З	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1.75	1	1	1	0.5	6.25
Р.Д	0	0	2	2	0	0	1	2	2	1	1	1	12
Ш.М	0	0	0	2	1	0	2	2	1.5	1.5	0	1	11
Е.М	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	2	2	1	2	0	10

1-A class

М.С	0.5	0	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	1.5	2	1	21
И.С	0.5	0	1	2	2	1	2	2	3	1.5	2	1	18
Х.Ц	1	1	2	2	2	2	1.75	2	3	1.5	2	1	21.75
М.Г	1	2	2	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2	3	1.5	2	1	21
К.А	0.5	0	1	1	3	2	2	2	2.5	1.5	2	1	18.5
Л.П	0	0	1	0	3	0	2	2	2.5	1.5	2	1	15
К.С	1	0	1	2	3	2	2	2	3	1.5	2	1	20.5
Ф.И	1	0	2	1	3	2	2	2	3	1.5	2	1	20.5
М.К	0	0	2	2	3	2	2	2	2.5	1.5	2	1	20
П.Д	1	0	1	1	0.75	0	2	2	3	1.5	2	1	15.25
И.И	0.5	0	1	1	2.75	0	2	2	2.5	1	2	1	15.75
М.М	0.5	0	2	2	2	0	0	2	2.5	1.5	2	1	17.5
Д.Н	1	0	2	2	2	1	2	2	3	1.5	2	1	19.5
С.П	1	1.5	2	2	0.75	0	2	2	2	1	2	1	17.25

1-B class

Име	зад.1	зад.2	зад.3	зад.4	зад.5	зад.6	зад.7	зад.8	зад.9-а	зад.9-б	зад.10	зад.11	Общо
С.П	2	0.75	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	1.5	2	1	24.25
Б.А	2	1	0	1	2	1	0	2	3	1.5	2	0	15.5
Д.Б	2	1	0	2	0	0	0	2	3	1.5	2	1	14.5
В.Н	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0.5	1	1	7.5
Е.Й	2	2	1	2	3	2	2	2	3	1.5	1	1	22.5
Д.И	2	1	2	2	2	1	0	2	2	1	0	1	16
И.Т	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	1.5	2	1	24
Н.М	2	0	1	2	0	1	0	2	1.5	1	0	0	10.5
К.Б	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	2.5	1.5	2	1	24
Я.К	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	1	2	1	24
И.Х	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	2	0.5	1	0	0	7.5
А.А	1	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	0.5	2	1	21.5
К.Х	1	1	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	1	2	1	21
М-М.С	0.5	1	0.5	2	0	0	0	2	2	1.5	2	1	12.5
А.В	2	1	2	2	3	2	1	2	3	1.5	2	1	22.5
Т.Т	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	1.5	2	1	24.5

1-C class

Име	зад.1	зад.2	зад.3	зад.4	зад.5	зад.6	зад.7	зад.8	зад.9-а	зад.9-б	зад.10	зад.11	Общо
С.С	0.5	0	2	1	1.5	1	2	2	3	1.5	2	1	16.5
А.Е	0	0	0	1	3	2	2	2	3	1.5	2	1	17.5
А.Т	0	0	2	2	3	0	2	2	3	1.5	2	1	18.5
Д.Б	1	2	2	2	1.5	2	1.5	2	2	0.5	2	1	19.5
В.И	1	0	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	1.5	2	1	21.5
А.С	0.5	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0.5	1	0	0	5
А.М	1	0	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	1.5	2	1	21.5
А.Р	0.5	1.5	0	0	0.5	0	0	2	1.5	1	2	1	10

М.Р	1	0	2	1	3	1.5	2	2	2.5	1	2	1	19
П.Д	0.5	0	2	2	2	1	2	2	3	1.5	1	1	19
Б.С	0	0	2	2	3	2	1	2	3	1.5	2	0	18.5
В.В	2	1.5	2	0	1.5	1	1	2	2.5	1.5	2	1	18
И.А	0	0	1	1	2.75	0	1.5	2	3	1.5	2	1	15.75
Д.Д	0.5	0	1	2	2.75	0	2	2	3	1.5	0	1	15.75
К.К	0	0	2	2	3	0	2	2	3	1.5	2	1	18.5
Д.Д	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	1	3	1.5	1.5	1	12
С.И	0.5	0	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	1.5	2	0.5	20.5
Д.Ю	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1.5	1	2	1	8.5
Л.В	0.5	0	2	1	3	1	2	2	3	1.5	2	1	19

