

TRAINING OF TRAINERS Handbook



COGNI-TEACH 2023-1-HU01-KA220-HED-000159529



Overall Purpose:

The purpose of this guide is to prepare specialists (trainers/multipliers) who can effectively support teachers in using **the Cognitive and Sensorimotor Profile Test** and its related instructional tools, maximising educational potential and ensuring effective dissemination of project outcomes.

Primary Objectives:

1 Capacity building of facilitators:

- Guide and support teachers in effectively utilising the video-based instructional course available on the project website: www.cogni-teach.com
- Promote and facilitate the practical implementation of the Cognitive and Sensorimotor Profile Test.

2 Enhanced teacher competencies:

Equip facilitators to effectively train a broader group of teachers to:

- Accurately administer the Cognitive and Sensorimotor Profile Test.
- Interpret assessment results meaningfully and practically.
- Implement evidence-based instructional practices tailored to children's cognitive and sensorimotor profiles.

3 Innovative pedagogical approach:

Provide facilitators with comprehensive knowledge and practical skills regarding:

- Traditional methods of evaluating children's cognitive and sensorimotor abilities.
- Contemporary methodologies emphasizing data-driven, personalized teaching strategies.

Target Groups:

1 **Primary:** facilitators (In the project lifetime the consortium trained 4 specialists per country).

2 **Secondary:** teachers (In the project lifetime the consortium trained over 160 teachers)

Implementation Strategy and Results:

- **TOT Training Course:** Develop and deliver a comprehensive ToT training course, clearly defining learning outcomes aligned with graduate and postgraduate training course modules. The course content will be available in Hungarian, German, and Ukrainian languages.
- **Face-to-Face (F2F) workshops:** Conduct structured, interactive ToT workshops.
- **Local online workshops:** Each of the trained facilitators will conduct 1 local online workshop, training, ensuring hands-on practice and direct application of learned methods.
- **Feedback and evaluation:** Collect structured feedback from the participating teachers, who will pilot the e-course, Cognitive and Sensorimotor Profile Test, and related instructional tools. Feedback will guide improvements and validate training effectiveness. – see attached the suggested Feedback form

Expected Outcome of the ToT course:

- **Skilled Facilitators:** Trainers capable of independently supporting teachers.
- **Effective Dissemination:** Widespread sharing of innovative educational practices.
- **Enhanced Teaching Practices:** Improved competencies leading to better educational outcomes for children.

Teacher Training Course Content and Methodology:

Session 1: The use of the Sensorimotor and Cognitive Profile Test

(Based on Training Videos 1–3)

Introduction

The **Sensorimotor and Cognitive Profile Test (SCPT)**, developed by **Éva Gyarmathy and Zénó Szabó**, is a unique tool designed to reveal **profiles of cognitive functioning** and **sensorimotor development**.

- Unlike traditional IQ or aptitude tests, it does not produce a single score.
- Instead, it identifies **strengths and areas for development** to support **school success and personal growth**.
- The training course is presented in four videos. This module integrates the **first three** into a single structured learning resource for teachers.

Part I – Principles of the Test (Video 1)

https://youtu.be/4rUJY_3iCdw

Key Concepts

- **Not just about scores:** The SCPT focuses on *how children think* rather than only *what they know*.
- **Test development:** Based on decades of research, updated into an **online, multilingual tool** that includes sensorimotor tasks.
- **Educational motivation:** Originally developed to help address rising **school failure rates in the 1990s**.
- **Limitations of testing:**
 - A test result is like a **photograph**—it shows a moment, not the whole story.
 - Context, motivation, fear, or fatigue can all affect results.
- **Complementary methods:** Testing should be combined with:
 - **Observation** (play, movement, social interaction)
 - **Conversations/interviews** (formal and informal)
 - **Questionnaires** (structured or semi-structured)

Part II – Profiles for School Success (Video 2)

<https://youtu.be/SiPkQcDMpKc>

Purpose of the Test

- Focuses on **skills critical for reading, writing, and arithmetic**.
- No “total score” is given — the **profile matters most**.
- Flexible task selection allows adaptation to **individual age, level, and professional questions**.

