Networking European Citizenship Education (NECE)

Expert Workshop: *Quality Assurance in Terms of Education for Democratic Citizenship*

Vienna, October 14-15, 2005

Dr. Viola B. Georgi

for
*Bundeszentrale für Politische Bildung /
Federal Agency for Civic Education*

October 2005

Viola B. Georgi, NECE, EDC and QA

Table of Contents

Abbreviations: QA: Quality Assurance
EDC: Education for Democratic Citizenship
HRE: Human Rights Education

1. Conference Report

> There is measure to all things.
> Horace (65-8 B.C.)

Questions of quality assurance (QA) and quality development are becoming more and more relevant not only in national educational policies but also on a comparative and transnational European level. Raising (national) educational standards – in the light of maintaining or increasing global competitiveness – seems to be a major concern in many European countries. While there seems to be a consensus that QA is a powerful approach to ensure educational improvement and to achieve set educational goals effectively, QA in education is developing in different ways across Europe, according to principles and priorities of the different educational systems.[1] It therefore seems high time not only to exchange national experiences with QA in education for democratic citizenship (EDC) but also to discuss common ground with the perspective of establishing European standards.

The expert workshop *Quality Assurance in Terms of Education for Democratic Citizenship* dealt with central questions of quality assurance within civic education in Europe: How can the effects of EDC be measured? What are the indicators for successful education for democratic citizenship? What are the most adequate methods and instruments of quality assurance in the EDC-context? What specific features and approaches does evaluation in the field of EDC need? What concepts and strategies of evaluation have been developed and applied in different European countries and Europe-wide? What experiences have been made with developing and implementing these concepts? What conclusions can be drawn from these experiences in different national contexts envisioning European approaches? What transfer-strategies of good practices in quality assurance could be developed in order to exchange experiences? How can we build sustainable networks in the field that encourage and foster a "culture of evaluation" in Europe that is seen in a positive light by those involved?

Following this set of guiding questions participants from different subject areas and professional backgrounds (school development, school inspection, quality assurance, curriculum and programme development, policy makers, NGOs, researchers, educators, etc.) from twelve European countries (Italy, UK, Czech Republic, Latvia, France, Austria, Greece, Slovenia, the Netherlands, Romania, Croatia, Germany) discussed major

---

[1] See *Prague Forum* 2003, "Quality in Education and the Democratic Agenda," *Council of Europe.*

challenges of quality assurance. The discussion examined democratic skills (competencies, abilities) inherent to EDC and tried to elaborate on the term quality in relation to these skills. The discussants exchanged their perspectives based on specific national educational systems (including the non-formal educational sector) and historical developments that formed the discourse on evaluation in their respective countries. Participants also discussed the possibility of creating **common standards for quality in EDC** and the (transfer-) potential of the standards developed for example by the *Council of Europe* (COE) or the *Institute of the European Commission for the Protection and Security of the Citizen* (IPSC).

The workshop was designed in co-operation of the German *Federal Agency for Civic Education* (bpb), the Austrian *Department for Citizenship and Environmental* Education at the Federal Ministry for Education, Science and Culture and the Austrian *Service Centre for Citizenship Education and Human Rights* Education and was meant to be a contribution to the "European Year of Citizenship through Education"[2] (EYCE). It was opened by Sigrid Steininger (Austrian *Federal Ministry for Education, Science and Culture*) and Petra Grüne (German *Federal Agency for Civic Education*).

The first presentation by Florian Wenzel (*Academy Leadership and Competence* at the *Center for Applied Policy Research*, University of Munich) introduced a new concept for evaluation within civic education: ***Participatory evaluation***. The concept of *participatory evaluation* is based on the assumption that (civic) education can only be evaluated adequately[3] by a process of self-evaluation that includes the perspectives of all stakeholders involved (e.g. founders, participants, teachers, headmasters, programme developers). Such an approach is transparent, participatory, and hence democratic. Wenzel stressed the political character of evaluation, arguing that programmes or curricula that promote participation and democratic values should not be evaluated by non-transparent external forms of quality assurance evaluation. Evaluation should not be positioned distanced from the actors involved in the educational process. Thus, Wenzel emphasised, evaluation needs to take place within a "democratic framework": The evaluation process itself shall reflect the values and goals of civic education. Wenzel further emphasised that evaluation itself should become part of the educational process. Quality assurance and organisational development should be combined.

