

# Development Plan for the UPPER Collaborative Benchmarking Approach

**3rd version**

***28/09/ 2019***

---

**Author:** *Claudio Dondi, IIHL*

**Contributors:**

- *UPPER Partners*
- *Participants to the parallel session in the Sanremo “EDUCATION INSPIRING PEACE” Workshop*
- *Members of the EIP Lab Local Organisational Group*

## 1. Purpose and context of this document

This document is produced in the framework of the UPPER Project (co-funded by the ERASMUS + Programme of the European Union) to present the current state of development of an approach - Collaborative Benchmarking (CB) – proposed to facilitate exchange and development of good practices in the field of Peace Education. **Benchmarking is a quality development practice based on the structured comparison among similar organisations, articulated on an agreed set of criteria and indicators.** Although it became popular among competing companies to stimulate progress, it has increasingly been used by policy makers and public interest organisations in a more collaborative spirit, to increase effectiveness of public policies and stimulate targeted collaboration on specific improvement areas (e.g. security, inclusiveness, innovation, etc.). **Benchmarking pre-supposes self-assessment as the start of the comparison, does not prevent the possibility of peer review and external evaluation based on the identified criteria, and prepares the ground for more interactive forms of collaboration** by helping organisations to identify the most interesting partners for future collaboration.

The document is produced when the collection of 50 Good Practices has taken place and when a first wave of feedback on the basic concept of CB has been conducted through a parallel session of the Sanremo International Workshop “Education Inspiring Peace” (November 2018) and some adjustments to the initial ideas have taken place. The actual launch of the online CB System is foreseen as Task 4.4 in the third year, while the next steps of design, developing and testing are taking place between Year 2 and the first part of Year 3 in collaboration with a group of experts and stakeholders identified through the workshop.

The document structure is the following: section 2 illustrates how the collection of good practices has allowed to identify certain principles and criteria that may constitute the basis for CB; section 3 explains how the system might be used to facilitate self-assessment, improvement and collaborative learning; section 4 reports the results of the workshop and the main conclusions in methodological and practical terms; section 5 summarises the present state of development and section 6 proposes a plan of action to complete the development of the online system.

## 2. From Good Practices Review and Analysis to Indicators

The collection of good practices in the field of peace education, the main activity conducted by UPPER Partners in the first year of the project, entails not only a purely descriptive effort, but also the identification of specific elements that make the practice “good” and effective in its context; the comparison among the different practices belonging to the same category; and the questioning of possible similarities in approaches and results.

An expected result of this comparative analysis was the identification of a limited set of indicators that might be able, once properly agreed, described and possibly associated to some level/metrics, to support self-assessment, peer review and a structured comparison of policies, teacher training programmes, evaluation practices, school practices and mainstreaming strategies. In fact, the review was conducted on 6 levels of action (Policy Making, Teachers competence development, Self-assessment approaches, Concrete school practice, Community Building and Mainstreaming/multiplication strategies), and using a set of 15 different strategies, to a large extent an adaptation by UNIMORE of the typologies proposed by the **NESET II Report “Education policies and practices to foster tolerance, respect for diversity and civic responsibility in children and young people in the EU”** (1. Avoiding segregation and promoting diversity; 2. Ensuring effective leadership and good governance; 3. Providing accurate information on diversity; 4. Providing high quality teachers education on diversity; 5. Encouraging diversity in the teaching workforce; 6. Establishing flexible and culturally relevant curriculum and pedagogy; 7. Providing bilingual and multilingual education; 8. Promoting the use of interactive culturally relevant teaching methods; 9. Promoting school-society relationship; 10. Making socially responsible and positive use of ICT; 11. Involving NGOs and Youth Organisations at school; 12. Provide incentives and reward good practice; 13. Social integration; 14. Awareness of injustice; 15. Promotion of peace value as such).

