Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the National Agency for the Erasmus+ Programme (FRSE) and European Solidarity Corps. Neither the European Union nor (FRSE) can be held responsible for them.

Co-funded by the European Union

BEST EUROPEAN EXPERIENCES
From 'Me' School to 'We' School

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This document reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use, which may be made of the information contained herein.

Reference Number: **2024-1-ES01-KA220-SCH-000243442**

Implementation period: November 2024 - November 2026

Best European Experiences:

from 'me' school to 'we' school

PSD Policy Recommendations

PUBLIC DOMAIN

This work is licensed under The Creative Commons Public Domain Dedication. CCO (aka CC Zero) is a public dedication tool, which allows creators to give up their copyright and put their works into the worldwide public domain. CCO allows reusers to distribute, remix, adapt, and build upon the material in any medium or format, with no conditions.
To view copy of this license, visit https://creativecommons.org/publicdomain/zero/1.0/

CONTENTS

CONTENTS 1
Document scope, evidence and use 7
Executive Summary 8
Chapter 1. Introduction: The Imperative of Personal and Social Development in European Education 10
1.1 The evolving landscape of education: addressing 21st-century challenges 10
1.2 Defining and contextualizing Personal and Social Development (PSD) 11
1.3 The role of the consortium: a pan-European perspective 11
1.4 Linking PSD to EU educational goals and frameworks 12
1.5 Shared policy principles and decision rules 13
1.6 Recommendations for decision-makers 13
1.7 From shared principles to a coherent implementation model 13
1.8 Additional implementation considerations 14
Chapter 2. Domain A: Cultivating Self-Awareness and Personal Development 16
2.1 Policy recommendations for enhancing self-awareness 16
2.2 Teacher training and professional development for Domain A 17
2.3 Linking Domain A to learning-to-learn competencies 18
2.4 Domain A implementation cycle: from intention to learner agency 19
2.5 Progression, evidence and differentiated support in Domain A 20
Chapter 3. Domain B: Strengthening Interpersonal Skills and Relationships 21
3.1 Policy recommendations for developing interpersonal competencies 21
3.2 Creating inclusive and collaborative learning environments 22
3.3 Linking Domain B to learning-to-learn competencies 23
3.4 Designing collaboration so that participation is fair 24
3.5 Conflict, bullying and safeguarding: a clear response pathway 25
3.6 Intercultural dialogue and digital relationships 25
Chapter 4. Domain C: Fostering Social Responsibility and Civic Engagement 26
4.1 Policy recommendations for enhancing social responsibility 26
4.2 Building partnerships with community organisations 27
4.3 Linking Domain C to learning-to-learn competencies 28
4.4 Safeguards for meaningful civic participation 29
4.5 From civic knowledge to meaningful participation 30
4.6 European citizenship and cross-border civic learning 30
4.7 Evaluating civic action responsibly 30
4.8 Family, learner and community participation protocol 31
4.9 Integrated practice protocols for reflection, conflict resolution, civic projects and evidence review 32
4.10 Applied practice patterns across the three PSD domains 34
4.11 Domain progression across school stages and age groups 37

4.12 Complementary transfer to VET contexts 39
4.13 Complementary transfer to adult-learning contexts 39
4.14 Teacher and trainer practice standards: preparation, delivery and reflection 39
4.15 Activity 39
Chapter 5. Implementing and Evaluating PSD Competencies at the EU Level 42
5.1 Recommendations for EU-level policy frameworks 42
5.2 Strategies for teacher training and professional development 43
5.3 Evaluation and assessment of PSD competencies 44
5.4 Promoting student-led evaluation of PSD competency development 45
5.5 Governance, accountability and institutional roles 46
5.6 Data protection, ethics and safeguarding 46
5.7 Quality assurance without over-standardisation 46
5.8 School Education as the primary setting; transfer to alternative pathways 47
5.9 European policy recommendations: action summary 47
5.10 Integrated governance, implementation and quality assurance 47
5.11 Baseline design, indicator selection and target-setting 48
5.12 Student-led evaluation and accountable feedback loops 48
5.13 Integrated implementation tool: PSD indicator bank 48
5.14 Eight-country context adaptation and cross-border transfer protocol 52
5.15 Implementation risk management and mitigation framework 53
5.16 Indicator definitions, data quality and responsible target-setting 54
5.17 Illustrative indicator specification sheet 55
5.18 Scenario-based implementation decisions and corrective actions 55
5.19 Professional learning pathway for teachers, trainers and leaders 57
5.20 Conditions for effective professional learning 59
5.21 Baseline and consultation question bank 59
5.22 Administration and interpretation rules 61
5.23 Annual review meeting and decision-log protocol 61
5.24 Decision log template 63
5.25 Questions that keep the review rigorous 63
5.26 The minimum institutional PSD plan 63
5.27 Governance roles and decision rights 64
5.28 Decision rules for continuation, adaptation and stopping 64
5.29 Recommended institutional cycle 65
5.30 Detailed indicator dictionary and target-setting protocol 65
5.31 Setting targets responsibly 67
5.32 Data-quality review questions 67
5.33 Safeguarding, ethics, referral and risk review 67
5.34 Ethical review before piloting 69

5.35 Stakeholder action and accountability matrix 69
5.36 Final implementation test 70
Chapter 6. Recommendations for Sustainability and Scalability 71
6.1 Ensuring long-term commitment and investment in PSD 71
6.2 Strategies for dissemination and knowledge sharing 72
6.3 Creating a sustainable network for PSD collaboration 73
6.4 Integrating digital tools and resources for scalability 74
6.5 Scaling responsibly: readiness, adaptation and stop rules 74
6.6 Sustainability indicators 75
6.7 Embedding PSD in budgets, workforce planning and continuity 75
6.8 Dissemination, open resources and responsible scaling 76
6.9 Integrated sustainability tool: phased 24-month implementation roadmap 76
6.10 Operational responsibilities by stakeholder group 77
6.11 European institutions and programme actors 77
6.12 National authorities 77
6.13 Regional and local authorities 78
6.14 School leadership 78
6.15 Teachers and school support staff 78
6.16 Learners 79
6.17 Families and carers 79
6.18 Community organisations and employers 79
6.19 Institutional PSD maturity and progression model 80
6.20 Maturity review dimensions 81
6.21 Resource planning, cost categories and value-for-effort review 81
6.22 Minimum budget narrative 82
6.23 Value-for-effort review 82
6.24 Transferability review 83
6.25 Digital resource stewardship, open access and accessibility 83
6.26 Resource metadata and quality control 83
6.27 Open educational resource principles 84
6.28 Maintenance and retirement 84
6.29 Digital inclusion and low-tech alternatives 85
6.30 Funding, procurement and long-term cost model 85
6.31 Full-cost planning categories 85
6.32 Funding principles for authorities and programme actors 86
6.33 Value-for-effort review 86
6.34 Continuation decision template 86
6.35 Institutional self-assessment and improvement-planning workshop 87
6.36 Preparation 87

6.37 Workshop sequence 87
6.38 Prioritisation matrix 88
6.39 Improvement plan 88
6.40 Model institutional policy commitments and Commitments 89
6.41 Adoption and review clause 90
6.42. Recommendations for different stakeholders 90
Chapter 7. Conclusion: A Vision for a More Empowered and Engaged European Generation 92
7.1 Reinforcing the importance of PSD in shaping future generations 92
7.2 Call to action for EU Member States and educational stakeholders 92
7.3 Final remarks from the consortium 93
7.4 The consortium implementation compact 93
7.5 Final consortium statement 94
Appendix A. Glossary of Key Terms 96
Appendix B. Stakeholder Implementation Matrix 97
Appendix C. Three-Year Implementation Roadmap 100
Appendix D. PSD Indicator Dictionary and Evaluation Protocol 102
Appendix E. Risk Register and Safeguarding Checklist 106
Appendix F. Funding, Costing and Sustainability Framework 108
Appendix G. Institutional PSD Action-Plan Template 110
Appendix H. Model Policy Brief for Decision-Makers 112

Document scope, evidence and use

This policy document has been developed for the B.E.E. consortium, bringing together Italy, Spain, Portugal, Romania, Cyprus, Greece, Lithuania and Serbia. Its primary field of application is School Education, with a focus on children and young people in pre-primary, primary and secondary education, school leaders, teachers, families and local communities. The recommendations translate the consortium's work into a school-centred framework for curriculum, wellbeing, inclusion, relationships, student voice and democratic participation. VET and adult learning are addressed only where a practice is transferable beyond mainstream school education.

The recommendations are proposals for policy and practice; implementation must comply with national education law, safeguarding obligations, equality requirements, data-protection rules and the professional responsibilities applicable in each setting.

If implemented coherently, the recommendations are expected to improve the visibility and continuity of PSD provision, support safer and more inclusive learning environments, strengthen learner agency and collaboration, and create more meaningful opportunities for civic participation. Institutions should test them through baseline assessment, periodic review, transparent reporting and willingness to adapt or discontinue practices that are ineffective, inequitable or unnecessarily burdensome.

Every participating institution should be able to answer five questions: Who is accountable for PSD? Where is it taught and practised? How are learners and families involved? What evidence will show whether provision is accessible and useful? What resources and decisions will sustain it after a project or funding cycle ends? A clear answer to these questions is the minimum threshold for moving from aspiration to institutional practice.

How to use the recommendations

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

European institutions and programme authorities can use the framework to shape guidance, peer-learning activities and funding priorities while respecting subsidiarity.
National and regional authorities can map PSD to existing standards, teacher competence frameworks, quality assurance and inclusion strategies.
School leaders can use the implementation protocols, indicators and annual review cycle to plan coherent provision.
Teachers and school support staff can adapt the practice examples to learners' age, language, learning pathway and support needs.
Learners, families and community partners can use the participation provisions to influence priorities and assess whether institutions respond to feedback.

Executive Summary

Personal and Social Development (PSD) should be recognised as a core educational outcome alongside subject knowledge, literacy, numeracy, science and digital competence in pre-primary, primary and secondary education. Children and young people need age-appropriate opportunities to understand themselves, manage learning and setbacks, build respectful relationships, cooperate across difference, exercise judgement and contribute to their school and local communities. These capacities are not fixed personality traits: they can be developed through explicit teaching, repeated practice, supportive relationships and school cultures whose everyday routines are consistent with the values they promote.

The B.E.E. consortium's framing—moving from "me" school to "we" school—captures the central policy proposition. Individual self-awareness is strengthened through relationships; relationships are shaped by inclusive institutional cultures; and social responsibility becomes meaningful when learners can participate in decisions and act on shared concerns. Domain A, Domain B and Domain C must therefore be designed as an interconnected progression rather than three disconnected programmes.

Three connected domains

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

Domain	Core learning focus	Institutional conditions	Illustrative evidence of progress
A — Self-awareness and personal development	Emotional vocabulary, self-regulation, autonomy, goal-setting, reflection, help-seeking and learning-to-learn.	Psychological safety, accessible reflection, trusted adults, formative feedback and clear referral routes.	Learners can identify a strategy, set a realistic next step, use feedback and request support.
B — Interpersonal skills and relationships	Listening, communication, empathy, cooperation, intercultural dialogue, conflict management and digital respect.	Inclusive group-work routines, anti-bullying systems, fair participation, staff modelling and safe reporting.	Learners contribute to shared tasks, listen and respond respectfully, and know how to report harm.
C — Social responsibility and civic engagement	Rights and responsibilities, critical thinking, participation, community contribution, sustainability and European citizenship.	Meaningful student voice, community partnerships, accessible civic projects and transparent decision cycles.	Learner proposals receive a documented response; projects show evidence use, reflection and community reciprocity.

Consortium-level recommendations

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

- Adopt a whole-school and whole-provider PSD framework that maps the three domains into existing curriculum, learner support, staff development, institutional governance and quality assurance.
- Set common European principles and adaptable competence descriptors, not a single compulsory lesson plan or high-stakes PSD test.
- Provide sustained professional learning, coaching and peer collaboration so teachers can rehearse strategies, reflect on implementation and access specialist support.

- Make student participation consequential: learners should know which decisions are open to influence, how their views will be considered and what changed as a result.
- Build safe, inclusive and culturally responsive practice into design from the outset, including reasonable adjustments, multilingual communication and alternatives to public self-disclosure.
- Use proportionate indicators and mixed evidence. Separate implementation measures, learner experience, observed practice and longer-term outcomes; avoid causal claims unsupported by the evaluation design.
- Fund coordination, staff time, accessible materials, evaluation and follow-up—not only launch events—and establish a cross-border network for adaptation and learning.
- Embed sustainability in leadership responsibility, annual planning, budget cycles, staff induction, community partnerships and continuity arrangements.

School Education focus and eight-country evidence base

The B.E.E. recommendations primarily address early childhood, primary and secondary schools. Eurostat's 2025 early-leaving indicator provides one contextual outcome measure for the eight partner countries: Italy 8.2%, Spain 12.8%, Portugal 6.1%, Romania 15.5%, Cyprus 9.8%, Greece 3.0%, Lithuania 5.9% and Serbia 5.1%, against an EU reference of 9.1% [1]. This indicator concerns 18–24-year-olds with at most lower-secondary attainment who are not in education or training; it is not a direct measure of the performance of current schools or of PSD competence.

Country	Early leaving (2025)	School Education context
Italy	8.2%	Persistent territorial gaps in learning outcomes; targeted support in southern regions and for disadvantaged pupils.
Spain	12.8%	Early leaving remains comparatively high; regional differences and teacher-profession reforms are relevant to school improvement.
Portugal	6.1%	Basic-skills and equity challenges remain, especially mathematics and the influence of socio-economic background.
Romania	15.5%	Highest early-leaving rate in the group; strong rural–urban and socio-economic disparities in school outcomes.
Cyprus	9.8%	Marked deterioration in basic skills and underachievement; continuing work on inclusion and participation.
Greece	3.0%	Low early-leaving rate coexists with serious mathematics and digital-skills challenges and regional differences.
Lithuania	5.9%	Competence-based curriculum implementation requires support; teacher shortages are acute in STEM and rural schools.
Serbia	5.1%	New achievement standards cover all three pre-university cycles; continuity, inclusion and basic skills need sustained attention.

Comparability note. The seven EU Member States can be considered against the Education and Training Monitor 2025 country reports. Serbia is a non-EU partner and is contextualised separately through the European Commission's 2025 Serbia Report and OECD PISA 2025 country note [2–10]. Country-specific figures from different years or instruments should not be combined into a ranking.

Chapter 1. Introduction: The Imperative of Personal and Social Development in European Education

School Education country application. *School Education application across the partnership. Italy's main equity issue is the territorial gap in learning outcomes; Spain combines comparatively high early leaving with regional differences; Portugal must address basic-skills gaps, especially mathematics; Romania faces the sharpest early-leaving and rural–urban challenges; Cyprus reports major basic-skills underachievement; Greece combines low early leaving with weak mathematics and digital outcomes; Lithuania is implementing a competence-based school curriculum amid teacher shortages; Serbia is consolidating new pre-university achievement standards and rebuilding continuity after disruption [1–10].*

1.1 The evolving landscape of education: addressing 21st-century challenges

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

European education systems prepare learners for changing labour markets, technological transformation, democratic participation and increasingly diverse communities. Knowledge remains indispensable, but learners also need to manage uncertainty, collaborate with people whose experiences differ from their own, assess information critically, navigate online communication and make decisions that affect others. PSD offers a structured educational response to these demands without reducing education to employability or treating learners merely as future workers.

The policy task is to connect personal growth, social relationships and civic responsibility with the daily work of schools. This means teaching emotional and interpersonal strategies explicitly, modelling them through adult behaviour, creating safe opportunities for practice and ensuring that school rules and institutional decisions do not contradict the competencies being taught. A lesson on respect has limited credibility if pupils experience humiliation; a unit on democracy is incomplete if student proposals are routinely ignored.

1.1.1 From isolated activities to coherent provision

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

One-off workshops can introduce vocabulary and stimulate interest, but transfer requires repetition across contexts. PSD should be embedded in ordinary subject teaching, classroom routines, school projects, pastoral support, student councils, digital citizenship and community engagement. School leaders should first map existing provision, identify gaps and duplication, and then select a manageable number of improvements. The purpose is not to create a parallel curriculum or burden teachers with new paperwork; it is to make existing school practice more intentional and coherent.

1.1.2 The implications of digital and social change

School Education lens. *School application: teach privacy, consent, source evaluation, respectful online behaviour and age-appropriate use of AI and mobile devices. Spain's regional variation in phone-use rules, Cyprus' digital-skills challenges and the OECD's 2025 evidence for Serbia support school-level digital citizenship policies [6,8,10].*

Digital environments can expand access to peers and resources while intensifying social comparison, misinformation, exclusion and conflict. Learners need to understand privacy, consent, tone, source credibility and the permanence or circulation of digital content. These skills belong across Domains A, B and C: self-regulation supports thoughtful posting; interpersonal competence supports respectful online interaction; civic competence supports informed participation and resistance to manipulation. Digital tools should be selected for a defined learning purpose, with accessibility, moderation and data protection built in.

1.2 Defining and contextualizing Personal and Social Development (PSD)

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

For this consortium, PSD is a developmental and educational process through which learners build self-awareness and agency, establish constructive relationships, and participate responsibly in shared social life. Domain A includes emotional literacy, reflection, autonomy, goal-setting, resilience understood as supported adaptation, and learning-to-learn. Domain B includes communication, listening, empathy, collaboration, inclusion, conflict resolution and intercultural dialogue. Domain C includes civic knowledge, rights and responsibilities, critical judgement, student voice, community contribution and democratic participation.

The domains are analytically distinct but operationally interdependent. A learner preparing to resolve a disagreement needs to notice their own reaction (A), listen and communicate respectfully (B), and consider fairness and consequences for the group (C). A community project similarly requires individual planning, cooperation among participants and accountable engagement with people affected by the project. Institutional plans should therefore identify domain-specific outcomes while deliberately creating activities that connect them.

1.2.1 PSD is teachable, contextual and non-diagnostic

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

Competencies should be treated as developable practices rather than fixed personality characteristics. A quiet learner may listen carefully and contribute through writing; a learner who speaks confidently may still need support to share control in group work. Eye contact, expressive style and willingness to disclose personal information are not reliable universal measures of competence. Assessment should focus on observable learning behaviours and opportunities provided, not on labelling learners as emotionally mature, resilient or deficient.

1.2.2 The boundary between education and specialist support

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

PSD education can promote protective relationships and teach strategies, but it must not become amateur diagnosis or a substitute for mental-health, social or safeguarding services. Activities should not compel disclosure of trauma, family circumstances or sensitive identity information. Staff should explain confidentiality limits, know the designated referral route and avoid promising secrecy where safety concerns require action. When a learner's needs exceed educational support, the institution should follow established procedures and coordinate with appropriate services within lawful information-sharing boundaries.

1.3 The role of the consortium: a pan-European perspective

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

B.E.E. brings together partners from Italy, Spain, Portugal, Romania, Cyprus, Greece, Lithuania and Serbia. The value of this partnership lies not in assuming that the eight contexts are identical, but in creating a disciplined way to compare experience, identify transferable principles and adapt practices to national, regional, linguistic and institutional realities.

Cross-border work can reveal common implementation challenges—such as limited time, uneven staff confidence or low visibility of activities—while also showing why delivery methods must remain locally responsive.

The consortium should operate as a learning network. Each partner can document the context in which a practice was used, the learners involved, the resources required, the adaptations made, the evidence collected and the limitations encountered. Partners should share unsuccessful trials as well as successful ones. A practice should be transferred only after local feasibility, accessibility, safeguarding and curricular alignment have been considered.

1.3.1 Principles for a shared consortium position

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

- Common purpose: PSD strengthens learning, relationships, agency and responsible participation.
- Local ownership: each partner aligns implementation with national law, curriculum, language and institutional structures.
- Reciprocal learning: partners exchange methods and evidence without assuming that a successful practice can be copied unchanged.
- Equity by design: learners who face barriers are involved in planning and review, not added as an afterthought.
- Evidence integrity: findings retain their source, sample, instrument and limitations.
- Continuity: knowledge and responsibilities are embedded in institutions rather than remaining with a single project officer or enthusiastic teacher.

1.4 Linking PSD to EU educational goals and frameworks

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

PSD should be mapped to relevant European competence and lifelong-learning approaches, including personal, social and learning-to-learn competence, citizenship competence, digital competence and the wider objectives of inclusive, high-quality education. Such alignment helps authorities and providers reduce duplication and make the contribution of PSD visible within existing policy. The consortium must distinguish alignment from formal endorsement: this document is a consortium proposal and should not be described as an official EU standard unless adopted through the appropriate process.

At European level, guidance should set principles, offer adaptable descriptors and support mutual learning. National and regional authorities should determine how those principles connect with school curriculum standards, teacher education, inspection and quality assurance, inclusion strategies and funding. Schools should translate the framework into practice through curriculum mapping, staff development, learner participation and annual improvement plans. This layered approach respects subsidiarity while enabling meaningful comparison across the eight partner countries.

1.4.1 Learning-to-learn as the connecting thread

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

Learning-to-learn links the domains because it asks pupils to plan, monitor, seek feedback, adapt strategies and reflect on progress. Domain A provides the self-monitoring and goal-setting foundation; Domain B supports learning through dialogue, peer feedback and collaboration; Domain C encourages pupils to apply knowledge and judgement to authentic

school and community issues. Teachers should explicitly name these connections so pupils can transfer strategies between subjects, classroom projects, school activities and everyday decisions.

1.5 Shared policy principles and decision rules

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

Principle	Policy test	Evidence that can be reviewed
Coherence	Are PSD outcomes embedded in ordinary institutional routines?	Curriculum maps, annual plans, lesson examples and governance records.
Equity	Can learners with different needs and circumstances participate meaningfully?	Accessibility review, participation patterns, learner feedback and documented adjustments.
Safety and dignity	Are disclosure, reporting and referral boundaries clear?	Activity briefings, safeguarding procedures, staff training and confidential follow-up records.
Agency	Do learners influence decisions rather than merely attend consultations?	Proposal logs, responses, decision records and student-led project reviews.
Proportionality	Does evidence collection serve a defined improvement purpose?	Data inventory, retention rules, indicator list and evidence of decisions made.
Sustainability	Are time, roles, resources and continuity arrangements identified?	Budget lines, staff induction, named ownership and annual review.

1.6 Recommendations for decision-makers

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

- Adopt a shared PSD definition covering Domains A, B and C and learning-to-learn, while permitting age-appropriate local descriptors.
- Require every participating institution to map existing provision before introducing new activities.
- Make inclusion, safeguarding, student voice and data protection design requirements, not optional add-ons.
- Fund staff learning and coordination time alongside teaching materials and evaluation.
- Use cross-border peer learning to test transferability and document contextual adaptations.
- Review progress annually through evidence and learner experience, with transparent decisions to continue, adapt or stop practices.

1.7 From shared principles to a coherent implementation model

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

The consortium recommends a layered implementation model in which European-level principles, national and regional policy choices, institutional plans and classroom practice reinforce one another. The purpose of a shared model is not to impose uniform activities on eight different national education contexts. It is to make intended learning outcomes

explicit, establish minimum safeguards, and give practitioners a practical route from policy language to observable educational practice.

At school level, the first task is a mapping exercise. Leaders should identify where self-awareness, relationship skills and civic participation are already developed through subject teaching, class tutor time, pastoral support, student councils, project work, digital citizenship, school events and partnerships with families and community organisations. The mapping should record formal provision and informal routines experienced by pupils, distinguishing planned and evaluated provision from activities that occur occasionally or depend on individual staff members.

The mapping should be followed by a gap analysis considering relevance, coherence, access, quality and sustainability. A school may offer many activities but still have weak continuity between them; another may offer fewer activities embedded in teaching and reviewed systematically. The number of events is therefore a poor primary measure of maturity. The central question is whether learners encounter repeated, safe and meaningful opportunities to practise competencies and receive useful feedback.

Every institution should translate the gap analysis into a limited annual improvement plan. The plan should name an accountable leader, coordinator, participating teams, learner groups, resources, indicators and review date. A small number of priorities implemented consistently is preferable to a long list of unresourced commitments. The plan should also identify what can be integrated, simplified or discontinued to avoid excessive workload.

1.8 Additional implementation considerations

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

Domain A, self-awareness and personal development, concerns identity, emotional literacy, resilience, autonomy and goal-setting. Domain B, interpersonal skills and relationships, concerns communication, empathy, cooperation, inclusion and constructive conflict resolution. Domain C, social responsibility and civic engagement, concerns rights, responsibilities, participation, community contribution and democratic decision-making. These domains overlap in practice: learners who understand their emotions can communicate more constructively, and those who can cooperate are better equipped to act responsibly in their communities.

The consortium recommends that education authorities establish a whole-school PSD framework; schools map competencies into existing curricula; teachers receive sustained professional learning; students participate in decisions; families become genuine partners; and institutions use proportionate evaluation to improve provision. Implementation should be supported by protected time, leadership accountability, accessible resources, safeguarding procedures and long-term funding. Common European principles should allow local adaptation rather than imposing a single lesson plan or assessment instrument.

Learners encounter pressure from examinations, peer relationships, online environments, social comparison and uncertainty about future pathways. These pressures are not identical for every learner and may be intensified by disability, poverty, migration, discrimination, family stress or limited access to support. Schools cannot resolve every social determinant, but they can provide predictable relationships, safe routines, opportunities for agency and explicit teaching of emotional and interpersonal strategies. PSD policy should be responsive to these varied circumstances.

Resilience education should equip learners with coping strategies while acknowledging that some difficulties arise from unsafe environments, discrimination, poverty or inadequate support. Policy must not imply that students are solely responsible for adapting to harmful conditions. Schools should pair personal strategies with action to remove barriers, address bullying and secure appropriate support. Resilience is best understood as supported adaptation: relationships, institutional flexibility and access to help matter as much as individual determination.

Families can reinforce emotional vocabulary, routines and goal review when schools communicate clearly and respectfully. Guidance should offer practical ideas rather than judging family practices or assuming all households have equal time, language access or digital resources. Schools should explain the purpose of PSD and invite families to share

observations. Teachers remain responsible for educational provision; families should not be expected to deliver specialist interventions. Where home and school perspectives differ, dialogue should focus on the learner's needs.

A school implementing Domain A should be able to show that learners encounter regular reflection; teachers use shared emotional and metacognitive language; goal-setting is scaffolded; students can access mentoring or trusted adults; and privacy safeguards are clear. Leaders should examine timetables, lesson plans, student voice and staff development records rather than relying on policy statements alone. Review should ask which learners benefit, which remain excluded and what changes are needed. The checklist is a prompt for improvement, not a punitive audit.

Language differences can be mistaken for lack of knowledge, confidence or social competence. Schools should provide visual supports, vocabulary scaffolds, peer collaboration and opportunities for learners to use their full linguistic repertoire where feasible. Interpersonal competence can be demonstrated through gestures, writing, assistive communication and other modes. Family communication should be accessible to people who do not use the school's main language fluently. Translation and interpretation should be planned rather than treated as an emergency measure.

The consortium materials identify opportunities to improve visibility and communication between school and family. Schools should communicate PSD aims, activities and progress through predictable channels, using accessible language and more than one format where feasible. Families should know how to ask questions and offer feedback. Communication must be two-way; schools should not merely send information. Leaders should review whether messages reach families with limited digital access, limited language proficiency or irregular availability.

Domain A helps learners notice their experiences, understand their strengths and needs, direct their learning and seek support. The policy objective is not to produce uniformly confident or emotionally expressive learners; it is to expand each learner’s capacity to reflect, make choices, learn from feedback and respond constructively to challenge.

Chapter 2. Domain A: Cultivating Self-Awareness and Personal Development

School Education country application. *Domain A in School Education should focus on emotional literacy, self-regulation, learner agency, metacognition and supported help-seeking across classroom and school life. The examples should be adjusted to age and school stage: Italy's territorial attainment gaps, Spain's school-retention challenge, Romania's disadvantage-related gaps, Cyprus' basic-skills underachievement and Lithuania's curriculum implementation needs all make accessible, formative support particularly important [2–8].*

2.1 Policy recommendations for enhancing self-awareness

School Education lens. *School application: use age-appropriate reflection, learning journals, classroom check-ins and private goal-setting; avoid diagnostic labels or compulsory disclosure. Give additional scaffolding where disadvantage affects learning access, as highlighted in Italy, Romania and Cyprus [2,5,6].*

2.1.1 Integrating reflective practices into curricula (journaling, self-assessment)

School Education lens. *School application: triangulate attendance, progression, basic-skills data, pupil voice, family feedback and classroom observation. Use the 2025 early-leaving figures only as contextual indicators, not as direct measures of PSD or individual school quality [1].*

Embed short reflection routines in existing lessons rather than treating reflection as an isolated subject. A practical sequence is: identify the learning intention; invite the learner to notice what strategy they used; compare the result with the intention; and select one next step. Journals, exit tickets, portfolios, audio reflections, visual scales and brief conferences are alternative formats, not interchangeable requirements. Institutions should explain who can access records and should never grade learners for personal disclosure or emotional openness.

Operational implementation: Operational protocol: each department selects one recurring reflection routine, trials it for a defined period, gathers learner feedback and reviews whether the routine improves strategy use or makes next steps clearer. Keep prompts focused on learning processes, such as "What helped me continue?" or "What will I try differently?", and offer fictional examples where personal reflection may feel intrusive.

Suggested indicators: Indicators: proportion of sampled lesson plans containing an explicit reflection step; proportion of learners who can identify a next learning action; learner-reported usefulness and accessibility of reflection formats; proportion of staff who can explain privacy arrangements.

2.1.2 Development of emotional-intelligence training for teachers and students

School Education lens. *School application: use age-appropriate reflection, learning journals, classroom check-ins and private goal-setting; avoid diagnostic labels or compulsory disclosure. Give additional scaffolding where disadvantage affects learning access, as highlighted in Italy, Romania and Cyprus [2,5,6].*

Teach emotional literacy as the ability to notice, name and respond to emotions safely—not as a demand to suppress feelings or disclose private experiences. Students can explore vocabulary and response options through stories, fictional cases, visual prompts and structured discussion. Teachers need practice in responding calmly, acknowledging feelings without making assumptions, de-escalating tension and identifying when specialist support is needed. Training should include cultural responsiveness, disability inclusion and the fact that outward expression differs across people.

