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Executive summary

Why this study?

The EU is frequently criticised for having a ‘democratic deficit’ and being too far away from its citizens. The enhanced opportunities for citizens to influence EU developments, such as the stronger role of the European Parliament or the European Citizens’ initiative brought in by the Treaty of Lisbon can only translate into stronger citizens’ engagement if the latter have adequate awareness of what the EU is, what it does and how it functions. The sense of European identity among adults and young people today is not shared by all. Furthermore, knowledge about the EU in the general population is limited which can lead to low participation at the EU level.

- 49% of Europeans stated that they do not understand how the European Union works in Eurobarometer Spring 2011.
- A third of Europeans do not know exactly how many Member States there are in the European Union.
- 71% of Europeans felt that they were not well informed about the European Union.
- Less than half of Europeans (43%) voted in the last European Parliamentary elections.
- This is not surprising given that only 56% of Europeans know that the European Parliament members are elected by the citizens of each country.
- The future of voting in European elections does not look much brighter. Whilst 78% of 8th graders surveyed in the IEA International Civic and Citizenship Survey 2009 intend to participate in national elections, only 58% intend to vote in European elections.
- In the last European Parliamentary elections not even a third of voters aged 18-24 years old voted.
- Beyond the very basic facts, knowledge about the EU amongst young people aged 14 is also low. Just a third of students (35%) correctly know who votes to elect members of the European Parliament.

The European dimension in education is clearly on the EU policy agenda for more than a decade. Prior to this study there was some evidence on how the European dimension in broad terms (covering also aspects such as foreign language learning) was embedded into the national curricula of Member States. However little was known about what Member States and schools are doing to deliver knowledge and understanding of the European Union specifically.

This study aims to bridge this gap. It outlines not only what Member States are doing to promote learning about the European Union (EU) but also identifies what works to develop students’ understanding of the EU. On the basis of the analysis of these elements, the study identifies a number of scenarios of what the EU could do to support EU learning and provides recommendations for action to address EU learning.

What the study did

This report was developed between January and November 2012. During this period, the research team

- Carried out a review of what is already known and what gaps exist in knowledge on the topic of learning about the EU;
- Mapped what requirements or guidelines exist for schools and teachers regarding the coverage of the EU.

---

1 Six out of ten feel that they are citizens of the EU (Eurobarometer, Spring 2012). Seven out of ten 14-years olds surveyed in the IEA ICCS 2009 survey felt being part of the EU but there were great differences across countries (ranging from 50% responding positively to 90%) (IEA (2010) ICCS 2009 European Report Civic knowledge, attitudes, and engagement among lower-secondary students in 24 European countries).
2 Eurobarometer Spring 2011
3 Ibid.
4 Ibid
5 IEA (2010)
What is meant by learning about the EU?

Defining the European dimension in education is complex and most authors see it as going well beyond the understanding and knowledge of the European Union. Nevertheless, the latter was the primary focus of this study. The affective dimension of European belonging was also included, as a secondary focus, in some of the case-studies which in frequently included more cultural aspects.

Scope

The study analysed learning about the EU in compulsory general education and covers all 27 Member States of the EU. Even though compulsory education stops before the completion of upper-secondary education in certain countries, this study focussed on:

- Primary;
- Lower-secondary; and
- Upper-secondary education.

What teaching about the EU is recommended or required?

National legislation: Reference to learning about the EU is made explicit in key education legislation in almost half of the Member States. In most cases the legislation mentions that education should prepare young people for their roles as citizens of their countries as well as of the European Union. This sends a strong signal to those involved in shaping and delivering the content of compulsory education in these countries. It shows that the importance for young people to understand the EU is recognised by legislators in a significant number of EU countries. However, one has to be careful in interpreting the number of countries as such. In many EU countries legislative acts do not refer to any principles that affect the content of education and hence in these countries it would not be seen as appropriate to refer to the EU either.

Curricula: Theoretically, each young person who has been through compulsory education today will have been exposed to some teaching that concerns the EU. In all countries national curricula or learning outcomes contain some requirements that cover the EU in at least one subject and typically at each level of schooling. Most commonly, the curricula prescribe that students should learn about:

- the physical geography of the EU so that they can identify the countries on a map;
- what it means to be a member of the European Union and develop an understanding that they are living in an EU Member State;
- why the EU was established in the first place; and
- the role the EU plays alongside other international organisations on the world stage.

It can hence be concluded that the framework conditions for teaching about the EU are in place in most countries. The curriculum depicts what should be taught about the EU providing teachers with a framework within which they can teach about the EU.

However, there are great differences among countries in what aspects of the European Union are expected to be covered in schools. In particular, the European citizenship dimension is rarely clearly defined. The curriculum content that covers the EU is very fragmented in most countries. There is little

---

7 With the exception of Denmark, Finland, Sweden and the UK which do not refer to learning about the EU explicitly in their primary school curricula (relating to ISCED1).
evidence that the information taught about the EU is designed in a progressive manner to lead pupils and students from basic facts towards a more complex understanding. There is little consistency and complementarity in what is taught at different levels and in different subjects. Bits and pieces of information about the EU can be found in curricula of different subjects without creating a clear picture of this entity. Furthermore, the functioning of EU institutions and the decision making process, which is core to civic participation, is a rather neglected topic compared to other more basic facts such as the geographic or historical aspects of the EU.

**Effective teaching about the EU**

**Teacher preparation:** There appears to be great disparity when it comes to teachers’ preparation for teaching about the EU. In some countries the national competence standards for teachers or guidelines for teacher education refer to the understanding of the EU. However competence standards or guidelines for teachers do not exist universally across Member States and even where they exist they do not necessarily refer to the EU.

In-service teacher training appears to be the most common source of teachers’ understanding of the EU. There is much less evidence of EU coverage in initial teacher education. Where in-service training is offered, it is mostly delivered by organisations whose core mission is to work on the European Union (be it as research activities or promotion of information). Traditional teacher training institutions (universities or national agencies) are rarely active in this field.

**Students:** Case study interviews indicate that students are somewhat interested in knowing more about the EU. This is mainly due to the amount of media coverage EU topics currently receive. They want to know about the crisis, how decisions are made, in what ways the EU affects their lives and what their opportunities are to travel abroad for study and work. At the same time, experts indicate that young people from more privileged backgrounds are more interested in this topic than others – a finding confirmed by the case studies.

**Teachers:** The extent to which the EU is covered in the curriculum actually delivered in the classrooms (as opposed to what is expected ‘on paper’) appears to depend greatly on teachers’ motivation and personal convictions. The importance of developing students’ understanding of the EU is not universally recognised within the profession, not even among the teachers of subjects where it is of strong relevance.

However, even motivated teachers face barriers such as difficulties keeping up-to-date with EU developments and the fact that EU topics are a relatively small part of the curriculum that they have to deliver.

A difficulty faced by any organisations arranging in-service training is how to attract those teachers who are not already receptive to this theme.

**Identifying Materials & Methods:** EU topics are included in some textbooks in an attractive way, however the coverage given to EU topics is relatively small for the most part. Teachers supplement the textbook material with other resources. They face difficulties identifying what is appropriate to use for the age groups they work with or taking into account the interests of their students.

The methods that are recognised to work well are the same as those that work with civic education in general. All stakeholders from initiative promoters to students recognise the value of using interactive methods such as role plays, quizzes, projects, discussions with people who can give a hands-on account of the EU. These give young people a more personal experience of the topic. These types of methods were used in the case studied schools but stakeholders and teachers generally report they are rare. As for other subjects, teachers face difficulties in finding the time and resources to integrate these methods into the education programme.

**Support for EU learning:** The support teachers received from within the school in the form of backing from the school head was often crucial. They also sought external support by engaging in initiatives that go beyond their school and which support learning about the EU. There is some evidence from the case-studies that networking activities can create a supportive environment offering teachers opportunities to collaborate or gain access to relevant information.

**What works?** The first step to effective teaching of EU topics was to bring EU topics closer to the daily lives of students. Making the connection between what the EU does for daily lives of students or
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citizens makes it real for them and more relevant. Like in other subjects, where students were given responsibility for their own learning, this gave them ownership rather than being passive learners. An enormous amount of value was placed on the use of external stimulation for students whether it be an external speaker or visits outside of the school. These were particularly memorable for students and the information they learned was more likely to ‘stick’ with them. These methods that engage students affectively and through experience, can then be the basis to explain more fundamental aspects about the EU institutions, the history as well as its policies.

Outcomes: The outcomes of initiatives aimed at strengthening learning about the EU go beyond increasing students’ knowledge about the EU. For the most part, students were not learning simple facts and figures, but were becoming more aware and informed about EU issues and were encouraged to think critically. Students themselves reported that their interest in EU issues had been sparked and they could create more of a personal relationship with the EU and develop an understanding of the Union and a European consciousness.

Limitations: However, the main drawbacks of initiatives studied are found in their reach. They are often small scale and reach out to those who are already interested. Many face difficulties to reach out to more disadvantaged or geographically distant areas, even though examples were studied which intentionally target more remote schools and less ‘obvious’ target groups. Furthermore, it can be difficult to overcome some of the issues that teachers still face in terms of the limited amount of time they have to insert EU topics into their teaching.

Scenarios for EU level support

Based on a review of the evidence and dialogue with key stakeholders, the report envisages six scenarios for EU level action to enhance teaching about the EU in schools. Several of these suggestions build up on existing EU-level activities. These are presented below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Summary and main features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen the focus of the Jean Monnet Module sub-action on teacher education</td>
<td>This scenario consists of stimulating greater take up of teacher training institutions in the Jean Monnet module sub-action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ Outreach activities to actively recruit higher education institutions that are involved in teacher training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ An internal quota reserved for funding these teacher training institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ Mutual learning exchange among funded institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen the activities of the Jean Monnet Learning Europe at School action</td>
<td>This scenario is about enhancing the pedagogical aspects and responsiveness to schools' needs of projects funded via the Learning Europe at School action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ Projects would be required to carry out a needs assessment for their planned activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ Mutual learning exchange among funded projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ Teaching materials only produced as a by-product of other funded activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen the focus of the eTwinning virtual platform on EU topics</td>
<td>This scenario envisages that the eTwinning portal would be modified to highlight EU learning collaboration among teachers, schools and students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ Opportunities for teachers to collaborate on EU topics would be more visible on the portal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ There would be more project kits which would focus on EU topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ Consideration would be given to creating a section for teachers to collaborate with teacher trainers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support EU learning networks at national level and exchange between the networks at the EU level</td>
<td>This scenario would support the establishment of national networks on EU learning and to enable EU level exchanges to take place between the various National networks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ Organisations involved in EU learning would be eligible to apply to coordinate a National network</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| | ■ Activities of the network would have to include a physical
Scenario: Add a Learning EU at School element to the Erasmus Student Mobility action

The premise of this scenario is to utilise student mobility periods abroad to bring EU topics into the classroom by having Erasmus students visit schools to discuss EU issues with students.

- Students would participate in a preparation course before visiting schools
- Erasmus coordinators would be responsible for the coordinator of the activities

Scenario: Issue a 'Euro Teacher' label to teachers in recognition of their competence to teach EU topics

The 'Euro Teacher' label would be awarded to individual teachers in recognition of their competence to teach EU topics.

- The label would be coordinated at the EU level
- The label would be actively promoted through outreach activities
- A network of 'Euro Teachers' would be created

These scenarios are not mutually exclusive and any number of these could be considered at EU level. The study weighs up the scenarios on the basis of six characteristics:

1. That the scenario includes outreach efforts to engage target groups;
2. The use of networking activities including mutual learning and exchange;
3. The degree to which the activities funded meet the needs of schools/teachers/students.
4. The amount of scope/reach the scenario potentially has;
5. The effort and resources required at EU level to support the scenario;
6. The visibility of the 'learning about the EU' dimension in the action.

The proposed change to the Jean Monnet ‘Learning Europe at School’ action meets most of the identified characteristics. The limitation of the approach is that it does not have extensive reach given the determinate number of projects that can be funded under the action. However, if the proposed changes to the Learning EU at School action were to be implemented alongside the suggested modifications to the eTwinning platform, this could have the biggest impact. Serious consideration should also be given to the scenario of adding an EU element to the current Erasmus programme in view of the weight given to using external stimulation as an effective approach to teach EU topics.

Recommendations

For the European Commission:

- Focus funding on activities that are based on a realistic assessment of teachers’ and students’ needs. Ensure that activities that are funded actively engage teachers and students in developing materials and methods that corresponds to students’ needs, interests and capacity. Avoid funding development of materials that are too theoretical or use a language that is not understood in the classroom. Focusing on teachers has a multiplying effect and therefore they should be a priority target group. However, they are not necessarily the best placed to be project leaders (due to time requirements and resources needed for project administration). Projects where organisations that have expertise on the EU and schools cooperate should therefore be supported.

- EU level funding should prioritise activities whose core purpose or activity goes beyond the development of content/material. Materials should be a by-product of other funded activities. These by-product materials should be designed and developed so that they contain information that will be valid longer terms and should not include information or materials that are likely to go out of date quickly.
Given that EU topics are not always a priority among key stakeholders such as schools or teachers, teacher training institutions or other associations who do or could play a role in supporting EU learning, the Commission should be active in disseminating information and engage in outreach activities to ensure that stakeholders are aware of funding opportunities at the EU level to support learning about the EU rather than relying on this target group to apply for support.

There are already networks and organisations in the Member States which have expertise on the EU and are active in cooperating with schools. EU-funded actions to strengthen learning about the EU should engage these existing networks to strengthen reach out and ensure that the actions funded do reach out to the schools in the end.

For those in charge of school policy and the curriculum:

Those in charge of curricular design should review how the topic of the EU is embedded into the curriculum. There is not necessarily a need to integrate more emphasis on the EU but to make sure that the most adequate content to develop understanding of the EU by students is included. The review should take into account whether the curriculum in designed in a way that EU topics are taught progressively and that it requires reflection on why the EU currently exists and how it operates, including the role and functioning of the EU institutions and the direct or indirect (through national institutions) place of citizens in the decision-making process.

Consider whether the context in which students are taught about the EU is the most adequate for development of European citizenship. In a number of countries the EU is taught about in the context of other international organisations, rather than as being closely related to national developments. This could be supporting the idea that the EU is something remote and abstract rather than encouraging students to think about it as ‘their own’ institutions.

Consider the space given to the topic of the EU in teaching materials given the impact the EU has on citizens’ activities.

Enlarge the provision of professional development opportunities for teachers to be prepared to teach about EU topics.

For the intermediary organisations working with schools to support learning about the EU:

Given the limited time teachers have to dedicate to the topic of the EU, supports should be designed and activities should be offered that do not require vast inputs from teachers or create substantial demands on their time. Organisations should ensure that they are adding value to what teaching staff are doing by ensuring that the support they offer is based on the identifiable needs of teaching staff and students.

Designing supports in a way that gives students responsibility for their learning is an effective approach as it gives students ownership over their learning.

Also, giving students responsibility for their own learning can give them more control over topics and activities that interest and engage them. Student participation in the activities of their classroom is an integral part of civic education as part of ensuring the realisation of active participation skills.

The use of interactive methods and external stimulations are also particularly engaging for students. This is in particular relevant for a topic like the EU which most people perceive as abstract. Organisations should find a place in their planning to support these activities for students in schools. Furthermore, it is these kinds of activities that teachers often find most time-consuming, therefore external support to support these types of activities can add value to what teachers are doing with their classes.

Organisations should use examples of how the EU is relevant to the daily lives of students as the starting point and build on this once the students are engaged and interested to expand their knowledge about the EU.

Organisations should signpost teachers to appropriate teaching materials and tools that they can use with their students, including other organisations and resources such as Europe Direct centres.
Teaching staff

- Teaching about the EU should lead students to develop an understanding of the EU that goes beyond knowledge of basic facts. They should have the tools that enable them to engage in a critical reflection on European matters and how these influence their country and their own activities. Effective learning about the EU requires both content and effective methods in order to develop the competences to be a European active citizen. Even where teachers delegate the methods to an external organisation, teachers need to ensure that their students have the basic knowledge about the EU in order for the combination of content and methods to be most effective.

- Teachers should integrate examples of how the EU is relevant to the daily lives of their students as the starting point to bring EU topics into their classroom. Teachers can then build on this once the students are engaged and interested to expand their knowledge about the EU.

- Teaching staff should consider, time and resources permitting, to put students into direct contact with people who are external to the school and are knowledgeable about EU issues or who can speak of their experience of benefitting from the EU. External organisations such as foundations or EDICs can support teachers in taking these contacts. Given that the analysis in this study shows the effectiveness of external stimulation, these external speakers should be invited into schools to share their expertise and engage students.

- Interactive, participatory teaching methods are the most effective means to create active citizens in citizenship education, and therefore are also an effective means that teachers can use for teaching EU topics to ultimately create active citizens at the EU level.

- The teaching methods used in the classroom should also give students responsibility for their own learning, creating student ownership of their learning, effectively engaging them and creating the opportunity for students to engage in peer learning.
About this report

Defining EU learning

Resolution of the Council and the Ministers of Education meeting within the Council on the European dimension in education of 24 May 1988

The European dimension in education should help students “improve their knowledge of the Community and its Member States in their historical, cultural, economic and social aspects and bring home to them the significance of the cooperation of the Member States of the European Community with other countries of Europe and the world”

The focus of this study has been on learning about the EU at school in the European Union, looking at what students learn, what makes for effective learning of EU topics and what could be done in the future at the EU level to support this.

Analysing the European dimension in education is a complex matter. Learning about the EU includes both a cognitive dimension in terms of knowledge gained, and an affective component such as the relationship or attitude one has towards Europe\(^8\). Learning foreign languages also plays a significant role as it not only fosters language skills, but language subjects often include an intercultural dimension.

Teaching/learning about the EU in schools can be thought about in three distinct ways.

- **Core knowledge**
  This can be considered as the basic knowledge (e.g. including facts on the EU such as the number of Member States, the flag of the Union, rights of European citizens, the role of the institutions, etc.) students would learn about the EU.

- **Cultural knowledge, behaviour, belonging and identity.**
  Schools also play a role in developing the European dimension in education based on and promoting shared values, mutual understanding, social and cultural integration (including the historical, cultural, economic and social aspects of European Union).

- **Learning languages**
  Development of the European dimension in education can take place through the teaching of European languages to promote the European Union’s philosophy of multilingualism.

The primary focus of this study was to look at the development of students’ knowledge and understanding of the EU. It should be said though, that while the ultimate focus of learning about the EU is the development of an understanding of this supra-national organisation, most of this study examined aspects related to the knowledge of the EU. This approach was taken as the dimension of understanding is much more difficult to assess in a study of this scope and focus (see explanation of the methodology). A secondary focus on cultural knowledge of the EU is also included where relevant, primarily in the case-studies where EU

---

\(^8\) According to Seebauer (2002)
learning in some cases involved going beyond EU knowledge and included more cultural aspects.

**Scope**

The study analyses learning about the EU in compulsory general education and covers all 27 Member States of the EU. Even though compulsory education stops before the completion of upper-secondary education in certain countries, this study focusses on:

- Primary;
- Lower-secondary; and
- Upper-secondary education.

**Navigating this report**

**Chapter One** sets out the main facts relating to what the general population and young people know about the EU, their attitudes towards the EU and the implication this has for active participation at the EU level.

**Chapter Two** looks at whether learning about the EU is on the national agenda of Member States by examining the evidence of the existence of references to the European Union in national education legislation.

**Chapter Three** describes how EU topics are embedded into subjects of the curricula in Member States in terms of what students learn about the EU.

**Chapter Four** addresses what factors result in effective teaching about the EU by drawing evidence together on the experience of teaching EU topics in the classroom.

**Chapter Five** outlines potential scenarios for future EU action that could be put in place to support EU learning.

The report concludes with recommendations for stakeholders at EU, National and organisational levels which include a comprehensive range of actions that can be taken to support and improve EU learning during compulsory education.

---

9 Educational decision making in a number of Member States does not take place at the central national level. For those countries, data was collected as follows: for Belgium information was collected for Flanders and the French speaking community with a short note on the German speaking community. For the UK information was collected for England and Wales together, and separately for Scotland with a short note for Northern Ireland. In Germany the federal level framework was examined alongside information on two Landers (Saxony and Baden-Wuerttemberg). Similarly, for Spain and Italy the national situation was examined alongside information from two regional areas in these countries (Galicia and Valencia in Spain and Emilia Romagna and Lombardia in Italy).
1 Introduction

Large numbers of Europeans do not know basic facts about the EU

- 49% of Europeans stated that they do not understand how the European Union works in Eurobarometer Spring 2011.
- A third of Europeans do not know exactly how many Member States there are in the European Union\textsuperscript{10}.
- 71% of Europeans felt that they were not well informed about the European Union\textsuperscript{11}.

Knowledge is key for active participation

- Knowledge of the EU has been associated with lower levels of support for the EU and developments in EU integration\textsuperscript{12}.
- Less than half of Europeans (43%) voted in the last European Parliamentary elections.
- This is not surprising given that only 56% of Europeans know that Parliament members are elected by the citizens of each country\textsuperscript{13}.

Young people lack the knowledge for future active participation

- The future of voting in European elections does not look much brighter. Whilst 78% of 8\textsuperscript{th} graders surveyed in the International Civic and Citizenship Survey 2009 intend to participate in national elections, only 58% intend to vote in European elections.
- In the last European Parliamentary elections not even a third of voters aged 18-24 years old voted (29%).
- Knowledge amongst 14 year olds beyond the very basic facts is also low. Just a third of students (35%) of students correctly know who votes to elect members of the European Parliament\textsuperscript{14}.

Active citizenship is defined as ‘participation in civil society, community and/or political life, characterised by mutual respect and non-violence and in accordance with human rights and democracy’ (Hoskins 2006).

A lack of active citizenship in society can compromise democracy.

Some studies show positive effects of citizenship education on future intentions to participate in elections at the national level. Gaining knowledge whilst still at school and understanding civic and citizenship issues has frequently been found to be a predictor of their expectation to vote\textsuperscript{15}. According to Morin (1996), the more knowledge people have about politics, the easier it is for them to obtain both political and participation skills.

Given that so far there is no reliable overall measure of young people’s knowledge of the EU, it cannot be said that EU knowledge leads to greater participation at the EU level, but the mechanism could be assumed to work in a similar manner.

Though not the only source of information about the EU for young people, schools sit at the heart of EU learning. They educate future citizens of the EU, and therefore have the possibility to plant the seeds that result in EU knowledge and active citizenship in later life.

---

\textsuperscript{10} Eurobarometer Spring 2011

\textsuperscript{11} Ibid.


