



Strasbourg, 20 April 2006

DGIV/EDU/CAHCIT (2006) 11

Evaluation of the ‘2005 European Year of Citizenship through Education’ ‘*Learning and Living Democracy*’

Final Report

**David Kerr
Joana Lopes**

April 2006



Contents

	Page
Acknowledgements	i
Executive Summary	ii
1. Introduction and context	1
1.1 The 2005 European Year of Citizenship through Education	1
1.2 Purpose and aims of the evaluation	2
1.3 Design and methodology	2
1.4 Report structure	3
2. Context and background	4
2.1 Budget	4
2.2 Management and coordinating structure	5
2.3 Aims of the '2005 Year'	6
3. Activities, support and partnerships	8
3.1 Activities	8
3.2 Support from political institutions and personalities	10
3.3 Partnerships	10
4. Dissemination and publicity	12
4.1 Dissemination and publicity of Council of Europe materials	12
4.2 Dissemination and publicity of new materials or publications	15
4.3 Translation of Council of Europe materials	16
4.4 Websites and media coverage for the '2005 Year'	17
5. Outcomes, achievements, constraints and good practice	19
5.1 Overall evaluation of the '2005 Year'	19
5.2 Achievements of the '2005 Year' in countries	19
5.3 Constraints on the '2005 Year' in countries	21
5.4 Examples of good EDC practice in countries	22
6. Follow-up	24
6.1 Follow up to the '2005 Year' in countries	24
6.2 Follow up to the '2005 Year' by the Council of Europe	25
7. Final comment	30

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the Council of Europe for commissioning the National Foundation for Educational Research in England and Wales (NFER) to undertake this evaluation of the 2005 European Year of Citizenship through Education. We appreciate the good relations established with the Council and value the support we have received from Olof Olafsdottir, Agneta Derrien and Yulia Pererva in the Council Secretariat. This made the task of completing the evaluation, in such a short space of time, achievable. We are grateful also for the helpful comments we received from the Ad Hoc Committee of Experts for the Year (CAHCIT) and EDC Coordinators on the first draft of the questionnaire.

We would also like to thank those EDC Coordinators in member states who took the time to coordinate the questionnaire responses in their country, with the assistance of others, and returned them to NFER within the agreed timescale. The report, and its outcomes, would not have been possible without such commitment.

Finally, we would like to thank colleagues at NFER for their support and assistance. We are grateful for the support of David Sims, head of Evaluation and Policy Studies, and for the sterling efforts of Sue Stoddart. We are appreciative of her excellent administrative and technical skills, and unfailing good humour, throughout the evaluation.

Above all, the production of this report has been a team effort within and beyond NFER. It has underlined the power of European collaboration in this area.

Executive Summary

Introduction

This executive summary details the **key findings** of an evaluation of the Council of Europe's *2005 European Year of Citizenship through Education* (hereafter the '*2005 Year*') conducted by NFER (National Foundation for Educational Research in England and Wales). The NFER evaluation sought to gather information about the implementation and outcomes of the *2005 Year* in the 46 member states of the Council of Europe.

The evaluation was conducted through a survey questionnaire completed by the EDC Coordinators of the '*2005 Year*' in the 46 member states of the Council in late 2005. The questionnaires were returned from 41 member states (an 89 per cent response rate) in early 2006. Data was entered and processed by NFER researchers on Excel spreadsheets enabled the generation of summary statistics.

Key Findings

Context and Background

- Less than half of respondents (46 per cent) said that there was a **designated budget** for the '*2005 Year*' in their country. The overall budget allocated to the '*2005 Year*' across member states was just over €2.5 million euros with the amount of designated budget per country ranging from a minimum of €14,000 to a maximum of €25,000.
- The majority of respondents (90 per cent) also reported that there were **non-financial contributions** made to the '*2005 Year*' in member states in the form of support in kind and staff being made available.
- The majority of member states (85 per cent) said that they had established a **coordinating structure** for the '*2005 Year*' which had, on average, between two and 20 members. Their main role was to provide a strategic overview, to raise awareness and to organise events.
- There was strong support in countries for all four overarching **aims** of the '*2005 Year*'. However, when asked to rank them in order of priority in their country respondents selected the aim of *raising awareness of the contribution of democracy learning to participation, to resolving societal problems, and to promoting social cohesion* as the most important.

Activities, Support and Partnerships

- There was a wide range of **activities** carried out as part of the ‘2005 Year’ in member states. The main focus of these activities was at **national level**, with some follow up at regional and local levels. The most frequent activity at all three levels was the hosting of conferences, seminars and workshops. This was followed at national level by the organisation of an official opening event and the publishing of materials.
- The main **target groups** for the ‘2005 Year’ were educational staff and EDC practitioners. This suggests that the primary aim of the ‘2005 Year’ in countries was to influence EDC policy and practice in educational institutions, including schools, rather than engage those more widely in society such as the general public and parents.
- There was a high level of support for the ‘2005 Year’ from **politicians and political institutions**. In the majority of member states: the Minister for Education publicly expressed support for the ‘2005 Year’: the Department/Ministry of Education produced one of more press releases; and EDC/HRE was reinforced in the curriculum.
- Almost three-quarters (73 per cent) of member states reported that the ‘2005 Year’ resulted in the creation of **new partnerships** or networks within countries. Just under half (49 per cent) of countries said that they had created **new cross-country partnerships** or networks of cooperation in the context of the ‘2005 Year’. Respondents said that most of these new partnerships and networks would continue beyond the ‘2005 Year’.