Benefits of Profiling

- Identifies **strengths and weaknesses** in cognitive structures.
- Useful for:
 - **Individual profiles** (support personal learning pathways)
 - **Group profiles** (compare with peers, track annual progress)

Not an IQ Test

- Evaluates **general cognitive ability** and **information processing functions**.
- Highlights underlying causes of **learning difficulties**.

Profiles of Common Problem Areas

- **Sociocultural disadvantage**: language/sequential processing difficulties.
- **Delays in intellectual abilities**: broad weaknesses in primary cognitive functions.
- **Learning difficulties**: immaturity in specific sensorimotor functions, often sequentiality.
- **Attention disorders**: inconsistent results (strengths in some areas, unexplained errors in others).

Data Presentation

- Results are shown in a **circular map** (easy to interpret, even without psychological training).

Part III – Practical Use of the Online Test (Video 3)

<https://youtu.be/nZMXeJ44WwU>

Getting Started

- **Registration & login:**
 - Examiners must register (choose “Parent” or “Professional” role).
 - Test subjects (children) do not register. They use **access codes** and **passwords** generated by the examiner.
- **Profiles & codes:**
 - Each examinee receives a unique access code and password.
 - Group codes can be created for classes or groups (results can be downloaded in bulk).

Conducting Assessments

- Younger children: examiner may log in for them.
- Older children: can log in independently with their code and password.
- Examiners can:
 - Reset passwords
 - Delete or update entries
 - View results in detail

Viewing & Interpreting Results

- **Individual Results Page:** task scores and completion times.
- **Visualizations:**
 - **Pie chart:** compares the child’s performance with reference averages.
 - **Statistical graph:**
 - Green = average range (± 1 SD)
 - Yellow = mild deviation ($\pm 1-2$ SD) Red = significant deviation ($\pm 2+$ SD)
- **Downloads:** results can be exported (XLS/CSV) for groups or individuals, over chosen time periods.

Key Takeaways:

1. The test is about **profiles, not scores**. Always interpret in context and combine with other assessment methods.
2. The test supports **school success** by identifying different **problem profiles** and strengths, using a clear, easy-to-interpret circular map.
3. The online platform makes the test **practical, accessible, and easy to manage**, with strong visualization and export options.

Suggested Discussion Questions fro the ToT Course:

1. (Video 1) Why is it dangerous to interpret a single test result as a complete picture of a child?
2. (Video 2) How might recognizing different profiles (e.g. sociocultural vs. attention disorder) influence the support strategies you choose in class?
3. (Video 3) How can the visualization tools (pie chart, statistical graph) make results easier for teachers to interpret and act upon?

Suggested Activities for the ToT Course:

Activity 1 – Case Interpretation (Video 1 focus)

- Give teachers **sample test “photographs” (fictional results)**.
- Ask them to identify limitations of interpreting only the data.
- Discuss what **additional observations/interviews** would be useful.

Activity 2 – Profile Mapping (Video 2 focus)

- Provide **circular profile maps** of sample learners.
- Teachers identify key strengths/weaknesses and propose **interventions**.

Activity 3 – Platform Walkthrough (Video 3 focus)

- Simulate logging into the online system.
- Teachers practice **generating codes, viewing results, and reading graphs**.
- End with group reflection: *How can this be integrated into your daily work?*

Activity 4 – “Promoting the Profile Test” (Multiplication Focus)

Objective: Encourage teachers to reflect on how they can introduce the Sensorimotor and Cognitive Profile Test to colleagues and embed it in their school’s professional culture.

1. **Small group brainstorm (10–15 min):**
 - Imagine you want to introduce the test platform to your colleagues in a staff meeting or teacher training day.
 - What *benefits* would you highlight (for teachers, for students, for parents)?
 - What *obstacles* might arise (time, resistance, lack of familiarity) and how would you address them?
 - What *practical examples* could you share to make the test’s value visible?
2. **Create a short “pitch” (5–7 min per group):**
 - Groups prepare a **2-minute presentation** as if they were explaining the test to their colleagues.
3. **Sharing & reflection (10 min):**
 - Each group presents their “pitch.”
 - Discuss as a whole group: Which messages were most convincing? What strategies could work best in your school context?

