

European Conference
**The European Union and the Promise of Democracy:
What can Citizenship Education and Civil Society contribute?**

14-16 November 2013
The Hague, the Netherlands

Report

Workshop 7 Funding outside the EU

by Leticia Díez Sánchez, FutureLab Europe (Spain)
Email-address: Leticia.diez.sanchez@gmail.com

Moderator: Paul de Ruijter, De Ruijter Strategy (the Netherlands)

Number of participants in the workshop: 7 participants

Number of participants in the workshop: The 5 interviewees

Interviews with: Gerda Bosdriesz (Pro Demos, the Netherlands), Eddy Habben Jansen (Pro Demos, the Netherlands), Jędrzej Witkowski (Center for Citizenship Education, Poland), Ada Alkemade (Gymnasium Novum, the Netherlands), Andy Thornton (Citizenship Foundation, UK) and Thomas Kruger (bpb, Germany).

What targets did the moderator indicate for the workshop?

The workshop aimed to obtain first-hand information on the different sources of funding that citizenship education entities could obtain according to their scope, priority goals and national institutional setting. The workshop also intended to see the interviewees' opinions on EU funding. Ultimately, the moderator intended to compile a series of inspiring ideas on how to get funding in an imaginative manner.

These very spontaneous and uncompleted interviews meant to be a beginning to promote a kind of basic report about financing citizenship education (formal and informal) in all EU states as well as the possibility of EU funding.

What central and guiding questions are put to the round for working/ focusing on?

The main questions of the interview was "How do you get funding?", "What advise would you give to other associations?" and "How do you see the situation in the near future in terms of funding?". According to the answers, we tailored the rest of the interview focusing on project or structural funding, private or public funders as well as what sort of activities an association could get funding for.

Were the questions or the issues discussed amended, expanded or modified by participants?

Since the interviewees came from various backgrounds, their understanding of "funding" was different and hence the group had to tailor the rest of the interview, in particular regarding to the countries with an extensive tradition of citizenship education (Germany) as opposed to

those with a more liberal understanding of the state (the UK). In the case of the UK, the line of the interview led to a discussion on corporate social responsibility and the interaction between professional associations and school teaching. In the case of Poland, it led to a discussion on the importance of personal contacts and a big professional network acquired along the years.

What were the main points of the input providers?

The strong differences between countries where citizenship education was a consensus on the political agenda, is on the one hand (Germany and recently the Netherlands) and those that needed a more creative approach from the foundations, on the other on (Poland and the UK). Seeking for alternatives for public funding was a common point in all the interviewees with the exception of Thomas Kruger (bbp), who mentioned that in Germany such “alternative approaches” are not needed.

What were the main points of the debate? Please primarily note the understandings and the most controversial questions.

Due to the format of the workshop there was no debate. The interviewees understood citizenship education differently and hence the possible sources of funding were difficult to extrapolate from one to another. The Center for Citizenship Education in Poland, for instance, had a very extensive conception of civic life and included leadership, entrepreneurship and ICT learning as part of their activities, which increased their chances of obtaining private funding. At the other side of the spectrum was Germany, where the need of citizenship education remains a consensus since the Second World War and hence receives a substantial amount of funding from the federal government. The particular evolution of ProDemos made its relationship with the members of the Parliament a good opportunity for lobbying the government in terms of funding, while in the UK this relationship was more effective vis-à-vis solicitors and barristers’ professional associations.

Appraisal, personal comment/statement of the rapporteur: What is the atmosphere in general; how is the debating atmosphere with one another during the forum?

All the interviewees were very collaborative and gave complete and direct answers to the questions. Because of the (unprepared) interview format, taking notes as they were replying was not an easy task. Yet, in general much information was obtained and the moderator was satisfied at the end of the workshop.

What method was applied in order to secure findings?

One-to-one interviews and the tailoring of the questions according to the relevant answers.

What were the main findings of the workshop?

1. Private funding is an important and often ignored source in those countries where citizenship education is not fully secured by the government. The involvement of corporate through looking for mutually advantageous collaboration was strong in Poland and the UK.
2. “Votematch platforms” were mentioned in Germany and the Netherlands as an importance source of funding from governments of different levels as well as companies seeking advertisement on the website.
3. Local councils could also secure funding in specific events and fairs as well as in cases where the organisation could host a Europe Direct centre for the information on EU-related matters.

4. National government remains the most important source of funding, so developing effective lobbying strategies is advisable.
5. An estimate amount of 200 million euro would be needed in order to implement an effective programme of citizenship education at the EU level.

Please describe the discussion results: Which aspects did the audience agree on and which aspects were seen differently by the participants?

The discussion resulted in a wide overview of funding sources and very interesting remarks on how to use imagination and personal contacts in order to expand the funding network. The participants agreed on the importance of funding for an effective programme of citizenship education, as well as on the need to seek for imaginative ways of obtaining it – hence the background line of the workshop was commonly shared by all of them. What they seemed to disagree about was (1) what do we exactly mean by funding (public vs. private sources) and (2) the very concept of citizenship education (a more extensive concept, able to reach a variety of funders, or a more reduced one relying mainly on ministerial funding).

Which key propositions regarding the three levels of reflection the participants agreed on?

How is the situation at the moment: They all agreed on the current state of the issue, particularly in the difficulty of getting funding in times of financial crisis as well as in the cumbersome procedures needed in order to obtain funding from the EU.

What are the future perspectives: They all agreed on how interesting would it be to establish an EU budget item for citizenship education.

What has to be done by whom: Most of them agreed on the need for transnational coordination in order to press Brussels for further EU funding.

(How) did the composition of participants influence the discussion (countries, educational systems, professional backgrounds)?

The result of the interviews was completely different across participants representing different foundations, but this was an intentional aspect of the format. To a great extent this differences reflected national particularities (different understandings of the role of the government in citizenship education). We did not observe variances according to professional backgrounds, since most of them had a very similar experience within their foundation.