Operational implementation: Operational protocol: introduce the skill; model it through a low-risk scenario; let learners rehearse a response; discuss alternatives; and identify a safe help-seeking route. For staff, combine training with coaching and peer reflection on classroom scenarios. Do not rely on a one-off presentation.

Suggested indicators: Indicators: staff confidence before and after training; frequency of planned emotional-literacy practice; learner ability to name more than one safe response to frustration; staff understanding of referral boundaries.

2.1.3 Promoting goal-setting and personal growth strategies

School Education lens. *School application: use age-appropriate reflection, learning journals, classroom check-ins and private goal-setting; avoid diagnostic labels or compulsory disclosure. Give additional scaffolding where disadvantage affects learning access, as highlighted in Italy, Romania and Cyprus [2,5,6].*

Use goals that are specific, realistic, reviewable and meaningful to the learner. A goal should include a first step, likely barriers, available support and a review date. Goals may relate to academic learning, attendance, participation, communication or teamwork; goals concerning sensitive personal circumstances must remain voluntary and confidential. Learners should be allowed to revise a goal without being framed as having failed.

Operational implementation: agree a learning goal; break it into manageable steps; identify classroom resources and possible obstacles; check progress at a planned point; and record the next adjustment. In a school setting, connect goals to subject learning, project work, participation and reflective feedback.

Suggested indicators: Indicators: proportion of learners with access to structured goal review; proportion able to state a feasible next step; completion of review conversations; learner perception that feedback supports improvement rather than judgement.

2.1.4 Implementing mentorship programmes for individualised support

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

Mentoring should provide a reliable relationship for goal review, help-seeking and connection to services. Schools should define eligibility and access routes, mentor responsibilities, boundaries, confidentiality limits, supervision and referral procedures. Students should have a voice in identifying a trusted adult where feasible. Mentors must not act as therapists or investigate safeguarding concerns independently.

Operational implementation: Operational protocol: map existing pastoral systems; identify learners who may benefit without stigmatising them; train and supervise mentors; agree a light-touch meeting rhythm; record agreed educational actions rather than sensitive narratives; and review whether learners feel supported. Ensure that quieter or marginalised learners are not overlooked.

Suggested indicators: Indicators: access to a named trusted adult; timeliness of agreed follow-up; learner-reported awareness of help routes; mentor training and supervision coverage; review of access equity.

2.2 Teacher training and professional development for Domain A

School Education lens. *School application: prioritise sustained teacher learning, coaching and shared planning time. Spain's teacher-profession reforms and Lithuania's acute shortages in STEM and rural schools show why national strategies must be translated into practical school-level support [3,8].*

2.2.1 Strategies for fostering a safe and supportive learning environment

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

Psychological safety means learners can ask questions, make mistakes, disagree respectfully and seek help without humiliation. It does not mean removing challenge. Staff should set norms against ridicule, respond consistently to disrespect, provide feedback focused on strategies and make participation options clear. Leadership should review whether the formal policy matches learner experience, especially for learners who rarely speak in public.

Operational implementation: Operational protocol: co-create a small number of classroom norms; model how to respond to error; use low-stakes practice before high-stakes assessment; and provide confidential routes for raising concerns. Review incidents and learner feedback at scheduled intervals.

Suggested indicators: Indicators: learner-reported safety and belonging; awareness of reporting routes; staff confidence responding to distress; documented changes following feedback.

2.2.2 Resources and tools for implementing self-awareness activities

School Education lens. *School application: use age-appropriate reflection, learning journals, classroom check-ins and private goal-setting; avoid diagnostic labels or compulsory disclosure. Give additional scaffolding where disadvantage affects learning access, as highlighted in Italy, Romania and Cyprus [2,5,6].*

Provide a curated resource bank with age-appropriate prompts, visual supports, accessible templates, scenario cards, goal-setting tools and guidance on privacy. Resources should be adaptable to different languages, literacy levels, disabilities and communication styles. Digital tools must be selected after considering data protection, accessibility, platform terms and whether a non-digital alternative is needed.

Operational implementation: Operational protocol: resource owners review each item for purpose, age suitability, inclusion, risk and ease of use. Pilot with learners and teachers before wider distribution; record adaptation notes and version dates.

Suggested indicators: Indicators: number and range of resources reviewed; teacher-reported ease of adaptation; availability of accessible alternatives; usage patterns across subjects and school settings.

2.2.3 Evaluation and assessment of personal development progress

School Education lens. *School application: use age-appropriate reflection, learning journals, classroom check-ins and private goal-setting; avoid diagnostic labels or compulsory disclosure. Give additional scaffolding where disadvantage affects learning access, as highlighted in Italy, Romania and Cyprus [2,5,6].*

Use formative assessment to guide next steps, not to rank personalities. Appropriate evidence includes learner self-assessment, observation of strategy use, portfolios, short conferences and the ability to seek support. A single answer or behaviour should never be treated as a complete measure of inner state. Assessment should be age-appropriate and contextualised; records should not become permanent labels or gatekeeping tools.

Operational implementation: Operational protocol: define observable behaviours; gather evidence on more than one occasion; discuss it with the learner; agree a next step; and review whether the assessment method itself creates barriers. Report aggregated trends only when privacy can be protected.

Suggested indicators: Indicators: proportion of assessment records linked to an actionable next step; learner understanding of criteria; consistency between teachers; absence of public rankings or inappropriate high-stakes use.

2.3 Linking Domain A to learning-to-learn competencies

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

2.3.1 Metacognition and strategic learning

School Education lens. *School application: use age-appropriate reflection, learning journals, classroom check-ins and private goal-setting; avoid diagnostic labels or compulsory disclosure. Give additional scaffolding where disadvantage affects learning access, as highlighted in Italy, Romania and Cyprus [2,5,6].*

Make planning, monitoring, help-seeking, feedback use and strategy adjustment visible in everyday teaching. Teachers can think aloud while approaching a task, compare two approaches and ask learners to explain when a strategy may or may not work. Avoid prescribing a single "learning style"; the purpose is flexible strategic choice.

Operational implementation: Operational protocol: choose one subject task, model a strategy, let learners apply it, invite comparison and revisit the strategy in a different context. Coordinate language across subjects so students recognise transfer.

Suggested indicators: Indicators: learners can describe a strategy and its purpose; teachers explicitly model strategy selection; examples of transfer between subject or curricular and school-community contexts.

2.3.2 Resilience as supported adaptation

School Education lens. *School application: use age-appropriate reflection, learning journals, classroom check-ins and private goal-setting; avoid diagnostic labels or compulsory disclosure. Give additional scaffolding where disadvantage affects learning access, as highlighted in Italy, Romania and Cyprus [2,5,6].*

Resilience should not be framed as an individual obligation to tolerate harmful conditions. Schools must pair coping strategies with action on bullying, exclusion, inaccessible tasks and structural barriers. Teach learners to pause, break tasks down, ask for help, change approach and return to a challenge when ready, while ensuring adults respond to the causes of repeated difficulty.

Operational implementation: Pilot the practice in a defined period, gather accessible feedback, and review feasibility, inclusion and next steps with learners and staff.

Suggested indicators: Indicators: availability of multiple support strategies; learner awareness of help routes; documented institutional responses to recurring barriers; reduction in avoidable exclusion from challenging tasks.

2.3.3 Family partnership and learner autonomy

School Education lens. *School application: use age-appropriate reflection, learning journals, classroom check-ins and private goal-setting; avoid diagnostic labels or compulsory disclosure. Give additional scaffolding where disadvantage affects learning access, as highlighted in Italy, Romania and Cyprus [2,5,6].*

Families can reinforce routines and celebrate progress when schools communicate clearly and respectfully. Provide practical suggestions, accessible language and flexible channels; do not assume every household has equal time, digital access or familiarity with school systems. Learners should retain appropriate autonomy, and families should not be asked to provide specialist intervention.

Operational implementation: Pilot the practice in a defined period, gather accessible feedback, and review feasibility, inclusion and next steps with learners and staff.

Suggested indicators: Indicators: family awareness of PSD aims; range of communication channels; response rates across different groups; evidence that family feedback informs adjustments.

2.4 Domain A implementation cycle: from intention to learner agency

School Education lens. *School application: use age-appropriate reflection, learning journals, classroom check-ins and private goal-setting; avoid diagnostic labels or compulsory disclosure. Give additional scaffolding where disadvantage affects learning access, as highlighted in Italy, Romania and Cyprus [2,5,6].*

Domain A should be implemented through a recurring cycle: establish a safe learning purpose; model a strategy; provide low-risk practice; invite reflection; agree a next step; and revisit the strategy in a new context. This sequence can be integrated into ordinary lessons, tutorials, class projects and school activities without creating a separate subject.

Teachers should distinguish between the skill being taught and the private content a learner may choose to share. A learner can demonstrate reflective thinking by analysing a fictional case, describing a learning strategy or reviewing a group task. No learner should be required to disclose family difficulties, trauma, health information or personal identity. Journals and portfolios need clear access rules; assessment should focus on the quality of reflection and usefulness of the next step, not the intimacy of disclosure.

Goal-setting should be treated as dialogue rather than compliance. A useful goal identifies an area the learner wishes to develop, a realistic action, a source of support, a review point and a way to recognise progress. When a goal proves unrealistic, analyse the conditions and revise the plan. Repeated difficulty may indicate a need to change teaching methods, workload, accessibility or institutional support, not merely a need for the learner to try harder.

Mentoring arrangements should be proportionate and transparent. Institutions should specify access routes, meeting frequency, recording rules, confidentiality limits and referral procedures. Mentors need preparation and supervision. Mentoring must complement, not replace, specialist psychological, social, medical or safeguarding support.

2.5 Progression, evidence and differentiated support in Domain A

School Education lens. *School application: triangulate attendance, progression, basic-skills data, pupil voice, family feedback and classroom observation. Use the 2025 early-leaving figures only as contextual indicators, not as direct measures of PSD or individual school quality [1].*

Progression should be described in terms of increasing independence and strategic flexibility, not a universal timetable for emotional development. Early stages may involve recognising a learning challenge and selecting from supported strategies. More advanced stages may involve setting goals, monitoring progress, seeking feedback, adapting a plan and explaining transfer to another context. Age, disability, language, neurodiversity, prior experience and current circumstances affect how behaviours are expressed.

Evidence should be collected on more than one occasion and, where practical, from more than one source. A learner reflection can be combined with teacher observation, portfolio evidence or strategy use in a task. Evidence should answer a specific question, such as whether learners can identify a next step after feedback, know how to seek help or find reflection formats accessible. It should not label learners as resilient, unmotivated or emotionally mature.

Institutions should monitor who benefits and who encounters barriers. Participation data may be reviewed by learner groups only where lawful, necessary and safe; small groups must not be identifiable. When a gap appears, staff should investigate whether the activity, language, timing, environment or assessment method creates the barrier.

Chapter 3. Domain B: Strengthening Interpersonal Skills and Relationships

School Education country application. *Domain B should be developed through classroom climate, peer relationships, anti-bullying practice, inclusive group work and family-school communication. Schools should pay particular attention to segregation and rural–urban exclusion in Romania, regional disparities in Italy and Greece, and the needs of multilingual and disadvantaged pupils across all eight partner countries. Serbia's latest PISA country note also provides a current school-life and bullying reference [5,8,10].*

3.1 Policy recommendations for developing interpersonal competencies

School Education lens. *School application: make respectful relationships visible in class routines, peer collaboration, anti-bullying procedures and safe reporting. Pay particular attention to school segregation and rural–urban gaps in Romania, regional inequalities in Italy and Greece, and inclusion of multilingual pupils [2,5,7,8,10].*

3.1.1 Incorporating collaborative learning and group project methodologies

School Education lens. *School application: make respectful relationships visible in class routines, peer collaboration, anti-bullying procedures and safe reporting. Pay particular attention to school segregation and rural–urban gaps in Romania, regional inequalities in Italy and Greece, and inclusion of multilingual pupils [2,5,7,8,10].*

Group work supports PSD only when collaboration is designed and taught. Each task should have a shared purpose, meaningful roles, clear participation expectations and an individual reflection component. Rotating roles—facilitator, evidence-checker, summariser, timekeeper and reporter—can distribute responsibility. Teachers should monitor who speaks, who is interrupted, whose work is recognised and whether the task disadvantages learners who need communication or language support.

Operational implementation: Operational protocol: establish the learning outcome and roles; model a collaboration routine; set a mid-task check; use peer feedback on observable behaviours; and close with a reflection on both the product and the process. Provide a confidential route to report unequal workloads.

Suggested indicators: Indicators: proportion of sampled group tasks with explicit roles and criteria; learner reports of fair contribution; use of peer reflection; teacher observations of participation distribution.

3.1.2 Implementing conflict resolution and mediation training

School Education lens. *School application: make respectful relationships visible in class routines, peer collaboration, anti-bullying procedures and safe reporting. Pay particular attention to school segregation and rural–urban gaps in Romania, regional inequalities in Italy and Greece, and inclusion of multilingual pupils [2,5,7,8,10].*

Teach learners to distinguish ordinary disagreement from bullying, harassment, coercion or abuse. For ordinary conflict, routines may include listening to each account, identifying needs, generating options, agreeing actions and checking follow-through. Mediation is inappropriate where there is intimidation, serious power imbalance or risk of harm. Peer mediators require selection criteria, training, adult supervision and clear limits.

Operational implementation: Operational protocol: train staff first; introduce a decision tree; practise with fictional scenarios; communicate reporting routes; and audit whether cases are referred appropriately. Never make a targeted learner responsible for resolving the behaviour of a person harming them.

Suggested indicators: Indicators: staff ability to distinguish conflict from bullying; learner knowledge of reporting routes; timeliness of appropriate response; follow-up on agreed actions.

3.1.3 Promoting empathy and respect for diversity through dialogue and role-playing

School Education lens. *School application: make respectful relationships visible in class routines, peer collaboration, anti-bullying procedures and safe reporting. Pay particular attention to school segregation and rural–urban gaps in Romania, regional inequalities in Italy and Greece, and inclusion of multilingual pupils [2,5,7,8,10].*

Use literature, case studies, structured dialogue and fictional role-play to explore perspectives without asking students to reenact trauma or represent an entire community. Debrief assumptions and evidence: what was inferred, what remains unknown and what alternative interpretation is possible? Participation should include options to observe, write or choose another role. Empathy does not require agreement and must not override personal boundaries.

Operational implementation: Pilot the practice in a defined period, gather accessible feedback, and review feasibility, inclusion and next steps with learners and staff.

Suggested indicators: Indicators: range of participation modes; learner ability to identify more than one perspective; facilitator use of debrief questions; student feedback on safety and respect.

3.1.4 Fostering effective communication skills across diverse contexts

School Education lens. *School application: make respectful relationships visible in class routines, peer collaboration, anti-bullying procedures and safe reporting. Pay particular attention to school segregation and rural–urban gaps in Romania, regional inequalities in Italy and Greece, and inclusion of multilingual pupils [2,5,7,8,10].*

Teach active listening, clarification, respectful disagreement, constructive requests and acknowledgement of uncertainty in ordinary lessons, classrooms and school laboratories and digital settings. Avoid assessing listening solely through eye contact or stillness. Multilingual learners and students using assistive communication should have equitable ways to demonstrate understanding.

Operational implementation: Operational protocol: model a communication behaviour; provide sentence stems or visual supports; rehearse in pairs or small groups; give feedback on behaviour rather than personality; and revisit the skill in a different context.

Suggested indicators: Indicators: explicit communication practice in lesson plans; learner-reported confidence using clarification and disagreement strategies; availability of multilingual or accessible supports.

3.2 Creating inclusive and collaborative learning environments

School Education lens. *School application: make respectful relationships visible in class routines, peer collaboration, anti-bullying procedures and safe reporting. Pay particular attention to school segregation and rural–urban gaps in Romania, regional inequalities in Italy and Greece, and inclusion of multilingual pupils [2,5,7,8,10].*

3.2.1 Strategies for addressing bullying and promoting positive peer relationships

School Education lens. *School application: make respectful relationships visible in class routines, peer collaboration, anti-bullying procedures and safe reporting. Pay particular attention to school segregation and rural–urban gaps in Romania, regional inequalities in Italy and Greece, and inclusion of multilingual pupils [2,5,7,8,10].*

Anti-bullying work requires clear reporting routes, prompt adult response, support for affected learners, proportionate accountability and follow-up. Awareness campaigns alone are insufficient if students expect reports to be minimised. Schools should examine repeated patterns, online dimensions, unequal power and whether institutional routines contribute to exclusion. Confidential case information must be protected.

Operational implementation: Operational protocol: publish a simple reporting route; explain what happens after a report; designate responsible staff; track response and follow-up; and review aggregate patterns without exposing

individuals. Keep restorative approaches separate from mandatory safeguarding action and never pressure harmed learners into face-to-face meetings.

Suggested indicators: Indicators: learner awareness of reporting; response-time monitoring; documented follow-up; learner perceptions of adult responsiveness; repeated incident patterns interpreted with care.

3.2.2 Utilising technology to enhance communication and collaboration

School Education lens. *School application: make respectful relationships visible in class routines, peer collaboration, anti-bullying procedures and safe reporting. Pay particular attention to school segregation and rural–urban gaps in Romania, regional inequalities in Italy and Greece, and inclusion of multilingual pupils [2,5,7,8,10].*

Digital platforms can support co-writing, peer feedback, project planning and transnational collaboration. Their use must be guided by a clear learning purpose, accessibility, privacy, age-appropriate consent, moderation and equitable access. Teachers should explicitly teach digital etiquette, attribution, consent before sharing images, source evaluation and responses to harmful content. Digital tools should not replace necessary face-to-face support or exclude learners without reliable connectivity.

Operational implementation: Pilot the practice in a defined period, gather accessible feedback, and review feasibility, inclusion and next steps with learners and staff.

Suggested indicators: Indicators: accessibility and data-protection checks completed; alternative access provided where needed; learner understanding of online conduct; evidence that digital collaboration supports a defined learning outcome.

3.2.3 Promoting intercultural dialogue

School Education lens. *School application: make respectful relationships visible in class routines, peer collaboration, anti-bullying procedures and safe reporting. Pay particular attention to school segregation and rural–urban gaps in Romania, regional inequalities in Italy and Greece, and inclusion of multilingual pupils [2,5,7,8,10].*

Intercultural dialogue should enable reciprocal exchange, critical curiosity and discussion of shared concerns; it should not reduce culture to food, festivals or national stereotypes. Partners can use multilingual resources, comparative case studies, joint projects and peer exchange. Facilitators must address discriminatory comments while allowing respectful disagreement. No learner should be expected to disclose identity or speak for a whole community.

Operational implementation: Operational protocol: establish dialogue norms; select a question that permits multiple evidence-based perspectives; ensure balanced participation; invite reflection on assumptions; and document what learners learned or reconsidered.

Suggested indicators: Indicators: diversity of voices represented; learner-reported respect; evidence of critical reflection; follow-up actions from cross-cultural projects.

3.3 Linking Domain B to learning-to-learn competencies

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

3.3.1 Peer learning and feedback literacy

School Education lens. *School application: make respectful relationships visible in class routines, peer collaboration, anti-bullying procedures and safe reporting. Pay particular attention to school segregation and rural–urban gaps in Romania, regional inequalities in Italy and Greece, and inclusion of multilingual pupils [2,5,7,8,10].*

Learning with peers requires students to give feedback that is specific, respectful and actionable, and to receive feedback without treating it as a judgement of identity. Teachers should model how to refer to criteria, ask clarifying questions and identify one next step. Peer assessment should be moderated and should not be the sole basis for high-stakes decisions.

Operational implementation: Pilot the practice in a defined period, gather accessible feedback, and review feasibility, inclusion and next steps with learners and staff.

Suggested indicators: Indicators: quality of peer feedback against agreed criteria; learner ability to identify a next step from feedback; staff use of modelling and moderation.

3.3.2 Collaboration as a transferable competence

School Education lens. *School application: make respectful relationships visible in class routines, peer collaboration, anti-bullying procedures and safe reporting. Pay particular attention to school segregation and rural–urban gaps in Romania, regional inequalities in Italy and Greece, and inclusion of multilingual pupils [2,5,7,8,10].*

Collaboration is relevant across subjects, classroom projects, school life and civic action. Pupils should practise planning, distributing roles, monitoring progress, managing disagreement and evaluating shared results. Scenarios can include group research, class presentations, peer support, school events, digital teamwork and community projects.

Operational implementation: Pilot the practice in a defined period, gather accessible feedback, and review feasibility, inclusion and next steps with learners and staff.

Suggested indicators: collaboration routines used across subjects and school projects; pupil reflections identifying transferable skills; balanced participation in group tasks; and feedback from teachers, families and community partners where appropriate.

3.3.3 Family-school communication as a relational system

School Education lens. *School application: make respectful relationships visible in class routines, peer collaboration, anti-bullying procedures and safe reporting. Pay particular attention to school segregation and rural–urban gaps in Romania, regional inequalities in Italy and Greece, and inclusion of multilingual pupils [2,5,7,8,10].*

Communication between school and family should be predictable, two-way and accessible. Institutions should explain the purpose of PSD activities, share examples and invite questions through more than one channel. Avoid assuming that a message sent digitally has reached every household. Review barriers related to language, work schedules, disability, transport and previous negative experiences.

Operational implementation: Pilot the practice in a defined period, gather accessible feedback, and review feasibility, inclusion and next steps with learners and staff.

Suggested indicators: Indicators: family awareness and participation; availability of accessible channels; evidence that feedback changes practice; communication reach across relevant groups.

3.4 Designing collaboration so that participation is fair

School Education lens. *School application: make respectful relationships visible in class routines, peer collaboration, anti-bullying procedures and safe reporting. Pay particular attention to school segregation and rural–urban gaps in Romania, regional inequalities in Italy and Greece, and inclusion of multilingual pupils [2,5,7,8,10].*

Collaborative learning requires deliberate task design. Each task should specify a shared outcome, expected individual contributions, roles, decision-making method and criteria for reviewing product and process. Roles should rotate so that the same learners do not always lead, take notes or perform routine tasks. Teachers should monitor participation during the activity, because unequal contribution can become invisible once a polished product is submitted.

Group composition should be considered in relation to the task, support needs and classroom dynamics. Mixed groups can broaden perspectives, but assigning a learner as the permanent translator, representative of a culture or mediator for peers is inequitable. Teachers should provide sentence starters, visual instructions, accessible tools and alternative ways to contribute.

Peer feedback should be taught explicitly. Learners need to practise describing observable work, linking comments to criteria, asking clarifying questions and suggesting a feasible next step. Feedback should not rank personalities or expose learners to ridicule. Where peer assessment contributes to formal grading, teachers should moderate it and guard against bias.

3.5 Conflict, bullying and safeguarding: a clear response pathway

School Education lens. *School application: make respectful relationships visible in class routines, peer collaboration, anti-bullying procedures and safe reporting. Pay particular attention to school segregation and rural–urban gaps in Romania, regional inequalities in Italy and Greece, and inclusion of multilingual pupils [2,5,7,8,10].*

Institutions should teach a clear distinction between disagreement, interpersonal conflict, bullying, harassment, discrimination, coercion and abuse. Ordinary disagreement may be addressed through structured listening when participants can engage voluntarily and on reasonably equal terms. Bullying or serious harm requires an adult-led safeguarding response; mediation must not create a false equivalence between the person harmed and the person responsible.

A response pathway should identify who receives a report, who assesses immediate safety, how the affected learner is supported, how information is recorded and shared lawfully, and who follows up. Learners should know what to expect after reporting. Staff should not promise absolute secrecy and should explain confidentiality limits appropriately.

Restorative approaches may be considered only when safe, appropriate and voluntary. They must not replace statutory duties, disciplinary procedures or specialist support. Institutions should review aggregate patterns while protecting identities and avoiding simplistic conclusions from incident counts alone.

3.6 Intercultural dialogue and digital relationships

School Education lens. *School application: make respectful relationships visible in class routines, peer collaboration, anti-bullying procedures and safe reporting. Pay particular attention to school segregation and rural–urban gaps in Romania, regional inequalities in Italy and Greece, and inclusion of multilingual pupils [2,5,7,8,10].*

Intercultural dialogue should be structured around questions, experiences and evidence rather than national stereotypes or tokenistic celebrations. Learners should compare interpretations, identify assumptions, ask respectful questions and revise views when evidence warrants it. No learner should be expected to represent an entire country, religion, language group or identity.

Digital collaboration requires attention to privacy, permanence, consent, moderation and unequal access. Before selecting a platform, institutions should review accessibility, data handling, age suitability, account requirements and non-digital alternatives. Learners should practise asking permission before sharing images or personal information, checking sources, attributing others' work and responding safely to harmful content.

Technology should support a defined educational objective. If it excludes learners, collects unnecessary personal data or creates unmanageable moderation demands, it should be adapted or discontinued.

Chapter 4. Domain C: Fostering Social Responsibility and Civic Engagement

School Education country application. *Domain C should be experienced through meaningful pupil voice, class and school councils, participatory projects, media literacy and community partnerships. Italy's 2025 Monitor notes strong civic competencies, while Cyprus reports comparatively weaker civic skills; these contrasting contexts reinforce the need for school-level baselines and opportunities for pupils to influence real decisions [2,6]. Serbia's pre-university standards and the national curriculum context should be considered when designing cross-border civic activities [9].*

Domain C connects individual and interpersonal competence to rights, responsibilities, community contribution and democratic life. Social responsibility should not be reduced to obedience or symbolic volunteering. Learners need opportunities to investigate issues, consider consequences, hear affected voices, make reasoned proposals and see how decisions are made.

4.1 Policy recommendations for enhancing social responsibility

School Education lens. *School application: connect civic learning to pupil councils, class decisions, local community projects and media literacy. Build on Italy's reported civic-competence strengths while addressing Cyprus' civic-skills challenge; ensure Serbian and EU partners adapt activities to their respective curriculum and governance frameworks [2,6,9].*

4.1.1 Integrating civic education and social issues into curricula

School Education lens. *School application: connect civic learning to pupil councils, class decisions, local community projects and media literacy. Build on Italy's reported civic-competence strengths while addressing Cyprus' civic-skills challenge; ensure Serbian and EU partners adapt activities to their respective curriculum and governance frameworks [2,6,9].*

Civic education should combine knowledge of institutions and rights with practice in deliberation, evidence analysis and decision-making. Teachers can connect curriculum to accessibility, local heritage, community well-being, digital misinformation or environmental quality. Complex issues should be presented with reliable evidence and room for legitimate disagreement, not as problems with only one acceptable answer.

Operational implementation: Map civic outcomes across subjects; select an issue suited to learners' age; identify affected stakeholders; compare evidence and options; and conclude with a reasoned recommendation.

Suggested indicators: Curriculum maps; student ability to distinguish evidence from opinion; quality of project reasoning; learner understanding of rights and responsibilities.

4.1.2 Promoting community service and volunteerism opportunities

School Education lens. *School application: connect civic learning to pupil councils, class decisions, local community projects and media literacy. Build on Italy's reported civic-competence strengths while addressing Cyprus' civic-skills challenge; ensure Serbian and EU partners adapt activities to their respective curriculum and governance frameworks [2,6,9].*

Community service should be safe, reciprocal and educationally meaningful. Partners should help define the need and role; activities must not replace paid work or essential services. Participation outside school should not disadvantage learners with caring responsibilities, disability, transport barriers or limited finances. Equivalent learning routes should be available when external participation is not feasible.

Operational implementation: Agree a written project brief, supervision and safeguarding arrangements; clarify what students can influence; prepare learners; reflect afterwards with both students and community partners; and report realistic outcomes.

Suggested indicators: Range of accessible opportunities; partner feedback; learner reflections; completion and follow-up; evidence of reciprocity and no displacement of essential work.

4.1.3 Developing critical thinking and problem-solving skills for social issues

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

Learners should practise asking what is claimed, what evidence supports it, which assumptions are present, whose perspectives are missing and what remains uncertain. A structured problem-solving cycle can include problem definition, stakeholder mapping, evidence gathering, option generation, trade-off analysis, action and review. The aim is reasoned judgement, not cynicism.

Operational implementation: Use a common project template; require source checks and alternative explanations; ask learners to state limitations; and review how new evidence changes a proposal.

Suggested indicators: Use of multiple sources; identification of uncertainty and trade-offs; quality of evidence-based proposals; learner reflections on changed views.

4.1.4 Fostering understanding of civic duties and rights

School Education lens. *School application: connect civic learning to pupil councils, class decisions, local community projects and media literacy. Build on Italy's reported civic-competence strengths while addressing Cyprus' civic-skills challenge; ensure Serbian and EU partners adapt activities to their respective curriculum and governance frameworks [2,6,9].*

Rights protect dignity and participation; responsibilities help ensure that rights are respected for others. Teaching should not present rights as rewards for compliant behaviour. Learners should know lawful routes for raising concerns, understand privacy and equality principles, and examine how institutions are accountable. Activities must protect pluralism and avoid partisan promotion.

Operational implementation: Use case studies and simulated decision processes; compare rights, responsibilities and institutional roles; provide routes to ask questions; and ensure balanced discussion.

Suggested indicators: Learner understanding of relevant rights and responsibilities; quality of case analysis; awareness of complaint and participation channels.

4.2 Building partnerships with community organisations

School Education lens. *School application: connect civic learning to pupil councils, class decisions, local community projects and media literacy. Build on Italy's reported civic-competence strengths while addressing Cyprus' civic-skills challenge; ensure Serbian and EU partners adapt activities to their respective curriculum and governance frameworks [2,6,9].*

4.2.1 Facilitating student involvement in local and regional initiatives

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

Schools can partner with libraries, cultural organisations, youth services, local authorities, charities, environmental groups and other relevant bodies. Partnerships should have a shared purpose, named contacts, safeguarding and data arrangements, clear roles and a review date. Community organisations should be treated as knowledge partners rather than simply venues for visits.

Operational implementation: Map local partners; jointly define the educational question and community need; agree responsibilities; prepare learners; document outcomes; and schedule a review before repeating the activity.

Suggested indicators: Active partnerships with written objectives; learner access and participation; partner assessment of reciprocity; evidence of continuity beyond a single event.

4.2.2 Creating platforms for student voice and participation in decision-making

School Education lens. *School application: connect civic learning to pupil councils, class decisions, local community projects and media literacy. Build on Italy's reported civic-competence strengths while addressing Cyprus' civic-skills challenge; ensure Serbian and EU partners adapt activities to their respective curriculum and governance frameworks [2,6,9].*

Student voice requires a visible route from contribution to decision. Use class discussion, representative councils, accessible consultations, anonymous suggestion routes and student-led project groups. Before consultation, explain what is open to influence, who decides, the response date and any legal or budget constraints. Publish an accessible response explaining which proposals were accepted, modified or declined and why.