TURKEY

Questions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		
Scores	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	4.5	2	1		
Students	Points for per question											Total Points	Percentage of success
1	2	1	2	1	0	2	1	2	2.5	1	1	15.5	63.26530612
2	0	1	2	1	0	2	0	1	3	0	0	10	40.81632653
3	2	1	2	2	3	2	2	2	3.5	2	1	22.5	91.83673469
4	2	1	2	2	3	2	1	2	3.5	1	1	20.5	83.67346939
5	2	2	2	2	3	0	0	2	3	1	1	18	73.46938776
6	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	16.32653061
7	2	1	1	1	3	1	0	2	2.5	0	0	13.5	55.10204082
8	2	2	2	1	3	2	2	2	1.5	0	0	17.5	71.42857143
9	0	0	2	1	3	2	1	2	2.5	0	1	14.5	59.18367347
10	2	1	2	2	3	1	0	2	2	1	0	16	65.30612245
11	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	3.5	0	1	21.5	87.75510204
12	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	4	1	1	23	93.87755102
13	2	2	2	2	3	2	0	2	3.5	0	1	19.5	79.59183673
14	2	2	2	2	3	2	1	2	3	2	1	22	89.79591837
15	2	1	2	2	3	2	1	2	2	1	1	19	77.55102041
16	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0.5	0	0	1.5	6.12244898
17	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	4.5	1	1	23.5	95.91836735
18	2	0	1	2	1	2	1	2	0	1	1	13	53.06122449
19	2	1	1	2	3	2	1	2	3.5	2	1	20.5	83.67346939
20	2	1	1	2	3	2	1	2	3.5	0	1	18.5	75.51020408
21	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	4.5	2	1	24.5	100
22	2	2	2	2	3	0	0	2	4.5	0	0	17.5	71.42857143
23	2	2	2	2	3	0	2	2	3	0	0	18	73.46938776

24	2	1	2	2	1	0	2	2	0.5	0	0	12.5	51.02040816
25	2	2	2	2	3	1	2	2	4	2	0	22	89.79591837
26	2	2	2	2	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	13	53.06122449
27	2	2	2	2	3	2	1	2	3	0	0	19	77.55102041
28	2	2	2	2	3	2	0	2	3	1	0	19	77.55102041
29	2	1	2	2	3	1	1	2	4	2	0	20	81.63265306
30	2	1	2	2	3	2	0	2	3.5	2	0	19.5	79.59183673
31	2	2	2	2	3	2	1	2	4	2	0	22	89.79591837
32	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	6	24.48979592
33	2	2	2	2	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	13	53.06122449
34	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	2	0.5	0	0	13.5	55.10204082
35	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	4.5	2	2	25.5	104.0816327
36	2	2	2	2	3	0	2	2	4	2	2	23	93.87755102
37	2	2	2	2	3	1	1	2	4	2	2	23	93.87755102
38	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	4.5	2	2	25.5	104.0816327
39	2	2	2	1	0	2	0	2	3.5	2	2	18.5	75.51020408
40	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	2	0	22	89.79591837
41	2	2	2	2	3	0	2	2	4	2	2	23	93.87755102
42	2	2	2	2	3	1	2	2	3	2	0	21	85.71428571
43	2	2	2	2	3	1	2	2	4	0	2	22	89.79591837
44	2	2	2	2	3	1	2	2	4.5	2	2	24.5	100
45	2	2	2	2	3	2	1	2	4.5	2	0	22.5	91.83673469
46	2	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	3.5	0	0	9.5	38.7755102
47	2	1	2	2	2	0	0	2	0.5	0	2	13.5	55.10204082
48	0	0	2	2	3	1	2	1	2	0	0	13	53.06122449
49	2	2	2	2	3	1	2	2	1.5	0	0	17.5	71.42857143
50	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	4.5	2	2	24.5	100
51	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	3.5	2	2	24.5	100
Success percentage of questions	80%	57.50%	85%	82.50%	76.60%	80%	47.50%	87.50%	57.70%	35%	70%	All over successes percentage 68%	