---

[2] For more detailed information see EYCE webpage of the *Council of Europe. European Year of Citizenship through Education* (http://www.coe.int/edc).

[3] With "adequately" Wenzel refers to three central dimensions of civic education: (1) concepts and facts, (2) reflection and irritation and (3) autonomy.

Wenzel briefly outlined the **history of evaluation** from a "measurement and assessment approach" to a "negotiation approach" that is the core of participatory evaluation. He described the process of **participatory evaluation** in four phases: (1) Firstly, there is the necessity of a *stimulus*, an initial context and a question that brings about the necessity or the desire to evaluate. (2) In the next phase – the *exploration* phase – stakeholders are identified and a stakeholder-group is formed that not only discusses the purpose of the evaluation but also sets the criteria. (3) The *differentiation* phase is the phase of collecting data and negotiating interpretations. Here it is important to focus on differences in order to sharpen and further develop the inquiry. (4) The last phase is the *assimilation* phase in which the results have to be "constructed" and compiled for a report. Wenzel underlined the necessity to embed evaluation in an appreciative context in order to support improvement as the main goal of (self-)evaluation. Wenzel concluded with six methodological steps to be followed within the process of *participatory evaluation* that aim at empowering the stake-holders to use the results of the evaluation: (1) Integration of stakeholders and the definition of the topic of the evaluation, (2) collection of current strengths and resources, (3) developing a common vision, (4) designing goals and indicators, (5) planning, running and evaluation projects, and (6) compiling an evaluation report.

The **discussion** concentrated on the following aspects and questions: Some discussants asked for the clarification of the terms civic education, political education, citizenship education and education for democratic citizenship (Romijn, Kontogiannopoulou-Polydorides). The representative of the *Council of Europe*, Yulia Pererva, explained that **EDC was meant to be an umbrella concept** in order to allow and bring together different (national) approaches and practices. She quoted the definition of EDC, according to which the "ultimate goal of EDC is to prepare individuals, and communities for civic and political participation. It implies respecting rights and respecting responsibilities. It values cultural and social diversity."

It was also remarked in that context that **citizenship education** had been abused under the communist regimes that forced people to participate in manifestations and political activities (Dainuvite). This historical experience resulted in general scepticism of EDC in these (transformation) countries which needs to be dealt with.

The group, however, in this first discussion did not succeed in developing a satisfactory definitional ground. This was most certainly due to the many different national perspectives. It was criticised that the notion of **civic education** is often based on an American understanding and concept of social studies that, as some participants argued, did not fit the European focus of conveying political literacy and social skills. There was a strong

desire to define a **European approach** of civic education that would not simply copy American models (Harrison, Kontogiannopoulou-Polydorides, Dessieux).

The discussion of terms was followed by a more general controversy on the significance of "numbers" within evaluation which was reflected in positions pro and contra **quantitative** and **qualitative approaches** of quality assurance pointing at the significance to distinguish between *formative* and *summative* evaluation (Abs, Becker, Palade). The concept of participatory evaluation was considered more useful for non-formal educational contexts (Dessieux) than for the formal-sector, where inspection (external evaluation) seemed more practicable and adequate. However, most participants agreed that participatory evaluation seems to be a good instrument in the context of self-evaluation. **The discussion concluded that considering evaluation an essential element of educational work, provides a great chance not only for continuous project development and quality assurance, but also for staff development and capacity building.**

The next panel with Anja Besand (*Institute for Social Science*, Pedagogical University Ludwigsburg, Germany) and Scott Harrison (*Office for Standards in Education*, UK) presented two (national) perspectives on quality assurance. Besand reported on the **academic discourse** on quality assurance in "political education" in Germany. Harrison outlined the practice of **school inspection** with respect to quality standards in England.

Besand presented the **German debate** on quality assurance within civic education. Doing so she touched upon the controversy on **democracy pedagogy** and **"political education"** in Germany. The major concerns about quality assurance in the German context are that evaluation would not fit the "humanistic educational ideal" and would neglect **the process** of education because it was only result-oriented. In addition to these concerns, the German educational system would not be ready yet for developing and implementing evaluation (inspection) on a large scale. To illustrate the wide anti-evaluation position in Germany, Besand quoted the German scholar in education Klaus Alheim who states that quality assurance is an attack on political education. Alheim represents a position widely spread in German political sciences where many are convinced that "political education" cannot and should not be measured. Measuring and standardisation are viewed very critically and from this perspective are often connected to assessment and "controlling." Alheim as quoted by Besand argues that quality assurance follows a pure economical logic, only focuses on short-term effects and serves the purpose to support only the most profitable and popular programmes and projects of "political education." Besand made clear that the debate on quality assurance is rather controversial in Germany. However,

the bad results of German schools in international comparative studies, she argued, had brought about an awareness for the necessity to think about quality assurance in German schools.