Operational implementation: Maintain a student proposal log; assign an adult contact; respond within an agreed timeframe; and review whether the same confident students dominate. Provide written, visual, digital and small-group contribution options.

Suggested indicators: Proposals received and answered; response timeliness; diversity of participation; proportion of decisions with documented feedback; student perception of influence.

4.2.3 Promoting awareness of European citizenship

School Education lens. *School application: connect civic learning to pupil councils, class decisions, local community projects and media literacy. Build on Italy's reported civic-competence strengths while addressing Cyprus' civic-skills challenge; ensure Serbian and EU partners adapt activities to their respective curriculum and governance frameworks [2,6,9].*

European citizenship education can explore shared democratic principles, rights, cultural diversity and cooperation without erasing local, regional or national identities. Cross-border projects can compare how communities address similar issues and how European cooperation affects daily life. Mobility should be complemented by preparation, digital exchange, reflection and follow-up for learners who do not travel.

Operational implementation: Select a shared question with partner institutions; prepare learners to compare contexts fairly; use collaborative outputs; reflect on similarities and differences; and make findings accessible to the wider school community.

Suggested indicators: Participation in cross-border activities; learner understanding of European cooperation; quality of comparative reflection; access for non-mobile learners.

4.3 Linking Domain C to learning-to-learn competencies

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

4.3.1 Project-based learning and reflective inquiry

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

Civic projects create an authentic context for planning, research, collaboration, feedback and revision. Students should record decisions, evidence and changes in approach, not only final products. Reflection should include whose needs were considered, which assumptions proved weak and what the team would change next time.

Operational implementation: Use a project cycle with milestones and a reflection log; provide formative feedback at each stage; and assess process as well as outcome.

Suggested indicators: Completion of milestones; quality of reflection; evidence of strategy adaptation; learner ability to explain what they learned.

4.3.2 Student-led evaluation of civic action

School Education lens. *School application: connect civic learning to pupil councils, class decisions, local community projects and media literacy. Build on Italy's reported civic-competence strengths while addressing Cyprus' civic-skills challenge; ensure Serbian and EU partners adapt activities to their respective curriculum and governance frameworks [2,6,9].*

Learners should help define what success means, choose feasible indicators and review the evidence. They may measure participation, accessibility, partner satisfaction or a tangible change in a shared space. They must avoid overstating impact or collecting unnecessary personal data. Adult supervision should preserve safety without taking over the project.

Operational implementation: Before action, agree a small set of indicators; establish a baseline where feasible; gather feedback; compare results with objectives; and communicate limitations and next steps.

Suggested indicators: Student contribution to evaluation design; proportion of projects with baseline and review; quality of evidence; realistic claims about impact.

4.3.3 Ethical responsibility in school life and community projects

School Education lens. *School application: connect civic learning to pupil councils, class decisions, local community projects and media literacy. Build on Italy's reported civic-competence strengths while addressing Cyprus' civic-skills challenge; ensure Serbian and EU partners adapt activities to their respective curriculum and governance frameworks [2,6,9].*

In School Education, ethical responsibility should be explored through age-appropriate classroom cases involving fairness, respect, privacy, inclusion, responsible digital behaviour, care for shared spaces and the consequences of group decisions. Pupils should connect school rules with rights, responsibilities and the wellbeing of others.

Operational implementation: Integrate realistic scenarios into subject lessons, class meetings and collaborative projects; agree clear behaviour and reporting expectations; and ensure that pupils can raise concerns safely and without retaliation.

Suggested indicators: classes using age-appropriate ethical scenarios; pupil understanding of school rights and responsibilities; documented opportunities to discuss fairness and inclusion; and pupil feedback on whether concerns are heard and addressed.

4.4 Safeguards for meaningful civic participation

School Education lens. *School application: connect civic learning to pupil councils, class decisions, local community projects and media literacy. Build on Italy's reported civic-competence strengths while addressing Cyprus' civic-skills challenge; ensure Serbian and EU partners adapt activities to their respective curriculum and governance frameworks [2,6,9].*

- Participation must be voluntary where the activity involves public exposure, political expression or external community engagement, with equivalent learning routes where needed.
- Schools must not use student participation to promote a party, candidate or institutional reputation; learners should be able to question proposals and consider alternatives.
- Community projects require risk assessment, appropriate supervision, consent and clear data-handling arrangements.
- Adults remain accountable for legal duties, safety and equitable treatment; student agency does not transfer adult responsibilities to children or young people.
- Projects should report both achievements and limitations, including unintended effects and groups whose perspectives were not heard.

4.5 From civic knowledge to meaningful participation

School Education lens. *School application: connect civic learning to pupil councils, class decisions, local community projects and media literacy. Build on Italy's reported civic-competence strengths while addressing Cyprus' civic-skills challenge; ensure Serbian and EU partners adapt activities to their respective curriculum and governance frameworks [2,6,9].*

Civic education becomes meaningful when learners connect knowledge of rights and institutions with deliberation, evidence and responsible action. A civic learning sequence should help learners define an issue, identify who is affected, distinguish evidence from opinion, compare possible responses, consider trade-offs and communicate a reasoned proposal. Teachers should protect pluralism and avoid presenting contested issues as exercises with only one acceptable conclusion.

Student voice must have a visible route to influence. Before consultation, the institution should explain what decision is open, who holds authority, what constraints apply and when a response will be given. After consultation, it should publish an accessible account of which proposals were adopted, modified or declined and why.

Civic projects should be reciprocal and ethically designed. Community partners should help define the issue. Projects must not replace paid work or essential services, expose learners to unsafe situations or disadvantage those with caring duties, disability, limited transport or financial constraints. Equivalent learning routes should be available when external participation is not feasible.

4.6 European citizenship and cross-border civic learning

School Education lens. *School application: connect civic learning to pupil councils, class decisions, local community projects and media literacy. Build on Italy's reported civic-competence strengths while addressing Cyprus' civic-skills challenge; ensure Serbian and EU partners adapt activities to their respective curriculum and governance frameworks [2,6,9].*

European citizenship should be explored through rights, democratic principles, shared responsibilities and cooperation, while recognising local, regional and national identities. Learners should examine how decisions at different levels affect their lives and how citizens can seek information, participate, question institutions and collaborate across borders.

The B.E.E. partnership can create comparative projects around issues that matter to learners in the seven participating countries. Partners should agree common inquiry stages while allowing each group to investigate its local context. Final products should identify similarities, differences, limitations and practical lessons rather than force a single explanation.

Mobility can deepen this work but should not be the only route to participation. Digital exchanges, collaborative research, shared presentations and local projects can involve learners who do not travel. Preparation and follow-up are essential.

4.7 Evaluating civic action responsibly

School Education lens. *School application: connect civic learning to pupil councils, class decisions, local community projects and media literacy. Build on Italy's reported civic-competence strengths while addressing Cyprus' civic-skills challenge; ensure Serbian and EU partners adapt activities to their respective curriculum and governance frameworks [2,6,9].*

Before beginning a project, learners and educators should agree a small number of indicators linked to the objective. These may include reach, accessibility, partner feedback, participation quality, completion of agreed actions or a change in a specific local condition. Where feasible, a baseline should be recorded before the intervention.

Students should participate in interpreting evidence, while adults remain responsible for safeguarding, ethics and the accuracy of public claims. A project that delivered an event can report that output; it should not claim to have changed community attitudes unless evidence supports the conclusion. Final reflection should identify what worked, what did not, what remains uncertain and whether the activity should continue, change or stop.

The following operational guidance translates the chapter's policy principles into procedures, review questions and accountability arrangements. It should be adapted to local law, learner needs and institutional capacity while preserving the stated purpose and safeguards.

4.8 Family, learner and community participation protocol

School Education lens. *School application: connect civic learning to pupil councils, class decisions, local community projects and media literacy. Build on Italy's reported civic-competence strengths while addressing Cyprus' civic-skills challenge; ensure Serbian and EU partners adapt activities to their respective curriculum and governance frameworks [2,6,9].*

PSD is more credible when learners can influence educational life and when family and community engagement is reciprocal. Participation, however, should not become a symbolic exercise or an additional burden on people with limited time, language access or trust in institutions. The following protocol establishes minimum conditions for consultation and co-design.

4.8.1 Define the scope before asking for views

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

Before inviting feedback, the institution should state what question is open, what constraints apply, who will make the decision and when a response will be provided. It should distinguish matters learners can decide, matters on which they can advise, and matters governed by legal, safeguarding or budgetary requirements. Transparent limits protect trust more effectively than a promise that every proposal will be accepted.

4.8.2 Offer multiple participation routes

School Education lens. *School application: connect civic learning to pupil councils, class decisions, local community projects and media literacy. Build on Italy's reported civic-competence strengths while addressing Cyprus' civic-skills challenge; ensure Serbian and EU partners adapt activities to their respective curriculum and governance frameworks [2,6,9].*

- Short surveys with accessible language and a clear explanation of purpose.
- Small-group discussions facilitated by a trusted adult, with a route for private feedback.
- Student councils or representative groups whose membership and selection process are transparent.
- Written, visual, audio or digital contributions for learners who do not wish to speak publicly.
- Family consultations at varied times and through accessible communication channels.
- Community partner meetings with a clear agenda, defined role and reasonable expectations.
- Anonymous suggestion routes where appropriate, paired with a clear explanation of what cannot be handled anonymously.

4.8.3 Close the feedback loop

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

After consultation, publish a short response explaining what was heard, what will change, what cannot change at this time and why, and when the issue will be reviewed again. If the institution cannot provide a full response, it should state the reason and a realistic date. A proposal-response log can record the date, topic, responsible decision-maker, response and follow-up without identifying individual learners. The quality of student voice should be judged partly by the clarity and timeliness of institutional response, not only by the number of meetings held.

4.8.4 Protect representation and dignity

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

Institutions should not expect one student to speak for all learners with a disability, all migrants, all young people or an entire cultural group. Representatives need preparation, support and a clear mandate, and should be able to decline a role without penalty. Staff should consider whether participation methods favour confident speakers or learners with greater time and digital access. The institution should offer reasonable adjustments and make clear that personal disclosure is not a condition of influence.

4.8.5 Community partnership agreements

School Education lens. *School application: connect civic learning to pupil councils, class decisions, local community projects and media literacy. Build on Italy's reported civic-competence strengths while addressing Cyprus' civic-skills challenge; ensure Serbian and EU partners adapt activities to their respective curriculum and governance frameworks [2,6,9].*

Every substantive partnership should specify the educational purpose, intended beneficiaries, activity scope, roles, supervision, safeguarding, accessibility, data handling, costs, communication arrangements and review process. Partners should understand whether they are contributing expertise, a venue, mentoring, a project brief or feedback. Learners should understand the partner's role and how concerns can be raised. The institution should review whether the partnership benefits the community as well as the provider and whether it creates unrealistic expectations or displaces paid work.

A European approach should combine shared principles with local discretion. Common language helps institutions compare practice and learn across borders, while national and regional authorities retain responsibility for curriculum, staffing, safeguarding and legal implementation. Evaluation must be proportionate: it should make provision visible and support improvement without reducing complex development to a single score.

4.9 Integrated practice protocols for reflection, conflict resolution, civic projects and evidence review

School Education lens. *School application: use age-appropriate reflection, learning journals, classroom check-ins and private goal-setting; avoid diagnostic labels or compulsory disclosure. Give additional scaffolding where disadvantage affects learning access, as highlighted in Italy, Romania and Cyprus [2,5,6].*

The following operational guidance translates the chapter's policy principles into procedures, review questions and accountability arrangements. It should be adapted to local law, learner needs and institutional capacity while preserving the stated purpose and safeguards.

4.9.1 Protocol A: introducing a reflection routine

School Education lens. *School application: use age-appropriate reflection, learning journals, classroom check-ins and private goal-setting; avoid diagnostic labels or compulsory disclosure. Give additional scaffolding where disadvantage affects learning access, as highlighted in Italy, Romania and Cyprus [2,5,6].*

- Define one learning-related purpose and explain it to learners.
- Model the routine using a neutral or fictional example.
- Offer more than one participation format and state what is optional.
- Ask learners to identify a strategy, a challenge or a next step without requiring sensitive disclosure.
- Use the response to shape feedback or the next lesson, rather than collecting it without action.
- Review accessibility, workload and learner usefulness after a defined trial.

4.9.2 Protocol B: responding to interpersonal conflict

School Education lens. *School application: make respectful relationships visible in class routines, peer collaboration, anti-bullying procedures and safe reporting. Pay particular attention to school segregation and rural–urban gaps in Romania, regional inequalities in Italy and Greece, and inclusion of multilingual pupils [2,5,7,8,10].*

- Establish immediate safety and distinguish ordinary disagreement from bullying, harassment, coercion or abuse.
- Where a safeguarding concern or serious power imbalance exists, use formal procedures and do not require mediation.
- For ordinary disagreement, hear perspectives separately if needed and clarify the issue without assigning blame prematurely.
- Support participants to identify needs, generate options and agree a realistic action.
- Record only necessary information, protect confidentiality and set a follow-up point.
- Review patterns and environmental causes rather than treating every incident as an isolated individual failure.

4.9.3 Protocol C: running a student-led civic project

School Education lens. *School application: connect civic learning to pupil councils, class decisions, local community projects and media literacy. Build on Italy's reported civic-competence strengths while addressing Cyprus' civic-skills challenge; ensure Serbian and EU partners adapt activities to their respective curriculum and governance frameworks [2,6,9].*

- Identify a real issue and confirm that students can influence at least one meaningful decision.
- Map stakeholders, risks, accessibility needs, evidence sources and required permissions.
- Agree roles, milestones, a modest resource envelope and a named adult support person.
- Gather evidence, compare options and document trade-offs before acting.
- Implement the agreed action with appropriate supervision and partner communication.
- Evaluate learning and contribution separately; report limitations and the next step honestly.

4.9.4 Protocol D: conducting a PSD evidence review

School Education lens. *School application: triangulate attendance, progression, basic-skills data, pupil voice, family feedback and classroom observation. Use the 2025 early-leaving figures only as contextual indicators, not as direct measures of PSD or individual school quality [1].*

- Restate the question the evidence is intended to answer.
- Confirm the source, sample, collection period, response rate and limitations.
- Separate implementation outputs, learner experience, demonstrated practice and longer-term outcomes.
- Compare quantitative and qualitative findings and identify plausible alternative explanations.
- Invite learner and staff interpretation where appropriate and safe.
- Record the decision, owner, deadline and the evidence that will be reviewed next.

The following operational guidance translates the chapter's policy principles into procedures, review questions and accountability arrangements. It should be adapted to local law, learner needs and institutional capacity while preserving the stated purpose and safeguards.

4.10 Applied practice patterns across the three PSD domains

School Education lens. *School application: test the activity with age-diverse primary and secondary classes, including pupils facing socio-economic, language, disability or geographic barriers. Record adaptations and pupil feedback before extending it across the school.*

Personal and Social Development (PSD) should be recognised as a core educational outcome alongside subject knowledge, literacy, numeracy, science and digital competence in pre-primary, primary and secondary education. Children and young people need age-appropriate opportunities to understand themselves, manage learning and setbacks, build respectful relationships, cooperate across difference, exercise judgement and contribute to their school and local communities. These capacities are not fixed personality traits: they can be developed through explicit teaching, repeated practice, supportive relationships and school cultures whose everyday routines are consistent with the values they promote.

The B.E.E. consortium's framing—moving from "me" school to "we" school—captures the central policy proposition. Individual self-awareness is strengthened through relationships; relationships are shaped by inclusive institutional cultures; and social responsibility becomes meaningful when learners can participate in decisions and act on shared concerns. Domain A, Domain B and Domain C must therefore be designed as an interconnected progression rather than three disconnected programmes.

The patterns below are adaptable examples rather than prescribed lesson plans. Each one connects a learning intention to a practical sequence, a safeguard and a review question. Institutions should select patterns based on the needs of their learners and avoid implementing every example at once.

4.10.1 A. Reflection after a challenging task

School Education lens. *School application: use age-appropriate reflection, learning journals, classroom check-ins and private goal-setting; avoid diagnostic labels or compulsory disclosure. Give additional scaffolding where disadvantage affects learning access, as highlighted in Italy, Romania and Cyprus [2,5,6].*

Learning intention: learners identify a strategy that helped, a point of difficulty and a realistic next step. Sequence: teacher models a fictional example; learners choose written, visual, audio or oral reflection; pairs may discuss only what they wish to share; the teacher uses the responses to plan feedback. Safeguard: no requirement to disclose family or emotional history. Review: did the reflection lead to a clearer next action?

A.1 Goal review in a classroom task

School Education lens. *School application: triangulate attendance, progression, basic-skills data, pupil voice, family feedback and classroom observation. Use the 2025 early-leaving figures only as contextual indicators, not as direct measures of PSD or individual school quality [1].*

Learning intention: pupils connect a classroom or project task to a learning goal. Sequence: define the learning objective; agree a first step; identify resources and possible obstacles; practise; review evidence against clear success criteria; and plan the next step. Safeguard: distinguish a learning difficulty from a judgement about personal worth. Review: can the pupil explain what they will practise next and what support is available?

A.2 Help-seeking rehearsal

School Education lens. *School application: use age-appropriate reflection, learning journals, classroom check-ins and private goal-setting; avoid diagnostic labels or compulsory disclosure. Give additional scaffolding where disadvantage affects learning access, as highlighted in Italy, Romania and Cyprus [2,5,6].*

Learning intention: learners know how to ask for clarification or support. Sequence: compare fictional examples of effective and ineffective requests; rehearse sentence stems; identify trusted adults and formal routes; discuss what

happens after a request. Safeguard: do not ask learners to disclose why they personally might need help. Review: can learners identify more than one appropriate route?

4.10.2 B. Structured group inquiry

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

Learning intention: learners practise shared planning, listening, equitable roles and evidence-based decisions. Sequence: agree a common question; rotate roles; use a mid-point participation check; record decisions; reflect individually on cooperation. Safeguard: provide communication alternatives and a confidential route to report unequal workload. Review: did the structure distribute meaningful contribution?

B.1 Constructive disagreement

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

Learning intention: learners distinguish disagreement about an idea from an attack on a person. Sequence: analyse a neutral proposition; state a claim and reason; summarise another view fairly; ask a clarifying question; identify common ground and remaining disagreement. Safeguard: intervene against discriminatory speech and do not compel consensus. Review: could participants disagree without humiliation?

B.2 Intercultural dialogue

School Education lens. *School application: make respectful relationships visible in class routines, peer collaboration, anti-bullying procedures and safe reporting. Pay particular attention to school segregation and rural–urban gaps in Romania, regional inequalities in Italy and Greece, and inclusion of multilingual pupils [2,5,7,8,10].*

Learning intention: learners compare perspectives without stereotyping. Sequence: set dialogue norms; examine a shared issue through several sources; invite questions rather than assumptions; allow multilingual and written contributions; debrief what changed in understanding. Safeguard: no participant is required to represent a nationality, religion or community. Review: whose perspectives were missing and how could the next activity include them?

B.3 Digital collaboration

School Education lens. *School application: make respectful relationships visible in class routines, peer collaboration, anti-bullying procedures and safe reporting. Pay particular attention to school segregation and rural–urban gaps in Romania, regional inequalities in Italy and Greece, and inclusion of multilingual pupils [2,5,7,8,10].*

Learning intention: learners practise respectful co-authoring and responsible digital communication. Sequence: agree the task and platform rules; assign roles; establish attribution and privacy expectations; moderate comments; review the group's process. Safeguard: provide an equivalent route for learners with limited connectivity and do not share personal data on unapproved platforms. Review: did the tool improve the learning task or merely add complexity?

4.10.3 C. Student proposal cycle

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

Learning intention: learners experience how input influences a real institutional decision. Sequence: define an issue; establish what is open to influence; gather evidence; compare options; submit a proposal; receive a reasoned response;

review the outcome. Safeguard: do not invite consultation on decisions that are already fixed without disclosing the limits. Review: can learners explain what changed and why?

C.1 Community project

School Education lens. *School application: connect civic learning to pupil councils, class decisions, local community projects and media literacy. Build on Italy's reported civic-competence strengths while addressing Cyprus' civic-skills challenge; ensure Serbian and EU partners adapt activities to their respective curriculum and governance frameworks [2,6,9].*

Learning intention: learners connect curriculum to a community-defined need. Sequence: consult a partner; agree the scope; assess risks; gather information; implement a feasible action; evaluate with the partner. Safeguard: do not displace paid work or expose learners to unsafe situations. Review: was the partnership reciprocal and was the impact described proportionately?

C.2 Media and information literacy inquiry

School Education lens. *School application: teach privacy, consent, source evaluation, respectful online behaviour and age-appropriate use of AI and mobile devices. Spain's regional variation in phone-use rules, Cyprus' digital-skills challenges and the OECD's 2025 evidence for Serbia support school-level digital citizenship policies [6,8,10].*

Learning intention: learners assess claims and sources before sharing information. Sequence: trace the original source; check date and context; corroborate with independent sources; distinguish fact, interpretation and opinion; state uncertainty. Safeguard: avoid shaming learners for having encountered misleading content. Review: can learners explain why a source is or is not reliable for a particular claim?

4.10.4 A+B+C. Restorative learning after a group breakdown

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

Learning intention: learners understand the process failure, repair ordinary harm where appropriate and improve future collaboration. Sequence: establish safety; distinguish ordinary disagreement from bullying or abuse; gather perspectives; identify practical repair steps; agree a follow-up; change group routines if needed. Safeguard: restorative dialogue is never a substitute for safeguarding or forced on a harmed learner. Review: did the institution address the conditions that contributed to the breakdown?

4.10.5 A+B+C. Reflective civic project portfolio

School Education lens. *School application: connect civic learning to pupil councils, class decisions, local community projects and media literacy. Build on Italy's reported civic-competence strengths while addressing Cyprus' civic-skills challenge; ensure Serbian and EU partners adapt activities to their respective curriculum and governance frameworks [2,6,9].*

Learning intention: learners document planning, collaboration, judgement and responsibility across a project. Sequence: set goals; log evidence and decisions; record how the group responded to feedback; assess the contribution; identify limitations and next steps. Safeguard: keep reflections focused on learning and avoid public disclosure of sensitive information. Review: can learners transfer a strategy from the project to a new context?

The following operational guidance translates the chapter's policy principles into procedures, review questions and accountability arrangements. It should be adapted to local law, learner needs and institutional capacity while preserving the stated purpose and safeguards.

4.11 Domain progression across school stages and age groups

School Education lens. *School application: test the activity with age-diverse primary and secondary classes, including pupils facing socio-economic, language, disability or geographic barriers. Record adaptations and pupil feedback before extending it across the school.*

A shared framework should describe progression in the complexity and independence of learning opportunities across early childhood, primary, lower-secondary and upper-secondary education, not rank pupils by personal worth. The same pupil may demonstrate a competence in one context and need support in another. Progression should therefore be interpreted in relation to age, developmental stage, task, available support, communication mode, prior experience and learning needs. VET and adult-learning pathways may use the same principles as a secondary transfer application, but are not the focus of this document.

4.11.1 Domain A progression

School Education lens. *School application: test the activity with age-diverse primary and secondary classes, including pupils facing socio-economic, language, disability or geographic barriers. Record adaptations and pupil feedback before extending it across the school.*

Developmental emphasis	Learning opportunity	Evidence of practice	Adaptation principle
Recognising experience	Name a feeling, challenge or learning condition using an accessible prompt	Learner identifies a relevant factor or selects a suitable response option	Offer visual, written, oral and private response formats
Using strategies	Select and practise a strategy for a defined learning challenge	Learner explains or demonstrates a chosen strategy	Do not prescribe one emotional response as universally correct
Setting and reviewing goals	Set a realistic next step and identify support or resources	Goal, action and review point are connected	Permit revision when circumstances or needs change
Seeking feedback and help	Ask a clear question or identify an appropriate support route	Learner uses a help-seeking script or route in a scenario	Do not require disclosure of the personal reason for seeking help
Transfer and self-direction	Apply a learning strategy in a new subject or school-community context	Learner explains what was adapted and why	Recognise that transfer may require modelling and renewed support

4.11.2 Domain B progression

School Education lens. *School application: test the activity with age-diverse primary and secondary classes, including pupils facing socio-economic, language, disability or geographic barriers. Record adaptations and pupil feedback before extending it across the school.*

Developmental emphasis	Learning opportunity	Evidence of practice	Adaptation principle
Listening and turn-taking	Practise listening, summarising and responding in a structured task	Learner accurately represents another contribution before responding	Allow written and asynchronous contributions
Shared work	Agree roles and a common outcome in a group	Task artefact and brief peer reflection show contribution and coordination	Rotate roles so status and confidence do not determine participation
Constructive disagreement	Question an idea respectfully and explain a reason	Learner distinguishes evidence, opinion and personal attack	Stop activity where discriminatory harm or coercion makes dialogue unsafe
Conflict response	Identify options for de-escalation and appropriate adult support	Scenario response identifies safe next steps	Do not use peer mediation for abuse, bullying or unequal-power harm
Intercultural cooperation	Work with differing perspectives without stereotyping	Learner asks clarifying questions and revises an assumption where warranted	Do not ask any learner to represent an entire group or culture

4.11.3 Domain C progression

School Education lens. *School application: test the activity with age-diverse primary and secondary classes, including pupils facing socio-economic, language, disability or geographic barriers. Record adaptations and pupil feedback before extending it across the school.*

Developmental emphasis	Learning opportunity	Evidence of practice	Adaptation principle
Understanding shared rules	Explore rights, responsibilities and reasons for common rules	Learner explains a rule's purpose and identifies a route to question it	Use accessible and relevant examples
Evaluating information	Compare claims and sources on a public issue	Learner distinguishes evidence, inference and uncertainty	Avoid partisan instruction; teach transparent reasoning
Participation	Contribute to a decision with a defined scope of influence	Learner can describe how input was considered	Do not consult on decisions that are already fixed without explaining limits
Community contribution	Plan an action with a community partner	Project records a need, agreed roles, safeguards and reflection	Avoid unpaid work that displaces paid roles or exposes learners to risk
Accountable civic action	Evaluate consequences, unintended effects and next steps	Learner uses evidence and stakeholder feedback to revise a proposal	Recognise uncertainty and legitimate disagreement

4.12 Complementary transfer to VET contexts

School Education lens. *School application: assign a named school leader, protected teacher time, recurring resources and an annual review. Cost and scale plans should reflect Romania's rural-school pressures, Italy's territorial inequalities and Lithuania's teacher-capacity constraints, alongside local needs in the other partner countries [2,5,8].*

This is a complementary transfer note, not a core strand of the recommendations. Where a partner also works in VET, the same PSD principles may be adapted to professional learning situations. The main School Education recommendations remain focused on curriculum learning, classroom relationships, pupil wellbeing, safeguarding, family engagement and student participation.

Where the framework is transferred to VET, external mentors may comment on observable behaviours, but schools and providers retain responsibility for safeguarding, support and educational decisions. This transfer should not displace the school-focused priorities of the B.E.E. policy framework.

4.13 Complementary transfer to adult-learning contexts

School Education lens. *School application: assign a named school leader, protected teacher time, recurring resources and an annual review. Cost and scale plans should reflect Romania's rural-school pressures, Italy's territorial inequalities and Lithuania's teacher-capacity constraints, alongside local needs in the other partner countries [2,5,8].*

This subsection is included only to clarify transferability beyond School Education. The core recommendations in this document concern children and young people in school settings. Adult-learning providers may adapt the principles to adult learners' autonomy, prior experience and support needs, but should not be treated as the primary implementation audience.

The following operational guidance translates the chapter's policy principles into procedures, review questions and accountability arrangements. It should be adapted to local law, learner needs and institutional capacity while preserving the stated purpose and safeguards.

4.14 Teacher and trainer practice standards: preparation, delivery and reflection

School Education lens. *School application: use age-appropriate reflection, learning journals, classroom check-ins and private goal-setting; avoid diagnostic labels or compulsory disclosure. Give additional scaffolding where disadvantage affects learning access, as highlighted in Italy, Romania and Cyprus [2,5,6].*

Professional standards for PSD should describe observable teaching practices and institutional support rather than prescribe a personality profile for teachers. The consortium recommends a developmental cycle in which teachers understand the purpose of a strategy, rehearse it, try it with learners, gather feedback and decide what to adjust. Teachers should not be evaluated solely by learner self-report or by short-term changes in complex social outcomes.

4.15 Activity

School Education lens. *School application: test the activity with age-diverse primary and secondary classes, including pupils facing socio-economic, language, disability or geographic barriers. Record adaptations and pupil feedback before extending it across the school.*

4.15.1 Before the activity

School Education lens. *School application: test the activity with age-diverse primary and secondary classes, including pupils facing socio-economic, language, disability or geographic barriers. Record adaptations and pupil feedback before extending it across the school.*

- State the learning intention in plain language and connect it to a real task or decision.
- Decide which domain is primary and how the activity connects to the other domains.
- Check whether learners need vocabulary, modelling, visual support, extra processing time or alternative communication routes.
- Explain whether responses are private, shared with a group or used for assessment; clarify confidentiality limits.

- Identify any foreseeable risk, including sensitive disclosure, peer targeting, accessibility barriers or digital exposure.
- Prepare a neutral example so learners can practise without having to disclose personal experiences.
- Agree how the activity will conclude and what support is available if a learner raises a concern.

4.15.2 During the activity

School Education lens. *School application: test the activity with age-diverse primary and secondary classes, including pupils facing socio-economic, language, disability or geographic barriers. Record adaptations and pupil feedback before extending it across the school.*

- Model the intended practice explicitly instead of assuming learners already know what respectful reflection or disagreement looks like.
- Give learners time to think and multiple ways to contribute; do not reward speed or public confidence as if they were the competence itself.
- Monitor participation patterns, including who speaks, who is interrupted and whose ideas are credited.
- Respond consistently to discriminatory or humiliating behaviour and follow established safeguarding procedures.
- Use formative prompts that focus on strategy, evidence and next steps rather than character judgements.
- Adapt the task if it is producing distress, exclusion or confusion that undermines the learning purpose.
- Keep records proportionate and avoid collecting unnecessary personal narratives.

