

*Alicja Pacewicz*

Center for Citizenship Education, Warsaw

## QUALITY ASSURANCE IN EDUCATION FOR DEMOCRATIC CITIZENSHIP. CAN THIS STRATEGY WORK IN POLISH SCHOOLS?

### Abstract

Education for democratic citizenship (EDC) encompasses all educational practices aimed at preparing young people and adults for life in a democratic society and helping them become active, informed and responsible citizens. The changes that have taken place over the past 18 years in Poland have not bypassed the school evaluation system. The country has slowly passed from a system of “hard control” to one of “soft supervision,” and its control functions have been strongly limited to make way for consultancy and support.

Obviously it is now impossible to foresee the future of school evaluation – many educators agree that the 2006 law meant less bureaucracy, but some add that it might also mean more control and less school autonomy. Whether and when we will see new regulations in this field remains unclear now. It can only be hoped that bodies running the school (both local governments and other “owners” of the schools), independent of the Ministry, will in some places (if not everywhere) support an initiative for real quality assurance. Incentives, such as diplomas or quality badges, might also help teachers and schools take part in a “pilot” or “large-scale” programme of introducing quality assurance in Education for Democratic Citizenship.

### Abstrakt

Edukacja dla demokratycznego obywatelstwa obejmuje wszystkie edukacyjne działania skierowane na młodzież i młodych dorosłych przygotowujące ich do życia w demokratycznym społeczeństwie i wspierających ich w stawianiu się aktywnymi, poinformowanymi i odpowiedzialnymi obywatelami. Zmiany, które miały miejsce w Polsce przez ostatnie 18 lat nie ominęły systemu ewaluacji szkół. Powoli system „twardej kontroli” zmieniono w „miękką nadzór”, a jego funkcja kontrolna została znacząco ograniczona, aby stworzyć miejsce na konsultacje i wsparcie.

Oczywiście nie można dzisiaj przewidzieć przyszłości ewaluacji szkół – wielu fachowców zgadza się, że prawo z 2006 roku oznacza mniej biurokracji, ale dodaje, że może również przynieść więcej kontroli i mniej autonomii w szkole. Nie wiadomo, kiedy pojawią się nowe regulacje w tym obszarze. Pozostaje tylko mieć nadzieję, że organy kierujące szkołami (zarówno samorządy lokalne, jak i „właściciele” szkół), niezależnie od Ministerstwa, będą w niektórych miejscach (o ile nie wszędzie) wspierać inicjatywy prawdziwego zapewniania jakości. Zachęty, takie jak dyplomy

czy znaki jakości, również mogą zachęcić szkoły i nauczycieli do wzięcia udziału w „pilotażowych” lub „o dużej skali” programach wprowadzających zapewnianie jakości w ramach Edukacji dla Demokratycznego Obywatelstwa (*Education for Democratic Citizenship – IDC*).

## Democratic School, Democratic Citizens

Education for democratic citizenship (EDC) encompasses all educational practices aimed at preparing young people and adults for life in a democratic society and helping them become active, informed and responsible citizens. It comprises citizenship education, human rights education, intercultural education, education for peace, education for sustainable development and media education.

Not only do schools impart civic knowledge, they can also facilitate democratic practices such as participation, negotiation and self-government. EDC occurs not only during lessons about democracy, but also in everyday school life – through school councils, peer learning, student-centered methods of teaching and assessment, and the overall school climate. If the daily school experience is not coherent with explicit citizenship education, EDC becomes ineffective.

## Quality Assurance Different from Quality Control

In the case of quality assurance, the stakeholders are interested in and ultimately responsible for the school's performance. They decide jointly on what quality is and work together to achieve it. By contrast, quality control implies that someone from outside (e.g. an inspector) is checking if the school is doing things in the way prescribed by education authorities. The key principle of quality assurance is that teachers, students and parents should be involved in the evaluation and improvement of school performance. Such joint “ownership” is beneficial for the individuals involved, for the education system and for society as a whole. It is widely recognized that Quality Assurance in school is closely linked to EDC because: it is based on participation; it empowers the less powerful; it promotes information sharing and accountability in school management; it encourages decentralized decision-making at the school level; and it gives the power of evaluation to the school and thus changes the culture of inspection. Quality Assurance and EDC practices in schools can support and inspire each other.