Dissemination and Publicity

- There was considerable use made by countries of **Council of Europe produced materials** to help to publicise and disseminate information about the ‘2005 Year’. Use was made of all existing documents and publications in at least some of the countries. The most heavily used documents and publications were the EDC Pack (used by 85 per cent of countries), Recommendation (2002) 12 of the Committee of Ministers to member states on EDC (80 per cent of countries) and the Council’s Year of poster, slogan and leaflet (used by over 60 per cent of countries).
- The Council of Europe materials were targeted at a wide range of groups and audiences in countries. The main **dissemination targets** were EDC practitioners and educational staff. There was some targeting also of policy makers, young people and NGOs, but little or no attempt to engage the general public and parents.
- Many countries put considerable effort into producing their own **new publications and dissemination materials** for the ‘2005 Year’. The most common forms of new materials produced were: press releases (produced by 60 per cent of countries); leaflets/brochures and posters (over 50 per cent of countries); and, CD-Rom/videos (almost 25 per cent of countries).
- The **new materials** were targeted at a wide range of audiences in member states. Though the **main target audiences** for all new materials, including

CD-ROMs and pens, were EDC practitioners and educational staff, there were also some attempts to reach audiences beyond education. For example, press releases were used to target all audiences including the general public and parents.

- There was **translation** of all or parts of all Council of Europe materials produced for the '2005 Year' in over half (55 per cent) of member states. The materials that were most commonly mentioned by countries as having been translated, in whole or part, were the Year of poster, slogan and leaflet. However, there was also mention, in over a quarter of countries, of translation of parts of the EDC pack, COMPASS manual, EDC glossary and Recommendation (2002) 12.
- Respondents reported that in over half of member states (51 per cent) an **official website** had been set up to promote the '2005 Year'. There were plans to continue this website beyond the end of 2005 in three-quarters of these countries.
- The '2005 Year' was picked up by a range of **media sources**, including television, radio, newspapers and internet based, at both national and regional level. Coverage tended to be occasional (at least twice or more during the '2005 Year') in most countries, though some countries achieved regular weekly or monthly coverage. The main sources of coverage were through radio stations and the press at regional and national level.

Outcomes, Achievements, Constraints and Good Practice

- The '2005 Year' was viewed as **successful**, at least to some extent, in meeting all four **overarching aims** in the majority of member states. It was seen as particularly successful in meeting the aims of *bridging policy and practice in the implementation of EDC and HRE and raising awareness of the contribution of democracy learning to participation, to resolving societal problems, and to promoting social cohesion*.
- Respondents noted that the '2005 Year' had been successful in making the work of the **Council of Europe** and EDC better known in their country. The majority of countries (93 per cent) said that it had raised the **profile** of the Council's work 'a lot' or 'to some extent'.
- There was also strong support in countries for the concept of '**European Years**' with over three-quarters of countries (80 per cent) commenting that 'European Years' were 'effective' or 'helpful' in getting other partners and the general public interested in an area, such as EDC.
- Respondents felt that, on balance, the impact of the '2005 Year' was characterised by a **lack of constraints** in their country. However, there were **some factors** that had constrained the impact of the '2005 Year' either 'somewhat' or 'very much' in countries. Over one-third of countries said that they had been '*somewhat constrained*' by the poor response to the '2005 Year' by certain groups, notably the government, media, civil society and local authorities. Meanwhile, one-quarter of countries reported that the impact of the '2005 Year' had been '*very constrained*' by

three particular factors: poor media response and insufficient budget and number of staff to coordinate activities.

- Respondents identified over 70 examples of **good EDC practice** in their countries. There were four **types of activity** that were chosen most frequently by countries as examples of good EDC practice: EDC seminars, conferences or workshops; EDC teaching developments (curriculum and teacher training programmes and resources); activities involving active citizenship and the participation of young people; and, awards and competitions. Good EDC practices also involved a wide **range of partners**, notably: NGOs and European/international organisations; government ministry/department of education; schools and colleges and their teaching staff; and other government agencies at local and regional level.

Follow up

- The majority of respondents (81 per cent) reported that there were activities planned in their countries as a **follow up** to the '2005 Year'. The most popular follow up activity (planned in 71 per cent of countries) was to have follow up conferences, workshops and seminars, while over half of countries were planning to follow up through training events for teachers and school leaders, the publishing of practice oriented documents and the development of sustainable EDC/HRE networks. Respondents reported that the majority of these follow up activities were taking place as a **direct result** of the '2005 Year'.
- Respondents were also asked to rank a number of areas – teacher training, quality assurance, youth participation and intercultural education - in order of priority in their country for follow-up work. These areas had been identified by the Council and its partners during the '2005 Year' as requiring further work. The responses show that **teacher training** was ranked as the number one priority, far outstretching the volume of support for the other three.
- Respondents were also given the opportunity to suggest what types of activities in relation to education for democratic citizenship and human rights education (EDC/HRE) that the Council should focus on following the '2005 Year' in the **short term (2006)**, **medium term (2007-09)** and **long term (2010 and beyond)**. Countries recommended that the Council should focus on a **broad range** of follow up activities between 2005 and 2010 and beyond in order to build on the **momentum** of the '2005 Year'.
- There were three main **follow up** activities that countries thought the Council of Europe should concentrate on in the **short term (i.e. in 2006)**: revision of the EDC pack; dissemination of know how and best practice; and, increasing collaboration with other international organisations.
- There were four leading **follow up actions** that countries wanted the Council of Europe to focus on in the **medium term (i.e. in 2007-09)**: maintaining and expanding the EDC coordinators network; strengthening EDC/HRE programmes for teachers; strengthening policy development

and implementation; and, the production of guidelines on assessment of EDC/HRE.