4.15.3 After the activity

School Education lens. *School application: test the activity with age-diverse primary and secondary classes, including pupils facing socio-economic, language, disability or geographic barriers. Record adaptations and pupil feedback before extending it across the school.*

- Ask learners what helped them understand or practise the intended competence.
- Record what was delivered and any important adaptations, without creating individual dossiers of sensitive disclosures.
- Identify whose participation was limited and whether the design, environment or resources contributed.
- Compare the intended outcome with the evidence actually available.
- Discuss uncertain or difficult cases with appropriate colleagues, respecting privacy and professional boundaries.
- Decide whether to repeat, simplify, adapt or discontinue the activity.
- Share a useful lesson with colleagues so that learning does not remain with one individual.

4.15.4 Reflective supervision and peer learning

School Education lens. *School application: make respectful relationships visible in class routines, peer collaboration, anti-bullying procedures and safe reporting. Pay particular attention to school segregation and rural–urban gaps in Romania, regional inequalities in Italy and Greece, and inclusion of multilingual pupils [2,5,7,8,10].*

Teachers need a setting in which they can discuss uncertainty without fear that every imperfect trial will be treated as incompetence. Peer observation should focus on a small number of agreed features, such as clarity of the learning intention, equitable participation, quality of feedback and response to safety concerns. It should not be used to score teachers on warmth, charisma or presumed emotional intelligence. Where a practice creates a risk, the institution should address the risk directly while preserving a learning-oriented approach to professional improvement.

A useful peer-learning conversation asks: what were learners invited to do; what did the teacher observe; whose experience may be missing; what evidence supports the interpretation; what alternative explanation is plausible; and what is the smallest change worth testing next? This approach supports professional agency and helps the consortium build a realistic evidence base across different teaching contexts.

Domain B concerns the teachable practices and institutional conditions that enable learners to communicate, cooperate, navigate disagreement and build respectful relationships across difference. It must not equate social competence with extroversion, conformity or one culturally preferred communication style.

Chapter 5. Implementing and Evaluating PSD Competencies at the EU Level

School Education country application. *Evaluation should remain school-centred: combine attendance and progression data, basic-skills evidence, pupil and family feedback, classroom observation, inclusion indicators and documented responses to student voice. The Eurostat 2025 early-leaving values in the country table are contextual outcomes only; schools should not treat them as direct PSD measures. For Serbia, interpret the 2025 PISA results in light of the OECD's stated testing and continuity caveats [1,10].*

5.1 Recommendations for EU-level policy frameworks

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

5.1.1 Integrating PSD competencies into national and regional educational standards

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

National and regional authorities should map Domains A, B and C against existing curriculum standards, teacher competence frameworks, school-quality criteria and inclusion strategies. The mapping should identify where PSD is already present, where outcomes are implicit, and where gaps remain. Consultation should include teachers, learners, families, schools, specialists and community partners. Revisions should be accompanied by practical descriptors, exemplars and time for implementation; adding expectations without reviewing workload risks superficial compliance.

Operational sequence: (1) establish a cross-sector working group; (2) map existing policy; (3) consult users and affected groups; (4) identify a limited set of progression descriptors; (5) pilot them in varied settings; (6) publish implementation guidance; and (7) review after a defined period. Authorities should document why recommendations were accepted or not adopted.

5.1.2 Establishing EU-wide guidelines and best practices for PSD implementation

School Education lens. *School application: test the activity with age-diverse primary and secondary classes, including pupils facing socio-economic, language, disability or geographic barriers. Record adaptations and pupil feedback before extending it across the school.*

European guidance should define minimum principles for inclusion, safety, pupil participation, teacher learning, evidence quality and sustainability in early childhood, primary and secondary schools. It should not mandate identical activities or create a high-stakes test of personality. Transfer to VET, adult learning or alternative provision may be noted briefly where relevant, but should not displace the School Education focus.

The consortium recommends a practice repository in which every example includes context, intended outcome, age or learner group, preparation, resources, implementation steps, accessibility adaptations, safeguarding considerations, indicators, limitations and contact for follow-up. A short "transferability note" should explain what another institution must preserve and what it may adapt.

5.1.3 Creating funding mechanisms to support PSD initiatives

School Education lens. *School application: assign a named school leader, protected teacher time, recurring resources and an annual review. Cost and scale plans should reflect Romania's rural-school pressures, Italy's territorial inequalities and Lithuania's teacher-capacity constraints, alongside local needs in the other partner countries [2,5,8].*

Funding should cover the conditions that make implementation possible: coordination, teacher release time, accessible materials, translation, specialist advice, partnership development, evaluation and follow-up. Small or rural schools and providers serving disadvantaged communities may need additional support to participate. Funding calls should reward

credible implementation plans, inclusion and learning from evidence rather than unrealistic claims of rapid transformation. Reporting requirements should be proportionate to the scale of the grant.

Funding element	Eligible purpose to consider	Sustainability question
Design and coordination	Curriculum mapping, stakeholder consultation, project coordination and staff planning.	Who owns the work after the funded project ends?
Professional learning	Training, coaching, peer observation, communities of practice and accessible materials.	How will new staff receive induction and ongoing support?
Equity and access	Translation, assistive formats, transport support, accessible venues and alternative participation routes.	Which barriers would otherwise exclude learners?
Partnerships	Community partner time, joint planning, cross-border exchange and dissemination.	Are partner roles and reciprocal benefits explicit?
Evaluation	Baseline, feedback tools, data analysis, student-led review and reporting.	What evidence will inform a concrete decision?
Continuation	Maintenance of resources, network coordination and annual review.	What recurrent cost remains, and who will meet it?

5.2 Strategies for teacher training and professional development

School Education lens. *School application: prioritise sustained teacher learning, coaching and shared planning time. Spain's teacher-profession reforms and Lithuania's acute shortages in STEM and rural schools show why national strategies must be translated into practical school-level support [3,8].*

5.2.1 Developing EU-wide training modules and resources for PSD

School Education lens. *School application: assign a named school leader, protected teacher time, recurring resources and an annual review. Cost and scale plans should reflect Romania's rural-school pressures, Italy's territorial inequalities and Lithuania's teacher-capacity constraints, alongside local needs in the other partner countries [2,5,8].*

A modular European professional-learning offer should combine shared principles with contextualised practice. Suggested modules include: understanding the three domains; emotional literacy and self-regulation; reflective and metacognitive teaching; inclusive collaboration; conflict and bullying response; intercultural dialogue; student voice and civic inquiry; digital communication; formative assessment; safeguarding and referral; and evaluation for improvement. Modules should be practical, accessible and available in formats that accommodate part-time staff and different institutional schedules.

Each module should include a learning outcome, concise conceptual input, a modelled activity, a rehearsal task, a classroom or workshop trial, a reflection prompt and an evidence-of-practice check. Completion should not be defined only by attendance or satisfaction. Participants should demonstrate that they can explain the purpose of a strategy, adapt it to learners' needs and recognise its limits.

5.2.2 Promoting cross-border collaboration and exchange of best practices

School Education lens. *School application: make respectful relationships visible in class routines, peer collaboration, anti-bullying procedures and safe reporting. Pay particular attention to school segregation and rural–urban gaps in Romania, regional inequalities in Italy and Greece, and inclusion of multilingual pupils [2,5,7,8,10].*

Cross-border collaboration should be structured around a question or challenge rather than a sequence of visits. Partners should prepare by sharing context and baseline information, observe or trial a practice, discuss what is transferable, adapt it locally and report evidence after implementation. The consortium should record failed or inconclusive trials alongside successful experiences so that knowledge sharing remains credible.

5.2.3 Professional learning for school leaders

School Education lens. *School application: prioritise sustained teacher learning, coaching and shared planning time. Spain's teacher-profession reforms and Lithuania's acute shortages in STEM and rural schools show why national strategies must be translated into practical school-level support [3,8].*

Leaders determine whether PSD has time, accountability and legitimacy. Leadership development should cover curriculum mapping, workload management, inclusive governance, safeguarding, student participation, staff coaching and the use of indicators. Leaders should be equipped to remove contradictions between policy and everyday practice—for example, promoting student voice while leaving no time for consultation, or requiring reflection while failing to protect privacy.

5.3 Evaluation and assessment of PSD competencies

School Education lens. *School application: triangulate attendance, progression, basic-skills data, pupil voice, family feedback and classroom observation. Use the 2025 early-leaving figures only as contextual indicators, not as direct measures of PSD or individual school quality [1].*

5.3.1 Developing standardised assessment tools and frameworks

School Education lens. *School application: triangulate attendance, progression, basic-skills data, pupil voice, family feedback and classroom observation. Use the 2025 early-leaving figures only as contextual indicators, not as direct measures of PSD or individual school quality [1].*

The consortium recommends common evaluation principles and a flexible indicator bank rather than a single universal test. Tools may include student surveys, structured observation, learner portfolios, staff self-assessment, family feedback, incident-response reviews and project records. Questionnaires in the supplied archive can inform local baseline questions, but they should not be described as validated standardised tests unless formal validation evidence exists. Translation and adaptation should be documented so that comparisons are not misleading.

5.3.2 Utilising qualitative and quantitative data to track progress and impact

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

Quantitative measures can show reach, frequency, access and changes in perceptions; qualitative evidence can explain how and why a practice was experienced. A balanced review should triangulate sources and consider context, sample size, missing responses and alternative explanations. Implementation outputs—such as the number of trained staff—must be distinguished from outcomes, such as improved learner perceptions of being heard. Longer-term impact claims require stronger designs than a simple before-and-after survey.

Evidence layer	Core question	Examples	Interpretation caution
Inputs	Were enabling resources available?	Staff time, budget, accessible materials, specialist support.	Inputs do not prove delivery or benefit.
Implementation	Was the planned provision delivered?	Lesson mapping, sessions delivered, staff trained, partnerships active.	Delivery counts do not prove quality.
Reach and equity	Who had access and who remained excluded?	Participation by cohort, accessibility adjustments, alternative formats.	Protect privacy and avoid small-cell disclosure.
Learner experience	How did learners experience the provision?	Safety, belonging, clarity, usefulness and perceived influence surveys.	Self-report is valuable but may be affected by response bias.
Demonstrated practice	What could learners do in context?	Reflection, communication, collaboration and project artefacts.	Use multiple observations; avoid personality labels.
Institutional response	What changed because of the evidence?	Revised routines, additional support, curriculum adjustments.	A survey without a response can undermine trust.
Longer-term outcomes	Did patterns persist or transfer?	Follow-up measures, transition feedback, partner observations.	Avoid causal claims without an appropriate design.

5.3.3 Establishing a European network to share best practices on PSD evaluation

School Education lens. *School application: triangulate attendance, progression, basic-skills data, pupil voice, family feedback and classroom observation. Use the 2025 early-leaving figures only as contextual indicators, not as direct measures of PSD or individual school quality [1].*

The B.E.E. network should maintain a shared repository of tools, indicator definitions, data dictionaries, adaptation notes and examples of improvement decisions. A network coordinator can organise periodic peer reviews, thematic exchanges and annual synthesis. Participating institutions should be able to contribute anonymously where appropriate and should retain control over identifiable learner information. The network's purpose is collective learning, not ranking countries or institutions.

5.4 Promoting student-led evaluation of PSD competency development

School Education lens. *School application: triangulate attendance, progression, basic-skills data, pupil voice, family feedback and classroom observation. Use the 2025 early-leaving figures only as contextual indicators, not as direct measures of PSD or individual school quality [1].*

Students should participate in defining what meaningful progress looks like, choosing accessible ways to provide feedback and interpreting findings. Student-led evaluation may include reviewing whether group roles are fair, whether reporting routes are understood, whether a civic project reached its intended audience or whether consultation influenced a decision. Adults must support students in using evidence responsibly and in protecting privacy.

Operational protocol: explain the purpose and limits of evaluation; co-design a small set of questions; offer anonymous and accessible response routes; review findings with students; agree a response; and communicate what changed. Student participation should be voluntary and must not expose learners to pressure from staff or peers.

5.5 Governance, accountability and institutional roles

School Education lens. *School application: triangulate attendance, progression, basic-skills data, pupil voice, family feedback and classroom observation. Use the 2025 early-leaving figures only as contextual indicators, not as direct measures of PSD or individual school quality [1].*

Level	Primary responsibilities	Minimum annual evidence
European / transnational	Shared principles, peer-learning infrastructure, accessible resources and synthesis of lessons.	Updated practice repository, network activity, cross-border learning report.
National / regional authorities	Policy alignment, guidance, funding, teacher standards, inclusion and quality assurance.	Policy mapping, funding support, professional-learning offer and review of barriers.
School / school leadership	Strategy, staff time, safeguarding, curriculum integration, student voice and improvement cycle.	PSD plan, named coordinator, curriculum map, indicator review and response log.
Teachers / trainers	Explicit teaching, modelling, accessible practice, formative feedback and referral when needed.	Lesson or workshop examples, learner feedback and reflective professional learning.
Learners	Reflection, peer collaboration, feedback, civic projects and evaluation where appropriate.	Portfolio or project evidence, proposal feedback and participation review.
Families / community partners	Contextual insight, reciprocal partnership and feedback on accessibility and relevance.	Consultation records, partner review and agreed follow-up.

5.6 Data protection, ethics and safeguarding

School Education lens. *School application: specify child-protection, anti-bullying, referral and data-protection procedures under each country's law. Activities must be age-appropriate, avoid forced disclosure and identify the designated school staff member and external service for escalation.*

PSD evidence may touch on emotions, relationships, disability, family circumstances or experiences of harm. Institutions should collect only information needed for a defined purpose, explain use and access, establish retention periods, secure records and comply with applicable data-protection law. Personal disclosures must not be repurposed for public comparison or inappropriate performance management. Reporting and referral procedures should be clear before an activity begins.

- Do not require public disclosure of personal or traumatic experiences.
- Do not score emotional openness, confidence or resilience as personality traits.
- Do not publish small-group data where individuals could be identified.
- Do not promise absolute confidentiality when safeguarding duties may require referral.
- Do not use mediation to manage abuse, coercion, harassment or serious power imbalance.
- Do not treat attendance at training or an event as proof of competence or impact.

5.7 Quality assurance without over-standardisation

School Education lens. *School application: triangulate attendance, progression, basic-skills data, pupil voice, family feedback and classroom observation. Use the 2025 early-leaving figures only as contextual indicators, not as direct measures of PSD or individual school quality [1].*

A balanced quality framework should combine a small common set of indicators with locally chosen measures. Review should consider provision, learner experience, inclusion, staff capacity, safeguarding and whether findings led to

improvement. External review should be developmental and proportionate. Institutions should be able to explain why a method was adapted or discontinued, rather than being rewarded for compliance with a template that does not suit their context.

5.8 School Education as the primary setting; transfer to alternative pathways

School Education lens. *School application: assign a named school leader, protected teacher time, recurring resources and an annual review. Cost and scale plans should reflect Romania's rural-school pressures, Italy's territorial inequalities and Lithuania's teacher-capacity constraints, alongside local needs in the other partner countries [2,5,8].*

PSD is primarily addressed here as a whole-school approach across early childhood, primary and secondary education. The main implementation responsibilities concern school leaders, teachers, pupils, families and local community partners. The principles may be adapted to VET, adult learning and alternative provision where useful, but these settings remain complementary rather than central to the present recommendations.

5.9 European policy recommendations: action summary

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

- Develop a non-prescriptive European PSD reference framework with shared principles, progression examples and an indicator bank.
- Invite Member States and regions to map PSD against existing standards and publish practical implementation guidance.
- Support multi-year or staged funding that includes coordination, professional learning, accessibility, evaluation and continuation.
- Create a European peer-learning network with documented adaptation notes and responsible evidence-sharing protocols.
- Integrate PSD into initial teacher education and continuing professional development through practical rehearsal and coaching.
- Require meaningful learner participation and transparent feedback loops in funded PSD initiatives.
- Protect subsidiarity, cultural and linguistic diversity, safeguarding and data protection in all common guidance.

5.10 Integrated governance, implementation and quality assurance

School Education lens. *School application: triangulate attendance, progression, basic-skills data, pupil voice, family feedback and classroom observation. Use the 2025 early-leaving figures only as contextual indicators, not as direct measures of PSD or individual school quality [1].*

PSD implementation should be governed through a clear distribution of responsibilities. European and transnational actors can support shared principles, resources and peer learning; national and regional authorities can align policy, standards, funding and quality assurance; institutional leaders can provide time, coordination and safeguarding; practitioners can design and deliver learning; learners and families can shape priorities and review experience; and community partners can contribute contextual knowledge.

Every institution should maintain a concise PSD plan containing a local needs statement, curriculum and provision map, manageable annual priorities, named responsibility, professional-learning plan, learner and family participation arrangements, safeguarding and referral procedures, a small indicator set, resource estimate and review date. The plan should be integrated into existing development and quality-assurance cycles.

Quality assurance should test coherence between policy, practice and learner experience. A written policy is not sufficient if learners do not know how to seek help; training attendance is not proof that teaching practice changed; and the number of activities is not evidence of improved competence. Reviewers should look for implementation examples, equitable access, learner feedback, follow-up decisions and realistic documentation of limitations.

Continue a practice when it is feasible, safe, accessible and shows credible value; adapt it when the purpose remains relevant but evidence identifies remediable barriers; pause it when safeguarding, privacy or equity concerns cannot be managed; and discontinue it when it repeatedly fails to meet its purpose or consumes disproportionate resources. Record decisions and reasons.

5.11 Baseline design, indicator selection and target-setting

School Education lens. *School application: triangulate attendance, progression, basic-skills data, pupil voice, family feedback and classroom observation. Use the 2025 early-leaving figures only as contextual indicators, not as direct measures of PSD or individual school quality [1].*

Baseline assessment should begin with a clearly stated decision need. Institutions should not collect data simply because a questionnaire is available. They should decide what they need to understand—such as learner awareness of PSD activities, perceived safety, access to support, opportunities for participation or consistency of staff practice—and choose the least burdensome method capable of answering the question.

Each indicator should have a written specification: purpose, definition, unit of analysis, numerator and denominator where relevant, source, collection frequency, responsible person, disaggregation rules, interpretation limits and the decision it informs. Targets should be set after baseline information and local capacity are reviewed, without encouraging superficial compliance or data manipulation.

Quantitative data should be interpreted alongside qualitative evidence. Participation rates may show reach, while open responses may explain why some learners did not attend or did not recognise an activity as PSD. Satisfaction scores may be high even where some groups experience exclusion. Reviewers should consider sample size, non-response, wording, translation, timing, population changes and other plausible explanations.

Questionnaires in the source materials may inform local consultation and baseline design, but should not be described as validated standardised instruments unless validation evidence is available. Country-level or consortium-wide claims must retain provenance, sample and limitations. Findings from a particular Spanish sample should not be reported as representative estimates for all seven partner countries.

5.12 Student-led evaluation and accountable feedback loops

School Education lens. *School application: triangulate attendance, progression, basic-skills data, pupil voice, family feedback and classroom observation. Use the 2025 early-leaving figures only as contextual indicators, not as direct measures of PSD or individual school quality [1].*

Student-led evaluation should be a structured learning process, not a transfer of institutional accountability to young people. Students can help formulate questions, test wording, select accessible feedback routes, review anonymised findings and propose changes. Adults remain responsible for ethical review, data protection, safeguarding and decisions requiring professional or legal authority.

Every consultation should include a feedback loop. Before asking for views, explain purpose and limits. After collecting responses, share a summary in an accessible format, identify what can change and state what cannot change at that time. Assign responsibility and a deadline for agreed actions, then return to learners to explain progress.

Participation should be reviewed for representation and influence. Institutions should ask who contributed, who was absent, whether the same confident voices dominate and whether students experienced the process as consequential. Alternative routes—small-group discussion, anonymous feedback, visual tools, written submissions or supported communication—should be available.

5.13 Integrated implementation tool: PSD indicator bank

School Education lens. *School application: triangulate attendance, progression, basic-skills data, pupil voice, family feedback and classroom observation. Use the 2025 early-leaving figures only as contextual indicators, not as direct measures of PSD or individual school quality [1].*

The indicators below are proposed for local selection. Institutions should choose a small set that matches their objectives and capacity, define the denominator and collection method, establish a baseline where feasible, and agree how results will trigger decisions. Indicators are not a ranking system and should not be used to label individual learners.

ID	Area	Indicator definition	Possible source	Frequency	Owner
A1	Curriculum integration	Share of sampled curriculum plans that identify at least one Domain A outcome and a learning activity.	Curriculum map / sample review	Termly	School leadership
A2	Reflection accessibility	Availability of at least two appropriate reflection formats for learners who need alternatives.	Resource audit / learner feedback	Annual	PSD coordinator
A3	Goal-setting	Share of learners participating in a structured goal review during the defined period.	Anonymised participation record	Termly	Teachers / tutors
A4	Help-seeking awareness	Share of learners who can identify a trusted adult or safe route for support.	Short learner survey	Baseline and annual	Safeguarding lead / tutors
A5	Staff capability	Share of relevant staff completing practice-based learning and a supported trial.	Training and coaching records	Annual	Professional learning lead
B1	Structured collaboration	Share of sampled group tasks with explicit roles and fair-contribution criteria.	Lesson observation / planning sample	Termly	Department leads
B2	Listening and dialogue	Learner-reported opportunity to express disagreement respectfully and be heard.	Anonymous learner survey	Annual	PSD coordinator
B3	Reporting awareness	Share of learners who know how to report bullying or harmful behaviour.	Survey / class discussion record	Annual	Safeguarding lead
B4	Response and follow-up	Share of reported cases receiving documented follow-up in accordance with local procedures.	Restricted safeguarding records, aggregated	Termly	Designated safeguarding lead

B5	Intercultural participation	Number and accessibility of structured intercultural dialogue opportunities.	Activity log and learner feedback	Annual	International coordinator
C1	Student proposals	Number of student proposals receiving a documented response within the agreed timeframe.	Proposal and response log	Termly	School leadership / student council
C2	Participation equity	Differences in access to civic projects or leadership roles, reviewed only where privacy permits.	Participation records	Annual	Inclusion lead
C3	Community reciprocity	Partner feedback on whether the activity addressed a real need and respected partner roles.	Partner review form	After each project	Project lead
C4	Evidence literacy	Learners' ability to identify sources, evidence, uncertainty and alternative explanations in project work.	Rubric applied to sample artefacts	Per project	Teachers / trainers
C5	European cooperation	Participation in cross-border learning, including non-mobile learners' access to follow-up.	Activity and access records	Annual	International coordinator
X1	Whole-school ownership	Existence of named accountable lead, deputy and annual review point.	Governance review	Annual	Headteacher / director
X2	Family communication	Family awareness of PSD purpose and accessible routes to ask questions or provide feedback.	Family survey / communication audit	Annual	Family liaison

X3	Resource sustainability	Share of core resources with named owner, version date and review date.	Repository audit	Annual	Resource coordinator
X4	Evidence-to-action	Number of documented improvement decisions that cite PSD evidence and specify follow-up.	Improvement plan review	Annual	Leadership team
X5	Workload proportionality	Staff assessment of whether reporting and implementation demands are manageable and useful.	Staff pulse survey / discussion	Annual	Leadership team

The following operational guidance translates the chapter's policy principles into procedures, review questions and accountability arrangements. It should be adapted to local law, learner needs and institutional capacity while preserving the stated purpose and safeguards.

5.13.1 Integrated quality tool: institutional self-review checklist

School Education lens. *School application: triangulate attendance, progression, basic-skills data, pupil voice, family feedback and classroom observation. Use the 2025 early-leaving figures only as contextual indicators, not as direct measures of PSD or individual school quality [1].*

- Has the institution adopted a shared definition of Domains A, B and C?
- Has existing practice been mapped before new activities were added?
- Are PSD outcomes connected to ordinary curriculum, school-based learning and learner support?
- Do learners have accessible options for reflection and participation?
- Are staff clear about privacy, safeguarding and referral boundaries?
- Are group tasks structured to distribute participation fairly?
- Can learners identify how to report bullying or harmful behaviour?
- Do student proposals receive a documented response?
- Are community partnerships reciprocal, safe and reviewed?
- Are teachers supported through practice-based professional learning?
- Are indicators defined with a baseline, denominator, owner and review date?
- Are results interpreted with attention to sample limitations and context?
- Does each evidence cycle lead to a decision or an explanation of why no change is needed?
- Are resources, staff time and continuation responsibilities identified?
- Is there a plan to induct new staff and preserve institutional knowledge?
- Are practices adapted or discontinued when they create avoidable barriers or burdens?

The following operational guidance translates the chapter's policy principles into procedures, review questions and accountability arrangements. It should be adapted to local law, learner needs and institutional capacity while preserving the stated purpose and safeguards.

5.13.2 Integrated annual PSD reporting framework

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

Section	Questions to answer
Context	What learner groups and institutional settings were covered? What local circumstances matter for interpretation?
Priorities	Which Domain A, B and C priorities were selected and why?
Implementation	What was delivered, by whom, and with what adaptations?
Reach and inclusion	Who participated, who may have been excluded and what access barriers were identified?
Learner and family voice	What feedback was received and how was it obtained safely?
Evidence	What quantitative and qualitative evidence was reviewed? What are the limitations?
Findings	What appears to have worked, for whom, under what conditions, and what remains uncertain?
Decisions	What will continue, change, stop or be tested next? Who owns each action and by when?
Resources	What time, budget, expertise and materials were required?
Sustainability	What is embedded in routine practice, and what remains dependent on temporary support?

The following operational guidance translates the chapter's policy principles into procedures, review questions and accountability arrangements. It should be adapted to local law, learner needs and institutional capacity while preserving the stated purpose and safeguards.

5.14 Eight-country context adaptation and cross-border transfer protocol

School Education lens. *School application: assign a named school leader, protected teacher time, recurring resources and an annual review. Cost and scale plans should reflect Romania's rural-school pressures, Italy's territorial inequalities and Lithuania's teacher-capacity constraints, alongside local needs in the other partner countries [2,5,8].*

The consortium includes EU Member States (Spain, Italy, Portugal, Greece, Lithuania, Romania and Serbia). Shared recommendations should be translated into locally valid arrangements rather than assuming identical governance structures, curriculum responsibilities, data rules or funding channels. The following protocol is designed to make adaptations explicit and comparable without producing a misleading country ranking.

- Identify the competent national or regional authority and the applicable curriculum, safeguarding, equality and data-protection requirements.
- Map existing PSD-related provision and identify where the three domains are explicit, implicit or absent.
- Consult teachers, teachers, learners, families and relevant community services, including groups who are often underrepresented.
- Select a small number of priorities based on local evidence, feasibility and equity; do not assume that the same priority has equal urgency in all eight contexts.
- Translate and adapt resources with attention to meaning, idiom, cultural interpretation and accessibility; record substantive changes.
- Define a local baseline and indicators using clear denominators and consistent collection periods.

- Pilot practices in more than one setting where feasible, including a context with constrained resources.
- Review implementation, learner experience, staff workload and unintended effects before scaling.
- Share an anonymised adaptation note with consortium partners, explaining what transferred, what did not and why.
- Revisit the local plan annually and update it when policy, learner needs or evidence changes.

Context dimension	Questions for local adaptation	Consortium reporting expectation
Governance	Who has authority over curriculum, teacher development, safeguarding and quality assurance?	Identify the relevant decision level without assuming a uniform structure.
Learner population	Which age groups, pathways, languages and support needs are represented?	Describe the context needed to interpret results; protect identities.
Existing provision	Which routines or programmes already address PSD?	Map existing work before adding new activity.
Resources	What staff time, specialist services, digital access and partnership capacity exist?	Record constraints and feasible alternatives.
Evidence	Which tools are appropriate, accessible and sufficiently clear?	State sample, method, timing, missing data and limitations.
Sustainability	Which institution or authority can maintain the practice?	Name an owner, a review point and likely recurring costs.

The following operational guidance translates the chapter's policy principles into procedures, review questions and accountability arrangements. It should be adapted to local law, learner needs and institutional capacity while preserving the stated purpose and safeguards.

5.15 Implementation risk management and mitigation framework

School Education lens. *School application: specify child-protection, anti-bullying, referral and data-protection procedures under each country's law. Activities must be age-appropriate, avoid forced disclosure and identify the designated school staff member and external service for escalation.*

Risk	Early warning sign	Mitigation	Responsible role
PSD becomes a one-off event	Activity count rises but no curriculum or follow-up exists.	Map provision, set routine-based objectives and review transfer.	School / provider lead
Staff workload becomes excessive	Forms multiply; staff report unclear benefit.	Use a small indicator set, integrate existing routines and remove redundant reporting.	Leadership team
Learners feel pressured to disclose	Prompts solicit personal stories; students avoid participation.	Use fictional examples, voluntary reflection and multiple formats; clarify privacy.	Teacher / safeguarding lead
Student voice is tokenistic	Consultations occur without feedback or decisions.	Publish response times and proposal logs; explain constraints honestly.	Leadership / student council contact
Bullying is misclassified as ordinary conflict	Targeted learners are asked to mediate with aggressors.	Train staff in triage and follow safeguarding procedures.	Designated safeguarding lead

Digital exclusion	Activities assume personal devices or stable connectivity.	Provide alternatives, accessible formats and planned access support.	Digital / inclusion lead
Data is overinterpreted	Different samples are combined or claims exceed evidence.	Maintain evidence register and limitations note; triangulate sources.	Evaluation lead
Project ends without continuity	No owner, budget or induction plan exists.	Confirm continuation responsibilities before project closure.	Senior leadership / consortium contact
Community partnership is extractive	Partner is used only as a venue or unpaid service provider.	Agree reciprocal aims, roles, resource expectations and review.	Project lead
Cross-country comparison becomes misleading	Different instruments or samples are ranked as equivalent.	Report context and methods; compare learning questions, not crude league tables.	Consortium evaluation group

The following operational guidance translates the chapter's policy principles into procedures, review questions and accountability arrangements. It should be adapted to local law, learner needs and institutional capacity while preserving the stated purpose and safeguards.

5.16 Indicator definitions, data quality and responsible target-setting

School Education lens. *School application: triangulate attendance, progression, basic-skills data, pupil voice, family feedback and classroom observation. Use the 2025 early-leaving figures only as contextual indicators, not as direct measures of PSD or individual school quality [1].*

Indicators are only useful when users understand what is counted, who is included, how information is collected and what decision the result can support. Before using an indicator, the institution should define its numerator, denominator, period, responsible owner, source, disaggregation rules and limitations. If an indicator cannot be interpreted reliably or does not inform a decision, it should be revised or removed.