LATVIA

Points' allocation	Max. points	Andrejs	Madara	Nikola	Maksims	Lorēna	Angelika	Arvids	Emilija	Annika	Milana	Ērika	Iļja	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	Aļina	Nikita	Ermiņa	Jānis	Nikola	Elīza	Aleksandrs	Rinalds	Jana	Milāna	Līana	Damirs	Gabriela	Elizabete	Iļja	Artjoms	Veronika	Ksenija	Līana	
0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	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	0	1	2	1,5
2	0	0	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	2	1	1	2	0	0	0	1	1	2
2	0	2	2	1	2	2	0	2	2	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	2	0	2	0
3	0	0	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	1	2	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	3	1
1	0	2	2	2	2	1,5	1	1	2	2	1	2	0	2	2	1	2	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	2	0
2	0	2	2	2	3	3	3	1	2	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
1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	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	Olvers	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

CZECH REPUBLIC

pupíl ID	TASK 1	TASK 2	TASK 3	TASK 4	TASK 5	TASK 6	TASK 7	TASK 8	TASK 9+10	TASK 11	TASK 12	TOTAL
Daník	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	4,5	2	1	24,5
Mati	2	1	2	0	3	0	1	1	2,5	2	1	15,5
Franta	1,5	2	2	2	3	2	0	1	4,5	2	1	21
Barbora	0	0	1	2	3	0	1	1	3	0	1	12
Vincent	2	2	2	2	3	2	1	2	4,5	2	1	23,5
Robin	1,5	1	2	2	2	2	1	2	4	1	1	19,5
Honzík	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	4,5	2	1	24,5
Miki V.	0	2	2	2	3	0	2	1	4,5	2	1	19,5
Ella	2	2	2	2	3	1	2	2	3	1	1	21
Matthew	2	2	2	2	2	2	0	2	4	2	1	21
Violka	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	1,5	1	1	8,5
Stela	0	1	1	1	3	2	2	2	3	0	1	16
Bertička	2	2	2	1	3	2	1	2	4	1	1	21
Miki K.	2	0	2	2	2	1	0	2	4,5	2	1	18,5
Jindra	2	2	1	2	3	1	0	2	3,5	2	1	19,5
Ota	2	2	2	2	1	0	2	2	4	2	1	20
Jáša	2	2	2	1	3	2	2	2	4,5	2	1	23,5
Julie	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	3,5	1	1	20,5
Anabel	0,5	2	2	2	3	2	0	2	4,5	0	0	18
Kubík	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	1	1	22
Sofie	2	1	2	2	3	1	2	2	4,5	2	1	22,5
Steli	2	1	2	2	3	1	2	2	4,5	2	1	22,5
Natalie	1	2	2	2	1	2	0	2	2,5	1	1	16,5
Sofi O.	2	1	2	2	3	1	2	2	4,5	2	0	21,5
Martin	2	1	2	2	1	1	0	2	4,5	2	1	18,5
Mia	1	0	2	2	3	1	2	2	4,5	0	1	18,5
Paťa	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	4,5	2	0	20,5

Klára	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	4,5	2	1	24,5
Matyáš	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	4,5	2	1	24,5
Terka	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	4	2	0	20
Odeta	2	1	2	2	3	0	2	2	4,5	2	1	21,5
Vilém	2	1	2	2	3	2	2	2	4,5	2	1	23,5
Víki	2	0	2	2	3	2	1	2	4,5	2	1	21,5
Thea	2	0	2	1	3	2	0	2	3,5	0	1	16,5
Šimon	2	2	2	1	3	2	2	2	4,5	2	1	23,5
Stella	1	1	2	2	3	2	1	2	4,5	2	1	21,5
Oskar	2	1	2	2	3	2	2	2	4,5	0	0	20,5
Natálka	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4,5	2	1	9,5
Kari	2	1	2	2	3	2	1	2	4	2	1	22
Kačka	0,5	0	2	2	1	0	0	2	3,5	1	1	13
Justýna	2	1	2	2	3	2	1	2	4,5	2	1	22,5
Julinka	1	0	1	2	2	2	1	2	4,5	2	1	18,5
Izi	2	1	2	1	3	2	0	2	4	2	1	20
Isabella	2	0	2	2	3	2	0	2	4,5	1	1	19,5
Hanička	0,5	1	2	2	3	2	0	2	4,5	1	1	19
Fany	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	4,5	2	1	24,5
David	2	0	2	2	3	0	0	2	4,5	2	1	18,5

