

**Pilot project on Quality Assurance of Education for Democratic Citizenship
in Romania, 2006 – 2007 and 2008 - 2009**

Corina Leca and Teodora Popa

Major actors

- ❖ Elementary schools and high schools in Dâmbovița county
- ❖ Local in-service teacher training center (CCD) in Târgoviște
- ❖ Dâmbovița County School Inspectorate
- ❖ “The Friendship Ambassadors” Association, Târgoviște (year 2)
- ❖ TEHNE, Center for Development and Innovation in Education, Bucharest (year1)
http://www.tehne.ro/projects/quality_assurance_edc.html
- ❖ RAQAPE (Romanian Agency for Quality Assurance in Pre-University Education)
www.aracip.edu.ro
- ❖ U.S. Embassy Bucharest, Romania (Democracy Commission Small Grants) both years
- ❖ Council of Europe (year 2)

Project justification

The main goal of the project was to enable people working and learning in local schools to perform the most efficient EDC and/or HRE activities based on the available regulations and resources and on their own needs and concerns.

As a second (follow-up) stage of the first Quality Assurance of the EDC project, the new proposal aimed at **securing/consolidating** the analysis and planning competencies of teachers developed so far.

The novelty of this project refers to the **holistic approach to EDC** and HRE activities at **school level** and the involvement of **all school people** (learners and teachers) in setting up a **democratic culture in school**.

Both project phases were rooted into the Council of Europe’s *Tool for quality assurance of education for democratic citizenship (EDC) in schools* published in the fall of 2005.

Project goals

Year 1

- to critically consider **all aspects of EDC** and HRE (curriculum, manuals, training courses, school atmosphere, their own performance, etc.);
- to develop an efficient **civic education policy** at school level;
- to set up **school development planning** of EDC;
- *to outline* school quality assurance system;
- to work in a professional team.

Year 2

- to integrate the EDC policy and development planning into general school development process;
- to introduce **democratic practices and accountability into various school proceedings** (analyzing community needs and interests; reporting back to students, colleagues, parents, community etc.) on a regular basis;
- **team building at school level** (or at least more peer education among teachers, viable partnerships between school and community, school-based responsive projects);
- to develop quality criteria for several EDC components.

Project components and tools

Year 1

2 seminars

School-based workshops

- SWOT analysis,
- EDC evaluation,
- EDC policy,
- EDC development planning

Year 2

5 seminars

School-based activities/workshops

- EDC evaluation,
- **EDC monitoring**
- EDC policy and development planning
- **Good practice guide**

Project outcomes

Year 1

- ❖ About 45 teachers participated in various training and counselling activities
- ❖ 5 schools evaluated their EDC profile and planned their development
- ❖ CDs with the 5 evaluation reports (and tools), the EDC policies and development plans were distributed to some schools in our county.
- ❖ CCD included this course/project in its regular training offer.
- ❖ Some teachers used aspects of this experience (evaluation process) in other academic or practical activities.

Year 2

- ❖ 45 teachers participated in various training and counselling activities
- ❖ 8 schools carried out various EDC/HRE activities based on their own analyses and development plans
- ❖ Almost all participants authored at least one activity for the *Good practice guide*
- ❖ Some schools ran joint projects/activities.
- ❖ CCD included this course/project in its regular training offer.