- There were five main **follow up activities** that countries felt the Council should concentrate on in the **long term (i.e. 2010 and beyond)**: increasing collaboration with other international organisations; dissemination of know how and best practice; consideration of policies and measures to ensure sustainability; increasing dialogue with NGOs; and strengthening EDC/HRE programmes for teachers.
- The suggested priorities for action for the Council, in the short, medium and long term from member states, though differing in emphases, have a number of **common themes**. Taken together, they have an overall aim of ensuring the increased **strengthening** of EDC/HRE in order to ensure its **sustainability** now and in the future. They suggest a commitment to EDC/HRE in countries that goes beyond the '2005 Year' and is based on a vision of continued close collaboration with the Council and its partners.

Final Comment

Overall, member states saw EDC/HRE as unfinished business. Though the '2005 Year' had achieved much there was still a considerable way to go before EDC/HRE was an accepted and sustainable component of policy and practice in countries. The sentiments match the spirit of the quote from William Hastings that:

'Citizenship is a journey not a destination'

Member states were united in their aspiration that the '2005 European Year of Citizenship through Education' should signal the start of a new collaborative journey, in partnership with the Council of Europe, to strengthen education for citizenship and human rights education (EDC/HRE) within and across Europe in 2006 and beyond.

1. Introduction and context

This report was commissioned by the Council of Europe and produced by researchers at the National Foundation for Educational Research in England and Wales (NFER). The report details the outcomes of an evaluation of the Council's *2005 European Year of Citizenship through Education* (hereafter the '*2005 Year*') conducted by NFER across the 46 member states of the Council.

1.1 The 2005 European Year of Citizenship through Education

In 1997, the Heads of State and Government of the Council of Europe officially recognised the need to develop '*education for democratic citizenship based on the rights and responsibilities of citizens*'. This was followed by the launch of a number of initiatives aimed at promoting the understanding and provision of **education for democratic citizenship (EDC)** in Council of Europe member states.

The first phase of the EDC project (1997-2000) addressed conceptual issues and the second (2001-2004) focused on policy development and implementation challenges. The EDC project has had considerable success in raising the profile and taking the development of education for democratic citizenship and, more recently, human rights education (EDC/HRE) forward across Europe. In recognition of this success, the Council of Europe and its member states designated **2005** as the *European Year of Citizenship through Education* with the overarching slogan '*Learning and Living Democracy*'. Through the '*2005 Year*' the Council sought to: raise awareness of the importance of EDC; bridge the 'implementation gap' between policy and practice in this area; encourage the development of partnerships and networks; and enhance the contribution of democracy learning in resolving societal problems and promoting social cohesion.

1.2 Purpose and aims of the evaluation

The NFER evaluation has sought to gather information about the implementation and outcomes of the *2005 Year* in the 46 member states of the Council of Europe. It has also sought to examine the extent to which the legacy of the *2005 Year* will live on in follow-up activities in member states and across the Council. Such information is helpful to the Council of Europe and its partners in taking Education for Democratic Citizenship and Human Rights Education (EDC/HRE) forward in 2006 and beyond.

1.3 Design and methodology

The evaluation was conducted through a survey questionnaire for completion by the EDC Coordinators of the '*2005 Year*' in the 46 member states of the Council. During autumn 2005, NFER researchers drew up a draft questionnaire, in collaboration with the Council Secretariat and EDC Coordinators, which was then agreed by the CAHCIT. The questionnaire was designed to be wide-ranging in its scope and to elicit information about a broad range of topics, including:

- Management and coordination of the '*2005 Year*'
- Budget
- Aims of the '*2005 Year*'
- Activities and target groups
- Support from political institutions and personalities
- Partnerships
- Dissemination and publicity
- Outcomes and achievements of the '*2005 Year*' and constraints
- Examples of good practice
- Follow-up activities (locally, nationally and by the Council of Europe).

The questionnaire¹ was sent out by the Council Secretariat at the end of 2005 for completion by the EDC Coordinators by January 2006. A further reminder was sent by the Council Secretariat in January.

¹ The questionnaire was made available in paper and electronic form, as well as in English and French versions. It was left up to EDC Coordinators to decide the form and version that best suited their circumstances.

During the course of January and February 2006, completed questionnaires were returned, in electronic and paper form, from 41 of the 46 member states (an 89 per cent response rate). The data was then processed by NFER researchers. Researchers coded and analysed responses to open questions and then entered all the data into an Excel spreadsheet. This enabled the generation of summary statistics of the responses to the questions. These summary statistics form the basis of this report.

