



16 February 2004

EDC-QA (27)

**PROJECT**  
**EDUCATION FOR DEMOCRATIC CITIZENSHIP :**  
**FROM POLICY TO EFFECTIVE PRACTICE THROUGH QUALITY ASSURANCE**  
**(EDC-QA PROJECT)**

*Tool Kit Drafting Group*  
*Second meeting*  
*Ljubljana, 6-7 February 2004*

*Draft report*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I	INTRODUCTION.....	3
II	UPDATE ON RECENT DEVELOPMENTS .....	3
	1. Evaluation.....	3
	2. Funding and fundraising.....	4
	3. Cooperation with the Council of Europe .....	4
	3.1 Inter-institutional meeting and overview document on QA in education and for EDC.....	4
	3.2 Cooperation between the EDC-QA project and the Council of Europe.....	4
	3.3 Quality label for democratic / EDC schools .....	5
III	ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE FIRST MEETING .....	5
IV	TOOL KIT(S) PREPARATION .....	6
	1. Structure.....	6
	2. Introduction on Quality Assurance .....	6
	3. Tool kit chapter 7 : guidelines for EDC QA at systemic level.....	6
	3.1 Contents of the guidelines.....	6
	3.2 Use of the tool kit as a whole.....	7
	4. Tool kit chapter 3 : the EDC map (what is EDC and what does it mean in schools ?).....	8
	5. Tool kit chapter 5 : framework to evaluate EDC .....	8
	5.1 Understandings and definitions.....	9
	5.2 Descriptors.....	9
	6. Tool kit chapter 6 : How to use the evaluative framework ? .....	10
V	NEXT STEPS.....	10
	1. Tasks and responsibilities .....	10
	2. Next meeting.....	11
	Appendix 1 : Meeting agenda .....	12
	Appendix 2 : List of participants.....	13
	Appendix 3 : Revised structure of EDC-QA tool kit .....	14
	Appendix 4 : Areas and Indicators for EDC .....	15
	Appendix 5 : Draft model descriptor.....	18

## **INTRODUCTION**

The second meeting of the Tool Kits drafting group took place in Ljubljana on 6-7 February 2004. The agenda and list of participants appear respectively in Appendix 1 and 2.

- discuss a number of developments which influence the project context and development;
- discuss and reach agreement on basic foundations of the tool kits, in particular the quality assurance rationale, the rationale of tool kit 2, the structure of indicators for EDC;
- review texts prepared so far and agree on next steps.

## **II UPDATE ON RECENT DEVELOPMENTS**

The following items were discussed in the function of EDC-QA the management group. Ilo Trajkovski and Myriam Karela, who were not present, would be kept informed about the results.

### **1. Evaluation**

- Following several email exchanges and conversations between the evaluator, Bernd Baumgartl, the project co-coordinator and the management group, an agreement was reached from both sides – the evaluator and the management – to interrupt the current evaluation contract.

- There was consensus in the management group about methodological difficulties and mismatch with expressed expectations. The management group acknowledged the evaluator's email who proposed to interrupt the contract on 28 February 2004, to finalise the second evaluation brief and to settle financial matters constructively.

- The management group emphasised that the interruption of the evaluation contract would not preclude possible future cooperation with Bernd Baumgartl.

- Concerning the future of the evaluation, the management group

- ❖ Insisted on the importance of carrying out an evaluation and that it should be addressed as a priority to audiences outside of the project. Target groups would therefore be : donors, institutions, project members;
- ❖ Agreed on carrying out a summative evaluation, i.e. at the end of phase 1;
- ❖ Requested that the evaluation would focus on examining the project's objectives through two main questions : what did the project set out to do, were objectives clear, reasonable, relevant ? To what extent did the project succeed in fulfilling the objectives ? The evaluation should examine the project's efficiency, effectiveness, relevance and sustainability;
- ❖ Agreed to invite Bruno Losito, from the Italian National Institute for the Evaluation of the education system (INVALSI), who has been involved in several research and evaluation initiatives in the field of EDC<sup>1</sup>, to carry out this evaluation and to invite him to participate in activities as soon as possible in order to get to know the project;

---

<sup>1</sup> IEA civic education study; Council of Europe all-European study on EDC policies, report for Southern Europe; evaluation of UNESCO project on human rights education.