Besand then outlined the "competence framework" of a German society for civic education – the GPJE[4] – that defines the educational goals as competences to be learned in "political education," such as: the ability to judge politically, the ability to act politically and methodical skills such as the ability to formulate new views on different levels of politics and society. Comparing this set of competences with the goals of EDC she stressed a major difference: namely, that the German competence framework focuses mainly on **the individual** and the developing of the individual ability to judge and act politically in relation to the democratic institutions of the state, whereas the EDC-definition by the *Council of Europe* puts stronger emphasis on the relation of individuals and **communities** to society (public welfare). Besand argued that due to the history of National Socialism the concept of community which had been abused by the Nazis (Volksgemeinschaft) was strongly rejected in today's Germany. This historical dimension, as Besand argued, would also be the reason why education focused on the critical thinking of individuals rather than fostering a sense of community. She underlined this difference by contrasting the German term "Staatsbürgerschaft" and the English term "Citizenship." Besand argued that the German concept was based on liberal and individualist terms, whereas citizenship emphasised the relation of people in a free society. "Staatsbürgerschaft," according to Besand, focused on the relation of the individual to his/her government and the rights and duties deriving from this. Citizenship by contrast promoted the ideal of public-welfare-attitudes that consists of rights, duties and responsibilities for fellow-citizens. **Besand concluded that the totalitarian past of Germany was an obstacle not only to clearly defining what was to be achieved in "political education" but also how this achievement could be measured.**

Scott Harrison (School inspector from the *British Office for Standards in Education*) presented the "English case" by reviewing the development of citizenship education in the **British school system**. Citizenship started off as a cross curricula theme in 1990 and gained statutory authority in 2002 by becoming a subject and being introduced into the **National Curriculum** which defines three dimensions of citizenship learning: (1) knowledge and understanding, (2) enquiry and communication, (3) participation and responsibility.

---

[4] Gesellschaft für Politikdidaktik und politische Jugend- und Erwachsenenbildung.

Harrison then outlined the **English school inspection system** that he considered a lever for change: schools are inspected every three years by external inspectors, who do not only see lessons and students work but also talk to students, teachers and headmasters. The reports produced by the inspectors include achievement and standards, teaching, curriculum, support and guidance, leadership and management. The whole school inspection also covers school ethos, leadership and management. **Citizenship education** is inspected within an inspection programme that deals with school subjects in particular. There is an **annual report on citizenship** published.

Harrison emphasised that after three years of integrating citizenship into the national curriculum substantial progress can be documented: Pupils' achievement is good in over four in ten schools; teaching is good overall in half of the inspected schools; **citizenship education is satisfactory in the majority of British schools.** Harrison highlighted that these results were remarkable when seen against the background that there is no tradition of civic education in England. Harrison also mentioned some of the characteristics of good implementation of a citizenship curriculum. He identified three aspects: (1) the training of subject leaders and teachers, (2) the understanding on the part of pupils and parents that citizenship is an important and distinct subject, and (3) the constructive appraisal of citizenship in order to "make" space for citizenship in an already overloaded curriculum.

Harrison gave some concrete examples of the inspection process, the gaining of data and the reporting on the basis of guiding questions and standards. With respect to citizenship he mentioned the attainment target for citizenship that is expressed in the following terms: "Pupils have (…) a broad knowledge and understanding of the topical events they study; the rights and duties of citizens; the role of the voluntary sector; forms of government; (…) public services; and the criminal and legal systems (…). They show … how opinion is formed and expressed; including the media (…). They show understanding of how and why changes take place in society. Pupils take part in school and community based activities."