1.4 Report structure

Following this brief introduction (Section 1) the report is divided into five further sections. These sections correspond with the main topics in the evaluation questionnaire. The second section addresses the context and background to the organisation of the '*2005 Year*' in member states. This is followed in Section 3 by details of the activities, support and partnerships and in Section 4 about dissemination and publicity for the '*2005 Year*'. The final two sections of the report detail the main outcomes, achievements and constraints of the '*2005 Year*' in member states (Section 5) and sum up the degree of follow-up (Section 6) at member state and Council of Europe level. The report also contains an Executive Summary which details the main outcomes from the evaluation.

2. Context and background

This section of the report contains information about the context and background of the '2005 Year' in member states, included details about budget, coordinating and management structures and overall aims. Evaluation questionnaires were received from 41 of the 46 member states in the Council of Europe; a response rate of 89 per cent. Questionnaires were completed by either the EDC Coordinator or a member of the '2005 Year' coordinating structure in each country.

2.1 Budget

Respondents were asked about the budget that was available in member states for the '2005 Year', and if there was a budget, its size and sufficiency and whether there were also contributions in kind.


Of the 39 respondents who answered this set of questions there was an equal split on the question of a budget for the '2005 Year'. While almost half (46 per cent) said that there was a designated budget for the '2005 Year' in their country, just over half (54 per cent) said there was no designated budget. The main reasons given for the lack of a budget were: the allocation of funds to other areas; the '2005 Year' not being a high priority; no funds being available, and the allocation of funds for particular activities or events during the '2005 Year' rather than for the '2005 Year' as a whole. The overall budget allocated to the '2005 Year' across member states was just over €2.5 million euros with the amount of designated budget per country ranging from a minimum of €14,000 to a maximum of €25,000. In most cases, respondents noted that the allocated budget was sufficient or more than sufficient to meet their requirements.

The majority of respondents (90 per cent) also reported that there were non-financial contributions made to the '2005 Year' in member states in the form of support in kind and staff being made available. Respondents said that these non-financial contributions were sufficient for their needs.

2.2 Management and coordinating structure

The majority of member states (85 per cent) said that they had established a coordinating structure for the '2005 Year' either before the '2005 Year' began or at its commencement. As Figure 1 below reveals the coordinating structures had, on average, between two and 20 members.

Figure 1 Members of coordinating structure for the '2005 Year'




Source: Responses to survey evaluation of *2005 European Year of Citizenship through Education*.

Coordinating structures primarily comprised representatives from the following groups: EDC coordinators; government departments or agencies; schools and other educational institutions; and, non-governmental organisations (NGOs). In only a handful of member states were young people or those in National Youth Councils involved in the coordinating structure.

As Figure 2 below illustrates the coordinating structures had a variety of roles in connection with the '2005 Year'. The main ones concerned providing a strategic overview, raising awareness and organising events.

Figure 2 **Role of the coordinating structure**



Source: Responses to survey evaluation of *2005 European Year of Citizenship through Education*.

In most countries, the coordinating structure met on average every three months, though in some countries there were monthly meetings.

2.3 Aims of the '2005 Year'

Respondents were asked to rank the four main aims of the '2005 Year', as set out in Council documents and publications, in terms of how important they were in their country. It should be noted that all four aims received strong backing from all member states. However, when asked to rank their importance the results were as follows:

- 1. Raising awareness of the contribution of democracy learning to participation, to resolving societal problems, and to promoting social cohesion* was ranked as the most important aim of the '2005 Year' in the majority of countries.
- 2. Bridging policy and practice in the implementation of EDC and HRE* – was reported as the second most important aim of the '2005 Year'.

3. *Encouraging the development of initiatives, networks and partnerships at Local, National, European and International levels* was ranked as the third most important aim.

4. *Strengthening the commitment to EDC/HRE as a priority objective in policy-making* was ranked as the fourth most important aim. However, it should be remembered that Phase 2 of the EDC project (2001-04), which preceded the '2005 Year' had provided a strong focus on this objective.


3. Activities, support and partnerships

The generation of activities and the building of partnerships were seen as important outcomes by the Council of Europe when the ‘2005 Year’ was conceived. Respondents therefore, were, asked a series of questions about the type and range of activities, support from politicians and partnerships that were attempted by member states during the ‘2005 Year’. This section of the report provides information about the responses to these questions.

3.1 Activities

Respondents were asked to list the types of activities carried out as part of the ‘2005 Year’ in their country at national, regional and local level. The results are shown in Figure 3 below

Figure 3 Type of activity carried out during the ‘2005 Year’ at national, regional and local level




Source: Responses to survey evaluation of 2005 European Year of Citizenship through Education.

Figure 3 confirms that there was a wide range of activities carried out as part of the ‘2005 Year’ in member states. The main focus of these activities was at national level, with some follow up at regional and local levels. The most frequent activity at all three levels was the hosting of conferences. This was followed at national level by the organisation of an official opening event and the publishing of materials.

Respondents were also asked to identify the main target groups for the activities carried out during the ‘2005 Year’ and the results are shown in Figure 4 below.

Figure 4 Target groups for activities during ‘2005 Year’



Source: Responses to survey evaluation of 2005 European Year of Citizenship through Education.


Figure 4 reveals that the activities carried out in member states during the ‘2005 Year’ were targeted at a range of audiences from policy makers to NGOs and young people. The main target groups were educational staff and EDC practitioners. This suggests that the primary aim of the ‘2005 Year’ in countries was to influence EDC policy and practice in educational institutions, including schools, rather than engage those more widely in society such as the general public and parents. Some activities were also targeted at specific groups. For example, the launch of initiatives was targeted exclusively at policy makers as was the use of theatre at young people. Meanwhile, official

closing events and the development of networks were aimed at a range of target groups.