\textsuperscript{13} Eurobarometer Spring 2011

\textsuperscript{14} According to the results of the International Civic and Citizenship Survey 2009

\textsuperscript{15} IEA Civic Education Study (CIVED)
1.1 Young people’s knowledge and attitudes towards the EU

Whilst a meaningful, reliable and valid test of student knowledge about national democratic institutions, principles and processes that is internationally comparable exists\textsuperscript{16}, international comparison on EU knowledge is not conclusive. 14 year old students were asked about their knowledge, attitudes and values about the EU in a regional module of the IEA International Civic and Citizenship Survey in 2009. The results from the survey show that it is hard to identify differences between countries in relation to their overall level of student knowledge on the EU. Knowledge is so inconsistent across the different items across countries, that it cannot be said that students in one country have overall better knowledge of the EU than students in another. Rather, countries are strong on some factors and weak on others and are not uniformly knowledgeable or not.

The survey does have limitations in terms of gauging what students know about the EU. Firstly, the survey takes place when students are quite young (on average only 14 years old) when they participate and therefore have not received the full curricular teaching on EU topics. Secondly, many of the questions that are asked of students are quite basic and some request that students identify whether a statement is true or false giving students a 50 per cent chance of correctly answering the questions regardless of whether they know the answer. Despite these limitations, the survey is the only comparable source of data on students’ knowledge of the EU and as such gives some insight into what young people know about the EU. Students of this age (average 14 years old) almost universally recognise five basic facts\textsuperscript{17} about the EU:

- Whether their country is a member of the EU (97% correct)
- What the EU flag looks like (93% correct)
- That the EU aims to promote peace, prosperity and freedom within its borders (89% correct)
- That all European countries have signed the European convention on Human Rights (86% correct)
- That the EU is an economic and political partnership between countries (85% correct)

Though there are notable exceptions to this general knowledge. For example, in England, only 66% of students were able to correctly identify the EU flag compared to 93% on average.

\textsuperscript{16} The International Civic and Citizenship Survey investigates how prepared young people are to undertake their roles as citizens and using individual survey items a reliable scale of civic knowledge has been produced.

\textsuperscript{17} Although the highest percentage of correct answers were found for these items, they should be interpreted with some caution. Other than the question asking students to identify the EU flag from among 4 options, the other items were true/false questions. Therefore, students had a 50% chance of selecting the correct answer simply by guessing.
Even though students almost universally know whether their country is in the EU at age fourteen, knowledge about how many countries are members of the EU varied considerably. The European average who knew the correct answer was only 57%, with national averages ranging from just 35% in England to 75% in Slovakia.

Anywhere between 49 and 85 per cent of students correctly knew that people gain new political rights when their country joins the EU, the highest being in Cyprus and the lowest in Slovakia, both of which joined the EU in 2004.

The EU civic knowledge amongst students was weakest in a couple of areas. Importantly, one of the lowest percentages of correct answers was found in relation to students knowing who is permitted to vote to elect MEPs. Only 35% on average knew the correct answer highlighting how limited knowledge about European elections is amongst this age group.

Students were given four options to choose from when they were asked ‘What can all citizens of the European Union do by law?’ and only 30% knew that all citizens of the EU can, by law, study in any country of the EU without needing a special permit. Though this might seem very low, it should be born in mind that these students are in the eighth grade (aged between 13.7 and 15) and may not be giving consideration to their future study options abroad yet.

The ICCS examined the answers in relation to knowledge about the EU and could not identify any observable coherent patterns, such as geography or how recently the country joined the EU which would explain the differences in the percentages of correct answers.

The ICCS also gathered interesting information from fourteen year olds, not just on what they know, but also on their attitudes. The survey found that a large majority of students at this age felt they had a strong sense of European identity. At the same time, they reported much more interest in their own national political and social issues than in European and international politics.

Even though the expectations young people have when they are fourteen do not perfectly predict their actual behaviour in the future when they are adults, it is interesting to ask what their voting intentions are for the future. The ICCS questionnaire posed a question to students asking them whether they will ‘certainly do this’, ‘probably do this’ or ‘probably not do this’ in relation to participating in elections as adults. The survey found that on average across the countries of the study, only 58 per cent intended to vote in future European elections compared to 78% intending to vote in national elections and 80% reported that they expected to vote in local elections.
Whilst on average only 58% of fourteen year olds say they intend to vote in future European elections, the Figure 2.1 illustrates the substantial variation across countries of the survey. Students in Austria, Ireland, Italy and Spain are all above average in terms of their intentions to vote, compared to Belgium (Flemish community), the Czech Republic and England who are all significantly below average.

**Figure 1.2** Percentage of 14 year olds intending to vote in future European elections

---

**What young people know and feel about the EU**

Knowledge of basic aspects of the EU (such as the flag, whether their country is a Member of the EU and that the EU is a political and economic partnership) was nearly universal.

Beyond that basic knowledge about the EU, amongst fourteen year olds there were major differences in proportions of correct answers between topics.

In general, the response patterns are not consistent. Within one country students will have very good knowledge of one aspect of the EU while they will score a lot worse on another one. Consequently, it is not possible to say that in one country students have better knowledge of the EU on the whole than in another one. In other words it was not possible to create a composite indicator based on the questions students were asked about the EU and to rank countries according to students’ knowledge of the EU.

In terms of political participation, students are much less interested in European politics than they are in their domestic situation. Furthermore, in terms of their intentions to vote in future European elections, young people at age 14 are much more likely to intend voting in the domestic elections (either locally or nationally) and a significantly lower percentage intend to vote at European level. This is despite student reports of a strong sense of European identity.
1.2 The European dimension at school on the EU policy agenda

The European dimension in education has long been on the policy agenda of the EU. The first European action programme for education\(^\text{18}\) included the concept of the European dimension in education. The European Council and National Education ministers worked to integrate this dimension into both curricula and teacher preparation in Member States since the 1988 Resolution on the European Dimension in Education\(^\text{19}\).

With the adoption of the Maastricht Treaty in 1992, a legal basis was established for the contribution and scope of action of the European Community in education. The first objective that the action of the Community was to address, according to Article 149 of the Treaty, was “the development of the European dimension in education, particularly through the teaching and dissemination of the languages of the Member States”. The programmes of the EU in the area of education and training (since Socrates to the current Lifelong Learning Programme) have specifically sought to include the European dimension in education as a result of the stipulation of the Treaty.

In 2000, the Lisbon strategy set out a plan towards a knowledge driven economy up to 2010. Central to the Lisbon process were policy objectives targeting active citizenship. Article 165\(^\text{20}\) of the treaty restates the Maastricht Treaty Article 149 action of the Union on developing the European dimension in education.

The role of education systems was central to promoting this sense of European citizenship and integration following enlargement. The joint interim report of the Council and the European Commission highlighted in 2004 that the “school has a fundamental role to play allowing everyone to be informed and understand the meaning of European integration\(^\text{21}\)”. This conclusion was reinforced by the European Parliament resolution in 2006 on “initiatives to complement school curricula providing appropriate support measures to include the European dimension\(^\text{22}\)”. The resolution called for all education systems to “ensure that their pupils have by the end of their secondary education the knowledge and competences they need...to prepare them for their roles as citizens and as members of the European Union”. Although not specifically identifying the EU dimension in education, the ET 2020 Strategic Framework\(^\text{23}\) which was adopted in 2009 also includes “promoting equity, social cohesion and active citizenship” as its third strategic objective.

In order to further support EU knowledge and facts in education, the EU 2011 budget for the European Commission\(^\text{24}\) comments that the in relation to the Lifelong Learning programme the “integrated programme should include measures to promote civic education (teaching and learning) on European Democratic Citizenship including studies of Europe and the European Union in the European Member States' secondary schools”. Through the support of the LLP-sub programmes (e.g. Comenius and Jean Monnet), numerous EU-funded projects have sought to foster the European dimension in compulsory education.

The figure on the following page illustrates the timeline and objectives for the European dimension at school on the EU policy agenda.

---


\(^{22}\) European Parliament resolution on initiatives to complement school curricula providing appropriate support measures to include the European dimension (2006/2041(INI)). Found at http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//NONSGML+TA+P6-TA-2006-0361+0+DOC+PDF+V0//EN


## EU policy and the European Dimension in Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Action Programme in the field of Education</td>
<td>Short study visits and exchanges for teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Resolution on the European Dimension in Education</td>
<td>Development of national information and advisory services for mobility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Maastricht Treaty</td>
<td>Contacts between teacher training institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Building our common future</td>
<td>Educational activities with European content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>European Parliament resolution</td>
<td>Strengthen a sense of European identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>ET 2020 Strategic Framework</td>
<td>Make young people aware of advantages and challenges of the Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>EU 2011 budget for the European Commission</td>
<td>Improve their knowledge of the Community and significance of cooperation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Key Events
- **1976:** Action Programme in the field of Education
- **1988:** Resolution on the European Dimension in Education
- **1992:** Maastricht Treaty
- **2004:** Building our common future
- **2006:** European Parliament resolution
- **2009:** ET 2020 Strategic Framework
- **2011:** EU 2011 budget for the European Commission

Source: ICF GHK
1.3 This study – why and how?

Active citizenship is crucial to healthy democratic societies and civic knowledge is vital for participation in all political systems. The sense of European identity among adults and young people today is not shared by all and knowledge about the EU in the general population is limited. Therefore, given that the EU population does not understand how the EU works, it is not very surprising that voter turn-out in European elections is low and young people’s intentions to vote at the European level in the future are considerably lower than their expectations to vote in domestic elections.

At the EU level, the European dimension in education has long been on the EU policy agenda. Furthermore, the education and training programmes of the EU have specifically sought to include the European dimension in education as a result of the issue being highlighted on the policy agenda.

In terms of an evidence base, in 2003 the “European Dimension in Secondary Education in Europe” study, commissioned by the European Parliament, painted a picture of the European dimension in secondary education at the beginning of the millennium. The study highlighted what should be done to further knowledge and awareness of Europe among secondary school students. Learning about the EU at school has been pushed forward on the policy agenda of the EU since that time coupled with the development of initiatives and strategies at the National and EU level.

Eurydice reports in 2005 and 2012 explored citizenship education in Europe. Both the reports examined how the European dimension of citizenship education was reflected in curricula including aspects such as European identity and belonging, European history, culture and literature and the functioning of European/international institutions.

The analysis of both the 2003 study and the Eurydice reports were based on country descriptions supplied by the Eurydice National Units and took a broad view, including all knowledge concerning Europe (historical, political, cultural, language etc.), when discussing the European dimension of citizenship education. Despite the insight these studies provide into the European dimension of citizenship education, they do not offer a comprehensive overview and understanding of the teaching of EU facts and knowledge in the compulsory education systems of Member States. Nor do they examine the experiences of teaching EU topics on the ground in schools.

Despite the clear policy agenda and the evidence from the Eurydice National Units, not enough is known about what is happening within education systems of the Member States to deliver knowledge on the EU in schools. There is a lack of comprehensive, comparable evidence on the teaching of EU at school.

Therefore, the aim of this study is three-fold, to map what Member States are doing to promote learning about the EU, to identify what is successful in developing students’ understanding of the EU and what barriers exist to that success, and finally to identify what the EU could do to support EU learning.

What the study did

This report was developed between January and November 2012. During this period, the research

25 Six out of ten feel that they are citizens of the EU (Eurobarometer, Spring 2012) and the ICCS found evidence of a strong sense of European identity among 14 year olds.
Carried out a review of what is already known and what gaps exist in knowledge on the topic of learning about the EU;

- Mapped what requirements or guidelines exist for schools and teachers regarding the coverage of the EU in curricula. This consisted of a review of legislation, national curricula, in some cases also national assessments, selection of teacher training programmes and voluntary initiatives relating to European Union in schools;

- Carried out case-studies of specific activities that went beyond the minimum national requirements on learning about the EU including collecting the views of teachers and students; and

- Held two meetings with stakeholders to analyse the relevant information, share knowledge and expertise on what works, obstacles and what the EU could do to support learning about the EU.

### 1.3.1 Mapping top-down approaches

Teaching in schools is governed and influenced within a country through different types of measures. Some are rather top-down and include the requirements and expectations defined at national or education system level. The first task of the study was to map these top-down approaches learning about the EU across the EU Member States. This included an examination of the:

- Legislation or national guidelines: including legislation and circulars at the national level;
- National curricula: including learning outcomes and guidelines for curricula;
- National assessment: where this exists, information on whether students’ learning outcomes on the EU dimension are formally assessed and the elements that are assessed in terms of coverage of EU topics;\(^{29}\);
- Teacher training (both initial and in-service training). Covering the extent to which future and current teachers are prepared to teach basic facts and knowledge on the EU; and
- Initiatives undertaken at national but also regional and local level (e.g. programmes of learning about the EU in school, labels and competitions or campaigns, etc.).

### 1.3.2 Engaging with stakeholders

Following the mapping of the top-down approaches, the study engaged with stakeholders who have practical experience in the area of learning about the EU. This took the form of one workshop with 24 participants and a smaller reflection group with 11 people. During the events, an exchange took place on the extent of learning about the EU that is present in the curricula. The discussions also centred on learning about the EU on the ground in classrooms, identifying the success factors and obstacles. This led to a conversation about identifying how EU level initiatives could potentially complement and add value to what is being done within Member States so that students learn about the EU at school. The results of these two events were used to:

- Inform the conclusions of the analysis; and
- Develop scenarios for possible future EU actions.

### 1.3.3 Case-studies

Subsequently, in order to get answers to what works well, what hinders EU learning, and what would be the most effective in terms of EU support, fourteen case-studies across the Member States were selected. Initiatives that were working directly with schools to support learning about the EU were identified and short-listed. The aim of the case studies was not to evaluate the initiatives themselves, but to learn from their experience and to find out what it is like for schools, teachers and students to learn and teach about the EU. Schools that were linked to these initiatives, as they either took part in the past or were due to take part in the initiative were identified as case-studies. The case-studies were selected on the basis of a number of criteria:

\(^{29}\) Information on this aspect was collected, however the analysis of the materials gathered did not provide any useful insights into the issue of learning about the EU and therefore is not included in any detail here.
Geography – the selection ensured a balanced country coverage including North-South-East and West as well as small, medium size and large countries.

How embedded learning about the EU is in the curriculum in order to examine the complementarity of the initiative with what is happening in the curriculum. Therefore the selection took into account whether learning about the EU is mostly compulsory, optional or mixed in the country.

Ensured that the various different types of activities were covered to include teacher training, student learning/engagement, competitions and teaching materials.

Researchers visited the schools in person to carry out interviews, a review of materials relating to the EU that were available in the school library and where possible to carry out on-site observation of EU learning.

**Table 1.1  Breakdown of case-study interviews**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative promoters</th>
<th>School heads</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of interviews</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ICF GHK

In total, 71 interviews were carried out with initiative promoters, school heads, teachers and students, 44 pieces of material were reviewed (primarily textbooks), and 8 on-site observations took place.

The table below outlines the case-study countries, schools and aspects of learning about the EU that were analysed. The countries, initiatives and schools can also be found in Annex 1. Full case study write ups are also annexed to this report (Annex 4).

**Table 1.2  Case-studies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Bringing the EU into the school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Sint-Bavohumaniora highschool</td>
<td>The school organises an annual “Europe Day” for their 6th grade students, which are delivered by trainers of Ryckevelde. The event combines both theory and practice, delivered through interactive teaching method. The school also organises a number of other activities on learning about the EU, including Model European Parliament and European Youth Parliament.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>High school Emiliyan Stanev and Kindergarten Sonya.</td>
<td>The high school and kindergarten that were interviewed for this case study have been involved in several of the initiatives for teaching about the EU led by the local Europe Direct centre. At the kindergarten, one of the methodologies recently implemented in partnership with the EDIC was educational theatre for teaching children’s rights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>Gymnázium Profesora Jana Patočky (GPJP)</td>
<td>The school runs an optional multidisciplinary module on EU integration. It also takes part in an initiative through which foreign Erasmus students go to schools and organise learning activities related to their home countries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Linden (pseudonym) Gymnasium</td>
<td>The school took part in a simulation game for students of social sciences. The initiative promoter was a teacher originally and understands the school context particularly well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Collège Françoise Dolto</td>
<td>The school brought in Jeunes Européens to give an interactive presentation in the school. After the initiative, the school committed to setting up a permanent ‘L’Europe à l’Ecole’ desk in the school library where a volunteer from Jeunes Européens comes once a week to answer students’ questions on the EU and proposes activities on the EU.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>School/Institute</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Ilmajoen Lukio</td>
<td>The school decided to take part in the initiative to carry out a simulation of the EU parliamentary process as it brought some variety to the teaching about the EU that the teacher could use with the students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Waldschule Schwanewede</td>
<td>For the teacher the participation of the politics students in a simulation game on EU decision making had been a success because the method of the experimental simulation games was a great addition to what she was able to do in her classes in school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Technical Commercial Institute (ITC) ‘Matteucci’</td>
<td>ITC Matteucci wanted to keep providing students with ‘an original and interesting activity aimed to teach about the EU in a more appealing method compared to traditional lessons’ so they got involved with the Europe Direct initiative which brought university students into their schools to work with students on EU issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>Rigas Juglas vidusskola</td>
<td>The deputy director of education of the school was one of co-authors of the materials produced for the initiative. These are tailor made materials that teachers can use with their classes to teach EU topics in an interactive way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Picasso Lyceum</td>
<td>The school has implemented a number of projects on the topic of EU learning. The school has implemented two main projects: “Europa Ja” and “Tien voor Europa”30. During the “Europa Ja” project students undertake research on a particular European country and produce a country poster with their key findings. The “Tien voor Europa” project, trains students for one hour per week on the EU in order to gain the status of EU Ambassador. In the second semester the students will teach their peers, who have not taken part in the project, about the EU as part of the regular curriculum during six EU classes as part of the social sciences subject.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Public Gymnasium No. 2</td>
<td>The school runs a European Club which inspired them to get involved with European Lessons, an initiative which holds an interactive lesson on EU issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Sheridan (Pseudonym)</td>
<td>Motivated teachers at this school have been running the European Club at the school for more than 20 years. There have been a number of teachers which have taken responsibility for the club over the years and have run various activities with the students of the club.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Lauaxeta Ikastola (School Four Winds)</td>
<td>This school was awarded with the first prize of the Francisco Javier de Landaburu awards for their contribution, travelling to Brussels as a reward. The trip allowed them to get in touch with the European institutions and to have a closer look at how the EU works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>St Mary’s Primary School</td>
<td>The class teacher established a lunch time club to run activities relating to the EU with students who were interested in being on the team for the Euroquiz initiative.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ICF GHK

30 [http://www.picasso-lyceum.nl/cgi-oic/pagedb.exe/show?no=3083&fromno=1](http://www.picasso-lyceum.nl/cgi-oic/pagedb.exe/show?no=3083&fromno=1)
2 Learning about the EU: The National Framework

Many countries state the mission and objectives of compulsory education in Acts and Laws that define the compulsory education system. It is not rare that this legislation refers to the civic and social values and identities that education systems are expected to lead young people towards. As this study examines the extent to which understanding of and belonging to the EU are embedded in Member States’ compulsory education, it was relevant to analyse the existence of references to the European Union in national education legislation.

As will be discussed below, nearly half of EU Member States refer to the European Union and more specifically learning about the EU in their education legislation. This shows a fairly high commitment to the topic from legislators. It should be sending a strong message to those in charge of developing curricula as well as to the teachers about the place of learning about the EU in education programmes and activities. At the same time, when reading this section, it should be borne in mind that EU countries have very different legislative traditions. For a number of EU Member States education legislation is not seen as an appropriate place to be affirming the European dimension of education and training. Therefore the fact that a country does not refer to the EU in its education legislation is not considered negatively here. The focus is rather on the positive meaning of this legislative reference to the EU in those countries where it can be found.

Key findings

An important share of EU Member States send a strong signal about learning about the EU to those involved in shaping and delivering the content of education. In these countries there is an explicit reference in key legislation to the fact that education should equip young people with the competences and knowledge needed to understand and take active part in democratic processes at European level. Understanding the European Union, its principles and rules are underlined as being among the objectives of compulsory education.

2.1 The countries that mention belonging to the EU in their education legislation

In 2012, when the data collection for this report was carried out, reference to the European Union and learning about the EU was found in the education legislation of 13 countries/education systems (AT, BE fr, BG, CY, CZ, DE, DK, EE, FR, IT, LT, SI, SK). These countries are shown in the Figure 2.1 below. As can be seen from the map, this group of thirteen comprises countries with very different historical relations with the EU. Some but not all of the founding Member States bear such legislative references and so do some of the countries that only acceded to the EU in the last decade.

When undertaking the data collection, the researchers were asked to review the main national legislation(s) on education and to identify references that indicate that learning about the EU is part of the compulsory education objectives. Therefore, they only selected those references to the EU that are clearly relevant for the topic of this study which is learning about the EU. Legislative references to aspects such as the freedom of movement of EU citizens (e.g. the fact that residents who are citizens of other EU countries have free access to education) were not taken into account in this mapping.

In addition to these 13, references that are less directly related to the key topic of the study were found in Malta where the main legislation encourages participation in EU programmes and in Poland where the preamble of the Education Act refers to opening young people to other European cultures (but not the EU specifically).
2.2 How does EU feature in education legislation

In most of the countries where education acts refer to the European dimension this mention is embedded in those sections which set out the principles and main objectives of education. In other words the mention to the EU has a rather prominent place in the legislative Act.

In a few countries, the EU is mentioned in the context of values that education should develop. For example the Estonian basic schools and Upper-secondary schools Act states that the basic values of general education and related ethical principles are based on the Constitution of the Estonian Republic, the United Nations’ Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Convention on the Rights of the Child and the European Union31.

In the majority of those countries where reference to the EU is made among education objectives, this is clearly related to the development of civic competence and enabling persons’ civic participation in the EU. In Bulgaria one of the aims of education is the acquisition of competences to understand and apply the principles and rules resulting from EU integration. The Austrian school organisation act states that education should lead young people to be able to take part in economic and cultural life in Europe32. Participation in the

31 https://www.riigiteataja.ee/akt/13332410
32 http://www.ris.bka.gv.at/GeltendeFassung.wxe?Abfrage=Bundesnormen&Gesetzesnummer=10009265
processes of EU integration is also explicitly mentioned in the Act on Organisation and Financing of Education in Slovenia. In France the emphasis in the Education code is not so much on the competence development (this is tackled in other documents defining the content of education) but rather on the fact that education needs to take into account the broader context (economic, social and cultural developments) of the country but also at European and international level. This emphasises the interconnection between the school, the national developments but also other socio-economic and political relationships that affect one’s life. In Slovakia one of the principles of education is the integration into European education area. In Malta and Cyprus the emphasis is also not on what students should learn but rather on what schools should be doing. The European dimension is brought into the legislation by encouraging schools to take part in European cooperation and programmes (Malta) and requiring them to celebrate Europe day (9 May in commemoration of the signature of Schuman Declaration in 1940) in Cyprus.

