

Study visit group report

Group No 78

Title of the visit Education - Participation - Citizenship
Topic Education for Active Citizenship and Sustainable Development
City, country Rotterdam, the Netherlands.
Type of visit General Education
Dates of visit 21st January 2013 to 25th January 2013
Group reporters Nuala McDonnell Ángela Sánchez and Mohamed Seedat

Dear participants,

The purpose of a study visit is to generate an exchange of experience and good practice between the country you visit and the countries you all come from. Thus, participating in a study visit can be an exciting experience and an important learning tool for you.

During the visit you are invited to prepare a group report summarising your discussions and learning. This will help CEDEFOP disseminate what you have learnt to others, who share your interest but did not participate in this particular study visit.

On the first day of the visit, you are to select a reporter who will be responsible for preparing the final report and submitting it to CEDEFOP. Everybody should contribute to the report by sharing their views, knowledge, and practices in their respective countries. Please start working on the report from the first day of the visit.

You will, of course, be taking your own notes during presentations and field visits; but the group report should highlight the result of the group's reflections on what was seen and learnt during the entire visit and the different perspectives brought by the different countries and participants. The report should **NOT** read as a travel diary, describing every day and every session or visit.

CEDEFOP will publish extracts of your reports on its website and make them available to experts in education and vocational training. When writing the report, please keep this readership in mind: make your report clear, interesting, and detailed enough to be useful to colleagues throughout Europe.

By attaching any photos to the report, you agree to CEDEFOP's right to use them in its publications on study visits and on its website.

Please prepare the report in the working language of the group.
Please do not include the programme or list of participants.

The reporter should submit the report to CEDEFOP
(studyvisits@CEDEFOP.europa.eu) within **ONE** month of the visit.

I FINDINGS

This section summarises the findings of the group while visiting host institutions, discussing issues with the hosts and within the group. You will be reflecting on what you learnt every day. But to put them together and give an overall picture, you need to devote a special session to prepare the final report on the last day of the visit.

In this section, it is important that you describe not only things you learnt about the host country but also what you learnt about the countries represented by group members.

1. One of the objectives of the study visits programme is to exchange examples of good practice among hosts and participants. CEDEFOP will select well-described projects/programmes/initiatives and disseminate them to former participants and a wider public, including potential partners for future projects. Therefore it is important that you identify and describe all aspects that, in your view, make these projects/programmes/initiatives successful and worth exploring.

The topic of this Study Visit was active citizenship, multiculturalism and diversity. It had participants from the following countries:

Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Finland, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Portugal, Romania, Spain and the United Kingdom.

Participants came from a diverse professional background including working in primary, post primary and special education. Others worked in Community and Voluntary Group, NGO and in the area of assessment and Board Game Manufacturing.

How countries express their values has a marked influence on the definition of and approach to Citizenship-Education-Participation. The range and scope of cultures, countries and roles represented enabled a rich mixing of ideas and experiences about topics such as cooperation, inclusion and multiculturalism

During the study visit the participants learnt about innovative approaches for student inclusion and multicultural integration in participating countries. Various approaches to multi disciplinary support, family mentoring and teacher recruitment were shared.

During the week there were many opportunities to visit different schools and organisations related to the theme of the visit. Among the features of note in the Netherlands was the idea that the goal of helping all students achieve a final diploma was paramount and determined the specific programme or learning environment that was needed in order to bring this about.

The participants would like to express their gratitude to their hosts for organising an informative, interesting and varied programme. The quality of the Study Visit facilitated the creation of a warm group atmosphere during the week. Particular thanks to Mr. Robert Roks for his care and attention.