The review of good practices also facilitated the identification of diverse contexts and “value perspectives” that potentially converge towards the good practice collection: in other words, some “good practice elements (GPE)” can be identified as specific components of several good practices that are different in terms of inspiration and original focus (e.g. the civic perspective, the value of forgiveness, the conflict transformation, the anti-radicalisation, the holocaust memory, etc.). The idea that some of these GPEs could be more “universally” transferable than the whole good practices - more heavily depending on the local context - is feeding the hypothesis that a collaborative benchmarking exercise should build on these CBEs (rather than on alternative and sometimes controversial “vision-led” strategies) to support collaboration among communities of practice that have been working in “cultural silos” with limited interaction among them. CBE can then be used as the ground where good practice criteria and indicators can be developed and proposed.

### 3. Use of Indicators to Measure Progress in a Comparative Way: Collaborative Benchmarking

Once indicators based on GPEs are agreed, they can be grouped, levels of accomplishment and progressive achievement can be temporarily defined according to the

set of practices observed, and a modular system of online self-assessment can be created. This Collaborative Benchmarking approach should allow:

- Policy makers/people involved in policy implementation and assessment to compare their measures, resources and results;
- Schools to compare their strategies and achievements;
- Teacher training institutions to compare their programmes and results in the field;
- Everybody involved in communication/dissemination to compare mainstreaming achievements.

In fact, collaborative benchmarking is not an alternative to self-assessment at the organisational level, to peer-reviewing, to workshops, staff mobility, joint project work, eTwinning and other collaboration practices, but a method to support all of them by providing a set of criteria and indicators defining good practice and a platform to find appropriate partners. While isolated self-assessment on a standard set of criteria/performance can already help an organisation to reflect on “what is present and what is missing”, a collaborative benchmarking system helps to relativize own results, to identify what is, in a given time and place, the real level of “best performance” and “low performance” for each indicator, based on a dynamic community of respondents; and potentially stimulates, if adequately supported, collaboration and peer learning. The automated and anonymous treatment of the replies would protect the respondents who do not want to appear low performing. Any attempt to use the Collaborative Benchmarking System to publicise unverified levels of performance associated to a participating organisation will be discouraged by the anonymity principle. The association of scores to a participant organisation will only be possible if a certified peer review has taken place and the reviewed participant agrees to be identified on request by other participants that want to establish collaboration with best performers.

## **4. Concept-testing the idea of Collaborative Benchmarking at the Sanremo Workshop (November 2018)**

The concept of Collaborative Benchmarking presented above was first discussed in the Partners Meeting held in Reggio Emilia in May 2018, when a long list of CB criteria was suggested through a brainstorming session, then presented (with a short list of criteria for school benchmarking and policy benchmarking) at the international workshop “Education Inspiring Peace” held in Sanremo on 23<sup>rd</sup> November 2018, in a parallel session specifically dedicated to present the idea and collect suggestions. These are the main conclusions reached in this session:

- Collaborative benchmarking is a promising approach, but the system has to progress gradually, checking its development at every step;
- Attention should be paid to definitions and to a good delimitation of the CB scope;
- The CB system of indicators should be “modular” and “evolutive”, easy to update when levels of achievement increase;
- The CB system should be context-sensitive, in order to be used in different situations e.g. post-war, high migration, polarised political environments, and others;
- The concept of conflict-transformation should be present in the conceptual development;
- Criteria must come from - or at least be tested on - the field before being consolidated as part of the CB. Reference to the “Everyday Peace Indicators” Project (Prof. Roger McGinty –University of Manchester) was made;
- Accept that, whatever delimitation of the field we choose, the CB system will always have some grey areas in which it will overlap with general quality criteria for good education;
- Benchmarking should not be the only way to use the indicators identified through the analysis of good practice: in some cases self-assessment might be enough to stimulate progress, in others collaboration may take other forms –still organised around the indicators- without passing through the online platform;
- The quantitative element in the UPPER benchmarking will probably be difficult to define;
- More than comprehensive policies, the CB might help to compare Programmes that focus on one or two target groups;
- It would be interesting to offer CB opportunities not only to schools and policy makers, but also to NGOs and local communities active in this field and promoting extra-curricular activities for children, sometimes involving teachers and parents;
- In spite of the complexity level and the concrete difficulties identified, the potential of CB to drive action should not be underestimated, so the effort of developing it is well directed.