Figure 2.2 Different aspects of the European dimension in national education legislations

Source: ICF GHK

The overview of main legislative documents where a mention of the EU was identified in the countries covered by this study is presented in the Annex 2.

33 http://www.see-educoop.net/education_in/pdf/law_fin_edu-slo-enl-t04.pdf
34 http://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/affichCode.do?cidTexte=LEGITEXT000006071191
35 http://www.minedu.sk/data/att/4189.rtf
3 Learning about the EU in the curriculum

Key findings

In all countries, students are expected to cover some content related to the EU when looking at all education levels jointly.

In most countries there is some element of EU learning at all levels of education, from primary school to upper secondary school. There are only four exceptions (Denmark, Finland, Sweden and the UK) where learning about the EU is not explicitly mentioned in curricula related to primary education. However, this does not exclude teachers from tackling this aspect where relevant (for example as part of geography related learning).

Most commonly, the curriculum covers the geography of the location of the Member States, understanding their home country as a member of the European Union, knowing the history of EU integration and learning about the EU as an international organisation.

Therefore, it can be concluded that the framework conditions for teaching about the EU are in place as the curriculum depicts what should be taught about the EU and teachers have a framework within which they can teach about the EU.

However, despite the coverage given to EU topics in the curricula, the content of EU issues can be very fragmented in most countries. There is little evidence that the information taught about the EU is designed in a progressive manner to lead pupils and students from basic facts towards a more complex understanding. There is little consistency and complementarity in what is taught at different levels and in different subjects. Furthermore, the functioning of EU institutions and the decision making process, which is core to civic participation, is a rather neglected topic compared to others.

As part of this study researchers carried out a review of the national curricula for all levels of education covered and the subjects likely to refer to the EU in each Member State. The review also included conducting interviews with staff of the Ministry or national agency in charge of curricula design in order to validate the information collected. Researchers mapped the main subjects where reference to the EU was made, such as geography, history, civics/social studies, business/economics and politics. The review did not include subjects such as the natural sciences, mathematics or languages. Researchers identified the subject and the content relating to the EU and the compulsory or optional nature of both the subject and content.

Whilst the focus was on the national level, this is the case across the board due to the fact that decisions are not always taken at that level. For countries where the decisions about education and the curricula are not taken at national level, researchers did the following:

- For Belgium, two separate reviews were carried out, one of which collected information about Flanders and another covering the French speaking community with a short note on the German speaking community.
- In the case of the UK two separate reviews were also carried out, one for England, Wales and Northern Ireland and one for Scotland.
- In Germany the federal level framework was examined and more detailed information was provided on two Landers (Saxony and Baden-Wuerttemberg).
- In Spain the review also considered the national framework and the autonomous communities of Valencia and Galicia;
- The review was carried out in a similar way in Italy and two regions were mapped (Emilia Romagna and Lombardia).

In addition to the fact that curricular decision making is not always taken at the national level, the curriculum is not subject based at all times. In a number of the countries, learning outcomes are defined in terms of what students should know at the end of a stage of education stage (see box below). In many cases the schools or teachers have the autonomy to decide in which subject areas these outcomes will be achieved.
Learning outcomes

A number of European Union Member States have outcomes-based curricula which provide the framework for learning. This means that the curriculum lists the learning outcomes for students. In the Flemish speaking community of Belgium and the Netherlands, the attainment targets are not subject specific, but simply describe what students should know at the end of key stages of schooling. In Scotland the learning outcomes are across broad curricular areas.

Belgium (Flemish speaking community):

The only reference to the EU was found in the attainment targets that are set by the Ministry of Education. Renewed attainment targets for the primary education sector entered into force on 1 September 2010. However, schools are highly autonomous with regard to how the attainment targets are implemented (i.e. in some case, schools need to demonstrate that the majority of pupils have reached the targets and in some case the schools only need to demonstrate that they have incorporated the attainment targets into the school curriculum and have taught this content to their pupils).

At primary level:
- attainment target 4.16 specifies that pupils need to "know that Flanders is one of the communities of federal Belgium and that Belgium is part of the European Union"
- As part of attainment target 4.16, pupils are aimed to acquire elementary knowledge of a number of international partnerships such as the European Union.

At lower secondary:
- Attainment target 7 stipulates that "pupils can collect elements that demonstrate the vulnerability of a valuable area and measures of nature conservation". An example is then given as to how students can achieve this target: "students carry out an investigation and link their own research to the Habitats Directive (Directive of the European Union of 1992)."

At upper secondary:
- EU institutions and democracy-related aspects are taught: i.e. democratic councils and parliaments as important for a democratic decision making and political policy at both Member States and EU level. As part of the cross-curricular attainment targets for secondary education, ‘political and legal society’ covers objectives on EU learning such as knowing how European cooperation works, and being able to name main EU policies and institutions.

The Netherlands:

Several core objectives for primary education have been identified by the Ministry of Education. These core objectives are set per learning area and not per subject course. The core objectives covering learning about the EU are part of the 'human and society' learning area. Even though schools are highly autonomous in implementing the attainment targets into their curriculum, it is very likely that the core objectives covering learning about the EU are spread across several subjects: Dutch, history, and social science class. It is however up to the schools themselves to decide in which courses the core objectives are to be addressed:

- Core objective 36 states that "the pupils learn about the essentials of Dutch and European politics and citizen's duties."
- Core objective 47 states that "pupils learn to compare the spatial planning of their own environment with other environments, in The Netherlands and abroad, covering the perspective of landscape, to live, to work, administration, traffic, recreation, welfare, culture and religion. In any case, attention is paid to two Member States of the European Union and two countries that became member in 2004, the United States and a country in Asia, Africa and Latin America."
- Core objective 50 states that "pupils learn to use a map and atlas and understand the topography of The Netherlands, Europe and the rest of the world and develop a contemporary geographical outlook".
- Core objective 52 states "pupils learn the characteristic aspects of the following periods: hunters and farmers; Greeks and Romans; monks and knights; cities and states; discoverers and reformers; kings and regents; wigs and revolutions; citizens and steam engines; world wars and Holocaust; television and computer. Core objective 52 does not explicitly refer to the learning about the EU, but schools, as part of this core objective, also focuses on the European Union. The website www.entoen.nu, used by schools, focusses on various periods and events that happened over time. The EU also is mentioned on the timeline (see http://www.entoen.nu/en)"

Scotland:
“Curriculum for Excellence” which is the Scottish curriculum provides the framework for learning for all children and young people in Scotland aged 3 to 18. Scotland has an outcomes-based curriculum and lists the learning outcomes for students in eight curricular areas (Expressive arts, Health and well-being, Languages, Mathematics, Religious and Moral education, Sciences, Social Sciences and Technologies). Social Studies does not explicitly mention learning about the EU, however reference is made to Europe. The following learning outcomes are described in the curricular framework in relation to learning about Europe:

- I can investigate the features of an election and the work of representatives at a local, national or European level to begin to develop my understanding of how democracy works. 2nd stage
- To extend my mental map and sense of place, I can interpret information from different types of maps and am beginning to locate key features within Scotland, UK, Europe or the wider world. 2nd stage
- I can explain the similarities and differences between the lifestyles, values and attitudes of people in the past by comparing Scotland with a society in Europe or elsewhere. 3rd stage
- Having investigated processes which form and shape landscapes, I can explain their impact on selected landscapes in Scotland, Europe and beyond. 3rd stage
- I can use a range of maps and geographical information systems to gather, interpret and present conclusions and can locate a range of features within Scotland, UK, Europe and the wider world. 3rd stage
- I have developed a sense of my heritage and identity as a British, European or global citizen and can present arguments about the importance of respecting the heritage and identity of others. 4th stage

As mentioned, EU topics are typically embedded into specific subjects of the curriculum. Given the nature of EU issues, primarily the subjects that teach aspects of the EU are Geography, History and Civics or Social Studies. Therefore, the following sections outline each subject area and how it integrates EU issues into the curriculum and the box below gives a general overview of what students are expected to learn at key stages of the compulsory education cycle.

### What students know about the EU at key stages

**Primary school**
- The majority of students of primary school age are expected to finish ISCED 1 knowing that their country is in the EU and being able to identify the other Members of the Union. Whilst teaching in the classroom may feature issues of feeling European and understanding European citizenship at this age, very few countries mention this objective explicitly in the curriculum for this age group.

**Lower secondary**
- Learning about the EU at lower secondary level is most common with the highest number of subjects teaching EU topics at this level. Students are expected to learn more about their rights and responsibilities as EU citizens and to learn about the history of European integration.

**Upper secondary**
- Commonly, EU learning becomes significantly more optional at upper secondary level. For the most part, the same types of EU issues that are taught at lower secondary level are also covered at upper secondary. However, there is more of a focus on EU politics and policies at the upper secondary level as students learn more about the EU alongside other international organisations and its role in international relations.

#### 3.1 Geography

**Geography curriculum**

The study of geography encompasses both physical and human geography aspects. Students learn about the physical geography of the world such as how landscapes are formed, place names and locations. Geography also includes human geography topics such as the connections between different economies, environmental issues, social and political issues of different societies.

Geography is well placed to teach EU topics as “geography inspires pupils to become global citizens by exploring their own place in the world, their values and responsibilities to other people, the
Primarily, the study of geography uses a spatial perspective to explore the location and interaction of people, places and environments. Teaching geography predominantly includes educating students about the nature of their region, country and the world. As citizens of the EU, the geography curriculum of Member States also includes teaching students about their membership of the EU.

Typically, geography of the EU is embedded into the geography curriculum in two main ways. The first dimension encompasses the physical dimension which emphasises the landscape aspects of the European Union. It stipulates various mapping abilities that should be learnt, for example that students should be able to locate the Member States of the European Union on a map, find their own country on a map of the EU, know the names and locations of capital cities of EU Member States or identify neighbouring EU countries. The weight is placed on having students being able to locate themselves beyond their region or country and place themselves in the European Union.

The second dimension embeds EU issues into a broader sense of geography including issues of demography and including social, economic and political components. EU topics in this arena relate to issues of EU policies, EU integration, economies of the Union and EU demographics.

### 3.1.1 Physical geography

In the majority of Member States the curriculum highlights the physical geographical aspects of the EU by having school children identify various aspects of the EU on a map. Belgium, Wales, England, France, Slovakia, Portugal, Luxembourg, Latvia, Hungary, Ireland and Malta all mention the location or map of the European Union Member States. Most often, this requires that students should be able to locate the EU Member States, their neighbouring countries or regions on a map. Knowing the capital cities of each Member State is also an explicit requirement of the curriculum in some countries such as France, Ireland, Malta, Portugal, Slovakia and Wales.

Although mapping European information on occasions includes other aspects, for example, in France, at the end of lower secondary education students are expected to locate the main European transportation routes and flows on a map, this was very rare. The curriculum focuses on the mapping abilities of students to identify the Member States and their locations.

Being able to identify the Member States, their cities or other aspects on a map is almost exclusively a requirement of the geography curriculum at primary school level and/or lower secondary school. The curriculum of only two Member States, Latvia and Malta, mentioned the physical aspects of the EU at upper secondary level.

Although not often explicitly stated, the reasoning behind including the physical dimension of EU learning into geography is likely to be that the first step towards a greater understanding of the European Union is to recognise that they are part of a wider community outside of their region or country. For example, in Ireland the geography curriculum states that “children’s understanding and appreciation of their local, regional and national identity should be fostered and they should develop a sense of their European and global citizenship. Children should begin to develop an understanding of the names and relative location of some natural and human features of Europe and the world a small number of major natural features some countries, capitals and major cities continental boundaries”. The strand on “country, regional and national centres” of the curriculum states that children should be able to "become familiar with the names, locations and some well-known features of the capital cities of the European Union”.

### 3.1.2 Human geography

Human geography aspects of the EU are included in the curriculum of most Member States, but often are secondary to the physical geographic characteristics of the EU.
EU citizenship is almost never explicitly mentioned in the geography curriculum with a couple of notable exceptions. The development of civic competences including European identity and European citizenship is mentioned in Slovenia and Ireland.

In Ireland the main emphasis of the geography curriculum is on fostering a European identity among students. The curriculum states that being part of the EU should be put in the wider context of citizenship. Ireland positions EU citizenship in the primary school geography curriculum as well as at secondary school level.

### EU Citizenship in Geography

**Ireland**

- **ISCED 1:** Children's understanding and appreciation of their local, regional and national identity should be fostered and they should develop a sense of their European and global citizenship. Children should begin to develop an understanding of the names and relative location of some natural and human features of Europe and the world, a small number of major natural features some countries, capitals and major cities continental boundaries. The strand on “country, regional and national centres” the curriculum states that children should be able to “become familiar with the names, locations and some well-known features of the capital cities of the European Union”
- **ISCED 2:** teaching practice should highlight the economic, social and cultural implications of Ireland's membership of the European Community and the challenges and opportunities which this provides within a wider context of citizenship.
- **ISCED 3:** "To develop and promote active citizenship and to encourage informed participation, through lifelong learning, in society at local, national, European and global level."

Although the geography curriculum does not often explicitly state that students should learn about EU citizenship, it is mentioned implicitly. In the vast majority of Member States the geography curriculum makes mention of being a member of the European Union. This is not surprising, given the general emphasis in the subject of geography on students understanding their place in the world. For European students, this means understanding that they live in a Member State of the European Union, therefore the geography curriculum covers membership of the EU often alongside other communities that the Member State is part of. The curriculum covers aspects such as the advantages and disadvantages of their membership and the implications of being part of the EU. Almost all EU Member States orientate their students as living in a country that is part of the EU and what being part of the European Union means for their country.

Students of some Member States do not only learn about their membership of the EU. Although not often mentioned, a minority of Member States explicitly raise the issue of regional differences in the EU in the geography curriculum. The curriculum outlines that students should probe the differences between EU regions, highlighting the disparities and similarities relating to social, economic and cultural issues. The French, Czech and Lithuania curricular documents also feature students studying possible solutions to the problems they identify.

By highlighting the differences and similarities in terms of cultural, economic, social and political aspects of EU regions, students gain an understanding of EU integration and the challenges associated with the multicultural societies that constitute the Union.

### Regional differences in the EU

**Lithuania ISCED2:**

Special attention is dedicated to comparative analysis of EU regions to identify various social and economic issues and possible solutions.

**France ISCED2:**

The curriculum includes the analysis of the EU Member States and the differences between European regions in order for students to be familiar with the main disparities within the EU area and the means to address these. The aim of this part of the curriculum
is to equip pupils with appropriate knowledge of the country in which they live and of the wider context in which it takes place.

Commonly reference is also made to the political and economic features of the EU. Where mentioned, both political and economic features are often cited together in the curricular documents. For example, in Denmark students of geography at ISCED 2 learn about political and economic cooperation between countries of the EU. The topics focus on the economic policies of the EU and economic cooperation between Member States.

**EU Economics**

Lithuania ISCED3: Students are expected to be able to describe the examples of economic cooperation: trade, free economic areas, joint companies, joint economic projects (such as the EU) and economic planning between the EU members states.

References to other EU policies, other than economic policies, are found in a minority of countries and touch on environmental (as found in Portugal, Slovenia and Malta) and agricultural policies (Malta and Slovenia).

**EU Policy**

Malta ISCED3: The EU Common Agricultural Policy. The EU as a trading block. Fishing areas; conservation of fish stocks and EU policies on fishing, the role of the EU management of environmental problems in tourist and recreational regions in Europe.

The human geography dimension is not very evident in relation to EU topics during primary school and students are mostly expected to learn about the physical geographical aspects of the EU. Whilst the social and economic features of human geography related to the EU become more of a focus during lower secondary schooling, the aspects discussed above primarily appear in the curriculum at upper secondary level.

### 3.1.3 Summary

The geography curriculum of European Member States primarily emphasises that students should identify the physical geographic location of the Union. In most countries, the curriculum has students place themselves in their country as part of the EU and understand how membership impacts their country. Students learn how the EU impacts them in terms of economic, social and other policies. In some countries explicit mention is made of the differences and similarities of the regions within the EU. Whilst explicit mention of EU citizenship is rare, by having students locate themselves in the Union and understand the implications of that membership, all these elements build a picture of potential learning about EU citizenship in geography.

### 3.2 History

**History curriculum**

Commonly, the objective of history education is to give students an understanding of history at personal, local, national and international levels. As a result, students gain understanding about the world they live in. Students learn about the concepts of time, historical periods of time and how to place events and happenings within certain time frames. Consulting various historical sources students discover that historical sources can disagree or contradict each other, or can depend upon what was known at that particular time.

The subject of history is well positioned to teach EU topics as history gives students an understanding of history at the European level.
A review of the history curriculum in eleven European countries found that the local dimension in historical content is especially emphasised over the European dimension in the earlier education cycles of the majority of the curricula reviewed. Therefore, it is not surprising that the EU dimension does not appear often in the primary school history curriculum of Member States, but appears predominantly in the lower and upper secondary education levels.

The subject of history during compulsory education can take two approaches, a traditional chronological approach, or a thematic approach. Even when preference is given to a thematic approach, this is often organised in a chronologic way.

Chronological timelines are evident in relation to learning about the EU in the history curriculum of Member States, though the time periods covered vary between Member States. Whilst the majority of Member States begin the timeline with the establishment of the EU, more recent events and developments are not universally covered. This is understandable given that more recent EU events may be considered too current to be considered ‘historical’ and therefore do not feature in the curriculum.

### EU Chronological timelines

The timelines that were explicitly mentioned in terms of learning about the EU in the history curricula varied. Almost all of the timelines began with the history of EU integration, however the periods covered in some countries include more current EU history, in others learning about the history of the EU does include more recent EU developments. Examples of timelines are:

- Estonia: World since 1990s to EU enlargement
- Cyprus: From 1963 to accession to the EU
- France: Construction of the EU in the 1950s to the EU in the early 2000s
- Ireland: 1960 to the present day
- Luxembourg: Early days of EEC (1957-1965) and EU enlargement
- Malta: From Schuman to the latest enlargement

The Hungarian curriculum is an interesting example. It states that the subject of history in first cycle of education should carry out media monitoring about the operation, successes and problems of the EU. Therefore, Hungarian students are taught about contemporary EU history first. During upper secondary education students then learn about the history of European integration.

#### 3.2.1 History of EU construction

The vast majority of Member States include the establishment of the EU in the history curriculum. The curriculum dictates that students learn the context and conditions under which unification of the EU countries began. Students learn not only how the EU was constructed, but the objectives of unifying countries in the process of EU integration. Within this framework, students learn about the key milestones and stages of EU integration. A few countries mention the enlargement process specifically, such as Malta, Estonia, Luxembourg and Slovenia, whereas the majority of Member States make a more general reference to EU integration without specifying whether the more recent enlargement process is covered or not.

Although the curriculum primarily describes that students should learn the key milestones and stages of EU integration, some countries explicitly state that students should learn about particular EU treaties.

---

Learning Europe at School

EU treaties

Ireland ISCED2 Option to choose ‘Moves towards European Unity’ and students should “have a knowledge and understanding of the Treaty of Rome, growth of the EU, Maastricht Treaty”.

Denmark ISCED2 The Maastricht treaty

Belgium FR ISCED 1&2 Treaty of Rome

France ISCED 2 Pupils are expected to know the dates of adoption of the treaties (Rome and Maastricht)

The institutions of the EU contribute and play an important role in European integration. As part of understanding the history of the EU, a number of Member States including the Czech Republic, Estonia, Italy, Spain and Hungary, include learning about the institutions of the EU at upper secondary level.

EU institutions covered in history curricula

Czech Republic ISCED 3 - the basic institutions unifying Europe, the scope of their functioning

Estonia ISCED 3 - explain and know how to use in context concepts: EU, European Parliament, Council of ministers, European Commission, European Council, Court of Justice. In this context other international organisations are also taught: Court of Human rights, Council of Europe and organisation for security and cooperation in Europe

Italy ISCED 3 - EU institutions and functions

Romania ISCED 2 - knowledge and facts about EU institutions

Spain ISCED 3 - institutions of the EU

Hungary ISCED 3 - institutions of Hungary and the EU

3.2.2 National history in an EU context

In addition to learning the history of the establishment of the EU, often EU history is taught in the context of either the Member State joining the EU or examining the history of the Member State in light of EU history. In the case of the latter, the emphasis is on students gaining a better understanding of the world that they live in and to relate changes on the national level with changes at the European level. Overwhelmingly, reference is made to the former, highlighting the history of the country joining the EU.

Accession to the EU

Cyprus, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Slovenia, Slovakia and Malta all make clear reference to the history covering their accession to the EU. Unsurprisingly, it is mainly the countries that most recently joined the EU that have this overtly stated in the curricula.

 Whilst students learn about how and why the EU was established and their own countries accession to the Union, some countries place an emphasis on maintaining their own national traditions and values. Whereas the history curricula in certain Member States highlights the importance of maintaining national identity in an EU context, other Member States underline the development of multi-cultural societies and awareness of cultures across the EU (for example, in Lithuania and Slovenia).

Maintaining national traditions and values

Cyprus ISCED1 - national independence and protection of unique cultural traditions and values

Slovakia ISCED3 - understand the importance of maintaining national values and traditions in the context of EU integration
3.2.3 The EU and international organisations

Commonly reference is made to the position of EU on the international stage and the EU is taught as one of several transnational entities. As opposed to the history of nations, the EU is discussed as part of the phenomenon of transnational integration where the nation states delegate some of their competence and give up certain autonomy to a supra-national authority in view of better achieving common aims. Furthermore, the curriculum often incorporates the analysis of the world role of the EU in international relations. The topics focus on the role of the EU in conflict resolution and developing cooperation internationally, for example in England, the German lander of Baden-Wuerttemberg, Estonia, Latvia and Ireland all make reference to the role of the EU as one player in resolving conflicts. Denmark emphasises international cooperation including the EU and other international organisations.