The criteria for measuring standards in this field are mostly task specific: that means that the degree to which identified "learning outcomes" have been met is measured. In addition inspectors report on the performance of different groups of pupils against the standards. **The findings of inspections, Harrison stressed, need not only to affirm good practice but also identify areas that can be improved upon. Hereby the capacity of the schools for self improvement can be promoted.**

The presentations of Besand and Harrison were discussed together which caused a lot of thematic jumping in the **discussion**. Again the need was articulated to further explore and compare definitions of ECD. The debate tackled the following questions: Should service-learning (community learning) be considered political learning or just as "doing good"? Is there a need to differentiate between active citizenship (that stresses participation and acting) and democratic citizenship (that puts stronger emphasis on democratic values and institutions)? What is the difference between political literacy and moral education? Do we need European standards, and if so, what should they look like and who will be authorised to adapt and implement them? How can standards relate to different cultural/national contexts? Who is responsible (accountable) for QA?

The presentation of the **"German case"** caused some irritation, mainly because of the terms "competence" and "ability to judge politically." The term competence was considered neo-liberal and therefore as a door opener for a market-driven "fit for purpose quality assurance" (Krek). The goal of "political education" in Germany summarised by the term "ability to act politically" was criticised in the light of the need to encourage students to act. The heart of EDC, it was argued, was activity (Spacjic-Vrkas). To educate in order to develop the "ability to judge and act politically" was considered too vague and little action-oriented. In that context the "Beutelsbacher Consensus"[5] became an issue and had to be explained (Grüne, Becker, Kröner, Abs). The "prohibition to overwhelm" (*Überwältigungsverbot*) students with political indoctrination as a consequence of the totalitarian experience of National Socialism was defended by the German participants whereas the other participants seemed to have a difficult time understanding the "German case." This may be illustrated by the misunderstanding that the "Beutelsbacher Consensus" would forbid students and teachers to argue and act politically in school.

Then the discussion turned to the different notions of **quality** that were described with three dimensions: (1) outcome (fit for purpose), (2) input, and (3) process (Abs). Spajić-Vrkaš underlined the need for a discussion that differentiates between the content of QA, the forms of QA and the terms. In addition she criticised that individual schools in England due to a centralist approach were held accountable for the evaluation (inspection) results. The different stakeholders (also the government) should be held responsible and accountable with respect to dealing with the results of evaluation. Harrison agreed but pointed out that the reports could

---

[5] For the German debate on the *Consensus in „political education"* see Sigfried Schiele und Herbert Schneider (editors): Das Konsensproblem in der politischen Bildung. Stuttgart 1977.

be read by parents and hence there was a great amount of transparency to inspection in the U.K. It was also remarked that holding schools accountable would make sense in the British school system where schools enjoy financial autonomy (Abs).

The next panel introduced the instrument **"Tool for Quality Assurance of EDC"** that was developed by an expert team on behalf of the *Council of Europe*.[6] The tool was introduced by two of its authors: Vedrana Spajić-Vrkaš (University of Zagreb) and Janez Krek (University of Ljubliana). Spajić-Vrkaš and Krek gave an overview on the history and the development of EDC from the *Second European Summit* 1997, the *Lisbon process* (2001)[7] up to now, including results from the IEA-study (1999) in order to underline the need for EDC. Against this background Spajić-Vrkaš explained the structure and the functions of the "Tool for Quality Assurance of EDC".

EDC was presented as the key to a **citizen-oriented Europe**, because it fulfilled the quests for a democratic citizen. Spajić-Vrkaš in that context pinpointed five relevant areas: (1) information and knowledge, (2) participation in decision-making, (3) value sharing, (4) trust, responsibility, solidarity, (5) co-operation/ partnership and networking.

EDC was sketched as "a set of multifaceted practises developed as a bottom-up approach to assist pupils, young people and adults participate actively and responsibly in decision making processes of their communities for the purpose of promoting and strengthening democratic culture based on awareness of, and commitment to shared values, such as human rights, equality and the rule of law, for their own benefit and for the benefit of their societies. It focuses on providing life-long opportunities for acquiring, applying and disseminating information values and skills related to democratic principles and procedures in a broad range of formal and non-formal teaching and learning environments" (Spajić-Vrkaš).

The authors of the QA-tool also explained why EDC can be regarded an advancement on a conceptual and a methodological level. On a conceptual level, according to Spajić-Vrkaš, the following dimensions of democratic citizenship are to be considered:

---

[6] For further information see Cesar Birzea, Michela Cecchini, Cameron Harrison, Janez Krek, Vedrana Spajić-Vrkaš. "Tool for Quality Assurance in Education for Democratic Citizenship in Schools," Unesco, Council of Europe, CEPS, 2005.

