



GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION IN EUROPE:

HOW MUCH DO WE CARE?

CONCORD

European NGO confederation for relief and development

ABOUT CONCORD

CONCORD is the European NGO Confederation for Relief and Development.

Our members are:

28

National Platforms

21

Networks

03

Associate Members

which represent over 2.600 NGOs supported by millions of citizens all around Europe.

Our confederation brings development NGOs together to strengthen their political impact at the European and global levels. United, we advocate for Europe-wide policies to promote sustainable economic, environmental and social development based on human rights, justice and gender equality. We also work with regional and global civil-society allies to ensure that EU policies are coherent in promoting sustainable development in partner countries.

More at: www.concordeurope.org

ABOUT THIS PAPER

CONCORD Hub 4 – Global Citizenship Education (GCE) and People's Engagement commissioned this research to capture the level of investment in GCE by National Governments across all EU member states plus Norway between the years 2011 and 2015. This study is primarily a quantitative analysis of the primary sources of investment by national governments directed at NGOs. However, there is also a qualitative narrative, which focuses on some of the differences in contexts and language.

Hub 4 feels strongly that GCE has huge potential is helping countries across the EU implement and contribute to achieving the Sustainable Development Goals. Identifying the level of investment in GCE and attempting to gauge patterns of support between 2011 and 2015 allows us work from a baseline, which this study provides. That baseline helps informing Civil Society in their efforts to achieve Agenda 2030.

Hub4 also acknowledges that different countries refer to GCE as Development Education, Global Education or Global Learning. This study assumes that those areas of endeavour are close enough in terms of frames and values to assume that they are GCE. According to UNESCO, Global Citizenship Education (GCED) aims to empower learners to assume active roles to face and resolve global challenges and to become proactive contributors to a more peaceful, tolerant, inclusive, prosperous and secure world.

Publisher: CONCORD Europe – Rue de l'industrie 10 – 1000 Brussels, Belgium

Year of publication: 2018

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Author: Ilze Saleniece (consultant-researcher)

With valuable contributions from Paola Berbeglia (CONCORD Italy), Veronica Castaneda/Freest Saralegui (Coordinadora ONGD), Mathieu Chaveneau (Coordination Sud), Monika Duelge (VENRO), Veronika Golianova (Habitat for Humanity), Stefan Grasgruber (Globale Verantwortung), Mari-Helene Kaber (AKU), Raffaella Kihrer (EAEA), Rilli Lappalainen (Kehys).

The country pages are based on information provided by focal points in the national platforms and their contacts in government, as well as other publicly accessible information, and have been produced by the consultant Ilze Saleniece with research assistance from Lucinda Allen.

Austria	Annelies Vilim, Franz Halbartschlager
Belgium	Vincent Stevaux, Magali Lucy, Vien Nguyen
Bulgaria	Lilia Krasteva, Ventzislav Kirkov
Croatia	Emina Buzinkic
Cyprus	Kerstin Wittig Fergeson
Czech Republic	Tereza Čajková, Kristýna Nnaji, Eliška Šertlerová, Michaela Ditrych Lenc
Denmark	Maria Molde, Sonja Salminen, Kim Jensen
Estonia	Mari-Helene Kaber
Finland	Rilli Lappalainen, Anne Peltonen
France	Mathieu Chaveneau, Laurence Rigollet, Patricia Spadaro
Germany	Monika Duelge, Sarah Louis
Greece	Marina Sarli
Hungary	Györgyi Újszászi, Dávid Bán
Ireland	Valerie Duffy
Italy	Paola Berbeglia
Latvia	Inga Belousa, Daiga Zake, Inese Vaivare
Lithuania	Edvinas Regelskis, Justina Kaluinaite, Vija Plataciute, Ugne Grigaite, Greta Gedgaudaite, Milda Lukoseviciute
Luxembourg	Rebecca Kirch, Lynn Hansel
Malta	Roderick Agius, Lorna Muscat, Federica Di Giulio, Dominik Kalweit, William Grech
Netherlands	Koos De Bruijn
Norway	Knut Hjelleset, Arfinn Nygaard
Poland	Elżbieta Kielak
Portugal	Luciana Almeida
Romania	Iuliana Rada, Adriana Zaharia, Stefan Cibian
Slovakia	Katarína Bajzíkóvá, Jakub Žaludko
Slovenia	Patricija Virtič, Tina Trdin
Spain	Irene Ortega, Enric Roig
Sweden	Jessica Poh-Janrell
United Kingdom	Alice Delemare, Susan McIntosh

Coordination: Francesca Minniti and Riccardo Roba (CONCORD Europe)

Design: Dagmar Bleyová (www.profigrafik.sk), Hélène Debaisieux (CONCORD Europe)

The positions adopted in this report are those of CONCORD Europe.

For further information about this report, please contact Francesca Minniti, francesca.minniti@concordeurope.org, CONCORD Policy and Advocacy Coordinator

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD	6
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	7
PART I: GENERAL OVERVIEW AND ANALYSIS	11
1. WHAT DO WE MEAN BY GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION?	12
2. GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION DELIVERY	17
3. HOW MUCH FUNDING DOES GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION GET?	20
4. WHO IS INVOLVED IN GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION?	33
5. RECOMMENDATIONS: WHERE NEXT?	36
<i>BIBLIOGRAPHY</i>	38
PART II: COUNTRY REPORTS	39
AUSTRIA	42
BELGIUM	44
BULGARIA	47
CROATIA	49
CYPRUS	51
CZECH REPUBLIC	53
DENMARK	56
ESTONIA	59
FINLAND	62
FRANCE	65
GERMANY	68
GREECE	70
HUNGARY	72
IRELAND	75
ITALY	79
LATVIA	81
LITHUANIA	84
LUXEMBOURG	87
MALTA	90
THE NETHERLANDS	92
POLAND	94
PORTUGAL	97
ROMANIA	100
SLOVAKIA	104
SLOVENIA	106
SPAIN	109
SWEDEN	111
UNITED KINGDOM	114
NORWAY	116
<i>LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS</i>	118

FOREWORD



Over the couple of years, the world has felt the severe consequences of populist politics. The EU, for its part, has struggled with how to deal with a rising wave of populism felt across the continent. Although extremist parties' leaders failed to get enough votes to seize power at elections, many others have been cautious because they know that those parties still have huge support across the European population nowadays.

Their narrative – built on competition, fear of others and the exclusion of people who are in some way different – has infiltrated the mainstream collective vocabulary, where increasingly the word 'people' is being replaced by the likes of 'irregular flows' or 'illegals', even in EU political agreements. The UK politician Jo Cox once said that 'we have more in common than that which divides us'. With that sentence she was summing up the entire EU project. The EU faces the massive challenge of bringing people together along the lines envisioned by Jo Cox, who was murdered for her views. But where to start?

How can the EU deal with such a deep challenge to its existence and to the survival and well-being of the populations inside and outside its borders? Furthermore, how can EU leaders be credible on their promises in terms of uprooting poverty and sustaining the planet, as set out in the Sustainable Development Goals, if its citizens are carried by the tide of populism, or simply ignore the challenges we face? One clear part of the solution is the Global Citizenship Education (GCE).

UNESCO defines GCE as a 'Sense of belonging to a broader community and common humanity'. It talks about learning to recognise and respect 'multiple levels of identity and collective identity that transcend individual cultural, religious, ethnic and other differences'. The power of Global Citizenship Education is that it takes a long-term, root cause approach to the social ills we are experiencing today. And yet, for some reason, it is being ignored as a solution.

From 2011-2015, the level of investment by national governments across the EU stagnated. Half of the EU countries depend on EU funding to cover GCE commitments, which shows the low level of political will to change things there. Civil society and education stakeholders could do so much more to activate citizens towards a better world, were they only to be given the support.

The EU has been accused in the past of short-term, short-sighted responses to the likes of the 'refugee crisis', which in reality is no more than a crisis of solidarity, of understanding and of compassion. Against this, Global Citizenship Education is a vital tool and sound long-term strategy to bring those values back to life and thus should play a bigger role within EU. As an organisation with 2600 members across all member states, we look forward to working with the EU to make that happen.

Laura Sullivan, CONCORD Vice-President

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This study examines the level of investment in Global Citizenship Education by national governments across EU member states as well as Norway, between the years 2011 and 2015. The premise of the study, as expressed in its title “How much do we care?”, shows that one of the critical indicators of each country’s commitment to both the idea of global solidarity, as well as its own citizens’ awareness and understanding of global interdependencies, is the amount of public funding dedicated to Global Citizenship Education and/or Global Education (hereafter GE/GCE). The amount of the allocated national funding is closely related to other factors at national and international level that influence the extent to which governments are supportive of and committed to GE/GCE. Thus, apart from looking at funding data, this study aims to explore the contexts in which governments and NGOs operate, in order to paint a more complete picture of the situation with GE/GCE in Europe.

By analysing information and data collected through questionnaires designed for Non-Governmental Development Organizations’ platforms and government institutions in 29 European countries, as well as reports, research and other type of documents published by the European Commission, the North-South Centre of the Council of Europe, UNESCO, the Global Education Network Europe (GENE), CONCORD, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, and others, we can get an insight into the significant contexts related to national funding situations, different stakeholders’ roles and involvement, and the way GE/GCE is delivered.

Additionally, this data is supported by qualitative interviews with global education experts working for non-governmental or international organizations.

During the 5 year period between 2011 and 2015 there were no significant changes in the funding devoted to GCE and the situation can be thus described as a situation of stagnation with regard to the amounts allocated for GE/GCE within the national budgets.

Furthermore, it is not that GE/GCE, both as an educational framework and as a call for awareness and deeper understanding of global interrelatedness, has disappeared from the agendas of various stakeholders. UNESCO’s active involvement in the promotion of GE/GCE demonstrates the opposite, as well as national governments’ use of GE/GCE-friendly language indicates that there is a common view on the importance of GE/GCE. Also, the current context of growing political, economic, social, and technological interdependencies, and the global scale challenges related to environmental issues, migration, and violent extremism sets the scene for the significance of GE/GCE. However, this doesn’t directly lead to financial investment in GE/GCE by national governments, particularly with regard to the activities implemented by NGOs.

Thus, several critical questions can be asked. Firstly, these questions are related to **the economic and political circumstances affecting GE/GCE funding in Europe.**



Public Dinner next to a supermarket in Cologne (Germany) to raise awareness for sustainable production and consumption of groceries.
Credit: Rodrigo Miranda

Although the global financial crisis of 2007 – 2008 had a serious impact on the public funding situation in general, as presented in the section “How much funding does GCE get?” of this study, when analysing the significant factors influencing financial commitments to GE/GCE of their national governments, NGOs refer to national politics and political priorities as the main influencing factor, and not, for example, the economic crisis.

Thus, the question on the place and understanding of GE/GCE in the context of national politics becomes vital. Do national governments see GE/GCE as a relevant concept in the context of their politics and policies? If there are any doubts, what are the significant internal and external factors influencing their uncertainty about its added value? What is NGOs role and influence in this regard?

The aforementioned also provokes the question about **the role of different stakeholders in the process of promotion and delivery of GE/GCE**, especially with regard to the national level eco-system of various stakeholders.

As indicated in the section “How much funding does GCE get?”, **the main public sector funding providers are the ministries of foreign affairs and their agencies.**

Also, it can be said that **there is little activity or involvement by the education sector.** As shown in the section “How is GCE delivered?”, formal and non-formal learning are the two

main ways to deliver GE/GCE. GE/GCE being part of the formal education process can ensure its systemic implementation and sustainability. This study shows little evidence of well-established partnerships in most of the European countries with the main national education providers, such as the ministries of education and agencies, with regard to GE/GCE delivery. Perhaps this suggests that GE/GCE is seen as rather a part of the foreign affairs and development discourse, and not in the context of the competencies necessary for the 21st century societies developed through the national-level education systems and processes. The struggle with language with regard to describing the current GE / GCE conceptual framework, which manifests in a plethora of co-existing terms used by various GE/ GCE stakeholders within the same country and in Europe in general (described in the part “What do we mean by GCE?”), is perhaps one indication that the GE/GCE process is still trying to locate itself, not only in the complex conceptual map, but also in the complex multi-stakeholders’ system.

As indicated in section “**Recommendations: Where Next?**”, it is important to focus on the following:

- multi-stakeholder and cross-sectoral partnership building processes and structures with an emphasis on meaningful and active involvement of public sector institutions in education (ministries, relevant agencies);
- development of such all-inclusive partnerships not only at the national, but also EU and international levels, considering the influence, policy guidance role and access

- to public sector networks international organisations have;
- with regard to GE/GC funding and how it is managed, it is important to think about cross-sectoral funding programmes at the national and EU level, in order to stimulate shared understanding of GE/GCE and co-operation between different sectors;
- GE/GCE conceptual and partnership mapping with the aim of understanding what different parties recognize as GE/GCE, what their priorities and goals are, what their expertise is and what resources they have access to. As regards conceptual mapping, it is recommended to focus on gaining conceptual clarity and understanding of how various stakeholders use different concepts instead of putting forward the use of one particular concept; such mapping process should be seen as an opportunity to build partnerships and avoid ineffective competition and duplication of roles.

Another significant aspect in this regard is ***the role of NGOs. How are they perceived by the other stakeholders and NGOs themselves?***

Although NGOs are the main GE/GCE public investment funding recipients, mostly provided by the ministries of foreign affairs and their agencies, the lack of funding and its stagnation urges one to ask questions related to the two significant factors outlined in the part “How much funding does GCE get?”. Firstly, about the relationship between the NGOs and their governments, and secondly, about the state of the civil society in general, both factors being closely related and interdependent. A significant part of NGO responses received as part of this study, as well as other research, suggests that there is a certain crisis of trust and a lack of effective partnership models between the governmental and non-governmental sectors. In cases where a good and mutually beneficial partnership between NGOs and their government has been established, the partnership is referred to as being critical for funding, as well as long-term planning purposes. This sets a broader framework for the stagnation of GE/GCE funding – the stagnation of public funding available to the NGO sector in general, as well as the lack of sustainable and innovative partnership models which ensure the effective involvement of players from different sectors.

Consequently, **this study recommends the following:**

- Considering that the EU and national governments’ support is critical for NGOs work in GE/GCE, there should be more national and EU funding programmes that are long-term, in order to have a substantial contribution to educational processes, as well as NGOs development and capacity building;
- As part of the aforementioned conceptual and partnership mapping, NGOs should review their role and influence at the national level, and identify their specific and unique contribution, actively communicate and advocate for it, and strengthen their capacity in this regard;
- It is highly important to build long-term and trustful relationship between NGOs and governments through working together and managing the complexities related to the various tensions connected to the national and international interests;

- There is a need for new and innovative partnership and communication models and tools that are relevant and effective in the current contexts.

What this report advocates is the critical role NGOs play in the establishment of stronger and more effective partnerships. NGOs are familiar with the language, the priorities, and the international frameworks of the two main governmental actors in the field – (1) ministries and agencies related to international development and foreign affairs and (2) ministries and agencies related to the education sector – operate with and within. Furthermore, NGOs are part of various European and international networks, and have access to significant knowledge reservoirs and expertise in the area. With a detailed knowledge and understanding of the local and national contexts, they have the capacity to deal with the national vs universal tensions characteristic to the field. This gives NGOs the authority to navigate the relationship with national stakeholders and stimulate the development and building of long-term partnership structures. However, NGOs should look for a more proactive and reinvented role in GE/GCE related processes. As said, this can be done through strengthening their expertise and capacity, advocating their unique positioning, and developing innovative partnership models involving different sectors.

The central goal of this study is to get an insight into the situation regarding public funding available to GE/GCE in European countries. This is a fairly ambitious goal, given the different national contexts, both in terms of what is understood with GE/GCE and the relationship between NGOs and the government and other influencing factors. Furthermore, it must be emphasised that data collection process within this study was challenging, i.e. it is hard to access and collect accurate information about national funding for GE/GCE. Consequently, not only the information gathered in the study, but also the process in itself and challenges related to the collection of funding data, makes it possible to draw significant conclusions about the funding situation for GE/GCE, and even more importantly - to highlight possible reasons for the emergence of the current situation of stagnation and to ask questions related to it. It is precisely these questions and our keeping them in mind when reading the report that can help us to think about the challenges, opportunities, and development of GE/GCE.