**EU on the international stage**

- **England ISCED2** – conflict resolution and cooperation development including through international institutions such as the United Nations and the European Union
- **German Baden-Wuerttemberg ISCED 2** - confrontation and cooperation in international politics
- **Denmark ISCED 2** - covers international cooperation including the EU and other international organisations
- **Estonia ISCED1&2 (together)** – teaching the world since the 1990s covers enlargement of the EU, enlargement of NATO and new conflicts
- **Hungary ISCED1&2 (together)** - students shall see that besides negative divergent tendencies among nation states there are consensus building and compensational efforts as well (EU & UN).
- **Ireland ISCED 1** - EU is taught in the strand ‘politics, conflict and society’.
- **Latvia ISCED1** - EU is taught alongside other international organisations NATO and UNESCO. ISCED 3 - covers Latvian place in international organisations and security systems during history.
- **Lithuania ISCED3** – history teaching assesses the impact of globalisation on contemporary life of society. How Member States of the EU foster the development of multi-cultural societies. Students should be able to illustrate the changes that Lithuania has and still is experiencing in relation to its membership in the EU and NATO.

3.2.4 EU history and citizenship

As was the case for the subject of geography, EU citizenship is almost never explicitly mentioned in the history curriculum. Once again, in the Slovenian and Irish curriculum explicit reference is made to EU citizenship and identity in the subject of history.

In Slovenia, the curriculum for lower secondary school level states that one of the teaching objectives of the syllabus is the development of civic competences including European citizenship and awareness of European cultural influences.

In Ireland the main emphasis of the history curriculum for primary school students is that they should ‘develop a growing sense of personal, national, European and wider identities’.

3.2.5 Summary

The history curriculum of the countries of the European Union predominantly highlights the history of EU construction. In most countries students should learn the chronological timeline of EU integration often including EU treaties and the role of the EU institutions. Students are taught about their country joining the EU, and in a few cases the history curriculum emphasises national independence in the context of EU membership. Students also discover the role of the EU on the international stage by studying issues such as conflict resolution and international cooperation. Once again, explicit mention of EU citizenship is rare, though students get a grounding in why the EU was established, their countries membership of the Union and the role of the EU internationally providing them with a comprehensive background to why the EU exists.
3.3 Civics and social studies

Civics and social studies

The main aim of citizenship education is to ensure that young people have the knowledge, skills, attitudes and values to become active citizens in society, capable of making a contribution to the development and well-being of society. Information from the ICCS European Module highlights the areas of emphasis in citizenship education in a number of European countries. The topics that the European ICCS countries most frequently nominated as being a major emphasis of citizenship education were human rights (18 countries), understanding different cultures and ethnic groups (16 countries), the environment (14 countries), and parliamentary and governmental systems (14 countries).

Citizenship education is particularly well placed to teach EU topics as these main aspects relate to citizenship at the EU level.

The Eurydice Citizenship Education in Europe Report examined the curricula as to how citizenship education is embedded. The review found that the curricula relating to citizenship covers a broad and very comprehensive range of themes, including the principles of democratic societies, contemporary societal issues as well as the European and international dimensions.

Citizenship education includes four main aspects according to the Eurydice review

- Political literacy
- Critical thinking and analytical skills
- Attitudes and value
- Active participation

This section of the report examines citizenship and social studies education and provides an overview of the content related to the EU specifically rather than the more broadly defined ‘European and International dimensions’.

Firstly, the curriculum of civics/social studies makes a connection between the individual and the EU and the impact of EU membership for the specific Member State. For example, the Swedish curriculum for lower secondary schooling states that students should learn about EU decision making and how the decisions made by the EU affect individuals, groups and society.

Given that human rights is a major emphasis of citizenship education in general according the ICCS study, it is not surprising that in terms of EU learning primarily students learn about the **rights and responsibilities of EU citizens** granted to them by virtue of their membership of the Union. In this way, students learn about the concept of European level citizenship and related rights. Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, Poland, Czech Republic, Denmark, Wales, Estonia, France, Italy and Greece all make explicit reference to the rights of EU citizens. A small number of countries clearly draw a connection between being a member of the EU and its impact on the life of an individual. For example, in Finland the curriculum of upper secondary school level states that students should learn about EU citizenship and the effects of that citizenship on individuals. Whereas in Sweden, in addition to learning how membership of the EU affects individuals, students also should be taught about the possibility they have as EU citizens to influence political decisions. The curriculum of the Czech Republic states that pupils shall describe the impact of Czech accession to the EU on the everyday lives of citizens.

The curriculum also depicts the national situation and how it is affected by membership of the European Union. Given that students are learning about the national political and democratic systems in civics/social studies, it is unsurprising that the curriculum illustrates links between the national level and the EU level. For example, Maltese students are expected to weigh up and assess the implications of Malta’s position in the EU and Swedish students are expected to learn about Sweden’s political system within the EU and to know at which level different decisions are made. Slovenia, Sweden, Malta, Bulgaria, Czech Republic
and Italy are all example of countries that make the link between the national and EU levels in the curriculum for civics/social studies.

Students do not only learn about how membership of the EU affects their Member State and influences their daily lives, but students are often expected to understand the position of the EU alongside other international organisations. Therefore, the EU can appear in the curriculum alongside the country’s membership of other international organisations such as the United Nations and NATO.

In the majority of Member States the curriculum highlights the **institutions of the EU** by having school children identify various EU institutions. Romania, Slovenia, Spain, Luxembourg, Malta, Bulgaria, Poland, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Hungary and Greece all make specific reference to the fact that students should learn about EU institutions. Most often, learning about the EU institutions in fact refers to the European Parliament, European Council, and European Commission. Primarily the curricula refer to learning about the institutions of the EU, though in some cases the curricula indicates that students should not only know about the EU institutions, but should understand the roles, functions and processes of these institutions.

### Understanding the roles of EU institutions

- Bulgaria ISCED3 Introduction to the structure and activities/functions of the state and EU institutions.
- Poland ISCED2 students should be able to explain what the role of the main EU institutions is (European council, European council, European parliament, European commission).

Although not often explicitly stated, the reasoning behind including knowledge of the institutions at the EU level is likely to be that students can learn about political systems of Europe and to understand the decision making process at the EU level. For example, in Denmark the curriculum states that students should learn about the main political institutions of the EU and the decision making process in the EU.

A diverse range of **social and economic issues** are also identified in the curricula of some Member States. Denmark, France, Germany Baden-Wuerttemberg and Greece make reference to students learning about the role the EU plays in promoting peace and conflict resolution, whilst Latvia, Estonia, Poland and Slovakia emphasised economic issues. Economic issues varied from the role of the EU in the economy of Estonia, to students learning how to use EU funds for business in Poland as well as Slovak students needing to demonstrate an understanding of how to orientate themselves on the labour market of the EU. Student mobility was mentioned in the curricula of Poland and the Czech republic.

Interestingly, a number of Member States including Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Finland, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Luxembourg, Poland, Slovakia, and Slovenia teach students about the **history of EU integration** in civics/social studies.

The curriculum in a small amount of countries also makes explicit reference to **developing certain values and attitudes**. European values are mentioned in Finland and Estonia, whilst students in Slovakia are expected to support the development of tolerance and understanding among the nations of the EU.

### Summary

All of the above elements combined, teach students to develop their civic literacy at the EU level. The majority of countries state that students should learn about their rights and obligations as citizens of the EU in conjunction with the functioning of various EU institutions. Students can then draw the connection between how the EU works and its role as an international organisation affecting the national situation and their own lives. In a minority of cases students are also explicitly expected to develop certain EU values and attitudes during citizenship education.
3.4 The EU alongside international organisations

Teaching about the EU as an international entity appeared as a common theme across the curriculum. This is a particularly interesting finding given that the ICCS European Module study found that the topic of the global community and international organisations was one of the topics less frequently nominated as having a major emphasis in the citizenship curricula.

Whilst it may not be considered a dominant topic in citizenship education according to the ICCS study, if we look at the curricula of EU Member States more broadly to include other subjects such as geography and history, the dominance of teaching about the EU alongside other international organisations becomes clear. Therefore, students do not just learn about their own place and the position of their country in the EU, but also where the EU fits into international and global systems.

Examples of the EU being taught alongside international organisations

Denmark
- ISCED 2 Geography: Through this subject, pupils will learn about political, military, and economic cooperation between countries - and the role of transnational organisations in relation to conflict resolution. This includes transnational organisations such as the EU, NATO, the World Bank, and the UN.

England & Wales
- ISCED 2 History: Pupils should develop an understanding of the changing nature of conflict over time and attempts to resolve conflict and develop cooperation, including through international institutions such as the United Nations and the European Union.
- ISCED 3 Civics/Social Studies: The national curriculum for Citizenship states that Human rights are part of national and international law. Students should explore the roles of the United Nations and the European Union in securing human rights.

Ireland
- ISCED 2 History: The EU is taught alongside other international organisations - NATO and UNESCO. Pupils provide their evaluation of Latvian membership in the EU and NATO.

Lithuania
- ISCED 3 History: Students should be able to describe the process of Lithuania’s integration into the European economic and political structures. Be able to illustrate the changes that Lithuania has and still is experiencing in relation to its membership in the EU and NATO.

Poland
- ISCED 3 History: Students present the facts and assess the importance of Polish accession to NATO and the European Union.

Hungary
- ISCED 1&2 Civics/Social Studies: Students have to argue in favour and against the importance of the EU and NATO membership of Hungary.

3.5 Other subjects

The curriculum of other subjects beyond geography, history and civics/social studies also references learning about the EU. Most commonly, the subject of business or economics includes mention of the European Union, though this subject is generally optional for students at upper secondary school. Almost half of Member States mention the EU in the curriculum for business/economic studies. Issues covered are predominantly related to free trade and trade policy in the EU, and also include European economic cooperation. Some countries, such as Denmark, Ireland and Portugal have students look at how the EU impacts the national economy.
Cyprus ISCED3 - Learning about the European Central Bank
Denmark ISCED3 - Students learn about the cooperation in different stages of economic integration - including coverage of economic cooperation in the EU, the EU's impact on and its importance for setting out a framework for economic and political policies at national level.
Estonia ISCED3 - covers European Union and free trade
Ireland ISCED3 – includes the importance of the European Union, the purpose of the main European Union policies and directives and their impact on Irish business.

Latvia ISCED3 - This subject looks, among other, at Latvian foreign trade policy in the context of the EU.
Lithuania ISCED3 - Reference to learning about the EU is found within the aim to foster pupils’ ability to assess positive and negative impact of globalisation to the national economies. Pupils are asked to describe the role of international trade organisations and trade agreements (including WTO and the EU).

Malta ISCED2 – students learning about Malta's main trading partners and Malta’s place in the EU. The impact of the EU on local trade practices.
Portugal ISCED3 – covers the Portuguese economy in the EU context. EU Trade mechanisms/implications for Portugal.

Romania ISCED2 - Pupils learn about financial instruments in Romania and in EU and gain basic knowledge about the EU currency
Romania ISCED3 - Reference to the EU is found in this subject that is aimed to equip students with knowledge about the economic/financial mechanisms for EU integration; EU rules for business creation, etc.
Slovenia ISCED3 - Students should understand/can explain the role and key activities of the EU and its institutions in the European economy
Spain ISCED3 - European economic integration

Austria, Latvia, Portugal and Greece mention EU topics in political education. These topics are similar to those found in civics/social studies, but primarily focus on the political systems of the EU, EU policies, the EU political institutions and decision making and in Greece students are also expected to learn about current political events at EU level.

Other EU topics are found across a diverse number of subjects, such as EU regulations on food labelling in home economics in Malta, EU consumer education in health studies in Cyprus, the rights of EU citizens in the subject of law in Lithuania and Portugal, and the legal provisions to protect the environment which are influenced by the EU in environmental education in the Czech Republic and Malta.

Malta, Romania, and Slovenia offer European studies at different levels of education. In Romania, European studies is offered during primary school, whereas in Malta European studies is an optional subject at lower secondary school and is an optional subject for students at upper secondary school in Slovenia. Students learn about the range of topics already discussed in the other subjects, such as European institutions, European integration, European decision making, and human and civil rights.
What factors result in effective teaching about the EU?

Earlier sections of this report show that there is a framework for teaching about the EU in all countries. Curricula or learning outcomes descriptions of all countries expect teachers to tackle this topic in the classroom, even though the details of what is expected to be covered vary. In many EU countries teachers have autonomy in deciding over what they teach and how\textsuperscript{39} and this autonomy is growing thanks to recent reforms introduced across Europe\textsuperscript{40}. Consequently it is teachers who are deciding on the extent to which they cover the EU in their teaching, from which angle they approach the theme and what methods they use to make the learning effective. These aspects of learning about the EU are analysed in this section of the report to understand how teachers are prepared, approach and bring EU topics into the classroom as well as understanding what works for student learning.

### Key findings

There appears to be great disparity when it comes to teachers’ preparation for teaching about the EU. In some countries the national competence standards for teachers or guidelines for teacher education refer to the understanding of the EU. However such standards or guidelines do not exist everywhere.

Information on the extent to which EU institutions, integration, policy making and policies are covered in initial teacher training is uneven. The number of courses identified as part of this study that clearly focus on the EU is low, but this is also due to the quality of the data available. Many teacher education institutions reviewed did not publish course descriptions that were detailed enough to determine whether EU topics were present.

In-service teacher training appears to be the most common source of teachers’ understanding of the EU. Where such training is offered, it is mostly delivered by organisations whose core mission is to work on the European Union (be it as research activities or promotion of information). Traditional teacher training institutions (universities or national agencies with this mission) are rarely active in this field.

Students are somewhat interested in knowing more about EU issues mainly due to the amount of media coverage EU topics currently receive. They want to know about the crisis, how decisions are made, in what ways the EU affects their lives and what their opportunities are to travel abroad to study and work.

Effectively incorporating EU topics into the classroom depends upon motivated teachers who find innovative ways to bring the EU into their teaching. However, teachers face barriers such as difficulties keeping up-to-date with EU developments and the fact that EU topics are actually a relatively small part of the curriculum that they have to deliver.

Textbooks do include EU topics in an attractive way in some cases; however the amount of coverage given to EU topics is relatively small for the most part. Teachers supplement textbooks with material from other resources. All stakeholders from the initiative promoter to the students, recognise the value of using interactive methods in the classroom in addition to attractive materials. However, resource issues and having the knowledge of how to effectively incorporate these methods can be a challenge for teachers.

The support teachers receive from within the school in the form of backing from the school head was often important to the teachers. They also sought external support by engaging in initiatives that would support EU learning for their students. There is some evidence from the case-studies that networking activities can create a supportive environment offering teachers opportunities to collaborate or gain access to relevant information whilst the initiatives themselves could benefit through learning from the experiences of schools.

The first step to effective teaching of EU topics was to bring EU topics closer to the daily
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\textsuperscript{39} Eurydice (2008) Levels of Autonomy and Responsibilities of Teachers in Europe

lives of students. Making the connection between who and what the EU is and does with the daily life of a student turns it into something real and more relevant for them. Where students were also given responsibility for their own learning, this gave students ownership rather than being passive learners. An enormous amount of value was placed on the use of external stimulation for students whether this takes the form of an external speaker or visits outside of the school. These types of activities were particularly memorable for students and made the things they learnt more likely to ‘stick’ with them.

The outcomes of the initiatives that were looked at in this study highlighted that supporting the teaching of EU topics in the variety of ways that these projects did went beyond increasing student knowledge about the EU. For the most part, students were not learning simple facts and figures, but were becoming more informed about EU issues and were encouraged to think critically. Students themselves reported that their interest in EU issues had been sparked and they could create a more personal relationship with the EU.

However, the main drawbacks were in terms of reach which was a problem for a variety of reasons including a lack of interest among certain schools, teachers or students and a lack of resources to reach more of the target group. Furthermore, it can be difficult to overcome some of the issues that teachers still face in terms of the limited amount of time they have to insert EU topics into their teaching.

4.1 How teachers are prepared

When asked about how confident they felt teaching about the European Union, the majority of civic education teachers (78%) in the 17 countries covered by the ICCS survey responded either very confident or confident. However, when looking at how confident this group of teachers feel teaching about other topics that fall under civic education, it appears that the EU is among those topics they are least confident about. Civics teachers are much more confident in teaching about human rights, citizens’ rights and responsibilities. They are also more confident in teaching about voting and elections and different cultures and ethnic groups. The only topics they are less confident in teaching about than the EU are legal institutions and courts (57%) and global community and international organisations (77%).

Though interesting, these measurements are however limited primarily because they build on self-perception and are thus subjective. They nevertheless helped the research team to draw a hypothesis for this study- that a lack of initial and in-service training related to teaching about the EU may result in only a small minority of teachers using European teaching materials and may de facto represent a barrier hindering learning about the EU in school. This hypothesis was partly confirmed by the rest of the research as discussed below.

To better understand how teachers were being prepared for teaching about the EU, this study looked at:

- The extent to which the EU was covered in initial teacher training programmes; and
- Whether teachers were offered continuous training opportunities to enhance their understanding and teaching skills with regard to the EU.

Information on these two aspects was gathered through:

- Review of a sample of teacher education and training programmes in all countries as part of the country fiche design. The researchers were instructed to look at the main teacher education institutions in the country (i.e. those that train most future teachers); and
- Interviews with teachers during case studies.

As part of the mapping, depending on countries, the researchers also reviewed documents such as:

- National guidelines for initial teacher education

---

Curricular descriptions for initial teacher education  
Teacher competence frameworks  
Professional standards for teachers

According to the information available online, national guidelines for initial teacher education were identified in eight Member States (Austria, Estonia, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Portuguese and Slovenia). An in-depth review of their content showed that European citizenship’s knowledge, understanding and values are listed among the requirements for prospective teachers across the EU in six of these (i.e. in all countries listed above with the exception of Ireland and Italy).

Specific references to the knowledge and understanding of EU institutions and policies were found in the curricular descriptions for initial teacher education in Denmark, Germany (decentralised level) and Spain. These are usually present for geography, history or social sciences as subject areas. In Spain and Denmark, citizenship is given special status as a subject studied on its own within the school curriculum, attributing even greater importance to the knowledge and understanding of Europe and the nation’s role in it.

Reference to the need to equip future teachers with appropriate skills and knowledge on the EU was predominantly found in the teacher competence frameworks of five Member States (Belgium (BEnl), Estonia, France, Lithuania and Spain). In the same vein, an indirect reference (i.e. rather incorporated into citizenship and democratic values) was noted in the professional standards that are set up, for example, in Ireland and in the UK. In the Netherlands where such standards also exist, a knowledge base has been defined for prospective teachers for all main subject areas and all school levels with a specific focus on EU-related knowledge in history and geography.

Some evidence of on-going developments supporting the need to better equip prospective teachers with appropriate knowledge about the EU was also found in the Czech Republic and Poland where the development of professional standards was being debated at the time when data was collected.

Identification of EU-related content through a review of teacher education study programmes proved difficult. In most cases the descriptions of course components are not detailed enough to see to what extent the EU is covered. Furthermore, as mentioned earlier, teacher education is fragmented in a number of countries with a broad range of pathways leading to the teaching profession. Finally, teacher education institutions have strong autonomy in deciding the content of their teacher training programmes. These characteristics of teacher education make it impossible to provide a comprehensive overview of how learning about the EU is covered in preparing teachers for the teaching profession.

As shown in Table 4.1 below, only in a small number of country researchers identified three teacher education (initial or continuing) courses that explicitly covered knowledge of the EU. In nearly half of cases no such activities were identified. In these cases, there was too little information on the web-sites of institutions reviewed to make a judgement on the extent to which the EU was part of the course content. For example, while courses for future history teachers cover contemporary history, from the review of teacher training institutions’ web-sites, the EU does not appear to be a prominent element of such courses. While it is unlikely that such courses do not cover the history of the EU, in many cases, as supported by the information from interviews, it can be assumed that it is probably covered rather superficially.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number of initiatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE fr</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE nl</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CY</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In terms of initial teacher education, researchers identified relevant courses for future teachers of history, geography, civics and economics. Such courses which mentioned EU learning were identified in the French speaking Community of Belgium, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Ireland, Sweden and Slovenia. In a few countries courses were identified that are provided at faculty level, which are not specifically targeted at future teachers but are open to future teachers (Finland, Estonia). Whilst these courses are likely to be offered in many countries and teacher education institutions, if the courses are not specifically advertised to those students preparing for the teaching profession, they are unlikely to enrol in them or only those who are already interested in the EU would do so. The content of these courses mostly focusses on EU institutions, EU integration, EU policy making and decision making. In two countries (Spain and Slovenia), courses that concern the EU dimension in education policies were identified.

When it comes to continuing training, seminars or training focused on the EU which are aimed at teachers were found in the French speaking Community of Belgium, Germany, Hungary, Luxembourg, Latvia, Poland, Romania, Slovenia and Slovakia. Most of these courses are open to teachers from different levels and subject areas. Only a few examples of modules specifically focused on geography or history teachers were identified (French speaking Community of Belgium, Latvia). It should be noted that many of these courses are funded from EU sources, via the Lifelong learning programme, European Social Fund or others. Many of these courses are offered and/or designed by organisations whose primary activities do not concern teacher training. Instead, these are organisations engaged in the discussion about the EU at national level. It should be noted here that the researchers were instructed not to include in this review the activities of Europe Direct centres or Commission representations in the countries. Information on Europe Direct Information Centres’ (EDIC) activities shows that these organisations do target teachers and students/ pupils. These constitute the primary target group for most EDICs (64% of these centres consider school children and teachers as the primary audience of their activities).

The full table presenting the results of the mapping of teacher education and training activities and learning about the EU is presented in Annex 3.
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Examples of initial teacher education courses found

In Denmark, initial teacher education content requirements (ISCED 1/2, compulsory education teachers) for social/citizenship studies make explicit references to skills in relating to values in the Danish and European context, and preparing students to take active part in democratic society developing critical thinking, by the knowledge of legal, political, social, cultural citizenship.

The quite detailed competence framework of professional standards in the Netherlands, seems to include implicit links to European knowledge and values in the areas of interpersonal, subject-knowledge and methodological competences, which are taken up, developed and explicitly explained in the subject-specific knowledge base descriptions for initial teacher education programmes (ISCED 1, 2, 3) for relevant subjects. In fact, the Netherlands have developed a knowledge base for ITE, for all main subject areas and school levels, which represents an interesting reference framework, with specific Europe-related aspects in the subject areas of geography and history. In particular, the knowledge base for geography (political geography) and history include detailed, explicit recalls to European institutions, cooperation and citizenship, across all school levels.

Examples of continuing training courses found

In Romania, the NGO organisation TEHNE, which has the promotion of active European citizenship as a main objective, has been running interesting European projects targeting all school levels and several different European education institutions.

In Slovenia, one specialised programme for teaching about the EU was offered for all teachers across school levels, in the school year 2011/2012.