Session 2: Interpretation, and application of the Sensorimotor and Cognitive Profile Test

Introduction

This session of the training builds on the foundations presented in **Videos 1–3** (principles, structure, and registration) by moving into **practical use, interpretation, and application of the Sensorimotor and Cognitive Profile Test**. Teachers will see how to:

- Familiarize themselves with the test tasks (Video 4).
- Understand results through a real case study (Video 5).
- Apply the test in group settings and research contexts (Video 6).

The focus is on helping teachers integrate this tool into their everyday teaching practice and use it for both **individual support** and **school-wide development strategies**.

Part 1. - Getting to Know the Test (Video 4)

<https://youtu.be/sY64DF8QatI>

- Examiners are encouraged to **complete the test themselves first** to gain experience.
- Practice with different individuals (including children) helps ensure smooth administration.
- The test is available in **multiple languages** and can be used at any age with age-appropriate tasks.
 - Under 8 years: **individual testing with adult support**.
 - Over 8 years: **group testing** becomes possible.
 - From 14 years: **remote testing** with access codes.
- **Tasks and modules:**
 - 40 tasks across 3 developmental areas.
 - Modules A–D = age-based groups.
 - Module E = offline sensorimotor tasks.
 - Module F = playful tasks for practice.
- **Categories of tasks:**
 - Touchscreen skills (tap, drag).
 - Cognitive development (abstraction, executive functions).
 - School skills (reading, writing, arithmetic).
 - Sensorimotor and sequential tasks (spatial, temporal, linguistic).
 - Offline tasks with downloadable sheets.
- Special questionnaires (e.g., Neurology-Based Performance Disorder Questionnaire) provide insight into learning disorders, attention deficits, and disharmony indicators.

Part 2. - Case Study: Peter (Video 5)

https://youtu.be/cbxVtjnrWhM?si=Q_7O-KuLBYcSlpZm

- **Background:** 13-year-old, bilingual (Hungarian–English), living in Germany, with learning difficulties.
- **Strengths:**
 - Abstract thinking = average.
 - Visual and sequential memory = strong.
 - Numerical ability = adequate.
 - Sensorimotor coordination = above average.
- **Weaknesses:**
 - Spelling and phonological awareness = below average.
 - Word-reading speed = problematic (failed to recognize words).
 - Missed working memory task (Digit Span Backward).
- **Interpretation:**
 - Core cognitive abilities are intact.
 - Main issue = **lack of literacy experience in the tested language**, not bilingualism itself.
 - Recommendation = targeted literacy support in language of schooling + retesting in second language.

Part 3. Using Group and Research Data (Video 6)

<https://youtu.be/aabMyj7nfdU>

- **Applications:**
 - Individual assessment.
 - Group/class profiles.
 - Longitudinal tracking of progress.
 - Scientific research.
- **Group comparisons:** Example of 3 first-grade classes.
 - 1A = average development.
 - 1B = weaknesses in control functions (attention, hyperactivity).
 - 1C = phonological deficits, improved after targeted interventions.
- **Pedagogical implications:**
 - Group averages highlight common issues.
 - Must also identify **individual deviations** from class profile.
 - Supports lesson planning and personalization.
- **Research findings:**
 - Children in small settlements often lag behind peers in larger towns.
 - Data helps teachers realize challenges are developmental, not teaching failures.
 - Movement-based rhymes proved highly beneficial for early literacy skills.

Suggested Reflection Questions for Session 2 :

1. How would you explain to a parent the difference between a *weak test result* caused by developmental delay vs. one caused by lack of experience in a specific language?
2. What advantages do you see in comparing **group profiles** (whole class) alongside **individual profiles**? How could you adapt your teaching if many children in your class showed **phonological awareness difficulties** in their profile test results?

