

Project:

Advancing Educational Inclusion and Quality in South East Europe

Good practices collection guidelines

- first draft (January 14, 2008) -

Table of content

<i>Introduction</i>	2
1. How to identify good practice	3
2. Good practices collection: steps and procedures	5
3. Monitoring and progress evaluation	7
4. Selection criteria and procedures	8
<i>Annex A (Elements of Call for proposals)</i>	9

Introduction

The purpose of this document is to provide the **common project framework for identification, collection and selection of good practices** for combating inequity and advancing quality of education through the stakeholders' participation - that will be carried out by the Country teams in the first phase of the project initiative *Advancing Educational Inclusion and Quality in South East Europe*.

The *Good Practices Guidelines* should provide and ensure

- Preliminary **criteria** and **key indicators of good practices** for combating education inequity through the stakeholders' participation - thus empowering and enabling various school actors (students and teachers in particular) and other education stakeholders (relevant NGOs, youth / parents / teachers associations and networks in particular) to identify relevant examples in their existing practice
- Flexible yet **standardized procedures** and **matrixes** for the good practices collection – thus enabling country teams to ensure sufficient accessibility and responsiveness of key education actors to 'call for proposals' as well as sufficient quantity and quality of the collected good practice descriptions
- **The collection process success criteria/indicators** for each step (minimal quality checks and deliverables) as well as **risk mitigation strategies** - that will enable country teams to self-evaluate the progress of collection process, recognise problems in execution and respond to them appropriately thus ensuring completion of collection process in accordance to agreed quality standards.
- **Selection criteria** and **procedure** proposal – that will serve as input for establishment of interculturality sensitive working group and good practices selection process thus ensuring compilation of cross-country relevant and applicable *Good Practice Collection* (publication).

At this initial stage the document is structured in four sections, each drafting critical milestones of the good practices collection and selection processes.

1st section suggests the most appropriate way of identifying the good practices by various education stakeholders (including school students & teachers, youth associations, NGOs working in the field of education, parents and teachers associations).

2nd section proposes steps and procedures for good practices collection that will be executed by Country teams.

3rd section proposes the collection process monitoring and progress self-evaluation and introduces risk mitigation strategies that will be developed with support of Country teams.

4th section provides inputs for development of good practices selection procedures.

In addition, **Annex A** introduces key elements for Call for proposals development.

At the later stage and upon the consultative process with project experts and country teams, the *Good Practices Guidelines* and *Call for proposals* will be compiled for cross-country distribution to all relevant school actors and other education stakeholders.

1. How to identify good practice for combating education inequity

The **main purpose** of the **collection of good practices** for combating inequity and advancing quality of education through the stakeholders' participation is to provide:

- ☛ review of different types of interventions initiated and/or implemented through stakeholder participation (school students and parents in particular) with the aim to advance educational inclusion and quality at school and local community level
- ☛ mechanism(s) for horizontal learning and best practice exchange thus supporting sustainable initiatives on institutional and local level.

Step 1: Development of preliminary good practice criteria and indicators

Starting from the overall project *Statement of the problem* and documents produced by *Central Research Team*, **specific and user friendly good practices criteria and indicators** should be defined - by project Working group (to be established) - based on which

1. targeted education stakeholders would be able to identify those examples of their practice that could serve as a model for advancing educational inclusion and quality through the stakeholders' participation
2. working group will be able to develop the good practice selection procedures.

The good practices criteria and indicators should be

S – Simple and clearly formulated / easy to comprehend

M – Manageable / easy to apply in practice

A – Adequate / appropriate for all countries involved (cross-country sensitive)

R – Relevant / covering those aspects and areas of inequity where sustainable impact could be obtained by targeted education stakeholders (school students, parents and teachers in particular)

T – Tangible / easy to verify by observing or measuring

Step 1: Development of preliminary good practice criteria and indicators	
<i>Deliverable(s):</i>	1. List of Working group members 2. List of preliminary good practices criteria and indicators
<i>Period:</i>	January – March 2008
<i>Teams & Responsible person:</i>	Steering committee and Working group (with support of Country teams). Njeza Mrse, Steering committee member