The group of participants in the parallel session offered to continue providing feedback to the CB development effort, and to constitute a “virtual” Working Group contributing to the Project Partners work.

## 5. Proposed approach: Principles, Scope, Criteria

On the basis of the feedback received and of the subsequent elaboration by the partners' team, the UPPER project is proposing the following principles, scope and criteria to develop the Collaborative Benchmarking system:

### ***5.1 Design Principles***

1. Unambiguous terminology, based on an *ad hoc* glossary;
2. Orientation towards formative evaluation and collaboration, rather than summative evaluation and ranking;
3. Evolutionary in its extension and depth, open to feedback from first users and to general developments in the education field (hopefully progress in awareness and performance);
4. Building on existing grassroots experience and connecting to similar initiatives worldwide;
5. Context-sensitive, able to grasp specificities of users and gather entities with similar levels of maturity and problems to address;
6. Usable also by people and organisations who simply desire to access the indicators for self-assessment or other forms of less structured collaboration;
7. Offering the possibility to publicly reward the best performers (only after a certified peer review) on each main criterion;
8. Keeping anonymity of participants and individual scores (unless specifically authorised to publicly celebrate best practices) and using the data just for statistical treatment necessary for "comparisons against the average, the best and the worst scores";
9. Based on qualitative as well as quantitative criteria and indicators;
10. Fundamentally aimed to support structured collaboration, thus offering support to identify relevant groups of "peer organisations" with whom to deepen collaboration across countries.

The web platform should be instrumental to the requirements that will be agreed through the interaction between the CB Working Group and the Technical Development Team who is developing the UPPER/EIP Laboratory overall platform.

### ***5.2 Scope and target groups of the CB exercise***

The scope of CB is not the whole field of peace-oriented activities, but the education field, and within this the practices and policies that lead education systems and activities to inspire peace in learner population and the surrounding communities.

The three main target groups of the CB system are:

1. Schools, first of all, because the project aims to have its main impact on daily school practice;

2. Policy making organisations at national, regional and local level, as far as they influence contents and practices of school education and share the objectives of making education the first collective ground for the development of citizenship, social and political competences inspiring peace as a major aim;
3. NGOs and other third sector entities (associations, foundations, organised cultural groups, etc.) collaborating with the education system in organising extra-curricular activities leading to the same objectives as the UPPER project.

People active in each of these kinds of organisation will find useful tools to check their own level of awareness and competence in the field through other instruments and resources that the UPPER project has developed and is continuing to develop, such as the Report on the collection of good practices, the Teachers Competence Framework (and the related self-assessment tools), the Peace Education Handbook and the Policy Recommendations. The CB system is designed to be used by a team, not by isolated individuals: the judgement on “where our organisation stands” in the proposed scales should be the result of an internal discussion, not the view of the top person. In fact, this is instrumental to the development of a serious debate within the organisation, the development of a collective approach and, ideally, of an improvement action plan that should lead to observable progress in the near future.

### ***5.3 Proposed Criteria for the initial modules of the CB system***

As a first attempt to progress towards the development of the CB system, the proposal is to start developing the two following modules, to be respectively used by school teams and policy making organisation, and the respective main criteria:

#### ***MODULE 1. SCHOOL CRITERIA***

- Whole school approach and planning;
- EIP school policy based on context analysis;
- Explicit policy statement publicised to local community;
- Diversity management and valorisation;
- Coherent pedagogical concepts and practice;
- Conflict transformation;
- Involvement of local community in EIP activities;
- School-home partnership;
- Provision of professional development opportunities to school staff;
- Participatory evaluation of impact.

#### ***MODULE 2. CRITERIA FOR PUBLIC POLICIES/PROGRAMMES RELATED TO EIP***

- Use of evidence and international examples to define action;
- Involvement of relevant stakeholders since the early phases of policy definition;
- System approach to link with other policy areas having direct influence on the expected impact of the Programme;
- Provision of clear objectives and funding accordingly foreseen;
- Provision of training and support to key people involved in the implementation;
- Encouraging and rewarding grassroots initiatives coherent with the objectives;
- Allowing necessary adaptation of curriculum and assessment;
- Implementing policy principles in terms of teachers' education and continuing professional development of school staff and inspectors;
- Participatory formative evaluation;
- Coherent communication with general public.