- ❖ Agreed to take a final decision on the basis of an evaluation plan to be prepared by Bruno Losito, and a particular consideration of proposed working methods.

## **2. Funding and fundraising**

Participants took note of the following information provided by the project co-coordinator :

- The project's current budgetary situation is balanced but tight, particularly because administrative costs are higher than originally budgeted, and because the project prolongation increases overhead costs;
- Additional resources, on top of the Norwegian contribution, are coming from UNESCO (\$40.000 = €32.000), and the Council of Europe's direct support of the tool kits (€17.600 in total);
- Two fundraising initiatives, via UNESCO's EFA programme and vis-à-vis Flanders, were unsuccessful. The negative answers were not due to the project's content, which was appreciated within UNESCO. However the application could not be supported on the one hand because Southeast European countries do not have EFA national implementation plans, and secondly as Flanders had decided to support the overall EFA fund rather than individual projects. It was also decided not to attempt to apply via the Participation Programme managed by UNESCO's National Commissions given their extremely tight priorities;
- New fundraising initiatives, including an information document for potential donors are being prepared in cooperation with UNESCO. Additional cooperation with and support from the Council of Europe are being discussed.

## **3. Cooperation with the Council of Europe**

### **3.1 Inter-institutional meeting and overview document on QA in education and for EDC**

Participants took note that the overview document prepared by CEPS had been positively received at the inter-institutional meeting organised by the Council of Europe on 26-27 January 2004, and that the meeting had helped increase the profile of CEPS and the EDC-QA project. The meeting had also paved the way for increased cooperation on EDC between the Council of Europe and the European Commission, and between the EDC-QA project, UNESCO and the Council of Europe.

### **3.2 Cooperation between the EDC-QA project and the Council of Europe**

- Participants welcomed the information provided by César Birzúa and the project co-coordinator, and considerations to :
  - ❖ include the tool kits prepared by the EDC-QA project into the EDC Pack which will be prepared by the Council of Europe in preparation of and to be used during the European Year of Citizenship through Education in 2005, hence the financial support discussed under item II.2 above. The Pack will include a conceptual presentation of EDC; the All-European study on EDC policies; EDC instruments on school self-evaluation and self-development, on teacher training and on the recognition of EDC lifelong learning;

- ❖ create links between the EDC-QA project and the EDC coordinators. Participants welcomed the fact that Janez Krek will participate and present the EDC-QA project at the coordinators' next meeting in April in Ljubljana. The EDC-QA project could also be discussed at the meeting of EDC coordinators of Southeast Europe in Sarajevo in June;
  - ❖ organise the training in the use of the tool kit as part of the Council of Europe teacher training programme / bursary scheme which is being revised following an evaluation;
  - ❖ include activities of the EDC-QA project as part of the European Year of Citizenship through Education in 2005 whose steering group will hold its first meeting in April in Strasbourg.
- Participants strongly underlined the need for UNESCO and the Council of Europe to reach an inter-institutional agreement of cooperation in connection with the EDC-QA project, clarifying particularly ownership and copyright issues of the EDC-QA tool kits.
  - The issue of the validation of the tool kits was raised, as a possible prerequisite for inclusion of the tool kits into the Council of Europe EDC pack. The drafting group agreed to consider possible validation methods at its next meeting. These could include for example the submission and discussion of the tool kits to a sample of headmasters from the three SEE countries present in the drafting group.