PART I

General Overview and Analysis



1. WHAT DO WE MEAN BY GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION?

When researching the funding available in the Global Citizenship Education area, it is impossible to avoid a review of what terminology is being used by the various actors and stakeholders of different countries when referring to their activities in this area. Becoming familiar with the usage and understanding of these concepts allows for a better assessment of whether funding has been allocated to “Global Citizenship Education” within the meaning of this study. It also provides information on the local (national) context and the experience and networks of a particular stakeholder.

There are several concepts coexisting and being used in the field, including global citizenship education, development education¹, global education², global development education, global dimension in education. Additionally, it should be noted that such concepts as citizenship education and civic education are also referred to as an important part of the global education discourse, especially on the national level³.

Each of these concepts has its own history of origin and development, including related societal processes and certain groups of stakeholders that have contributed to their development and mark the specifics of each concept. Although these concepts focus on common values, such as tolerance, solidarity, co-operation, equality, and similar pedagogical approaches, they each have a slightly different central thematic axis. For example - development education is mostly related to understanding development and North-South relationships, while global education offers a more a holistic look at global interconnectedness.

The most topical concept is that of Global Citizenship Education as promoted by UNESCO. UNESCO began actively participating in GCE in 2012 when the United Nations Secretary-General

launched the Global Education First Initiative (GEFI). The purpose of this initiative was to support the successful attainment of the Education for All and the Millennium Development Goals by 2015. One of the three GEFI priority areas, in particular, was “to foster global citizenship”, emphasising the role of education in forging a society that is tolerant, respectful towards diversity and an active participant⁴. In the final stages of the GEFI initiative, due to interest from Member States, UNESCO selected Global Citizenship Education as one of the main aims in the field of education for the period 2014–2021⁵.

Apart from GEFI initiative Global Citizenship Education as a concept is also promoted through 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), set by the United Nations; in particular the SDG 4.7 that centres around education that focuses on Global Citizenship Education and Education for Sustainable Development⁶. The principle of universality in the SDGs/Agenda 2030 provides an important basis for solidarity amongst citizens and thus the global concept of GCE.

UNESCO uses the following understanding of the concept of “Global Citizenship Education”:

Global Citizenship Education aims to empower learners to engage and assume active roles, both locally and globally, to face and resolve global challenges and ultimately to become proactive contributors to a more just, peaceful, tolerant, inclusive, secure and sustainable world (UNESCO, 2014)⁷.

1 *The origins of the concept “Development Education” is related to development discourse, international cooperation and North-South relationship (Hicks, 2003; Bourn, 2012); and it was largely promoted by the NGOs and governmental organisations working in international aid and development in 1960s and 1970s (Bourn, 2012).*

2 *Likewise, the concept “Global Education” originates in the late previous century and in the development of various global movements and initiatives (Bourn, 2012). Among the most active promoters of this concept was the Council of Europe, in particular the Council of Europe’s North-South Centre whose 2002 definition of “global education” published in the Maastricht Declaration on Global Education in Europe remains in use today.*

3 *Empirical research shows that among European countries there are different views on what citizenship education is and should focus on, and what an ideal citizen is; however, it can be concluded that citizenship education aims to explore the relationship between the individual and the community and to develop the following core competences: (1) interacting effectively and constructively with others; (2) thinking critically; (3) acting in a socially responsible manner; and (4) acting democratically (Eurydice report (2017): Citizenship Education at School in Europe).*

4 https://issuu.com/globaleducationfirst/docs/gefi_brochure_eng

5 <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0022/002277/227729E.pdf>

6 *SDG 4.7. aims “by 2030, ensure that all learners acquire the knowledge and skills needed to promote sustainable development, including, among others, through education for sustainable development and sustainable lifestyles, human rights, gender equality, promotion of a culture of peace and non-violence, global citizenship and appreciation of cultural diversity and of culture’s contribution to sustainable development.”, <https://en.unesco.org/gced/sdg47progress>*

7 P.15.; <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0022/002277/227729E.pdf>

Comparing the UNESCO explanation of Global Citizenship Education with two other concepts and their explanations used extensively among NGOs, namely, Development Education (referring to the explanation of this concept as proposed by the CONCORD Development Education Forum 2004)⁸ and Global Education (referring to the explanation of this concept as published by the Council of Europe in 2002 and within the Maastricht Declaration on Global Education in Europe)⁹, it is possible to identify both new conceptual emphasis and spot certain risks regarding the GCE proposal.

1.1. NEW EMPHASIS

It can be argued that, compared to other conceptual frameworks, the central thematic axis of GCE¹⁰ is the concept of “global citizen”. Although previous development education and global education conceptual positions emphasise the importance of active citizenship and citizen participation and accent the global dimension of the Education for Citizenship, UNESCO brings to light and focuses on the concept “global citizen” in particular. This approach gives urgency to the active role of the individual and their responsibility and capability to affect and change situations.

UNESCO understands “global citizenship” as the “sense of belonging to a broader community and common humanity” (UNESCO, 2014; p.14). Thus, when talking about competences that this education aims to develop, central becomes an idea about “multiple levels of identity, and the potential for a collective identity that transcends individual cultural, religious, ethnic or other differences” (UNESCO, 2014; p.17).

The ideas related to this concept of “belonging to a common humanity” and “understanding of multiple levels of identity” indicates a need for an active and mindful self-assessment and reflection process on the part of the individual. In a way, this echoes the idea of Selby (1999), one of the founding fathers of global education, of the “inner dimension” as one¹¹ of several important parts of global education, highlighting the importance of “outward and inward learning journeys” in the process of developing the skills, knowledge and attitudes of the individual (Selby, 1999; p.132).

Similar leanings regarding the necessity for a “more personal” and transformative global education, as well as new and

more radical thinking on the role of global education, can also be spotted in the works of other authors, including more, Troll and Krause (2016) who refer to a necessity to perceive DE as a process which, through the global citizens movement, may provide impetus for a global “transformational systemic change” (Troll & Krause, 2016; p.146). Wintersteiner et. al (2015) also outlines the role of Global Citizenship Education as a “forward-looking mental framework”, which although built on previous educational concepts in the area, is the necessary critical educational perspective in the context of globalisation (Wintersteiner et. al, 2015; p.3).



The Prometheans Intergenerational Net for Community Wellbeing Project in Marathon, Greece. LADDER project: Regranting Scheme Action. Credit: ALDA

1.2. NEW RISKS

At the same time, the term “global citizenship” carries new risks and challenges. One of the most topical issues is the matter of the capability of an individual to think and act as a global citizen, i.e. to navigate between these different identity levels and form a relationship between the conceptual global citizenship and legal citizenship, connected to the individual belonging to a certain country (or countries), as well as the political, historical, cultural and social context of legal citizenship. In this context, UNESCO indicates a point of tension regarding “how to promote universality (e.g. common and collective identity, interest, participation, duty), while respecting singularity (e.g. individual rights, self- improvement)” (UNESCO, 2014; p.10). As Tawil (2013) points out, citizenship as such is a contested notion, because even if we aren’t talking about post-national or trans-national frameworks of citizenship, even within a

⁸ *Development education is an active learning process, founded on values of solidarity, equality, inclusion and co-operation. It enables people to move from basic awareness of international development priorities and sustainable human development, through understanding of the causes and effects of global issues to personal involvement and informed actions. Development education fosters the full participation of all citizens in world-wide poverty eradication, and the fight against exclusion. It seeks to influence more just and sustainable economic, social, environmental, human rights based national and international policies (CONCORD Development Education Forum, 2004).*

⁹ *Global Education is education that opens people’s eyes and minds to the realities of the world, and awakens them to bring about a world of greater justice, equity and human rights for all. Global Education is understood to encompass Development Education, Human Rights Education, Education for Sustainability, Education for Peace and Conflict Prevention and Intercultural Education; being the global dimensions of Education for Citizenship (The Council of Europe, the Maastricht Declaration on Global Education in Europe, 2002).*

¹⁰ *Each of these aforementioned concepts — development education, global education and global citizenship education — has its own origin and central thematic axis. Development education concentrates on the in-depth understanding and responsible action regarding issues and processes related to international development. In contrast, one of the most important aspects of the definition of global education is the call to view global education as something that integrates various other types of education, including by demonstrating the interconnectedness of these various domains: international development, peace and conflict, human rights, sustainability, active citizenship.*

¹¹ *These four dimensions are: temporal dimension, spatial dimension, issues dimension and inner dimension.*

specific nation-state, its citizens may have some difficulties with regard to their citizenship (for example, if they are part of a minority group). This tension is characterised by the remark of an NGO which took part in this study, and which comments on the connotation of “citizenship” in national contexts:

“After presenting the “new, improved” term of global education on EU level, [we] decided we will still use the Global Education term: since the term started to get recognized, since its translation in [our language] would bring a different meaning ([...] to emphasize patriotism, voting, etc. on national level)”.

In addition, opinions are divided on whether the promotion of Global Citizenship Education and its use makes it possible to have clearer conceptual boundaries, namely, what is understood by it and what it applies to or, conversely, widens the scope of the concept even further, adding a new dimension to the existing concepts of development education and global education, which makes it a rather obscure and blurred concept. One of the international GE/GCE experts who was interviewed for this study emphasises the risks connected to this new layer and extension:

“It [Global Citizenship Education] is a fuzz-word. It is useful in a sense that it can mobilize international cooperation and international community, but it is not operational, it creates confusion, especially for teachers”.

A representative from UNESCO in an interview refers to the GCE concept as “ambitious” and links it with potential challenges for governments to direct their funding to GE/GCE activities:

“The concept of GCE is very ambitious – it covers education at all ages, it covers all subject areas, it covers cognitive, socio-emotional and behavioural learning. Funding may be easier to mobilize when we focus on specific concepts within GCE – as we have seen with the prevention of violent extremism through education, or with education to prevent genocide, or with regard to peace building in specific local settings. It seems to be more difficult to mobilize a donor for the broad concept of GCE, hence, we should come through the specificities”.

While looking at the term from the perspective of stakeholder usability and perception, it has to be reiterated that several NGOs that took part in this study refer to being “tired of

changes” regarding the conceptual frameworks of the field. Furthermore, a comment from another NGO representative allows us to infer that “Global Citizenship Education” is not perceived in the context of paradigmatic change, rather than yet another “wording war”:

“The wording wars in the context of global development community have proven, over the years, to be in great extent a simple waste of time. Let the final target groups of our policies and projects define what we should do for/with them and what should be its definition/title. Thus we understand this whole debate as rather a useless challenge”.

In this context, it is possible to conclude that, from the perspective of NGOs and practitioners who work in the field, these conceptual changes are seen not as new value- or meaning adding, but on the contrary – are rather disturbing. They are challenging, especially as regards long-term planning, both in the areas of policy planning and implementation, as well as in terms of communication and partnership building, and also in the context of financial attraction. Consequently, it is possible to assume that a large proportion of those involved in GE/GCE (NGOs and governments) do not see this conceptual debate as a paradigm shift or a new breakthrough in thinking, which significantly influence how they function, but rather as a discussion of language and nomenclature.

1.3. VARIETY OF TERMINOLOGY: THE REAL SITUATION

This study also mapped the usage of the various terms used in different European countries¹², by both the NGDO platforms and relevant government institutions. They identified the term they use in their daily work and what is understood by it.




























In Table 1 below, definitions are grouped in four wider categories according to the central concept referred to by the organisations, and its usage frequency. The term “CSO” is indicative of the civil society sector, and this usage of the definition is echoed by NGDO platforms; the term “Gov DEV” denotes the position of MFAs and development aid agencies; the term “Gov EDU” can be used to identify the definitions used by MoEs and educational institutions.

The information collected illustrates the differences in the usage of terminology

- both between different countries
- and between the three main stakeholders discussed in this study — (1) the NGDO platform, (2) the most significant government organisation(s) in education and (3) the most significant government organisation(s) in foreign affairs or international development,
- including the differences in how the three stakeholders in a given country use the terms.
- as well as the fact that different terms may also be used by

¹² There are a couple of studies that focus on the usage of terms in the area. UNESCO is also undertaking research to explore local and national concepts relating to Global Citizenship Education.

TABLE 1

Country	Development Education	Global Education	Education for Sustainable Development	Global Citizenship Education
 Austria	CSO (Development Education and Awareness Raising) Gov DEV (Development Education)	CSO (Global Learning) Gov DEV (Global Learning)		
 Belgium	CSO (Development Education) Gov DEV (Development Education)			CSO (Global Citizenship Education)
 Bulgaria		CSO (Global Education) Gov EDU (Global Education)		Gov EDU (Global Citizenship Education)
 Croatia		CSO (Global Education)		CSO (Global Education within the framework of civic education)
 Cyprus		CSO (Global Education) Gov EDU (Global Education) Gov DEV (Global Education)	Gov EDU	
 Czech Republic	CSO (Global Development Education) Gov DEV (Global Development Education)			
 Denmark	CSO (Capacity Development in the field of Development) Gov DEV (Enlightenment on Development)	CSO (Global Education) Gov EDU (International Dimension in Education)	CSO (Education for Sustainable Development) Gov EDU (Education for Sustainable Development)	CSO (Global Citizenship Education and Democracy teaching) Gov EDU (Citizenship Education)
 Estonia		CSO (Global Education) Gov DEV (Global Education)		
 Finland	CSO (Development Education)	CSO (Global Education) Gov DEV (Global Education)	CSO (Education for Sustainable Development) Gov EDU (Education for Sustainable Development)	CSO (Global Citizenship Education)
 France				CSO (Education for Citizenship and International Solidarity)
 Germany		CSO (Global Learning)	CSO (Education for Sustainable Development)	CSO (Global Citizenship Education)
 Greece	CSO (Development Education) CSO (Global Development Education)			CSO (Global Citizenship Education)
 Hungary		CSO (Global Education) Gov DEV (Global Responsibility Education)		
 Ireland	CSO (Development Education) Gov DEV (Development Education)		Gov EDU (Education for Sustainable Development)	Gov EDU (Citizenship Education) Gov DEV (Global Citizenship Education)
 Italy				CSO (Global Citizenship Education)
 Latvia	Gov DEV (Development Education)	CSO (Global Education) Gov DEV (Global Education)	Gov EDU (Education for Sustainable Development)	Gov EDU (Citizenship Education)
 Lithuania		CSO (Global Education)		
 Luxembourg	CSO (Global Citizenship Education) Gov DEV (Development Education and Awareness Raising)		CSO (Education for Sustainable Development)	Development education and awareness raising
 Malta	CSO (Development Education)		Gov EDU (Education for Sustainable Development)	CSO (Global Citizenship Education) Gov EDU (Citizenship Education and Global Citizenship Education)
 Poland		CSO (Global Education)		
 Portugal	CSO (Development Education) Gov DEV (Development Education)			
 Slovakia	CSO (Global Development Education) Gov DEV (Global Development Education, Development Education) Gov EDU (Global Development Education)	CSO (Global Education) Gov DEV (Global Education) Gov EDU (Global Education)		
 Slovenia		CSO (Global Education) Gov DEV (Global Education)	Gov EDU (Education for Sustainable Development)	
 Spain				CSO (Global Citizenship Education for Sustainable Development)
 Sweden	Gov DEV (Development Education)			
 United Kingdom				CSO (Education for Global Citizenship; Global Citizenship Education) Gov DEV, Gov EDU (Education for Global Citizenship; Global Citizenship Education)
 Norway	Gov DEV (Development Education and Awareness Raising)		Gov EDU (Education for Sustainable Development)	

different representatives from the same field, e.g. different civil society organisations.

As regards the content, it is possible to conclude that:

- a comparatively large proportion of government institutions in the field education refer to Education for Sustainable Development and Citizenship Education as conceptual frameworks concerning the GE/GCE, whereas a majority of the MFAs and development aid agencies continue to actively use the Development Education. This suggests a certain conceptual tradition and its force, understanding of the term, and a network that has gradually developed over time and continues to carry a particular term and interact with it;
- at the same time, taking into consideration the aforementioned, it is possible to identify an ambiguity in interpreting the terms, thus causing confusion about a common use and view of a certain term. For example, the actors of several countries (Ireland; Belgium) point out that Global Citizenship Education is perceived as an umbrella term, encompassing Development Education and Education for Sustainable Development. At the same time, there are countries that see Global Citizenship Education as a part of Citizenship Education; there is also an approach where the relationships between concepts are seen through the prism of Global Citizenship Education for Sustainable Development (Spain);
- overall, by reviewing the substantive explanations of terms, it can be concluded that their contents, namely, thematic coverage, knowledge, skills and values that is topical in the context of GE/GCE, largely overlap; the boundaries are rather vague, unclear and provide for various directions;
- likewise, there is a perception that two different processes exist — how we name the learning process we operate within, and what precisely we are doing and what fundamentals it is based on. The first seems to be defined by political postulates and frameworks, while the other is driven by practitioners.