PORTUGAL

E.B. nº1 class: 1ºA

Nº	Nome	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	Total	%
		2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	4,5	2	1		
1	André	2	2	2	2	3	2	1	2	4,5	2	1	23,50	96%
2	Constança	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	4,5	2	1	24,50	100%
3	Daniel	2	2	2	2	3	1	2	2	4,5	2	1	23,50	96%
4	Davi	2	2	1	1	1	2	0	2	4,5	0	1	16,50	67%
5	Flora	2	2	1	2	1	2	2	2	3,5	2	1	20,50	84%
6	yara	2	2	2	1	0	1	0	2	3	0	1	14,00	57%
7	Jason	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	4,5	2	1	24,50	100%
8	Julieta	0	2	2	2	3	0	2	2	4	2	1	20,00	82%
9	lucia	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	2	1	0	1	8,00	33%
10	Yara	2	2	2	2	3	0	0	2	3,5	2	1	19,50	80%
11	Martim	0	2	1	1	3	2	0	2	3,5	2	1	17,50	71%
12	Melissa	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1,00	4%
13	Rodrigo	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2,5	0	1	5,50	22%
14	Samuel	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	1	0	7,00	29%
15	Samir	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	2,00	8%
16	Tomás	0	0	2	1	1	2	0	2	4,5	2	1	15,50	63%
17	Vítor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	1	5,00	20%

E.B. nº2 class: 1ºC

Nº	Nome	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	Total	%
		2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	4,5	2	1		
1	Afonso	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	2	2,5	2	0	17,5	71,40%
2	Alicia	0	2	1	1	3	2	0	1	1,5	0	1	12,5	51,00%
3	Beatriz	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	1,5	1	1	18,5	75,50%
6	Camila	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	8%
7	Enzo	0	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	1,5	2	1	17,5	71,40%
8	Gabriel	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
9	Gonçalo	2	0	2	1	1	0	0	2	1	2	1	12	48,90%
10	Gustavo	0	1	2	1	3	2	1	2	3,5	0	1	16,5	67,30%
11	Inês	2	2	2	2	0	2	0	2	4,5	1	1	18,5	75,50%
13	Júlia	2	2	0	2	2	2	2	2	3,5	2	1	20,5	83,60%
15	Martim	0	1	0	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	1	17	69,30%
16	Martim	2	2	2	1	2	0	2	2	3,5	2	1	19,5	79,50%
17	Pedro	2	2	1	1	1	2	0	2	4	0	0	15	61,20%
18	Suri	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	4,5	0	1	22,5	91,80%
19	Violeta	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	4	1	1	23	93,80%
20	Wallace	0,5	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	4	2	1	21,5	87,70%
21	Paula	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	5	20,40%

E.B. n^o2 class: 1^oD

N ^o	Nome	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	Total	%
		2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	4,5	2	1		
2	Afonso	2	2	2	2	0	0	0	2	2	2	1	15	61,20%
3	Alexandre	2	0	1	2	0	2	2	2	4,5	0	1	16,5	67,30%
4	Ana Júlia	2	2	2	1	3	1	1	2	4	0	1	19	77,5
5	Ariana	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3,5	2	1	22,5	91,8
6	Catarina	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	4	2	1	24	98%
7	Cauã	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	3,5	2	1	23,5	95,90%
8	Daniel	0,5	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	1	5,5	22%
9	Elena	2	2	2	2	3	2	1	2	2	2	1	21	85,70%
10	Gustavo	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	1	21	85,70%
11	Gonçalo	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2,5	2	1	20,5	83,60%
12	José	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	4,5	2	1	24,5	100%
13	Leticia	1	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1,5	2	1	17,5	71,40%
14	Maria	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	4,5	2	1	24,5	100%
15	Matilde	1	0	1	1	2	1	1	2	0	0	1	10	40,80%
16	Rui	1	2	1	2	1	2	0	2	3,5	2	1	17,5	71,40%
17	Salvador	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	4,5	2	1	22,5	91,80%
18	Tiago	2	2	1	1	1	1	0	2	2	1	1	14	57,10%
19	Valentina	2	2	2	2	2	2	0	2	3,5	0	1	18,5	75,50%
20	Xavier	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	4	1	1	23	93,80%