3.2 Support from political institutions and personalities

Respondents were also asked about the level of support given to the ‘2005 Year’ by politicians and political institutions. Figure 5 below shows the outcomes.

Figure 5 Support from political institutions and personalities



Source: Responses to survey evaluation of *2005 European Year of Citizenship through Education*.

Figure 5 confirms the high level of support for the ‘2005 Year’ from politicians and political institutions. In the majority of member states the following actions occurred: the Minister for Education publicly expressed support for the ‘2005 Year’; the Department/Ministry of Education produced one of more press releases; and EDC was reinforced in the curriculum.

3.3 Partnerships

The questionnaire also asked about the extent to which new partnerships or networks of cooperation were created, within the context of the ‘2005 Year’,

both within and between member states. The responses highlight the fact that the *'2005 Year'* resulted in the creation of new partnerships or networks within countries in almost three-quarters (73 per cent) of member states. There were three main reported aims of these partnerships or networks: the promotion and sustainability of EDC and HRE; increased cooperation between different bodies; and the sharing of good practice and information. Two-thirds of respondents (66 per cent) believed some and/or at least one of these new partnerships or networks would continue after the end of the *'2005 Year'*.

Just under half (49 per cent) of countries said that they had created new cross-country partnerships or networks of cooperation in the context of the *'2005 Year'*. The main reasons for the creation of such partnerships were: the sharing of experiences and knowledge with partners from other countries; teacher training; and, the development and translation of teaching materials. Respondents stated that most of these new cross-country partnerships and networks would continue beyond the *'2005 Year'*.


4. Dissemination and publicity

Dissemination and publicity about the '2005 Year' were seen as key to its success by the Council and its partners. The survey questionnaire therefore contained a number of questions that probed: the extent to which the existing dissemination and publicity materials produced by the Council were used by countries and with which target audiences, as well as the extent to which countries produced new materials or publications and for which target audiences. This section reports on the findings from these questions.

4.1 Dissemination and publicity of Council of Europe materials

Figure 6 below highlights the existing Council of Europe produced documents or publications, to support the '2005 Year', which were both used and/or translated by countries.

Figure 6 Existing Council of Europe documents or publications used or translated by countries



Source: Responses to survey evaluation of *2005 European Year of Citizenship through Education*.


It confirms the range of existing documents or publications that were used by countries to help to publicise and disseminate information about the '2005 Year'. Use was made of all existing documents and publications in at least some of the countries. The most heavily used existing documents and publications were the EDC Pack (used by 85 per cent of countries), Recommendation (2002) 12 of the Committee of Ministers to member states

on EDC (80 per cent of countries) and the Council’s Year of poster and slogan (used by over 60 per cent of countries).

All existing documents or publications were translated in at least some of the countries. The most heavily translated were the Year of slogan, poster and leaflet (translated by over 40 per cent of countries). This is to be expected as these were the most visible forms of dissemination and publicity produced by the Council in support of the ‘2005 Year’.

Figure 7 provides information about the groups that were targeted by member states to receive the existing documents and publications produced by the Council. It reveals the wide range of groups and audiences that were targeted for dissemination during the ‘2005 Year’ particularly through the Year of poster and slogan. The main dissemination targets were EDC practitioners and educational staff. These match the groups that the ‘2005 Year’ was aimed at in the majority of countries. There was some targeting also of policy makers, young people and NGOs, but little or no attempt to engage the general public and parents.

Figure 7 Target groups for the existing materials produced by the Council of Europe




Source: Responses to survey evaluation of 2005 European Year of Citizenship through Education.

4.2 Dissemination and publicity of new materials or publications

Figure 8 below shows the range of new documents and publications produced by member states to publicise and disseminate information about the '2005 Year'.

Figure 8 New documents or publications produced by countries




Source: Responses to survey evaluation of *2005 European Year of Citizenship through Education*.

It highlights the fact that many countries put considerable effort into producing their own new publications and dissemination materials for the '2005 Year'. The most common forms of new materials produced were: press releases (produced by 60 per cent of countries); leaflets/brochures and posters (produced by over 50 per cent of countries); and, CD-Rom/videos (produced by almost 25 per cent of countries).

Figure 9 sets out the target audiences that the new materials produced by countries were intended to reach. It underlines the wide range of such target audiences in member states. Though the main target audiences for all new materials, including CD-ROMs and pens, were EDC practitioners and educational staff, there were also some attempts to reach audiences beyond education. For example, press releases were used to target all audiences including the general public and parents.

Figure9 Target groups for new materials produced by countries



Source: Responses to survey evaluation of 2005 European Year of Citizenship through Education.

4.3 Translation of Council of Europe materials

Respondents were also asked whether any translation (complete or parts of) was undertaken of Council of Europe materials for the ‘2005 Year’ and who financed such translation. It should be remembered that the translation of documents and publications for the ‘2005 Year’ was not an issue in all countries.

Overall, there was translation of parts of all Council of Europe materials produced for the ‘2005 Year’ in over half (55 per cent) of member states. The materials that were most commonly mentioned by countries as having been translated, in whole or part, were the Year of poster, slogan and leaflet. These correspond with the materials that were most widely distributed to a range of audiences during the ‘2005 Year’. However, there was also mention, in over a quarter of countries, of translation of parts of the EDC pack, COMPASS manual, EDC glossary and Recommendation (2002) 12.