Taking into account the above conclusions regarding the use of the concepts, as well as the dissatisfaction of the NGOs, mentioned in the previous paragraph, with the relatively frequent process of change regarding the concepts used in the field, it is possible to conclude that language use and conceptual boundaries are an important area of attention and time. However, the question arises as to the purpose of these activities, whether this objective is shared both within a single country and in the field as a whole, and most importantly - to what extent does this process contribute to the development of the field and the active participation and cooperation of the various stakeholders? In the context of sustainability in the field, it would be important that this discussion of concepts is not a self-sustaining linguistic exercise, but an effective tool for building relationships between the various stakeholders.

1.4. TYPOLOGIES OF THE DEFINITIONS

There are also several proposals regarding term typologies (Hicks, 2003; Krause, 2010). In addition, the (thematic) categories of terms may be viewed from several different perspectives, at least three:

(1) General aims and expressions of the learning process in question. For example, Krause (2010) distinguishes

between not recognized and recognized approaches to development education, the former being public relations for development aid and the latter covering such domains as awareness raising, global education and life skills. EC's DEAR study highlights the distinction between (a) Campaigning and Advocacy and (b) Global Learning activities in the GE/GCE field, where the main goal of Campaigning and Advocacy is to attain attitudes and behavioural changes in an individual or society in relation to a GE/GCE, whereas the main goal of Global Learning is to develop and strengthen competences for individuals in the context of global education, through the use of appropriate pedagogical approaches in formal or non-formal education.¹³ In practice, to a large extent, these activities complement and overlap each other;

- (2) **From a point of view oriented towards philosophy, values and principles of teaching and learning.** For example, Andreotti refers to soft vs critical Global Citizenship Education, emphasizing the role of critical reflections and critical thinking with an aim “to understand [the] origins of assumptions and implications” (Andreotti, 2014; p.7). A similar line is taken by Wintersteiner et. al who point to two approaches with regard to global citizenship education – “education of the global citizen (with a focus on the individual; “individual cosmopolitanism”) and education for global citizenship (with a focus on societal structures; “structural cosmopolitanism”)” (Wintersteiner et. al, 2015; p.10);
- (3) **From a point of view associated with the main proponent of a particular concept** — a particular stakeholder who promotes and explains the concept and thus represents a particular tradition, network, political or other framework.

When looking at the data collected in this study, as in the situation with conceptual boundaries of different terms, it is impossible to draw clear borders between the different categories stakeholders are using to frame their GE/GCE activities. Rather, it is possible to talk about the GE/GCE as a continuum with the awareness-raising approach as one point, and trans-formative global education experiences as a point on the other side of the continuum.

What should be emphasised is that GE/GCE in this context, and within the framework of this study, particularly with regard to MFAs and their agencies, is not understood as purely informative and public relations activities.

However it should be taken into account that, without sufficiently detailed information on the specific investments made by each government, it is often difficult to draw a line between them, i.e. are specific information and communication activities government PR or do they also have an educational and awareness raising value added aspect. In the same way GE/GCE funding is not considered by governments to strengthen NGOs' capacity. These two aspects - the PR aspect and the capacity building aspect of the organization - are important divisions, which are not and should not be included in the presentation of information on the GE/GCE activities and funding dedicated to those activities.

¹³ P.14, Commission staff working document on Development Education and Awareness Raising (DEAR) in Europe.

2. GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION DELIVERY

Global Citizenship Education can be delivered through formal learning (organised and structured learning with clear learning objectives), non-formal learning (organised learning, can have learning objectives), as well as informal learning (no specific purpose and structure, but learning can occur)¹⁴. Learning can occur/take place in different environments — schools, museums, informal education centres, various events, online environment, at home and elsewhere. GE/GCE also has to be viewed as a lifelong learning process.

Within the framework of this study, NDGO platforms were invited to briefly describe how GE/GCE is delivered in their countries.

The NDGOs of almost all countries refer to non-formal learning as a major component in the introduction of GE/GCE. The following activities have been mentioned: various thematic workshops, trainings, conferences and summer schools, debates, theatre related events, exhibitions, film screenings, campaigns and advocacy events, mobilisation and political activities, thematic travels and experiential camps, volunteer activities, community events, and many more. Mostly, it is the NGO sector, especially youth organisations that are the key agents in setting up and supporting these activities. In most cases, they are part of projects financed either from the budgets of local government organisations or of European and international organisations.

However, in the context of state-level long-term and systemic changes concerning GE/GCE, the formal education is central in this regard. Three main thematic categories or three central dimensions were identified which the NDGO platforms refer to when stating how, and to what extent, the country in question delivers GE/GCE in formal education. These three dimensions are:

- (1) The place of GE/GCE in the national curriculum — when characterising GE/GCE delivery, NGOs discuss whether GE/GCE topics are present, are included in the national curriculum, if yes — in what manner;
- (2) Teaching practice — NGOs point out the critical role of teachers in delivering a quality GE/GCE, emphasising both their preparedness and resource availability;
- (3) Education policy — when characterising GE/GCE delivery, NGOs refer to and relates it to the political framework and how “favourable” education policies are concerning the introduction of GE/GCE.

It has to be added that these dimensions are mutually complementary and interdependent. Also, the aspects identified within them indicate certain leverage points in the system that impact successful delivery of the GE/GCE.

2.1. GE/GCE PRESENCE IN THE NATIONAL CURRICULUM

When characterising the presence of GE/GCE in formal education, countries mostly refer to practice of integrating GE/GCE **within different subjects in the existing curriculum** (Bulgaria; Lithuania; Malta). The subjects mentioned most often are: Civic or Citizenship Education, Social Sciences subjects, such as History, Politics, Philosophy, Psychology, Geography, Religious Education, Ethics, as well as Environmental Studies.

Some countries refer to the practice when GE/GCE is **delivered through cross-curricular approach**, bringing together various subject areas in the research of GE/GCE topics and encouraging teachers to cooperate (Austria; Finland; UK).

Occasionally, when characterising GE/GCE in the formal education, it is possible to see aspects from the so-called **whole school approach**. This approach emphasises the presence of GE/GCE not only in the learning curriculum and approach, but also the culture and values of the school, its plans and vision, learning environment and the relationships between various school-related stakeholders and local community¹⁵. This view reminds of the idea that an important role in the learning process is not only about the explicit curriculum (the stated, formal curriculum), but also implicit curriculum, encompassing unstated, but pervasive aspects related to, for example, the school environment and teacher’s attitudes (Eisner, 1979).

The whole school approach encompasses the school leadership, namely, the school leadership team supports and participates in integrating GE/GCE aspects in everyday life of the school, as well as the learning process. Lack of support from the school leadership is mentioned by several countries as a barrier to the successful integration of GE/GCE in formal education.

Also, even though country evaluations do not refer to the so-named whole school approach, in some cases certain aspects concerning this approach are mentioned, for instance, that elements of the GE/GCE are included in the evaluation of the learning process or of the school (for example, in Austria, GE/GCE aspects are taken into account in the School Quality Assessment).

Some countries indicate that the presence of GE/GCE in the formal education is either **minimal or non-existent** (Croatia; Cyprus; Poland; Slovakia).

¹⁴ *The understanding of differences between formal, non-formal and informal learning is based on OECD classification, <http://www.oecd.org/edu/skills-beyond-school/recognitionofnon-formalandinformallearning-home.htm>*

¹⁵ *P.48, UNESCO, GCE, Topics and Learning Objectives. P.48, UNESCO, GCE. Topics and Learning Objectives; <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0023/002329/232993e.pdf>*

Example: ENGLAND (United Kingdom)

WHOLE SCHOOL APPROACH TO GLOBAL LEARNING

In 2013, the UK launched a Global Learning Programme (GLP) which was ambitious in both resources and scope. Its purpose is to provide the necessary support for schools in the whole UK in order pupils could systematically learn about global issues and acquire competences that are relevant in the global world of today.

GLP in England emphasises that the most effective and influential is a whole school approach to global learning, thus, within the framework of this programme, the schools are invited to integrate aspects of global learning in as many school-life and learning related areas as possible, including curriculum, teaching, learning, school ethos and culture, leadership, planning and management process, extra-curricular activities, community connections and others.

GLP in England offers the schools various practical tools and guidelines for process management with a view to evaluating the present situation and planning future actions concerning the whole school approach:

- the GLP Whole School Framework encompassing 12 criteria supporting schools to embed global learning; these criteria are divided into four key areas: (1) pupil achievement, (2) teachers' practice, (3) behaviour and relationships, and (4) leadership and the community),
- the GLP Whole School Audit and
- the GLP Action Plan¹⁶.

It shall be noted that the 12 criteria established under the Whole School Framework are linked with the evaluation framework set by The Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills (Ofsted), the UK government department responsible for school inspections¹⁷, thus it is possible to talk about opportunities for systemic and comprehensive integration of GCE aspects within the process and system of education.

2.2. TEACHING PRACTICE

It is important to stress that even if GE/GCE subjects are included in the national curriculum, how they are taught is also important. The teacher is the person who "activates and unlocks" concepts existing only on paper, thus the role of the teacher is of critical importance in the successful delivery of GE/GCE.

When summarising the information provided by various countries concerning the national GE/GCE situation, it is possible to establish the following aspects related to teaching practice which affect teachers' performance within the context of GE/GCE.

IN-SERVICE TEACHER COMPETENCES

Several countries emphasise in their answers that whether and how GE/GCE is implemented depends on individual teachers: "teachers lack the needed competences" (Lithuania); "it takes a very engaged and decisive teacher to carry them [GCE themes] out" (Denmark).

In this context, the concept of "competence" may be viewed in a complex light, encompassing skills, knowledge, values and attitudes.

Firstly, GE/GCE is associated with participatory and transformative pedagogy. Thus it is important whether teachers are familiar with and apply teaching strategies and methodologies that allow learners, for instance, to critically evaluate and analyze various complex situations, think creatively, find alternative solutions to common problems, see their role and influence of various processes, actively reflect about their own and others' attitudes and opinions, develop cooperation skills and actively participate in creating a better environment.

Secondly, an important aspect is the teacher's values and attitude and their willingness to show a greater depth and understanding of topics and contexts related to GE/GCE. Country responses to this study refer to an example where, teaching GE/GCE topics without the necessary reflexion, in-depth approach and critical analysis, the opposite occurs, namely, stereotypes are built and simplified messages about complex global issues repeated.

PRE-SERVICE AND IN-SERVICE TEACHER TRAINING

Whether the particular aspects of GE/GCE are included in the pre-service teacher training and in-service teacher training is important to ensure effective delivery of GE/GCE, as it provided the possibility to develop the actual teacher competences described in the previous paragraph.

Several countries indicate that GE/GCE is included within in-service teacher training (Austria; Estonia; Belgium; Ireland; Czech Republic; Greece; Latvia; Slovenia; Spain), yet in many cases there is a lack of information about whether this training is included in any government-accredited in-service training programmes or if it is NGO-established training for individual

¹⁶ <http://glp.globaldimension.org.uk/pages/10558>

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

interested teachers, as mentioned by, among others, Poland, Cyprus, Slovakia. Some countries remark that the aspects of GE/GCE are also present in the initial teacher education (Austria; Belgium; Denmark; Ireland).

In this context, it is important to emphasise that the NGOs and the civil society have a large role and influence as to whether GE/GCE topics are included in teacher training (Bourn; 2017); this is manifested in the fact that the NGOs and civil society puts GE/GCE on the educational agenda and that the NGOs are frequently actively engaged in teacher training. The platforms of many countries point out their members have an important role in educating teachers in GE/GCE topics.

AVAILABLE RESOURCES

Another important aspect frequently mentioned in the context of GE/GCE delivery is whether training materials are available and what is their quality.

NGOs have an active role in this aspect too, providing both printed and online training materials to schools; countries such as Estonia, Belgium, Cyprus, Spain, Norway particularly emphasise their involvement in creating and providing such resources.

Certain countries also have a GE-themed resource centres or networks of such centres (e.g., Network of Global Learning Resource Centres in Austria; Consortium of Development Education Centres in the UK).

In this regard and in particular with regard to teachers and their competencies, country-specific contexts that are related should be taken into account, for example, the support and provision of resources to schools and teachers, teacher remuneration, pedagogical traditions, and other factors affecting teachers' work and teaching practices.

2.3. EDUCATION POLICY

When characterising the presence of GE/GCE in formal education, country NGOs refer to policy level initiatives as a major stimulating factor in the integration of GE/GCE in the education and the possibility to introduce GE/GCE systemically. In this aspect, curriculum reforms initiated by the Ministries of Education (Italy; Finland) or reforms related to teacher training (Bulgaria) are mentioned the most often.

The fact that several countries in their questionnaires refer to the curriculum reform as an opportunity and framework for discussion on what should be taught in schools, points to the potential for constructive conversation on GE/GCE role in national education systems and active partnership between various stakeholders.

Furthermore, two key players in international education - the OECD within the project The Future of Education and Skills 2030 and UNESCO's International Bureau of Education - highlight that for the society of the 21st century it will be crucial to have competencies that are closely related to the

¹⁸ <http://www.oecd.org/pisa/pisa-2018-global-competence.htm>

skills, knowledge and attitudes promoted by the GE/GCE. For example, OECD has recently introduced and started work around "global competence" that is understood as "the capacity to examine local, global and intercultural issues, to understand and appreciate the perspectives and world views of others, to engage in open, appropriate and effective interactions with people from different cultures, and to act for collective well-being and sustainable development"¹⁸.

Example: BULGARIA

THE ROLE OF NGOS IN SUPPORTING TEACHERS

The Bulgarian NGDO platform points out that a targeted attention to supporting future and present teachers in order to improve their competences regarding teaching global issues and, through training of teachers, provide for the nationwide dissemination of GCE practices.

Members of the platform are active learning and support providers themselves. Namely, several members of the Bulgarian NGDO platform are state-accredited Continuing professional development (CPD) providers to the Bulgarian pedagogical staff. Another important achievement is that two national-level university centres providing post-graduate qualification to teachers have included in their curriculum and accredited courses related to global education.

Example: ITALY

A MINISTRY-LEVEL PROGRAMME EMPHASISING THE IMPORTANCE OF GE/GCE

The Italian national NGDO platform points out that changes initiated at the state and systemic level (reforms) open up an opportunity for GE/GCE to be represented in the formal education. Namely, Ministry of Education has adopted a National Program "Competences and Learning environments" for 2014-2020. This programme encompasses the promotion of global citizenship (related to the specific objective "improving the core competencies of students") with interventions "aimed at developing transversal competences, social and civic competences, covered by the broader concept of promoting global citizenship, in order to form conscious and responsible citizens in a modern connected and interdependent society" (Questionnaire, Italy).

3. HOW MUCH FUNDING DOES GCE GET?



Mural painted by the artist Rafael Campaña Ochoa and students of the Erich Kästner - school in Bochum, Germany
Credit: Beate Black

Several major challenges exist concerning the collection of funding data; it is important to take them into account when analysing the data in this study:

- 1 Terminological inconsistencies** — as mentioned, different countries and organizations within the same country use various concepts, therefore it is impossible to accurately compare the budgets of various countries, because it is possible that the conceptual boundaries or the perception of GE/GCE in one country does not match that of another country, which consequently influences what is or is not included in a funding category.
- 2 Different budget formats** — the methods of planning and recording the budget may vary between different countries and institutions. Since the funding allocated to GE/GCE purposes in a particular governmental institution may not be partitioned in a separate budget item, but is rather integrated in different budget items and comes from a variety of budget sources, it can be very hard to capture and trace this information. It can be assumed that this situation applies, in particular, to state educational establishments whose GE/GCE-related funding has been integrated in various, e.g., target-group related budget categories;
- 3 Access to data** — thanks in part to both aforementioned limitations, it is hard to access and collect accurate information about funding assigned to GE/GCE from governments; therefore it is possible that the information provided by the countries does not cover the whole funding related to GE/GCE, or vice versa — includes funding that is not directly attributable to GE/GCE;
- 4 Reliability of the data collected** — data collected through questionnaires are compared with the information in other studies (GENE; 2015). In certain cases, discrepancies have been observed, thus concerns exist about the reliability of the data collected; these cases have been identified and clearly singled out in this report;
- 5 Encompassing the entire public funding** — this study is primarily oriented towards ministries and institutions acting in the field of foreign affairs or international development, but it is possible that public funding resources available to other sectors, such as culture, environment, agriculture etc., have not been factored in.