The reform of school curricula in Cyprus has implied an intensive, comprehensive in-service training programme for all teachers (ISCED 1-2-3); geography curricula, in particular, highlight the international and global dimension of students as active citizens, with specific references to the knowledge of the European Union institutions and policies.

This disparity in terms of teachers’ preparation for teaching about the EU was confirmed during the case study interviews. As part of the case studies, 30 teachers were interviewed. These were mostly teachers of civic education or politics, history or geography. As shown in Table 4.2 below, half of the teachers interviewed did not take part in any specific training about the EU. Another third took part in continuous training on this topic. Only a small number of the teachers interviewed (four) remembered having received a solid basis for teaching about the EU via their initial teacher education. This indicates that in-service training is a much more common source of teachers’ information and understanding of the EU than initial training. In most cases the teachers who undertook some continuous training on the topic referred to training received from EDICs, European parliament or Commission representation, a centre/ think tank working on EU issues (such as the Jacques Delors centre in Portugal). This confirms the findings of desk research that in-service teacher training on the EU is rarely delivered by the mainstream teacher training institutions and mostly covered by organisations that are otherwise involved in researching or communicating about the EU.

Table 4.2 Interviewed teachers’ participation in training about the EU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Teacher 1</th>
<th>Teacher 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BE nl</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>continuous training on the EU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>Teacher 1</td>
<td>continuous training on the EU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 2</td>
<td>continuous training on the EU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG</td>
<td>Teacher 1</td>
<td>continuous training on the EU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 2</td>
<td>continuous training on the EU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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4.2 Approaching EU topics

Students are raising questions about the EU in the classroom and evidence from the case-studies illustrated that they were showing some interest in wanting to discuss EU issues at school. Given that the mass media is an important influencing factor for civic knowledge amongst students\(^44\), it is not surprising that the media was mentioned in a number of the case-studies as acting as a trigger for students to raise EU issues with their teachers. Students were curious because they hear about the current economic crisis and they want to know more about how decisions are made, where funding comes from, what the various options are to resolve the crisis and how it is likely to affect them.

Combine this with the fact that some teachers also felt a responsibility to prepare students to learn about EU topics as citizens of the EU with future voting rights. Several teachers brought up the fact that they feel it is important to make their students aware of the opportunities that being part of the EU can offer them as they get older, particularly in terms of mobility prospects.

Though teachers interviewed were generally aware of the importance of the EU, they also raised the issue of keeping current with EU developments. Given that the case studies were carried out in schools and with teachers active in promoting teaching about the EU, it is not surprising that they were aware of the role of the EU. This positive tendency however cannot be generalised to the rest of the teaching population (nor to the rest of teachers in the given school). Furthermore, teachers in Belgium, Denmark and Finland all felt that the changing nature of current EU issues can be intimidating to keep up with and can lead them to feel insecure and hesitant when teaching these topics.

The phenomena of curriculum overload has been identified\(^45\) in countries across Europe and internationally. It affects both teachers who struggle to meet all the requirements of the curriculum, and children who are subject to it. This has two consequences for learning about the EU. Firstly, curriculum overload can mean that as EU topics are often a smaller part of the curriculum compared to other issues that the teacher has to cover, they get minimal coverage. The second issue in this context is that curriculum overload does not leave
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\(^{44}\) As previous work from Linnenbrink & Anderman (2005) and the IEA has found.

\(^{45}\) NCCA (2010) Curriculum overload in primary schools: an overview of national and international experiences
enough space for interactive and reflective pedagogy to be used when teaching EU topics in the classroom and teachers have to use more factual teaching methods.

Curriculum overload

Interviewees in France, Italy and Latvia all expressed the opinion that the curriculum in general is very dense and the amount of time that can be spent explicitly on EU topics is quite limited.

In almost all of the case-studies the issue of teacher autonomy was raised by those interviewed (the Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Italy, Latvia, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal and Spain). Whilst the curriculum integrates topics relating to the EU into the subject that is being taught, meaning that there are requirements for teachers to include EU topics, teachers have a considerable amount of autonomy. Firstly, teachers often have autonomy to delve deeper into EU topics should they wish to or can plan within their lessons to spend more time on EU issues. Most often, those interviewed spoke about the freedom to decide the methods of how to teach EU topics that are in the core curriculum. Teachers may be obliged to follow the curriculum in terms of what is taught, but they can choose their own methods of teaching those topics. The types of materials that teachers choose to use with their class in order to reach the learning requirements set out in the curriculum are also often freely selected by teachers. Given the freedom teachers often have to decide how much depth they give to EU topics, how to teach and what materials to use, teachers who have a particular interest in EU topics can use this autonomy to explore the EU in their classrooms beyond the curriculum. Of course, on the flipside, some teachers may be less motivated and therefore do not devote much time to covering EU topics in their classrooms.

Teacher autonomy

The national curriculum depicts what students should learn about the EU. However, teachers often have the autonomy to decide how they teach EU topics in terms of the methods and materials they use, and how much time or coverage they give to EU issues in the classroom. Therefore, it can be down to the interest or motivation of individual teachers which determines the amount of teaching that takes place in relation to EU topics, and whether they bring interesting and innovative methods of teaching EU issues into the classroom. If teachers do not feel confident in teaching about the EU or do not perceive the importance of this issue they are likely to minimise the time dedicated to this topic. Therefore any activities aimed at strengthening learning about the EU should be focused on ensuring that teachers are willing to cover this topic in greater depth in their teaching.

Even when teachers have an interest and are motivated to give EU topics space in their classroom lessons, given the overloaded curriculum and that EU issues are not often the main priority of a given subject, frequently teachers can find themselves facing a choice. The choice they face is between teaching their students the basic facts about the EU through factual learning or to take an approach using more interactive teaching methods.

4.3 Bringing EU topics into the classroom

The fieldwork carried out for this study spoke to teachers who made the latter decision, to use more interactive methods with their students. All the case-study schools had decided to connect with an initiative in the area of learning about the EU. However, before this report gets into a discussion about the external support they received through the initiative, firstly it looks at what the teachers and schools did to bring EU topics into their teaching in an effective way.

In preparation of teaching EU topics in the classroom teachers often spend their own personal time outside of school hours in various ways. Teachers in Finland, Italy, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal and Scotland all brought up the issue of using time outside of their teaching hours to prepare to bring EU topics into their classroom. This takes numerous forms, from using their personal time to keep abreast and up to date with developments at the EU level, attending training outside of school hours, identifying methods and materials
that will be appropriate for their class group, to organising extra-curricular activities for students to get to grips with EU topics.

4.3.1 Finding appropriate materials

The first step for many teachers is to identify materials on the EU that can be used in the classroom and are appropriate for their students both in terms of the type of content and the target age-group. The subject textbooks are an obvious source for teachers. However, textbooks have their limitations when it comes to teaching EU topics. In half of the case-study schools, researchers reviewed the textbooks used during subject teaching which includes EU topics. This review of the core textbooks, shown in Table 4.3 below, found that overwhelmingly the coverage given to EU topics in the subject textbooks was small or minimal, often comprising of a sub-chapter of the textbook. Whilst four of the seven reviews found the material to be appealing, including elements such as illustrations and easy-to-understand text, the other three reviews found the content to be unappealing where the information was presented as text and in quite an ‘academic’ or ‘dry’ manner.

Given that the coverage of EU topics in the textbooks is not prominent, case-study teachers often supplement and complement the information provided in the textbook with other materials. Only in Finland did the teachers express that there was enough information available in the subject textbooks, though they also use additional materials with their classes.

Table 4.3 Review of textbooks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Textbook subjects</th>
<th>Coverage of EU topics</th>
<th>Attractiveness of content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>Geography &amp; History</td>
<td>Coverage of EU topics was only a small part of the textbook compared to other topics. In three of the four textbooks coverage was one sub-chapter: from a few paragraphs to at most two pages long.</td>
<td>The material did not seem appealing, some of the information was out-of-date and in the lower secondary textbook the information was presented solely as text. Very few illustrations or appealing information in the upper secondary textbooks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>European studies</td>
<td>All the materials were focused on the EU</td>
<td>The books had stimulating illustrations and the contents were well presented and easy-to-read for students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>History, geography and civics</td>
<td>Coverage of EU topics was marginal, equating to 3 pages out of 70, for the younger age group (14-15). The textbook for the older age group (15-16) there is a significant amount of coverage, most of the information relates to geography.</td>
<td>The textbooks were considered to be appealing with illustrations and maps presented in a way that would be easily understood by young people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Geography, Law and History</td>
<td>In one textbook the EU receives marginal coverage as a subchapter. In the other two textbooks the EU receives much more coverage with a separate chapter (20-30 pages) dedicated to EU issues.</td>
<td>The textbooks are very ‘academic’ and not viewed as particularly appealing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>Geography, Politics and History</td>
<td>With the exception of one textbook where the EU comprised a separate chapter, coverage was marginal.</td>
<td>The material was appealing as there were some illustrations, maps, charts, text from newspapers, interviews, internet sources and some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Textbook subjects</td>
<td>Coverage of EU topics</td>
<td>Attractiveness of content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Civic education</td>
<td>EU content is a sub-chapter of the text book.</td>
<td>The material was not considered appealing with the information presented in quite a 'dry' manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Geography, history, economics</td>
<td>The EU topics were included in sub-chapters of the text books which meant that only a small part of the text books were dedicated to EU issues.</td>
<td>The textbooks were considered to be mostly appealing with boxes of key information, pictures of EU institutions and colourful maps and charts and the text was presented in an understandable way using colour, bold text and bullet points.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of additional materials beyond the available textbooks, the primary issue that teachers raised was that they felt it often was not a question of being able to find enough materials, but that materials were not always easily identifiable as being appropriate to use with their class.

### Identifying appropriate materials

There is good availability of materials and information on the EU that teachers can use, however whilst availability is not the issue there is a difficulty in identifying what is appropriate to use in the classroom due to:

- The content not being appropriate for the level of teaching they are doing – Netherlands
- The information available is not presented as specific teaching material, but more general information. Therefore it has to be adapted to meet teaching needs – Spain
- Checking whether the information is up-to-date and current is time consuming – Scotland, Belgium, Denmark
- Not knowing what will raise the interest of the group of students they teach – Czech Republic, Latvia, Denmark, the Netherlands, Scotland.

Teachers in the Netherlands, Scotland, Denmark and Spain all mentioned that they felt there was enough materials available, however these materials were not always specifically educational materials (rather they are more general materials such as booklets or online resources aimed at the general public), where they were educational materials they were not targeted at the level of teaching they were doing, it was difficult to know what was current and accurate and that teachers have to adapt the materials to their own teaching needs which can be a time consuming activity. Using materials that are not current or accurate can potentially harm student engagement with the topic.

Interestingly, five of the case-study schools (Bulgaria, Finland, Italy, the Netherlands, and Poland) all mentioned that they are using materials that they located from the Europe Direct information centres.

### 4.3.2 Knowing what methods to use

Whilst teachers felt that there are plenty of materials about the EU, even if there are difficulties identifying what is appropriate to use with their class, teachers did express the opinion that there could be more support for teaching methods. Those interviewed in Belgium, Denmark, the Netherlands and Portugal all raised the issue of using appropriate methods in their classrooms. The issue brought up in these cases was the use of interactive teaching techniques.
The majority of those interviewed identified interactive methods as being the most effective to teach EU topics as these were highly likely to stimulate interest in the issues among their students. In the experience of those in Bulgaria, teaching about the EU using attractive interactive approaches not only has the potential to grab the attention of young people, but involves them fully in the learning process.

Students also prefer interactive teaching methods. Young people in Portugal, France, Belgium, Latvia, Italy, Scotland and Spain all mentioned that they find interactive methods more interesting than theoretical learning. They identified the use of pictures, videos, online materials, quizzes, games, having classroom discussions and engaging with sources of information from the media as being something they favour. It creates more stimulation in the classroom in comparison to rote learning of EU facts. Also, it was not simply the case of bringing one of these methods into the classroom, but using a diverse range of pedagogies that was most motivating.

“It is most interesting when teachers use videos or movies, books or literature, stories and newspaper articles to teach about the EU. The teaching should be diverse and not the same all the time.” Students in Belgium

Students in Italy also cautioned that whilst a range of interactive methods being used in the classroom is most appealing to them, it also depends on the way the methods are used by the teacher. They stated that it was important for them as students to get involved with the methods being used in the classroom.

The issue of how teachers use interactive methods in the classroom was not only a concern for students that were interviewed. Teachers in Belgium, Denmark, the Netherlands, Portugal, France and Poland all expressed their difficulties in incorporating interactive methods into their regular teaching on EU issues. The first struggle was discerning which interactive methods to use in the classroom, for example teachers in Belgium, Denmark, the Netherlands and Portugal conveyed that they were not well prepared and were unsure about delivering EU topics in an interactive and participatory way that would encourage student learning. Secondly, the time involved in designing and implementing these types of methods was also viewed as a barrier to engaging in these types of approaches.

“If there wasn’t something available, it would be difficult to come up with something myself as I’m not that creative and the time it takes to come up with interactive teaching methods is too much of a burden. I wouldn’t spend the time doing it”. Teacher in Denmark

### 4.4 Getting support

The fieldwork took place in schools which had all become involved with initiatives to support EU learning. Therefore, the school personnel the study researchers spoke to had sought external support from an outside organisation or initiative. This assistance took a variety of forms, from providing schools with appropriate materials to use in their classrooms, to delivering interactive techniques. Table 4.4 below briefly outlines the support that the initiatives provide.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.4 Types of support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bringing an initiative into the school to support EU learning was often a result of one or two teachers being motivated and interested enough in EU topics. The case-studies in Belgium, Bulgaria, Germany, Finland, Italy, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Scotland and Spain all
emphasised the motivation of particular teachers. For example, in Germany and Finland, it was the personal interest of one particular subject teacher that resulted in the students taking part in the simulation game. The same scenario holds for Belgium where ‘Europe Day’ events the school has organised have depended on two devoted teachers who have ensured it has been successful. Likewise, in Portugal the European club has a motivated coordinator and depends on the commitment of that teacher. Without the investment of their extra-curricular time, the club would not survive.

The case-studies revealed that the school head or the philosophy of the school in relation to the value placed on EU topics plays an important supporting role for teachers bringing EU topics into their classrooms. In Belgium, the school has a long history of holding Europe Day events at the school and therefore it is now part of the school’s mission. The philosophy of the school in Spain includes the promotion of European values and aims to equip students to feel integrated into European society making it easier to bring EU supports into the school. The school’s mission in Portugal is also to broaden student’s views about the EU and to foster a feeling of belonging to the EU. Given that the school missions and leadership value EU learning, teachers receive the necessary support to engage in an initiative which assists EU learning.

Although this issue was not raised in all case-studies, the personnel in a number of the case study schools were involved in partnerships or networks, for example in Portugal, Denmark, the Netherlands and Belgium. Being part of network kept schools informed of activities or developments in the area of EU learning, and from the side of the initiative enabled them to ensure that the supports they offer continue to meet the needs of schools, teachers and students.

### Successful networking

According to the Danish case-study, running a successful network has its challenges. In their experience the first hurdle was to get teachers involved in joining the network. Therefore, they incentivised membership by providing their materials and services to schools and teachers upon condition that they agreed to join the network and to work with the initiative to identify what their needs were. However, they still had difficulties in engaging teachers to share with one another. Therefore, the initiative replaced network meetings with conferences that involve not only teachers, but include textbook authors, university personnel, experts on the EU etc. This strategy of bringing together many stakeholders has so far proven to be very attractive to teachers and has been successful in engaging them.

In Portugal a similar experience was described. The European clubs are funded and coordinated by the Ministry of Education and Science and therefore clubs apply centrally and are enrolled into the national network of European clubs. The network coordination makes sure that the clubs follow the main objectives of the initiative when they develop their activities in the annual programme. The Ministry also keeps in contact with the clubs that are registered with the network such as providing information and answering questions or requests that they may have. They also provide clubs with ideas of activities that can be developed and acts as a bridge between the clubs and other associations that want to develop activities related to the EU with the schools. The main incentive behind joining the network for schools is that only those clubs that register with the network receive funding for their activities.

### 4.5 What works?

#### 4.5.1 Bring EU topics closer to students

Even though students see evidence of the EU in many different areas of the world around them, such as hearing the media make reference to it, seeing EU funding in action and learning about it at school, EU issues can feel very distant and far away from the day to day life that students live. Every single case-study described how making the connection between the daily lives of students and the EU is an effective starting point when fostering EU learning among students.
As mentioned earlier, student's interest in the EU is generally in relation to topical issues such as the economic crisis. Therefore, initiatives and teachers in cases such as Denmark, Finland, Poland and Spain found that it was effective to capitalise on this, and bring these topics closer to students by exploring these issues using interactive and/or participatory approaches.

Another strategy mentioned in countries such as France, the Czech Republic, Latvia, Portugal and Italy was to teach students about the benefits being part of the EU brings to them as EU citizens, such as the ability to study or work abroad.

### EU topics are relevant for students' lives

In Spain, the case-study school took part in the Francisco Javier de Landaburu Civis award which was organised by Eurobask. Eurobask is an award targeted at Basque secondary education level students and is awarded on the basis of projects presented around the subject topic chosen for the European Year. The subject topic was so close to the student's lives so they could relate and this also allowed them to make the link between their personal experience and the EU. Thanks to the initiative they discovered that the EU is not only about things that are far away or that they do not understand, but also about things that matter in their day-to-day lives.

In Latvia, during the discussion that took place with students they emphasised many times that they are more interested in learning about things that concern them. They would like to study facts about the EU much less and learn more about the issues that can be brought to bear in real life situations. Students mentioned topics such as climate change, budget issues, travelling and studying abroad.

### 4.5.2 Give students ownership of the learning process

Whilst the first step was to stimulate student interest and demonstrate how the EU relates to their lives, another success factor was to give students responsibility for their own learning. Giving students responsibility or roles in the learning process enables students to take part directly in the educational process rather than being passive learners. This responsibility results in students having ownership over the experience and what they learned.

In Denmark, Germany and Finland this involved giving students ownership over their roles in simulation games. In Scotland, Portugal, Italy and Spain it is the students that decide what topics they want to cover about the EU and the activities they want to carry out when they take part in the initiative (be it the European extra-curricular club, preparation for the Euroquiz or projects they carry out on EU learning).

### Student ownership

In the Portuguese case-study the school runs a European Club where students have to help organise activities and games for the whole school (e.g. developing stands, games, etc. for the school fairs). They feel responsible for the activity they run and develop strategies to engage other students to take part to the activities. The success of the club lies on the fact that it enables students to feel responsible for something they created. Consequently, it makes them feel engaged with a project/cause.

The Spanish initiative is designed in such a way that students can prepare the group project on their own with little guidance from their teachers. Students took decisions themselves. They divided the work among themselves, so each person of the team was responsible for a particular task.

In the Dutch school, students are trained for one hour per week on the EU in order to gain the status of EU Ambassador and then they will teach their peers about the EU as part of the social sciences subject. This enables them to put in practice their knowledge and feel responsible for transmitting what they have learnt.

### 4.5.3 External stimulation

The majority of the case-studies highlighted the importance of using external stimulation. In order to see the relevance of this strategy, it is helpful to think about the daily life of students...
while at school. Whilst there is no average length of the school day in Europe in terms of the amount of hours due to a lack of comparable data, students spend long periods of time sitting in a classroom listening to one or more teachers. Any variation in this model, for example by bringing in an external speaker to the classroom, can stimulate the students and motivate their learning simply by the presence of a ‘new’ person. The issue of external stimulation for students was commented upon in all the case-studies that this study looked at.

There were a number of key elements as to why having an external speaker was seen as a significant success factor. Firstly, those who are external to the school can have a new way of speaking in comparison to their teachers which has a good chance of sparking their interest and having them listen. The external actors also often bring variety and new methods into the classroom that students may not have experienced before, such as using games, making interactive presentations or carrying out a simulation with the group. It is not only new methods, but new perspectives on EU issues that are also brought into the school. The Danish case-study also felt that bringing in speakers, such as politicians or those working at the EU level made students more aware of the importance of the EU if these real people spent their working lives dedicated to EU issues. Likewise, evidence from a number of the case-studies suggests that bringing in external speakers who are young and therefore close in age to the target audience of young students was effective as the students could identify with them and viewed them as their peers.

### External visitors who are young

The Czech Republic case-study uses an innovative idea developed originally in Germany. The university organises and arranges for visiting Erasmus students from another country to visit schools. The Erasmus students make a presentation to students in schools and speak about a topic of their interest and engage in interactive activities with the pupils. Whilst the topics are not focussed on teaching EU issues directly, it gives pupils a positive experience of the diversity of the EU and of the possibilities it offers in terms of mobility.

In the French case-study the volunteers that visit schools to discuss EU topics are also young people (aged between 18-30 years old). Students were more interested in what people of more or less the same generation as them told them. Furthermore, these young people also shared the same cultural references as the students.

The evidence from the case-studies suggests that having external visitors in the form of speakers, those who run activities or those who work in the EU area, was most likely to spark interest in students about EU issues. However, there were limitations to this approach which were primarily financial. Schools often struggled to find funding in order to support activities that involve external speakers or visits outside the school (such was the case in the Czech Republic, Latvia and Poland). Whilst the experience of engaging politicians in school visits was very positive in Denmark and widely used by the initiative there, in the Netherlands the initiative had the opposite experience with politicians declining or not responding to requests to visit schools.

4.5.4 Using interactive methods

As was mentioned earlier, teachers that were interviewed all saw the value of using interactive and participatory teaching techniques to bring EU topics into their regular teaching. However, these approaches were not always chosen by teachers in the classroom as there were issues knowing how to incorporate these methods into their teaching and the amount of preparation time using these techniques requires of teachers. Therefore, the teachers in Denmark, Finland, Germany, Belgium, the Czech Republic, Poland, Italy, and France all turned to the initiatives that carried out interactive methods with the students. In Bulgaria teachers turned to the initiative in order to be trained in using interactive teaching and in Spain, the Netherlands, Latvia, Scotland and Portugal teachers implemented interactive teaching methods with their students with support from the initiatives.

Therefore, all of the case-study initiatives incorporated interactive and participatory methods into their programme in a variety of ways. There was a strong belief, not only amongst the
initiative promoters, but teachers and students that interactive techniques were most effective in reaching students about EU issues. Therefore, the added value of getting the school and students involved with these initiatives was their ability to bring these types of activities into the school or support their own efforts to use these approaches.

Interactive techniques varied from role play in simulation games, carrying out classroom discussions and debates on EU issues, using presentations in the classroom, interactive quizzes and games as well the Bulgarian case which was training teachers to use interactive methods in their classrooms.