- Define the unit of analysis: Specify whether the indicator refers to learners, classes, staff, activities, reports or institutions. Do not switch units between reporting periods without explanation.
- Use explicit denominators: For every percentage, state the number of valid responses and the relevant total. Missing or "not applicable" responses should be handled transparently.
- Preserve source identity: Record the questionnaire or method, language, date, sample and any adaptation. Similar wording does not automatically make two instruments comparable.
- Separate outputs and outcomes: Training delivered, sessions held and resources published are implementation outputs. Changes in learner experience or demonstrated practice are different evidence layers.
- Use triangulation: Where feasible, compare survey responses with observation, artefacts, interviews or administrative records. Disagreement between sources is a prompt for inquiry, not necessarily a data error.
- Avoid unsupported causality: A change after an intervention may have other explanations. Use cautious language unless the evaluation design supports a causal conclusion.
- Protect privacy: Collect the minimum information needed. Suppress or combine small groups where reporting could identify individuals.
- Check accessibility and response bias: Consider who could understand the question, access the response method and feel safe answering. Low response rates or systematic non-response may distort findings.
- Record changes in context: Staff turnover, timetable changes, policy revisions or external events may affect implementation and results.

- Link evidence to decisions: Every annual review should identify which action was continued, adapted, stopped or newly tested because of the evidence.

5.17 Illustrative indicator specification sheet

School Education lens. *School application: triangulate attendance, progression, basic-skills data, pupil voice, family feedback and classroom observation. Use the 2025 early-leaving figures only as contextual indicators, not as direct measures of PSD or individual school quality [1].*

Indicator name: Learner awareness of a safe route for requesting support

Purpose: Check whether learners know how to access help, not whether they have a particular emotional state.

Definition: Number of respondents who can identify at least one appropriate support route divided by the number of valid respondents to the item.

Source and method: Anonymous, age-appropriate learner questionnaire or structured class check.

Timing: Baseline and annual review, with additional collection only where a clear decision requires it.

Disaggregation: Use only categories justified by an equity question and safe sample sizes.

Limitations: Self-report measures awareness, not the quality, availability or responsiveness of support.

Decision rule: If awareness is low, clarify routes and test understanding; if awareness is high but learners report low trust, investigate response experience rather than repeating information campaigns.

Owner: Named PSD coordinator with safeguarding lead oversight.

Data protection: Do not collect names or personal case details in the indicator dataset.

The following operational guidance translates the chapter's policy principles into procedures, review questions and accountability arrangements. It should be adapted to local law, learner needs and institutional capacity while preserving the stated purpose and safeguards.

5.18 Scenario-based implementation decisions and corrective actions

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

- **Scenario 1: high activity count, low learner awareness**

School Education lens. *School application: test the activity with age-diverse primary and secondary classes, including pupils facing socio-economic, language, disability or geographic barriers. Record adaptations and pupil feedback before extending it across the school.*

Interpretation: activities may not be visible, may be described using unfamiliar language, or may not feel relevant to learners. Do not assume the problem is a lack of learner interest. Actions: ask learners how they understand the purpose; map who participates; make learning intentions explicit; and review communication. Evidence: student feedback, curriculum mapping and participation records.

- **Scenario 2: strong average satisfaction but persistent exclusion**

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

Interpretation: an overall average may conceal barriers experienced by a smaller group. Actions: review accessible formats, timetable, language support and representation; invite confidential feedback; and examine whether the same

learners repeatedly take leadership roles. Evidence: carefully protected disaggregated data, qualitative accounts and access audits.

- **Scenario 3: staff report improved confidence after training but classroom practice is unchanged**

School Education lens. *School application: prioritise sustained teacher learning, coaching and shared planning time. Spain's teacher-profession reforms and Lithuania's acute shortages in STEM and rural schools show why national strategies must be translated into practical school-level support [3,8].*

Interpretation: knowledge or motivation may not be translating into routines; staff may lack time, coaching or leadership support. Actions: arrange a supported classroom trial, peer observation and a short review; simplify implementation requirements. Evidence: lesson samples, staff reflection and learner experience.

- **Scenario 4: student council proposals are repeatedly declined**

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

Interpretation: the issue may be that consultation topics are outside student influence, constraints are not explained, or decision-makers are not closing the feedback loop. Actions: define a meaningful scope before consultation, publish reasons and offer alternatives. Evidence: proposal-response log and student perceptions of influence.

- **Scenario 5: a conflict-resolution activity includes a bullying incident**

School Education lens. *School application: make respectful relationships visible in class routines, peer collaboration, anti-bullying procedures and safe reporting. Pay particular attention to school segregation and rural–urban gaps in Romania, regional inequalities in Italy and Greece, and inclusion of multilingual pupils [2,5,7,8,10].*

Interpretation: ordinary conflict methods may be unsafe where power is unequal or behaviour is repeated and targeted. Actions: stop the mediation process, follow safeguarding and anti-bullying procedures, support the affected learner and review whether staff need further training. Evidence: restricted case records and aggregate process review.

- **Scenario 6: a community partner withdraws**

School Education lens. *School application: connect civic learning to pupil councils, class decisions, local community projects and media literacy. Build on Italy's reported civic-competence strengths while addressing Cyprus' civic-skills challenge; ensure Serbian and EU partners adapt activities to their respective curriculum and governance frameworks [2,6,9].*

Interpretation: the partnership may have lacked reciprocal value, clear roles, realistic workload or continuity arrangements. Actions: consult the partner respectfully, document lessons, review the agreement and identify whether a different format is appropriate. Do not pressure the partner to continue. Evidence: partner feedback and revised project plan.

- **Scenario 7: cross-country results appear very different**

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

Interpretation: differences may reflect real context, but also sample composition, translation, question interpretation or collection methods. Actions: check instrument comparability, sample and response rates; conduct qualitative follow-

up; report uncertainty. Do not publish a ranking until comparability is justified. Evidence: data dictionary and methodological note.

- **Scenario 8: a successful practice creates excessive workload at scale**

School Education lens. *School application: test the activity with age-diverse primary and secondary classes, including pupils facing socio-economic, language, disability or geographic barriers. Record adaptations and pupil feedback before extending it across the school.*

Interpretation: the core learning mechanism may be valuable while the delivery format is inefficient. Actions: identify essential elements, remove redundant forms, simplify frequency, use shared resources and re-pilot. Evidence: staff time estimates, learner feedback and practice quality.

- **Scenario 9: digital collaboration excludes learners without reliable access**

School Education lens. *School application: make respectful relationships visible in class routines, peer collaboration, anti-bullying procedures and safe reporting. Pay particular attention to school segregation and rural–urban gaps in Romania, regional inequalities in Italy and Greece, and inclusion of multilingual pupils [2,5,7,8,10].*

Interpretation: the technology choice has created a barrier rather than an inclusive opportunity. Actions: provide devices or supervised access where feasible, use asynchronous or offline formats, and assess whether a non-digital method would achieve the same outcome. Evidence: access audit and participation review.

- **Scenario 10: a survey reveals sensitive disclosures**

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

Interpretation: the data collection may have crossed its intended boundary or a learner may be seeking help. Actions: follow safeguarding procedures, restrict access, avoid using the disclosure in aggregated reporting if identification is possible, and review whether the instrument needs redesign. Evidence: procedure review without unnecessary retention of personal detail.

The following operational guidance translates the chapter's policy principles into procedures, review questions and accountability arrangements. It should be adapted to local law, learner needs and institutional capacity while preserving the stated purpose and safeguards.

5.19 Professional learning pathway for teachers, trainers and leaders

School Education lens. *School application: prioritise sustained teacher learning, coaching and shared planning time. Spain's teacher-profession reforms and Lithuania's acute shortages in STEM and rural schools show why national strategies must be translated into practical school-level support [3,8].*

Professional learning should be sequenced around classroom and workshop practice. The following pathway is a flexible design for institutions that need to build confidence without removing teachers from teaching for long periods. It can be delivered through short sessions over a term, with peer learning and follow-up rather than a single intensive event.

- **Module 1 — Shared language and boundaries**

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

Participants define the three domains, map current practice and distinguish educational support from diagnosis or specialist intervention. They review examples of appropriate reflection and identify when an activity risks compelling personal disclosure.

Output: a local PSD map and a short list of safeguarding questions.

- **Module 2 — Modelling Domain A**

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

Participants rehearse a reflection prompt, goal-setting conversation and strategy-focused feedback. They adapt the activity for different literacy levels and communication modes.

Output: one tested reflection routine and an accessibility plan.

- **Module 3 — Designing Domain B collaboration**

School Education lens. *School application: make respectful relationships visible in class routines, peer collaboration, anti-bullying procedures and safe reporting. Pay particular attention to school segregation and rural–urban gaps in Romania, regional inequalities in Italy and Greece, and inclusion of multilingual pupils [2,5,7,8,10].*

Participants design group roles, listening routines and peer feedback criteria. They analyse how dominant voices, language differences and unequal task allocation can affect learning.

Output: a revised group task with participation checks.

- **Module 4 — Conflict triage and safe response**

School Education lens. *School application: make respectful relationships visible in class routines, peer collaboration, anti-bullying procedures and safe reporting. Pay particular attention to school segregation and rural–urban gaps in Romania, regional inequalities in Italy and Greece, and inclusion of multilingual pupils [2,5,7,8,10].*

Participants distinguish ordinary disagreement from bullying, harassment, coercion and abuse. They practise the local decision tree and clarify reporting and referral responsibilities.

Output: a staff-facing response map and identified training needs.

- **Module 5 — Domain C and student voice**

School Education lens. *School application: connect civic learning to pupil councils, class decisions, local community projects and media literacy. Build on Italy's reported civic-competence strengths while addressing Cyprus' civic-skills challenge; ensure Serbian and EU partners adapt activities to their respective curriculum and governance frameworks [2,6,9].*

Participants design a decision cycle in which learners can influence a real issue. They define the scope of influence, response deadline, evidence needs and feedback process.

Output: a student proposal-response protocol.

- **Module 6 — Evaluation for improvement**

School Education lens. *School application: triangulate attendance, progression, basic-skills data, pupil voice, family feedback and classroom observation. Use the 2025 early-leaving figures only as contextual indicators, not as direct measures of PSD or individual school quality [1].*

Participants distinguish outputs from outcomes, select a small indicator set and interpret hypothetical mixed evidence. They practise recording limitations and avoiding unsupported causal claims.

Output: an indicator sheet and a review meeting agenda.

- **Module 7 — Classroom or workshop trial**

School Education lens. *School application: test the activity with age-diverse primary and secondary classes, including pupils facing socio-economic, language, disability or geographic barriers. Record adaptations and pupil feedback before extending it across the school.*

Each participant tests one practice with a defined learner group and records implementation, adaptations, learner feedback and unexpected effects.

Output: a brief practice note, not a personal or learner dossier.

- **Module 8 — Peer review and next cycle**

School Education lens. *School application: make respectful relationships visible in class routines, peer collaboration, anti-bullying procedures and safe reporting. Pay particular attention to school segregation and rural–urban gaps in Romania, regional inequalities in Italy and Greece, and inclusion of multilingual pupils [2,5,7,8,10].*

Colleagues discuss what happened, what was useful, who was excluded, what required more time and what should change. Leadership agrees which routines to sustain or revise.

Output: a documented decision and a next-cycle commitment.

5.20 Conditions for effective professional learning

School Education lens. *School application: prioritise sustained teacher learning, coaching and shared planning time. Spain's teacher-profession reforms and Lithuania's acute shortages in STEM and rural schools show why national strategies must be translated into practical school-level support [3,8].*

- Protect time for planning, rehearsal and follow-up; do not count attendance as evidence of changed practice.
- Offer examples from different age groups, subjects, school contexts and levels of learner support.
- Make it safe for staff to discuss a trial that did not work as intended.
- Use coaching and peer observation to support practice, not as a mechanism for public ranking.
- Ensure part-time staff, support staff and colleagues working across sites can participate.
- Ask staff whether the activity improved learning enough to justify its workload.

The following operational guidance translates the chapter's policy principles into procedures, review questions and accountability arrangements. It should be adapted to local law, learner needs and institutional capacity while preserving the stated purpose and safeguards.

5.21 Baseline and consultation question bank

School Education lens. *School application: triangulate attendance, progression, basic-skills data, pupil voice, family feedback and classroom observation. Use the 2025 early-leaving figures only as contextual indicators, not as direct measures of PSD or individual school quality [1].*

The questions below are examples for local adaptation, not a validated standardised instrument. Institutions should pilot wording with the intended respondents, check translation and accessibility, and remove questions that do not inform a

decision. Surveys should be short enough to respect respondents' time. Questions about safety or harm must be accompanied by an appropriate response and referral process.

- **Learners — Domain A**

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

I know at least one strategy that helps me continue when a learning task becomes difficult. / I can identify an adult or route I can use when I need support. / I understand what I am expected to learn from reflection activities. / I can choose a way to reflect that helps me communicate my thinking.

Follow-up: What would make reflection more useful or comfortable? Avoid asking for personal histories.

- **Learners — Domain B**

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

In group work, I understand my role. / I have a chance to contribute in a way that works for me. / I know how to report bullying or harmful behaviour. / Adults respond when learners are treated disrespectfully.

Follow-up: What makes it easier or harder to take part in group work?

- **Learners — Domain C**

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

I understand how student proposals can influence decisions in this institution. / I receive an explanation when a proposal cannot be adopted. / I have opportunities to investigate issues that matter to my community. / I can disagree respectfully without being ridiculed.

Follow-up: What is one decision students should have a meaningful opportunity to influence?

- **Teachers and school support staff**

School Education lens. *School application: prioritise sustained teacher learning, coaching and shared planning time. Spain's teacher-profession reforms and Lithuania's acute shortages in STEM and rural schools show why national strategies must be translated into practical school-level support [3,8].*

I can integrate PSD into my subject or subject teaching and school projects without creating an unnecessary parallel curriculum. / I know how to adapt activities for different learners. / I can distinguish ordinary conflict from concerns requiring safeguarding procedures. / I have enough time and support to review the impact of PSD routines.

Follow-up: Which resource or professional-learning opportunity would most improve implementation?

- **Families and carers**

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

I understand the purpose of PSD activities. / I know how to ask questions or provide feedback. / Communication about PSD is accessible to me. / I understand how school and family responsibilities complement one another.

Follow-up: What communication format or timing would make engagement easier?

- **Community partners and employers**

School Education lens. *School application: connect civic learning to pupil councils, class decisions, local community projects and media literacy. Build on Italy's reported civic-competence strengths while addressing Cyprus' civic-skills challenge; ensure Serbian and EU partners adapt activities to their respective curriculum and governance frameworks [2,6,9].*

The learning purpose and our role were clear. / The activity addressed a relevant need. / Safeguarding, supervision and data arrangements were adequate. / The partnership was reciprocal and proportionate to our capacity.

Follow-up: What should be retained or changed before another collaboration?

5.22 Administration and interpretation rules

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

- Explain the purpose, voluntary nature where applicable, confidentiality limits and expected use of responses.
- Do not collect names unless there is a clear and lawful operational reason; separate support requests from anonymous evaluation.
- Include "not sure" or "not applicable" where those are meaningful options, and report them transparently.
- Pilot the instrument with a small group to identify confusing wording, inaccessible formats or unintended pressure.
- Use open responses selectively and remove identifying details before wider sharing.
- Share a plain-language summary of findings and explain what action will follow.
- Do not compare countries or institutions unless the samples, instruments, language adaptations and collection periods are sufficiently comparable.

The following operational guidance translates the chapter's policy principles into procedures, review questions and accountability arrangements. It should be adapted to local law, learner needs and institutional capacity while preserving the stated purpose and safeguards.

5.23 Annual review meeting and decision-log protocol

School Education lens. *School application: triangulate attendance, progression, basic-skills data, pupil voice, family feedback and classroom observation. Use the 2025 early-leaving figures only as contextual indicators, not as direct measures of PSD or individual school quality [1].*

The annual PSD review should be a decision meeting rather than a presentation of activity counts. A 90-minute meeting may be sufficient for a small institution if evidence is prepared in advance; larger providers may need separate discussions. The meeting should include leadership, staff, learner representation and other stakeholders as appropriate, while protecting confidential case information.

- **0–10 minutes: purpose and context**

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

Restate the priorities, learner groups and changes in context. Confirm that the review is developmental and that the evidence will not be used to rank individual learners.

- **10–25 minutes: implementation**

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

Review what was planned, what was delivered, what was adapted and what could not be implemented. Distinguish incomplete delivery from an intervention that was delivered but did not work.

- **25–40 minutes: reach, equity and safety**

School Education lens. *School application: specify child-protection, anti-bullying, referral and data-protection procedures under each country's law. Activities must be age-appropriate, avoid forced disclosure and identify the designated school staff member and external service for escalation.*

Ask who participated, who may have been excluded, what access barriers were identified and whether any safeguarding or privacy issues require changes to the process.

- **40–55 minutes: learner and family experience**

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

Review accessible feedback and examples of student proposals. Identify where experience differs between groups or between formal policy and everyday practice.

- **55–70 minutes: evidence and uncertainty**

School Education lens. *School application: triangulate attendance, progression, basic-skills data, pupil voice, family feedback and classroom observation. Use the 2025 early-leaving figures only as contextual indicators, not as direct measures of PSD or individual school quality [1].*

Triangulate indicator results, qualitative feedback and examples of practice. Record limitations and alternative explanations; do not infer causality from timing alone.

- **70–82 minutes: decisions**

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

For each priority, decide to continue, adapt, scale, pause or discontinue. Identify the reason and any additional evidence required.

- **82–90 minutes: ownership and communication**

School Education lens. *School application: make respectful relationships visible in class routines, peer collaboration, anti-bullying procedures and safe reporting. Pay particular attention to school segregation and rural–urban gaps in Romania, regional inequalities in Italy and Greece, and inclusion of multilingual pupils [2,5,7,8,10].*

Assign each action to a named role with a deadline. Agree what will be communicated to learners, families and staff and when.

5.24 Decision log template

School Education lens. *School application: triangulate attendance, progression, basic-skills data, pupil voice, family feedback and classroom observation. Use the 2025 early-leaving figures only as contextual indicators, not as direct measures of PSD or individual school quality [1].*

Priority	Evidence considered	Decision and rationale	Owner / deadline	Follow-up evidence

5.25 Questions that keep the review rigorous

School Education lens. *School application: triangulate attendance, progression, basic-skills data, pupil voice, family feedback and classroom observation. Use the 2025 early-leaving figures only as contextual indicators, not as direct measures of PSD or individual school quality [1].*

- What evidence would change our current interpretation?
- Which learners are not represented in the evidence, and why?
- Are we measuring the activity, the learner experience, the demonstrated practice or the longer-term outcome?
- Could a result be explained by changes in sample, timing, staffing or context?
- Which action is realistic with the resources available?
- What will we stop doing to create space for a new priority?
- How will learners know what changed as a result of their feedback?

The following operational guidance translates the chapter's policy principles into procedures, review questions and accountability arrangements. It should be adapted to local law, learner needs and institutional capacity while preserving the stated purpose and safeguards.

5.26 The minimum institutional PSD plan

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

Every participating school should maintain a concise PSD plan within its existing strategic or improvement planning process. The plan should not be a separate document created only to demonstrate project compliance. It should identify the learners and programmes concerned, the needs or opportunities that justify action, the priorities for Domains A, B and C, the relationship to learning-to-learn, the staff and partners involved, the resources required and the evidence that will be reviewed. A plan is useful when it supports decisions; it is not useful merely because it exists.

- Context statement: describe the educational setting, learner pathways, access barriers and existing practices relevant to the chosen priorities.

- Outcome statement: define what learners should have an opportunity to practise or demonstrate, using observable and non-diagnostic language.
- Implementation sequence: specify preparation, trial, feedback, adaptation and review dates.
- Ownership: identify a leadership sponsor, a practical coordinator and the staff who deliver the activities.
- Participation: explain how learners can shape activities and how the institution will respond to their input.
- Evidence: select a small set of indicators, identify the source and collection method, and state the limitations.
- Safeguards: document accessibility, privacy, safeguarding, referral and partner-supervision arrangements.
- Continuation: identify recurrent costs, induction requirements and the process for retaining or replacing resources.

5.27 Governance roles and decision rights

School Education lens. *School application: connect civic learning to pupil councils, class decisions, local community projects and media literacy. Build on Italy's reported civic-competence strengths while addressing Cyprus' civic-skills challenge; ensure Serbian and EU partners adapt activities to their respective curriculum and governance frameworks [2,6,9].*

Governance should prevent two common failures: a PSD initiative that belongs to nobody once its original champion leaves, and a structure so centralised that teachers cannot adapt practices to their learners. The leadership team should retain accountability for institutional conditions and resources. The coordinator should support planning and evidence use, not personally deliver every activity. Teachers and school support staff should make pedagogical decisions within agreed principles. Learners should have meaningful influence over issues within the institution's remit. Safeguarding leads and relevant specialists should retain their formal responsibilities.

Function	Accountable role	Evidence of completion	Review frequency
Strategic priority and resourcing	Headteacher or principal	PSD priorities included in annual plan and resource decisions	Annual
Coordination and implementation support	Named PSD coordinator or existing equivalent	Schedule, staff support, action log and partner contacts	Each term
Classroom and workshop practice	Teachers and school support staff	Learning intentions, accessible activities and formative feedback	Ongoing
Learner participation	Student council or agreed learner representatives with staff support	Proposal log and reasoned responses	Each term
Safeguarding and referral	Designated safeguarding lead under local rules	Current procedure, staff awareness and referral route	At least annually and after relevant incidents
Evidence and improvement	Leadership with staff and learner input	Reviewed indicator set and documented decisions	Annual
Community partnership	Named institutional contact and partner representative	Agreed purpose, roles, risk controls and review	Each project cycle

5.28 Decision rules for continuation, adaptation and stopping

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

The annual review should use explicit decision categories. "Continue" means the activity remains relevant, accessible and feasible, with no material safeguard issue identified. "Adapt" means the intended learning mechanism remains

plausible but the delivery method, accessibility arrangements, duration or support needs to change. "Scale" means a practice has sufficient evidence of feasibility and usefulness in its current context to justify a carefully monitored expansion. "Pause" means further implementation should wait for a condition to be resolved, such as staff training or a safeguarding question. "Stop" means the activity is ineffective, disproportionate, unsafe or no longer needed. Stopping a weak practice is evidence of responsible governance, not failure.

The decision record should include the evidence considered, the interpretation, alternative explanations, the groups whose experiences may be missing, the resources required and the person responsible for follow-up. Where evidence is inconclusive, the correct decision may be a small additional trial rather than either scaling or abandoning the practice.

5.29 Recommended institutional cycle

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

Stage	Key question	Output	Quality test
Diagnose	What do learners and staff need, and what already exists?	Context and provision map	Does it include learner experience and access barriers?
Co-design	What should change, and who can influence it?	Agreed priority and outcome	Are the outcomes clear and non-stigmatising?
Prepare	What staff, time, resources and safeguards are needed?	Implementation brief	Are responsibilities and referral routes clear?
Deliver	What was actually provided, and to whom?	Brief implementation record	Were adaptations and non-delivery recorded honestly?
Listen	How did learners, staff and partners experience it?	Feedback summary	Could participants respond safely and accessibly?
Evaluate	What does the combined evidence support?	Interpretation note	Are limitations and uncertainty explicit?
Decide	What should continue, change, stop or be tested?	Decision log	Is each action owned and time-bound?
Sustain	How will useful practice survive staff or funding changes?	Continuation plan	Are recurrent costs and induction addressed?

The following operational guidance translates the chapter's policy principles into procedures, review questions and accountability arrangements. It should be adapted to local law, learner needs and institutional capacity while preserving the stated purpose and safeguards.

5.30 Detailed indicator dictionary and target-setting protocol

School Education lens. *School application: triangulate attendance, progression, basic-skills data, pupil voice, family feedback and classroom observation. Use the 2025 early-leaving figures only as contextual indicators, not as direct measures of PSD or individual school quality [1].*

The consortium used a common indicator dictionary to improve clarity without forcing every institution to collect the same data. Indicators have been selected because they inform a decision, not because they are easy to count. A small set of well-defined measures is usually more useful than a long dashboard that staff cannot interpret or maintain. The definitions below are proposed examples and have been tested locally before use.

5.30.1 Indicator families

School Education lens. *School application: triangulate attendance, progression, basic-skills data, pupil voice, family feedback and classroom observation. Use the 2025 early-leaving figures only as contextual indicators, not as direct measures of PSD or individual school quality [1].*

Family	What it examines	Illustrative evidence	What it cannot prove alone
Reach and access	Who had an opportunity to participate	Participation records, access audit, learner feedback	That the activity was effective or equally accessible in practice
Implementation	Whether the planned practice was delivered with appropriate adaptations	Brief delivery log, lesson artefact, staff reflection	That the practice caused a change
Learner understanding	Whether learners understand the purpose or can identify a strategy	Short questionnaire, scenario response, learner explanation	Long-term transfer or internal emotional states
Demonstrated practice	Whether learners can apply a strategy in a defined task	Rubric-based observation, portfolio, work sample	A stable personality trait or performance in every context
Relationships and climate	How learners experience participation, respect and response to harm	Anonymous survey, focus group, aggregate incident trends	That no bullying or exclusion exists
Student influence	Whether learner input receives consideration and response	Proposal-response log, student evaluation	That every proposal should be accepted
Staff capability	Whether training is translated into teaching routines	Practice sample, peer review, coaching note	That training attendance alone improved learner outcomes
Sustainability	Whether ownership, resources and routines continue	Budget note, induction record, annual plan	That outcomes will remain unchanged indefinitely

5.30.2 Writing an indicator specification

School Education lens. *School application: triangulate attendance, progression, basic-skills data, pupil voice, family feedback and classroom observation. Use the 2025 early-leaving figures only as contextual indicators, not as direct measures of PSD or individual school quality [1].*

Each indicator should have a stable name and a specification sheet. The sheet should state its purpose, unit of analysis, numerator and denominator where relevant, source, collection period, responsible owner, disaggregation rules, privacy controls, limitations and decision use. For qualitative evidence, it should describe how accounts will be selected and summarised, how identifying details will be removed, and how the institution will avoid presenting a few vivid examples as representative of all learners.

- Prefer “percentage of learners who can identify one appropriate support route” to “learner resilience score” when the actual purpose is awareness of help-seeking routes.
- Prefer “percentage of group tasks using agreed participation roles” to “teamwork quality” if only implementation is being measured.
- Prefer “number and proportion of student proposals receiving a reasoned response within the agreed period” to “student voice improved” when monitoring institutional responsiveness.
- Prefer “staff who trialled a strategy and submitted a reflective practice note” to “staff trained” when the objective is classroom application.

- Use a clearly stated denominator and report the number of valid responses alongside a percentage.
- Do not infer that a missing response is a negative response, and do not silently remove missing data from the report.
- Use small-group suppression or aggregation where reporting could identify a learner or staff member.

5.31 Setting targets responsibly

School Education lens. *School application: triangulate attendance, progression, basic-skills data, pupil voice, family feedback and classroom observation. Use the 2025 early-leaving figures only as contextual indicators, not as direct measures of PSD or individual school quality [1].*

Targets should be based on a baseline, a realistic implementation capacity and a clear rationale. An institution without a baseline should first measure the current position rather than invent a percentage target. For implementation indicators, the target may concern coverage of agreed routines; for experience indicators, it may concern improvement in learner understanding or access; for sustainability, it may concern ownership and resourcing. Targets should be reviewed when context changes substantially.

A target can create harmful incentives if it rewards only a numerical outcome. For example, a target for fewer recorded bullying incidents may discourage reporting unless it is paired with indicators of trust in reporting and the quality of the institutional response. Similarly, a target for student participation may encourage token attendance unless learners can show that their contributions receive consideration. The consortium recommends balanced indicator sets that combine implementation, access, experience and follow-up.

5.32 Data-quality review questions

School Education lens. *School application: triangulate attendance, progression, basic-skills data, pupil voice, family feedback and classroom observation. Use the 2025 early-leaving figures only as contextual indicators, not as direct measures of PSD or individual school quality [1].*

- Does the measure correspond to the stated learning or policy outcome?
- Are the language and response options understood by the intended group?
- Who was unable or unwilling to respond, and might that affect interpretation?
- Has the instrument, sample, timing or method changed since the previous collection?
- Can the result be triangulated with another source without collecting unnecessary personal information?
- Does the result support a decision, or is it being reported only because it is available?
- Could the target encourage staff or learners to conceal problems, select easier participants or overstate success?
- Has the institution communicated findings in a way that is understandable and respectful?

The following operational guidance translates the chapter's policy principles into procedures, review questions and accountability arrangements. It should be adapted to local law, learner needs and institutional capacity while preserving the stated purpose and safeguards.

5.33 Safeguarding, ethics, referral and risk review

School Education lens. *School application: triangulate attendance, progression, basic-skills data, pupil voice, family feedback and classroom observation. Use the 2025 early-leaving figures only as contextual indicators, not as direct measures of PSD or individual school quality [1].*

PSD activities can be valuable, but the language of personal development can unintentionally create pressure to disclose, conform or interpret structural difficulties as individual weakness. Ethical implementation requires the institution to anticipate such risks and provide clear routes for prevention and response. This annex complements, and does not replace, applicable national law or institutional safeguarding policies.