Suggested Activities for Session 2 of the ToT Course:

Activity 1 – Hands-on Exploration

Teachers complete at least one module of the test themselves, reflecting on how the **format and task design** might affect children of different ages.

Activity 2 – Case Study Role Play

Teachers are divided into groups, each receiving a simplified version of Peter's profile. Groups prepare recommendations for:

- Classroom strategies.
- Home support suggestions for parents.
- Follow-up testing needs.

Activity 3 – Group Profile Analysis

Teachers are given a sample dataset of 2–3 class profiles. They discuss:

- Which developmental areas are most in need of support.
- How whole-class activities could address these.
- How to balance group-level interventions with individual attention.

Activity 4 – Promoting the Test (Multiplication)

Teachers work in small groups to design a **2-minute pitch** for introducing the test to colleagues at a staff meeting. They must highlight:

- Benefits for teachers.
- Benefits for students.
- How it supports decision-making and reduces frustration.
- Groups present their pitches, followed by a discussion of the most convincing strategies.

Activity 5 – Designing Local Online Workshops

Teachers plan a **mini online workshop** for their own school or local network. In groups, they outline:

- **Target audience** (e.g., early-grade teachers, special educators, school leadership).

- **Practical activities** to showcase the test (e.g., demo tasks, interpreting a class profile, comparing two case studies).
- **Interactive online strategies** (polls, breakout room discussions, collaborative whiteboards) to keep participants engaged.
- **Follow-up actions** (e.g., inviting colleagues to try the test, setting up a peer support group for implementation).

Learning Outcomes:

Upon successful completion of the ToT course, participants will be able to:

- Confidently administer and interpret results from the Cognitive and Sensorimotor Profile Test.
- Plan and deliver engaging, effective training sessions for teachers.
- Employ evidence-based methodologies, including playful learning, experiential learning, and personalized teaching approaches.
- Facilitate online instructional sessions clearly and interactively.
- Effectively support teachers in applying data-based decision-making to enhance student learning.
- Promote differentiated and enriched learning opportunities tailored to individual student profiles and developmental needs.
- Teachers practice *advocacy skills* and leave the training with concrete ideas for **multiplying the platform's impact** among peers.

Support for facilitators:

- WP2 content developers and trained consultants, including school psychologists, will support online workshops for facilitators.
- Facilitators will disseminate knowledge locally, nationally, and internationally.

Annex 1. Template for ToT Sessions

Agenda

Session 1: Understanding and Planning (2 hours)

Time	Activity	Notes
10 min	Introduction & Icebreaker	Brief introductions & expectations
30 min	Clarification and Q&A	Addressing participant questions
60 min	Collaborative Planning: Playful Activities	Planning practical, playful tasks
20 min	Reflection and Summary	Group presentations & facilitator feedback

Session 2: Implementation and Online Facilitation (2 hours)

Time	Activity	Notes
10 min	Warm-up and Recap	Recap & new questions
30 min	Online Facilitation Techniques	Engaging online teaching methods
60 min	Collaborative Planning for Online Workshops	Developing detailed online session plans
20 min	Course Closure	Reflection, feedback, final clarifications

Annex 2. Attendance Sheet

Training of Trainers (ToT) Session

Date: _____

Location: _____

Facilitator(s): _____

Min. number of participants: 4 + min. 1 facilitator

No. Participant Name Signature Notes/ Role (facilitator/participant/ other)

1

2

3

4

5

6

Annex. 3. Feedback Form for ToT Sessions/ Semi structured interview

You can use this template to collect feedback from the participants. Alternatively, you can collect feedback orally and report the answers in the Reporting Form (Annex. 4)

Please provide your feedback on the Training of Trainers (ToT) sessions, the Cognitive and Sensorimotor Profile Test, and the instructional materials. Your responses will help us improve future training sessions.

Feedback on the ToT Sessions:

- On a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent), how would you rate the overall quality of the ToT sessions?