Good practices guidelines

The list of good practices criteria and indicators should:

- Include and promote **participation** – involvement of “all or any relevant stakeholder groups (school students, parents, teachers, local community members) in any kind of school management or decision making” (see the project Literature Review).
- Reflect **6 Critical Paradigm Shifts for Equity in Education** (and the questions that should be asked) as briefly described by Paul C. Gorski:

1. The Base Shift: Equality → Equity
 - a. Does every student who walks into our schools have an opportunity to achieve to her or his fullest regardless of race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, religion, socioeconomic status, first language, (dis)ability, and other social and cultural identifiers?
 - b. Is my work contextualized in a bigger social picture that incorporates the history of oppression experienced by a variety of individuals and groups?
2. **Identifying “at-risk” students → Acknowledging a broken system**
 - a. Who am I problematizing?
 - b. Is my goal to make shifts in student outcomes (for which inequities are actually symptoms, not the root problems) working within a broken and inherently racist, sexist, classist, etc., system? Is this possible?
3. **Color-blindness → Self-examination**
 - a. How am I recycling the history of inequity in education?
 - b. Is color-blindness possible? And if so, is it desirable?
4. **Learning about “other cultures” → Dismantling systems of power and privilege**
 - a. “Other” than what?
 - b. Is my work focused on helping people feel OK sitting next to each other, or on addressing the root problem of imbalances of power and privilege that will remain regardless of who sits next to whom?
5. **Celebrating diversity → Advocating and fighting for equity**
 - a. Am I asking students who are already alienated by most aspects of education to celebrate a difference for which they are routinely oppressed? If so, to whose benefit?
 - b. Can I justify the use of limited resources for celebration when inequities persist?
6. **Focus on intent → Focus on impact**
 - a. Is it enough that I intend to do well and fight toward equity, even when my work is misguided and recycles oppressive systems?
 - b. Is it enough to support equity philosophically (such as including it in a school mission statement) while I fail to reflect equity in practice?

- Cover **different** and sometimes overlapping **areas** such as:

- School policy, governance and organization
- Curriculum and textbooks (content)
- Teaching-learning processes (delivery)
- Assessment and school self-evaluation
- School culture (ethos) and intergroup relations
- Partnership between school and local community

2. Good practices collection - steps and procedures

Descriptions of good practice examples will be collected through

- Call for proposals
 - dissemination via post or mailing list(s)
 - advertising (web, relevant newspapers)
- Coordination Network establishment at national level and direct invitation to practitioners who already prove to be innovative in this area of work.

Main task/responsibility of Country teams will be to ensure sufficient accessibility and responsiveness to 'call for proposals' of key education actors as well as sufficient quantity and quality of the collected good practice descriptions. In order to accomplish these objectives several steps have to be executed:

Step 2: Coordination Network establishment at national level

Parallel with [Step 1](#) *Development of preliminary good practice criteria and indicators* (see page 3 of this document), each Country team will prepare review of relevant projects / initiatives and impacts achieved so far and identify institutions/organizations and individuals who carried out these activities. In addition, meeting of key education stakeholders (10-20 representatives) will be organized with aim to establish coordination network and thus ensure sufficient responsiveness to 'call for proposals'.

Step 2: Coordination Network establishment at national level	
<i>Deliverable(s):</i>	3. Mailing list of targeted education stakeholders (both institutions/organizations and individuals) 4. Review of implemented relevant projects and actions 5. List of Coordination Network members
<i>Period:</i>	February – March 2008
<i>Teams & Responsible person:</i>	Country teams appointed Country team member

Step 3: 1st Call for proposal development and dissemination

Parallel with [Step 2](#), the project Working group will compile 1st Call for proposals and draft preliminary selection criteria and procedures (to be used in the next step). Mailing lists and network meetings will be used – besides Ads – for dissemination of 1st Call. *Note:* 1st Call for proposals could be modified by each Country team.