Describe each of the good practices you learnt about during the visit (both from the hosts and from one another) indicating the following:

title of the project/programme/initiative	country	name of the institution that implements it (if possible, provide a website)	contact person (if possible) who presented the programme to the group	whom the project/programme/initiative addresses	what features of the project/programme/initiative make it an example of good practice
Education, Participation Citizenship	Netherlands (Rotterdam)	Eenheid Zorg	Robert Roks	Students with Behavioural Problems.	<p>“Time out” programme-rebound places for pupils with behavioural problems.</p> <p>Teachers work individually with pupils.</p> <p>Care and responsibility evident in practise.</p> <p>Parents’ active involvement.</p> <p>Cooperation of pupil’s previous school with programme.</p>
	Netherlands (Rotterdam)	HO, Rotterdam.	Dr.Frans Spierings, Lecturer.	Students at Risk of Dropout.	<p>Better career guidance.</p> <p>Greater opportunities for training.</p> <p>Flexibility-pupils can change educational path to a more suitable one.</p> <p>Early identification and monitoring of at risk students.</p> <p>Support both inside and outside the school</p> <p>Collaboration between schools and support workers.</p> <p>Emphasis on parental responsibility and involvement.</p>
	Netherlands (Rotterdam)	OBS Vierambacht (Primary School).		Primary school students.	<p>Ability to reflect on own practise.</p> <p>Ability to target areas that need improvement.</p>
	Netherlands (Rotterdam)	Samenwerkings Koers Vo-Association for Cooperative Secondary Education.	Mr.Koert Suer, policy advisor.	Secondary schools offering VMBO. Schools with general Secondary education (HAVO) and	<p>Motto-Working together to give each pupil a future with perspective.</p> <p>Individual talents and possibilities form the starting point in education.</p> <p>Cooperation between school boards,</p>

				pre-university education (VWO) on a voluntary basis.	management and school staff. Availability of a consultant from Koers VO to support schools with individual problems.
	Spain	Almadraba High School	Angela Sanchez	Secondary Students	Key features include <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bilingual projects • Intercultural and peace project • Special educational needs • After school lessons (specifically extra support for a variety of needs that may be identified)
	UK	Community and Voluntary Sector	Mohamed Seedat	Community Organisations and Schools	Training which includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cultural awareness • Addressing faith issues Assisting schools towards dialogue Equality and Diversity training
Osservatorio Dispersione Scolastica	Italy (Sicily).	<p>“Scuola Secondaria di I Grado” Cosmo Guastella</p> <p>www.scuolamediaiguastella.it</p> <p>from the school website there is a link to Osservatorio per la Dispersione Scolastica Distretto 9</p>	Rita La Tona Principal and Co-Ordinator.	Students and families.	<p>Since 2008 the school has been coordinating activities and special European and regional projects to address school loss and failure in 9 schools located in an at risk district (School Loss Observatory Net) in cooperation with the association and Town Council.</p> <p>The Regional Board provides specialists in each Observatory (identified as a priority risk zone) and each school network trains teachers to support, mentor and guide students in order to revitalise difficult situations and promote motivation, family cooperation and success.</p> <p>The school network teachers meet monthly, work on specific cases and try to improve practise. The headmistress and specialist network coordinator meet the</p>

					Central Board and other school Networks at least three times a year to communicate results and to identify Solutions and new strategies. The network is organised on French ZED zone models.
Supporting Pupils with Special Educational Needs.	Ireland.	National Council for Special Education www.ncse.ie	Nuala McDonnell	Students with Special Educational Needs in Primary, Secondary and Special Schools.	Team of Special Educational Needs Organisers available to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support parents, pupils with SEN and school staff • Provide information around schools and assessment. • Provide resources for schools to support pupils with SEN. • Set up special classes for SEN pupils.
	Finland	Laukaan kunta, Laukaan lukio	Helina Patana		Single curriculum across the country One national test Focus on guiding rather than teaching Involvement of students in teachers meetings Citizenship - invite political candidates to engage students with their manifestos
	Romania	GradinitaPP "Vis de Copil"	Constanta Teodorescu	Primary School	Pre school -3yrs Compulsory primary education until vocational education is optional
	Bulgaria	46 Primary School, "Konstantin Fotinov"	Kina Dimitrova	Primary School	30% -40% are bilingual International projects
KommMIT	Bavaria (Germany)	ISB (State Institute for Quality of Schools and Research in Education) in cooperation with StMUK (Ministry of Education in Bavaria).	Dr.Eva Huller	Teachers, Headmasters, School Administration, Politics.	Measures taken for pupils with migration background: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improvement of German language skills. • Improvement of cooperation between schools and parents (also with language courses for parents) • Intercultural