The Tool for QA in EDC – a joint effort by Council of Europe, UNESCO and Centre for Educational Policy Studies can be applied by school principals, teachers, students and other stakeholders, by policy makers and administrators on all levels of the education system and by non-governmental organizations active in this field. The Tool was published jointly by UNESCO, Council of Europe and the Centre for Educational Policy Studies (Ljubljana). It is part of the “EDC Pack” – a set of guidelines and manuals developed by the Council of Europe – and fits into the World Program for Human Rights Education proclaimed by United Nations General Assembly.

While many successful democratic school practices have been put in place all around Europe, a lot remains to be done to bring genuine democracy to every classroom. The Tool was prepared to help bridge the gap between the reality of school life and official policy declarations. It can also be seen as a response to the growing attention paid to quality assurance in the field of education. It is planned to improve the Tool on the basis of the feedback received, to develop supporting materials, and to facilitate the exchange of experience among schools, education practitioners and policy makers.

The “Tool for QA of EDC in Schools” is a very promising concept, both for evaluating a school with regard to its “democratic added value,” and for planning activities which can increase this value. The tool not only indicates the areas of school life where EDC may explicitly or implicitly be present, but also gives examples of good practices in all of them. The idea of EDC being something more than a curriculum subject is worth promoting. Most Poles would agree that lessons in civics or political education are not sufficient preparation for young citizens – a large part of this job should still rest with parents, the media and politicians. And yet, awareness that schools also transmit citizenship values and skills mainly through the everyday experience of students, teachers and parents, and not only during specific classes, is by no means common. Such principles as sharing responsibility, assuring transparency and accountability, or empowerment of all school stakeholders, are rarely connected with EDC. The tool can also be treated as a gentle way of introducing QA to those schools which have no experience with such procedures, or for other reasons are reluctant to assess the processes and effects of their work.

## How to Use the Tool?

Imagine you are a school principal planning to introduce Quality Assurance into EDC. This could be done in several steps: one should begin with awareness raising on usefulness of evaluation, then proceed to setting up a team (composed of school staff, students and parents), collecting information on the situation of EDC at school, drawing conclusions, disseminating the evaluation report and – last but not least – preparing a development strategy. Then it is time to act – change part of the curriculum, reform some school procedures, introduce more “democratic” learning and assessment styles. And start evaluating what is going on in school in respect of EDC on a regular basis.

## Quality of EDC at Schools and Its Possible Indicators

Quality assurance has to start by defining quality (what we value most) and its indicators (basic items submitted for evaluation). The Tool suggests six indicators within three thematic areas.

**Curriculum, teaching and learning**

Indicator 1: Is there evidence of an adequate place for EDC in the school's goals, policies and curriculum plans?

Indicator 2: Is there evidence of students and teachers acquiring understanding of EDC and applying EDC principles to their everyday activities in schools and classrooms?

Indicator 3: Are the design and practice of assessment within the school consonant with EDC?

**School ethos and climate**

Indicator 4: Does the school ethos adequately reflect EDC principles?

**Management and development**

Indicator 5: Is there evidence of effective school leadership based on EDC principles?

Indicator 6: Does the school have a sound development plan reflecting EDC principles?

**Collecting Data and Reporting to Stakeholders**

It is important to find the best ways of collecting reliable and valid data – it can be done through interviews, focus-groups, student diaries, questionnaires (e.g. online), recording and analyzing lessons or events. Collecting the views of students develops EDC competencies such as self-reflection, critical thinking or responsibility for improvement. It fulfils students' right to express their views on matters that concern them, encourages participation and contributes to more equal relations between students and teachers.

The conclusions of the evaluation should cover four basic areas:

- the school's achievement in EDC in general;
- the school's position on each quality indicator;
- the most successful and the weakest aspects of EDC;
- the critical points that threaten the development of EDC in the school.