3.1. NATIONAL PUBLIC FUNDING: TOTAL AMOUNT

In this study, national NGDO platforms were invited to select two most important government institutions that invest in funding GE/GCE in each respective country and to contact them in order to inform them of their involvement in GE/GCE funding and to ask them to fill out the study questionnaire.

For the most part, MFAs or national development agencies reported on the public funding situation in their country; in some cases (Ireland, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Slovakia), in addition to MFA or national development agencies, MoE or other education sector institutions also reported on their involvement in GE/GCE and/or funding of GE/GCE. This may characterise both the involvement of various sectors and various players of each sector in GE/GCE and its funding, as well as relationships between NGDO platforms and these institutions.

Table No. 2 shows aggregate national data. Questionnaires completed within the framework of this study and sent in by countries are the primary data source; in some cases, the questionnaire was followed up with an interview to gather more detailed information. As regards the countries (Austria, France, Spain) for which there was no complete information on the financial resources allocated by national governments to GE/GCE, the data related to the funding were taken from other recognized studies that were carried out within the relevant period, namely GENE; 2015.

These data show the funding provided by each country for GE/GCE during the period from 2011 to 2015, providing information on the years for which it is available. The table shows which state institution and to what extent has funded GE/GCE activities during the relevant period and, based on the information available, provides a brief commentary on the funding (its primary application: main objectives, activities, audiences and the programme it is available for). The last column of the table contains a comment on additional funding provided by the same or another institution to which references have been given in the questionnaires received within the framework of the study.

WHERE WAS AN INCREASE IN FUNDING WITNESSED?

When comparing each country's data between the first reporting year (mostly 2011) and the last year (2015), it shows that there is a slight increase in funding in some of the countries (Luxembourg +1%, Finland +2%, Ireland +14%). There are also countries with an average growth (Slovakia +30%, Czech Republic +25%) or a substantial increase in funding (Slovenia +65%, Denmark +77%), as well as countries where the increase exceeds 100% growth (Germany +108%, Latvia +285%).

With regard to the relatively high increase in funding in some of the countries, it is important to distinguish between different situations:

(a) The increase has been gradual, growing from year to year (Germany);

(b) The increase is due to a difference in funding between 2014 and 2015 (Denmark, Latvia), which may be related to a particular budget programme, a priority, such as EDY 2015, which was allocated a significant amount of funding in 2015;

(c) Although the funding has increased significantly comparing the first and last year of the period, the amount of funding varies from year to year, and there is no gradual trend (Slovenia).

WHERE WAS A REDUCTION IN FUNDING WITNESSED?

Several countries witnessed a reduction in funding, when comparing the beginning of the period (mostly 2011) and the last year of the respective period (2015), i.e. Portugal – 0,17%, Sweden -2%, Belgium -11%.

This is a general overview of funding trends by comparing the amount of funding between the first and the last year of the 2011-2015 survey period (depending on available information). In order to get a complete picture of the funding situation, one has to look at the situation and annual funding changes in each particular country.

Differences in funding in annual breakdown are another parameter, which allows comparing the situation in different countries. There are countries with a certain degree of stability and graduality in terms of funding (Luxembourg), and there are countries where funding varies from year to year (both growing and decreasing), and hence the situation may be characterized by a certain degree of unpredictability (Slovenia). Perhaps this can be explained with certain political and/or policy level conditions that affect the sector as a whole or budgetary predictability of the country concerned; however, such conclusions lack more detailed information.

However, despite the few exceptions of increases and decreases in funding, the overall picture is one of stagnation with neither massive increases nor decreases in funding provided across the countries in question as a whole.

Although the study examines the funding for GE/GCE activities for the period from 2011 to 2015, another significant figure for the overall situation is the funding allocation for the year after 2015, namely 2016. In the course of this study 11 governments and their agencies have also provided information on their questionnaires regarding funding in 2016. The amount of funding provided for GE/GCE in 7 countries (Estonia, Finland, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Slovakia) decreased in 2016 compared to 2015, and in 4 countries (Germany, Portugal, Slovenia, Sweden) 2016 GE/GCE funding was larger than 2015. All of these institutions are either MFAs or development aid agencies.

This is an important fact, since 2015 was the EYD year, and also the year when the MDGs were concluded and SDGs were introduced, so it can be assumed that the increase in funding in this year is attributable to one of these events. It also shows that funding for the GE/GCE area is, to some extent, a form of campaigning.

3.2. NATIONAL PUBLIC FUNDING: COUNTRY-SPECIFIC CONTEXTS

The following table (Table 3) shows the national funding figures, but they are supplemented with other country-specific indicators that allow comparing and better assessing the amount of funding of each specific government. These two indicators are the number of population of each country and GNI (gross national income).

The table below shows GE/GCE funding per capita and GE/GCE funding ratio of 1 million EUR of GNI. In addition, given that primary funding of GE/GCE comes from MFAs and development aid agencies, the last column shows the share of ODA of GNI in order to better characterize the country's commitment and development settings in the specific field.

These are Eurostat (Population, 2015¹⁹; GNI, 2015²⁰) and OECD (OECD/GNI %²¹) data of 2015.

3.3. NATIONAL PUBLIC FUNDING VS OTHER TYPES OF FUNDING

Based on the assumption that NGOs as active funding seekers/recipients are well aware of the local funding-related situation, within the framework of the study NGDO platforms were asked to provide their understanding of how the major funding organizations fund the most GE/GCE activities implemented by NGOs in their country. They were also asked to rank these funding bodies by their perceived significance of investment. Although these data do not provide a completely objective reflection of reality (since NGOs do not have access to information on all funding different organisations, and the information provided is based on and depends on each individual NGO's knowledge, experience, activity and interpretation of the current situation), it nevertheless allows for a general overview of the funding situation in each country from NGO perspective. It also allows the view on funding of the respective state institutions to be expanded, comparing it with other sources of funding.


Particular attention was paid to what NGDO platforms choose and indicate as their perceived primary/main/most important GE/GCE funding body in their own country. Based on the correctly and comparably completed questionnaires, i.e., of the 22 countries that provided information, 45% (NGDO platforms of 10 countries) indicated that in their country the national government was the main funding body of NGO activities in the field of GE/GCE; 55% (NGDO platforms of 12 countries) considered that it was an extra-national, namely a European or international funding body.

NATIONAL FUNDING AS THE PRIORITY FUNDING SOURCE

Comparing the answers, it can be concluded that the 10 countries that had indicated any of the national public bodies as their main funding body, are the so-called EU-15 countries, or the old EU Member States (plus Norway). These are countries with the highest GNI (nominal) per capita in Europe: Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Portugal, Spain, and Norway.

Furthermore, in all 10 countries that had indicated that the primary NGO financial resource for GE/GCE came from public funding bodies, the identified public funding institution was either MFA or a development agency. None of the countries have identified, for example, a ministry or state agency in education sector as their main funding body. Three of these countries identified MoE as the second most important source of funding for NGOs in the GE/GCE sector (Austria, Finland, Italy), and one country identified MoE as the third most important source of funding for NGO sector in GE/GCE matters (Denmark).

COUNTRY'S MOST SIGNIFICANT NGO FUNDING BODY IN GCE AREA



EXTERNAL FUNDING AS THE PRIORITY FUNDING SOURCE

In turn, the new EU Member States indicated a foreign and non-government funding body as the main funding body of NGO activities in the field of GE/GCE. These are countries with lower GNI (nominal) per capita as compared to the first group: Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Estonia, Greece, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Slovakia and Slovenia.

As regards this group, it is important to note that all 12 countries indicated that the EU was their most significant foreign funding body of the NGO sector. This coincides with other studies, such as the European Commission's report which confirms that the European Commission has significantly influenced development education and awareness raising agendas, as well

19 <http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/tgm/table.do?tab=table&init=1&language=en&pcode=tps00001&plugin=1>

20 <http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/tgm/table.do?tab=table&init=1&language=en&pcode=teina080&plugin=1>

21 Detailed summary of 2015 ODA data, <http://www.oecd.org/dac/stats/ODA-2015-detailed-summary.pdf>



Demonstration in London, UK.
Credit: Clem Onojeghwo, Unsplash Database

as CSO activity and capacity in the EU Member States, and especially in those countries that joined the EU after 2004²². However, taking into account the feedback from this study, it can be concluded that the situation has largely not changed for almost a decade and that the activity of certain NGOs in the GE/GCE sector is dependent on and based on EU funding again, contributing to the current situation of a stagnating GE/GCE funding and delivery model.

Furthermore, it is worth taking a closer look at this EU funding situation in order to gain a better understanding of the funding opportunities and obstacles. Most countries receive EU funding through the European Commission's Directorate-General for International Cooperation and Development (DG DEVCO) and in particular thematic program "Non-State Actors and Local Authorities in Development" (NSA-LA), that is oriented to DEAR projects. This funding is organized through Calls for Proposals, in which eligible beneficiaries can participate and receive EC funding directly.

In this context, it is important to emphasize that within the framework of this thematic program, already in 2006 special supportive rules were set for candidates from the newer EU member states for funding, namely the amount of funding, a lower co-financing rate, and others²³.

The TRIALOG study, which evaluated the funding situation for this program during the period from 2004 to 2013, stated that in this period EU countries, which joined after 2004, were "relatively successful" with regards to receiving funding for the DEAR project Call For Proposals, namely, as lead applicants were able to attract 17.4% of the total number of grants and 14.1% of the total financial amount²⁴. However, it is worth noting that the so-called EU10/12 countries received less than 15% of the total funding. Looking at this data in the context of the above, and concluding that the EU is the main source of funding for GE/GCE activity in these countries, it is possible to identify an unequal situation with regard to the amount of GE/GCE funding for the so-called EU15 and EU10/12 countries.

22 Data from report "General evaluation of actions to raise public awareness of development issues in Europe/development education" (2008), referred to in Commission staff working document on Development Education and Awareness Raising (DEAR) in Europe (2012), https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/sites/devco/files/working-document-development-education-awareness-raising-programme-swd2012457-20121220_en.pdf

23 P.7, TRIALOG Study "A Decade of EU13 Civil Society Participation in European Development Education and Awareness Raising Projects" (2014), http://www.trialog.or.at/images/doku/trialog_study_eu13_ec_dear_final.pdf

24 *Ibid*, p.7

The TRIALOG study also points to inequalities in the EU10/12 countries themselves, which have received funding, namely 60% of the total EC funding granted by the DEAR Call for Proposals for the period 2004 to 2013 has been channeled to CSOs of three states - Czech Republic, Poland and Hungary²⁵. One of the reasons for these national differences is the availability of national government co-financing schemes for EC grants.

3.4. PROFILES OF FUNDING BODIES

This study shows that MFAs and development aid agencies are the main funding bodies of GE/GCE at national level, followed by MoEs and education sector agencies. Based on the information collected during the study, it is possible to outline the general profile of each funding body.

MFAS AND DEVELOPMENT AID AGENCIES

Main funding objectives:

- GE/GCE funding is targeted towards raising public awareness of international development, interdependencies in a globalized world, and encouraging people's involvement in creating a fairer, more sustainable world. The argumentation includes both a reference to MFA and agencies' practical need to communicate the vision of the country and the contribution of the country to making a fairer world, as well as references to global solidarity. The funding context is closely linked to European and international frameworks that apply to the respective national authorities.

Main target groups to reach:

- The general public is the primary target group.

Main funding recipients:

- Summarising the information of survey questionnaires on the main recipients of funding of MFAs and development aid agencies, absolutely all countries that provided relevant information indicated that NGOs were their priority funding recipients. They are followed by higher education institutions and schools.

Main activities funded:

- MFAs and development aid agencies fund a relatively wide range of activities. These are mostly communication and awareness raising activities (campaigns; various events; content for media, etc.) or educational activities (trainings for teachers, NGOs, students, development of educational materials, partnerships with higher education institutions, etc.). Mostly, these activities take the form of projects.

Procedures for allocating funding:

The main procedure for allocating the funding is an open call for proposals (primarily applicable to the NGO sector). Similarly, in individual countries, funding is granted to certain organizations, platforms that are delegated a specific function or that distribute this funding further.

MOES AND OTHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS

The main objectives of GE/GCE funding:

- Generally, GE/GCE funding is geared towards education that meets today's needs, namely to provide students with such competences (skills, knowledge and attitudes, values) that are needed in a globalized and complex world. In the argumentation concerning the role of GE/GCE for students and creators of future society, there are two directions that are often viewed in a context of interdependence: the direction of values, solidarity, co-responsibility and participation, and the direction of competitiveness in global, international environment.

Main target groups to reach in the GE/GCE context:

- Participants of the education process (in particular students, teachers) are the primary target group.

Main funding recipients (in the GE/GCE context):

- Governmental agencies or other sectoral public bodies responsible for specific functions of the education sector in a particular country and within the current education strategy (for example, curriculum development, teacher education and professional development, education quality, assessment, etc.).

Main funded activities and traceability of granted funds:

- Most of the funding allocated to GE/GCE's objectives cannot be separated, since it is both thematically and functionally integrated into other funding streams covering different functions and activities of the education sector (curriculum development and implementation, teacher education and capacity development, school networking, etc.). Consequently, it is possible to identify funding resources directed at a narrow target or a specific target group, for example, the development of a specific thematic and methodological material, organizing a specific event, such as summer school on GE/GCE, Global Education Week etc.

Procedure for allocating funds

- The main procedure for allocating the funding is an open call for proposals (primarily applicable to the NGO sector). Similarly, in individual countries, funding is granted to certain organizations, platforms that are delegated a specific function or that distribute this funding further.
- In the light of the foregoing, most of the funding, which also covers GE/GCE, is redistributed to the relevant governmental agencies or other sectoral public bodies for the implementation of their functions in accordance with the procedures and processes established within each education system.

A number of important conclusions may be drawn based on the above information. Firstly, for MFAs and development aid agencies formal education also plays an important role in the promotion and implementation of GE/GCE ideas and in achieving their GE/GCE-related goals. However, with regard to funding management process, it is possible to indicate a tendency that MFAs and development aid agencies in their funding allocations focus on

25 *Ibid*, p.12

yearly contributions and project-type activities, whereas MoEs or education agencies invest in long-term processes. Secondly, given that MFAs and development aid agencies do not have direct co-operation with the education sector, namely, schools (students and teachers), there is a need for an intermediary or “interpreter” that understands both MFAs and development aid agencies, as well as the language, environment and needs of participants of the education process. This also leads to the third major finding: NGOs play an important role in the implementation of GE/GCE activities in their countries.

3.5. FACTORS AFFECTING FUNDING

NGO PERSPECTIVE

In this study, NGOs also assessed what they believe to be the most important factors in sustaining or increasing public funding for NGOs for GE/GCE activities at national level. Below are three most frequently marked choices. They are arranged in the order of priority based on the importance of the factors as ranked by respondents.

1 Supportive national political priorities (politics that support for global outlook)

In their responses countries point out that a political framework that supports the objectives of GE/GCE affects both co-operation between NGOs and government, as well as the available funding.

“This one is a crucial factor. If political priorities are coherent with global education aims, co-operation between the NGOs sector and the authorities is good also in terms of funding opportunities” (Poland)

The political environment is an essential condition for the recognition and prioritization of GE/GCE at the national level. Furthermore, GE/GCE and, in particular, the concept of “global citizenship”, is political and more favourable to “global citizenship” is a liberal rather than conservative political framework. Hicks (2003), describing the situation with regard to global education in the UK in 1980s, already then notes the “attacks from the right” and conservative politicians dissatisfaction with the content and teaching approaches used in global education.

Looking at it in the context of the current tendency in Europe, when right-wing political parties are gaining popularity in many countries, it is possible to draw conclusions about the challenges, which are particularly relevant in such right-wing political contexts and which are linked to the successful implementation of GE/GCE and, consequently, to the financial involvement of public bodies. Recent GENE report on the state of global education in Europe outlines this particular political context as one of the main cross-cutting political challenges at the macro level.

Furthermore, it should be noted that education process in itself and curriculum policy in particular is highly influenced by politics,

and “politics is the primary process through which public policy decisions [in education] are made” (p.8; Levin, 2007).