					<p>competences.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Help by transition into the job market <p>http://www.isb.bayern.de/schulartuebergreifende/schule-und-gesellschaft/migration-interkulturelle-kompetenz/</p>
Kompetenz-interkulturell.de	As Above.	As Above	As Above	As Above (especially teachers)	Information and ideas for teachers, who has to deal with pupils with different cultural background and native languages.
Mama lernt deutsch (Mother is learning German)	As Above.	St.Muk	As Above.	Schools, parents.	Language courses for Mothers (Material also in Turkish and Russian Language).
	Latvia	Barbele Primary School	Dace Penke	Primary School	Proposed Professional Educational Programmes "Baby school" Mazpulki.

The study visits programme aims to promote and support policy development and cooperation in lifelong learning. That is why it is important to know what you learnt about such policies and their implementation during your visit. You are invited to describe your findings concerning the following:

2.1 APPROACHES TAKEN BY PARTICIPATING COUNTRIES (BOTH HOST AND PARTICIPANTS’) REGARDING THE THEME OF THE VISIT. ARE THERE ANY SIMILAR APPROACHES/MEASURES IN PARTICIPATING COUNTRIES? WHAT ASPECTS ARE SIMILAR AND WHY? WHAT ASPECTS ARE DIFFERENT AND WHY?

Among the similarities observed by the participants were the following:

- The age of compulsory school attendance usually from five or six to fifteen or sixteen.
- Schools in all of the participating countries are trying to address the issue of social inclusion through the development of an “inclusive culture” by means of an innovative, cooperative and collaborative approach to methodology.
- Additional staff training to accommodate difference.
- Attention to diversity and multiculturalism evident in the work of the institutions represented by the participants.
- A cooperative approach between local authorities and other organizations was evident across countries.
- Bulgaria also works with a multicultural group.
- In Portugal NGO’s can apply to take part in a programme which has been running for two years that works with neighbourhoods with problems in several areas including education.

- In some countries such as Spain and the UK there are special classrooms for teenagers over 16 who do not have their educational certificate. Here they have the opportunity to get both the certificate and do training.
- In Spain subjects are integrated among the bilingual students.
- The UK has Pupil Referral Units which are available for students with a particular level of behavioural difficulties who are taken out of the mainstream setting. They are not as intensive as the example presented in Rotterdam.
- In countries such as Italy, Ireland, Bulgaria, Latvia, UK, Spain and Romania the emphasis is on finding a solution to student problems within the school.
- Some schools in Bavaria have teachers visit their pupils' homes in common with some schools in the Netherlands.
- The Netherlands and Bavaria are also alike in providing language courses for parents whose first language is not the language of instruction in the school.
- The Bulgarian system is also centralised. In this country there is a programme called "Success" that works in the area of dropout prevention by organising clubs and workshops for students' free time.
- **Differences.**

Among the differences observed were the following:

- How inclusion is promoted and how students with SEN are supported. There are special schools for students with behavioural difficulties in the Netherlands. The focus in most other countries is on the school providing additional support to meet the students' needs either in the class or by withdrawing the student.
- Funding is available in countries such as Finland, Holland, Ireland and Germany (Bavaria) to provide support staff for pupils with SEN.
- Rotterdam has a school for teenage mothers unlike participants' countries.
- In Rotterdam schools are given funds and how goals are achieved is not prescribed.
- Ireland and Netherlands once a child reaches the age of four he can start school.
- In the UK and Spain a child can only start school at the beginning of the academic year.
- In countries like the UK, Bulgaria, Romania, Latvia and Ireland a school with a diverse ethnic mix is not provided with extra funding. However, in Finland, Holland and Bavaria they are.
- In the UK an application is made for a school that is nearest the child's home. However, in Holland it is chosen according to the child's needs.
- In the case of Bavaria schools are selected on the basis of a pupil's grades or special aptitudes.
- Finland has only one national exam. The curriculum is one regardless of whether the school is public or private. In Finland Active

Citizenship is the goad of education and political officials are invited into the schools.

- In one school visited as part of this Study Visit home visits by tutors are compulsory. In most other countries home visits are not carried out.
- In Sicily politicians may also be involved.
- In Bulgaria politics are not part of education. Indeed Bulgarian educationalists are not allowed to demonstrate political involvement as education has to be independent of political interests.
- Portugal enjoys a completely different approach to autonomy than presented during the study visit. Portugal has a more centralised system. There is no autonomy in hiring staff.
- In Portugal there's a specific subject called Civic Training.
- In Italy and Latvia primary school students have single desks.
- In Italy there aren't interactive whiteboards in every class. The teachers don't have the same degree of technological expertise.
- Teachers' recruitment is totally different in Holland than it is in Sicily. In Italy the process is long and too complicated. Being a centralised system there is less freedom in recruitment.
- How to involve busy parents is the main problem in Latvia.
- In Holland parents apply for the school which best suits their children's abilities and interests. In Spain, Ireland and the UK application is made to the school nearest to the child's home.
- Unlike their Romanian counterparts teachers in Holland have assistant teachers to assist them with children with special needs.
- Variation in teacher recruitment. Schools in countries such as Holland, UK, Finland and Germany have greater freedom in choosing suitable teachers. In Italy and Spain for example teachers are assigned to a school on the basis of their results.

2.2 CHALLENGES FACED BY PARTICIPATING COUNTRIES (INCLUDING HOST) IN THEIR EFFORTS TO IMPLEMENT POLICIES RELATED TO THE THEME OF THE VISIT. WHAT ARE THE CHALLENGES? ARE THEY COMMON CHALLENGES? IF SO, WHY? IF NOT, WHY NOT?

Some challenges shared by all countries:

- School drop out.
- How to motivate parents to participate in their children's education.
- How to accommodate difference in pupils-social background, cultural and/or religious traditions.
- Reduction in funding.
- Lack of flexibility and autonomy in how funding is utilised.
- Difficulty in increasing policy awareness about social inclusion and students' right to an appropriate education.
- Suitability of teachers.
- Recruitment strategies
- Poor language skills
- Risks of students not choosing the right career.

- Building networks and links with other agencies.

The main challenges for citizenship education are to:

- Achieve a clear definition and approach.
- Secure its position and status in the curriculum.
- Address teacher preparedness and teacher training.
- Increase the range of appropriate teaching and learning approaches.
- Improve the quality and range of resources.
- Decide on appropriate assessment arrangements.
- Develop and disseminate more widely effective practice.
- Influence the attitudes of young people.

2.3 NAME AND DESCRIBE EFFECTIVE AND INNOVATIVE SOLUTIONS YOU HAVE IDENTIFIED THAT PARTICIPATING COUNTRIES (BOTH HOST AND PARTICIPANTS) APPLY TO ADDRESS THE CHALLENGES MENTIONED IN QUESTION 2.2. PLEASE MENTION SPECIFIC COUNTRY EXAMPLES.