[7] This summit formulated the four strategic aims of the Council of Europe: (1) Democracy and human rights, (2) social cohesion, (3) security of citizens, (4) democratic values and cultural diversity.

- Political dimension (participation in decision making and political power)
- Legal dimension (understanding and exercising rights and freedom)
- Cultural dimension (respect for difference and common values, adherence to peace and pluralism)
- Social and economic dimension (combating poverty and exclusion through new types of economic relations)
- European dimension (awareness of European unity and diversity)
- Global dimension (recognition and promotion of global interdependency and solidarity)

The methodological advancement is reflected in the application of methods that include participation, decision-making, team-work, conflict resolution, trans-generational learning, respect for diversity and power-sharing. EDC can furthermore be viewed as a new philosophy of learning, teaching and training. EDC stands for new types of knowledge and skills, methods of training and learning. It propagates new forms of school leadership and management. EDC can also be considered a central element of lifelong learning in the context of an information society. Spajić-Vrkaš argued that EDC had an integrating function for formal and non-formal education because it includes human rights education, education for social reconstruction, intercultural education and peace education. She also stressed that EDC was therefore a key to integration (the state, private enterprise, civil society) and social cohesion.

However, in spite of all these convincing arguments for the implementation of EDC, Krek stressed that **all-European studies on EDC policies**[8] show that there are **structural challenges** for EDC to be overcome in many European countries. The greatest challenge is described as a gap between policy and practice that needs to be bridged. Besides the issues of participation, **teacher training** and **quality assurance** are regarded to be priority concerns. Spajić-Vrkaš presented some results of the IEA-study[9] that helped her to illustrate the need of EDC. She mentioned, for example, the growing mistrust in government institutions, political parties and politicians and the unsatisfactory knowledge students have on democratic principles and values. She then introduced a cycle of strategic

---

[8] Cesar Birzea, Davis Kerr, Rolf Mikkelsen and others: All European Study on Politics for Education for Democratic Citizenship. Strasbourg. Council of Europe 2001.

[9] Torney-Puta, J. et al. Citizenship and Education in Twenty-eight Countries: Civic Knowledge and Engagement at Age Fourteen (IEA). Amsterdam, 1999.

planning for change that she considered relevant to EDC.[10] One product of such a planning cycle is the so called *EDC pack* that is composed of four tools. *Tool 1* focuses on key issues for *EDC policies (all-European study for EDC policies), Tool 2* on democratic governance in education (democratic school participation and civic attitudes among European youngsters, democratic governance in universities), *Tool 3* on teacher training for EDC and HRE (support structures and mechanisms, teacher competencies, process and methods), and *Tool 4* on quality assurance of EDC in schools (quality assurance versus quality control).

Tool 4 was explained in more detail by Krek who introduced the framework to evaluate EDC in schools. He outlined the relevant areas of QA in EDC: *curriculum*, *teaching* and *learning*, *school ethos* and *climate*, as well as *management* and *development* with regard to quality indicators (e.g. the integration of EDC in the school curriculum) and subthemes (e.g. school policies in EDC) that have to be considered in order to get valid results.[11]

Spajić-Vrkaš and Krek stressed **that QA and EDC were closely interrelated**: On the one hand, EDC principles are to be considered essential components of quality in education. On the other hand, EDC principles are also reflected in a type of QA, that implies: sharing responsibility, transparency and accountability, empowerment for change and decentralisation of decision-making. Therefore, it was argued, that making EDC principles explicit within quality assurance would enhance democratic educational structures from school to government level. Moreover, both authors pointed out that a good quality assurance system for schools should take into account four components: (a) self-evaluation, (b) self development, (c) (inter)national standards (national inspection), and (d) the needs and interests of the institution and its local community. Spajić-Vrkaš made clear that self-evaluation was crucial to evaluation in general. She argued that evaluation carried out by the educational institution itself (school self evaluation) would provide valuable feedback for the purpose of accountability, effectiveness and improvement, which can be considered as the basis for capacity building and school development planning with respect to EDC.

---

[10] This cycle consists of five phases: (1) Visions and goals, (2) environmental scanning, (3) strategy design, (4) strategy implementation and monitoring, and (5) evaluation and reporting.

[11] See "Tool for Quality Assurance if Education for Democratic Citizenship in Schools," Unesco, Council of Europe, CEPS 2005, 82-83.