2 Established relationship and partnership structures between NGOs and government

Several NGO platforms point out that lack of successful co-operation has a significant impact on the availability and scope of funding. Similarly, if such relationships are established, they must be maintained and should focus on long-term co-operation.

In this context, it was also mentioned that there was some tension in relation to NGOs-government co-operation and the roles of each player, i.e., often NGOs must act as watchdogs and controllers of different processes, and this can affect these relationships and their establishment as such.

Another very important aspect emerging both in comments to questionnaires and in several interviews is the issue of trust. In this context, it is possible to identify two distinctions, namely (a) government trust of NGOs as field experts both in terms of content and management of funding; and (b) government trust of NGOs as supporters of national interests (often NGOs that are active in the GE/GCE sector are seen as opponents of the national level political agenda). The trust issue is fundamentally important, since it allows for non-existent or formal relationships to grow into fruitful and productive co-operation.

“This [Established relationship and partnership structures] might help us in the future to establish a funding mechanism. In the past (10 years ago) there was very little trust from the government in Civil Society and the capacity of CSOs to manage funds; this trust has now been established” (Cyprus)

3 Economic resources available to the respective policy makers

The financial crisis is one of the illustrations used by respondents to describe the extent to which the availability of financial resources affects the options of redirecting them to GE/GCE. This is a question that is subordinate to the question about political priorities and strategy.

In addition to the availability of resources as such, individual respondents point to some more nuanced conditions associated with GE/GCE activities, i.e., the long-term nature of these activities often conflicts the allocation mechanism, regularity and predictability of allocation.

“Due to its long-term impact dimension, organisations need to have financial resources to develop impactful activities. Without it they just engage citizens in short term initiatives which have less meaningful outcomes” (Portugal)

CIVIL SOCIETY SITUATION

In assessing the availability of GE/GCE funding to the NGO sector, the civil society situation in a specific country in general is a significant contextual condition.

First, a number of recent studies on the situation of the civil society indicate that there are significant financial challenges regarding the funding of CSOs, mainly that it is inadequate or is being reduced, resulting in significant barriers to the survival of CSOs, the realization of goals and effective work (The Impact of the Crisis on Civil Society Organisations in the EU, 2012; Report on the State of Civil Society in the EU and Russia, 2016; The Civic Space in Europe Survey, 2016).

In this respect, the two main factors underlying the financing gap and/or reduction are (1) the economic crisis, and (2) the unfavourable attitude of governments towards CSOs.

In the context of the economic crisis, it is highlighted that policy makers are more and more focused on the dimension of financial accountability regarding their funding allocations for CSOs and operate with such categories as economic efficiency and social return on investment.²⁶ This, of course, signals the need for CSOs to adapt to the changing context, language and patterns of the management of governmental financial resources.

Regarding the government's unfavourable attitude towards CSOs, these studies show the following aspects:

- In some cases it is possible to identify the state's desire to control CSOs, for example, in the case of Hungary and Poland, the government's negative attitude towards CSOs, which are funded by foreign donors and criticize the government of its own country;²⁷
- It also refers to the implementation of specific legislation, which limit the activities and freedoms of CSOs;²⁸
- Formally involving CSOs in consultation processes and a climate of mistrust regarding CSOs expertise and effective long-term partnerships;²⁹
- Excessive emphasis on bureaucracy, which affects the effectiveness and opportunities for co-operation.³⁰

Taking into account the above, and elsewhere in this study, it is possible to talk about a certain type of crisis in the CSO sector as a whole. This crisis, which raises the question of whether the customary model of CSOs, that is, how CSOs organize themselves, is still relevant, as well as the question of how to build effective and trustful cooperation with the government.

This conclusion is in line with the previously stated - that to some extent, that to further develop GE/GCE, there needs to be a breakthrough and a change of the collaborative model for various stakeholders in this field.

²⁶ P.3, *The Impact of the Crisis on Civil Society Organisations in the EU*, 2012.

²⁷ P.11-12, *The Impact of the Crisis on Civil Society Organisations in the EU*, 2012; *Report on the State of Civil Society in the EU and Russia*, 2016.

²⁸ P.8, *The Civic Space in Europe Survey*, 2016.

²⁹ *Ibid*, p.9.

³⁰ *Ibid*.



GOVERNMENT PERSPECTIVE

Representatives of governments were also invited to identify the most significant factors in the context of GE/GCE funding, with a particular focus on national and international level policy frameworks and initiatives.

With regard to policy documents or regulations of national significance, the following has been identified by governmental institutions as most significant:

- National strategy for DE;
- Governmental strategy for development co-operation/international development (priority areas etc.);
- Policies, regulations that govern or to some extent determine relationships between government institutions and NGOs (civil society);
- Education sector strategic documents (guidelines, strategy) and certain regulations;
- Policies, regulations and rules (for example, who can conduct extra-curricular activities at schools, what is the status of non-formal education, how is teacher training and professional development arranged, etc.) applying to specific education sector matters;
- Policies, regulations and rules (for example, funding procedure, use of public money, etc.) that may be applied to public funding.

With respect to international frameworks, government institutions most strongly refer to the following initiatives as having a positive impact on funding issues:

- OECD DAC peer reviews; GENE peer reviews;
- The Maastricht Global Education Declaration (2002); European Consensus on Development: the contribution to global education and awareness raising (2007); Declaration of the European Parliament on Development Education and Active Global Citizenship (2012);
- United Nations Agreement on Millennium Development Goals, and 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (2015);
- UNESCO lead on GCE (Global Citizenship Education – Preparing learners for the challenges of the 21st century).

TABLE 2

Country	Government institution awarding the budget	Comments on the funding received	Year	GE/GCE funding, EUR	Comments concerning the additional funding from the same institution or another.
 Austria	The Austrian Development Agency, ADA	Funding comes from the Development Communication and Education programme; recipients: CSOs and Austrian Federal States (funding for 89 projects, most of the projects related to EYD 2015).	Year 2011-2014	NDA	
			Year 2015	4.080.000	
 Belgium	The FPS Foreign Affairs	Most of the funding (20-22 million EUR per year) is allocated to NGOs to carry out various activities; in addition, funding is provided for an Adult training programme, School programme (including teacher training, development of materials, research etc.), as well as funding for films and television series.	Year 2011	28.175.187	
			Year 2012	27.962.606	
			Year 2013	28.022.822	
			Year 2014	27.300.663	
			Year 2015	25.116.109	
 Bulgaria	N/A	No information about the possibility of financing from a governmental institution.	Year 2011-2015	0.00	However, MES refers to student competition in the framework of civic education to develop projects related to global citizenship. Funding for the projects is approximately 30.678 EUR (60.000 BGN) per year.
 Croatia	The Ministry of Foreign and European Affairs	No sufficiently detailed information exists.	Year 2011-2013, 2015	NDA	
			Year 2014	246.000	
 Cyprus	N/A	Public funding not available for GE/GCE.	Year 2011-2015	0.00	
 Czech Republic	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	The vast majority of funding is allocated to NGOs for the purposes of raising awareness and educational activities for teachers, pupils and the general public; a small amount of funding is awarded to the organization of university summer schools; an even smaller amount is provided to the media.	Year 2011	457.093	
			Year 2012	504.987	
			Year 2013	617.864	
			Year 2014	809.472	
			Year 2015	570.387	
 Denmark	The Danish International Development Agency, DANIDA	Funding primarily comes from the DANIDA Information Grant, a large part of which is allocated to awareness raising activities in cooperation with the media; the funding is also partly awarded for the development of learning materials (largely digital) in schools (the development involves NGOs, teachers, journalists, film production companies). In addition to the Information Grant, DANIDA allocates separate funding to NGO activities.	Year 2011	2.866.696	
			Year 2012	2.859.304	
			Year 2013	2.910.468	
			Year 2014	2.832.279	
			Year 2015	5.080.776	
 Estonia	The Ministry of Foreign Affairs	The framework of funding is the Communication and Global Education; the funding is allocated to awareness raising activities and materials (films, public events, campaigns) and to NGOs (NGDO platform; NGO Mondo Global Education Centre) for working with teachers, youth, and Global South volunteers.	Year 2011	23.000	
			Year 2012	170.000	
			Year 2013	300.000	
			Year 2014	490.000	
			Year 2015	460.000	
 Finland	The Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Funding is primary sourced from funds intended for the purposes of Development Communication; funding is allocated to awareness raising and educational activities related to international development and global issues; funding is also allocated to schools, teachers, development of materials, and various media-related events.	Year 2011	2.000.000	GE/GCE-related funding might also be identified in various budget items of the Ministry for Education and Culture (Promoting religious dialogue, Media education, Integration of asylum seekers and immigrants, etc.).
			Year 2012	2.000.000	
			Year 2013	2.300.000	
			Year 2014	2.074.620	
			Year 2015	2.042.000	
 France	The French Development Agency	Financial support for GE/GCE increased from 2 million EUR to 3.5 million EUR between 2011 and 2014. AFD investment in NGO-led projects increased in 2015, amounting to a total of 8 million euros in 2015, including 4.46 million euros allocated to GE/GCE specific projects.	Year 2011-2014	From EUR 2.000.000 to 3.500.000 EUR	In the context of the EYD2015, the GENE Peer Review refers to a call for proposals to allocate 0.23 million EUR for "development and international cooperation"-related AR activities.
			Year 2015	4.460.000	

Country	Government institution awarding the budget	Comments on the funding received	Year	GE/GCE funding, EUR	Comments concerning the additional funding from the same institution or another.
 Germany	The Federal Ministry of Economic Cooperation and Development	The funding is intended for CSOs projects for global learning and awareness raising; CSO campaigning; Main themes: fairtrade; flight and migration; SDGs; understanding globalization and its effects; Africa.	Year 2011	12.000.000	
			Year 2012	17.600.000	
			Year 2013	19.825.000	
			Year 2014	22.000.000	
			Year 2015	25.000.000	
 Greece	N/A	Public funding not available for GE/GCE.	Year 2011-2015	0.00	
 Hungary	The Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade	Funding is mainly oriented towards NGO activities related to awareness raising, education and training, and capacity building.	Year 2011	NDA	
			Year 2012	6.686	
			Year 2013	114.912	
			Year 2014	15.134	
			Year 2015	30.645	
 Ireland	Irish Aid, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade	Recipients of the funding are NGOs and education centres, schools, HE institutions, youth organisations and community groups; Funding priorities are mainly geared towards formal education. DE and GE/ GCE programmes and projects in post-primary and primary schools, primary initial teacher education, adult, youth and community education.	Year 2011-2012	NDA	Department of Education and Skills also participates in the implementation of GE/GCE, but it is difficult to separate a funding for any specific programmes.
			Year 2013	2.990.000	
			Year 2014	2.900.000	
			Year 2015	3.400.000	
 Italy	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	As indicated on the InfoCooperazione website, there was funding allocated for development education activities in 2013-2014 and global citizenship education in 2015.	Year 2013	1.750.000	
			Year 2014	1.000.000	
			Year 2015	1.000.000	
 Latvia	The Ministry of Foreign Affairs	The funding primarily supports the activities of NGDO platform and NGO projects related to education un awareness raising.	Year 2011-2012	NDA	
			Year 2013	11.115	
			Year 2014	20.062	
			Year 2015	42.792	
 Lithuania	The Ministry of Education, The Ministry of Foreign Affairs	The total public funding consists of the funding from the MoE: 5.271 EUR (2011), 4.634 EUR (2012), 9.123 EUR (2013), 10.137 EUR (2014), 7.330 EUR (2015) and the MFA: 752.612 EUR (2014), 1.188.400 EUR (2015). MoE funding is primarily oriented towards youth and educational NGOs that implement Global Action Week, Global Education Week. MFA funding is allocated to raise social awareness about development issues, development cooperation, and to support civic society, youth organisations.	Year 2011	5.271	
			Year 2012	4.634	
			Year 2013	9.123	
			Year 2014	762.749	
			Year 2015	1.195.730	
 Luxembourg	The Ministry of Foreign and European Affairs	The funding is allocated for NGO development education and awareness raising activities. The Ministry also provides financial support to GENE to create links between policy and research.	Year 2011	1.843.722	
			Year 2012	1.856.786	
			Year 2013	1.860.625	
			Year 2014	1.838.816	
			Year 2015	1.870.928	
 Malta	N/A	Public funding not available for GE/GCE.	Year 2011-2015	NDA	
 Netherlands	N/A	No information available.	Year 2011-2015	NDA	
 Poland	The Ministry of Foreign Affairs	The funding is allocated and included in the Multi-annual Development Cooperation Programme; the funding is intended to raise awareness and understanding on global issues and interdependencies.	Year 2011	439.142	In addition to the GE/GCE allocated funding, the budget of The Ministry of Foreign Affairs also provides funds to be spent on information and promotion of the Polish DC programme.
			Year 2012	571.071	
			Year 2013	540.397	
			Year 2014	495.001	
			Year 2015	595.879	







Country	Government institution awarding the budget	Comments on the funding received	Year	GE/GCE funding, EUR	Comments concerning the additional funding from the same institution or another.
 Portugal	The Institute for Cooperation and Language	Funding is primarily geared towards NGOs – Non-governmental Development Organisations and the Portuguese Platform of NGOs. Higher education institutions, local authorities and schools are mainly supported through the projects implemented by NGOs.	Year 2011	0.00	
			Year 2012	400.783	
			Year 2013	424.276	
			Year 2014	438.160	
			Year 2015	400.086	
 Romania	The Ministry of Foreign Affairs	No sufficiently detailed information is available. However, as indicated in reports by Romania's development cooperation Agency on average 3.44% of the ODA budget each year is provided for development education and awareness raising activities.	Year 2011-2015	NDA	
 Slovakia	The Slovak Agency for International Development Cooperation, SAIDC	Funding is primary given to the projects of NGOs and HE institutions in the field of DE and awareness raising (max budget per project 35.000 EUR).	Year 2011-2013	NDA	In addition to this funding, SAIDC has envisioned separate funding to support Slovak organizations which have received funding from EC projects (2014: 50.000 EUR; 2015: 90.000 EUR).
			Year 2014	100.000	
			Year 2015	130.000	
 Slovenia	The Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Funding is primarily given to NGOs educational activities and activities for awareness raising on global issues, including learning, preparation of learning materials; main target audience — young people and educators.	Year 2011	NDA	
			Year 2012	13.000	
			Year 2013	76.093	
			Year 2014	56.172	
			Year 2015	21.463	
 Spain	The Spanish Agency for International Cooperation	The funding is linked to the direction of the Agency's strategic plan, which is related to global citizenship, public awareness, co-responsibility and communication with citizens about international cooperation and development. An allocation of 600.000 EUR is provided for in the year 2015 budget.	Year 2011-2014	NDA	In addition, GENE report (2015) refers to additional 3.5 million EUR intended for partnership agreements (out of the budget of the Spanish Agency for International Cooperation), but there is a shortage of information concerning the nature and aim of these partnerships.
			Year 2015	600.000	
 Sweden	The Swedish International Development Agency, SIDA	Several organisations have a frame agreement with SIDA, and some of them redistribute received funding to other smaller CSOs (for example, Forum Syd redistribute funding for information and communication to up to 40 smaller CSOs). Since 2015 special funding for information on Agenda 2030	Year 2011	7.259.297	
			Year 2012	8.004.963	
			Year 2013	7.547.477	
			Year 2014	7.582.678	
			Year 2015	7.136.687	
 United Kingdom	The Department for International Development, DFID	When characterising the 2011–2015 time-frame, reference can be made to two projects: (1) Connecting Classrooms, a project aimed at building partnerships between schools in the UK and developing countries (between 2012-2015 DFID contributed 17 million GBP and the British Council contributed 25 Million GBP); (2) The Global Learning Programme (GLP), programme for schools; separate programme in each UK country; the total value of the GLP is 20.9 million GBP. In 2015 DFID allocated the following amounts as part of the GLP for each UK country: EUR 5.511.000 (England); EUR 276.000 (Northern Ireland); EUR 882.000 (Scotland); EUR 12.000 (Wales). In total – EUR 6.681.000.	Year 2011-2014	Not enough information	
			Year 2015	6.681.000	