Reporting the effects of the evaluation is necessary for school-development planning and for promoting EDC at local and national level. Reports for different groups of stakeholders can be prepared, including:

- comprehensive reports to the school staff, school board, the ministry and inspectorate;
- simplified reports to students and parents;
- brief reports to the wider public (leaflets, brochures, etc.) and for a school website.

All reports must be kept simple and clear, so that the public can see their relevance to the real school life issues.

**Can QA in EDC Work in Poland?**

Any experts concerning the possibility of introducing quality assurance (QA) of Education for Democratic Citizenship (EDC) into Polish schools must consider

both the long-term changes that have taken place in Polish education since 1989, and the current political context. In the last 18 years there have been two significant reforms of the educational system:

- The decentralisation of schools. The Ministry of Education passed the administration of educational institutions over to the local government authorities – municipalities (gminas) and districts (powiats).
- Curricular and structural reform. The introduction of new guidelines for curricula and external examinations, and the change in the structure of education from a two to a three-tier system.<sup>1</sup>

All of the changes introduced in post-communist Poland have led from centrally-administered schools with a uniform curriculum and identical textbooks, to schools with a greater degree of autonomy, managed by a director rather than a minister, in which the teachers are responsible for developing curricula and educational activities, after taking into consideration the voices of students and parents. Attempts were also made to increase the roles of the school council – a collective body comprising representatives of teachers, parents and students, parental committees – and of the student council. Much has been said about the need to set up proper procedures in order to protect the rights of students, and for several years schools and Kuratoria Oświaty (regional administration and evaluation bodies) even had students' ombudsmen.

As a recent study entitled “The Education Systems of Europe” suggests, despite the major economic difficulties accompanying social change, educational reforms have been introduced persistently in parallel with the ongoing processes of the decentralisation and democratisation of educational structures. Decision-making prerogatives have been placed in the hands of head teachers and the competencies of the local consulting structures have been broadened, especially those of parents.<sup>2</sup>

In general it may be said that schools were becoming more democratic and more modern, though it was evident that there was still a long way to go. A document prepared in 2005 by the Ministry of Education entitled “Education and Competencies” presented policies for 2007–2013, and stated that transformation (in the field of politics, economy, society and civilisation) was taking place both outside the educational system and within it. It included both learners and teachers. Systemic solutions adequate to the new reality have not been formed however. Schools have not kept pace with this transformation even though education has become increasingly important.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> For more information on the Polish system of education, see P. O'Brien, W. Paczynski, *Poland's Education and Training: Boosting and Adapting Human Capital*, OECD, [http://www.oalis.oecd.org/olis/2006doc.nsf/43bb6130e5e86e5fc12569fa005d004c/7aba6dd8019b46e7c12571a3003c9834/\\$FILE/JT03211668.DOC](http://www.oalis.oecd.org/olis/2006doc.nsf/43bb6130e5e86e5fc12569fa005d004c/7aba6dd8019b46e7c12571a3003c9834/$FILE/JT03211668.DOC), 2006, and W. Hörner, H. Döbert, B. von Kopp, W. Mitter, *The Education Systems of Europe*, Springer Verlag, 2007.

<sup>2</sup> W. Hörner, H. Döbert, B. von Kopp, W. Mitter, op.cit.

<sup>3</sup> Ministerstwo Edukacji Narodowej 2005.

## School Evaluation in Poland

The changes that have taken place over the past 18 years have not bypassed the school evaluation system. The country has slowly passed from a system of “hard control” to one of “soft supervision,” and its control functions have been strongly limited to make way for consultancy and support. This found its expression in educational law: in 2004 a Directive<sup>4</sup> was passed which no longer referred to inspection, but rather to measuring the quality of school performance. It was then decreed that in order to develop the educational system and especially to assist the qualitative development of schools and educational institutions, to support student development and the professional development of teachers, the bodies responsible for educational supervision should:

- conduct systematic, planned evaluations of the quality of performance of schools and other educational institutions;
- undertake activities to support schools and educational institutions in improving their performance;
- ensure that schools and educational institutions comply with the law with respect to organisation and performance;
- support teachers and directors of schools and educational institutions in meeting performance quality standards;
- support schools and educational institutions in determining the direction of their qualitative development;
- give schools and educational institutions access to information concerning changes in the law related to the functioning of schools and educational institutions.