The subsequent **discussion** circled around the following considerations: The tool was considered good for stimulating a debate on EDC and QA. Some discussants stressed that they would appreciate regarding evaluation as a process geared towards improvement (Dessieux, Harrison). Bartak reported on the state of the arts of EDC in the Czech Republic stressing that it will become relevant to the national curriculum in 2008. In the meantime there were a lot of projects piloted and evaluated that dealt with citizenship education. However, no standards were agreed upon yet.

A major concern in the discussion was the question of how to bring together **external evaluation** (inspection) **and self-evaluation** for the purpose of identifying the "right" indicators and interpreting the collected data. Some discussants stressed that it would be necessary to initiate and foster a negotiation process between external evaluation (inspection) and self-evaluation (Harrison, Spajić-Vrkaš). Krek opposed this view by arguing that the indicators and results of self-evaluation and inspection might be contradicting for good reasons and should not be harmonised.

Pererva stressed that the idea of developing European standards should be at the forefront of future discussions. She made clear that the tool on QA in EDC is only a first step that needs to be taken further by the relevant actors in the member states of the Council of Europe.

2. Results of Working Groups

Four working groups were composed of participants of different countries but with similar professional background. They were asked to discuss the following three questions: (1) What is needed to further develop and implement QA and EDC? (2) What could you/your institutions contribute to this? (3) What would be a good follow-up to this workshop? The groups came up with the following suggestions for developing and implementing EDC and QA in EDC. I grouped the comments and recommendations in six thematic focal points:

(1) Follow-up Workshops and Conferences

- Forum for further reflection on the implementation of EDC and QA in EDC with respect to content, school development, teaching material and training
- European conference for school inspectors
- Series of workshops on contents of EDC, indicators and teacher training
- Workshop on content standards that relate to teacher education and to school development
- Conference on the effects of "neo-liberal" approaches being introduced to educational system(s) taking into account quality assurance versus quality assessment

(2) Research and Consulting

- Establishing a European research and resource centre for EDC and QA
- Setting up an international working group that develops and consults QA in schools
- Scrutinising different levels of accountability and responsibility within the EDC-context (formal and non-formal educational sector)
- Piloting a project on QA in EDC together that is funded by the EU
- Testing the tool in practice: collecting and comparing case studies

(3) Teacher Training

- Strengthening teacher training in EDC
- Integrating QA into teacher training on EDC
- Establishing focus groups with teachers on QA

(4) Policy Level

- Linking the activities of the Council of Europe and the European Union
- Developing (national) policy strategies in order to implement European standards in different national contexts

(5) Standardisation

- Identifying indicators: working on a common vision and standards in Europe
- Introducing a certificate or a "label" for EDC-schools

(6) Implementation

- Adapting the QA-tool by the Council of Europe for different local (national) contexts
- Translating and adapting the QA-tool
- Compiling a multilingual glossary with terms relevant to EDC
- Improving the dissemination of texts and materials on EDC and QA
- Establishing a network of institutions that supports the development and implementation of EDC
- Developing specific implementation strategies for EDC in the member states (school authorities, governments, schools etc.)

3. Feedback of Participants

A questionaire was prepared for gathering feedback of the participants. The questionaire concentrated on thematic questions (e.g. about chances and obstacles of implementing QA in EDC) but also asked about the participants' own contributions, usefulness of the workshop and suggestions for continuation. The following list presents a summary of the main comments. Some of the comments on thematic issues are taken up in the relevant passages of the report, particularly in the recommendations (Point 5 of this report).

(1) All participants stated that they found the workshop very useful for their respective work in the field. Participants appreciated the opportunity to learn about, and exchange, different European approaches in EDC and QA. However, some emphasised that they would have liked a more practical, case-study-oriented workshop. Many participants felt that **best practice** examples from different European countries would have helped to give a more concrete picture of EDC and QA.

(2) Most participants appreciated the chance to meet and **exchange** with people from other European counties.

(3) Some participants said that they will use the QA-tool on **EDC as frame of reference** in their countries.

(4) Some participants would like to pilot **projects on EDC**.

(5) Some participants would like to contribute to developing **teacher training** with respect to QA in order to provide the ground for improving and implementing EDC.

(6) Many participants offered their personal **expertise** and their institutional affiliation to help developing dissemination and implementation strategies for EDC.

(7) Some participants offered their **research capacities** in order to accompany EDC and QA scientifically.

(8) Some participants criticised that a lot of discussion time was devoted to clarifying **terms**, which slowed down the process to get to concrete aims and purposes.