The benefits of interactive techniques were seen to be that students found the activities very engaging and it promoted collaborative learning among peers. Students were also profiting from learning by doing rather than being passive learners. The activity basis of interactive learning was perceived as being more stimulating for learners in comparison to more traditional theory based teaching.

At the same time it has to be noted that to use interactive methods effectively it is important that students already have some basic knowledge of the EU. The interactive methods are strong in developing an understanding of the EU but, due to the time required, they often cannot convey a large volume of knowledge. At the same time for students to develop an understanding of the EU, they need to have some knowledge of it. Therefore interactive methods are often used in combination with more traditional classroom-based lecture-format teaching or autonomous study by the students outside the classroom.

**Interactive techniques**

In Bulgaria, the initiative trains teachers to be able to use interactive methods in their classrooms. The teachers usually undergo three training modules– thematic, methodological, and a module on how to design and implement a mini project. One example is the use of educational theatre to teach children about EU rights.

The initiative in Germany runs a simulation game with students at a venue in Berlin. Students play their roles in the game and have to agree on a compromise relating to the EU issue that is being discussed at the end of the game and they have to make a presentation of their solution. From the student’s point of view the participation in the game was a great addition to what they had learned in class and the interviewed students agreed that they gained a deeper understanding of the legislative process in the EU Parliament and the EU parties, as well as a more personal relation to the EU institutions. For the teacher the participation had been a success because the method of the experimental simulation games was a great addition to what she was able to do in her classes in school. The teacher had the feeling that the students were more interested in politics in general. Another successful aspect of the game was that quiet students who are not very participative in class became really activated through their role.

### 4.6 After students have exposure to EU topics

The ultimate goal of many of these activities was to improve the democratic skills of students and develop civic competences by raising student awareness of EU issues and to apply critical thinking.

Bringing EU topics closer to students and illustrating how the EU bears on the lives of EU citizens, the students gain knowledge of the EU beyond the simple facts and figures. The evidence from the case-studies suggests it increases student awareness of how the EU works and the effects of the EU on the average person. As a result of illustrating the influence and connection between the EU and the lives of students, students are free to form their own opinions on EU issues in an informed way.

The EU learning that took place as a result of the initiatives that these schools took part in, often went beyond theoretical learning to explore real EU issues such as how the EU works in practice, the cultural aspects of the EU, what possibilities there are as a result of EU membership etc. According to the students in the German case, they felt this led them to have a more personal relationship with EU issues and were more interested in the current political debates. Italian students expressed similar sentiments.
The use of external speakers or activities and interactive techniques was considered to be particularly beneficial for student learning and the transfer of more lasting knowledge. Activities, such as those carried out in the Czech Republic involving Erasmus students visiting classrooms or those in Bulgaria teaching students about EU citizenship went beyond developing EU knowledge of facts and were perceived as creating a European consciousness among young people.

The case-studies also provided some evidence that being involved with EU learning in a way that really connects with students sparks an interest among young people to want to find out more about these issues beyond the time period of the initiative in their school.

“The more we know about the EU, the more we feel it. It’s like with a school: the more we get to know it, the more part of it we feel” Poland, Students

Nevertheless, despite many positive outcomes, there were some identifiable weaknesses. Some of the initiatives could be considered one-off in nature rather than developing something that was more integrated into regular teaching in the classroom. Though these one-off initiatives sparked interest amongst students and did transfer EU knowledge, given the complexity of EU topics students still found it difficult to understand all the issues that had been raised and still viewed EU topics as being complicated.

Problems relating to reaching the target group were also raised. For example, in France, students were hard to reach. Though they were attracted by the interactive approach that the initiative took, most of the students in this case had limited or no interest in the EU as a topic. This might be related to the demographic of this school which was mainly students from more disadvantaged backgrounds and therefore the students felt that the EU was very far away from their reality and lives. Furthermore, although the initiative visits up to 200 schools per annum, it only takes place in the school for one hour and therefore it is reliant on teachers to invest more of their classroom time to integrating EU issues into their classes.

The Spanish case-study raises a similar issue as the competition primarily receives applications from private schools with a higher socioeconomic demographic and therefore is not reaching students from lower socioeconomic schools. The Scottish initiative has extensive reach with around 400 schools in 31 of the 32 local authorities participating in the Euroquiz. However, increasing the number of schools that participate has been a challenge for them which suggests that there may be schools that prioritise learning about the EU to a lesser degree who are not reached by the initiative. To address this, they have concentrated on building strong relationships with local authorities so that they can use local knowledge and links to reach and recruit schools.

### Table 4.5 Reach of the initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Reach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>The initiative reaches up to 5,000 students a year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>30-40 teachers are trained by EDIC every year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>The initiative began in around 5 schools in 2008/09 and today there are around 30 presentations given by Erasmus students in schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>12 democracy cafes (simulation games) are held each year. The initiative is not able to keep up with demand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>30-40 schools take part in interactive simulations every year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>The initiative visits up to 200 schools every year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>The initiative runs around 200 simulation games and holds around 15 teacher training courses training approximately 150 teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>31 schools have participated in the initiative since December 2011.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>There are 43 participating schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>No statistics on who is using the material are available, as the material is also available online. 1500 CDs were recorded for teachers to use in the classes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>56 Euro lessons took place in 2012.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>There are 300 European clubs registered in the national network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>400 schools in 31 of 32 local authorities take part in the quiz with a total of 1,600 pupils.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>On average there are 10 projects submitted to the competition each year, primarily from private schools.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5 What can the EU do?

5.1 Key issues for the scenarios to incorporate

From the analysis presented in the previous section, there are a number of key issues that potential EU level support should bear in mind and seek to incorporate into any future action in the area.

Outreach

- The study found that although EU topics are generally taught across the different education levels and across various subjects of compulsory education, they primarily constitute a small part of the curriculum that a given teacher has to deliver. Furthermore, EU topics are not often viewed as being particularly ‘hot’ topics. The implication from this finding is that support for EU teaching is not always a priority among key stakeholders such as schools or teachers, teacher training institutions or other associations who do or could play a role in supporting EU learning. Therefore, these key stakeholders which may be the target group for EU level action may not actively express their interest or actively seek support to teach EU topics. As a result, actions may be most effective if they reach out to stakeholders rather than relying on the target group to apply for the support.

Networking

- Networks and networking activities including mutual learning and exchange can serve a number of beneficial purposes, including creating the conditions for effectively supporting and stimulating teachers to teach EU topics. Networks can be particularly valuable when the network is composed of multiple types of stakeholders, for example networking can provide the opportunity for teachers to be connected to other schools, universities, NGOs, politicians, experts, textbook authors etc. rather than solely other teachers. These activities are not only advantageous for teachers and schools, but organisations involved in these networks can also learn from network members in terms of what the needs are and what supports they require.

Needs assessment

- Given that EU topics are not a main priority of the curricula and the limitations on teachers time to invest in effectively teaching EU topics, schools and teachers need supports that can effectively provide them with assistance that is adapted and relevant to their particular needs. This means that the supports for EU learning cannot be demanding in terms of the amount of time and effort that a given teacher would have to dedicate to it. Supports should also take into account issues such as the age group of students, how relevant the topics are for that group of students, and provision of stimulating and interactive methods. Meeting the needs of the schools/teachers/students should also be taken into consideration. Whilst there should be a focus on excellence, the scenarios should also consider who is best positioned in terms of effective delivery of activities with schools, teachers and students. It may be the case that higher education institutions are not always best placed to work with these particular target groups. For example, the analysis highlighted the importance of effective interactive teaching methods, and it may be the case that some higher education institutions have difficulty adapting to the pedagogical skills required to work with school students in comparison to university students.

Furthermore, there are a number of broader issues that are related to the introduction of a new action or modifications to existing actions which would also have to be weighed up.

Scope/Reach

- The characteristics of an action create a situation where there is potential to reach a large volume of stakeholders, schools and/or students. Given the priorities and goals of an action it may be designed in such a way that has consequences for its potential scope. Actions may face the limitation of only reaching a small number of beneficiaries in
order to fund larger or longer-term activities, or actions may have the potential to involve larger numbers of the target group. The reach is affected by the likelihood of it being taken up by those at who it is targeted which is reliant upon how well the action has been designed to meet their needs, whether they know about it, etc.

Effort/Resources

- This refers to the amount of effort and resources at the EU level that the scenario would require. Effort and resources can be necessitated to varying degrees to build, brand, coordinate and fund the proposed activities of the action. The amount of effort and resources depends on whether the proposed scenario requires a new action or builds on existing measures, works with target groups that are well versed and active in the area or requires the recruitment of those who do not have experience in the area, requires a large amount of funding for activities or whether levels of funding would be relatively modest etc. Efforts and resources also include whether the action is targeted towards those that would be most effective in supporting EU learning. For example, the analysis shows that it is primarily institutions and associations outside of higher education that are involved in delivering teacher education on EU issues. Therefore, a scenario where other stakeholders would be funded to carry out these activities may require more effort and resources rather than funding stakeholders who are already engaged in these types of activities.

Visibility

- Visibility of a given scenario depends upon the approach taken. Some scenarios can be thought of as being clearly identifiable as measures at the EU level whose purpose is to support EU learning, whereas others are not if learning about the EU is not at the core. This is dependent on the way the scenario is designed and is mainly related to whether the core business of the scenario is to support EU learning, or whether the core objective is broader or incorporates other elements that are not specific to supporting EU learning but can be utilised in such a way.

5.2 Scenarios for EU action

Assumptions

When developing these scenarios, the study assumes that the following aspects of any potential action for Learning Europe at School will remain unchanged:

- Based on the Treaty, the EU cannot require changes to the curricula of Member States:
  Member States are responsible for deciding their own curricula for compulsory education; therefore EU Member States will continue to set their own national education policies rather than implementing an EU-wide policy laid down by law.

- Participation in EU actions supporting Learning EU at School is voluntary:
  The EU can provide actions and support for Learning EU at School, but it is up to stakeholders, schools and Member States to decide whether they participate or not.

- The EU can provide funding for projects/products:
  Projects and/or products that involve learning about the EU during compulsory education could be supported by funding at the EU level through various action lines.

- The EU can arrange exchange of experience:
  Exchange of experience means that stakeholders can learn from each other by sharing information and comparing practices/methods/projects etc.

- The amount of EU funding is unlikely to change significantly:
  It is assumed that the amount of EU funding is not likely to change significantly in terms of significant increases or decreases in the budget that can be dedicated to Learning Europe at School. Currently, the Jean Monnet ‘Learning Europe at School’ action has an annual budget of 2 million euro.
The following scenarios are the result of discussions that took place with stakeholders during the course of two events and take into account the key issues that arose from the study analysis. An initial discussion relating to potential EU action took place amongst 24 stakeholders during the workshop which was organised by the study team at the end of May 2012. As a result of these discussions, virtual and physical networking activities and training of teachers were identified as important areas where EU action could support EU learning.

Potential action was further discussed at the reflection panel held in October 2012. The participants at the reflection panel brainstormed about the opinions for EU action taking into account the Commission competence in education and training and within the limits of current funding levels allocated to the Learning EU in schools actions. In addition to the supports identified at the earlier event, discussions were held in relation to the current Jean Monnet and Erasmus actions and the concept of a label.

As a result of these consultations, the following six scenarios were identified as plausible future options:

1. Strengthen the focus of the Jean Monnet Module sub-action on teacher education;
2. Strengthen the activities of the Jean Monnet Learning Europe at School action;
3. Strengthen the focus of the eTwinning virtual platform on EU topics;
4. Support EU learning networks at national level and exchange between the networks at the EU level;
5. Add a Learning EU at school element to the Erasmus Student mobility action;
6. Issue a ‘Euro Teacher’ label to teachers in recognition of their competence to teach EU topics.
Scenario 1: Strengthen the focus of Jean Monnet Module sub-action on teacher education

Status quo:

- Jean Monnet Modules are short teaching programmes/courses of a minimum of 40 teaching hours in the field of European integration studies.
- The action is open to all higher education institutions and is not open to other organisations.
- Higher education institutions that are involved in training future teachers are also eligible to apply for funding for a Jean Monnet Module. Some teacher education institutions have been awarded Jean Monnet Module funding.
- However, there are very few teacher training institutions that have applied for Jean Monnet Module funding. They are not clearly visible as a group of beneficiaries and therefore do not create a community of funded projects with a similar focus. The action is not specifically visible to teacher training institutions. Those who apply identify this funding possibility on ad-hoc basis.
- There is no specific promotion of Jean Monnet action with teacher training institutions. Therefore the action is currently not explicitly supporting the learning about the EU in schools.

Proposed change:

In summary, this scenario consists of stimulating greater take up of teacher training institutions in the Jean Monnet module sub-action.

- Currently, teacher training institutions are not particularly aware of or interested in taking part in this action. To address this, the Executive Agency would do outreach activities to teacher education institutions
  - The first step is to identify a pool of institutions which are likely to participate. These institutions will have to be made aware of the opportunity to apply for funding to design and deliver teaching on this matter.
  - The awareness raising can take various forms. An information event targeted to the pool of identified institutions can be organised. Promotional material could be sent to individual contacts as sending it to a general address at the institution is unlikely to be as effective. The agency could host webinars to present the action specifically to the identified contacts in the teacher training institutions.
- There should be a clearly defined part of funding that would be reserved for teacher training institutions – an internal quota
  - The Executive Agency would decide and agree a percentage of the Jean Monnet module projects funding which would be dedicated to funding teacher training institutions.
- In order to foster exchange of ideas amongst institutions taking part, the EACEA would support mutual learning among institutions. This would take the form of seminars focused on common work and peer-advice. There could even be an element of peer-review.
  - This would also increase the visibility to the teacher education within the action in order to build up an identifiable element of the module that supports learning about the EU for trainee teachers.

Alternative:

An alternative option can also be considered. In addition on focusing on the content of the teaching module (EU integration issues) it would also emphasise the development of methodologies for teaching about EU topics. One of the challenges of the ‘basic option’ is that the Modules can be too academic or too focused on

---

46 included in the list of institutions funded by the action are some teacher training institutions, e.g. Bessenyei György Teacher Training College, Vitéz János Roman Catholic Teachers Training College
knowledge of the EU. However, in practice, future teachers do not only need to know what to teach about the EU but also how to make it attractive and effective for their pupils and students. This could be addressed by building requirements for working on teaching methods into the call.

- This option would have to be addressed in a separate call where teacher training institutions are only eligible to apply. Other institutions applying for the Jean Monnet Module would not have to comply with this requirement as they are not targeting future teachers but students in other areas.

**Target Group:** Higher education institutions that deliver teacher training would be the main target group in terms of those eligible to apply for funding. The ultimate beneficiary of the action would be trainee teachers who would increase their knowledge about European integration, and their future students.

**Rationale:** EU topics are rarely covered during initial or continuous teacher training in most Member States of the EU. Therefore, one obstacle to teaching EU topics in the classroom is a lack of knowledge amongst teachers about the EU. This action can support programmes that educate teachers about EU integration issues which would go some way towards addressing the gap in teacher training on the EU.

**Strengths:**

- The existing Jean Monnet Module sub-action would remain, therefore there is no need to create a new action
- The proposal is to further develop teacher training on EU topics, the Learning Europe at School study shows that this lacking in most Member States
- The Jean Monnet Module is already known and has an identity
- The proposed changes would not require large inputs in terms of resources (both monetary and non-monetary)

**Challenges:**

- Identifying the pool of teacher training institutions to target will require some efforts. As said earlier the outreach activities will need to be addressed toward clearly defined persons in order to be effective.
- Limited reach, there will only be a limited number of teacher training institutions that this sub-action can provide funding for.
- The module requires a substantial stand-alone programme (40 hours) on EU integration issues to be developed. Teacher training institutions may be reluctant to create a full module dedicated to EU topics alone, as EU topics are not a complete subject area in most national curricula and are taught by teachers as part of other subjects. It is also unclear if there would be take-up by trainee teachers of the module once it is in place. Alternatively the action could fund shorter courses (e.g. 10 hours) open to future teachers in different subject areas (civics, geography, history).
- The modules developed run the risk of being too academic as it is only higher education institutions that eligible for funding and no other stakeholders would be involved.
- The executive agency may not have the capacity to carry out the outreach activities and therefore could consider externalisation.

**Resources:** Currently modules developed under this sub-action can receive up to 21,000 euro over a three year period. This would remain unchanged under this scenario. However, further resources would be needed for the executive agency to conduct outreach and marketing.
**Scenario 2: Strengthen the activities of the Jean Monnet Learning Europe at School action**

**Status quo:**

- The Jean Monnet ‘Learning Europe at School’ action funds a range of activities to support learning about the EU at school.
- The action is open to Higher Education Institutions with experience in teaching and conducting research on European integration issues, and
  - Associations of professors and researchers specialising in European integration studies;
  - Associations of teachers and pedagogues;
  - Associations that are involved in continuing education and training;
  - Associations of higher education institutions and/or schools.
- The action is not open to schools to directly apply.
- Although schools cannot apply directly themselves, a list of schools that have agreed to take part in a project must be submitted with the application.
- Current activities that are eligible for funding are to:
  - Develop and deliver content/material to teach EU integration in primary/secondary/vocational education.
  - Implement teacher training and CPD for teachers to provide them with skills to teach European integration.
  - Provide specially designed seminars or workshops to students in primary/secondary/vocational education on EU integration.
- As currently set up, the action emphasises the quality of the content about the EU. The higher education institutions taking part are expected to guarantee that the information about the EU in the project is accurate. However, it is not clear to what extent the action emphasises other aspects of quality – in particular the extent to which the activities and products are adapted to the needs of the final target group (teachers and pupils/students in compulsory education). The application process does not require the applicant to show that the pedagogical and communication aspects will be tackled accurately.
- Projects receive funding for a period of one year which is a relatively short time to create and implement activities.
- Given the time involved in designing a specific new action to support EU learning it would be a number of years before activities would begin to be funded. Therefore, the initiative was designed using the existing action of ‘Information and Research activities’ in the framework of Jean Monnet. The fact the action had to be designed for this purpose meant that the goals of the Jean Monnet Learning EU at School action had to be adapted to fit those of the existing framework.

**Proposed change:**

*This scenario is about enhancing the pedagogical aspects and responsiveness to schools’ needs of projects funded via the Learning Europe at School action.*

- Priority should not be given to developing content/material as the core purpose or activity of the project. Evidence from the ‘Learning Europe at School’ study suggests that a lack of materials is not the main obstacle to teaching EU topics.
  - The creation of materials to teach EU integration should be a by-product of the other funded activities.
- Make it a requirement that projects carry out a needs assessment for the proposed activities.
  - To ensure that the projects understand the kinds of problems teachers experience. Projects identify the requirements for their activities to meet this need.
  - The projects should be driven by concrete needs of schools and teachers and they should emphasise not only the content – in terms of knowledge of the EU – but also the methods to teach about the EU.
  - The projects should focus on teachers (rather than students alone) to enhance
sustainability.

- Organise exchange between the projects in the early stages of setting up.
  - 2 or 3 physical events focusing on joint work and peer-advice using participatory leadership techniques to foster mutual learning and networking.

- Fund projects for a longer period of time.
  - As said above the current funding is one year but it is not clear if the projects funded continue their activities beyond this one year period. Consideration could be given to providing funding for a longer period of time, such as three years in line with the way Jean Monnet Modules are funded.

Alternatively the action would encourage cooperation between higher education institutions, multiplier organisations (NGOs or other) and schools. Higher education institutions and their staff would have the role of experts and would guarantee the ‘EU-focused’ content of the activities. Multiplier organisations would be in charge of arranging and implementing the process of exchange and learning between higher education institutions and teachers. Schools would be the target group. Under this alternative it would be preferable for the multiplier organisations to be the leading project partner as they would be the bodies in charge of implementation. Higher education institutions are more likely to be interested in offering expertise rather than in the practical aspects of the project which would be better taken care of by another type of bodies.

Target Group: Higher education institutions and associations of those primarily in found in these institutions who have experience teaching and researching European integration issues are the main target group in terms of those eligible to apply for funding. The action targets this type of organisation because they can guarantee the quality of the content when it comes to information about/ understanding of the EU. In the alternative option, multiplier organisations beyond the currently eligible associations would have a key role.

The main target group would be teachers teaching on EU topics that the activities would be aimed at. The ultimate beneficiary of the action would be students who potentially benefit from the projects submitted to take place in their school.

Rationale: This scenario brings together schools (teachers and pupils) which are expected to be interested in strengthening the EU dimension in their teaching and higher education institutions which have expertise on the EU. The main challenge is to ensure that the actions and products designed are adapted and usable by schools in a sustainable manner.

Strengths:

- Existing action would remain and would not have to create a new action
- It is an action that is clearly identifiable as a specific support for EU learning at school
- The proposed changes would not require significant additional resources
- Projects would be meeting the identified needs of schools and teachers
- Foster mutual learning between the projects

Challenges:

- Limited reach as only a relatively small number (47 projects in 2011) of projects receive funding.
- The projects developed run the risk of being too academic as it is primarily higher education institutions that are eligible to make the application for funding. Higher education institutions do not always have experience working together with schools and their approach may not fit the needs of schools or students.
- The alternative approach would require changes in how the action/ programme is set up as currently only higher education institutions are eligible applicants.

Resources: Currently projects developed under this sub-action can receive up to 60,000 euro for a one year period. The period of time would be extended under this scenario. Additional resources would be needed to create physical events in the setting up stages of the projects.
Scenario 3: Strengthen the focus of the eTwinning virtual platform on EU topics

Status quo:
- eTwinning currently offers a virtual web-based platform for school staff, including teachers, school heads, librarians etc. to communicate, collaborate and share information across European countries.
- The website enables users to connect with other teachers and form partnerships and collaborate on projects. Schools and teachers wishing to collaborate can be identified by particular subject areas, European Studies being one of these.
- The main concept is that schools pair with other schools in Europe to develop an eTwinning project. The schools communicate online and share and learn from each other.
- The platform also hosts ready-made project kits which give step-by-step guides to carry out eTwinning projects on specific topics. There is a section of guides under the category of ‘European Affairs and Politics’.
- eTwinning also hosts a ‘Learning Labs’ which are short online courses for teachers to improve their skills and connect them with other eTwinners.
- However, the ready-made project kits that have been developed for the purpose of EU learning are limited in number, it is difficult to identify schools interested in working on EU topics specifically and the eTwinning portal is not an obvious direct support to learning about the EU.