From 2004 up to December 2006 two kinds of quality evaluation processes were conducted in Polish schools: external inspection through the Ministerial monitoring system, and in-house evaluation or self-assessment, carried out by the school itself and coordinated by the head teacher. This situation changed in December 2006, when the former Minister issued the new law on pedagogical supervision, practically eliminating the latter process.

## Evaluating by Exams as a Chance and a Threat

It should be added here that since the introduction of external exams in 2002, all school evaluations have had to include an analysis of the students’ achievements. For inspectors, local governments and school principals, the results of the exams have become a very significant part of the external and internal evaluation. These results are often treated as a basis for comparisons and checking school progress. Thus the achievements of particular schools can easily be compared. This comparison is not only a means to assess their performance; it also, and more importantly, diagnoses their problems and provides a valuable overview, hopefully

---

<sup>4</sup> Rozporządzenie z dnia 23 kwietnia 2004.

leading to substantial developments in the quality of education.<sup>5</sup> Many experts warn however that analysis of students' results may oversimplify the complicated matter of school performance.

Polish schools take part in various international evaluation studies, such as PISA conducted by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and research organised by the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA). Their results help evaluate different aspects of students performance and school education, but not of individual schools.

### Evaluation in 2004—2006 and What to Do Now

Under the Directive of 2004 the main task of inspectors was defined as measuring the performance quality of schools and other educational institutions – assessing the state, conditions and effects of the school's tuition, educational and nurturing practice, as well as other of its statutory activities, and the evaluation of progress in these areas. The responsibilities of Kuratoria mainly included:

- conducting external quality measurement;
- verifying whether there was an in-house QA system in place in the school, i.e. whether the director was organising quality self-evaluations;
- evaluating the usefulness and efficacy of school practice in relation to goals set.

The external evaluation was above all concerned with the extent to which the school was meeting standards set in the Directive, in certain cases modified by the appropriate regional Kuratorium.<sup>6</sup> 16 standards relating to the four areas of a school's responsibility were put forward, namely:

- a scheme of work developed by the school or educational institution;
- management and organisation;
- instruction/tuition;
- education and nurturing.

The standards set in the Directive were illustrated by examples of indicators which precisely defined what the inspectors should pay attention to in the process of controlling a school. These sample indices turned out to be more than mere examples – however, the Kuratoria and school directors began to treat them as mandatory. This in turn detracted from the independent search for quality criteria or indicators which would be more appropriate for the given school.

Under this law quality assurance in schools constituted a key element of the whole quality management system. Responsibility for internal evaluations rested on the director, who – in cooperation with all teachers – developed and put into practice an in-house quality assurance system. He or she conducted the self-evaluation, including an assessment of students' results; chose diagnostic tools and techniques; and wrote a report on the in-house evaluation during the school

---

<sup>5</sup> W. Hörner, H. Döbert, B. von Kopp, W. Mitter, op.cit.

<sup>6</sup> For example Pomorskie Certyfikaty Jakości 2005.

year and presented it to the Kuratorium, school council, board of parents and the local body administering the school. He or she was responsible for creating programmes to develop the school, analysing the results of external examinations and launching remedial measures.

Most of the supervisors did not manage to implement the expectations expressed in the regulation: the Kuratoria's approach to monitoring school quality and performance is sometimes criticised as being too centred on "box ticking," verifying the formal respect of criteria on teacher qualifications, equipment and so on, and neglecting a more careful evaluation of teaching performance and educational outcomes.<sup>7</sup>

The new directive put in motion in December 2006 does not mention school quality assurance, and in place of "external quality measurement" by Kuratoria, we find "diagnostic and evaluative activities." These activities include controlling legal aspects of school operation; examining, diagnosing and evaluating school operation in the areas of instruction, education and nurturing; and checking how teachers have fulfilled their tasks in these areas. There are no quality standards, which means that everything will rest in the hands of the individual inspectors who may have their own points of view, priorities and criteria.

Obviously it is now impossible to foresee the future of school evaluation – many educators agree that the 2006 law meant less bureaucracy, but some add that it might also mean more control and less school autonomy. Whether and when we will see new regulations in this field remains unclear now.