- Increasing school autonomy in teacher recruitment in order to get a match between pupils' needs and teachers' strengths. The autonomy in teacher selection and the management of funding in Rotterdam was seen as attractive by several participants.
- The Irish and Italian way to support students with Special Educational Needs and their families.
- Better career guidance.
- Better communication with parents and local organizations.
- Better monitoring
- Greater parental involvement.
- LO (Learning Object) created by a university in the Czech Republic.
- In Rotterdam there was emphasis placed on the tracking of students from primary to secondary schools. Other countries could try to improve this.
- The exemplary learning environment and school layout of the primary school visited.
- Collaborative working across schools-experts hired out from schools.
- Education for active citizenship is important for all countries.
- Teachers visiting the children's homes. Teachers guiding rather than teaching children.
- In the Netherlands there are coffee mornings for parents in the schools to stimulate dialogue between parents and staff.
- In Great Britain dialogue among different religious traditions is used with the support of religious authorities e.g. with the help of an Imam.
- In the Netherlands pupils attending schools in difficult areas may avail of additional school hours.
- Increased funding of schools to promote inclusion of pupils with SEN through support staff, for example.

2.4 ASSESSMENT OF THE TRANSFERABILITY OF POLICIES AND PRACTICES. COULD ANY EXAMPLES OF GOOD PRACTICE PRESENTED IN THIS REPORT BE APPLIED AND TRANSFERRED TO OTHER COUNTRIES? IF SO, WHY? IF NOT, WHY NOT?

The sharing of examples of good practise can be a stimulus for participants to reflect on improvements in their own countries.

Inclusive strategies may be introduced and shared with each country.

However, it is not possible to easily introduce some changes without a change in national policy or an increase in funding.

Among the valuable ideas which may be transferrable are the following:

- The **FAST** project in UK. (Families and Schools Together).
- Adoption of “15 minutes of reading” every day in secondary school.
- New programme starting in Latvia next year.
- Generous funding of education in Finland.
- Collaborative work between industry and tertiary education.
- Ideas from the visit to the primary school in terms of involving the neighbourhood in order to build up trust. When parents feel trust they work better with schools.
- The development of effective communication based on mutual respect. This represents a task for every level of the school system.
- Respect for school involvement in diversity and specialist staff to provide additional support.
- Teachers’ lack of knowledge about different cultures is a challenge.
- The use of key players in the community to support schools to overcome problems. This is an existing resource that requires tolerance and acceptance.
- Good practise can transfer between cultures if account is taken of the individual differences in countries.
- It is noteworthy that there are so many projects involving parental involvement. Measures to improve cooperation with parents may be transferred with commitment and do not require great funding.
- Increase in the school hours of pupils would be expensive.
- Finding new ways to motivate students is an objective of all participating countries.
- Citizenship education is part of history and civics at lower secondary (12 to 15 years).

3. Creating networks of experts, building partnerships for future projects is another important objective of the study visit programme.

Please state whether and which ideas for future cooperation have evolved during meetings and discussions.

- Post visit communication among participants by email or Skype.
- Future exchange visits.
- The creation of a digital space where the participants can meet. A closed communication group e.g. a Google group.

- Bilateral cooperation. Multilateral project.
- Participation in a Grundtvig Programme.
- Sharing others' resources
- Adapting of the Czech board game "Thinking about Cities and People" to stimulate intercultural dialogue by creating models based on participants' countries and individual issues.
- Opportunity for students to learn the language and culture of other countries.
- Proposed future study visit in Sicily.

TO SUM UP

4. What is the most interesting/useful information that the group believes should be communicated to others? To whom, do you think, this information will be of most interest?

All of the countries represented in this study visit have similarities and differences. What unites them is their common aim: the education and training of young people to become citizens who are free and autonomous while being cooperative and supportive. The good practise of the Dutch Educational System and how it operates was both interesting and useful to the participants' professional development.

All participants agreed that preventing school dropout is a key target. The following aims are also common to the work in all countries:

- Promoting social cohesion through respect for diversity
- Active promotion of multicultural knowledge, skills and understanding for all.
- Guiding young people to enable them to participate actively in the roles and responsibilities of their adult lives.
- Involving students in learning by doing, through active, participatory experiences in the school or local community.