Step 3: 1 st Call for proposal development and dissemination	
<i>Deliverable(s):</i>	6. Copy of 1 st Call for proposals with list of advertisements 7. List of contacted education stakeholders in the 1 st round
<i>Period:</i>	February – April 2008
<i>Teams & Responsible person:</i>	Working group and Country teams Coordination Network

Good practices guidelines

Step 4: 1st round of good practice collection & preliminary assessment

Country teams (supported by Coordination Network) will collect good practice examples and do preliminary selection (by piloting *preliminary selection criteria and procedures*). Working group will assess all the selected good practice examples in order to see are they in accordance to agreed quality standards and recommend improvements and main focus of the 2nd round of good practice collection.

Step 4: 1 st round of good practice collection & preliminary assessment	
<i>Deliverable(s):</i>	8. Number and types of good practice examples collected 9. Number and list of good practices examples that are matching criteria and indicators 10. Recommendations for the 2 nd round by Working group
<i>Period:</i>	May – August 2008
<i>Teams & Responsible person:</i>	Country teams and Working group.

Step 5: 2nd Call for proposal development and dissemination

Based on the **Step 4** findings, Working group will compile 2nd Call for proposals (if needed) and finalise selection criteria and procedures. Suggested ways of 2nd Call dissemination (mailing lists, network meetings, Ads etc.) will be used by each Country team. *Note:* 2nd Call for proposals could be modified by each Country team.

Step 5: 2 nd Call for proposal development and dissemination	
<i>Deliverable(s):</i>	11. Copy of 2 nd Call for proposals with list of advertisements 12. List of contacted education stakeholders in the 2 nd round
<i>Period:</i>	August – September 2008
<i>Teams & Responsible person:</i>	Working group and Country teams.

Step 6: 2nd Round of good practice collection

Country teams (supported by Coordination Network) will collect good practice examples¹ and forward them to National Commission for selection (to be established by Working group).

Step 6: 2 nd round of good practice collection	
<i>Deliverable(s):</i>	13. Number and types of good practice examples collected 14. List of Selection Commissions members (for each country)
<i>Period:</i>	October – November 2008
<i>Teams & Responsible person:</i>	Country teams.

¹ The project **participatory action research initiatives** should be **incorporated in the 2nd round.**

3. Monitoring and progress evaluation

For each step of the collection process the Working group (with support of Country teams) should define:

- **success criteria/indicators** (minimal quality checks and deliverables)
- **main risks** and **appropriate risk mitigation strategies** (bearing in mind different cross-country treats and contexts)

in order to enable Country teams to self-evaluate the progress of collection process, recognise problems in execution and respond to them appropriately thus ensuring completion of collection process in accordance to agreed quality standards.

Country teams will monitor the process and assess the progress at the end of each step – submitting short monitoring reports to Working group. In addition, each Country team will be obliged to report on problems in execution the very moment they appear and start jeopardising the process. *Working group* will be responsible for developing the *Monitoring & Process Evaluation plan* and helping country teams overcome reported problems in execution (if and when they appear).

Good practices collection: Monitoring & Process Evaluation plan (*in progress*)

Step	Time	Risk & Mitigation strategy	Deliverables	Process Evaluation Success criteria
1: Development of preliminary good practice criteria and indicators	Jan – Mar 2008	Risks / treats: <i>Mitigation strategy.</i>	1. List of Working group members 2. List of preliminary good practices criteria and indicators	
2: Coordination Network establishment at national level	Feb – Mar 2008	Risks / treats: <i>Mitigation strategy.</i>	3. Mailing list of targeted education stakeholders (both institutions/organizations and individuals) 4. Review of implemented relevant projects and actions 5. List of Coordination Network members	
3: 1 st Call for proposal development and dissemination	Feb – Apr 2008	Risks / treats: <i>Mitigation strategy.</i>	6. Copy of 1 st Call for proposals with list of advertisements 7. List of contacted education stakeholders in the 1 st round	
4: 1 st round of good practice collection & preliminary assessment	May – Aug 2008	Risks / treats: <i>Mitigation strategy.</i>	8. Number and types of good practice examples collected 9. Number and list of good practices examples that are matching criteria and indicators 10. Recommendations for 2 nd round by Working group	
5: 2 nd Call for proposal development and dissemination	Aug – Sept 2008	Risks / treats: <i>Mitigation strategy.</i>	11. Copy of 2 nd Call for proposals with list of advertisements 12. List of contacted education stakeholders in the 2 nd round	
6: 2 nd round of good practice collection	Oct – Nov 2008	Risks / treats: <i>Mitigation strategy.</i>	13. Number and types of good practice examples collected 14. List of Selection Commissions members (for each country).	