The numbers of copies of each document or publication (full or parts of) that was produced revealed a wide range from over 100,000 for the most popular documents, such as the Year of leaflet (123,501 copies translated), Year of

slogan (111,213 copies) and poster (74,880 copies) to under 2000 for the least popular, such as the Declaration by the Ministers of Education (Athens 2003) (1,801 copies translated) and the European Charter on the Participation of Young People in Local and Regional Life (140 copies). Interestingly, over 28,000 copies were made of all or parts of the COMPASS manual and 5,000 copies of all or parts of the EDC pack. The translations were financed either by ministries or departments of education or by the Council of Europe, or through a mixture of the two.

4.4 Websites and media coverage for the ‘2005 Year’

The Council and its partners were also interested to find out about the extent to which information about the ‘2005 Year’ was made available through and picked up by new information and communications technologies (ICT) and the media. There were a series of questions about whether there was an official website for the ‘2005 Year’ in countries and how far events concerning the ‘2005 Year’ were picked up by a range of media.


Respondents reported that in over half of member states (51 per cent) an official website had been set up to promote the ‘2005 Year’. The website had four main functions: to provide basic information about the ‘2005 Year’; to provide basic information about the ‘2005 Year’ to internal audiences; to provide links to other relevant sites (such as the Council of Europe); and, to stimulate networks, through the use of teacher and NGO pages. The number of hits reported to these sites in countries during the ‘2005 Year’ ranged from almost one and a half million to just under 31,000. However, it should be remembered that member states vary considerably in size and in the ease of access to ICT. Three-quarters of countries, who reported having an official website for the ‘2005 Year’, stated that there were plans to continue and/or expand the site after 2005.

Those countries that did not have an official website explained that this was for two main reasons: lack of financial resources and because information about the ‘Year of’ had been incorporated into an existing website.

Figure 10 reveals the frequency of media coverage of events about the ‘2005 Year’ in countries. It shows that the ‘2005 Year’ was picked up by a range of

media sources, including television, radio, newspapers and internet based, at both national and regional level. Coverage tended to be occasionally (at least twice or more during the '2005 Year') in most countries, though some countries achieved regular weekly or monthly coverage. The main sources of coverage were through radio stations and the press at regional and national level.

Figure 10 Frequency of media coverage about the '2005 Year' in countries



Source: Responses to survey evaluation of *2005 European Year of Citizenship through Education*.

5. Outcomes, achievements, constraints and good practice

Clearly when reviewing the outcomes of the '2005 Year' it is useful to the Council of Europe and its partners to get a sense from participating countries of the overall impact and achievements of the activities, actions and events connected with the '2005 Year'. It is also helpful to gauge the extent to which the overall impact was constrained by various factors and the range of examples of good EDC practice that were developed as a consequence of the '2005 Year'. A series of questions were designed and included in the evaluation questionnaire to address these issues. This section of the report details the findings from those questions.


5.1 Overall evaluation of the '2005 Year'

Of the 39 respondents who answered the series of questions about whether there was to be an overall evaluation of the '2005 Year' there was an even division between those countries that were carrying out an overall evaluation of impact (46 per cent of countries) and those countries that were not (54 per cent). Where an impact evaluation was taking place it was being undertaken in-house (i.e. by those involved in EDC activities during the '2005 Year') rather than through a commissioned independent evaluation. Over half of countries (51 per cent) were also planning other forms of evaluation of the '2005 Year', such as through cumulative evaluations after events and by means of a questionnaire at the closing event.

5.2 Achievements of the '2005 Year' in countries

Figure 11 shows the opinion of respondents about the extent to which the '2005 Year' was successful in meeting the four overall aims, as set out for it by the Council and its partners, in member states.

Figure 11 Degree of success of the ‘2005 Year’ in meeting the four overarching aims in member states



Source: Responses to survey evaluation of 2005 European Year of Citizenship through Education

It reveals that the ‘2005 Year’ was successful, at least to some extent, in meeting all four overarching aims in the majority of member states. Interestingly, the level of achievement for each aim closely matches the order in which the aims were ranked by countries in terms of their priority to them (see Section 2.3 of this report). Thus:

1. *Raising awareness of the contribution of democracy learning to participation, to resolving societal problems, and to promoting social cohesion* was ranked as the most important aim of the ‘2005 Year’ in the majority of countries and was the second most successfully achieved aim.
2. *Bridging policy and practice in the implementation of EDC and HRE* – was reported as the second most important aim of the ‘2005 Year’ and was the most successfully achieved aim.
3. *Encouraging the development of initiatives, networks and partnerships at Local, National, European and International levels* was ranked as the third most important aim and was the third most successfully achieved aim.


4. *Strengthening the commitment to EDC/HRE as a priority objective in policy-making* was ranked as the fourth most important aim, and was the third most successfully achieved aim.

Respondents also stated that the ‘2005 Year’ had been successful in making the work of the Council in this area better known in their country. The majority of member states (93 per cent) said that it had raised the profile of the Council’s work ‘a lot’ of ‘to some extent’. There was also strong support for the concept of ‘European Years’ with over three-quarters of countries (80 per cent) commenting that ‘European Years’ were ‘effective’ or ‘helpful’ in getting other partners and the general public interested in an area, such as EDC. In only a minority of countries (12 per cent) were ‘European Years’ seen as unhelpful in this respect.