## Other Evaluation Systems

There are also at least several organisations outside the state supervisory system which conduct evaluations that schools and other educational institutions can participate in on a voluntary basis. These evaluations – usually in-house, but frequently supported by an external assessment conducted by bodies especially ordained for this purpose – are often part of a broader quality assurance system. They are frequently also a precondition for receiving quality certification and accreditation.

There are several other independent QA systems operating in the country. The best known are the following:

- *Learning Schools* – a programme run under the patronage of the Centre for Citizenship Education and the Polish-American Freedom Foundation (for more information, see below);
- *Schools of Quality* – certificates awarded for meeting standards in three areas: education, teaching and learning, management, awarded by the privately owned training centre EKO-TUR;

---

<sup>7</sup> P. O'Brien, W. Paczynski, op.cit.

- *ISO 9001:2000* – certificates of the International Organization for Standardization;
- *Health Promoting School* – a network of “healthy” schools (“healthy” as defined by the World Health Organization), coordinated by the Methodological Centre for Psychological and Educational Support;
- *Polish Good School Now* – an accreditation system for non-public schools which are members of the Civic Educational Association;
- *Interkl@sa* – a quality guarantee given to schools which can prove that they are ICT-literate;
- *Green Certificate* – awarded to environment-friendly kindergartens and schools by the Centre for Ecological Education EKO-OKO;
- *European Label* – A European certificate for schools introducing innovative language education with a European dimension.

It should be noted that under the 2004 Directive, the Kuratorium supervisors could abstain from evaluating a school’s performance, basing their decision on certificates and other documents that prove that the school has put into effect an in-house QA system. It is unclear whether participation in such voluntary QA networks can be beneficial for a school under the new Directive.

## The Learning Schools Self-Evaluation Programme and Network

Learning Schools is a programme, run under the patronage of the Centre for Citizenship Education<sup>8</sup> and the Polish-American Freedom Foundation, which already encompasses 500 schools. Its goal is to help schools improve performance quality and effectiveness, design and then implement the necessary changes. Schools define their own goals, the methods of achieving them and monitoring techniques in four major areas of school operation such as the effects of tuition and education, teaching and learning, the school as an institution, and the school and its environment (the standards are based on the European Project Evaluating Quality in School Education). Fundamental to the Learning Schools are: cooperation within teacher teams; defining tuition and educational goals in a manner which enables control of the degree in which they have been reached; a reliable system for monitoring performance effects; and building a local community incorporating teachers, students and parents.<sup>9</sup>

Schools also network around the more significant educational challenges, such as motivating students to study and behave appropriately, strengthening responsibility, individualising work with students, preventing aggression and

---

<sup>8</sup> Centrum Edukacji Obywatelskiej, *Szkola ucząca się*, <http://www.ceo.org.pl/portal/sus>, retrieved November 28, 2007.

<sup>9</sup> For more information, see *ibidem*.

bullying, encouraging cooperation between the school and home, and working with children with behavioural problems.<sup>10</sup>

A school is awarded the title of a “Learning School” (which it is entitled to for a period of three years) only after it has organised a “Collegial Panel.” The Panel invites representatives of other schools in the LS, the local authorities and the local community, and functions as a forum for open debate on the school’s priorities and working methods. It is also a space for working out new methods of dealing with previously identified problems. Representatives of the local authorities also often take part in discussion of the evaluation results. They are frequently interested in how “their” schools are working and which direction they should be taking. As an example, local government representatives – the mayor or president of the town, as well as district or regional representatives of the department of education – always participate in the evaluation panels organised within the Learning Schools programme. It is worth remembering that education often accounts for over half of local government expenditure; hence it is easy to understand the local authorities’ interest.

It should also be added here that 15 schools from the Learning Schools programme also participated in the European “Bridges across Boundaries” project, cross-disseminating quality development practices for schools in southern and eastern Europe. Activities such as sharing self-evaluation models, action research and critical friends groups were carried out based on the earlier European Pilot Project and on the book entitled “Self-Evaluation in European Schools: A Story of Change.”<sup>11</sup>

To sum up, quality self-evaluation in Polish schools is still in its incubatory phase and there are many conditions that make its development difficult. This in turn may negatively influence the quality of the school work, not only in the field of EDC.