While the approaches and programmes of one country may be transferred to another they will only succeed if they take account of the unique historical, cultural and social traditions of the new European context. Careful adaptation rather than wholesale adoption should be the watchword. Educational policy is a matter of concern to all involved in both formal and informal education. The role of all educators is not only to teach, but to guide their students in order to form them as responsible and confident citizens of society in a European context.

To whom do you think this information will be of most interest?

- National Agency.
- Teacher training organisation
- Colleagues.
- Organization.

II Organisation of the visit

This part of the report will not be published but it will be made available to the organiser and will be used by national agencies and CEDEFOP to monitor and improve implementation of the study visits programme.

We recognise the value of ongoing feedback as a way of ensuring that the programme is at all times a responsive and dynamic initiative, meeting the needs of its various participants and target audiences. In this section you are invited to give us your feedback on several factors that, in our opinion, contribute to an effective visit.

1. Discuss within the group and check if you agree or disagree with the following statements. Please mark only one box (☑) that expresses most closely the opinion of the entire group. Please use Question 2 of this section to elaborate on your responses, if needed.

		All agree	Most agree	Most disagree	All disagree	Not applicable
e.g.	The size of the group was good.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.1.	The programme of the visit followed the description in the catalogue.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.2.	There was a balance between theoretical and practical sessions.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.3.	Presentations and field visits were linked in a coherent and complementary manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.4.	The topic was presented from the perspectives of the following actors of the education and training system in the host country:					
1.4.1.	government and policy-makers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.4.2.	social partners	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
1.4.3.	heads of institutions	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.4.4.	teachers and trainers	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.4.5.	students/trainees	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.4.6.	users of services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.5.	There was enough time allocated to participants' presentations.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.6.	The background documentation on the theme provided before the visit helped to prepare for the visit.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.7.	Most of the group received a programme well in advance.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.8.	The information provided before the visit about transportation and accommodation was useful.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.9.	The organiser	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

		All agree	Most agree	Most disagree	All disagree	Not applicable
	accompanied the group during the entire programme.					
1.10.	The size of the group was appropriate.	√ <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.11.	The group comprised a good mixture of participants with diverse professional backgrounds.	√ <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.12.	There were enough opportunities for interaction with representatives of the host organisations.	√ <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.13.	There was enough time allocated for discussion within the group.	√ <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.14.	The CEDEFOP study visits website provided information that helped to prepare for the visit.	<input type="checkbox"/>	√ <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2. If you have any comments on the items 1.1. - 1.14 above, please write them in the box below.

III Summary

1. Having summarised all your reflections and impressions, please indicate how satisfied you are with your participation in the study visit. Indicate the number of participants for each category, e.g.

Very satisfied

Very satisfied Satisfied Somewhat satisfied Not satisfied Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied

2. What elements and aspects of the study visits do you think could be changed or improved?

Overall, this was an excellent Study Visit.

The following suggestions are not meant to be critical or to take in any way from the quality of the visit.

The schools visited were quite similar and some participants would have liked greater variety here. The study visit could have included a wider range of settings and the opportunity to observe active citizenship in a livelier manner. The study visit was regarded as particularly relevant to teachers and would have had a broader field of relevance had organizations other than schools been included.

The topic of sustainable development was part of the programme and could have been covered more directly in the visit.

Participants would have liked to observe active citizenship in practise by, for example, observing a class.

Other opportunities which participants would have welcomed included meeting parents & observing how the community develops active citizenship. For example, it might have been helpful to have attended a Parents' Association meeting or for the Czech participant to introduce one of his board games on citizenship to students.

3. If there is anything else you would like to write about that is not included in the above questions, please feel free to write below or attach a separate sheet.

THANK YOU!

Please submit the report to CEDEFOP (studyvisits@CEDEFOP.europa.eu) **within one month** of the visit.



Rotterdam Study Visit, January 2013.