5.3 Constraints on the ‘2005 Year’ in countries

Respondents were also asked about the extent to which the overall impact of the ‘2005 Year’ was constrained by a number of factors, such as poor responses from particular groups, insufficient finance and staff, lack of clarity and poor timing. Figure 12 highlights the responses from member states.

Insert Figure 12 Constraints to the impact of the ‘2005 Year’ in member states



Source: Responses to survey evaluation of 2005 European Year of Citizenship through Education

Respondents felt that, on balance, the impact of the ‘2005 Year’ was characterised by a lack of constraints in their country. Over half of the countries surveyed stated that they had not felt constrained either by a lack of clarity concerning the concept of the ‘2005 Year’, or by inadequate timing, poor responses from NGOs and schools, or insufficient information from the Council of Europe.

However, there were some factors that had constrained the impact of the ‘2005 Year’ either ‘somewhat’ or ‘very much’ in countries. Over one-third of countries said that they had been ‘somewhat constrained’ by the poor response to the ‘2005 Year’ by certain groups, notably the government, media, civil society and local authorities. Meanwhile, one-quarter of countries reported that the impact of the ‘2005 Year’ had been ‘very constrained’ by three particular factors: poor media response and insufficient budget and number of staff to coordinate activities.

5.4 Examples of good EDC practice in countries

The aims of the ‘2005 Year’ were concerned with strengthening EDC policy and practices through awareness raising, creating new partnerships and bridging the gap between policy and practice. The development of effective EDC practices is central to these aims. Countries were, therefore, given the opportunity in the evaluation questionnaire to identify and provide details of up to two examples of what they saw as the most innovative and inspiring examples of good EDC practice in their country.

Respondents identified over 70 examples of good EDC practice in countries. It would be unfair in this report to include details of specific examples of good practice from particular countries. This may lead to bias and the wrongful assumption that the cited examples were chosen because they were the best EDC practices. This would be a disservice to all the countries that provided such examples.

Rather, it is of more value, in the context of the overall evaluation of the ‘2005 Year’, to focus on the general characteristics of the examples of good EDC practice that were chosen by member states. These characteristics include the types and range of good EDC practice, the partnerships and target groups

involved in such practice and the main reasons why they were considered to be examples of good practice.

Respondents identified a broad range of good EDC practice in their countries. However, there were four types of activity that were chosen most frequently by countries as examples of good EDC practice. These were: EDC seminars, conferences or workshops; EDC teaching developments (curriculum and teacher training programmes and resources); activities involving active citizenship and the participation of young people; and, awards and competitions. Good EDC practices also involved a wide range of partners. The partners most frequently mentioned by countries as involved in good practice were: NGOs and European/international organisations; government ministry/department of education; schools and colleges and their teaching staff; and other government agencies at local and regional level.

Good EDC practices in countries were aimed at a wide range of target groups, including the general public, researchers, parents and EDC practitioners. The target groups for good practice most frequently mentioned by countries were: educational staff; young people; EDC practitioners; NGOs; and, policy makers. Countries also offered a considerable number of reasons why the examples of good practice had been chosen. The four most common reasons given were: because they were successful in promoting active citizenship and participation by young people; because they contributed to the fostering of a democratic, inclusive and tolerant society; because they stimulated the involvement of a range of partners at different levels; and, because they promoted the development of improved teaching and learning in EDC. Examples of good EDC practice were chosen because of their impact and/or promotion of the aims and processes of education for democratic citizenship.

6. Follow-up


The strengthening of EDC policy and practice within and across member states was central to the aims of the *'2005 Year'*, as envisaged by the Council and its partners. The intention, made clear in the publicity and documentation, was for the actions, activities and events during the *'2005 Year'* to act as a springboard to follow-up activities to strengthen and build the sustainability of EDC beyond 2005. The evaluation questionnaire, therefore, concluded with a series of questions about the extent and nature of any planned follow-up activities in countries beyond 2005, as well as suggestions from member states as to what the Council of Europe should do to follow up the *'2005 Year'* in the short term (2006), medium term (2007-09) and long term (2010 and beyond). This section reports on the answers of respondents to these questions. This information is valuable to the Council and its partners in helping to shape the plans for taking education for democratic citizenship and human rights education (EDC/HRE) forward in 2006 and beyond.

6.1 Follow up to the *'2005 Year'* in countries

The majority of respondents (81 per cent) reported that there were activities planned in their countries as a follow up to the *'2005 Year'*. However, in a minority of countries (14 per cent) there were no such plans.

Figure 13 shows that member states were planning a range of activities as a follow up to the *'2005 Year'*.

Figure 13 Planned follow up activities to the ‘2005 Year’ in member states



Source: Responses to survey evaluation of *2005 European Year of Citizenship through Education*.

The most popular follow up activity (planned in 71 per cent of countries) was to have follow up conferences, workshops and seminars, while over half of countries were planning to follow up through training events for teachers and school leaders, the publishing of practice oriented documents and the development of sustainable EDC/HRE networks. Respondents reported that the majority of these follow up activities were taking place as direct result of the ‘2005 Year’.