### **3.3 Quality label for democratic / EDC schools**

- Participants held a discussion about the proposal of creating a quality label for democratic / EDC schools which was initially presented at the Council of Europe inter-institutional meeting. They were informed about steps taken to introduce such a label in Slovenia.
- The discussion highlighted the risks of focusing on external standards and on control through external evaluation for obtaining the quality label. Hence the need was emphasised to combine schools internal self-evaluation with external evaluation. The label should not be seen as an end in itself but as a means to initiate self-development and change. Resources and instrument should also be secured for supporting change processes by schools.
- The quality label and its related external evaluation should be included into the tool kit as an example of a possible accountability measure.
- Following a request by the Council of Europe, Cameron Harrison will prepare a paper on this issue. He will do so in the name of the drafting group, send the group a draft for comments including the above elements. Janez Krek will have an opportunity to present the paper and the proposal at the April meeting of EDC coordinators in Slovenia.

### **III ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE FIRST MEETING**

The drafting group revised and adopted the report of its first meeting, document EDC-QA (22).

## **IV TOOL KIT(S) PREPARATION**

### **1. Structure**

The drafting group revised the structure of the tool kits. In particular it agreed to integrate the two tool kits, i.e. to produce one single document and to turn tool kit 2 into guidelines, see chapter IV.3. below.

The end product will be called **Tool kit for the development of quality assurance for EDC in schools**

The revised structure of the tool kit appears in Appendix 3.

### **2. Introduction on Quality Assurance**

- The drafting group discussed the relationship between EDC and quality assurance. It considered that in Southeast Europe the awareness and existence of EDC, as a comprehensive approach is weak and still an aspiration. Nevertheless EDC is a permeating issue in terms of the role of schools and education in the transmission of values.

- The drafting group agreed that within a whole school approach and the understanding of the school as a learning organisation, the EDC-QA project focuses on specific EDC aspects : it aims at producing an instrument for school self-evaluation and development planning on EDC, answering the questions “how good is the school doing EDC and how can it be improved?”.

- At the same time, school self-evaluation (of EDC) must be embedded in a wider quality assurance system. Quality assurance means, *inter alia*, sharing accountability, empowerment for change, decentralisation of decision making. In other words, an effective quality assurance system should be based / influenced by EDC principles. The quality assurance technology is in general a mode of learning. It is also a mode of learning EDC principles both by the school and the education system.

- It reviewed the first draft introduction prepared by Cameron Harrison (see document EDC-QA(25), pp.3-6) and proposed that it should include

- ❖ A reference about the relationship between EDC and quality assurance as discussed above;
- ❖ A summary box explaining in simple terms what quality assurance is.

### **3. Tool kit chapter 7 : guidelines for EDC QA at systemic level**

In its discussion of (originally) tool kit 2, the drafting group considered the objectives, content and use of this part of the document. The discussion resulted in changing the structure of the whole tool kit (c.f. point 1. above and Appendix 3) and reviewing the project’s phase 2 devoted to implementation through training in the use of the tool kit and piloting it in schools.

#### **3.1 Contents of the guidelines**

*Objectives* : the following objectives of the guidelines were agreed to

**Provide advice, guidelines and procedures on how to set up the context supporting, enabling and ensuring school development processes**

*Contents :*

i) the drafting group reviewed the key elements of a quality assurance system included in chapter 2 of the tool kit (c.f. document EDC-QA(25), pp.5 and 6) and agreed that the following points should be included in the guidelines :

- the school as a unit of educational performance and its measurement. The OECD carried out a review on this issue in 1990.
- school's empowerment for decision-making
- a teacher-training system, including pre and in-service training, and particularly teacher training for EDC
- clear national educational goals, particularly for EDC
- national assessment / benchmarks
- a national agency for QA implementation
- measures to ensure accountability, (c.f. the quality label, see chapter II.3.3 above)

ii) it also discussed

- the importance of EDC in non-formal and informal learning and agreed to include those dimensions in the school context, e.g. through school-community relations, informal learning taken into account when teaching, and in the school's hidden curriculum.
- the need for substantial development work concerning teacher training
- the relevance and potential difficulties of national assessments and benchmarks for EDC
- the relevance of the statutory position of self-evaluation, i.e. voluntary, compulsory or a combination of both, via legislation, educational policies and support provided.