TABLE 3

Country	Government institution	Year	GE/GCE funding, EUR	Population, mil., 2015	GE/GCE funding per capita	GNI, mil. EUR, 2015	GE/GCE/GNI (€ / 1 mil. €)	ODA/ GNI, %, 2015
	Austria	The Austrian Development Agency, ADA	Year 2011-2014	NDA				
			Year 2015	4.080.000	8,58	0,48	342.545	11,91
	Belgium	The FPS Foreign Affairs	Year 2011	28.175.187				
			Year 2012	27.962.606				
			Year 2013	28.022.822				
			Year 2014	27.300.663				
			Year 2015	25.116.109	11,24	2,23	409.501	61,33
	Bulgaria	N/A	Year 2011-2015	0.00	7,2	0,00	44.263	0,00
	Croatia	The Ministry of Foreign and European Affairs	Year 2011-2013, 2015	NDA				
			Year 2014	246.000	4,25	0,06	NDA	NDA
	Cyprus	N/A	Year 2011-2015	0.00	0,84	0,00	20.342	
	Czech Republic	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Year 2011	457.093				
			Year 2012	504.987				
			Year 2013	617.864				
			Year 2014	809.472				
			Year 2015	570.387	10,54	1,48	157.180	3,63
	Denmark	The Danish International Development Agency, DANIDA	Year 2011	2.866.696				
			Year 2012	2.859.304				
			Year 2013	2.910.468				
			Year 2014	2.832.279				
			Year 2015	5.080.776	5,66	0,90	280.898	18,09
	Estonia	The Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Year 2011	550.000				
			Year 2012	170.000				
			Year 2013	300.000				
			Year 2014	490.000				
			Year 2015	460.000	1,31	0,35	19.913	23,10
	Finland	The Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Year 2011	2.000.000				
			Year 2012	2.000.000				
			Year 2013	2.300.000				
			Year 2014	2.074.620				
			Year 2015	2.042.000	5,47	0,37	211.205	9,67
	France	The French Development Agency	Year 2011-2014	From EUR 2.000.000 to 3.500.000 EUR				
			Year 2015	8.000.000	66,49	0,12	2.227.485	3,59
	Germany	The Federal Ministry of Economic Cooperation and Development	Year 2011	12.000.000				
			Year 2012	17.600.000				
			Year 2013	19.825.000				
			Year 2014	22.000.000				
			Year 2015	25.000.000	81,2	0,31	3.099.786	8,07
	Greece	N/A	Year 2011-2015	0.00	10,86	0,00		0,14

Country	Government institution	Year	GE/GCE funding, EUR	Population, mil., 2015	GE/GCE funding per capita	GNI, mil. EUR, 2015	GE/GCE/GNI (€ / 1 mil. €)	ODA/GNI, %, 2015
 Hungary	The Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade	Year 2011	NDA					
		Year 2012	6.686					
		Year 2013	114.912					
		Year 2014	15.134					
		Year 2015	30.645	9,86	0,00	NDA	N/A	0,13
 Ireland	Irish Aid, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade	Year 2011-2012	NDA					
		Year 2013	2.990.000					
		Year 2014	2.900.000					
		Year 2015	3.400.000	4,63	0,73	207.086	16,42	0,36
 Italy	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Year 2015	1.000.000	60,80				0,02
 Latvia	The Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Year 2011-2012	NDA					
		Year 2013	11.115					
		Year 2014	20.062					
		Year 2015	42.792	1,99	0,02	24.204	1,77	0,09
 Lithuania	The Ministry of Education, The Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Year 2011	5.271					
		Year 2012	4.634					
		Year 2013	9.123					
		Year 2014	762.749					
		Year 2015	1.195.730	2,92	0,41	35.922	33,29	0,11
 Luxembourg	The Ministry of Foreign and European Affairs	Year 2011	1.843.722					
		Year 2012	1.856.786					
		Year 2013	1.860.625					
		Year 2014	1.838.816					
		Year 2015	1.870.928	0,56	3,34	NDA		0,93
 Malta	N/A	Year 2011-2015	NDA	0,43				0,15
 Netherlands	N/A	Year 2011-2015	NDA	17				
 Poland	The Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Year 2011	439.142					
		Year 2012	571.071					
		Year 2013	540.397					
		Year 2014	495.001					
		Year 2015	595.879	38,00	0,02	413.425	1,44	0,10
 Portugal	The Institute for Cooperation and Language	Year 2011	0.00					
		Year 2012	400.783					
		Year 2013	424.276					
		Year 2014	438.160					
		Year 2015	400.086	10,37	0,04	174.867	2,29	0,16
 Romania	The Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Year 2011-2015	NDA					
		Year 2015	297.780	19,87	0,01			
 Slovakia	The Slovak Agency for International Development Co-operation, SAIDC	Year 2011-2013	NDA					
		Year 2014	100.000					
		Year 2015	130.000	5,42	0,02	77.463	1,68	0,10

Country	Government institution	Year	GE/GCE funding, EUR	Population, mil., 2015	GE/GCE funding per capita	GNI, mil. EUR, 2015	GE/GCE/GNI (€ / 1 mil. €)	ODA/GNI, %, 2015
 Slovenia	The Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Year 2011	NDA					
		Year 2012	13.000					
		Year 2013	76.093					
		Year 2014	56.172					
		Year 2015	21.463	2,06	0,01	37.561	0,57	0,15
 Spain	The Spanish Agency for International Cooperation	Year 2011-2014	NDA					
		Year 2015	600.000	46,45	0,01	1.077.707	0,56	0,13
 Sweden	The Swedish International Development Agency, SIDA	Year 2011	7.259.297					
		Year 2012	8.004.963					
		Year 2013	7.547.477					
		Year 2014	7.582.678					
		Year 2015	7.136.687	9,74	0,73	455.669	15,66	1,40
 United Kingdom	The Department for International Development, DFID	Year 2015	6.681.000	64,88	0,10	2.544.972	2,63	0,71
 Norway	The Ministry of Foreign Affairs/The Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation	Funding is primarily allocated to NGOs, and directed at development education and awareness raising activities.	Year 2011-2013					
			Year 2014					
			Year 2015	5,17	1,97	367.027	27,71	1,05

4. WHO IS INVOLVED IN GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION?



As part of this study, NGDO platforms were invited to observe the GE/GCE-related process as a whole and to identify and evaluate the most important stakeholders in various stakeholder categories who influence GE/GCE in their countries. Below is a short summary of the main actors in the process and their influence, as well as an overall description of the environment.

4.1. MAIN STAKEHOLDERS

Government and its agencies

The two actors mentioned most often in this category are MFAs and development aid agencies, as well as MoEs and agencies in the educational sector. Both of these categories have been characterised by NGDOs as high-impact players, whose influence is felt through both power and funding. It shall also be emphasised that, as regards MoEs, their key role in formal education — what and how is being taught — is being noted.

The category also sees the mention of Local Authorities that actively participate in the introduction of GE/GCE; also, various government institutions (ministries and agencies) working in fields such as environment, agriculture, regional development, youth issues and others. Some countries also mention the Parliament as an important partner.

NGOs

NGOs note that their activities, as well as the sector in general, are generally affected not only by the platform member organisations, but also NGOs from other sectors, both regarding the forming of new partnerships and the cooperation and support in bringing and advancing various issues important to civil society as a whole, not only to organisations in specific fields.

Youth organisations also have to be mentioned as active players, opinion leaders and policymakers in this category.

International Organisations

The organisations and their spheres of influence mentioned most often are:

- European Union, in particular the European Commission's DG DEVCO (policy power, financial resources, access to various networks) and Council of Europe North South Centre (capacity building, education, access to various networks);
- UN and UNESCO (policy power, access to various networks);
- GENE (capacity building, access to various networks);
- CONCORD (capacity building, access to various networks).

In this context, it is worth highlighting the OECD, and the OECD's work in the field of education. Namely, referring to the UN's SDGs, the OECD emphasizes global competence as an essential element when thinking about education which reflects our modern needs. Furthermore, the OECD plans to include

a global competency assessment in PISA 2018³¹. Given the recognition of the OECD assessments, this is an important message when thinking about the systematic and sustainable implementation of a global dimension in education.

General, international organizations play an extremely important role in the promotion and implementation of GE/GCE. It is possible to identify several of the most commonly mentioned ways in which this role is manifested:

1. Agenda setting and regional or international priority setting

On the political level, initiatives such as the UN's 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development define common priorities and operational frameworks, and address and involve national governments. Although, for example, the SDGs mentioned above are not legally binding, they are nevertheless an essential reference point for mobilizing various national and regional resources.

2. Creating a common communication platform

For example, regular activities such as Global Education Week, and one-offs such as EYD 2015, and the resources devoted to their implementation, enable national governments and the NGO sector to raise some GE/GCE related issues.

3. Capacity building

An essential contribution of these organizations is to raise the capacity of different players in GE/GCE. In particular, the work of the European Commission's North-South Center and the implementation of various educational activities, ensuring the provision of on-line learning opportunities, are particularly highlighted in this respect. Given that this study identified the inadequate redirection of national governments' financial resources to the GE/GCE goals, it would be important to increase the involvement of policy makers in these capacities and educational activities.

4. Development of materials and resources

There is a tendency for international organizations to participate in the development of training resources and materials for various target groups. For example, as particularly successful are mentioned the European Commission's North-South Centre's Global Education Guidelines: Concepts and Methodologies on Global Education for Educators and Policy Makers and UNESCO's Global Citizenship Education: Topics and Learning Objectives, Preventing violent extremism through education: a guide for policy-makers and Teacher's guide on the prevention of violent extremism. The unique contribution of international organizations in this regard is the expertise of various countries available to them, as well as the ability to distribute these resources to all countries.

5. Networking and building alliances

An important contribution of international organizations is networking, which provides for the exchange of information, knowledge, and resources, as well as the opportunity to form regional partnerships that are essential for the advocacy and resolution of a regional issue. For example, the North-South

Center holds seminars focusing on specific regions on the inclusion of GE/GCE in formal education - the Balkans, Baltics, South-East Europe, the Mediterranean, and Visegrad regions. This is a successful approach, as it allows to go into the context of specific policies and practices in the region.

6. Evaluation and monitoring function

The responses provided by governments in this study point to the fact that the reviews conducted by both GENE and the OECD are important tools for both GE/GCE promotion and its successful implementation.

7. Creation of national structures and partnerships

From the information gathered in this study, it is possible to conclude that activities focusing on the establishment and strengthening of long-term structures and processes within the framework of the field are extremely important. A good example is the GENE Increase Program, which focuses on "capacity building for the development of national structures of coordination, funding and support" in the GE/GCE field. Its success is determined by its focus on building relationships among all the key stakeholders (e.g. MFAs, MoEs and their agencies; EC; CSOs and LA national bodies; teachers, learning centres and youth organisations) as well as contributing both to strategic building and educational activities, as well as to the development of long-term co-financing systems.

Overall, it's possible to conclude that international organizations are critical players in the field, since they have access and points of co-operation with stakeholders at all levels and sectors, but have a particular role to play in building relationships with national level policy makers.

Education and Research Institutions

Overall, even though most NGDO platforms have identified one or more universities or research and scientific centres as participants in GE/GCE eco-system in their answers, they point out that the influence of same is either medium or low.

Media

Media as participants and influencers of the GE/GCE process are very seldom mentioned in the answers by NGDOs and their influence is estimated to be fairly low. However, some countries emphasise the role of various social media outlets and their large influence of GE/GCE processes.

Other

NGDO platforms have identified private foundations, consultation companies, church, certain political organisations (right-wing organisations), and community activists as other actors in the field.

Overall, it is possible to draw a conclusion that an active relationship formation, cooperation and exchange of resources is taking place mainly within the relationship and network between the three main stakeholder categories — NGOs, the government, international organisations.

31 <https://www.oecd.org/education/Global-competency-for-an-inclusive-world.pdf>

Furthermore, as concluded in previous sections, public sector bodies in education are rather passive with regard to GE/GCE and there is a lack of cross-sectoral partnerships in the context of GE/GCE. An observation in this regard should be made – not only at the national level there is not well established co-operation platforms between foreign affairs or international development and education sectors, but also at the EU and international level, for example, when referring to GE/GCE in the EU context it is mostly The Directorate-General for International Cooperation and Development that is mentioned (and not the Directorate General for Education and Culture); similarly, in the context of the OECD – when referring to GE/GCE, it is OECD DAC that is associated with the area, and not, for example, OECD's work in education.

Also, in order to effectively implement GE/GCE, a wider representation of the stakeholders and innovations in relation to the creation of a collaborative model is needed.

Similarly, the success of GE/GCE is determined not only by how many and what kind of cooperation partners are involved in the implementation of GE/GCE, but what kind and how strong their mutual relationships are.

4.2. COMPLEXITY OF THE SYSTEM

Overall, the system of various partners and processes can be characterised as complex. In this sense, the complexity refers to the system having many components, action levels and processes without linear relations and variable mutual interactions, subject to various influences and with the potential to facilitate major overall changes in the system.

More specifically, the complexity can be expressed through the following important aspects:

- Multi-stakeholder process: it shall be emphasised first that GE/GCE encompasses a wide variety of actors — NGOs, government institutions representing the education, foreign affairs and development sectors, as well as various international actors. Each of these has an important role and expertise to offer, therefore relationship-building and relationships between the various actors are essential for a satisfactory performance of the system.
- Priority and strategy level: taking into account the aforementioned concerning a successful delivery of GE/GCE as a multi-stakeholder process, one also has to note the priority and strategy level or the aims and directions of each stakeholder. In the vertical level, namely, various categories of stakeholders — NGOs, schools, ministries, international organisations — have their own priorities and work strategy. Likewise, in the horizontal level, priorities and strategies are divided between various sectors — foreign affairs, education, regional development, youth, societal cooperation. It is essential to understand the priorities of various stakeholders to identify common benchmarks and agree on the cooperation in pursuing mutual objectives.

- Transnational scope: the specifics of GE/GCE lie in its broad scope, namely, the presence of an international context in terms of actors, philosophy and values. In any given country, an important role in the implementation of GE/GCE is played by international organisations (European Union, UNESCO).

Taking into account the aforementioned, i.e., the diversity of stakeholders and the co-existence of the various priorities in different fields, and the broad international scope, two main points of tension can be identified which the actors involved in the process shall take into account and try to navigate between their expressions.

- The differences in the aims and working methods of various stakeholders. These manifest itself in whether and how NGOs may cooperate with government institutions; who and how can become involved in the process of formal education; who has what competences and expertise.
- National vs International. In the context of this field, especially when considering attracting funding from the public sector, it is essential to take into account the relationships between national-level priorities and interests and international priorities and interests. This tension can be observed not only in relation to access to financing and the relationships between the organisations involved in that process, but also in content-related discussions, for example, emphasis in citizenship teaching, what determines and impacts it.

In this context, it is possible to identify four significant leverage points that affect GE/GCE, looking at how it functions as a system, including the ability to raise funding:

1. The role and resources of international organizations for the involvement of national governments and building bridges between different partners,
2. More coordinated cross-sectoral strategies, involving organizations and institutions working in both the sector of international development and education sector,
3. National NGOs expertise and accumulated knowledge and access to various networks in the field,
4. Trustful and long-term cooperative relations between NGOs and governments, among other partners.

5. RECOMMENDATION: WHERE NEXT?

Based on the findings of the study, it is possible to make the following recommendations. They are focused on the core audience of this study - non-governmental organizations and public sector bodies involved in GE/GCE.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE GE/GCE CONCEPT:

1 Given that the current state of the GE/GCE domain is characterized by the combination of different concepts used, and the different stakeholders refer to different concepts of their activities, **it is essential**, first of all, at the national level and, if possible, at the European level, **to make use of the concepts used and to map their understanding, in order to gain a deeper insight into the involvement of various stakeholders in the GE/GCE field, their vision of the concepts used, as well as their goals and contributions to the field;**

2 In general, taking into account the concepts used and the diversity of stakeholders, it is advisable, in a discussion of the purpose and outcome of the understanding and use of different GE/GCE concepts, to put forward not so much the use of one particular concept, but **to achieve conceptual clarity and agree on relationship and boundaries between different concepts;**

3 This nuanced mapping of the GE/GCE concepts can be used as a platform and process for national and regional partnership building; namely, the added value of this process can occur if it **involves all or as many stakeholders as possible;**

4 With regard to GE/GCE funding, both **funding providers and recipients should be relatively flexible with regard to terms used, and should be able to navigate national and regional conceptual maps**, focusing not on the synchronisation of concepts but on the different partners and institutions understanding of what is GE/GCE, and that this understanding coincides with the objectives of these different partners and institutions in the GE/GCE field.