Proposed change:
This scenario is about enhancing the eTwinning portal to highlight EU learning collaboration among teachers, schools and students.
- Adapt the portal to enable teachers to easily identify schools who wish to collaborate on EU topics
  - Learning about the EU can fall under a number of the subjects listed on the eTwinning portal when identifying schools to collaborate with (e.g. history, European studies, citizenship, geography etc.). Therefore, the browsing facility to identify collaborating schools/teachers would be adapted to make EU specific projects more easily identifiable by creating a category for ‘EU topics’.
- Increase the number of project kits which focus on EU topics on the portal.
  - Identify existing tools and projects that have been developed, such as those previously funded under the ‘Learning EU at School’ action, and feature them as project kits on the eTwinning portal.
- Award a special prize for projects that promote learning about the EU
  - This would be similar to the Mevlana prize for intercultural understanding which would highlight projects on EU learning.
- Support the creation of a learning lab which delivers a course to teachers on teaching EU topics.
  - Identify experts to develop and deliver teacher training (this could be attached to the projects that have been funded under ‘Learning Europe at School’).

Alternative:
In addition to the above, the target groups would be expanded from teachers to teacher trainers. The restriction to register to use the platform would be expanded from only school personnel to include teacher trainers who would collaborate and communicate with teachers on the platform.
- This would have to be a separate section of the eTwinning platform, or the whole model of eTwinning would have to include access to teacher trainers which would change the fundamental basis of the platform.

Target Group: The virtual community would directly target school personnel (and teacher
trainers under the alternative) and indirectly it would benefit the students of those teachers.

**Rationale:** This action would aim to foster the exchange of ideas and practice among teachers and enable multiple schools to work together on a project focused on EU topics (and under the alternative this could also include cooperation with teacher trainers).

**Strengths:**
- The existing infrastructure of the eTwinning portal, which has a presence amongst school personnel, can be exploited for more impact than setting up a new portal.
- The current eTwinning portal has a relatively large reach which could be utilised.
- It would not require many additional inputs in terms of resources.
- Interested schools that wish to work or are working on EU topics would be more easily identifiable for those looking to collaborate than currently exists.
- Support for learning about the EU would become more visible to teachers if it was a more identifiable topic on the eTwinning portal, was a Learning Labs topic and/or an identifiable prize.
- Under the alternative option, it would foster partnerships between schools and teacher training institutions.

**Challenges:**
- Schools will only use the platform for the purpose of collaborating in areas that they are interested in. Given that EU topics are often not a main priority for teachers, despite the proposed changes to the platform, there is no guarantee that schools will wish to use the portal to collaborate in this specific area.
- There could be wider criticism if it is viewed that there is more attention or priority given on the platform to supporting projects that are about EU topics in comparison to other subjects/topics on the eTwinning platform.
- The changes to the eTwinning portal may only attract schools that are already active in the area of learning about EU topics and may not have a wider impact.

**Resources:** The suggested changes are to strengthen the existing eTwinning portal in the area of EU topics and therefore there would be a limited amount of additional resources needed.
Scenario 4: Support National level EU learning networks and exchange between the networks at the EU level

**Status quo:**
- There is no existing EU level support for physical networking on issues related to learning about the EU at school.

**Proposal:**

*This scenario is to support the establishment of national networks on EU learning and to enable EU level exchanges to take place between the various National networks.*

- The European Commission/Executive Agency would create an action to support EU learning networks.
  - Organisations who are involved in EU learning would be eligible to apply to coordinate a network of EU learning at the National level. These organisations eligible to apply would not be limited to universities, but would include NGOs or other associations working in the area.
  - Funding would be two-fold, so that it would support the coordination of the network and the activities of the network.
  - Activities to be funded would have to include a physical networking element (at both national and European level) whether this takes places through organised conferences, seminars, workshops or similar approaches.
- One National network per country would be supported. There is no requirement for each country to set up such network but the EC and the EACEA should promote the action to encourage large share of Member States to put in place a network. This could be similar to the model under which operates the action of Bologna expert teams or ECVET national expert teams under the Lifelong Learning Programme. However compared to these two actions the networks should be larger.
  - The networks could be coordinated by the National LLP agencies (such as it is the case for the other two networks named) or they could be coordinated by a third organisation.
  - If the latter is pursued, organisations that demonstrate that they are currently successfully promoting learning about the EU in schools amongst teachers should be eligible, in order to avoid overlap of national level activities. These could be NGOs but also public bodies (such as agencies in charge of curriculum development).
- Joining the network would be free for members.
  - To promote membership of the networks, the action would stipulate that and members of the network are not charged a fee to join.
- The activities of the network would be driven by the members but could consist of aspects such as:
  - Seminars/ workshops;
  - Peer-advice;
  - Showcasing good practice;
  - Working with those in charge of curriculum and text book design to ensure the topic is integrated into programmes/ textbooks adequately.
- The national networking could also be an opportunity to promote information about other existing options – in particular those presented in scenarios 1 and 3 which are already running. For example the networks could design new content for the eTwinning platform or encourage teacher training institutions to apply for Jean Monet modules.
- The European Commission/Executive Agency would do outreach activities to promote the new National networks.
  - Identify teacher associations and other similar bodies to create awareness of the new National networks and membership possibilities.
  - Promotion could include promotional material sent to contacts at teacher associations, webinars or similar information event. The promotion would have to
make clear what the benefits of joining the network would be.

- Support an EU level network of those coordinating national activities.
  - In order to foster the exchange of ideas, physical networking should also take place at the EU level.
  - An annual (or bi-annual) conference for organisations coordinating networking activities would take place which includes workshops and participatory methods to exchange ideas and foster cooperation.

**Target Group:** The target group would include all organisations working in the area of EU learning which would include NGOs/initiatives that are working in the area and other stakeholders such as universities or teacher associations.

**Rationale:** The physical network would bring together key personnel to primarily share good practice and give teachers and schools an opportunity to work together with each other and other key partners to improve the teaching of EU topics in their schools.

**Strengths:**

- The physical network would offer teachers and schools the opportunity to be connected to other schools and stakeholders (such as universities, politicians, experts in the area, textbook authors etc.) to exchange best practice and learn from each other. Virtual networks are viewed as being over saturated and physical networking therefore may be more effective at engaging people. Face-to-face interaction is a very effective form of communication, can be more useful for motivating people and can engage people more successfully.

- A physical network could also help activities on EU topics in schools to be more coordinated across schools rather than happening in isolation.

- Organisations coordinating the network would also learn from the members of the network in terms of their needs and provide a framework for activities or interventions in the area.

- Successful National networks working in this area would reach a greater number of teachers and other personnel than funding a small number of projects.

**Challenges:**

- This would require a new action to be set up.

- Supporting physical networking is resource intensive.

- Given the demands on teachers, it may be difficult to find the time to participate in a network if they are not somehow incentivised. Schools and teachers with little interest in EU topics may not see any added value to participating in such a network.

- The networks are very reliant on the competences of those carrying out the coordination and the interest of those wishing to join the network.

- The capacity at the EU level to coordinate such an action and related activities may not be available and may have to be externalised.

**Resources:** Resources would be needed to fund the action (funding for both coordination of the network and activities of the network) as well as funding for the EU networking events amongst National network coordinators. This funding would include the costs associated with physical meetings and events. Funding for the promotion of the National networks would also be required.
Scenario 5: Add a Learning EU at school element to the Erasmus Student mobility action

Status quo:
- The Erasmus Student Mobility action enables higher education students to study abroad for a period of time during their studies.
- Currently over 4,000 higher education institutions in 33 countries take part in the Erasmus programme.
- In 2010-11, 231,408 people went abroad to other European countries under the Erasmus Student Mobility action.
- Before students embark on the mobility period there is a learning agreement which is signed by the student and the sending and receiving institutions. The agreement sets out the details of the planned activities abroad.
- Mobility can only take place between higher education institutions that hold the Erasmus University Charter. The Charter sets out the principles and minimum requirements which the higher education institution must comply with when implementing its Erasmus activities.
- It is currently proposed that the Erasmus for All programme will begin in 2014-2020.
- The new programme will offer mobility opportunities to 2 million higher education students across Europe.
- This equates to a large volume of young people being mobile across Europe as a result of this EU action.

Proposed change:

*This scenario is about utilising student mobility periods abroad to bring EU topics into the classroom by having Erasmus students visit schools to discuss EU issues with students.*

The analysis in the remainder of this study shows that bringing external speakers to schools who can ‘impersonate’ what the EU means concretely is an effective way of raising pupils’ and students’ awareness.

- Eligibility to take part in this scenario would be reserved for Erasmus students who have some knowledge of the EU due to the nature of their studies, such as students of the economics, law, social science, political science, international studies etc. departments.
- Erasmus would finance specialised courses for these students to prepare them to visit schools:
  - Modelled on the current Erasmus Intensive Language Courses, a short course preparing students to give presentations on EU topics to school students would be financed.
  - These courses would present students with refresher information on the EU.
  - Students would also receive guidance on how to structure their presentations.
  - Students would receive examples of activities that can be carried out during their presentation. Creativity would be promoted.
- The participation of the Erasmus student in this activity would be voluntary. If they decide to take part it would be recorded in the Learning Agreement and recognised by issuing a participation certificate. For those students who volunteer, the Learning Agreements would be amended:
  - The learning agreements between sending and receiving institutions and the student would include a statement of the activities to be carried out by the student in relation to visiting a school.
- Erasmus coordinators would be responsible for coordination of the activities. The university could have access to additional resources to cover these activities:
  - Conduct outreach activities with schools in the area/region to promote the Learning EU element of Erasmus.
  - Would provide schools with a list of topics that Erasmus students can present at
the school.

– Coordinate the arriving Erasmus students by being the main contact point and offering advice about the local context.
– Organise the logistical aspects of the school visits.

**Target Group:** The beneficiaries of this scenario would be both the students of the schools that would be visited as they get a different perspective about the EU, and those on Erasmus students mobility periods visiting the schools would benefit from learning EU topics and connecting with the host country.

**Rationale:** This approach would not only teach students about the EU, but would engage students with the idea of the European Union and give them first-hand experience of what the EU funds and promotes. It would bring the EU closer into the classroom and lives of students which is often currently missing in classrooms; the connection of the EU to the daily lives of students.

**Strengths:**

- The Erasmus ‘brand’ is the most well-known of the programmes and adding a ‘learning about the EU’ dimension is likely to be very visible amongst schools who are interested in bringing the EU dimension into their classrooms.
- The volume of Erasmus students on mobility periods is large, therefore utilising this existing action to have visits take place in schools would have a large reach.
- Having external speakers come to the school can be particularly effective to spark both an interest in EU topics amongst students, and increase the chance of student recall.
- The use of younger people who are close in age to students in the schools they visit is likely to have better resonance with students at school.
- Erasmus students would also learn about the EU through this addition to the programme and would foster their integration into the host country/community.

**Challenges:**

- Because the interventions are so short in time, the focus is on raising awareness among pupils/students rather than on acquiring knowledge and understanding of the EU;
- Risks include the quality of what is delivered by Erasmus students in the schools and ensuring that the information they provide is accurate.
- Those on mobility periods may not be motivated to carry out such activities, take up if these activities are to be on a voluntary basis could be low. On the other hand such scheme is already operational in Germany on fully voluntary basis and in some universities in other countries and it appears that Universities do not face difficulties recruiting Erasmus students.
- Universities may not be interested in taking part because they may consider that such activities are not part of the core work. On the other hand many European universities see outreach activities as part of their core mission.
- Erasmus coordinators may not have interest in the additional tasks of coordinating these activities.
- Identifying schools to participate could be difficult for Erasmus coordinators who may not have links with local schools.
- The language skills of the mobile student may not include the host countries language, which would require additional resources (such as including language students) for translation services during student presentations.

**Resources:** Resources would be needed to coordinate such an action, such as the additional activities of the Erasmus coordinators in the host country to organise the visits to schools. Resources would also be required to carry out the initial preparation of students for the school visit. However, no further resources for the mobility element of the action would be required.
Scenario 6: Issue a ‘Euro Teacher’ label

Status quo:

- Currently National Quality labels can be awarded to eTwinning projects that meet eligibility requirements and are evaluated against set criteria. The National Support Services (NSS) who have been appointed by the national authorities to promote and implement eTwinning in their countries, carries out the evaluation of projects and awards the National Quality Labels.
- The National Support Service can propose a selection of National Quality label projects for the award of European Quality Label.
- Similarly, the European Language Label is an award for innovative projects in the field of teaching and learning languages that use new techniques in language teaching and spread knowledge of their existence.
- A similar model of awarding a label could be adopted in the area of EU learning by granting individual teachers a ‘Euro Teacher’ label to recognise competence to teach EU topics.

Proposal:

The ‘Euro Teacher’ label would be awarded to individual teachers in recognition of their competence to teach EU topics.

- The European Commission or Executive Agency would coordinate the ‘Euro Teacher’ label scheme.
  - The requirements to be considered eligible to make an application for a ‘Euro Teacher’ label would have to be identified.
  - These eligibility requirements would depend on how teacher competence to teach EU topics is defined (e.g. assessed knowledge of EU issues, involvement in an innovative project, participation in CPD in the area, etc.).
  - Once the eligibility requirements for applications have been defined, the criteria for issuing the award to individual teachers would have to be set.
- National Support Service (NSS) evaluate the applications
  - The applications for ‘Euro teacher’ labels would be evaluated by the National Support Service (NSS) as is currently the case for eTwinning National quality labels.
- Number of ‘Euro Teacher’ labels to be issues
  - The Commission or Executive Agency would have to decide and agree what quota of labels are to be issued and whether there should be one ‘Euro Teacher’ label, or labels at the National level and European level.
- Outreach activities to schools and teachers to market the new ‘Euro Teacher’ label
  - Using existing networks, such as the eTwinning platform and Comenius networks (such as the Learning Teacher network).
  - Promotional material could be sent to Europe Direct Centres that often have contacts with teachers and schools in the locality.
- Support a network of those with the ‘Euro Teacher’ label.
  - In order to foster the exchange of ideas amongst teachers of EU topics from a variety of subject areas.
  - An annual (or bi-annual) conference for teachers with the ‘Euro Teacher’ label which includes workshops and participatory methods to exchange ideas and foster cooperation.

Target Group: Teachers would be the target group in terms of issuing the ‘Euro Teacher’ label.

Rationale: Creating a ‘Euro teacher’ label would give recognition to teachers for their teaching on EU topics. The label could incentivise teachers to keep their EU knowledge up-to-date and to engage in activities that promote EU topics among their students. The label could raise the standards of teaching about EU issues.
## Strengths:

- The label would give recognition to teachers that invest their time improving their skills or invest their time in creating activities/projects in this area.
- The label may act as an incentive for teachers to improve their knowledge, skills and competencies to teach EU topics, though it is more likely that those with these competencies already are the ones who apply.
- By having a visible ‘Euro teacher’ label, this may make other teachers more aware or interested in teaching EU topics and give the EU dimension in education more visibility.

## Challenges:

- Possibly only teachers who already have the competences to teach about the EU apply for the ‘Euro Teacher’ label. Therefore, it may not be enough of an incentive for other teachers to update their knowledge and to engage their students with EU topics.
- The capacity of the Commission/Agency/Central Support Service and the National Support Service to administer the award as screening and evaluating the applications would require resources.
- There could be wider criticism if it is viewed that teachers are only being recognised for their competences to teach about the EU and not in other subject areas.

## Resources:

At a minimum, resources would be needed to establish the award (including resources to identify the evaluation criteria for the award), advertise and market it and administer it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strengths</strong></td>
<td>The label would give recognition to teachers that invest their time improving their skills or invest their time in creating activities/projects in this area. The label may act as an incentive for teachers to improve their knowledge, skills and competencies to teach EU topics, though it is more likely that those with these competencies already are the ones who apply. By having a visible ‘Euro teacher’ label, this may make other teachers more aware or interested in teaching EU topics and give the EU dimension in education more visibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Challenges</strong></td>
<td>Possibly only teachers who already have the competences to teach about the EU apply for the ‘Euro Teacher’ label. Therefore, it may not be enough of an incentive for other teachers to update their knowledge and to engage their students with EU topics. The capacity of the Commission/Agency/Central Support Service and the National Support Service to administer the award as screening and evaluating the applications would require resources. There could be wider criticism if it is viewed that teachers are only being recognised for their competences to teach about the EU and not in other subject areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resources</strong></td>
<td>At a minimum, resources would be needed to establish the award (including resources to identify the evaluation criteria for the award), advertise and market it and administer it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5.3 Weighing up the scenarios

As mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, there are a number of key criteria that the scenarios can be assessed against alongside broader issues that are related to the introduction of a new EU action or modifications to existing actions.

In terms of key issues, the proposed scenarios can be compared along the following dimensions:

1. That the scenario includes outreach efforts to engage target groups;
2. The use of networking activities including mutual learning and exchange;
3. The degree to which the activities funded meet the needs of schools/teachers/students.

The proposed scenarios can also be compared in terms of the dimensions related to the introduction of a new action or modifications to existing actions:

4. The amount of scope/reach the scenario potentially has;
5. The effort and resources required at EU level to support the scenario;
6. The visibility of the ‘learning about the EU’ dimension in the action.

#### The inclusion of outreach efforts to engage target groups

The proposed scenarios can include activities that have an element of outreach activities which involve actively involving the target group. Therefore, the proposed scenario either:

- Actively implements outreach activities
- Does not actively implement outreach activities

#### The use of networking activities

The proposed scenarios can include activities that involve networking and promoting mutual learning between the target group and/or beneficiaries. Therefore the proposed scenario either:

- Involves networking/mutual learning/exchange activities
- Does not involve networking/mutual learning/exchange activities
The degree to which the activities meet the needs of schools/teachers/students

The degree to which the activities funded clearly meet the needs of schools/teacher/students;

- A clear element of the scenario either involves needs identification or activities that meet target groups needs and interests.
- No clear element of the scenario involves needs identification or activities that meet target groups needs and interests.

The amount of scope/reach the scenario potentially has

The extent to which the proposed scenarios have the potential to reach a large volume of stakeholders, schools and/or students:

- Extensive reach where the scenario is likely to be spread or taken up among the key target group or beneficiaries;
- The reach is likely to be quite dependent on the interest of those being targeted, therefore it is unclear what the scope of the scenario will be;
- Limited reach due to the limitations of funding a small number of projects.

The effort and resources required at EU level to support the scenario

The amount of effort and resources at the EU level that the scenario would require fall into the following categories:

- High effort and need for resources required at the EU level in order to brand, build, coordinate, and fund the proposed activities due to the introduction of new activities, cost-intensive activities;
- Medium effort and need for resources as the scenario does not call for a large degree of change and funding but still calls for a medium level of resources;
- Low effort and need for resources as the scenario calls for efforts at the EU that would not require large amounts of resources from personnel or monetary sources.

The visibility of the ‘learning about the EU’ dimension

Depending on their approach, the scenarios can be said to be:

- Clearly identifiable as being measures at the EU level whose purpose is to support teaching/learning about the EU
- Not being measures that are clearly identifiable as having the purpose of supporting teaching/learning about the EU
The strengths of the six described scenarios along these dimensions are shown in Table 5.1 below.

### Table 5.1  Key strengths of the proposed scenarios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jean Monnet Module</th>
<th>Jean Monnet Learning Europe at School</th>
<th>Add EU focus to eTwinning</th>
<th>Support National EU networks</th>
<th>Add EU learning to Erasmus</th>
<th>Issue Euroteacher label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actively implements outreach activities</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involves networking/mutual learning activities</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A clear element of the scenario either involves needs identification or activities that meet target groups needs and interests</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensive reach where the scenario is likely to spread among the key target group or beneficiaries</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low effort and need for resources as the scenario calls for efforts at the EU that would not require large amounts of resources from personnel or monetary sources</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearly identifiable and visible as being measures at the EU level whose purpose is to support teaching/learning about the EU</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Actively implements outreach efforts

Outreach efforts are envisaged in almost all of the scenarios, with the exception of the proposed changes to the eTwinning portal. Strengthening the Jean Monnet Modules would involve outreach activities in order to actively recruit higher education institutions involved in teacher education, which could prove to be challenging. Higher education institutions involved in initial teacher education may not be interested in taking part in this action given that for the main part they are not currently active in delivering EU education to future teachers and outreach efforts may not be able to address this.

The Jean Monnet Learning Europe at School action already has a requirement that the applying higher education institution or eligible association has a commitment from a list of schools that will participate in the project. The proposed new action of creating national level EU networks envisages that the European Commission/Executive Agency would carry out outreach activities to promote the networks amongst the target group. A similar situation is envisaged for the proposed inclusion of EU support in the Erasmus programme whereby participating universities would conduct outreach activities with schools in the area/region.
Outreach in these cases may be more likely to be successful given that they are engaging those stakeholders who would directly benefit from the action.

Outreach activities in the case of the Euroteacher label would be mainly for marketing purposes to ensure there is visibility of the label.

**Involves networking/mutual learning activities**

The scenarios all include an element of networking and mutual learning with the exception of the proposed changes to Erasmus. The eTwinning portal is an example where mutual learning and exchange is one of the core activities of the action as it currently exists, and therefore the scenario can exploit this readymade environment to adapt it for mutual learning on EU topics and potentially create a network of teachers active in the area. Opening up the portal to teacher trainers as well as teachers would allow mutual exchange between different types of stakeholders. This could incentivise teachers to get involved as they are attracted to exchanging with those outside of the teaching profession.

Mutual learning activities would be added to the current Jean Monnet actions (both the Module and the 'Learning Europe at School' actions) under the scenarios proposed, but would require both resources and coordination to organise so would not happen as instantaneously as in eTwinning. The advantage of the Jean Monnet Learning Europe at School scenario is that the funded stakeholders are already involved in EU learning activities and have experience to bring to the mutual exchange activities.

As mentioned before, the new actions that would have to be set up to issue a ‘Euroteacher’ label or support national networks would be resource intensive and require the most effort. The initial focus therefore would be on coordinating, marketing and establishing such actions. It would take some time to roll out the mutual learning elements envisaged, and therefore may take a few years of setting up before becoming operational. However, the national networks would have the unique position of involving a diverse range of actors in the area meaning that networking and mutual learning activities would span a larger pool of stakeholders compared to the other scenarios.

**Needs assessment**

Meeting the actual needs of schools, teachers and students is an important criterion given that the analysis found that they often have specific needs which are not always met. In order to ensure that supports are designed to specifically meet the needs of the target group, the suggested change to the Jean Monnet Learning Europe at School action would require funded projects to carry out a needs assessment of the activities they are planning to carry out. Given that the availability of materials is not the primary concern of teachers, but rather that it is the identification of appropriate materials or adaptation of those materials that is the key issue, projects the proposed change to the Jean Monnet Learning EU at School action would result in the creation of materials only as a by-product of the funded activities. Whilst these changes go towards ensuring that these projects meet the needs of the target groups, the issue remains that currently it is higher education institutions that primarily engage with this action. Higher education institutions do not always have the experience or expertise to work with schools and these age groups of students. Their approach may be too academic and not fit the needs of the schools making a fair assessment of the needs of their target groups of their funded projects crucial.