Risk	Early warning	Preventive or corrective control	Primary owner
Compelled personal disclosure	Learners feel required to describe trauma, family circumstances or sensitive identity information.	Use fictional examples, private reflection or a right to pass; explain how responses will be used.	Teacher/trainer; safeguarding lead consulted where relevant
Labelling and stigma	Learners are described as deficient in resilience, empathy or emotional maturity.	Assess task-specific practices and opportunities; avoid personality labels and public ranking.	Teacher and school/school leadership
Bullying treated as ordinary conflict	Mediation is offered where power is unequal or behaviour is repeated and targeted.	Use anti-bullying and safeguarding procedures; do not force restorative dialogue.	Designated safeguarding lead
Inaccessible participation	Learners with disability, language barriers or limited connectivity cannot take part fully.	Provide alternative formats, assistive supports, extra time and non-digital routes.	Leadership and activity lead
Privacy breach	Sensitive reflections or survey responses are shared beyond the stated purpose.	Minimise collection, restrict access, set retention periods and explain confidentiality limits.	Data protection lead or responsible authority
Tokenistic student voice	Learners are consulted but receive no explanation of decisions.	Define influence scope and response deadlines before consultation; maintain a response log.	Leadership and learner representatives
Unbalanced group work	Confident learners dominate while others receive nominal or low-status tasks.	Use rotating roles, individual accountability and participation checks.	Teacher/trainer
Digital harm	Online collaboration exposes learners to harassment, unwanted contact or data collection.	Use approved platforms, moderation, clear conduct rules and accessible alternatives.	Leadership, digital lead and safeguarding lead
Unrealistic impact claims	Activity counts or satisfaction scores are presented as proof of long-term outcomes.	Separate outputs from outcomes, document limitations and use cautious causal language.	Evaluation lead
Unsustainable workload	Staff maintain parallel paperwork or activities without protected time.	Integrate into existing routines, remove duplication and review effort against value.	Leadership and PSD coordinator
Partner dependency	A key activity relies on a single volunteer or organisation without a continuity plan.	Document roles, create alternatives and avoid promising services outside partner capacity.	Partnership coordinator
Cultural stereotyping	Learners are expected to represent or explain a whole nationality, language or faith group.	Use multiple sources and voluntary contributions; challenge generalisations respectfully.	Teacher/trainer and leadership

5.34 Ethical review before piloting

School Education lens. *School application: connect civic learning to pupil councils, class decisions, local community projects and media literacy. Build on Italy's reported civic-competence strengths while addressing Cyprus' civic-skills challenge; ensure Serbian and EU partners adapt activities to their respective curriculum and governance frameworks [2,6,9].*

Before a new activity or survey is piloted, the responsible team should ask whether participation is voluntary where it should be; whether the purpose is clear; whether the activity could expose a learner to embarrassment or stigma; whether accessible alternatives exist; whether the data collected are necessary; whether the staff are prepared to respond to concerns; and whether a less intrusive method could achieve the same learning objective. If any answer raises a material unresolved risk, the activity should be redesigned before it proceeds.

The following operational guidance translates the chapter's policy principles into procedures, review questions and accountability arrangements. It should be adapted to local law, learner needs and institutional capacity while preserving the stated purpose and safeguards.

5.35 Stakeholder action and accountability matrix

School Education lens. *School application: triangulate attendance, progression, basic-skills data, pupil voice, family feedback and classroom observation. Use the 2025 early-leaving figures only as contextual indicators, not as direct measures of PSD or individual school quality [1].*

This matrix is designed to make recommendations actionable for the audiences identified in the brief. The responsibilities are complementary. European-level actors can enable comparison and cooperation; national and regional authorities can create coherent conditions; institutions can organise implementation; and teachers, learners, families and community partners can contribute to practice and review.

Stakeholder	Priority action	Operational mechanism	Core evidence	Sustainability condition
European institutions and programme actors	Support shared principles and cross-border learning	Guidance, peer-learning formats, reusable resources and proportionate funding criteria	Quality of shared resources, transfer notes and documented learning	Avoid parallel reporting and support reuse
National authorities	Map PSD against existing curriculum, inclusion and teacher-development policy	Policy mapping, guidance and consultation with providers	Mapping note, implementation barriers and review record	Integrate with existing standards and budgets
Regional and local authorities	Connect institutions with training, services and community partners	Local directory, pooled support and inter-institutional learning	Participation access, referral clarity and provider feedback	Maintain named contacts and realistic service capacity
School leaders	Assign ownership and protect time	Annual PSD plan, coordinator, staff collaboration and decision log	Delivery records, learner voice and annual review	Embed in strategy, induction and recurring resource plans
Teachers and school support staff	Teach and model the competencies through authentic tasks	Explicit learning intentions, accessible practice and formative feedback	Work samples, observation prompts and learner feedback	Provide coaching and reduce unnecessary paperwork
Learners	Influence learning routines and institutional decisions	Student councils, accessible consultation and proposal-response cycle	Response time, learner understanding and participation routes	Close the feedback loop visibly

Families and carers	Contribute contextual insight through accessible dialogue	Multiple communication channels and clear consultation questions	Feedback themes and documented institutional response	Avoid assumptions about time, language or digital access
Community organisations	Provide authentic contexts and reciprocal expertise	Partnership agreement, supervised project and joint review	Partner feedback, project learning and agreed outcomes	Clarify roles, resources and continuity
Employers and community partners	Support professional-context learning within defined boundaries	Briefing, observable feedback and escalation routes	Learner reflection and relevant work-based evidence	Do not assess private emotional states or replace provider responsibility

5.36 Final implementation test

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

Before a recommendation is considered implemented, the responsible institution should be able to show the following: the intended learners had a genuine opportunity to participate; the learning purpose was explained; staff understood their roles and safeguards; accessibility was considered; evidence was gathered proportionately; the institution reviewed what happened; learners received an appropriate response; and a decision was made about continuation. A policy document alone is not evidence of implementation. A completed activity alone is not evidence of impact. Credible progress requires a traceable link between intention, practice, evidence and decision.

Sustainability means more than keeping a project website online. It means that effective PSD practices remain part of institutional routines, staff capability, budgets, governance and relationships after external funding or project leadership changes. Scalability means extending a practice without losing its educational purpose, safety, accessibility or responsiveness to context.

Chapter 6. Recommendations for Sustainability and Scalability

School Education country application. *Sustainability depends on school leadership, teacher capacity, protected collaboration time, family trust and practical resourcing. Country adaptation should address Italy's territorial inequalities, Spain's early-leaving and regional context, Portugal's basic-skills priorities, Romania's rural school disparities, Cyprus' inclusion and achievement challenges, Greece's mathematics and digital gaps, Lithuania's teacher shortages and Serbia's school continuity and curriculum implementation [2–10].*

6.1 Ensuring long-term commitment and investment in PSD

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

6.1.1 Institutional ownership and strategic alignment

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

Each school should identify a senior accountable lead and a coordinator with sufficient time to support implementation. PSD objectives should appear in the institutional development plan, staff learning plan and annual review. Responsibility must be distributed: the coordinator enables coherence but does not become the sole person expected to deliver every activity. Leadership changes should trigger a formal handover of priorities, resources and unresolved actions.

6.1.2 Multi-year resource planning

School Education lens. *School application: assign a named school leader, protected teacher time, recurring resources and an annual review. Cost and scale plans should reflect Romania's rural-school pressures, Italy's territorial inequalities and Lithuania's teacher-capacity constraints, alongside local needs in the other partner countries [2,5,8].*

Budgeting should distinguish start-up costs from recurring costs. Recurring costs may include staff collaboration time, translation, accessible materials, specialist consultation, platform maintenance, evaluation and community partnership coordination. Institutions should map which costs can be absorbed into existing provision and which require additional funding. Financial planning should avoid creating programmes that depend on unpaid overtime or a single temporary grant.

6.1.3 Embedding PSD in staff induction and professional routines

School Education lens. *School application: prioritise sustained teacher learning, coaching and shared planning time. Spain's teacher-profession reforms and Lithuania's acute shortages in STEM and rural schools show why national strategies must be translated into practical school-level support [3,8].*

New staff should receive a concise induction to the institution's PSD framework, classroom routines, safeguarding procedures, student voice mechanisms and evaluation approach. Existing staff should have periodic opportunities for coaching, peer observation and reflective discussion. Staff turnover should not erase practice knowledge: retain templates, lesson examples, decision logs and adaptation notes in a shared, access-controlled repository.

6.1.4 Building family and community ownership

School Education lens. *School application: connect civic learning to pupil councils, class decisions, local community projects and media literacy. Build on Italy's reported civic-competence strengths while addressing Cyprus' civic-skills challenge; ensure Serbian and EU partners adapt activities to their respective curriculum and governance frameworks [2,6,9].*

Sustained PSD is more likely when families and community partners understand the purpose of activities and can influence how they are delivered. Engagement should be reciprocal, accessible and realistic. Institutions should not expect families to replace professional support or community partners to provide unpaid services indefinitely. Written partnership agreements should clarify objectives, roles, safeguarding, data handling, communication and review dates.

6.2 Strategies for dissemination and knowledge sharing

School Education lens. *School application: assign a named school leader, protected teacher time, recurring resources and an annual review. Cost and scale plans should reflect Romania's rural-school pressures, Italy's territorial inequalities and Lithuania's teacher-capacity constraints, alongside local needs in the other partner countries [2,5,8].*

6.2.1 A layered dissemination strategy

School Education lens. *School application: assign a named school leader, protected teacher time, recurring resources and an annual review. Cost and scale plans should reflect Romania's rural-school pressures, Italy's territorial inequalities and Lithuania's teacher-capacity constraints, alongside local needs in the other partner countries [2,5,8].*

Dissemination should be designed for use, not simply visibility. European audiences may need policy briefs and cross-country syntheses; national and regional authorities may need implementation notes and indicator definitions; school leaders may need checklists and planning templates; teachers may need ready-to-adapt classroom examples; learners and families may need plain-language summaries. Each product should state its intended audience, use case, version date and contact or feedback route.

6.2.2 Quality standards for shared resources

School Education lens. *School application: assign a named school leader, protected teacher time, recurring resources and an annual review. Cost and scale plans should reflect Romania's rural-school pressures, Italy's territorial inequalities and Lithuania's teacher-capacity constraints, alongside local needs in the other partner countries [2,5,8].*

- State the problem and intended learning outcome clearly.
- Identify learner age, context, duration, resources and prerequisites.
- Include step-by-step implementation and accessible alternatives.
- Describe safeguarding, privacy and inclusion considerations.
- Provide feasible indicators and explain evidence limitations.
- Record adaptations, review date, authoring partner and version history.
- Use plain language and provide translations or accessible formats where feasible.

6.2.3 Dissemination through professional networks

School Education lens. *School application: assign a named school leader, protected teacher time, recurring resources and an annual review. Cost and scale plans should reflect Romania's rural-school pressures, Italy's territorial inequalities and Lithuania's teacher-capacity constraints, alongside local needs in the other partner countries [2,5,8].*

Partner institutions should share resources through teacher networks, school leadership communities, local authorities, family groups and relevant European cooperation platforms. Events should include a practical demonstration, a discussion of constraints and a plan for follow-up. Dissemination success should be assessed through use, adaptation and feedback—not only the number of participants or social-media impressions.

6.2.4 Open resources and responsible reuse

School Education lens. *School application: assign a named school leader, protected teacher time, recurring resources and an annual review. Cost and scale plans should reflect Romania's rural-school pressures, Italy's territorial inequalities and Lithuania's teacher-capacity constraints, alongside local needs in the other partner countries [2,5,8].*

Where rights, consent and platform conditions allow, resources should be shared in reusable formats with clear attribution and adaptation permissions. Materials containing personal information, identifiable learner work or sensitive case examples must be excluded or properly anonymised. The consortium should maintain a version-controlled repository and remove outdated resources that could mislead users.

6.3 Creating a sustainable network for PSD collaboration

School Education lens. *School application: make respectful relationships visible in class routines, peer collaboration, anti-bullying procedures and safe reporting. Pay particular attention to school segregation and rural–urban gaps in Romania, regional inequalities in Italy and Greece, and inclusion of multilingual pupils [2,5,7,8,10].*

6.3.1 Consortium network model

School Education lens. *School application: assign a named school leader, protected teacher time, recurring resources and an annual review. Cost and scale plans should reflect Romania's rural-school pressures, Italy's territorial inequalities and Lithuania's teacher-capacity constraints, alongside local needs in the other partner countries [2,5,8].*

The B.E.E. network should have a light but explicit governance model. Each partner appoints a contact person and identifies a deputy to preserve continuity. The network agrees an annual work plan, thematic priorities, a calendar of peer exchanges and a process for updating shared resources. Coordination should be distributed where possible, with responsibilities documented so that the network does not depend on a single individual.

6.3.2 Peer review and communities of practice

School Education lens. *School application: make respectful relationships visible in class routines, peer collaboration, anti-bullying procedures and safe reporting. Pay particular attention to school segregation and rural–urban gaps in Romania, regional inequalities in Italy and Greece, and inclusion of multilingual pupils [2,5,7,8,10].*

A community of practice should focus on a real implementation question, such as improving student voice, making reflection accessible or assessing group collaboration fairly. Members share a short case record, discuss contextual factors, agree a trial and return with evidence. Peer review should be supportive but rigorous: participants should ask what changed, for whom, under what conditions and with what limitations.

6.3.3 Maintaining cross-border learning after project closure

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

Before the end of the funded period, partners should agree which network functions will continue, who will host the resource repository, how often the group will meet and what minimum coordination effort is feasible. Sustainability options include integrating the network into existing professional associations, rotating facilitation, annual online exchanges and joint applications for relevant funding. No continuation model should be described as secured until responsibilities and resources are confirmed.

6.4 Integrating digital tools and resources for scalability

School Education lens. *School application: teach privacy, consent, source evaluation, respectful online behaviour and age-appropriate use of AI and mobile devices. Spain's regional variation in phone-use rules, Cyprus' digital-skills challenges and the OECD's 2025 evidence for Serbia support school-level digital citizenship policies [6,8,10].*

6.4.1 Digital infrastructure with a clear purpose

School Education lens. *School application: teach privacy, consent, source evaluation, respectful online behaviour and age-appropriate use of AI and mobile devices. Spain's regional variation in phone-use rules, Cyprus' digital-skills challenges and the OECD's 2025 evidence for Serbia support school-level digital citizenship policies [6,8,10].*

A shared digital space can host resource packs, implementation logs, training modules, indicator definitions and partner case studies. It should be searchable, accessible, secure and easy to maintain. The consortium should avoid collecting identifiable learner data in the shared repository. Local institutions should retain sensitive data within their own approved systems and share only aggregated or anonymised evidence when appropriate.

6.4.2 Blended professional learning

School Education lens. *School application: prioritise sustained teacher learning, coaching and shared planning time. Spain's teacher-profession reforms and Lithuania's acute shortages in STEM and rural schools show why national strategies must be translated into practical school-level support [3,8].*

Online modules can provide common concepts and resources; live workshops can support rehearsal and discussion; local trials allow staff to adapt practice; and follow-up sessions help assess implementation. Blended formats can widen access for rural or small providers, but they should not assume that every participant has reliable connectivity, dedicated study time or equal digital confidence. Downloadable materials and asynchronous options should be considered.

6.4.3 Digital accessibility and inclusion

School Education lens. *School application: teach privacy, consent, source evaluation, respectful online behaviour and age-appropriate use of AI and mobile devices. Spain's regional variation in phone-use rules, Cyprus' digital-skills challenges and the OECD's 2025 evidence for Serbia support school-level digital citizenship policies [6,8,10].*

Digital resources should use clear navigation, readable typography, captions or transcripts for audio-visual content, alternative text where appropriate and compatibility with assistive technologies. Materials should avoid unnecessary complexity and provide non-digital alternatives when the activity does not require technology. Accessibility should be tested with users rather than inferred from a checklist alone.

6.5 Scaling responsibly: readiness, adaptation and stop rules

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

Not every successful pilot is ready to scale. Before expansion, leaders should ask whether the practice is feasible with available staff, safe for the intended group, accessible to learners who were not represented in the pilot, and compatible with local policy. Scaling should preserve the essential mechanism of the practice while allowing changes to examples, timing, language and delivery format. A practice should be adapted or stopped if it increases exclusion, creates unnecessary workload, exposes sensitive data or fails to produce a plausible educational benefit after a fair trial.

Readiness question	Evidence to examine	Decision
Is the purpose clear?	Defined learning outcome and rationale.	Proceed only if staff and learners can explain the purpose.
Is it feasible?	Staff time, resources, timetable and specialist support.	Pilot, simplify or defer based on capacity.
Is it safe and inclusive?	Risk review, accessible formats, feedback from diverse learners.	Redesign before scaling if barriers or risks remain.
Is there evidence of value?	Implementation records, learner feedback and observed practice.	Continue or adapt based on triangulated evidence.
Can it be sustained?	Named owner, budget, induction and continuity plan.	Do not scale without an ownership and resourcing route.
Are unintended effects acceptable?	Workload, exclusion, privacy and safeguarding review.	Modify or discontinue where harms outweigh benefits.

6.6 Sustainability indicators

School Education lens. *School application: connect civic learning to pupil councils, class decisions, local community projects and media literacy. Build on Italy's reported civic-competence strengths while addressing Cyprus' civic-skills challenge; ensure Serbian and EU partners adapt activities to their respective curriculum and governance frameworks [2,6,9].*

- PSD remains visible in the institutional development plan and annual review.
- A named lead and deputy are in place, with responsibilities documented.
- Recurring staff time and resource needs are identified in budget planning.
- New staff receive induction to PSD routines and safeguarding boundaries.
- Resources have owners, version dates and review arrangements.
- Student and family feedback receives a documented response.
- Community partnerships have agreed roles and a review date.
- Evidence is used to continue, adapt or discontinue activities.
- At least one cross-institutional or cross-border learning exchange is maintained where feasible.
- Continuation arrangements are confirmed rather than assumed.

6.7 Embedding PSD in budgets, workforce planning and continuity

School Education lens. *School application: assign a named school leader, protected teacher time, recurring resources and an annual review. Cost and scale plans should reflect Romania's rural-school pressures, Italy's territorial inequalities and Lithuania's teacher-capacity constraints, alongside local needs in the other partner countries [2,5,8].*

Sustainability should be assessed before a practice is scaled. Institutions should distinguish start-up costs from recurring costs and identify staff time, coordination, accessible materials, translation, specialist advice, platform maintenance, partnership management and evaluation required after external funding ends. Full-cost estimates should include the opportunity cost of staff time and should not rely on unpaid overtime as a hidden resource.

Leadership should name an accountable senior lead and an operational coordinator while distributing delivery across teams. A succession arrangement should ensure that priorities, materials, decisions and unresolved risks survive staff turnover. PSD should appear in staff induction, annual planning, professional learning and quality review.

Continuation decisions should consider value, feasibility and equity together. A low-cost activity is not sustainable if it relies on one person or excludes learners who need adjustments. A promising intervention may need to be simplified, combined with existing provision or delivered less frequently. Where an institution cannot sustain a practice safely, it should communicate this openly.

6.8 Dissemination, open resources and responsible scaling

School Education lens. *School application: assign a named school leader, protected teacher time, recurring resources and an annual review. Cost and scale plans should reflect Romania's rural-school pressures, Italy's territorial inequalities and Lithuania's teacher-capacity constraints, alongside local needs in the other partner countries [2,5,8].*

Dissemination should be designed for uptake by distinct audiences. Policy-makers may need evidence summaries and options; school leaders may need planning templates and cost models; teachers may need adaptable activities; learners and families may need plain-language explanations; community partners may need clear agreements. Every output should identify its user, version date, adaptation permissions, accessibility features and feedback route.

Scaling should proceed in stages: local trial, structured review, adaptation, replication in a second context, and only then wider dissemination. At each stage, check whether the practice retains its purpose, remains safe and accessible, fits staff capacity and produces useful evidence. Expansion should pause if quality deteriorates or workload becomes unreasonable.

Where rights and consent permit, materials should be shared in reusable formats with clear attribution and licensing. Resources should avoid identifiable learner stories unless there is a lawful basis and appropriate consent; fictionalised or anonymised examples are usually preferable. The repository should use version control and a named maintainer.

6.9 Integrated sustainability tool: phased 24-month implementation roadmap

School Education lens. *School application: connect civic learning to pupil councils, class decisions, local community projects and media literacy. Build on Italy's reported civic-competence strengths while addressing Cyprus' civic-skills challenge; ensure Serbian and EU partners adapt activities to their respective curriculum and governance frameworks [2,6,9].*

Phase	Indicative period	Core actions	Deliverables / decision gate
1. Prepare	Months 1–3	Name accountable lead and deputy; map existing practice; identify stakeholders; review safeguarding and data arrangements; establish baseline questions.	PSD baseline and institutional ownership note.
2. Co-design	Months 4–6	Select priorities across A, B and C; consult learners and families; map curriculum; select indicators; plan staff learning.	Approved PSD action plan with roles, timetable and resource needs.
3. Pilot	Months 7–12	Trial a manageable set of routines; train and coach staff; run accessible learner voice activities; develop one community or civic project where feasible.	Pilot record with implementation evidence, learner feedback and barriers.
4. Review and adapt	Months 13–15	Compare evidence with baseline; review equity and workload; consult staff and learners; adapt or discontinue weak practices.	Written review with decisions and rationale.

5. Consolidate	Months 16–21	Integrate effective practices into annual plans, staff induction and resource repository; strengthen partnerships; exchange learning with consortium partners.	Updated curriculum map, resource pack and sustainability plan.
6. Sustain and share	Months 22–24	Confirm recurrent ownership and costs; publish audience-specific resources; complete peer review; agree next cycle.	Continuation decision, final evidence note and next-year priorities.

The following operational guidance translates the chapter's policy principles into procedures, review questions and accountability arrangements. It should be adapted to local law, learner needs and institutional capacity while preserving the stated purpose and safeguards.

6.10 Operational responsibilities by stakeholder group

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

The recommendations in the main chapters require differentiated action. A European policy framework can establish shared principles, but the operational responsibilities of a ministry, regional authority, school leader, classroom teacher, teacher, family representative and learner are not interchangeable. The following guidance clarifies what each group can reasonably own and what evidence can demonstrate progress. It is designed for adaptation, not as a compulsory organisational chart.

6.11 European institutions and programme actors

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

European-level actors can add value by making PSD visible across relevant policy conversations, supporting transnational learning and funding work that institutions cannot easily undertake alone. They should avoid creating parallel reporting systems where existing quality assurance can be adapted. Calls for proposals can ask applicants to explain how their approach connects personal development, relationships and civic engagement, how learners will participate, and how continuation will be resourced.

At implementation stage, European-level support should prioritise reusable materials, common definitions, translation and accessibility, evaluation literacy, and mechanisms for sharing adaptation evidence. Comparative reports should describe differences in context and method rather than rank countries on incompatible measures. Funding should recognise coordination and partner time as legitimate costs.

6.12 National authorities

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

National authorities can map PSD against curriculum, teacher education, inclusion, citizenship and quality assurance frameworks. They should identify whether existing policy already covers the relevant competencies and where practical

guidance is missing. Where new expectations are introduced, authorities should assess workload, curriculum capacity and the availability of professional learning before requiring implementation.

National guidance should provide examples of age-appropriate progression and indicate the minimum safeguards expected for reflective activities, student voice, safeguarding and evaluation. It should allow schools to select methods appropriate to their learners and should make clear which elements are required by law, which are recommended practice and which are optional examples.

6.13 Regional and local authorities

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

Regional and local authorities are well placed to connect schools with specialist services, teacher development, community organisations and peer support. They can reduce inequality by pooling resources for small or rural institutions, facilitating shared training and supporting translation or accessibility. They should avoid assuming that every school can independently secure specialist support or maintain a complex digital platform.

Local implementation can be strengthened through a named contact point, a directory of relevant services, a schedule of professional-learning opportunities and a periodic review of barriers. Authorities should use evidence to target support, not to penalise institutions for structural constraints outside their control.

6.14 School leadership

School Education lens. *School application: prioritise sustained teacher learning, coaching and shared planning time. Spain's teacher-profession reforms and Lithuania's acute shortages in STEM and rural schools show why national strategies must be translated into practical school-level support [3,8].*

Leaders turn policy into an institutional routine. They should identify a senior accountable owner, a coordinator, staff collaboration time and a realistic set of annual priorities. They should also ensure that the school's own behaviour—discipline, consultation, workload allocation, accessibility and communication—matches the values taught in PSD activities.

Leadership teams should review a small dashboard at least annually. The dashboard should cover implementation, access, learner experience, staff capacity and the actions taken in response to evidence. Leaders should be prepared to discontinue an activity if it adds workload without a clear educational purpose or excludes learners who need alternative access.

6.15 Teachers and school support staff

School Education lens. *School application: prioritise sustained teacher learning, coaching and shared planning time. Spain's teacher-profession reforms and Lithuania's acute shortages in STEM and rural schools show why national strategies must be translated into practical school-level support [3,8].*

Teachers and school support staff should select a manageable strategy, model it explicitly, give learners opportunities to practise, and use feedback to decide what comes next. They should not be expected to diagnose mental-health conditions or resolve serious safeguarding concerns independently. Their professional role includes noticing barriers, responding appropriately and referring concerns through established procedures.

Teachers should document enough to support continuity and reflection, but not collect personal narratives unnecessarily. Professional learning should provide space to discuss dilemmas, test approaches and adapt them to age, language, disability, developmental stage and group dynamics. Evidence of classroom practice is more informative than attendance at a training event alone.

6.16 Learners

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

Learners are participants in PSD, not merely recipients of interventions. They should receive clear explanations of learning goals, assessment boundaries and available support. Their views should influence the design of activities and institutional decisions where appropriate. Participation must be accessible and should not require public speaking, personal disclosure or agreement with adult preferences.

Learners can contribute through class discussion, anonymous feedback, student councils, peer collaboration, project evaluation and accessible digital or written channels. Institutions should close the feedback loop by explaining what changed, what could not change and why.

6.17 Families and carers

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

Families can provide contextual knowledge, reinforce routines and share observations about whether learners understand the purpose of PSD. Schools should communicate in accessible language, avoid assumptions about family structure or available time, and offer multiple routes for dialogue. Families should not be asked to deliver specialist interventions or become responsible for shortcomings in institutional provision.

Engagement is meaningful when schools listen as well as inform. Family feedback should be summarised without exposing individual circumstances and should be connected to visible actions. Institutions should review whether meeting times, language, digital access or previous experiences make participation difficult.

6.18 Community organisations and employers

School Education lens. *School application: connect civic learning to pupil councils, class decisions, local community projects and media literacy. Build on Italy's reported civic-competence strengths while addressing Cyprus' civic-skills challenge; ensure Serbian and EU partners adapt activities to their respective curriculum and governance frameworks [2,6,9].*

Community organisations and employers can help learners connect PSD to real social contexts, professional ethics and shared needs. Partnership agreements should clarify the learning purpose, reciprocal benefits, roles, supervision, accessibility, safeguarding, data handling and review arrangements. A partner should not be treated simply as a venue, source of unpaid labour or endorsement for an institution.

Pupils, families and community partners should be invited to comment on the relevance and fairness of activities and on whether the school honoured its commitments. Their feedback should be gathered through age-appropriate, accessible and safe formats and should inform the annual school-improvement review.

The following operational guidance translates the chapter's policy principles into procedures, review questions and accountability arrangements. It should be adapted to local law, learner needs and institutional capacity while preserving the stated purpose and safeguards.

6.19 Institutional PSD maturity and progression model

School Education lens. *School application: assign a named school leader, protected teacher time, recurring resources and an annual review. Cost and scale plans should reflect Romania's rural-school pressures, Italy's territorial inequalities and Lithuania's teacher-capacity constraints, alongside local needs in the other partner countries [2,5,8].*

The maturity model is intended to help institutions decide what to do next, not to rank schools or certify learners. A setting may be advanced in one domain and still need support in another. The model should be completed through discussion among leadership, teachers, learners and, where appropriate, families and partners. Institutions should record evidence for their judgement and identify one realistic next step rather than attempting to reach the highest level in every area simultaneously.

- **Level 1 — Emerging**

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

PSD is recognised as important, but activities are mainly occasional and depend on individual staff. Roles, curriculum links and evaluation are not yet consistent.

Next step: map existing provision, identify a lead and agree one priority in each domain.

- **Level 2 — Planned**

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

The institution has identified outcomes, some curriculum links and an initial staff-learning plan. Learner feedback is collected but does not always lead to documented action.

Next step: clarify the response loop, define indicators and make participation accessible.

- **Level 3 — Embedded**

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

PSD routines are used across several subjects or programmes, staff understand safeguarding boundaries, and learner voice influences selected decisions. Evidence is reviewed regularly.

Next step: examine equity, transferability and workload; extend peer learning and family engagement.

- **Level 4 — Evaluative**

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

The institution triangulates implementation records, learner experience and practice evidence. Decisions to adapt or stop activities are documented and resources are planned beyond a single cycle.

Next step: share learning with other institutions and test whether effective practices transfer.

- **Level 5 — Sustainable and collaborative**

School Education lens. *School application: make respectful relationships visible in class routines, peer collaboration, anti-bullying procedures and safe reporting. Pay particular attention to school segregation and rural–urban gaps in Romania, regional inequalities in Italy and Greece, and inclusion of multilingual pupils [2,5,7,8,10].*

PSD is embedded in strategy, induction, budgets, governance and community partnerships. The institution contributes to a wider learning network and revisits practice as context changes.

Next step: maintain critical review, prevent complacency and ensure that participation remains meaningful.

6.20 Maturity review dimensions

School Education lens. *School application: triangulate attendance, progression, basic-skills data, pupil voice, family feedback and classroom observation. Use the 2025 early-leaving figures only as contextual indicators, not as direct measures of PSD or individual school quality [1].*

Dimension	Emerging	Planned	Embedded / sustainable
Leadership and ownership	No named owner; responsibility informal	Named owner and coordinator	Distributed roles, annual review and continuity plan
Curriculum and practice	Occasional events	Mapped outcomes and recurring routines	Cross-curricular progression and transfer evidence
Staff capability	Training depends on individual initiative	Training and trial opportunities available	Coaching, peer observation and induction routine
Learner participation	Feedback is occasional	Several participation routes exist	Proposals receive documented, timely responses
Equity and safety	Safeguards implicit or inconsistent	Procedures and adaptations are documented	Access and unintended effects reviewed routinely
Evidence and improvement	Activity counts only	Indicators and feedback reviewed	Triangulated evidence informs recorded decisions
Sustainability	Temporary funding or individual champion	Basic resources and role identified	Recurring costs, partnerships and repository maintained

The following operational guidance translates the chapter's policy principles into procedures, review questions and accountability arrangements. It should be adapted to local law, learner needs and institutional capacity while preserving the stated purpose and safeguards.

6.21 Resource planning, cost categories and value-for-effort review

School Education lens. *School application: triangulate attendance, progression, basic-skills data, pupil voice, family feedback and classroom observation. Use the 2025 early-leaving figures only as contextual indicators, not as direct measures of PSD or individual school quality [1].*

A credible PSD plan should identify both direct and indirect costs. The purpose of this framework is not to prescribe amounts, which will vary by country, institution and funding rules, but to prevent implementation plans from relying on invisible staff effort or short-lived project resources. Cost planning should be proportional to the scale of the intended change.