## Correspondent Material for QA in EDC in Poland

Polish schools have no direct procedure for diagnosing and improving education for democratic citizenship. The areas of school life encompassed by the tool are sometimes present in the QA instruments that particular schools use. For example, the principles and practice of assessing students are very often chosen as worth diagnosing, analysing and modifying, because of the lack of transparency or fairness in this area. This is an issue in many schools (probably not only in Poland), as students, parents and even the teachers themselves are usually dissatisfied with how assessment works. Sometimes debates of this kind lead to significant changes – such as the introduction of formative assessment. However,

---

<sup>10</sup> Pomysły dobrej praktyki 2006.

<sup>11</sup> J. MacBeath, M. Schratz, D. Meuret, L. Jakobsen, *Czy nasza szkoła jest dobra*, WSiP, Warszawa 2000.

the practice of assessment is seldom considered an issue related to EDC – it is treated as pure assessment during maths or chemistry lessons.

Of course, in many schools students are encouraged to participate in some decision-making processes (although these are usually limited to marginal topics, such as when to organise a “School Day”), and students’ opinions about their role in school governance are collected. But again, this is rarely a planned and integrated effort to provide them with experience in the role of young citizens, or then to check whether they are satisfied, and to identify any other ideas for involvement they may have. Undertakings of this kind are usually an intuitive effort on the part of a director or teacher to find out what can be done in one or two isolated fields of school life, rather than part of a systemic approach to EDC. So – paradoxically – even if students are completing questionnaires about the school board or students’ rights, this is usually done within a non-EDC framework.

## The Tool as an Instrument of School Evaluation in Poland

Putting QA of EDC into practice could strengthen the changes taking place in the educational sector in Poland, among others:

- showing the value of authentic QA and self-evaluation;
- raising the quality of the education of young citizens;
- supporting the autonomy of schools and directors;
- overcoming the professional isolation of teachers through the teamwork it propounds;
- empowering all school stakeholders.

As I wrote earlier, however, the current political situation may delay, hinder or completely block the introduction of QA of EDC into schools. Nevertheless, we should not lose hope and need to search for schools or institutions which could attempt to implement the project at least on a small-scale basis, as a pilot study or “QA of EDC laboratory,” then verify and develop it, to be able to teach the procedure to others in the future.

## Circumstances that Might Promote the Usage of the Tool

We are now witness to the dynamics of an encounter between contradictory forces – on the one hand the modernisation of schools and education, and on the other, reactionary trends expressing themselves in the desire (or nostalgia) for central government, limiting the autonomy of the school and the diversity of its projects and teaching styles, an authoritarian style of work with students, and a distrust of teacher and student responsibility or self-evaluation. There are factors which favour, as well as those which hinder the introduction of the tool into schools, both of which will be mentioned below.

The introduction of QA of EDC might certainly be supported by concrete undertakings which schools, NGOs and institutions supporting schools can engage in:

- offering training courses in the use of the tool, including online training (e-learning);
- running support groups for teachers and schools, and maybe even students, who decide to introduce the tool in their establishments;
- publishing a Polish language version of the tool, adapted to conditions in Poland, and additional material useful for its implementation;
- giving NGOs operating in the educational sector access to the tool, so that – independently of ministerial policy concerning QA and EDC – schools may use it on a purely voluntary basis;
- including debate about the procedure into the Quality Forum movement coordinated by British Council; liaising with other undertakings to encourage the introduction of QA of EDC, such as creating national – or better yet, European and international – networks or associations of schools that use the tool.

## Preparation of Teachers

As has already been mentioned, QA does not constitute part of a typical teacher training curriculum, neither at pedagogical institutes nor during in-service teacher training. A serious training and counselling programme would be required to prepare teachers to use the tool. In our experience as an institution which has been training teachers for similar QA systems, teachers need a relatively long training period and sustained support to be able to introduce QA practice in the workplace, especially as this is not a task to embark on single-handed. A critical mass of teachers in a school have to devote themselves to the project and to be educated in the procedure, if its implementation is not to be a matter of pure fiction. It is also indispensable to start with the school principal – without his or her personal commitment and professional skills, nothing can be attained. All training should be synchronised with real-life school practices, so that participants soon have a chance to try out what they have just learnt at the course – to avoid engaging in a useless “training for training’s sake” activity.