### **3.2 Use of the tool kit as a whole**

- The drafting group considered that, within the EDC-QA project, the tool kit is planned be used in piloting activities. To be piloted is the **whole quality assurance process**, which includes both the school development planning process based on self-evaluation, and the ensuing interaction with the QA / educational system which influence the school's changes and development (Ministry of Education, teacher training institutions, inspection, etc).

- However, initial findings of the regional analysis based on the national reports on QA in education in Southeast Europe point to strong weaknesses and obstacles in the educational and QA systems in Southeast Europe. The feasibility of an immediate training and piloting phase, as currently foreseen as phase 2 of the EDC-QA project, was therefore questioned, as it presupposes ambitious systemic changes. Given the extent of the systemic challenges, the mechanisms foreseen so far within the project – UNESCO's endorsement, the regional consortium, the EDC-QA national teams, the focal points, the envisaged link with the EDC coordinators - were seen in part as very important but insufficient to result in systemic change.

- There was agreement that the implementation of a second phase and the project's offer of appropriate activities was strongly dependant on a clear and firm commitment of Ministries of Education and their endorsement of the project's results and plans. Several possible ways to move ahead were mentioned : simulating a quality assurance environment; limiting the scope of the piloting process to a small number of schools and / or countries; using the guidelines (chapter 7) as a basis for national debates on quality assurance in education and for EDC, e.g. through the organisation of national roundtables, and the preparation of national strategy plans for QA in education and EDC; building alliances with relevant initiatives particularly in SEE<sup>2</sup>; holding inter-institutional discussions on the needs for systemic change for QA and the institutions' roles in this context.

- The drafting group underlined the need to continue discussing these issues and the project's next steps, including in relation to the finalisation of phase 1 (c.f. organisation of the concluding seminar; tool kit validation process) and as part of the project's fundraising strategy.

#### 4. **Tool kit chapter 3 : the EDC map (what is EDC and what does it mean in schools ?)**

The drafting group reviewed the draft prepared by César Birzúa (see document EDC-QA (25), pp. 7-9) and agreed

- ❖ That the primary users of the whole tool kit will be teachers and headmasters ;
- ❖ That the EDC map is not a tool for training in EDC, but a conceptual reference for the self-evaluation process ;
- ❖ To include the comprehensive understanding of citizenship both as a status and a role in society ;
- ❖ That the presentation of EDC skills and competences should be differentiated for pupils, teachers and headmasters ;
- ❖ That the map should be checked with other existing EDC frameworks, for example in England, Scotland.

#### 5. **Tool kit chapter 5 : framework to evaluate EDC**

The drafting group held an in-depth discussion about indicators in general and the evaluative instrument for EDC in particular. The discussion was based on the first list of indicators prepared by César Birzúa (see document EDC-QA (25), pp. 10-12); an analysis of issues to be considered when defining indicators prepared by Janez Krek (see document EDC-QA (26)); the reference to the Swedish framework of indicators (BRUK) and the English EDC assessment tool.

The discussion resulted in a shared understanding of indicators and agreed definitions, and an **evaluative framework including nine indicators for EDC**, which is set out in Appendix 4.

---

<sup>2</sup> E.g. SEE-ECN seminar on inspection, Bgrade, February 2003; SEE-ECN seminar on decentralisation, Bucharest, February 2004; the Education Reform Initiative in Southeast Europe (ERI-SEE); the Council of Europe next informal conference of Education Ministers, focusing on teacher training, Istanbul, April 2004.

## 5.1 Understandings and definitions

The drafting group agreed on the following understandings and definitions :

*General considerations* : while indicators can refer to both the education system and schools, the focus of the EDC-QA project is on schools. Indicators refer to measurable elements which schools have an influence on. They are organised in a structure of inter-related elements. The users of indicators are school heads and teachers, their target group are all school stakeholders, whoever is connected to the school (e.g. pupils, parents, the community).

*Structure elements* :

- *key areas* : correspond to meaningful parts of interest; key areas are not evaluative units; they include items of input, output, context and process; the areas need to be clearly distinguished one from another
- *quality indicators* : are the units of judgement / evaluation; they need to be usable.