Score (1-5): _____

- What suggestions do you have to improve future ToT sessions?

Your suggestions (clarity, intuitiveness, structure, consistency, flexibility, functionality, format, usability):

Feedback on the Cognitive and Sensorimotor Profile Test

- On a scale of 1 (difficult) to 5 (easy), how would you rate the usability of the Cognitive and Sensorimotor Profile Test?

Score (1-5): _____

- What improvements or adjustments would you suggest for the test?

Your suggestions (clarity, intuitiveness, structure, consistency, flexibility, functionality, format, usability):

Feedback on the Instructional Materials (videos, slides)

- On a scale of 1 (not useful) to 5 (very useful), how helpful were the instructional materials provided?

Score (1-5): _____

- Do you have any suggestions to enhance the instructional materials (videos, slides)?

Your suggestions (clarity, intuitiveness, structure, consistency, flexibility, functionality, format, usability):

Annex 4. Reporting Form for ToT Sessions

1 Title and content of the TOT Course (One sentence, relevant for reporting):

2 Logistics and preparation:

2.1 How did you organise it?

2.2 How did you recruit participants?

2.3 How did you adapt the suggested [Methodology](#) to better suit your organisation's or target group's needs?

2.4 Please share any other information relevant for reporting.¹

3 Number and Profile of Participants

4 Implementation:

Time and Place

5 Conclusions and feedback:

Please summarize the participants' feedback for each of these aspects:

5.1. Feedback on the ToT Sessions:

On a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent), how did the participants rate the overall quality of the ToT sessions?

Feedback provided by the participants (Details, comments, suggestions for future sessions, min 500 characters):

5.2. Feedback on the Cognitive and Sensorimotor Profile Test:

On a scale of 1 (difficult) to 5 (easy), how did the participants rate the usability of the Cognitive and Sensorimotor Profile Test?

What improvements or adjustments did the participants suggest for the test (regarding clarity, intuitiveness, structure, consistency, flexibility, functionality, format, usability):

5.3. Feedback on the Instructional Materials used (videos, slides):

On a scale of 1 (not helpful) to 5 (very helpful), how helpful were the instructional materials provided?

What suggestions did the participants have to enhance the instructional materials (videos, slides), including suggestions on clarity, intuitiveness, structure, consistency, flexibility, functionality, format, usability, etc.:

6 Impact and future plans:

Draft summary of plans for future online trainings facilitated by the TOT participants, for min. 10 teachers each, and the impact they expect:

Annex 5. Comparative analysis of the ToT trainings implemented in the CogniTeACH Project:

1 Reach and Implementation Patterns

All four partner countries (Austria, Finland, Hungary, Romania) implemented the ToT in line with the project objectives, but with varying levels of scope and modality.

- Austria (JKU) integrated ToT into public STEM outreach events, focusing more on testing the platform with children and teachers than formal training.
- Finland (JYU) used a hybrid self-study and coaching model, emphasizing reflective practice in teacher education contexts.
- Hungary (AVKF) delivered fully online ToT sessions, focusing on data-driven pedagogy and flipped-classroom preparation.
- Romania (SEC) adopted a blended, field-based mentoring model, directly supporting teachers' classroom implementation and peer dissemination.

2 Quantitative Overview

KPI	Target per country	AT	FI	HU	RO	EU Total
Facilitators trained	4	7	4	6	11	28
Local online/on-site workshops	≥4	3	2	4	6	15
Teachers trained (direct)	~40	11	4	6	11	32
Teachers reached (indirect via peer CPD)	—	—	planned 10+	planned 40+	53	100+
Avg. satisfaction (1–5)	≥4	2	3	n/a	4	3.25

3 Quality and Feedback Trends

- Highest satisfaction was reported in Romania (avg. 4.0), where ToT combined theory, practice, and mentoring.
- Lowest ratings came from Austria (2.0), where participants struggled with sometimes ambiguous platform design and curriculum relevance.
- Finland rated moderately (3.0), highlighting the strength of conceptual grounding but insufficient classroom examples.
- Hungary provided qualitative indications of strong engagement but lacked numeric feedback data.