E.B. n^o3 class: 1^oG

N ^o	Nome	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	Total	%
		2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	4,5	2	1		
1	Ana	2	2	2	2	1	0	2	2	2	2	1	18	73,40%
2	André	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	4,5	2	1	24,5	100,00%
3	Arthur	2	2	2	2	3	2	1	2	4	2	1	23	93,80%
4	Diana	1	0	2	2	2	2	0	0	2,5	1	1	13,5	55,10%
5	Diogo	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1,5	0	1	17,5	71,40%
6	Emanuel	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2,5	2	1	20,5	84%
7	Francisco	2	2	2	1	0	0	0	2	4	2	1	16	65,30%
8	João C.	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	4	2	1	24	98%
9	João F.	0,5	2	2	2	0	2	0	2	2	1	1	14,5	59,10%
10	Lourenço	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	1	4	2	1	23	93,80%
11	Lucas	2	2	2	2	0	1	0	2	3	2	1	17	69,30%
12	Luna	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	1,5	2	1	19,5	79,50%
13	Manuel	2	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	2,5	2	1	11,5	46,90%
14	Martim	2	0	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	2	1	21	85,70%
15	Miguel	2	2	2	2	0,5	2	1	2	2	2	1	18,5	75,50%
16	Ricardo	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	4,5	2	1	24,5	100,00%
17	Rúben	2	2	2	2	3	0	2	2	3	2	1	21	85,70%
18	Tomás	1	2	2	2	0	1	1	2	4	2	1	18	73,40%

E.B. de Porto Côvo class: PC1

Nº	Nome	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	Total	
		2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	4,5	2	1	24,5	
1	Bárbara	1	2	2	2	3	0	2	2	2	0	1	17	69,00%
2	Clara	0	2	2	2	2	2	0	2	2	0	0	14	57,00%
3	Francisco	0,5	2	2	2	1	0	0	2	2,5	0	0	9,5	49%
4	Gustavo	0	2	2	2	1	1	0	2	1,5	0	0	11,5	47%
5	João	0	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	0	1	19	78%
6	José	0,5	2	1	1	0	1	0	2	4,5	2	1	15	61,00%
7	Laura	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	1	20	82%
8	Matilde	1	2	2	2	2	0	2	2	0,5	0	1	14,5	59,00%
9	Micaella	1	2	2	2	1	0	0	2	0,5	0	0	10,5	43,00%
10	Tiago	0,5	2	2	1	2,5	2	2	1,5	3	2	1	19,5	80,00%
11	Victoria	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	2	1	23	94,00%
12	Yasmin	2	2	2	2	3	2	1	2	3,5	0	1	20,5	84%
13	Giulia	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0,5	0	0	2,5	10,00%

ITALY

Class 1st course A

Students	Task 1	Task 2	Task 3	Task 4	Task 5	Task 6	Task 7	Task 8	Task 9	Task 10	Task 11	TOTAL	%
1	0	1	1	0	1,5	0	2	2	4,5	1	1	14	57%
2	0	1	1	0	1,5	0	2	2	4,5	1	1	14	57%
3	0	1	1	0	1,5	0	2	2	4,5	1	1	14	57%
4	2	2	1	2	3	2	2	2	4,5	2	1	23,5	96%
5	2	1	2	2	3	2	2	2	4,5	2	1	23,5	96%
6	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	4,5	2	1	24,5	100%
7	1	1	1	0	3	2	2	2	4,5	1	0	17,5	71%
8	0,5	1	0	1	2	1	0	2	4,5	1	1	14	57%
9	2	2	2	2	3	1	2	2	4,5	2	1	23,5	96%
10	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	4,5	2	1	24,5	100%
11	2	2	1	2	3	2	2	2	4,5	2	1	23,5	96%
12	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	4,5	2	1	24,5	100%
13	1	0	2	2	3	1	0	2	4	1	1	17	69%
14	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	4,5	1	1	23,5	96%
15	1	1	2	2	3	2	2	2	4,5	2	1	22,5	92%
16	2	2	2	2	3	1	2	2	4,5	2	1	23,5	96%
17	2	2	2	2	1,5	2	2	2	4,5	2	1	23	94%