5 However, despite the multitude of concepts already mentioned, it is essential, within conceptual discussions, to preserve the conceptual foundations defined so far in the field, namely, that there must be clear limits to what are understood not to be the activities of GE/GCE - government public relations activities with regard to their development cooperation and humanitarian assistance activities, as well as general NGO capacity building activities - as these do not refer to the core idea of GE/GCE;

6 In conceptual discussions, particular **attention should be paid to the understanding and use of the concept of “global citizens” and “global citizenship”**, taking into account historical, cultural and political contexts at a national level;

7 As regards the tensions related to the national/singularity vs international/universality dimensions in education (national citizens vs global citizens), as well as in politics (national interests vs international interests), a recommendation could be to move away from the either-or approach and take a perspective that implies that Global Education/Global Citizenship Education could be the platform that allows each individual to see and understand the complexity associated with these positions and, by actively and deliberately examining their own as well as others' point of view, understand their attitude and stance. Given that we live in an ever-interconnected world, such issues will become increasingly more important in the context of any nation-state. Thus, it is especially important for GE/GCE to position itself by its nature, namely as a place where these questions can be discussed efficiently and in a meaningful way.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR GE/GCE FUNDING:

8 Given that the nature and objectives of GE/GCE are geared towards long-term processes, and taking into account changes in society and the attitudes and behaviour of individuals, there is also a **need for long-term, consistent and stable GE/GCE funding structures, which can offer (a) the implementation of meaningful and effective GE/GCE activities and (b) predictability and a sense of security for GE/GCE implementers.** As recommended by the UNDP³² as well as by the “European Consensus on Development - 2007”: the contribution of Development Education and Awareness Raising³³ and various fora for the support for Global Citizenship Education and Awareness Raising should be risen to 3% of ODA;

9 Given the critical role of the **European Commission** in financing GE/GCE and developing the field in all the countries of the European Union, it **must continue to invest in financing GE/GCE, thereby ensuring the continuation of the initiated process and the effective functioning of the established stakeholder systems**, while at the same time promoting their development. A break or reduction in funding would have a significant impact on the development of the field;

³² Recommendation of the Overview to the Human Development Report of UNDP 1993, Page 8

³³ The contribution of Development Education & Awareness Raising - https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/sites/devco/files/publication-development-education-for-the-european-consensus-200806_en.pdf

10 Given that this study shows that funding for NGO activities in many GE/GCE areas depends to a large extent on funding from the European Commission, there is a need to think about the **creation of new financial instruments whose goal is to promote the active involvement of national governments in channelling funding to GE/GCE**, thus creating financial policies oriented to the long-term and multi-stakeholders approach;

11 In order to promote and stimulate multi-stakeholder and cross-sectoral partnerships that are vital for a successful GE/GCE delivery, **cross-sectoral funding schemes on national and EU levels should be introduced**;

12 It is also necessary to think of ways to find new sources of funding (private sector, donations) and to think about **creating new types and models of partnerships and funding mechanisms**;

13 For countries whose activities in the field of GE/GCE depend on the financing of European or international organizations, national governments must try to at least create a balanced allocation of funding between national and European/international resources, thereby contributing to the development of a national GE/GCE ecosystem and strengthening local GE/GCE expertise;

14 In order to have a sustainable, high-impact and effective approach to GE/GCE delivery, an advocacy both at the national and EU level to ring-fence a certain % of ODA towards GE/GCE should be considered particularly due to the fact that this contributes to realising the SDG 4.7.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR GE/GCE STAKEHOLDERS:

15 Given the history of the development of the GE/GCE field, which has been developed by many and diverse stakeholders, and its thematic multidimensionality, effective and long-term GE/GCE is closely linked to the **creation of multi-stakeholder platforms at national, European and international levels, covering various sectors** (education, foreign affairs, international development, environment etc.) and various actors (NGOs, ministries, teachers, etc.);

16 Recognizing the crucial role of the education sector in ensuring sustainable GE/GCE, **it is essential to develop, at different levels, active relationships with the educational sector institutions - education and science ministries and various education agencies**. Taking into account the influence of international partners, such as the European Commission's and UNESCO's influence and cooperation with public sector bodies, it is possible to initiate and build networks and structures, which cover both the education sector and other GE/GCE stakeholders, thereby stimulating a multi-stakeholder approach to the GE/GCE field;



The Youth for Peace project implemented by Wezesha (Ireland). LADDER Project: Regranting Scheme Action. Credit: ALDA

17 Apart from education and science ministries and education agencies, it is important to also actively engage various other ministries and/or government agencies that work on youth issues and/or in non-formal education in GE/GCE processes;

18 With regard to the education sector, it is essential at the national level to identify and involve existing resources in the GE/GCE area, for example, which are connected to Education for Sustainable Development, Citizenship Education, and other areas, thereby building on the existing capacities and strengths of each country;

19 Given that NGOs within the GE/GCE field cooperate with both national and European and international institutions, belong to different expert networks, and specialize in different topics - education, international development, and others, they are **critical partners and even to some extent mediators in the national GE/GCE ecosystem**. Consequently, the accumulated **experience and knowledge of NGOs is an essential resource that should be used by relevant national policy makers, defining GE/GCE related policies and identifying funding priorities**;

20 To develop a multi-stakeholder and cross-sectoral strategic framework within each country that covers the priorities and vision of GE/GCE, GE/GCE implementation mechanisms, as well as the provision of funding and other sustainability mechanisms. The first step in the development of such common strategy might be a national study actively involving all key stakeholders. A similar positive action model is being implemented within the framework of the GENE programs;

21 Overall, GE/GCE has to be regarded as a part of a larger, time-consuming, gradual and systemic process, that is unique to each country, taking into account its social, economic and political context, while at the same time being equally important for all countries and considering the context of the 21st century - the impact of various global processes and events on local developments.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Andreotti, O. A. (2006). Soft versus critical global citizenship education. *Policy & Practice: A Development Education Review*, Vol. 3, p. 40-51.
- Bourn, D. (2012). Development Education: From the Margins to the Mainstream. *The International Journal for Global and Development Education Research*, Issue one (February), p.25-39.
- Bourn, D., Hunt, F., Bamber, P. (2017). Paper commissioned for the 2017/8 Global Education Monitoring Report, Accountability in education: Meeting our commitments, available at <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0025/002595/259566e.pdf>
- Civil Society Europe, CIVICUS (2016). Civic Space in Europe Survey, available at https://civilsocietyeuropedoteu.files.wordpress.com/2016/10/civicspaceineuropesurveyreport_final251015.pdf
- Eisner, E.W. (1994) *The educational imagination: On design and evaluation of school programs*. (3rd. ed) New York: Macmillan.
- European Commission (2012). Commission staff working document on Development Education and Awareness Raising (DEAR) in Europe. Available at https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/sites/devco/files/working-document-development-education-awareness-raising-programme-swd2012457-20121220_en.pdf
- Eurydice (2017). Citizenship Education at School in Europe. Available at https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/fpfis/mwikis/eurydice/images/6/68/215_EN_Citizenship_2017_N.pdf
- Hicks, D. (2003). Thirty Years of Global Education: A reminder of key principles and precedents. *Educational Review*, Vol. 55, No. 3, p.265-275.
- Krause, J. (2010). European Development. Education Monitoring Report: "DE Watch". GENE (Global Education Network Europe). January-May, available at <https://concordeurope.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/09/DEEEP-REPORT-2015-001.pdf?c676e3&c676e3>
- Levin, B. (2007). Curriculum Policy and the Politics of What Should be Learned in Schools. In: Connelly, F., He, M.F., Phillion, J. (eds.). *The SAGE Handbook of Curriculum and Instruction*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Maastricht Global Education Declaration: European Strategy Framework for Improving and Increasing Global Education in Europe to the Year 2015 (2002).
- OECD (2016). Development aid in 2015 continues to grow despite costs for in-donor refugees, available at <http://www.oecd.org/dac/stats/ODA-2015-detailed-summary.pdf>
- OECD (2018). Preparing Our Youth for an Inclusive and Sustainable World. The OECD PISA global competence framework, available at <https://www.oecd.org/education/Global-competency-for-an-inclusive-world.pdf>
- Selby, D. (1999). Global Education: Towards a Quantum Model of Environmental Education. *Canadian Journal of Environmental Education*, Vol. 4, p.125-141.
- Tawil, S. (2013). Education for "Global Citizenship": A Framework for Discussion. UNESCO Education Research and Foresight, Paris. [ERF Working Papers Series, No.7].
- The EU-Russia Civil Society Forum (2017). Report on the State of Civil Society in the EU and Russia, available at http://eu-russia-csf.org/fileadmin/State_of_Civil_Society_Report/18_05_2017_RU-EU_Report_spaudai_Hyperlink_Spread.pdf
- The Institute for European Studies, Vrije Universiteit Brussel (2012). Study on the Impact of the Crisis on Civil Society Organizations in the EU – Risks and Opportunities, available at <http://www.eesc.europa.eu/resources/docs/qe-32-12-548-en-c.pdf>
- TRIALOG (2014). Study "A Decade of EU13 Civil Society Participation in European Development Education and Awareness Raising Projects", available at http://www.trialog.or.at/images/doku/trialog_study_eu13_ec_dear_final.pdf
- Troll, T. And Krause, J. (2016). The Future of Development Education. Transformational Learning for a World Citizens Movement. In: Amy Skinner, Matt Baillie Smith, Eleanor Brown and Tobias Troll (eds.). *Education, Learning and the Transformation of Development*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, p.143-157.
- UNESCO (2012): Global Education First Initiative (GEFI) brochure, available at https://issuu.com/globaleducationfirst/docs/gefi_brochure_eng.
- UNESCO (2014): Global Citizenship Education. Preparing learners for the challenges of the twenty-first century, available at <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0022/002277/227729e.pdf>.
- UNESCO (2015): Global Citizenship Education. Topics and Learning Objectives, available at <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0023/002329/232993e.pdf>.
- Wintersteiner, W., Grobbauer, H., Diendorfer, G., Reitmair-Juárez, S (2015). Global Citizenship Education. Citizenship Education for Globalizing Societies. Klagenfurt, Salzburg, Vienna. Available at http://www.demokratiezentrum.org/fileadmin/media/pdf/Materialien/GlobalCitizenshipEducation_Final_english.pdf

PART II: Country Reports



COUNTRY REPORTS

The following, arranged in alphabetical order, are individual country reports on the situation with public funding available for GE / GCE in each respective country. In total, information was collected on 28 European countries plus Norway. These reports focus on the period from 2011 to 2015. In addition, if the information was available, a comparison of the available public funding with the situation in 2010, as identified by the European Development Education Monitoring Report “DE Watch” (Krause, 2010) was also carried out. Similarly, a comparison was made with 2016 data, if available.

Country reports are based on information from questionnaires that were sent to national NGDO platforms and national governments. In addition to each completing a questionnaire themselves, the national NGDO platforms were asked to identify the two main public funding bodies in their country, and to contact their respective representatives, asking them to complete a questionnaire. In most cases, NGOs were able to get answers from only one national funding body, which in most cases was the MFA or the development aid agency.

Given that information on the amount of funding was not always available, other research and reports were also used to characterize the situation in the country. One of the most significant was The State of Global Education in Europe 2015 by GENE, which was a useful source of information as it looked at the research period of this study. In addition to questionnaires and GENE reports, individual country reports also relied on other studies and documents that provided additional relevant information.

All reports are organized around a common structure:

1. Terminology and definitions used¹
2. Ways of Delivering GCE
3. Different stakeholders involved in GCE
4. Public funding for GCE
5. Funding patterns
6. Policy context for investment
7. NGOs involvement in GCE related policy processes
8. NGO capacity

¹ This section uses the terms (and abbreviations) used in the European Development Education Monitoring Report “DE Watch” (Krause, 2010), namely AR - Awareness Raising, GE - Global Education, LS - Life Skills, as well as GL - Global Learning.



1. TERMINOLOGY AND DEFINITIONS USED

1.1. Terms

The questionnaire respondent representing the national platform asserts that the terms “Global Learning” [GL] and “Development education and awareness raising” [DEAR] are used by their respective institutions to refer to GCE. The official ADA website also employs “global learning” (ADA 2018). The NP further explains that different stakeholders, including governmental and academic institutions, are involved in the development of the “Global Learning Strategy” (2009, since updated).

1.2. Definitions

According to the definitions provided by the NP, GL is here understood as an “educational concept” employed by “providers of educational programs on development issues.” The approach to GL is outlined as AR and GE with the aim of engaging learners “with global dimensions of today’s globalized world”. The NP clarifies that DEAR is employed to refer more broadly to “education, awareness raising and campaigning in a global context”.

2. WAYS OF DELIVERING GCE

When asked about GCE delivery in formal education between 2011 and 2017, the NP explains that although there is no specific course offered, aspects of GL are covered in subjects such as “Intercultural Learning” and “Political Education”. The NP further discusses the integration of GL in teacher training and the “School Quality Assessment” process. It summarises the key programmes and initiatives as follows; NGO-led GL themed workshops and exhibitions in schools, the annual Global Education Week, which is coordinated by a NGO and supported by the MoE and a network of “GL Resource Centres” (for Südwind and Welthaus). Another activity of interest in this sector is the “Global Citizenship Education” course offered at the University of Klagenfurt in cooperation with the Society for Communication, Development and Dialogical Education, KommEnt (1994) (Hartmeyer and Wegimont, *The State of Global Education in Europe 2015*) as well as Global Learning courses at University Colleges of Teacher Education in Graz, Linz and Innsbruck, coordinated by Südwind (in Linz and Innsbruck) and Welthaus and Südwind (in Graz)

Regarding GCE delivery through non-formal education in the same period, the NP explains that whilst this is not yet carried out regarding adult learning, there are some activities in the youth sector. The platform of Austrian Youth Organizations (BJV) has carried out an extensive program on Global Learning, focussing on thematic further education of youth group leaders... Furthermore in the Global Learning Strategy a chapter for the youth sector was integrated, as well as the limited integration of GL in the “Living in the World” chapter of the Austrian Youth Strategy.

3. DIFFERENT STAKEHOLDERS INVOLVED IN GCE

From the perspective of the NP, the main governmental entities involved in GCE delivery and support within the government are the Austrian Development Agency [ADA], the MFA and MoE; the NP summarises that these institutions have high-level involvement in funding (ADA/MoE), policy (MFA/MoE), and outreach (MoE) activities.

Regarding international organisations, the NP cites the low-level impact of the North-South Centre, with their access to different networks, on GCE delivery in their country

Within the NGO sector, the NP lists “Global Responsibility” and its DEAR working group as the most significant stakeholder, with mid-level impact. The NP further perceives the education-focused NGO “Südwind” as a low-level influence in the media.

Another significant stakeholder is the aforementioned KommEnt. Initially established with the aim of mediating between NGOs and the MFA, since the establishment of ADA in 2004, KommEnt’s chief role has been to coordinate – together with the NGO Südwind - the “Global Learning Strategy Group” [SGGL] (KommEnt 2018). Founded in 2003 and formed of both governmental and NGO institutions, the SGGL is “a co-ordinating group, which discusses GL programmes, projects and initiatives in Austria and contributes to networking in this area,” and has also been highly involved in the development of the aforementioned GL Strategy (Strategieguppe Globales Lernen 2009). When asked about the main education and research institutions engaged in GCE delivery, the NP refers generally to the low-level impact of academia and teaching colleges, through access to networks and programs offered.

Comparative significance of funding bodies

The NP’s responses suggest limited funding available for GCE-related activities in Austria. When asked about the perception of the comparative significance of primary funding bodies (both national and international) for GCE activities carried out by NGOs in their country, the NP cites the ADA as the most significant funder. Furthermore, they refer to the “limited funds, but high commitment” of the MoE. It should be noted that no international investors are listed.

4. PUBLIC FUNDING FOR GCE

The present study did not receive responses from any government institutions regarding funding for GCE delivery in Austria. Relevant existing research is provided below.

Funding trends

Although data is not supplied by the government, a 2015 GENE report indicates that the ADA’s total budget was 4.2 million euros in 2015, including approximately 4.08 million dedicated to 89 initiatives led by CSOs and Austrian Federal States (Hartmeyer and Wegimont, *The State of Global Education in Europe 2015*,

23). When compared with figures taken from a 2010 DE Watch Report, this indicates an overall increase in their investment in GCE funding since 2008 when the ADA's total budget amounted to 4 million euros (Krause, European Development. Education Monitoring Report: "DE Watch" 2010, 37). According to the official ADA website, the institution's budget is allocated by the MFA (ADA 2018).