For each of the SCHOOL PRACTICE proposed criteria a tentative scale of achievement/maturity has been developed (ANNEX 1) developed, indicatively of 4 layers identifying basic, intermediate, advanced and very advanced levels of implementation. Participant teams (School teams, see Annex 1 for composition criteria) will be invited to indicate their current level of performance, the system will automatically compare it with the average level among all participants or subsets of the participant organisation that better correspond to the participant's identity (country, level of the school; policy level of the programme, etc.). On the basis of the exercise the team will be able:

- to reflect on the reasons for its strengths and weaknesses;
- to work on an improvement plan and use again the CB system after an interval of a few months;
- to ask the project team to provide contacts with "more advanced" or same-score" teams to do collaborative project work and/or study visits/peer review sessions.

## **6. Next steps towards the development of the collaborative benchmarking system and platform**

1. This document is distributed to the UPPER project partners and to the pilot schools involved in the UPPER Project in Autumn 2019;
2. The selected twenty pilot schools will start to use the CB system by hosting a kick-off meeting (KoM) with one project partner and will discuss/produce a school piloting plan, specifying what are the selected GPE, how and when they could be tested in the school, which kind of modifications are identified as necessary to fit with the local context and the school particularities. After six months from the KoM, each school will be asked to shortly report on



progress made and add written/multimedia documentation for the Project Results Showcase. At that time, they will also be asked to go through the CB system again and to check their new position within the participating schools. Project partners will try to connect pilot schools that share similar objectives;

3. As far as the policy criteria are concerned, they have been articulated in performance levels and will be discussed by project partners referring to one relevant programme in their country; after internal review, they will be presented to a Policy Workshop to be organised in Sanremo, at the EIP Laboratory, in November 2019;
4. As foreseen, the CB system will be launched for public use in *Year 3* of the UPPER Project and feedback from users will be regularly collected through electronic forms available on the platform and through local stakeholders' sessions during 2020;
5. An improved version will be delivered by summer 2020, providing also a module for NGOs and organisations active in adult learning.

# Annex 1

## *Collaborative Benchmarking system for schools*

**The following draft is conceived to define a structure for the implementation of the UPPER benchmarking system by the educational institutions.**

The form includes 10 criteria through which schools will have the possibility to identify their own state-of-the-art in peace and citizenship education delivering process and other similar fields. The CB system is designed to be used by a team (indicatively 5 to 10 people including the management team and representatives of educators, students, parents and other local stakeholders who know the school), not by isolated individuals: the judgement on “where our organisation stands” in the proposed scales should be the result of an internal discussion, not the view of the top person alone. In fact, this is instrumental to the development of a serious debate within the organisation, the agreement of a collective approach and, ideally, of an improvement action plan that should lead to observable progress in the near future. However, individual participants may use this questionnaire offline and try to answer each question from their perspective before entering into the team discussion.

## *1 - Whole school approach*

Please choose 1 of the following options:

<input type="checkbox"/> 1.0	Absence of a coordinated general approach in the field / individual teacher's activities are carried on;
<input type="checkbox"/> 1.1	A group of educators is organised to pilot activities in the field within the school;
<input type="checkbox"/> 1.2	A whole school approach is planned to be established;
<input type="checkbox"/> 1.3	A whole school approach has already been in place for at least one year and all school staff and students are aware of its implementation by the institution;
<input type="checkbox"/> 1.4	A whole school approach is in place, adopted and assessed with the contribution of internal and external stakeholders on the basis of agreed criteria;
<input type="checkbox"/> 1.N	None of the proposed levels is applicable (please specify):

## *2- EIP school policy based on context analysis*

Please choose 1 of the following options:

<input type="checkbox"/> 2.0	Absence of an EIP school policy;
<input type="checkbox"/> 2.1	An EIP policy by the school management team is in preparation;
<input type="checkbox"/> 2.2	An EIP policy is being discussed with the contribution of all school staff and by involving students too;
<input type="checkbox"/> 2.3	An EIP policy has been defined in cooperation with local stakeholders and on the basis of the identification of specific conditions of the local context (demographic, social, cultural, economic, etc.);
<input type="checkbox"/> 2.4	As in 2.3 but the policy has already been implemented and monitored , with public results and updates;
<input type="checkbox"/> 2.N	None of the proposed levels is applicable (please specify):

### *3- Explicit policy statement publicised to local community*

Please choose 1 of the following options:

<input type="checkbox"/> 3.0	No peace education public policy statement exists;
<input type="checkbox"/> 3.1	A peace education policy statement is available at the main hall of the school and is occasionally distributed to representatives of the local community;
<input type="checkbox"/> 3.2	A peace education policy is published on the school website and presentation materials, making it a distinctive quality of the school for its students and stakeholders;
<input type="checkbox"/> 3.3	The peace education policy statement has been developed through an open debate with the local community and is subject to review on a periodic basis, based on the results of participatory assessment;
<input type="checkbox"/> 3.4	The peace education policy statement is subject to a lively debate and consultation process to keep it adaptive to new achievements and new challenges emerging in the local community;
<input type="checkbox"/> 3.N	None of the proposed levels is applicable (please specify):

#### *4- Diversity management and valorisation*

Please choose 1 of the following options:

<input type="checkbox"/> 4.0	No specific anti-discrimination policy is applied;
<input type="checkbox"/> 4.1	The school has an anti-discrimination policy but shows no specific sensitivity in dealing with diversity;
<input type="checkbox"/> 4.2	The school has a general diversity awareness policy and informally but systematically takes care of avoiding discriminatory practices;
<input type="checkbox"/> 4.3	The school is officially committed to respect diversity and is effectively intervening against any discriminating practice or abusive individual behavior identified;
<input type="checkbox"/> 4.4	The school has an explicit policy to respect diversity and to build education practices which build on the positive contribution of diversity to develop critical thinking, conflict transformation, and "living together competences";
<input type="checkbox"/> 4.N	None of the proposed levels is applicable (please specify):

## *5- Coherent pedagogical concepts and practice*

Please choose 1 of the following options:

<input type="checkbox"/> 5.0	No specific implication of peace education policy on educational practices;
<input type="checkbox"/> 5.1	The school adopts a generic participatory approach in educational activities and prevents the segregation of student groups;
<input type="checkbox"/> 5.2	The school deliberately explores and promotes concrete ways to build "peace education practices" in the curricular programme;
<input type="checkbox"/> 5.3	Teachers are committed to work together and include peace-oriented activities transversally in education programmes, and to stimulate "living together competences" of the students;
<input type="checkbox"/> 5.4	The school has a tradition in education inspiring peace and monitors its results on a regular basis, providing yearly reports on its activities and implementation plan for the future;
<input type="checkbox"/> 5.5	The school has a long tradition in this area and is a source of good practices for other schools, satisfying all the of conditions of 5.3 and 5.4;
<input type="checkbox"/> 5.N	None of the proposed levels is applicable (please specify):

## *6- Conflict positive transformation*

Please choose 1 of the following options:

<input type="checkbox"/> 6.0	No positive understanding of conflict exists in the school;
<input type="checkbox"/> 6.1	The school appreciates the potential positive role of conflict transformation, but has no structured approach to it;
<input type="checkbox"/> 6.2	The school has started to experiment conflict transformation practices, but there is no generalised approach among the school staff;
<input type="checkbox"/> 6.3	The school has developed a significant experience in conflict transformation and its staff can be considered competent in the field;
<input type="checkbox"/> 6.4	Same considerations of point 6.3 are applicable. Additionally, the school has become a reference point for other schools, both within its territory and/or beyond;
<input type="checkbox"/> 6.N	None of the proposed levels is applicable (please specify):



## *7- Involvement of local community in EIP activities*

Please choose 1 of the following options:

<input type="checkbox"/> 7.0	The school does not interact with the local community on these issues;
<input type="checkbox"/> 7.1	The school occasionally involves local authorities and other relevant stakeholders in its peace education activities;
<input type="checkbox"/> 7.2	The school has developed its policy in this field with a systematic involvement of local community stakeholders;
<input type="checkbox"/> 7.3	The school has very recently (less than 12 months) established an ad hoc advisory group for peace education and other related activities, in which local stakeholders are represented;
<input type="checkbox"/> 7.4	A multi-stakeholders advisory group for peace education and citizenship education has been in place for more than one year and assesses/supports the school activities in this domain, guaranteeing a broad involvement of the local community in the concrete educational activities;
<input type="checkbox"/> 7.N	None of the proposed levels is applicable (please specify):

## *8- School-home partnership*

Please choose 1 of the following options:

<input type="checkbox"/> 8.0	Families of students are not involved in the peace education activities developed by the school;
<input type="checkbox"/> 8.1	Families and parents in particular are regularly informed about peace education activities proposed to students and are invited to support the students;
<input type="checkbox"/> 8.2	Families of students are invited to shape and take part in peace education projects, thus creating favorable conditions to the "living together competences" learning;
<input type="checkbox"/> 8.3	Representatives of students' families are part of the advisory group that shapes the peace education policy and action plans;
<input type="checkbox"/> 8.4	Family representatives are among the most active facilitators of peace education activities, constantly encouraging the school to improve its level of achievement in the field of peace education and conflict transformation;
<input type="checkbox"/> 8.N	None of the proposed levels is applicable (please specify):

## *9- Provision of professional development opportunities to school staff*

Please choose 1 of the following options:

<input type="checkbox"/> 9.0	No specific training opportunity in this field is offered;
<input type="checkbox"/> 9.1	The school encourages teachers to take up existing training opportunities in this domain;
<input type="checkbox"/> 9.2	The school has started a training requirements analysis for its teaching staff in this domain and plans to activate a training programme for them;
<input type="checkbox"/> 9.3	The school has already trained a group of teachers to be leading an action programme on peace/citizenship education and positive transformation of conflict;
<input type="checkbox"/> 9.4	The school has an effective continuing professional development (CPD) approach for all its teachers in this domain and is a reference institution for other schools;
<input type="checkbox"/> 9.N	None of the proposed levels is applicable (please specify):

## *10-Participatory evaluation of impact*

Please choose 1 of the following options:

<input type="checkbox"/> 10.0	The impact of peace education policy and actions is informally assessed only by the school leader;
<input type="checkbox"/> 10.1	An ad hoc peace education group within the school staff is in charge of both implementation and assessment of the peace education school policy and actions;
<input type="checkbox"/> 10.2	All school staff and representatives of students take part in impact assessment through the request of evaluative information;
<input type="checkbox"/> 10.3	In addition to point 10.2, also parents/families and external stakeholders are requested to evaluate the impact of the peace education programme according to predefined criteria; they also contribute to the positive use of evaluation results
<input type="checkbox"/> 10.4	School staff, students, families and external stakeholders contribute to the definition of impact assessment criteria and are active contributors to the concrete evaluation activities and to the use of evaluation results;
<input type="checkbox"/> 10.N	None of the proposed levels is applicable (please specify):

## Annex 2

### *Collaborative Benchmarking System for Policies and Programmes promoting Education Inspiring Peace and Democratic Citizenship*

**The following draft is conceived to define a structure for the implementation of the UPPER benchmarking system by the educational institutions.**

This form includes 10 criteria through which policy makers and other contributors to policy making will have the possibility to identify their maturity level in peace and citizenship education policies, or more specifically programmes and initiatives. The CB system is designed to be used by a team (indicatively 5 to 10 people including the responsible decision makers and representatives of educators, students, parents and other stakeholders who know the policy field), not by isolated individuals: the judgement on “where our programme stands” in the proposed scales should be the result of a discussion, not the view of the top person alone. In fact, this is instrumental to the development of a serious debate within the group, the agreement of a collective approach and, ideally, of an improvement action plan that should lead to observable progress in the near future. However, individual participants may use this questionnaire offline and try to answer each question from their perspective before entering into the team discussion.