*Scope of detail* : the drafting group discussed the tension between on the one hand making indicators explicit, and on the other hand making them operational. The first approach implies unpacking / detailing the areas in several levels (e.g. area, sub areas, indicators) and narrowing the scope of the indicators.

It agreed to adopt the second wider approach and to **structure the framework in two levels**, identifying key areas and indicators. Each indicator will be described with a number of components, which are explanatory and not items for evaluation.

*Context aspects* : the drafting group discussed elements referring to the context of the school, for example available resources, multicultural mix. It agreed that they are essential background information for evaluating and interpreting the results of the self-evaluation process. However it considered that these were not necessarily aspects which a school has an influence on and did not include them into the framework.

*Cross-curricular approach* : it was agreed to include for example in chapter 3 (the EDC map) an encouragement to develop a cross-curricular approach to EDC rather to define it as a quality indicator. On the contrary, coordination of EDC activities and programmes was included as a component of indicator 1 (place of EDC, see Appendix 4) and needs to be explained further in a users' section.

## 5.2 Descriptors

The drafting group reconsidered the proposal of its first meeting that performance would be evaluated against a four point scale and that descriptors would be prepared for level two (beginning to work on EDC) and four (excellent performance).

It agreed

- ❖ To rename the four levels :
  - level 1 : significant weaknesses in most or all areas;
  - level 2 : more weaknesses than strengths;
  - level 3 : more strengths than weaknesses;
  - level 4 : strengths in most or all areas and no significant weaknesses.
- ❖ To develop each of the nine indicators as one paragraph, about half a page long, using the components and describing an excellent EDC performance (level 4);

- ❖ To include the four point scale as a graphic presentation in the final instrument, as a summary of the evaluation of each indicator by the teacher / school, for example

	Performance level 1	Performance level 2	Performance level 3	Performance level 4
Indicator 1				◆
Indicator 2	◆			
Indicator 3		◆		
Indicator 4	◆			
Indicator 5			◆	
Etc.....				

## 6. Tool kit chapter 6 : How to use the evaluative framework ?

The drafting group reviewed the initial text prepared by Vedrana Spajic (see document EDC-QA(25), pp. 13-15). It agreed that

- ❖ the chapter would provide guidance on how to use the evaluative framework and how to form judgement;
- ❖ it would describe relevant and adequate evaluation / measurement methods for each indicator and its description, highlighting the methods' strengths and weaknesses;
- ❖ the drafting of chapter 6 depends on the finalisation of the indicators descriptions and would be prepared thereafter.

## V NEXT STEPS

### 1. Tasks and responsibilities

The agreed drafting tasks, responsibilities and deadlines are outlined in the following table :

Task	Responsibility	Deadline
Revise chapter 2	Cameron Harrison	8 April 2004
Revise chapter 3	César Birzúa	8 April 2004
Draft new chapter 4 (4-6 pages)	Cameron Harrison	8 April 2004
Prepare sample descriptor (indicator n.1)	Cameron Harrison	13 February 2004 (see Appendix 5)
Descriptors for indicators n. 2	Cameron Harrison	8 March 2004
Descriptors for indicators n 3 and 6	Janez Krek	
Descriptors for indicators n. 4 and 5	Vedrana Spajic	
Descriptors for indicators n. 7-9	César Birzúa	
Develop chapter 6	Vedrana Spajic	8 April 2004
Draft new chapter 7	Janez Krek and Cameron Harrison	8 April 2004

**2. Next meeting**

It was agreed to hold the next meeting on the following dates :

**Arrival**        16 April 2004 evening

**Meeting**       17 and 18 April 2004 until lunchtime

**Departure**    18 April 2004 afternoon

James Cuthbert, Secretary General of SICI and Bart Maes, Flemish Ministry of education will be invited to participate in the meeting.