4. Selection criteria and procedures

Selection procedures should allow for

- establishment of interculturally sensitive Selection Commissions at national levels and project Working group
- objective / impartial yet interculturally sensitive selection process
- identification of those good practice examples that could serve as effective models for advancing educational inclusion and quality through the stakeholders' participation

thus ensuring compilation of cross-country relevant and applicable *Good Practice Collection* (publication).

Steps

1. Development of criteria for Working group and national Selection Commissions establishment.
2. Development and piloting *preliminary selection criteria & procedures* (see [Step 4](#) in 3rd section).
3. Final selection criteria & procedures development and implementation (see [Step 5](#) in 3rd section).

The selection criteria – main aspects (draft 1)

The evaluation form – proposal	Scores	
1. Relevance of the action	<i>Sub-score</i>	
1.1 Area / type of inequity addressed - relevance of the problems to needs and constraints of the country/region and target groups & beneficiaries.		
1.2 Scope and level of participation		
2. Effectiveness of the action	<i>Sub-score</i>	
2.1 Scope and level of beneficiaries targeted by and involved in the action		
2.2 Scope and level of influence obtained by the action		
2.3 Scope and importance of impact / change achieved		
3. Sustainability of the action / impacts	<i>Sub-score</i>	
3.1 Sustainability of action – multiplying potential of the action (resources needed, cost-benefits effectiveness etc.).		
3.2 Sustainability of impacts / change achieved - .		
TOTAL SCORE		

Annex A: Elements of Call for proposals

Key elements of Call for proposals (and questions to be answered) should be:

1. What kinds of proposals are called for?
2. Why – purpose of collecting them (who will benefit?)
3. Who are invited - who can participate?
4. What needs to be done, how and when? – steps in procedure
5. *Supplements*: Application form & guidelines

Application form - part 1:	
Title of good practice example:	
Education area	
Author's or editor's name & surname	
Institution / Organisation	Name:
	Contacts:
Date and place	
<i>Author's remark(s)</i>	

Application form - part 2:	
Title of good practice example:	
Detailed description of the action	<i>(Duration, objectives and results achieved, number and structure of participants, steps implemented and by whom, who & how benefited...)</i>
Specific aspects of the action	<i>(Scope and level of participation, Innovative procedures / techniques applied etc.)</i>
Impacts (changes accomplished)	
Main difficulties and how they were overcome	
Lessons learned	
What inspired and who initiated the action	
Cost of the action & other resources needed	
Products – visibility of impacts (to be enclosed)	

References

Banks, J. A. (1997b). Multicultural education: Characteristics and goals. In J. A. Banks and C. A. M.

Banks, J.A. (2002) An Introduction to Multicultural Education (3rd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon

Hofstede, G. (1991) Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind, New York, McGraw-Hill

Sleeter, C. E. (1996). *Multicultural education as social activism*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Guidebooks

Logical Framework Approach (1990), NORAD

UNESCO Guidelines on Intercultural Education, (2006), Paris: UNESCO

Guidebooks (in Serbian)

Vodič za unapređenje rada nastavnika i škola (2005), Beograd: FOSS i ROK

Vodič za unapređenje učeničke participacije (2006), Beograd: FOSS i ROK

Vodič za unapređenje interkulturalnog obrazovanja (2007), Beograd: FOSS i Grupa MOST

Twining Tehnikarijum (2004), Zbirka inovativnih postupaka i tehnika za unapređivanje rada škola i Školskih uprava Ministarstva prosvete, Beograd: MPS