4 Pedagogical Capacity Building

Across contexts, facilitators gained an understanding of cognitive profiling and its educational applications, though confidence levels varied:

- Austria and Finland emphasized platform usability and theoretical integration.
- Hungary and Romania prioritized practical classroom adaptation and mentoring.
- The most effective knowledge transfer occurred when ToT included live modeling (Romania, Finland).

5 Adoption and Early Impact

- Romania achieved the highest dissemination reach (53 additional teachers via school CPD).
- Hungary plans systematic follow-up trainings using online dissemination.
- Finland intends to expand via a blended school-based cascade model.
- Austria identified barriers to adoption (unclear curriculum link, usability issues), offering critical insight for refinement before wider rollout.

6 Equity and Inclusion

All partners ensured participation of educators from diverse backgrounds. Romania explicitly involved rural and vocational teachers. Finland and Hungary included special-needs specialists, while Austria engaged both pre-service and in-service STEM teachers. Limited device availability (Romania) and timing constraints (Finland) highlighted systemic barriers affecting accessibility.

7 Key Cross-National Insights

1. Blended learning is most effective: Romania and Finland's hybrid or field-based approaches led to higher satisfaction and better understanding of the tool.
2. Curriculum integration is essential: Teachers in Austria and Finland stressed the need for curriculum alignment to ensure perceived relevance.
3. Technical and linguistic clarity matters: Interface usability and accurate translations (especially in Finnish) are prerequisites for successful adoption.
4. Mentoring and peer sharing enhance sustainability: Romania's mentoring model offers a replicable structure for cascading capacity building.
5. Theory-practice balance remains key: Teachers appreciate theoretical context but need concrete, classroom-level examples and child-centered interpretations.

8 Effectiveness of the ToT Model

The WP4 design (two-session ToT + local workshops) proved adaptable across contexts. The most successful implementations maintained the flipped-classroom structure and hands-on practice, allowing participants to connect test administration with instructional application.

Strengths observed:

- Flexibility of format (online, hybrid, or field-based).
- Strong facilitator collaboration and peer learning.
- Integration of playful and experiential pedagogies improved teacher motivation.

Areas for improvement:

- The platform and test require clearer orientation materials and consistent navigation.
- Facilitators need ready-to-use examples (lesson plans, case studies) linking cognitive results to teaching strategies.
- More consistent feedback collection across countries would enhance comparability.

9 Lessons Learned

- Design & content: ToT content is relevant and engaging when contextualized with concrete school practices.
- Delivery & logistics: Shorter, more focused sessions (2x2 hours) worked well, but online-only formats limited experiential learning.
- Support needs: Teachers require post-training mentoring or communities of practice to integrate the Cognitive and Sensorimotor Profile Test effectively.

10 Recommendations

Short term (next 6 months):

- Revise and simplify the platform interface; address translation and device compatibility issues.
- Add practical classroom examples and curriculum-aligned guides.
- Provide follow-up micro-sessions or webinars for facilitators.

Medium term (6–18 months):

- Create a certification pathway for facilitators and structured support materials (FAQs, troubleshooting guide).
- Develop short case libraries illustrating application of test results in teaching decisions.
- Establish a shared repository for ToT resources and feedback data.

Sustainability:

- Integrate ToT and Cognitive Profile Test components into national CPD frameworks.
- Encourage cross-country mentoring exchanges to maintain alignment and innovation.

11 Limitations

- Data consistency: quantitative metrics incomplete for Hungary.
- Technical issues and differing ToT interpretations complicate comparisons.
- Small sample sizes and pilot-level implementation limit generalization.

12 Conclusions

The TOT course successfully established a foundational network of facilitators across four partner countries. While national contexts and challenges varied, all partners demonstrated increased capacity to train teachers in cognitive and sensorimotor profiling. The next phase should focus on refining the tool, ensuring curricular integration, and supporting long-term adoption through mentoring and community-based learning.