## **Appendix 1 : Meeting agenda**

### **1. Update on recent developments**

- EDC-QA project evaluation
- Funding and fundraising, see for information doc EDC-QA(23)
- Council of Europe inter-institutional forum on QA in education and for EDC, 26-27 January 2004
- Council of Europe preparatory meeting of the informal conference of education ministers in SEE, 9 – 10 January 2004
- Regional capacity building seminar on decentralisation in education organised by Enhanced Graz Process / SEE-ECN / Institute for educational Sciences (Bucharest), 6-7 February 2004
- D@dalos Regional EDC Roundtable, Tirana, 14-16 May 2004
- Meeting of EDC coordinators, Slovenia, Spring (to be confirmed)

### **2. Adoption of draft report of first meeting, document : EDC-QA (22)**

### **3. Introduction on Quality Assurance**

*see paper by Cameron Harrison, doc EDC-QA(25)*

### **4. Tool Kit 2**

*Document : EDC-QA (25)*

- rationale, objectives
- contents :
  - i) school development programming
  - ii) accountability – see paper by Cameron Harrison
  - iii) other QA elements – see email discussion,
- methods for tool kit preparation – consultation of researchers and focal points, see email discussion

### **5. Tool Kit 1**

- EDC map – see paper by César Birzúa, and email discussion, doc EDC-QA(25)
- indicators – see paper by César Birzea and email discussion, doc EDC-QA(25), and by Janez Krek, doc EDC-QA (26)
- data collection – see paper by Vedrana Spajic, doc EDC-QA(25)
- guidelines for further tool kit drafting

### **6. Next steps**

- tasks and responsibilities
- calendar and deadlines
- dates for next meeting

**Appendix 2 : List of participants**

Mr César BÎRZEA, Director, Institut de Sciences de l'Education, 37 rue Stirbei Voda,  
70732 BUCHAREST, Roumania

Tel: +40 1 313 64 91                    +40 1 315 84 53                    Fax: +40 1 312 1447

E-mail: cesar.birzea@ise.ro

Michela Cecchini, co-coordinator

6 Parkway Close, WELWYN GARDEN CITY, Herts, AL8 6HJ,UK

Tel : + 44 1707 377 148

Email : cecchini@btopenworld.com

Mr Cameron HARRISON, Director, Harrison Leimon Associates, Woodfield House,  
Priormuir, GB-ST ANDREWS KY16 8LP

Tel: +44 (133) 447 80 67                    Mobile: +44 777 342 7195

E-mail: cameron@harrisonleimon.co.uk

Mr Janez KREK, coordinating institution

Faculty of Education, University of Ljubljana, Bicevje 7,

1111 LJUBLJANA, Slovenia

Tel: +386 41 45 99 43 & +386 1 566 14 92

Fax: +386 1 566 14 93

E-mail: janez.krek@guest.arnes.si

Ms Mateja PERSAK, project assistant

CEPS, Faculty of Education

Kardeljeva ploščad 16

1000 LJUBLJANA, Slovenia

Phone: + 386 1 566 14 92

E-mail : Mateja.Persak@Uni-Lj.si

Ms Vedrana SPAJIC-VRKAŠ, Ph. D. (Professor, Educational Anthropology and  
Intercultural Education), University of Zagreb, Faculty of Philosophy, Department of  
Education, Ivana Luciceva 3, 10000 ZAGREB, Croatia

Tel: + 385 1 61 20 167/46 49 656

Fax: +385 1 61 56 880

E-mail: vedrana.spajic-vrkas@zg.tel.hr

**Appendix 3 : Revised structure of EDC-QA tool kit**

- CHAPTER 1 :** What is the tool kit about and how to use it ?
- CHAPTER 2 :** What is quality assurance and why is it important ?
- CHAPTER 3 :** What is EDC and what does it mean in schools ?
- CHAPTER 4 :** What is school development planning and how to do it ?
- CHAPTER 5 :** Framework to evaluate EDC
- CHAPTER 6 :** How to use the evaluative framework ?
- CHAPTER 7 :** Guidelines for the development of quality assurance for EDC at systemic level