6.2 Follow up to the ‘2005 Year’ by the Council of Europe


Respondents were also asked to rank a number of areas – teacher training, quality assurance, youth participation and intercultural education - in order of priority in their country for follow-up work. These areas had been identified by the Council and its partners during the ‘2005 Year’ as requiring further work. The responses show that teacher training was ranked as the number one priority, far outstretching the volume of support for the other three. It was followed by support for work on youth participation, as a second priority, ahead of quality assurance and intercultural education, which were joint third priorities.

Respondents were also given the opportunity to suggest what types of activities in relation to education for democratic citizenship and human rights education (EDC/HRE) that the Council should focus on following the ‘2005 Year’ in the short term (2006), medium term (2007-09) and long term (2010 and beyond). The outcomes are shown in the three figures below: Figure 14 on short term follow up activities in 2006, Figure 15 on medium term follow up activities in 2007-09 and Figure 16 on long term follow up activities in 2010 and beyond.

The figures confirm that member states recommend that the Council should focus on a broad range of follow up activities between 2005 and 2010 and beyond in order to build on the momentum of the ‘2005 Year’. However, there are differing emphases as to which follow up actions should be the main focus of the Council, and which should have a lesser focus, in the short, medium and long term.

Figure 14 highlights the short term follow up activities on which the Council should focus in 2006.

Figure 14 Short term (i.e. in 2006) follow up activities to the ‘2005 Year’ by the Council of Europe




Source: Responses to survey evaluation of 2005 European Year of Citizenship through Education

There were three main follow up activities that countries thought the Council of Europe should concentrate on in the short term (i.e. in 2006): revision of the EDC pack; dissemination of know how and best practice; and, increasing collaboration with other international organisations. These actions are united in their emphasis on sharing knowledge and expertise about effective practice with a wide range of partners in and beyond Europe. There was less support for actions focusing on strengthening policy development and implementation.

Figure 15 shows the follow up activities that member states wanted the Council to concentrate on in the medium term (i.e. 2007-09).

Figure 15 Medium term (i.e. 2007-09) follow up activities to the ‘2005 Year’ by the Council of Europe




Source: Responses to survey evaluation of 2005 European Year of Citizenship through Education.

There were four leading follow up actions that countries wanted the Council of Europe to focus on in the medium term (i.e. in 2007-09): maintaining and expanding the EDC coordinators network; strengthening EDC/HRE programmes for teachers; strengthening policy development and implementation; and, the production of guidelines in assessment of EDC/HRE. These medium term priorities focus on strengthening existing networks and revisiting and updating the foci of EDC/HRE in the first and second phases of the EDC project, for example on policy development. There was less support

among countries for follow up actions in relation to the revision of the EDC Pack and the creation of a data and information base.

Figure 16 reveals the follow up activities that countries wanted the Council to concentrate on in the long term (i.e. 2010 and beyond).

Figure 16 Long term (i.e. 2010 and beyond) follow up activities to the ‘2005 Year’ by the Council of Europe



Source: Responses to survey evaluation of 2005 European Year of Citizenship through Education.

There were five main activities that countries felt the Council should concentrate on in the long term (i.e. 2010 and beyond): increasing collaboration with other international organisations; dissemination of know how and best practice; consideration of policies and measures to ensure sustainability; increasing dialogue with NGOs; and strengthening EDC/HRE programmes for teachers. These priorities have in common a focus on strengthening and sustaining EDC through dialogue with partners, the sharing of practice and the strengthening of networks and partnerships. Though still priorities for action, countries suggested that the Council should focus less on revision of the EDC pack; production of guidelines in assessment of EDC/HRE; and production of guidelines on quality assurance in EDC/HRE.

The suggested priorities for action for the Council, in the short, medium and long term from member states, though differing in emphases, have a number

of common themes that run through them. They are united in wanting the Council to strengthen and maintain EDC/HRE networks, while simultaneously increasing collaboration with a wider range of partners. They also have a strong emphasis on the continued dissemination of know how and expertise. Taken together, they have an overall aim of ensuring the increased strengthening of EDC/HRE in order to ensure its sustainability now and in the future. They suggest a commitment to EDC/HRE in member states that goes beyond the '2005 Year' and is based on a vision of continued close collaboration with the Council and its partners.

7. Final comment

The evaluation questionnaire ended with space for respondents to make further comments about the '2005 Year'. Though there were a range of comments made they contained a number of common themes. They:

- Underlined the overall success of the '2005 Year' in member states in meeting many of its aims.
- Were realistic about the limitations and barriers to the overall impact of the '2005 Year'.
- Recognised the need for concrete follow-up actions in order to build on the momentum of the '2005 Year'.
- Remained committed to working in partnership to strengthen EDC/HRE with a range of partners in member states and through collaboration with the Council of Europe.

Above all, the comments underlined that countries saw EDC/HRE as unfinished business. Though the '2005 Year' had achieved much there was still a considerable way to go before EDC/HRE was an accepted and sustainable component of policy and practice in countries. The sentiments match the spirit of the quote from William Hastings that:

'Citizenship is a journey not a destination'

Member states were united in their aspiration that the '2005 European Year of Citizenship through Education' should signal the start of a new collaborative journey, in partnership with the Council of Europe, to strengthen education for citizenship and human rights education (EDC/HRE) within and across Europe in 2006 and beyond, and not mark the end of that journey.