Cost category	Potential cost elements	Planning question
Coordination	Time for planning, meetings, curriculum mapping, partner communication and annual review.	Can an existing role absorb this work realistically, or is protected time required?
Professional learning	Training, coaching, peer observation, substitute cover or staff release.	How will part-time staff and staff across multiple sites access the offer?
Accessible resources	Translation, plain-language versions, visual supports, assistive formats and printing.	Which adaptations are essential for equitable access?
Digital infrastructure	Platform hosting, security review, accessibility checks, maintenance and technical support.	Can existing approved tools meet the need without collecting unnecessary data?
Specialist input	Safeguarding advice, inclusion expertise, counselling or referral coordination where available.	What is the boundary between teacher responsibility and specialist support?
Community engagement	Partner time, travel, materials, accessible venues and supervision.	Are partner contributions reciprocal and adequately resourced?
Evaluation	Baseline collection, analysis, learner consultation, translation and reporting.	What minimum evidence is needed to make the intended decision?
Continuation	Resource updates, induction, network coordination and replacement of materials.	Who owns recurrent costs when external funding ends?

6.22 Minimum budget narrative

School Education lens. *School application: assign a named school leader, protected teacher time, recurring resources and an annual review. Cost and scale plans should reflect Romania's rural-school pressures, Italy's territorial inequalities and Lithuania's teacher-capacity constraints, alongside local needs in the other partner countries [2,5,8].*

Every institutional PSD plan should contain a short budget narrative stating: the resources already available; the additional resources required; the staff time assumed; the accessibility and inclusion costs; the evaluation effort; the recurrent costs after the initial period; and the source of funds or decision still needed. Where resources are unavailable, the plan should identify a lower-cost alternative or phase the work rather than claiming that the full programme can be delivered without the necessary conditions.

6.23 Value-for-effort review

School Education lens. *School application: triangulate attendance, progression, basic-skills data, pupil voice, family feedback and classroom observation. Use the 2025 early-leaving figures only as contextual indicators, not as direct measures of PSD or individual school quality [1].*

At the annual review, leaders should compare the effort required with the educational value observed. This is not a demand to monetise every benefit. It is a way to identify duplication, excessive paperwork or activities that do not reach their intended learners. A practice with modest direct costs may still be unsustainable if it requires repeated unpaid work. Conversely, an activity with an initial cost may be worthwhile if it can be integrated into routine teaching and reused across years.

- Retain activities with a clear purpose, reasonable workload and evidence of usefulness.
- Simplify activities that appear useful but require unnecessary documentation.
- Redesign activities that reach only confident or well-resourced learners.

- Pause or stop activities that create safety risks or do not produce plausible benefit after a fair trial.
- Do not scale a practice until ownership, staff capacity and recurrent costs have been considered.

The following operational guidance translates the chapter's policy principles into procedures, review questions and accountability arrangements. It should be adapted to local law, learner needs and institutional capacity while preserving the stated purpose and safeguards.

6.24 Transferability review

School Education lens. *School application: triangulate attendance, progression, basic-skills data, pupil voice, family feedback and classroom observation. Use the 2025 early-leaving figures only as contextual indicators, not as direct measures of PSD or individual school quality [1].*

Question	If the answer is no or uncertain	Required response
Is the learning purpose clear and relevant locally?	The original problem may not exist in the same form.	Reframe the activity around a locally documented need.
Can the practice fit the curriculum or programme?	It may become an isolated extra task.	Map it to an existing learning activity or reconsider its value.
Are staff prepared to deliver it safely?	Implementation may vary or create avoidable risk.	Provide briefing, rehearsal, supervision or defer the trial.
Can all intended learners participate?	The practice may widen existing gaps.	Redesign formats, resources or participation routes.
Can evidence be collected proportionately?	The institution may overburden staff or intrude on privacy.	Use a smaller indicator set or less intrusive method.
Are recurrent resources available?	The practice may end when temporary support ends.	Phase the plan, identify a funding route or do not scale yet.
Can local adaptations be documented?	Results may be misinterpreted across partners.	Record changes and limit comparative claims.

6.25 Digital resource stewardship, open access and accessibility

School Education lens. *School application: teach privacy, consent, source evaluation, respectful online behaviour and age-appropriate use of AI and mobile devices. Spain's regional variation in phone-use rules, Cyprus' digital-skills challenges and the OECD's 2025 evidence for Serbia support school-level digital citizenship policies [6,8,10].*

Digital tools can support the reuse of PSD resources, multilingual collaboration, staff learning and dissemination. They do not guarantee inclusion or quality by themselves. The consortium should select tools according to the task, accessibility, data protection, moderation, cost and maintenance requirements. A resource repository should be designed as a maintained educational service, not merely a folder of files uploaded at project end.

6.26 Resource metadata and quality control

School Education lens. *School application: assign a named school leader, protected teacher time, recurring resources and an annual review. Cost and scale plans should reflect Romania's rural-school pressures, Italy's territorial inequalities and Lithuania's teacher-capacity constraints, alongside local needs in the other partner countries [2,5,8].*

Metadata field	Purpose	Minimum expectation
Title and version	Identifies the resource and its current edition	Version number, date and change note
Learning domain	Makes the resource discoverable	Primary domain and links to other domains
Intended users	Clarifies audience and setting	Age or pathway guidance without rigid exclusion
Learning intention	Explains why the resource is useful	Observable, non-diagnostic learning purpose
Duration and materials	Supports realistic planning	Estimated time and required resources
Accessibility	Helps users plan inclusion	Formats, language level and known limitations
Safeguarding and privacy	Alerts users to sensitive elements	Disclosure risks, data handling and referral notes
Evidence basis	Distinguishes examples from evaluated practice	Source, pilot context and known limitations
Reuse conditions	Supports lawful and responsible adaptation	Licence or permission statement where applicable
Contact and maintenance	Identifies where corrections can be raised	Responsible partner or role and review date

6.27 Open educational resource principles

School Education lens. *School application: assign a named school leader, protected teacher time, recurring resources and an annual review. Cost and scale plans should reflect Romania's rural-school pressures, Italy's territorial inequalities and Lithuania's teacher-capacity constraints, alongside local needs in the other partner countries [2,5,8].*

Where rights permit, the consortium should favour resources that can be accessed without unnecessary barriers and adapted lawfully for local needs. Open access does not remove the obligation to protect personal data, respect copyright or ensure accessibility. Images, case studies and learner work should be shared only with appropriate permissions and safeguards. If a resource includes examples from a specific partner context, that context should be stated so users do not assume universal applicability.

6.28 Maintenance and retirement

School Education lens. *School application: assign a named school leader, protected teacher time, recurring resources and an annual review. Cost and scale plans should reflect Romania's rural-school pressures, Italy's territorial inequalities and Lithuania's teacher-capacity constraints, alongside local needs in the other partner countries [2,5,8].*

Each resource should have an owner responsible for checking links, updating references, reviewing accessibility and recording significant changes. A review date should be set according to the resource's risk and rate of change. Resources that are outdated, unsafe, inaccessible or no longer supported should be corrected, archived with a warning or withdrawn. The repository should provide a way for users to report errors and should publish a short change log for substantive revisions.

6.29 Digital inclusion and low-tech alternatives

School Education lens. *School application: teach privacy, consent, source evaluation, respectful online behaviour and age-appropriate use of AI and mobile devices. Spain's regional variation in phone-use rules, Cyprus' digital-skills challenges and the OECD's 2025 evidence for Serbia support school-level digital citizenship policies [6,8,10].*

All core activities should have a realistic route for learners and staff who cannot reliably access a particular device, platform or high-speed connection. This may mean printable materials, offline tasks, facilitated sessions or asynchronous participation. Digital collaboration should not require learners to reveal personal accounts or share sensitive reflections in public spaces. Platform selection should be based on approved institutional arrangements and applicable data-protection requirements, not convenience alone.

The following operational guidance translates the chapter's policy principles into procedures, review questions and accountability arrangements. It should be adapted to local law, learner needs and institutional capacity while preserving the stated purpose and safeguards.

6.30 Funding, procurement and long-term cost model

School Education lens. *School application: assign a named school leader, protected teacher time, recurring resources and an annual review. Cost and scale plans should reflect Romania's rural-school pressures, Italy's territorial inequalities and Lithuania's teacher-capacity constraints, alongside local needs in the other partner countries [2,5,8].*

Sustainability requires more than an intention to continue. Each institution should understand the staff time, materials, accessibility supports, training, digital infrastructure, evaluation and partnership costs associated with PSD. This does not mean every benefit must be converted into money. It means that decision-makers should know what resources are necessary and should avoid building a programme on unrecognised unpaid labour.

6.31 Full-cost planning categories

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

Cost category	Examples	Planning test
Coordination and leadership	Planning, meetings, coordination, partner liaison and review	Is the work included in a role and protected time allocation?
Staff development	Training, coaching, peer observation, release time and induction	Can staff apply the learning after the training?
Accessible delivery	Translation, plain-language versions, assistive formats, adapted venues	Are these costs included from the start rather than treated as optional?
Learner participation	Travel, accessible meeting arrangements, materials and facilitation	Can all intended learner groups participate meaningfully?
Community partnership	Supervision, partner time, transport, materials and risk controls	Is the partnership reciprocal and proportionate?
Digital resources	Hosting, maintenance, security, accessibility and technical support	Is there a sustainable owner and a non-digital alternative?
Evaluation	Data collection, analysis, consultation, reporting and translation	Will the evidence inform a real decision?
Continuity	Resource updates, staff replacement, network coordination and future review	What happens when project funding ends?

6.32 Funding principles for authorities and programme actors

School Education lens. *School application: assign a named school leader, protected teacher time, recurring resources and an annual review. Cost and scale plans should reflect Romania's rural-school pressures, Italy's territorial inequalities and Lithuania's teacher-capacity constraints, alongside local needs in the other partner countries [2,5,8].*

Funding mechanisms should recognise the costs of quality implementation, including coordination, accessible delivery, staff learning and evaluation. Short-term grants can support experimentation, but authorities should avoid implying that every pilot must become a permanent programme regardless of evidence. Funding should encourage institutions to plan for continuation while retaining the option to stop ineffective activity. Applications should explain how the proposed work fits existing provision, who will own it and how recurrent costs will be considered.

Where resources are constrained, institutions should prioritise a small number of coherent routines that can be integrated into existing teaching, rather than launching a broad menu of activities that cannot be maintained. Shared consortium resources may reduce duplication, but translation, contextual adaptation and local facilitation still require time and expertise. Budget plans should not assume that all partners have equal staffing, digital access or access to specialist services.

6.33 Value-for-effort review

School Education lens. *School application: triangulate attendance, progression, basic-skills data, pupil voice, family feedback and classroom observation. Use the 2025 early-leaving figures only as contextual indicators, not as direct measures of PSD or individual school quality [1].*

At least annually, leadership should compare the effort required with the educational value and equity of the practice. The review should ask whether the activity reached its intended learners, whether it duplicated existing work, whether staff documentation can be simplified, whether digital tools created barriers, and whether the evidence suggests a plausible benefit. An activity with low direct cost may still be unsustainable if it depends on repeated unpaid work. An activity with a moderate initial cost may be justified if it becomes part of routine practice and is reused across cohorts.

6.34 Continuation decision template

School Education lens. *School application: test the activity with age-diverse primary and secondary classes, including pupils facing socio-economic, language, disability or geographic barriers. Record adaptations and pupil feedback before extending it across the school.*

Question	Institution response
Which practices should continue after the current project or funding cycle?	Name each practice and the reason for continuation.
Who owns each practice and the related resources?	Identify role, not only an individual name.
What recurring staff time is needed?	Estimate planning, delivery, training and review time.
What accessibility costs must be protected?	Identify adaptations that are necessary for participation.
Which costs can be shared across institutions?	Specify reusable materials, joint training or common platforms.
What will be discontinued or simplified?	Identify low-value or duplicative work.
When will the continuation plan be reviewed?	Set a date linked to the institutional planning cycle.

The following operational guidance translates the chapter's policy principles into procedures, review questions and accountability arrangements. It should be adapted to local law, learner needs and institutional capacity while preserving the stated purpose and safeguards.

6.35 Institutional self-assessment and improvement-planning workshop

School Education lens. *School application: triangulate attendance, progression, basic-skills data, pupil voice, family feedback and classroom observation. Use the 2025 early-leaving figures only as contextual indicators, not as direct measures of PSD or individual school quality [1].*

The following workshop can be used by school leadership teams to review current provision and select a manageable improvement priority. It should include more than senior management where possible. Learners, teachers, support staff and relevant partners should contribute through formats appropriate to their roles. The workshop is developmental and should not be used to label an institution as successful or unsuccessful without context.

6.36 Preparation

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

- Collect the current institutional plan, curriculum or programme map, relevant safeguarding procedures and available PSD resources.
- Summarise existing evidence, including who was and was not represented in surveys or consultations.
- Invite learner and staff contributions through accessible methods before the meeting.
- Identify constraints that cannot be resolved by the team alone, such as staffing, transport, specialist support or digital infrastructure.
- Share the workshop purpose and explain that the objective is to select a feasible next step, not to audit individual teachers.

6.37 Workshop sequence

School Education lens. *School application: test the activity with age-diverse primary and secondary classes, including pupils facing socio-economic, language, disability or geographic barriers. Record adaptations and pupil feedback before extending it across the school.*

Time	Activity	Facilitator prompt	Output
10 minutes	Agree purpose and boundaries	What decision must this meeting make?	Shared objective and ground rules
15 minutes	Map current practice	Where are A, B and C already taught or practised?	Provision map
15 minutes	Review learner access	Who can participate easily and who may face barriers?	Access and inclusion issues
15 minutes	Examine evidence	What is known, uncertain or missing?	Evidence summary with limitations
15 minutes	Choose priority	Which change is important and feasible this cycle?	One or two priorities
10 minutes	Define measures	What evidence would tell us whether to adapt?	Indicator and collection plan
10 minutes	Assign ownership	Who will do what, by when, with which resources?	Action log and review date

6.38 Prioritisation matrix

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

Criterion	Guiding question	Rating guidance
Educational relevance	Does the priority address a documented learner or institutional need?	Low / medium / high, with evidence
Equity	Could it improve access or reduce a barrier?	State which groups may benefit and how
Feasibility	Can the institution deliver it with available or attainable resources?	Identify constraints rather than scoring in isolation
Safety and dignity	Can it be delivered without compelled disclosure or avoidable harm?	Any unresolved material risk requires redesign
Integration	Can it be embedded into existing teaching or quality routines?	Prefer coherent integration over duplication
Evidence potential	Can a proportionate review inform a real decision?	Define the source and limitation
Sustainability	Can ownership and recurrent costs be maintained?	State the continuation condition

6.39 Improvement plan

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

Priority	First action	Owner	Resources	Evidence	Review date	Decision options
Domain A priority	Map existing reflection routines and pilot one accessible method	Named role	Planning time and adapted prompts	Learner feedback and sample work	Set locally	Continue / adapt / pause / stop
Domain B priority	Revise one collaborative task with explicit roles and participation checks	Named role	Task redesign and peer review	Observation and learner feedback	Set locally	Continue / adapt / pause / stop
Domain C priority	Create one student proposal cycle with a defined decision scope	Named role	Facilitation and response time	Proposal-response log	Set locally	Continue / adapt / pause / stop

The following operational guidance translates the chapter's policy principles into procedures, review questions and accountability arrangements. It should be adapted to local law, learner needs and institutional capacity while preserving the stated purpose and safeguards.

6.40 Model institutional policy commitments and Commitments

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

The following model commitments may be adapted for an institutional policy statement. They should be adopted only after checking compatibility with local law, governance and safeguarding procedures. They are intentionally written as commitments to practice and accountability rather than promises of guaranteed outcomes.

Commitment 1 — Coherent provision

We will integrate personal and social development into ordinary teaching, subject learning and learner support and civic participation rather than relying only on isolated events. We will map existing provision before introducing additional activities and will review whether new expectations create unnecessary duplication.

Commitment 2 — Learner dignity and agency

We will treat PSD competencies as learnable practices rather than fixed personality traits. We will not require learners to disclose sensitive personal experiences as a condition of participation. We will offer accessible ways to contribute and explain how learner feedback will be considered.

Commitment 3 — Safe and inclusive relationships

We will model respectful communication, respond consistently to discrimination and bullying, and use established safeguarding and referral procedures. We will not treat repeated targeted harm as an ordinary disagreement requiring compulsory mediation.

Commitment 4 — Explicit learning intentions

We will explain the purpose of PSD activities and connect them to observable learning behaviours, feedback and next steps. We will provide repeated opportunities to practise and transfer strategies across curricular, digital and civic and civic contexts.

Commitment 5 — Professional capability

We will support teachers and school support staff through relevant professional learning, rehearsal, peer discussion and proportionate follow-up. We will not treat attendance at a course as sufficient evidence that practice has changed.

Commitment 6 — Meaningful participation

We will define the scope of student influence before consultation, provide a reasoned response to proposals and communicate what changes as a result. We will avoid tokenistic consultation and will not expect one learner to represent an entire group.

Commitment 7 — Responsible evidence use

We will use quantitative and qualitative evidence to improve provision, report denominators and limitations, protect privacy and avoid unsupported causal claims. We will not rank learners by presumed emotional maturity or publish comparisons that are not methodologically justified.

Commitment 8 — Sustainable implementation

We will assign ownership, plan staff time and recurrent costs, maintain accessible resources and include PSD in induction and annual review. We will continue, adapt, scale or stop practices in light of evidence and feasibility.

Commitment 9 — Partnership and reciprocity

We will work with families, community organisations and employers through clear agreements that define purpose, roles, safeguarding, access, data handling and review. We will seek reciprocal value and avoid shifting institutional responsibilities onto partners.

Commitment 10 — Transnational learning

We will share practices across the B.E.E. consortium with context notes, evidence and limitations. We will distinguish common principles from local adaptations and will treat unsuccessful trials as useful learning when reported honestly.

6.41 Adoption and review clause

School Education lens. *School application: triangulate attendance, progression, basic-skills data, pupil voice, family feedback and classroom observation. Use the 2025 early-leaving figures only as contextual indicators, not as direct measures of PSD or individual school quality [1].*

The institution should identify the body or role authorised to approve the commitments, the date of adoption, the review date and the process for consulting learners and staff. The policy should be reviewed when relevant legal requirements change, a material safeguarding concern identifies a weakness, the institution's learner population or provision changes substantially, or evaluation evidence shows that the current approach is not working as intended. Any revision should be communicated in accessible language.

6.42. Recommendations for different stakeholders

For teachers

School Education lens. *School application: prioritise sustained teacher learning, coaching and shared planning time. Spain's teacher-profession reforms and Lithuania's acute shortages in STEM and rural schools show why national strategies must be translated into practical school-level support [3,8].*

- Make one PSD learning intention explicit in relevant lessons and provide repeated opportunities to practise it.
- Model respectful disagreement, repair mistakes openly and use feedback that describes behaviour and next steps.
- Offer varied ways to participate and avoid forcing students to disclose private experiences.
- Use short reflective routines and observable criteria rather than broad judgements of personality.
- Seek collegial support and follow safeguarding procedures when a concern exceeds the educational role.

For school leaders

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

- Treat PSD as part of educational quality and school culture, not as a temporary project or optional extra.
- Protect planning time and connect PSD routines with existing curriculum and policy priorities.
- Support staff well-being, professional learning and collaborative reflection.
- Create meaningful channels for student voice and communicate how feedback informs decisions.
- Review whether policies and everyday practice consistently promote inclusion, dignity and accountability.

For students

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

- Practise noticing emotions and choosing responses that support both personal well-being and respectful relationships.
- Listen to understand, check assumptions and express disagreement without attacking people.
- Ask for help when a problem exceeds what peers can safely resolve.
- Consider who is affected by decisions and how evidence can support a fair response.
- Recognise that responsible participation can take many forms and does not require public visibility.

For families and community partners

School Education lens. *School application: connect civic learning to pupil councils, class decisions, local community projects and media literacy. Build on Italy's reported civic-competence strengths while addressing Cyprus' civic-skills challenge; ensure Serbian and EU partners adapt activities to their respective curriculum and governance frameworks [2,6,9].*

- Support opportunities for young people to practise independence, communication and shared responsibility.
- Engage with schools through accessible channels and share relevant perspectives without expecting schools to solve every social difficulty alone.
- Collaborate on authentic projects with clear objectives, safeguards and reciprocal benefit.
- Respect learners' privacy and avoid using public activities to expose personal difficulties.
- Offer feedback on whether partnership activities are useful, inclusive and sustainable.

For policy-makers and educational authorities

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

- Provide coherent guidance and professional development that connect PSD with existing competence frameworks and curricula.
- Ensure that schools have the time, resources and support services required for implementation.
- Encourage formative, multi-source assessment and discourage simplistic high-stakes ranking of personal or social traits.
- Support cross-school and cross-border peer learning, including transparent reporting of limitations and adaptations.
- Monitor equity and access, ensuring that PSD opportunities reach learners who face structural barriers.

Chapter 7. Conclusion: A Vision for a More Empowered and Engaged European Generation

School Education country application. *The consortium's final commitment is to make PSD part of the everyday experience of children and young people in schools across all eight partner countries. Common principles should be retained, while priorities and delivery are adapted to national curricula, school stages, local inequalities, safeguarding systems and the evidence available. VET and adult-learning transfer remains complementary and outside the main scope [1–10].*

7.1 Reinforcing the importance of PSD in shaping future generations

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

The B.E.E. consortium's central message is that School Education should enable children and young people to move from understanding themselves to relating constructively with others and contributing responsibly to shared life. These outcomes are not supplementary activities to be postponed until academic learning is complete: they should be developed through curriculum, classroom relationships, school governance, family engagement and participation in the local community. The main recommendations therefore address schools and school systems; references to VET or adult learning are complementary and limited to transferability.

Domain A develops the reflective capacity and agency needed to learn and act. Domain B builds the relationships through which people cooperate, recognise difference and repair ordinary disagreements. Domain C connects those capacities to rights, responsibility and democratic participation. Their integration is the defining feature of the consortium approach: learners should experience them as connected aspects of education, not as a series of unrelated campaigns.

7.2 Call to action for EU Member States and educational stakeholders

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

The consortium calls on European institutions to support a shared but flexible School Education reference approach; national and regional authorities to integrate PSD into school policy, curricula and resourcing; school leaders to embed it in everyday routines; teachers to model and teach the competencies explicitly; and learners, families and community partners to participate meaningfully in decisions that affect school life.

Stakeholder	Immediate commitment	Commitment over the next 12–24 months
European institutions and programme actors	Promote common principles, peer learning and accessible resources.	Support a practice repository, evaluation exchange and sustainable cooperation opportunities.
National and regional authorities	Map existing standards and identify implementation gaps.	Align guidance, teacher learning, funding and quality assurance with PSD principles.
School leaders	Name an accountable lead and conduct a baseline review.	Embed PSD in curriculum maps, staff induction, budgets and annual improvement cycles.
Teachers and school support staff	Select a manageable routine in each domain and gather learner feedback.	Share practice, participate in coaching and use evidence to refine delivery.
Learners	Identify what helps them feel safe, learn and participate.	Contribute to decisions and evaluation through accessible, meaningful routes.
Families	Engage with the purpose of PSD and share contextual insight where possible.	Participate in review and help improve communication and accessibility.
Community partners	Agree a clear, reciprocal role in a learning activity or project.	Review impact and maintain partnerships where both sides see value.

7.3 Final remarks from the consortium

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

The consortium does not propose one universal programme or a single numerical score for personal and social development. It proposes a disciplined approach: clear purposes, inclusive practice, competent staff, meaningful learner agency, proportionate evidence and sustainable institutional ownership. Success should be judged not by the number of activities delivered but by whether learners have more consistent opportunities to reflect, collaborate, participate and seek support—and whether institutions learn from the evidence they collect.

The move from "me" school to "we" school is both a pedagogical and institutional commitment. It requires individual development to be supported by relationships, relationships to be protected by fair systems, and civic responsibility to be practised through real opportunities to influence shared decisions. The B.E.E. consortium invites European educational stakeholders to make that commitment concrete, measurable and durable.

7.4 The consortium implementation compact

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

The B.E.E. consortium proposes that every adopting institution make eight practical commitments: define PSD coherently across Domains A, B and C; integrate provision into existing learning rather than rely on isolated events; protect dignity, privacy and safeguarding; ensure accessible participation; invest in staff capability and coordination;

give learners a consequential voice; use evidence proportionately and honestly; and identify resources and responsibility for continuity.

These commitments should be translated into a public-facing institutional statement and an internal implementation plan. The public statement should be short enough for learners and families to understand. The internal plan should specify actions, ownership, indicators, review dates and resources. Both should be reviewed annually and revised in response to evidence and stakeholder feedback.

The consortium's ambition is not to prescribe a single model of the ideal learner. It is to help educational institutions create conditions in which learners can develop agency, build relationships across difference and participate responsibly in shared life. Progress should be judged by the quality of opportunities, the dignity of learners' experience, the fairness of access and the institution's willingness to learn and change.

7.5 Final consortium statement

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

These recommendations are intended to support a shared European commitment to PSD while preserving the diversity of educational contexts across Italy, Spain, Portugal, Romania, Cyprus, Greece, Lithuania and Serbia. The framework is strongest when treated as a practical cycle—diagnose, co-design, implement, listen, evaluate, adapt and sustain. Its credibility depends on protecting learner dignity, reporting evidence honestly and making institutional decisions visible. The ultimate measure is not whether an institution can claim to have delivered a PSD activity, but whether it has created durable opportunities for learners to understand themselves, work constructively with others and participate responsibly in the world they share.

The country-specific additions use the latest comparable Eurostat early-leaving series available for 2025 and the European Commission's Education and Training Monitor 2025 country reports for the seven EU Member States in the consortium. For learner belonging, they draw on OECD PISA 2022 country notes for Italy, Spain, Portugal, Romania, Greece, Lithuania and Serbia. PISA belonging data are not used as a proxy for Cyprus; the Cyprus context is drawn from its Education and Training Monitor 2025 country report. Indicators refer to different populations and reference years and should not be combined into a composite score. The 2025 early-leaving values are contextual indicators, not causal evidence about PSD. Country examples are intended to guide adaptation and should be validated by each national partner against current legislation, curriculum, safeguarding and administrative data.

[15] European Commission (2025), Education and Training Monitor 2025 – Lithuania country report. https://op.europa.eu/webpub/eac/education-and-training-monitor/en/country-reports/lithuania.html

[14] European Commission (2025), Education and Training Monitor 2025 – Greece country report. https://op.europa.eu/webpub/eac/education-and-training-monitor/en/country-reports/greece.html

[13] European Commission (2025), Education and Training Monitor 2025 – Cyprus country report. https://op.europa.eu/webpub/eac/education-and-training-monitor/en/country-reports/cyprus.html

[12] European Commission (2025), Education and Training Monitor 2025 – Romania country report. https://op.europa.eu/webpub/eac/education-and-training-monitor/en/country-reports/romania.html

[11] European Commission (2025), Education and Training Monitor 2025 – Portugal country report. https://op.europa.eu/webpub/eac/education-and-training-monitor/en/country-reports/portugal.html

[10] European Commission (2025), Education and Training Monitor 2025 – Spain country report. https://op.europa.eu/webpub/eac/education-and-training-monitor/en/country-reports/spain.html

[9] European Commission (2025), Education and Training Monitor 2025 – Italy country report. https://op.europa.eu/webpub/eac/education-and-training-monitor/en/country-reports/italy.html

[8] OECD (2023), PISA 2022 Results, Country Note: Serbia. https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/pisa-2022-results-volume-i-and-ii-country-notes_ed6fbcc5-en/serbia_961b99f9-en.html

[7] OECD (2023), PISA 2022 Results, Country Note: Lithuania. https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/pisa-2022-results-volume-i-and-ii-country-notes_ed6fbcc5-en/lithuania_633ad03a-en.html

[6] OECD (2023), PISA 2022 Results, Country Note: Greece. https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/pisa-2022-results-volume-i-and-ii-country-notes_ed6fbcc5-en/greece_a24e696b-en.html

[5] OECD (2023), PISA 2022 Results, Country Note: Romania. https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/pisa-2022-results-volume-i-and-ii-country-notes_ed6fbcc5-en/romania_cfe329e8-en.html

[4] OECD (2023), PISA 2022 Results, Country Note: Portugal. https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/pisa-2022-results-volume-i-and-ii-country-notes_ed6fbcc5-en/portugal_777942d5-en.html

[3] OECD (2023), PISA 2022 Results, Country Note: Spain. https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/pisa-2022-results-volume-i-and-ii-country-notes_ed6fbcc5-en/spain_f1a3afc1-en.html

[2] OECD (2023), PISA 2022 Results, Country Note: Italy. https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/pisa-2022-results-volume-i-and-ii-country-notes_ed6fbcc5-en/italy_2e8d98df-en.html

[1] Eurostat, Early leavers from education and training (age 18–24), dataset edat_lfse_14 / SDG 4.10, 2025 observations; Eurostat, Key figures on Europe – 2025 edition. https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/databrowser/view/edat_lfse_14/default/table

School Education evidence, sources and methodological note

The country-specific school priorities use the European Commission's Education and Training Monitor 2025 reports for Italy, Spain, Portugal, Romania, Cyprus, Greece and Lithuania, the European Commission's 2025 Serbia Report, and the OECD PISA 2025 Serbia country note published on 8 September 2026. The common early-leaving comparison uses Eurostat's 2025 series. Early leaving is an outcome indicator for 18–24-year-olds and must not be interpreted as a direct measure of current school performance or PSD competence. PISA results refer to 15-year-old students and should be interpreted with the OECD's methodological cautions. Serbia is a non-EU partner and is not covered by the EU Education and Training Monitor country-report series.