## *1 – Systemic approach and link with other policy areas*

Please choose 1 of the following options:

<input type="checkbox"/> 1.0	Absence of a coordinated general approach in the field ;
<input type="checkbox"/> 1.1	Occasional support to specific initiatives, no programme or general policy;
<input type="checkbox"/> 1.2	A general policy is drafted and few initiatives are supported, but a comprehensive implementation system is not in place yet;
<input type="checkbox"/> 1.3	A coherent policy framework is in place, and some forms of cooperation with other policy areas are actually taking place;
<input type="checkbox"/> 1.4	The policy is an integrated part of a multi-sector policy framework, including not only education, but also, for example, social inclusion, culture, migration, employment, citizens participation;
<input type="checkbox"/> 1.N	None of the proposed levels is applicable (please specify):

## *2- Involvement of relevant stakeholders*

Please choose 1 of the following options:

<input type="checkbox"/> 2.0	The policy was conceived and defined by the policy maker with the advice of experts;
<input type="checkbox"/> 2.1	A consultation of relevant stakeholders was organized before the programme was approved;
<input type="checkbox"/> 2.2	The first ideas about the policy were formally checked with a set of stakeholders;
<input type="checkbox"/> 2.3	Stakeholders were periodically and formally consulted during the whole definition and implementation cycle;
<input type="checkbox"/> 2.4	The whole policy framework is the result of a permanent dialogue with relevant stakeholders, included in the monitoring process;
<input type="checkbox"/> 2.N	None of the proposed levels is applicable (please specify):

### *3- Use of evidence and international examples to define action*

Please choose 1 of the following options:

<input type="checkbox"/> 3.0	The programme was conceived by policy maker; without specific reference to research or international examples
<input type="checkbox"/> 3.1	The programme has been defined on the basis of clear signals coming from stakeholders and political impulse, but not really on research evidence input;
<input type="checkbox"/> 3.2	The programme has been designed on the basis of the results of a study and of impact assessment;
<input type="checkbox"/> 3.3	The programme is the result of a comprehensive review of the local context and international experience;
<input type="checkbox"/> 3.4	The policy in this field is guided by periodic collection of data and is systematically compared with similar policies in other regions/countries;
<input type="checkbox"/> 3.N	None of the proposed levels is applicable (please specify):



#### *4- Provision of clear objectives and resources*

Please choose 1 of the following options:

<input type="checkbox"/> 4.0	The policy has clear general objectives, but is lacking resources and is based on voluntary efforts;
<input type="checkbox"/> 4.1	The policy has clear objectives and some resources have been allocated for its start-up phase;
<input type="checkbox"/> 4.2	The policy has some very clearly communicated macro-objectives, the ways to fund specific actions are not completely defined;
<input type="checkbox"/> 4.3	A complete implementation plan has been developed and is implemented with sufficient resources;
<input type="checkbox"/> 4.4	The policy is well known by the education community, its funding mechanisms are clear and open to bottom-up initiative, resources are sufficient to match good proposals;
<input type="checkbox"/> 4.N	None of the proposed levels is applicable (please specify):

## *5- Encouraging and rewarding grassroots initiative*

Please choose 1 of the following options:

<input type="checkbox"/> 5.0	The policy does not foresee grassroots initiative, actions to be implemented are precisely defined by the responsible public authority;
<input type="checkbox"/> 5.1	There is some room for local adaptation/contextualization of the planned actions;
<input type="checkbox"/> 5.2	The policy requires a good level of coordination, but 30 to 50% of funds are allocated to bottom-up projects;
<input type="checkbox"/> 5.3	As 5.2, but more than 50% of funds allocated to bottom-up projects;
<input type="checkbox"/> 5.4	The policy is based on stimulating good practice at school level and reward good results achieved locally Networking of schools is the main method to diffuse good practices;
<input type="checkbox"/> 5.N	None of the proposed levels is applicable (please specify):