One of the ways of supporting schools is by providing them with an e-learning course for the principal and teacher team on how to implement the tool – the consecutive modules should be presented some time ahead of the actual activity taking place in the school (e.g. a week or a month before), so that the course is closely aligned with the eight steps of QA of EDC.

## How to Make Working with the Tool Valuable for Schools

How to make it work is the greatest obstacle in the implementation process in the case of Poland. Schools will have to “swim against the stream,” as neither QA nor EDC are regarded as valuable by the ministerial and administrative authorities. On the contrary – both ideas may be even associated with the “Do what you like” approach to school governance which is openly criticised by the Minister.

It can only be hoped that bodies running the school (both local governments and other “owners” of the schools), independent of the Ministry, will in some places (if not everywhere) support this initiative. Incentives mentioned before, such as diplomas or quality badges, might also help teachers and schools take part in a “pilot” or “large-scale” programme of introducing QA of EDC. The European dimension of the project – seminars, networking, study visits – will certainly be seen as an extra source of motivation for joining the movement.

This text based on materials written by the author for the information leaflet on QA for EDC prepared for Council of Europe (Strasbourg 2007) and as part of a joint publication *Expertise on the possibilities of introducing QA in EDC*, prepared by DIPF, edited by Hermann Joseph Abs, (Frankfurt 2007).

The text of the Tool is available on-line at: <http://www.coe.int/edc>

### References

- Birzea C., Cecchini M., Harrison C., Krek J., Spajic-Vrkas V., *Tool for Quality Assurance of Education for Democratic Citizenship in Schools*, Council of Europe, UNESCO, Centre for Educational Policy Studies, Paris 2005.
- Centrum Edukacji Obywatelskiej, *Szkoła ucząca się*, <http://www.ceo.org.pl/portal/sus>, retrieved November 28, 2007.
- Hörner W., Döbert H., von Kopp B., Mitter W., *The Education Systems of Europe*, Springer Verlag, 2007.
- MacBeath J., Schratz M., Meuret D., Jakobsen L., *Czy nasza szkoła jest dobra*, WSiP, Warszawa 2000.
- O'Brien P., Paczynski W., *Poland's Education and Training: Boosting and Adapting Human Capital*, OECD [http://www.oecd.org/olis/2006doc.nsf/43bb6130e5e86e5fc12569fa005-d004c7aba6dd8019b46e7c12571a3003c9834/\\$FILE/JT03211668.DOC](http://www.oecd.org/olis/2006doc.nsf/43bb6130e5e86e5fc12569fa005-d004c7aba6dd8019b46e7c12571a3003c9834/$FILE/JT03211668.DOC) 2006.
- Program Operacyjny “Kapitał Ludzki”. Narodowe Strategiczne Ramy Odniesienia, Warszawa: Ministerstwo Rozwoju Regionalnego, 2006.
- British Council, *Quality Forum* <http://www.britishcouncil.org/poland-quality-in-education.htm>, 2004, retrieved November 28, 2007.
- Rozporządzenie Ministra Edukacji Narodowej i Sportu z dnia 23 kwietnia 2004 roku w sprawie szczegółowych zasad sprawowania nadzoru pedagogicznego [...]*, MEN [http://www.men.gov.pl/prawo/wszystkie/rozp\\_288.php](http://www.men.gov.pl/prawo/wszystkie/rozp_288.php), 2004, retrieved November 28, 2007.
- Rozporządzenie Ministra Edukacji Narodowej z dnia 15 grudnia 2006 roku w sprawie szczegółowych zasad sprawowania nadzoru pedagogicznego [...]* MEN <http://isip.sejm.gov.pl/servlet/Search?todo=file&id=WDU20062351703&type=2&name=D20061703.pdf>, 2006, retrieved November 28, 2007.