[1] Eurostat (2026), 'Early school leavers down to 9.1% in 2025', 4 June 2026; dataset edat_lfse_14. https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/products-eurostat-news/w/ddn-20260604-1

[2] European Commission (2025), Education and Training Monitor 2025 – Italy country report. https://op.europa.eu/webpub/eac/education-and-training-monitor/en/country-reports/italy.html

[3] European Commission (2025), Education and Training Monitor 2025 – Spain country report. https://op.europa.eu/webpub/eac/education-and-training-monitor/en/country-reports/spain.html

[4] European Commission (2025), Education and Training Monitor 2025 – Portugal country report. https://op.europa.eu/webpub/eac/education-and-training-monitor/en/country-reports/portugal.html

[5] European Commission (2025), Education and Training Monitor 2025 – Romania country report. https://op.europa.eu/webpub/eac/education-and-training-monitor/en/country-reports/romania.html

[6] European Commission (2025), Education and Training Monitor 2025 – Cyprus country report. https://op.europa.eu/webpub/eac/education-and-training-monitor/en/country-reports/cyprus.html

[7] European Commission (2025), Education and Training Monitor 2025 – Greece country report. https://op.europa.eu/webpub/eac/education-and-training-monitor/en/country-reports/greece.html

[8] European Commission (2025), Education and Training Monitor 2025 – Lithuania country report. https://op.europa.eu/webpub/eac/education-and-training-monitor/en/country-reports/lithuania.html

[9] European Commission (2025), Serbia Report 2025, Chapter 26: Education and Culture. https://enlargement.ec.europa.eu/document/download/6e68ce26-b95b-48e1-921a-c60c12da8f00_en?filename=serbia-report-2025.pdf

[10] OECD (2026), PISA 2025 Results, Volume I: Serbia, country note, 8 September 2026. https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/pisa-2025-results-volume-i-country-notes_2d4ff9ea-en/serbia_85c64193-en.html

[11] OECD (2023), PISA 2022 Results, Volume II: Learning During – and From – Disruption, section on school belonging and learning environment. https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/pisa-2022-results-volume-ii_a97db61c-en/full-report/

Appendix A. Glossary of Key Terms

Term	Working definition in this document
Personal and Social Development (PSD)	The educational process through which learners develop self-awareness and agency, constructive relationships, and responsible participation in shared life.
Domain A	Self-awareness and personal development, including emotional literacy, autonomy, reflection, goal-setting and learning-to-learn.
Domain B	Interpersonal skills and relationships, including communication, empathy, collaboration, inclusion and constructive conflict response.
Domain C	Social responsibility and civic engagement, including rights, responsibilities, critical judgement, student voice and community contribution.
Learning-to-learn	The capacity to plan, monitor and adapt learning strategies, use feedback and reflect on progress.
Formative assessment	Assessment used to guide learning and identify next steps rather than to rank or label learners.
Student voice	Structured opportunities for learners to contribute to decisions, with a clear explanation of how their input is considered.
Baseline	Initial evidence collected to understand current provision or experience before a planned change is implemented.
Indicator	A defined measure or evidence prompt used to monitor implementation, experience, practice or outcomes.
Transferability	The extent to which a practice can be adapted to a different setting while preserving its intended purpose and safeguards.
Safeguarding	Policies and procedures to protect learners from harm and ensure concerns are responded to appropriately.
Sustainability	The capacity to maintain useful practices through ongoing ownership, resources, staff capability and review.

Appendix B. Stakeholder Implementation Matrix

Purpose. This matrix translates the seven-chapter framework into responsibilities that can be assigned, resourced and reviewed. It is a proposed governance tool for the B.E.E. partnership and future adopters. It does not imply that any authority has already approved the measures. Each organisation should identify the legally competent body, adapt responsibilities to its governance structure and record decisions.

B.1 European institutions and programme authorities

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

European institutions can strengthen PSD by making it visible within existing education, inclusion, citizenship and lifelong-learning priorities rather than creating a parallel regulatory layer. The recommended action is to publish non-binding implementation guidance with shared principles, adaptable descriptors, examples of age-appropriate practice and safeguards. The guidance should clarify the distinction between common outcomes and nationally determined curriculum arrangements. It should be accompanied by peer-learning opportunities and a repository of evaluated practice.

- Commission or agency action: convene a technical working group including ministries, school leaders, teachers, learners, youth organisations, disability and inclusion experts, researchers and data-protection specialists. Publish a consultation summary and explain how feedback changed the guidance.
- Programme-authority action: encourage applicants to budget for staff release time, accessible materials, translation, evaluation and continuation planning, not only mobility, events or production of outputs.
- Monitoring action: request proportionate reporting on reach, accessibility, implementation quality and learning—not only counts of activities. Allow contextual narrative and avoid league tables of countries or schools.
- Transfer action: support peer-learning cycles in which an adopter states the problem, documents local baseline conditions, pilots a practice, records adaptations and reports what did not transfer.

B.2 National ministries and agencies

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

National authorities should determine how PSD relates to curriculum standards, teacher professional standards, student welfare, citizenship education, inclusion and quality assurance. The first step is a crosswalk of existing policies; a new subject or reporting requirement should be considered only where the mapping demonstrates a substantive gap. Ministries should appoint a policy owner and a cross-sector group able to coordinate education, youth, social services and relevant health or safeguarding systems.

- Within 6 months: identify the competent units and map current PSD-related requirements, initiatives and data sources.
- Within 12 months: publish national School Education guidance with minimum safeguards, age- and stage-appropriate descriptors, and examples for early childhood, primary and secondary schools; include a short transfer note for other learning pathways where relevant.
- Within 18 months: fund or designate a pilot cohort representing different regions, school sizes, learner populations and resource conditions.
- Within 24 months: review pilot evidence, staff workload, learner experience and equity; decide whether to continue, adapt, expand or discontinue each practice.
- Annually: report aggregate progress and unresolved barriers, while protecting personal data and avoiding unsupported causal claims.

B.3 Regional and local authorities

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

Regional and local authorities are positioned to connect policy with local support services and community partners. They should establish a coordination mechanism that schools can access without requiring every institution to build a separate network. This mechanism may include educational psychologists, social workers, youth workers, inclusion specialists, libraries, cultural organisations and civil-society groups, subject to national law and available capacity.

- Create a directory of referral pathways and community learning partners, with named contacts and periodic verification.
- Offer shared training, supervision and accessible resources to small or rural institutions that cannot provide these independently.
- Use local needs assessments to prioritise barriers such as transport, language access, disability accommodations, digital exclusion or limited family engagement.
- Support inter-school communities of practice and publish anonymised learning notes on implementation barriers and solutions.
- Include learner representatives in local planning, with accessible participation formats and a clear response to proposals.

B.4 School leaders and provider managers

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

School leaders and managers are responsible for converting broad commitments into timetable decisions, staff roles, classroom expectations, support pathways and annual improvement plans. Leadership should not rely on one enthusiastic teacher or a temporary project officer. The institution should appoint an accountable senior sponsor and a coordinator with protected time, while distributing delivery across subject teams and support staff.

- Complete a provision map before introducing new activities; identify duplication and discontinue low-value paperwork where possible.
- Set no more than three to five annual PSD priorities, each linked to one or more domains and a defined learner need.
- Agree a staff development plan combining initial training, rehearsal, peer observation, coaching and reflective review.
- Ensure safeguarding, complaints, anti-bullying, data protection and referral procedures are aligned with the proposed activities.
- Review participation and feedback for groups who may be under-represented, and record the adjustments made.
- Report to the governing body or equivalent once per year, including resources used, evidence limitations and next decisions.

B.5 Teachers, trainers, social workers, psychologists and pedagogues

School Education lens. *School application: prioritise sustained teacher learning, coaching and shared planning time. Spain's teacher-profession reforms and Lithuania's acute shortages in STEM and rural schools show why national strategies must be translated into practical school-level support [3,8].*

Practitioners need practical methods, clear boundaries and access to consultation. Teachers and school support staff can teach PSD skills through subject learning, group work, reflection and feedback. Social workers, psychologists and pedagogues contribute specialist perspectives, help design referral pathways and support staff learning, but roles must remain clear. PSD teaching should not become unqualified diagnosis or therapy.

- Use observable learning behaviours rather than labels such as 'resilient', 'unmotivated' or 'emotionally immature'.
- Offer alternative ways to participate, including spoken, written, visual, assistive and small-group formats.
- Explain privacy and confidentiality limits before activities involving personal reflection or sensitive topics.
- Use fictional scenarios where personal disclosure could be intrusive; never grade the intimacy of a learner's disclosure.
- Distinguish ordinary disagreement from bullying, harassment, coercion, abuse or serious power imbalance; follow formal safeguarding routes when required.
- Record educational actions and agreed follow-up rather than unnecessary sensitive narratives.

B.6 Learners, families and community partners

School Education lens. *School application: connect civic learning to pupil councils, class decisions, local community projects and media literacy. Build on Italy's reported civic-competence strengths while addressing Cyprus' civic-skills challenge; ensure Serbian and EU partners adapt activities to their respective curriculum and governance frameworks [2,6,9].*

Learners should participate as contributors to design, delivery and review, not simply as recipients of interventions. Families should receive accessible information and a genuine opportunity to respond, without being assigned responsibility for specialist educational or therapeutic work. Community partners should co-define projects and benefit from reciprocal relationships.

- Explain in advance which decisions are open to influence, who will decide and when a response will be given.
- Provide multiple participation routes and avoid requiring a learner to represent an entire identity group.
- Publish a short 'you said / we did / we could not do yet' response after consultations.
- Use written partnership agreements for substantive community projects, covering roles, costs, supervision, safeguarding, accessibility and data handling.
- Offer equivalent learning routes when transport, disability, caring duties, cost or other barriers prevent participation in an external activity.

Appendix C. Three-Year Implementation Roadmap

The roadmap is a planning model rather than a fixed requirement. Institutions should adjust timing to their school calendar, national regulations, staffing and budget cycle. The sequence deliberately separates diagnosis, piloting, review and scale-up so that implementation is evidence-informed rather than driven by the number of activities delivered.

Phase	Timing	Core actions	Accountable lead	Evidence / decision gate
1. Mandate and map	Months 1–3	Appoint sponsor and coordinator; map existing provision; review safeguarding, inclusion, curriculum and data practices; consult learners and staff.	Institution leader	Approved baseline plan; identified gaps; initial risk review.
2. Co-design	Months 4–6	Select a small number of priorities; define outcomes and indicators; adapt resources; agree referral routes and participation methods.	PSD coordinator with staff and learner group	Action plan, indicator specifications, accessible materials.
3. Pilot	Months 7–12	Trial routines in selected classes or teams; provide staff coaching; gather low-burden evidence; document adaptations and unintended effects.	Participating teams	Implementation log, learner feedback, workload notes.
4. Review and revise	Months 13–15	Compare evidence with baseline; investigate unequal access; discuss findings with learners and families; decide what to continue or change.	Leadership and evaluation group	Written continue/adapt/pause/stop decision for each practice.
5. Extend carefully	Months 16–24	Expand only practices that are feasible and safe; support new teams; develop partnerships; provide induction and shared resources.	Leadership / regional support	Evidence of reach, quality, accessibility and capacity.
6. Embed and sustain	Months 25–30	Integrate PSD into annual plans, staff induction, professional learning and routine quality assurance; identify recurrent funding.	Governing body and budget holder	Named budget, role descriptions, annual reporting cycle.

7. Transfer and renew	Months 31–36	Share adaptation notes; conduct follow-up; review transfer to new contexts; refresh priorities and resource bank.	Consortium/network and local owners	Sustainability review, next-cycle plan, published learning note.

C.1 Minimum implementation conditions

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

Scaling should not begin simply because an initial activity was popular. Before expanding, the institution should be able to show that the practice has a clear purpose, staff understand it, learners can participate safely, accessible alternatives exist, data collection is proportionate, and someone is responsible for follow-up. A practice that works only with unusually high staffing or external project funding should be described as resource-dependent until feasibility under routine conditions has been tested.

C.2 Decision gates

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

- Continue when the practice is safe, feasible, aligned with learner needs and supported by credible evidence of value.
- Adapt when the purpose remains relevant but implementation or access barriers can reasonably be addressed.
- Pause when safeguarding, privacy, workload or equity concerns cannot yet be managed.
- Stop when the practice repeatedly fails to meet its purpose, causes avoidable harm or consumes disproportionate resources.
- Document the evidence, uncertainty, decision owner and date for each decision.

Appendix D. PSD Indicator Dictionary and Evaluation Protocol

Indicators are proposed tools for local improvement, not a mandatory European scoring system. Every institution should choose a small number that answer a decision question. The same indicator may be interpreted differently across settings; definitions, denominators, data sources and collection conditions must therefore be documented before comparison.

D.1 Indicator specification template

School Education lens. *School application: triangulate attendance, progression, basic-skills data, pupil voice, family feedback and classroom observation. Use the 2025 early-leaving figures only as contextual indicators, not as direct measures of PSD or individual school quality [1].*

Field	Required specification
Indicator ID and name	Unique code and concise label.
Purpose	The decision or improvement question the indicator informs.
Domain	A, B, C, or cross-domain.
Definition	What is counted or assessed, including exclusions.
Numerator / denominator	State both where a percentage is used; explain missing data.
Source and method	Survey, observation, portfolio, interview, administrative record or project artefact.
Frequency and owner	Collection schedule and person accountable for quality.
Disaggregation	Only categories that are lawful, necessary, safe and sufficiently aggregated.
Interpretation limits	Bias, sample size, translation, timing and alternative explanations.
Decision trigger	What response will be considered if the result changes or reveals a gap.

D.2 Illustrative indicator bank

School Education lens. *School application: triangulate attendance, progression, basic-skills data, pupil voice, family feedback and classroom observation. Use the 2025 early-leaving figures only as contextual indicators, not as direct measures of PSD or individual school quality [1].*

Code	Domain / area	Illustrative measure	Suggested source and frequency	Caution
A1	Curriculum integration	Share of sampled plans with an explicit Domain A outcome and learning activity.	Termly sample review by department.	A plan does not prove high-quality delivery.
A2	Reflection and agency	Share of learners able to identify a feasible next learning step after feedback.	Short learner prompt or portfolio, twice yearly.	Do not grade private disclosure.
A3	Help-seeking	Learner awareness of at least one trusted adult or appropriate support route.	Anonymous survey, twice yearly.	Awareness does not prove services are accessible.

A4	Staff capacity	Staff confidence and demonstrated ability to model reflective routines.	Pre/post training pulse plus observation.	Self-report should be triangulated.
B1	Fair collaboration	Learner-reported opportunity to contribute meaningfully to group tasks.	Survey and sampled observation, termly.	Consider communication and disability accommodations.
B2	Conflict response	Staff can distinguish ordinary conflict from bullying or serious harm in scenario-based exercises.	Training check and annual safeguarding review.	Do not infer incident prevalence from reporting counts alone.
B3	Respect and belonging	Learner perception that disagreement can occur without ridicule or discrimination.	Anonymous survey and focus groups.	Ensure safe, confidential collection.
B4	Digital collaboration	Share of sampled digital projects with documented accessibility, privacy and moderation checks.	Project audit, termly.	A checklist alone does not establish effective practice.
C1	Student voice	Share of learner proposals receiving a documented response by the agreed deadline.	Proposal-response log, termly.	Count response quality, not only speed.
C2	Civic inquiry	Share of projects that identify affected stakeholders, use multiple sources and state limitations.	Project rubric, annually.	Do not treat project completion as proof of social impact.
C3	Community reciprocity	Partner feedback on whether the activity met a jointly agreed need and avoided burden or displacement.	Partner review after project.	Include critical feedback and non-participating partners where feasible.
C4	European citizenship	Learners can explain one example of cross-border cooperation and reflect on differences across contexts.	Portfolio or interview, annually.	Avoid equating travel participation with learning.
X1	Equitable access	Participation and perceived usefulness across relevant learner groups, where safe and lawful.	Aggregated participation data plus feedback.	Suppress small cells and avoid deficit framing.

X2	Institutional response	Share of evidence reviews leading to a documented decision and assigned action.	Annual improvement-plan audit.	A documented decision may reasonably be to maintain current practice.
X3	Sustainability	Share of priority practices with a named owner, recurrent time allocation and continuation resource.	Annual governance review.	Formal allocation must be checked against actual delivery.

D.3 Evidence hierarchy and interpretation

School Education lens. *School application: triangulate attendance, progression, basic-skills data, pupil voice, family feedback and classroom observation. Use the 2025 early-leaving figures only as contextual indicators, not as direct measures of PSD or individual school quality [1].*

A credible PSD review separates inputs, implementation, reach, learner experience, demonstrated practice, institutional response and longer-term outcomes. Training attendance is an input or output; it is not evidence that teaching changed. A high satisfaction rating is useful but does not establish equitable access or improved competence. A fall in reported incidents may indicate improvement, reduced reporting confidence or changed definitions; it must be interpreted alongside learner trust and response quality.

Use mixed methods when feasible. Quantitative data can identify patterns and reach; interviews, open responses and observations can explain mechanisms and barriers. Record the instrument version, language, sample, response rate, collection dates and changes to implementation. Where the sample is small or self-selected, describe the result as a finding about that sample rather than a population estimate.

D.4 Baseline and follow-up protocol

School Education lens. *School application: triangulate attendance, progression, basic-skills data, pupil voice, family feedback and classroom observation. Use the 2025 early-leaving figures only as contextual indicators, not as direct measures of PSD or individual school quality [1].*

- State the decision question before collecting data and use the least burdensome method that can answer it.
- Check whether a relevant baseline already exists; avoid duplicating administrative data collection without a clear reason.
- Use the same core wording and collection window for repeated measures where comparability is intended; record every adaptation.
- Pilot translated questions for meaning and accessibility; do not assume literal translation guarantees equivalence.
- Offer accessible formats and explain purpose, voluntariness where applicable, privacy and confidentiality limits.
- Analyse non-response and participation patterns; do not silently treat missing answers as negative or positive outcomes.
- Discuss findings with learners and staff, identify alternative explanations, and record the decision taken.
- Publish only aggregate findings that protect identities; retain data only as long as necessary under applicable rules.

D.5 Model annual PSD review questions

School Education lens. *School application: triangulate attendance, progression, basic-skills data, pupil voice, family feedback and classroom observation. Use the 2025 early-leaving figures only as contextual indicators, not as direct measures of PSD or individual school quality [1].*

- What changed in curriculum, routines or learner support during the review period?
- Which learners had meaningful access, and who may have been excluded or underserved?
- What do learner reports, observations and project artefacts show when considered together?
- What was difficult, ineffective or unexpectedly burdensome?
- Did any activity create pressure to disclose personal information or participate publicly?
- Did learner feedback lead to a visible institutional response?
- What should be continued, adapted, paused or stopped, and who owns the next action?
- What resources are required to sustain the decision after temporary funding ends?

Appendix E. Risk Register and Safeguarding Checklist

PSD implementation involves personal reflection, relationships and civic participation. Risk management should therefore be designed into activities rather than added after an incident. The following register is illustrative and should be adapted to the local safeguarding, equality, data-protection and professional framework.

Risk	Early warning signs	Preventive controls	Response / owner
Forced or unsafe disclosure	Learners feel compelled to share private experiences; distress during reflection.	Use fictional cases; explain choice and privacy; never grade disclosure; provide opt-out alternatives.	Stop or adapt activity; offer appropriate support; safeguarding lead reviews.
Confusion between education and therapy	Staff attempt diagnosis or promise therapeutic confidentiality.	Role descriptions, training, referral map, supervision and clear confidentiality boundaries.	Refer through established procedures; consult designated specialist.
Bullying misclassified as mutual conflict	Pressure on harmed learner to mediate; unequal power ignored.	Decision tree differentiating conflict, bullying, harassment, coercion and abuse.	Use safeguarding/anti-bullying pathway; do not force mediation.
Tokenistic student voice	Consultations occur after decisions are fixed; proposals receive no response.	State scope and decision owner in advance; maintain proposal-response log.	Leadership publishes response and corrective timeline.
Unequal participation	Same learners dominate; disability, language, cost or transport blocks access.	Accessible formats, role rotation, adjustments, equivalent activities and representation review.	Modify design; consult excluded groups safely.
Data protection failure	Sensitive journals shared widely; unnecessary identifiers collected.	Data minimisation, access rules, retention schedule, platform review and lawful basis.	Follow institutional breach procedures; notify responsible officer as required.
Digital harm	Unmoderated channels, image sharing without consent, exclusion due to connectivity.	Age-appropriate platforms, moderation, consent and non-digital alternative.	Apply reporting pathway; preserve evidence only under policy.
Staff overload	PSD is added without time or removed when workload rises.	Map existing provision; protect coordination time; simplify reporting; phase implementation.	Reduce scope, reallocate support or pause low-priority activity.
Funding cliff	Activities depend on a short grant or single champion.	Identify recurrent owner and budget before scale-up; induction and succession plans.	Use sustainability gate; retain only feasible core components.
Misleading impact claims	Activity counts presented as social change; small samples treated as national evidence.	Evidence protocol, peer review, limitation statements and clear definitions.	Correct reporting and publish a transparent clarification.

E.1 Pre-activity safeguarding checklist

School Education lens. *School application: specify child-protection, anti-bullying, referral and data-protection procedures under each country's law. Activities must be age-appropriate, avoid forced disclosure and identify the designated school staff member and external service for escalation.*

- Purpose and learning outcomes are explicit, age-appropriate and connected to a PSD domain.
- Participation methods include accessible alternatives and do not require personal disclosure.
- Staff understand their roles, confidentiality limits, reporting routes and referral thresholds.
- Risks related to physical settings, online interaction, external partners and public exposure have been considered.
- Consent, permissions, supervision and emergency arrangements are in place where required.
- Data collection is necessary, proportionate, secure and explained to participants.
- Students know how to raise concerns and what will happen after a report.
- Debriefing and follow-up are planned, including access to support where needed.

Appendix F. Funding, Costing and Sustainability Framework

Sustainability is a governance and resource decision, not a dissemination activity at the end of a project. Before a practice is scaled, the institution should estimate its recurrent cost, identify the budget holder and determine which elements can be maintained through existing provision. The model below helps authorities distinguish start-up investment from recurring commitments.

Cost category	Examples	Budgeting question	Possible sustainability route
Staff time	Coordination, planning, coaching, supervision, review.	How many protected hours are required per term and who covers them?	Embed hours in workload allocation and annual planning.
Professional learning	Initial modules, peer observation, specialist consultation.	What capability must be maintained for new and existing staff?	Use induction, school networks and train-the-trainer approaches with quality checks.
Accessible materials	Translation, easy-read formats, visual supports, assistive formats.	Which materials need adaptation for language, age and disability?	Maintain an open, version-controlled resource bank.
Digital infrastructure	Approved platforms, moderation, accessibility and security review.	Can existing systems meet the purpose without unnecessary data collection?	Use approved institutional systems and provide offline alternatives.
Evaluation	Surveys, focus groups, observation, analysis and reporting.	What is the minimum evidence needed for decisions?	Integrate proportionate review into existing quality assurance.
Community partnerships	Transport, supervision, partner time, materials and insurance where relevant.	Who bears costs, and is participation equitable?	Written agreements and shared local contributions where appropriate.
Specialist support	Referral coordination, supervision, professional advice.	What is the boundary between classroom practice and specialist provision?	Coordinate existing services; do not substitute volunteers for qualified staff.
Network and transfer	Peer-learning meetings, translation, adaptation notes.	What ongoing coordination is necessary after the grant?	Assign network stewardship and rotate hosting responsibilities.

F.1 Three levels of resourcing

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

A minimum viable model should protect safety and basic quality: a named lead, a mapped set of activities, clear referral routes, staff briefing, accessible participation options and an annual review. An intermediate model adds regular coaching, a curated resource bank, learner co-design and structured community partnerships. A mature model adds sustained specialist support, cross-institution evaluation, longitudinal follow-up and formal network participation. Authorities should avoid requiring a mature model from small or under-resourced providers without funding the necessary capacity.

F.2 Sustainability test before expansion

School Education lens. *School application: connect civic learning to pupil councils, class decisions, local community projects and media literacy. Build on Italy's reported civic-competence strengths while addressing Cyprus' civic-skills challenge; ensure Serbian and EU partners adapt activities to their respective curriculum and governance frameworks [2,6,9].*

- Named owner: who is accountable after the project team disperses?
- Time: what routine staff time is required and how is it protected?
- Budget: which recurrent costs are funded, and which remain uncertain?
- Capability: how will new staff be inducted and existing staff supported?
- Materials: who maintains versions, translations, accessibility and permissions?
- Partnerships: are community roles, safeguarding and mutual benefits documented?
- Evidence: what will trigger review, adaptation or discontinuation?
- Continuity: what happens if the coordinator leaves or a funding stream ends?

Appendix G. Institutional PSD Action-Plan Template

Institutions may copy and complete this template as a practical planning record. The template is intentionally concise: it is designed to support decisions and avoid generating paperwork that does not improve provision.

Planning field	Institution response
Institution / setting	Name, type, region, learner pathways and relevant context.
Accountable sponsor	Role with authority to approve priorities and allocate resources.
PSD coordinator	Named role, protected time and contact route.
Baseline summary	What is already in place, what evidence exists and what remains unknown.
Priority 1	Domain, learner need, proposed change and rationale.
Priority 2	Domain, learner need, proposed change and rationale.
Priority 3	Domain, learner need, proposed change and rationale.
Learner and family participation	How views will be collected, who may be missing and how feedback will be answered.
Staff learning	Training, rehearsal, coaching, supervision and induction needs.
Safeguarding and inclusion	Risk assessment, referral routes, accessibility and data safeguards.
Indicators	Definition, source, baseline, review frequency, owner and interpretation limits.
Resources	Staff time, materials, specialist support, digital tools and funding.
Milestones	Dates for pilot, review, revision and reporting.
Decision record	Continue / adapt / pause / stop, evidence and rationale.
Sustainability	Budget owner, recurring allocation, continuity plan and resource maintenance.
Approval and review	Decision date, responsible body and next annual review date.

G.1 Example of a completed priority

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

Illustrative example only: a school identifies that learners do not consistently understand how to raise concerns about bullying or harmful online behaviour. The proposed change is to teach reporting routes through age-appropriate scenarios, publish a simple route map and review learner awareness after one term. The baseline is collected anonymously, without asking learners to disclose incidents. The safeguarding lead owns the route map; teachers deliver short scenario-based learning; student representatives review whether the language is understandable. Indicators include awareness of at least one reporting route, staff understanding of escalation procedures and whether reported concerns receive documented follow-up. The institution does not use a lower incident count as the sole measure of success, because reporting confidence may affect counts.

G.2 Annual decision record

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

At the end of the cycle, the responsible team should record: (1) the intended change; (2) what was implemented; (3) who participated and who may have been excluded; (4) the evidence collected and its limitations; (5) unintended effects and workload; (6) the learner and family feedback received; (7) the decision and rationale; and (8) the owner, resources and date for the next action. This record should be short enough to use and detailed enough to support accountability.

Appendix H. Model Policy Brief for Decision-Makers

H.1 Policy problem

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

Personal and Social Development is often present in education through pastoral care, classroom routines, citizenship education, group work, student councils and community projects, but these elements may be fragmented or dependent on individual staff. The policy challenge is to make PSD coherent, teachable, inclusive and reviewable without turning it into a high-stakes personality test or an additional bureaucratic curriculum.

H.2 Proposed decision

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

Adopt a whole-school and whole-provider PSD approach based on three interconnected domains: (A) self-awareness and personal development; (B) interpersonal skills and relationships; and (C) social responsibility and civic engagement. Embed the domains in existing curriculum and institutional routines, supported by professional learning, learner participation, safeguarding and proportionate evaluation.

H.3 Recommended measures

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

- Publish adaptable competence descriptors and minimum safeguards rather than a single compulsory lesson plan or universal high-stakes test.
- Require institutions receiving implementation support to map existing provision and produce a short annual improvement plan.
- Fund protected coordination time, staff development, accessibility, translation, evaluation and continuation—not only one-off activities.
- Establish a student voice protocol requiring a clear scope for consultation and a documented response to proposals.
- Create a cross-sector referral and partnership map that clarifies the boundary between education and specialist support.
- Use a small common indicator bank with local baselines, mixed evidence and explicit limitations.
- Support peer learning among the eight B.E.E. country contexts and invite other providers to test adaptations.

H.4 Implementation sequence

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

During the first six months, authorities should map existing provision, consult stakeholders and define a manageable pilot. During months 7–12, selected institutions should trial practices and report on feasibility, inclusion, learner experience and staff workload. During months 13–18, the competent authority should review the evidence and decide which practices to adapt or expand. During months 19–36, validated and feasible elements can be integrated into routine professional learning, quality assurance and budget planning. These timeframes are indicative and should be adapted to local governance and funding cycles.

H.5 Evidence and accountability

School Education lens. *School application: triangulate attendance, progression, basic-skills data, pupil voice, family feedback and classroom observation. Use the 2025 early-leaving figures only as contextual indicators, not as direct measures of PSD or individual school quality [1].*

The policy should distinguish delivery from outcomes. The number of workshops or trained staff is evidence of activity, not proof of improved learner competence. Evaluation should combine administrative information, learner feedback, observation and examples of demonstrated practice, while documenting sample limitations and alternative explanations. No country or institution should be ranked using unvalidated instruments or incomparable samples. Authorities should publish the actions taken in response to findings.

H.6 Equity and safeguards

School Education lens. *School application: specify child-protection, anti-bullying, referral and data-protection procedures under each country's law. Activities must be age-appropriate, avoid forced disclosure and identify the designated school staff member and external service for escalation.*

Implementation must accommodate disability, neurodiversity, language differences, age, pathway, digital access and differing family circumstances. Learners should not be required to disclose sensitive experiences. PSD activities must not replace specialist mental-health or social services. Bullying, abuse, coercion and serious safeguarding concerns must follow the relevant formal pathways rather than being treated as ordinary interpersonal conflict. Data collection must be necessary, proportionate and lawful.

H.7 Sustainability

School Education lens. *School application: connect civic learning to pupil councils, class decisions, local community projects and media literacy. Build on Italy's reported civic-competence strengths while addressing Cyprus' civic-skills challenge; ensure Serbian and EU partners adapt activities to their respective curriculum and governance frameworks [2,6,9].*

Before expansion, the authority should identify a responsible owner, recurrent staff time, resource maintenance, induction for new staff and an annual review mechanism. Temporary project funding can support development and testing, but continuation should depend on evidence of value, feasibility and equity under routine conditions. The network should share both successful adaptations and inconclusive or unsuccessful trials.

H.8 Decision requested

School Education lens. *School Education application: translate the shared recommendation into a practical school routine, identify the responsible school staff, specify age-appropriate pupil participation and review implementation with evidence from pupils, families and teachers.*

Decision-makers are invited to endorse the direction of travel, nominate a competent policy lead, authorise a time-limited pilot, identify the resources required for safe implementation and agree a review point at which continuation or scale-up will be decided. This is a proposed policy pathway, not a claim of formal adoption by the European Union or any national authority.