## *6- Provision of training and support to key people implementing the programme*

Please choose 1 of the following options:

<input type="checkbox"/> 6.0	The policy assumes that educators and school heads are motivated and competent to implement the foreseen actions;
<input type="checkbox"/> 6.1	The policy/programme includes a provision to train the key people implementing the action;
<input type="checkbox"/> 6.2	The programme includes a standard training programme for all participants;
<input type="checkbox"/> 6.3	The programme includes the analysis of individual learning needs and the provision of personalized training;
<input type="checkbox"/> 6.4	All school staff are regularly encouraged to develop individual learning paths to improve their capacity to implement relevant education experiences in the classroom and beyond;
<input type="checkbox"/> 6.N	None of the proposed levels is applicable (please specify):

## *7- Allowing adaptation of curriculum and assessment*

Please choose 1 of the following options:

<input type="checkbox"/> 7.0	No variations in curriculum and assessment methods are allowed to make room for peace education;
<input type="checkbox"/> 7.1	A possible adaptation of curriculum and assessment has been considered, but no decision has been taken;
<input type="checkbox"/> 7.2	Schools are free to propose a certain amount of variation to the overall curriculum to adapt to local needs: this allows, among other things, to include peace education activities;
<input type="checkbox"/> 7.3	A specific provision to encourage schools to modify curriculum according to the policy has been foreseen;
<input type="checkbox"/> 7.4	Every participating school has to provide an action plan explaining how peace education is being implemented locally (curriculum, assessment, learning methods, out-of-school activities etc.);
<input type="checkbox"/> 7.N	None of the proposed levels is applicable (please specify):

*8- Implementing the key policy principles (referring to Peace Education) in terms of teachers education and Continuing Professional Development of school staff and inspectors*

Please choose 1 of the following options:

<input type="checkbox"/> 8.0	No specific change in initial training of teachers or in-service training for involved teachers;
<input type="checkbox"/> 8.1	In-service training for teachers and school heads is available, but initial education to become teachers is not involved;
<input type="checkbox"/> 8.2	In-service training is regularly provided on this theme, and some effort to include it in initial teachers education is being made;
<input type="checkbox"/> 8.3	Initial teachers training is progressively including more elements of education to peace and conflict transformation;
<input type="checkbox"/> 8.4	Education to peace is recognized to be a key component of teachers education, both in initial academic education and continuing training;
<input type="checkbox"/> 8.N	None of the proposed levels is applicable (please specify):

## *9- Participatory formative evaluation*

Please choose 1 of the following options:

<input type="checkbox"/> 9.0	Programme Evaluation is run by the funding institution with the help of internal inspectors at the end of the period;
<input type="checkbox"/> 9.1	Stakeholders representatives are consulted once-per-year on the general results of the programme;
<input type="checkbox"/> 9.2	Questionnaires are collected centrally and focus groups are organized locally to get participants' feedback;
<input type="checkbox"/> 9.3	Participatory evaluation is regularly conducted in every participating school/organization, results are processed mainly at the central level;
<input type="checkbox"/> 9.4	As in 9.3, but results are also processed and used locally, thus stimulating immediate corrections/improvements of the implementation process;
<input type="checkbox"/> 9.N	None of the proposed levels is applicable (please specify):

## *10-Coherent communication with general public*

Please choose 1 of the following options:

<input type="checkbox"/> 10.0	No specific effort has been made to introduce the programme to the general public, schools have been informed by official internal channels;
<input type="checkbox"/> 10.1	The policy/programme has been announced to media as part of ordinary political communication, but no specific communication campaign has been implemented on general or specialized media;
<input type="checkbox"/> 10.2	The programme is well followed by specialized media of the school sector, but not by general media;
<input type="checkbox"/> 10.3	The programme has been explained and advertised on both specialised and general media, although the awareness level of general public is probably low;
<input type="checkbox"/> 10.4	The programme has been the object of important and repeated communication efforts, its aims and action lines are well known and present in the general debate, particularly among students and their families;
<input type="checkbox"/> 10.N	None of the proposed levels is applicable (please specify):