Class 1st course B

Students	Task 1	Task 2	Task 3	Task 4	Task 5	Task 6	Task 7	Task 8	Task 9	Task 10	Task 11	TOTAL	%
1	2	1	2	2		1	2	2	4,5	2	1	19,5	80%
2	2	1	1	2	2	2	1	2	4,5	1	1	19,5	80%
3	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	4,5	2	1	24,5	100%
4	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	4	0	1	20	82%
5	1	1	2	2	3	1	0	2	4	2	1	19	78%
6	2	0	2	2	2,5	2	2	2	4,5	1	0	20	82%
7	2	2	1	2	3	2	2	2	4,5	2	1	23,5	96%
8	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	4,5	2	1	24,5	100%
9	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	4	2	1	24	98%
10	0	2	1	2	0	1	0	2	4,5	0	0	12,5	51%
11	1	2	2	0	0,5	2	0	2	4,5	1	1	16	65%
12	2	1	2	1	3	2	2	2	2,5	0	1	18,5	76%
13	2	2	1	2	3	2	2	2	4,5	2	1	23,5	96%
14	1	2	2	2	3	1	2	2	4,5	1	1	21,5	88%
15	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	4,5	2	1	24,5	100%
16	4	2	1	2	2	1	2	2	4,5	2	1	23,5	96%
17	0,5	0	2	0	3	2	2	2	4	0	0	15,5	63%

MALTA

Task	Points' allocation	Max. points	GIORGA	HUSSEIN	SOPHIE	BEA	ERIC	ARIA	NEVAN	ZOE	CHARLIE	SARA	MOLLIE	LEXANDER	SERGIO	EBUAD	FEDERICA
Task 1	x 0,5 p for each correctly numbered sentence	2 points	1	0,5	0,5	1	2	1	0,5	1	0,5	1	1	1	1	1	1
Task 2	x 1 p for spelling; x 1 p for handwriting (cursive)	2 points	2	1	0	2	2	2	0	2	1	2	2	2	2	1	2
Task 3	x 1 p for each correct answer	2 points	2	0	1	2	2	2	1	2	2	0	2	2	2	1	1
Task 4	x 1 p for each correct answer	2 points	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	1	2
Task 5	x 1 p for each correctly divided chain	3 points	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0
Task 6	x 1 p for each correctly "arranged" word	2 points	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Task 7	x 1 p for each correctly "arranged" sentence; x 1 p for respecting punctuation, capital letter	2 points	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	2	2	2	2	0	0	0	0
Task 8	x 1 p for each correct numerical row	2 points	0	2	2	2	2	1	2	1	2	2	1	2	1	2	2
Task 9	x 0,5 p for each correct calculation	4.5 points	1.5	4.5	1.5	4	4.5	3	4	2.5	4.5	3.5	4.5	4	1.5	2.5	3
Task 10	x 1 p for correctly composed solution (correctly chosen arithmetic operation; logic); x 1 p for correct calculation	2 points															
Task 11	x 1 in case of correct answer	1 point	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1
Total max.score		24.5 points	11.5	17	9	18	18.5	13	12.5	16.5	17	15.5	16.5	16	10.5	8.5	14

	CLARA	MARA	MAX	KATE	LUCY	MELLO	RUBEN	PENNY	MAXINE	CATTY	SALLY	MARCUS	STEFAN	GIOVE	MARY
1	1.5	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	1	2
2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
4	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	2	2	2
5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2
6	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2
7	1	1	2	2	1	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
8	1	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
9	4	4	4	4.5	4	4.5	3.5	3	4	4	4.5	4	4	4	4
10	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
11	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
12	18.5	21	21	21.5	20	20.5	18.5	20	20	19	20.5	20	20	21	23

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