Schools are very positive about activities that involve an external speaker (especially close in age to the students) visiting the classroom, therefore the proposed scenario to add an EU element to the Erasmus programme would meet this identified need. It would also overcome the problems schools face bringing in external speakers due to a lack of funds.

**Scope/Reach**

The suggested change to the eTwinning portal has potential for extensive reach given the number of existing members of the portal. However to realise this potential there will be a need to actively stimulate interest through innovative and engaging solutions. Proactive moderation and targeting teachers would be needed. Using the Erasmus programme also has the potential to reach out to a large number of schools and students but this potential
would take some time to realise as it is likely that universities would first start small scale and roll out the scheme only after a few years of setting up and testing. It is for the moment unclear to what extent there would be interest in the use of Jean Monet module among teacher training institutions. In this respect it would be helpful to better understand the motivations and activities of those teacher education institutions that are already taking part.

**Effort/Resources**

The proposed scenarios that would require the most effort as they would need to be set up and would be resource intensive are the proposals to set up a ‘Euroteacher’ label and support to National EU networks. These two scenarios also do not benefit from being associated with already known EU programme brands and would have to build a reputation amongst teachers and stakeholders.

Although not as resource intensive, adding an EU learning element to Erasmus would require quite some changes to the current action. In particular it would require mobilisation of universities and students on a new type of activities. This does not necessarily require large resources as the mobility is already funded and the coordinators are in place, but it requires creating interest and commitment that would result in take up.

Although the changes to the current Jean Monnet Module would not require substantial additional investment in terms of monetary investment, it potentially requires a large amount of effort. As the analysis showed, predominantly it is not higher education institutions that are involved in training teachers in EU issues or pedagogy to teach EU topics, therefore engaging these institutions in such activities would require more efforts and resources compared to funding institutions that are currently already active in this area.

The proposed changes to the Jean Monnet Learning EU at School action and eTwinning do not necessitate significant additional investment.

**Visibility**

The core business of the Jean Monnet Learning EU at School is to support EU learning, as would be the case for the potential EU National Networks and the Euroteacher label therefore these scenarios are highly visible as specific support for EU learning. This visibility could help with reach and scope among the target group. The changes to the Jean Monnet Modules to include outreach activities is because the action as it currently stands is not obviously support for EU learning, and therefore higher education institutions who train teachers need to be made aware that it can be used for this purpose.

Given that Erasmus is one of the most well-known brands of the Lifelong Learning Programme, adding an element which supports EU learning is likely to benefit from that visibility. Furthermore, universities would make the new element visible amongst schools in their region, though this would be on a longer term basis as the initial focus would be on setting up and establishing the EU element.

5.4 **Conclusion**

Each proposed scenario has beneficial characteristics and specific strengths in relation to supporting Learning about the EU as illustrated when the various scenarios are weighed up.

The biggest drawback of the first scenario to target higher education institutions under the Jean Monnet Modules action is the uncertainty of whether this target group has an interest in carrying out these activities and that they are not the institutions most experienced in this area. The resources required to set up national EU networks is a major limiting factor to establish an action like this. Issuing a ‘Euro teacher’ label would also be resource intensive and its main shortcoming is that teachers already active in EU learning might be the only people making applications for the label and it was not recognition for their work that was the key issue in the analysis, but that teachers receive the necessary supports to fit their needs. Requiring teachers to provide evidence of their eligibility could just act as a further burden for teachers given their limited time and the low priority given to EU topics.
The proposed change to the Jean Monnet ‘Learning Europe at School’ action meets most of the specified characteristics. The scenario requires few additional resources and the action is clearly identifiable as an EU level action to support EU learning. The proposed changes would focus on ensuring the funded projects meet the identified needs of the target group and would enhance the pedagogical approaches taken in schools to teach EU topics. The focus would be on activities and materials would be a by-product of these activities rather than a main activity of itself. As higher education institutions should remain as a main target of the action as their expertise ensures the quality of the information delivered. However, given that higher education institutions are not always best placed in terms of the practical aspects of running a project at school level, consideration should be given to having multiplier organisations to be the leading project partner in partnership with HEIs. The advantage of the proposed exchange between the projects at an early stage is that primarily the projects have experience in EU learning activities and can share this experience for mutual benefit at the beginning of the project process.

The limitation of the approach is that it does not have extensive reach given the determinate number of projects that can be funded under the action. However, if the proposed changes to the Learning EU at School action were to be implemented alongside the suggested modifications to the eTwinning platform, this could have the biggest impact. Furthermore, both actions could be linked together. For example, on the basis of the experience of the projects of the ‘Learning EU at School’ action, project kits for EU learning available on the eTwinning portal could be designed and made available to a wider audience of teachers. Serious consideration should also be given to the scenario of adding an EU element to the current Erasmus programme as this would also address the issue of reach. Furthermore, external stimulation was one of the most mentioned effective approach for teaching EU topics and the main limitations to seeing this in the classroom would be overcome as a result of this scenario.
6 Recommendations

Whilst it is important to have a basic understanding about the EU in order to put EU issues into context, knowing where to locate the EU on map is not going to foster active citizenship. Learning the basic facts about the EU has to be accompanied by a deeper reflection about why the EU exists, what it really does and how.

However, the main difficulty is that the context in which schools, teachers and students are learning means that some issues such as the priority given to EU topics and the limited time teachers have is unlikely to change. So recommendations have to consider this situation and offer solutions that work within this framework.

Based on the evidence collected during this study, the report has a number of recommendations to make at different levels.

For the European Commission:

The emphasis of solutions should not be solely on teachers improving learning about the EU in their classrooms. Teachers will not always be able to do everything so EU level funding for external supports will be needed.

- Focus funding on activities that are based on a realistic assessment of teachers’ and students’ needs. Ensure that activities that are funded actively engage teachers and students in developing materials and methods that corresponds to students’ needs, interests and capacity. Avoid funding development of materials that are too theoretical or use a language that is not understood in the classroom. Focusing on teachers has a multiplying effect and therefore they should be a priority target group. However, they are not necessarily the best placed to be project leaders (due to time requirements and resources needed for project administration). Projects where organisations that have expertise on the EU and schools cooperate should therefore be supported.

- EU level funding should prioritise activities whose core purpose or activity goes beyond the development of content/material. Materials should be a by-product of other funded activities. These by-product materials should be designed and developed so that they contain information that will be valid longer terms and should not include information or materials that are likely to go out of date quickly.

- Given that EU topics are not always a priority among key stakeholders such as schools or teachers, teacher training institutions or other associations who do or could play a role in supporting EU learning, the Commission should be active in disseminating information and engage in outreach activities to ensure that stakeholders are aware of funding opportunities at the EU level to support learning about the EU rather than relying on this target group to apply for support.

- There are already networks and organisations in the Member States which have expertise on the EU and are active in cooperating with schools. EU-funded actions to strengthen learning about the EU should engage these existing networks to strengthen reach out and ensure that the actions funded do reach out to the schools in the end.

For those in charge of school policy and the curriculum:

- Those in charge of curricular design should review how the topic of the EU is embedded into the curriculum. There is not necessarily a need to integrate more emphasis on the EU but to make sure that the most adequate content to develop understanding of the EU by students is included. The review should take into account whether the curriculum in designed in a way that EU topics are taught progressively and that it requires reflection on why the EU currently exists and how it operates, including the role and functioning of the EU institutions and the direct or indirect (through national institutions) place of citizens in the decision-making process.

- Consider whether the context in which students are taught about the EU is the most adequate for development of European citizenship. In a number of countries the EU is taught about in the context of other international organisations, rather than as being...
closely related to national developments. This could be supporting the idea that the EU is something remote and abstract rather than encouraging students to think about it as ‘their own’ institutions.

- Consider the space given to the topic of the EU in teaching materials given the impact the EU has on citizens’ activities.

- Enlarge the provision of professional development opportunities for teachers to be prepared to teach about EU topics.

For the intermediary organisations working with schools to support learning about the EU

- Given the limited time teachers have to dedicate to the topic of the EU, supports should be designed and activities should be offered that do not require vast inputs from teachers or create substantial demands on their time. Organisations should ensure that they are adding value to what teaching staff are doing by ensuring that the support they offer is based on the identifiable needs of teaching staff and students.

- Designing supports in a way that gives students responsibility for their learning is an effective approach as it gives students ownership over their learning.

- Also, giving students responsibility for their own learning can give them more control over topics and activities that interest and engage them. Student participation in the activities of their classroom is an integral part of civic education as part of ensuring the realisation active participation skills.

- The use of interactive methods and external stimulations are also particularly engaging for students. This is in particular relevant for a topic like the EU which most people perceive as abstract. Organisations should find a place in their planning to support these activities for students in schools. Furthermore, it is these kinds of activities that teachers often find most time-consuming, therefore external support to support these types of activities can add value to what teachers are doing with their classes.

- Organisations should use examples of how the EU is relevant to the daily lives of students as the starting point and build on this once the students are engaged and interested to expand their knowledge about the EU.

- Organisations should signpost teachers to appropriate teaching materials and tools that they can use with their students, including other organisations and resources such as Europe Direct centres.

Teaching staff

- Teaching about the EU should lead students to develop an understanding of the EU that goes beyond knowledge of basic facts. They should have the tools that enable them to engage in a critical reflection on European matters and how these influence their country and their own activities. Effective learning about the EU requires both content and effective methods in order to develop the competences to be a European active citizen. Even where teachers delegate the methods to an external organisation, teachers need to ensure that their students have the basic knowledge about the EU in order for the combination of content and methods to be most effective.

- Teachers should integrate examples of how the EU is relevant to the daily lives of their students as the starting point to bring EU topics into their classroom. Teachers can then build on this once the students are engaged and interested to expand their knowledge about the EU.

- Teaching staff should consider, time and resources permitting, to put students into direct contact with people who are external to the school and are knowledgeable about EU issues or who can speak of their experience of benefitting from the EU. External organisations such as foundations or EDICs can support teachers in taking these contacts. Given that the analysis in this study shows the effectiveness of external stimulation, these external speakers should be invited into schools to share their expertise and engage students.
Interactive, participatory teaching methods are the most effective means to create active citizens in citizenship education, and therefore are also an effective means that teachers can use for teaching EU topics to ultimately create active citizens at the EU level.

The teaching methods used in the classroom should also give students responsibility for their own learning, creating student ownership of their learning, effectively engaging them and creating the opportunity for students to engage in peer learning.
ANNEXES
## Annex 1  Case-study countries, initiatives and school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Case Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Belgium       | • Ryckevelde 'Europe Days'  
                | • Sint-Bavohumaniora highschool in Ghent, Belgium is a secondary school (ISCED 2, for children aged 12 – 19). It has approximately 1 100 students. |
| Bulgaria      | • Europe Direct Veliko Turnovo  
                | • High school in Veliko Turnovo, <em>Emiliyan Stancev</em> and one of the kindergartens in the city, <em>Sonya</em>. Both educational establishments are public. |
| Czech Republic| • Erasmus club of the Philosophical Faculty of Charles University 'Europe meets school'  
                | • Gymnázium Profesora Jana Patočky (GPJP) is a general secondary school in Prague, Czech Republic. In the school year 2011/2012 the school had 20 classes of around 30 students each. |
| Denmark       | • Demokrati i Europa (DEO)  
                | • Linden (pseudonym) Gymnasium is a high school (ISCED 3) in the capital of Copenhagen, Denmark. The school has approximately 800 students. |
| Germany       | • German EU Commission Representation 'EU Planspiele'  
                | • The Waldschule Schwanewede is an integrative comprehensive school. The school comprises approximately 1500 students for all school branches and 110 teachers. |
| Finland       | • Osallistu ja Opi (Take part and Learn)  
                | • Ilmajoen Lukio is an upper secondary school in Ilmajoki, Finland which offers education at ISCED level 3. The school is relatively small in size with approximately 200 students. |
| France        | • Jeunes Européens 'L'Europe à l'Ecole'  
                | • Collège Françoise Dolto is a public secondary school located in Paris. In the school year 2011/2012, the school had 20 classes of around 22-24 students each. |
| Italy         | • Europe Direct Centre of Forli 'Teach and Learn'  
                | • Technical Commercial Institute (ITC) 'Matteucci', is an upper secondary school (for pupils aged 14-18) in the city of Forli (around 120,000 inhabitants), Emilia Romagna |
| Latvia        | • Education and Development Centre (EDC)  
                | • Rigas Juglas vidusskola is a school that offers classes for students aged 7 to in Riga, Latvia. It is a public school and the school has around 1,000 students enrolled. |
| Netherlands   | • European Parliament Information Office 'Tien voor Europa'  
                | • The Picasso Lyceum in Zoetermeer, the Netherlands is a secondary school (ISCED 2 and 3, for pupils aged 12-18). It has approximately 1 000 – 1 100 pupils. |
| Poland        | • European Club (Clube Europeu)  
                | • Sheridan (pseudonym) is a public secondary school for students aged 12 to 18. In the school year 2011/2012 the school has around 1,100 students enrolled. |
| Portugal      | • Euroquiz  
                | • St Mary’s Primary School in Clydebank, Scotland, is a publicly-funded Roman Catholic primary school (ISCED 1, for children aged 5-11). It has approximately 350 pupils. |
| Spain         | • Eurobask Francisco Javier de Landaburu awards  
                | • Lauaxeta Ikastola (School Four Winds) is a semi private school and covers ages from 2 to 18 years-old. The school has 91 teachers on its staff and 1329 students. |
### Annex 2  Main legislative acts and how these refer to learning about the EU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Act</th>
<th>What does it refer to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>School organisation Act[^47]</td>
<td>Among education objectives: to lead young people to independent judgement and social understanding …. to be able take part in economic and cultural life in Austria, Europe and the world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE fr</td>
<td>Decree defining the primary mission of primary and secondary education[^48]</td>
<td>The French speaking Community of Belgium … adapts educational programmes (at secondary level) to … ensure understanding of history and reasons for and consequences of European integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE nl</td>
<td>Law on Primary education[^49] and Law on Secondary education[^50]</td>
<td>No reference that can be related to learning about the EU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG</td>
<td>(Draft) Law on Pre-school and school education[^51]</td>
<td>One of the objectives of education is to lead young people to the acquisition of competences to understand and apply the principles and rules arising from European integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CY</td>
<td>Law 225 of 2008 on Basic Education[^52]</td>
<td>Schools should organise celebrations at the occasion of the Europe Day (9 May)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ</td>
<td>School Act (317/2008)[^53]</td>
<td>One of the objectives of education is to develop understanding and acquisition of principles and rules related to European integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>Note: Education legislation is issued at Lander level At federal level there is a Recommendation of the Standing Conference of the Minister of Culture on education in schools[^54]</td>
<td>Defines the guiding principles for teaching and learning about the EU in compulsory education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>Note: The Primary Education Act[^55] does not refer to learning about the EU. The education objectives and targets that schools are required to translate into curricula and in which education should result are adopted by ministerial decree, hence they have a legislative form[^56]</td>
<td>European cooperation, decision-making in the EU, EU integration and EU institutions are mentioned in several aspects of the education targets (this is discussed under curriculum)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[^47]: [Rechtsvorschrift für Schulorganisationsgesetz.](http://www.ris.bka.gv.at/GeltendeFassung.wxe?Abfrage=Bundesnormen&Gesetzesnummer=10009265)
[^50]: [Besluit van de Vlaamse Regering van 17 december 2010 houdende de codificatie betreffende het secundair onderwijs.](http://www.ond.vlaanderen.be/secundair/Codex%20secundair%20onderwijs.pdf)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Law/Act/Regulation</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>Basic Schools and Upper Secondary Schools Act 2010&lt;sup&gt;57&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>The basic values of general education are based on the Constitution of the Republic of Estonia, the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Convention on the Rights of the Child and European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>Organic law on education&lt;sup&gt;59&lt;/sup&gt; (4 May 2006)</td>
<td>No mention that can be related to learning about the EU Note: the law refers to Spain’s commitment to European education targets and objectives. An earlier project of the law (from 2005&lt;sup&gt;60&lt;/sup&gt;) defined among the education objectives the acquisition of civic competence inspired by the values of the Spanish constitution, European Union and human rights but the reference to the EU in this sentence was dropped in the final version of the Law.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI</td>
<td>Basic Education Act&lt;sup&gt;61&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>No reference that can be related to learning about the EU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td>Education Act&lt;sup&gt;62&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Among the objectives of education, the law states that the education provided by schools should be adapted to economic, social and cultural developments of the country and its European and international environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HU</td>
<td>Act on Public Education&lt;sup&gt;63&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>No reference that can be related to learning about the EU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>Education Act 1998&lt;sup&gt;64&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>No reference that can be related to learning about the EU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>The Law 169/2008 and the Ministerial Circular n. 86, 27/10/2010 on citizenship and education&lt;sup&gt;65&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>These define civic competence as transversal topic in education and the more detailed description contains several references to the EU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT</td>
<td>Law on Education&lt;sup&gt;66&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>One of the goals of education is to enable young persons to the civic competence … needed by a person as a competent a citizen of the Republic of Lithuania, a member of the European and global community as well as of a multi-cultural society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>Laws and regulations regarding compulsory education&lt;sup&gt;67&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>No reference that can be related to learning about the EU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


<sup>57</sup> Põhikooli ja gymnaasiumiseadus, Vastu voetud 09.06.2010. [https://www.riigiteataja.ee/akt/13332410](https://www.riigiteataja.ee/akt/13332410)


<sup>65</sup> Direzione Generale per gli Ordinamenti Scolastici e per l’Autonomia Scolastica, 27 ottobre 2010 [http://hubmiur.pubblica.istruzione.it/alfresco/d/d/workspace/SpacesStore/19b60061-d624-4dbd-be97-784876c6393/cm86_10.pdf](http://hubmiur.pubblica.istruzione.it/alfresco/d/d/workspace/SpacesStore/19b60061-d624-4dbd-be97-784876c6393/cm86_10.pdf)


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Legislation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LV</td>
<td>Education Law and General Education Law&lt;sup&gt;68&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>Education Act&lt;sup&gt;69&lt;/sup&gt; &lt;br&gt;The Minimum curriculum requirements are set by legislation (these are discussed under curriculum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>Primary education act&lt;sup&gt;70&lt;/sup&gt; and Secondary education act&lt;sup&gt;71&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>Basic law on the education system&lt;sup&gt;72&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>Law on national education&lt;sup&gt;73&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Education Act&lt;sup&gt;74&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Organisation and Financing of Education Act&lt;sup&gt;75&lt;/sup&gt; &lt;br&gt;The act on organisation and financing of education states that education shall prepare pupils and students for the participation in processes of European integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK</td>
<td>Schools Act&lt;sup&gt;76&lt;/sup&gt; &lt;br&gt;One of the principles of education and training on which the legislation is based is the integration of the Slovak education and training framework into the European education area, with emphasis on own traditions and experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Education Act&lt;sup&gt;77&lt;/sup&gt; and Education Scotland Act&lt;sup&gt;78&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


<sup>70</sup> Law on Primary Education (WPO) [http://www.st-ab.nl/wetten/0725_Wet_op_het_primair_onderwijs_WPO.htm](http://www.st-ab.nl/wetten/0725_Wet_op_het_primair_onderwijs_WPO.htm)

<sup>71</sup> Law on the Secondary Education (WVO) [http://www.st-ab.nl/wetten/0728_Wet_op_het_voortgezet_onderwijs_WVO.htm](http://www.st-ab.nl/wetten/0728_Wet_op_het_voortgezet_onderwijs_WVO.htm)


<sup>75</sup> Education Act (1985:1100) [http://www.government.se/content/1/c6/02/15/38/1532b277.pdf](http://www.government.se/content/1/c6/02/15/38/1532b277.pdf)

<sup>76</sup> Law on Organisation and Financing of Education, Article 2. [http://www.see-educcoop.net/education_in/pdf/7.doc](http://www.see-educcoop.net/education_in/pdf/7.doc)

<sup>77</sup> Act of 22 May 2008 on education (Education Act) [http://www.minedu.sk/data/att/4189.rtf](http://www.minedu.sk/data/att/4189.rtf)


### Annex 3  Review of teacher education and training programmes in the 27 countries covered

Footnotes to sources where courses are mentioned will be added in the final version.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Teacher training/education initiative 1</th>
<th>Teacher training/education initiative 2</th>
<th>Teacher training/education initiative 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE fr</td>
<td>continuing education (history and geography) teaching about the EU</td>
<td>optional module for future teachers of economics in upper-secondary</td>
<td>Module on contemporary socio-economic issues contains knowledge of the EU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE nl</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CY</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ</td>
<td>optional subject on the EU for teachers of civics - past - no longer on offer Teaching the EU and the CZ</td>
<td>optional subject specifically for teachers EU studies for teachers</td>
<td>continuing training (various subjects teachers) optional subject specifically for teachers (does not appear to be offered in 2012-2013) EU and regional policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>continuing training (various subjects teachers) teaching about the EU</td>
<td>continuing training (various subjects teachers) recent developments in the EU</td>
<td>continuing training (various subjects teachers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>all teachers in social studies have to undertake a course on the EU institutions, decision-making and policy making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>optional (open to many fields of study) basics of the EU</td>
<td>optional (open to many fields of study) Theories of EU integration</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>optional (open to many fields of study) course on EU education policies as part of programme on education sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI</td>
<td>training for future geography teachers EU policies</td>
<td>training for future geography and history teachers France within the EU</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td>training for future geography teachers EU policies</td>
<td>training for future geography and history teachers France within the EU</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Continuing Education</td>
<td>EU Dimension in Public Education</td>
<td>Teaching About the EU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HU</td>
<td>optional module for future geography teachers</td>
<td>European and the European Union</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>continuing training</td>
<td>EU institutions and citizenship</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV</td>
<td>continuing education (geography teachers)</td>
<td>EU economic and regional development policies</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>continuing education (completed in 2012)</td>
<td>how to teach about the EU</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>compulsory module for future teachers of civics</td>
<td>Europe in a comparative perspective</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>compulsory module for future professors of education science</td>
<td>European systems and policies in education</td>
<td>compulsory part of state examination for future teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>continuing training</td>
<td>EU integration</td>
<td>continuing education (e-learning)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 4  Case-studies