## **Appendix 4 : Areas and Indicators for EDC**

### **Curriculum, teaching and learning**

- 1. Is there evidence of an adequate place for EDC in the school's curriculum and lesson plans?**
  - Priority
  - Co-ordination of EDC activities and programs
  - School community links
  - Reflection of national priorities
  - School based curriculum
  
- 2. Is there evidence of pupils and teachers acquiring understanding of EDC dimensions, and applying EDC principles to their everyday practice in school and classrooms?**
  - Learning outcomes
  - Teaching and learning methods and processes
  - School community links
  - Relationships
  - Monitoring learning progress and personal development
  
- 3. Is the design and practice of assessment within the school consonant with EDC?**
  - Transparency
  - Fairness
  - Sensitivity
  - Improvement
  - Results of assessment used in SDP

### **School climate and ethos**

- 4. Does the school have explicit and appropriate policies relating to the development of a school climate and ethos based on EDC principles, together with sound implementation strategies?**
  - Personal dignity
  - Individual responsibility
  - Endorsement of values
  - Conflict resolution

- Inter-cultural understanding
- Avoidance of violence, bullying and discrimination
- School identity

**5. Is there evidence that school practice and organisational behaviour reflects EDC principles?**

- Interpersonal transactions and relationships
- Feeling safe
- Responses to violence, bullying and discrimination

**6. Is there evidence of the active participation of students and other stakeholders in school life and policy and decision-making?**

- Involvement and ownership
- Structures and procedures
- Communication

### **Management and development**

**7. Is there evidence of effective school leadership based on EDC principles?**

- Leadership style
- Decision making
- Shared responsibility
- Collaboration and team-work
- Responsiveness
- Communication

**8. Does the school have a sound development plan reflecting EDC principles?**

- Participation
- Informative and useful self-evaluation processes
- Identification priorities for action, and sound strategies for implementation
- Good working links to professional and organisational development
- Appropriate monitoring and accountability
- EDC as priority within development plan

**9. Are available resources well deployed in pursuit of the school's development priorities?**

- Financial
- Human
- Time
- Material
- Community

## **Appendix 5 : Draft sample descriptor<sup>3</sup>**

### **Curriculum, teaching and learning**

#### **1. Is there evidence of an adequate place for EDC in the school's curriculum and lesson plans?**

A school which is functioning well in this area will have a clear and well articulated policy on the development of Education for Democratic Citizenship as an important strand of its educational goals for its staff, students and community. This policy will relate the broad goals of EDC to the immediate context and circumstances of the school and to national priorities for action. The policy will include clear, practical and strategically important goals for development in this area - reflecting local needs. The policy will also recognise the range of matters to which attention must be paid including curriculum, teaching styles and practices, and matters of whole school organization and leadership.

A plan will exist to put these policies into practice, setting out the practical steps which will have to be taken to achieve these goals. All staff will be aware of this policy and these plans and will be able to relate them to their own professional role and responsibilities.

The school will have a policy for integrating EDC into its curriculum in a manner consonant with national curriculum policies – whether policies for cross-curricular strategies, whole curriculum permeation or special curriculum inserts or courses. A good school will also show evidence of taking all these possible courses of action into account in its planning and action. An examination of the whole curriculum will reveal an appropriate emphasis on EDC in terms of time allocation and priority amongst targeted learning outcomes.

The school will have appointed a Co-ordinator for EDC activities and will have taken steps to delegate the necessary powers and responsibilities to him or her. All staff will recognise the importance of this role and mechanisms will exist for joint planning and monitoring of EDC activities. The school will also have committed an appropriate level of available resources to its plans in this area, and suitable learning materials will be available and in use.

The school will have developed a rationale and program for a range of links with the local community – paying particular attention to important areas of need. Arrangements will be in place for appropriate student and staff involvement in governance and there will be evidence of significant activity in this field.

The school will also be able to show evidence of appropriate progress in putting its plan into action, and in achieving its goals for EDC.

---

<sup>3</sup> This DRAFT sample descriptor was prepared after the meeting by Cameron Harrison as a possible way to prepare descriptors and to indicate style. Its content has not been discussed nor approved by the drafting group.