5. FUNDING PATTERNS

5.1. Types of funding activities

Limited information is provided regarding the types of activities provided with public funding. Since 2008, the ADA and EC co-fund national-level initiatives "aiming to raise public awareness of development issues and promote development education" (ADA 2018). Regarding the types of projects which received investment, in particular, the GENE report refers to nation-wide "discussions, workshops, concerts, films, festivals, courses, competitions, campaigns, etc." organised in the context of EYD2015 (Hartmeyer and Wegimont, The State of Global Education in Europe 2015).

5.2. Funding recipients

As cited in Section 4.1, according to the aforementioned GENE report, CSOs and Austrian Federal States received the majority of the ADA budget to support development communication and education projects (Hartmeyer and Wegimont, The State of Global Education in Europe 2015).

5.3. Funding procedure

The present study received no information regarding the government's procedure for deciding recipients of GCE funding.

6. POLICY CONTEXT FOR INVESTMENT

Regarding the policy context for GCE investment at a national-level between 2011 and 2015, existing reports highlight the impact of public sector cuts and the threat of further cuts on the distribution of GCE funding and GCE delivery more generally since the turn of the millennium (North-South Centre 2005) (Hartmeyer and Wegimont, The State of Global Education in Europe 2015). Another factor perceived to be significant is the issue of extremism. The MoE has introduced further programmes in direct response to concerns regarding extremism, and GL is considered to contribute towards "open-mindedness, tolerance and mutual understanding" in this context (Hartmeyer and Wegimont, The State of Global Education in Europe 2015, 23).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ADA. 2018. Austrian Development Agency. Accessed January 15, 2018. <http://www.entwicklung.at/en/ada>.

Globales Lernen Strategieguppe. 2009. "Global Learning in the Austrian education system." *Komment*. Accessed January 15, 2018. <http://www.komment.at/media/pdf/pdf64.pdf>.

Hartmeyer, Helmuth, and Liam Wegimont. 2015. *The State of Global Education in Europe*. Dublin: Global Education Network Europe, European Union.

KommEnt. 2018. "Society for Communication, Development and Dialogical Education." *KommEnt*. Accessed January 20, 2018. <http://www.komment.at/media/pdf/pdf213.pdf>.

Krause, Johannes. 2010. "European Development. Education Monitoring Report: "DE Watch"." *GENE (Global Education Network Europe)*. January-May. Accessed January 5, 2018. gene.eu/wp-content/uploads/Gene_OtherPublications-DEWatchReport.pdf.

North-South Centre. 2005. *Global Education in Austria. National Report*, North-South Centre.

7. NGOS INVOLVEMENT IN GCE RELATED POLICY PROCESSES

Analysis of the NP's questionnaire responses indicates a low level of NGO involvement in GCE policy processes. According to the NP, NGOs have limited involvement in agenda setting, and policy implementation and evaluation. The NP further explains that GCE is "not a priority of the Austrian development policy," and that the NP has attempted to drive agenda setting despite this being "rather difficult." From the NP's perspective, NGO engagement in policy formulation and consultations is "medium level," qualifying that, "if there are policies formulated we are consulted."

8. NGO CAPACITY

Regarding Austria's civic society situation and environment, the involvement of this sector has been important regarding GCE since the 1960s, prior to increased state support from the late-1970s onwards (North-South Centre 2005, 61).

The NP was established in 2008. 35 members in 2017. According to the NP, the member organisations are NGOs active in the "fields of development cooperation, development education and policy work, as well as humanitarian aid and sustainable global economic, social and ecological development".

8.1. Platform activity and influence

The NP has a separate working group dealing with GCE. The NP considers education and AR to be the main focuses of this group. It further cites its roles in advocacy and lobbying, policy, and developing national networks. It considers international networking to be a lesser priority of the working group.

8.2. Strategy building

Regarding their organisation's involvement in GCE strategy building, the NP identifies two relevant recommendation documents developed between 2011 and 2015. The first is its 2009 position paper on DEAR, aiming to inform and advocate CSOs, educators, and governmental stakeholders on "DE and GCE" – this paper is considered to have had a short-term (1-5 years) focus. Secondly, the NP refers to its participation in the development of the GL Strategy for all relevant stakeholders, which aims to "mainstream Global Learning as an educational concept in different sectors of the education landscape of Austria," perceived as a long-term (5+ years) goal.



1. TERMINOLOGY AND DEFINITIONS USED

1.1. Terms

Questionnaire respondents representing the NP and the government institution in Belgium both assert that the term “development education” [DE] is used by their respective institutions to refer to GCE. The NP qualifies that this term is used in their dealings with the government, adding that the French equivalent of the term “Global Citizenship Education” is used by francophone NGOs. In addition to the two terms cited in the questionnaire responses, the GENE Peer review report finds that the terms “Global Education”, “World Citizenship Education”, and “Education for Sustainable Development” are used (Global Education Network Europe 2017, 22).

1.2. Definitions

Both respondents provide the same definition used in the relation between NGOs and the government, taken from the official Belgian MFA website (FPS Foreign Affairs, Foreign Trade and Development Cooperation 2011, 2). DE is here understood as a subsection of GCE with a focus on “North-South relations” and “local-global rights”. The approach to DE is outlined as both AR and GE with the aim of “raising awareness among [...] mobilising citizens and communities” to address development issues.

Francophone NGOs use another definition for themselves : “Global citizenship education” with 3 aims :

- Education of a global and inclusive citizenship : reinforcing a change in values, attitudes and behaviour.
- Engagement of citizens : strengthening individual and collective action.
- Advocacy : to influence political decisions in order to change legislation.

In this way, GCE contributes, in particular, to the emancipation of people and the transformation of society ; it is, in that, a political act.

2. WAYS OF DELIVERING GCE

When asked about GCE delivery between 2011 and 2017, as well as GCE within the teacher training system, the NP summarises the key programmes and initiatives in formal education as “educative and mobilisation activities, trainings [sic], extra-curricular activities, pedagogical materials, etc.”, implemented at all levels of education from preschool to higher education. They also mention a new “philosophy and citizenship education” programme in Belgium’s francophone primary and secondary schools, which they consider could be developed to include GCE. Regarding GCE delivery through informal education in the same period, the NP refers primarily to AR and GE activities- for example through training, undertaking research, and immersive travel initiatives- and to efforts to mobilise the community through the development of networks and the “creation of movements”.

A another important way of delivering GCE in Belgium is advocacy (Denouncing injustice and/or formulating constructive proposals; Constructing alliances/networks to create effective power relations; Directly influencing and feeding into political decisions; Informing, raising awareness, training decision-makers).

3. DIFFERENT STAKEHOLDERS INVOLVED IN GCE

From the perspective of the NP, the main entities involved in GCE delivery and support within the government are the Administration of development cooperation (DGD) and the Belgian Development Agency (BDA/ENABEL since 2018). The NP considers the DGD to primarily impact GCE delivery through the provision of legal and national policy framework, and funding. The main resources of the BDA/ENABEL are summarised as expertise and “access to educational actors”. Amongst government bodies, the NP also considers the Ministries of Education to have a medium-level of influence due to their access to school and regional policy influence, and local-level administrations to have low-level input regarding funding, access to the public and local-level policy. Amongst international organisations, the NP cites UNESCO as Belgian GCE’s main influencing body due to its control on policy. They further perceive the North South Center and CONCORD to impact GCE delivery in their country through recommendations and networking respectively.

Within the NGO sector, the NP highlights those development NGOs accredited by the Ministry of Development Cooperation as the most significant stakeholders, with high-level influence due to their expertise and relationship with the Belgian public and with international and Global South partners.

Concerning stakeholders in the education and research sectors, universities, research and training centres and scientific institutions are seen by the NP as having medium-level involvement in GCE delivery. Specifically, they describe how universities use their expertise to impact GCE delivery not only by conducting research and supporting scholarships for GCE, but also by carrying out AR programmes.

Within the media, the NP highlights the role of social networks, with their significant access to the Belgian public thought, whereas audio-visual and print media are not seen to be a significant influencing factor, despite their perceived “moral authority”. Otherwise, a sets of films, documentaries, TV series related to N/S relationships are produced by traditional media-producers.

In addition to these categories of organisations, the NP refers to the minor influence in GCE delivery in Belgium of private foundations and business-NGO consultants, with their resources in funding and expertise.

Comparative significance of funding bodies

Table 1

Organisations funding NGO GCE activities in order of perceived significance of investment, 2011-17.	
1.	Ministry of Development Cooperation (national subsidies)
2.	Regional subsidies (VAIS and Wallonie-Bruxelles International)
3.	Provinces – cities and municipalities
4.	Private gifts and funds
5.	European funds (EuropeAid)


As mentioned in the box, the NPs perception of the comparative significance of the primary funding bodies (both national and international) for GCE activities carried out by NGOs in their country. The NP highlights the MDA as the most significant investors. Significantly, both national, regional and local-level investment is perceived to be greater than the international (European) funding.

4. PUBLIC FUNDING FOR GCE

Having been asked to consider the most significant sources of public funding for GCE in their country, the NP chose to contact the governmental unit of Development Cooperation and Humanitarian Aid within the Federal Public Service Foreign Affairs department. Accordingly, the questionnaire was completed by the Head of Unit for Development Education within this institution.

Funding trends

Fig. 1. Government Institution's GCE Funding (€), 2011-15



As Figure 1 shows, the data supplied by the government institution shows that there was a general decrease in their investment in GCE funding during the period considered in the present study. According to the institution, funding is sourced from the state budget. Proportionate to the department's total budget, a different pattern emerges. Across the whole period, funding represents on average 2.4% of the department's total

budget and year-on-year data is as follows; 2011 (2.1%), 2012 (2.7%), 2013 (2.4%), 2014 (2.2%), 2015 (2.5%). Previous research finds that governmental funding for Development Education in Belgium constituted 24.000.000 € in 2008 (including investment into NGO and government-implemented DE activities) (Krause, 2010, p. 11), which suggests increased investment between 2008 and 2011 when compared with data from the present study. Regarding development since 2015, the organisation was unable to give GCE investment data, however it should be noted that the institution's total budget did increase in 2016, following a significant decrease in 2015.

5. FUNDING "PATTERNS"

5.1. Types of funding activities

Table 2. Types of funding activities in order of amount of funding allocated, 2011-17.

Type of activity
1. Development of teaching materials and publishing in Global Citizenship Education.
2. Informal education activities focused on global citizenship (outside a structured curriculum).
3. Global Citizenship Education in formal education.
4. Teacher training activities (pre-service and continuing in-service training of teachers).
5. Work with media to promote Global Citizenship Education.

Table 2 shows the five primary GCE activities selected for the government institution's investment, organised by funding priority. This suggests that the educational approach to GCE is the highest priority for funding for the Belgian government. The government institution further specifies that teaching materials are developed through both NGO programs and "the official program for GCE in formal education" but are used for both formal and informal education. "Annoncer le couleur/Kleur Bekennen," organised by BTC, is described as "a federal education program for world citizenship" (Enabel, 2018). Teacher training activities are also carried out as part of this official program and, significantly, the respondent notes that these represent a new initiative and funding for these is growing. Additionally, BTC/Enabel also received funding for Infocycle, an 8-day training program on global issues for adults which, according to the questionnaire responses, engages 1000 adults per year.

Despite the NP highlighting social media, the government institution outlines chief media-related activities as the co-production and co-financing of films, documentaries and television series regarding "global issues".

In addition to these primary activities, the organisation also mentions investment in GCE research, though this is not considered a priority for financial support, rather funding is provided to university and other initiatives; specifically, they cite the Pulse programme (2009-2013) and the 2015 Barometer report.

5.2. Funding recipients

During the period between 2011 and 2017, the government institution perceives the following to be its most significant recipients of GCE funding; higher education institutions, media organisations, NGOs, research institutions and think-tanks, and private companies. Specifically, in reference to private companies as investees, development agency BTC/Enabel is cited.

5.3. Funding procedure

The government institution's responses outline the procedure for deciding which NGO programs receive funding as follows; programs are initially developed independently by NGOs but they must coordinate on proposals with other organisations as part of a common strategic framework before evaluation by the MFA; it is significant to note the engagement of diverse stakeholders in this procedure. Regarding the production of GCE-related media, as well as media producers and the MFA, French and Dutch-speaking communities are consulted. According to the institution, the MFA and BTC/ENABEL were involved in the process of selecting BTC's/ENABEL's official GCE programs (Annoncer la couleur and Infocycle) as targets for funding.

6. POLICY CONTEXT FOR INVESTMENT

Regarding the policy context for GCE investment at a national-level between 2011 and 2015, the government institution notes indicates the requirement of decrees and policy documents to the support civil society for GCE initiatives and public procurement for media productions. The Strategic Note for DE, which outlines the governmental aims, approach and priorities for GCE (Ministre de la Coopération au développement 2012), is highlighted as significant in their organisation's distribution of GCE funding.

At the international-level, the government institution perceives OMD/ODD, the Agenda on Aid Effectiveness, and the Decent Work Agenda (ILO) to have positively impacted decisions regarding GCE funding in their country. They add that DAC and GENE peer reviews influence GCE investment.

When asked more generally about other relevant contextual factors, the government institution cites that austerity measures have had a negative impact of GCE investment, in line with aforementioned funding trends. Conversely, concerns regarding radicalisation due to national terrorist attacks, the perceived international issue of migration, and ODD have had

a positive effect on GCE investment in their country. However, the influence of these factors is not clearly exemplified in the information given about GCE programs in Belgium.

7. NGOS INVOLVEMENT IN GCE RELATED POLICY PROCESSES

Comparison of both the NP and the government institution's questionnaire responses indicates a strong level of NGO involvement in GCE policy processes. According to both, NGOs are involved in many aspects, including formal consultation on agenda setting and formulation, implementation and evaluation of relevant policy. From the NP's perspective, there is a high level of involvement in all processes "both in development cooperation field and also in educational field" [sic].

8. NGO CAPACITY

Regarding Belgium's civic society situation and environment, the 2015 GENE report concludes that there is a strong government-NGO relationship concerning DEAR in Belgium (Hartmeyer and Wegimont 2015, 26). This perspective is supported by the GENE Peer Review, which states that "important actors in the field of Global Education in Belgium with a wide range of target audiences and pedagogical approaches" (Global Education Network Europe 2017, 48).

The NP was established in 1997, along with the establishment of CONCORD. Limited data is available regarding its members, but in 2017 the platform consisted of 188 member-organisations .

8.1. Platform activity and influence

Inside The NP; there are different separate working groups dealing with GCE. (for ex. WGs for advocacy and lobbying, WGs for GCE in formal education; WG on GCE (in general); WGs focuses on global themes as migration, food sovereignty, etc.

8.2. Strategy building

Regarding their organisation's involvement in GCE strategy building, the NP identifies several relevant recommendation documents they developed between 2011 and 2015. These include general referential frameworks on GCE goals and documents produced primarily for CSOs, and documents outlining specific goals for GCE in schools, aimed at both French and Flemish governmental communities. The institution perceives all strategies proposed as having long-term (5+ years) goals.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ACODEV, Reference frame : *Global Citizenship Education. Education, mobilization and advocacy actions (2016)*
http://www.acodev.be/system/files/ressources/ref-ecms-anglais-def-1_0.pdf

Enabel. 2018. *Annoncer le couleur. January. Accessed December 29, 2017.* <http://www.annoncerlacouleur.be/qui-sommes-nous>.

FPS Foreign Affairs, Foreign Trade and Development Cooperation. 2011. "Development Education: notions and concepts." *Kingdom of Belgium Foreign Affairs, Foreign Trade and Development Cooperation. April. Accessed January 5, 2018.* https://diplomatie.belgium.be/sites/default/files/downloads/development_education.pdf.

Global Education Network Europe. 2017. *The European Global Education Peer Review Process: Global Education in Belgium. Global Education Network Europe.*

Hartmeyer, Helmuth, and Liam Wegimont. 2015. *The State of Global Education in Europe. Global Education Network Europe, European Union.*

Krause, Johannes. 2010. "European Development. Education Monitoring Report: "DE Watch"." *GENE (Global Education Network Europe). January-May. Accessed December 28, 2017.* gene.eu/wp-content/uploads/Gene_OtherPublications-DEWatchReport.pdf.

Ministre de la Coopération au développement. 2012. "Note de stratégie Education au développement." *SPF Affaires étrangères, Commerce extérieur et Coopération au développement. Accessed January 5, 2018.* https://diplomatie.belgium.be/sites/default/files/downloads/note_strategie_education_au_developpement.pdf.



1. TERMINOLOGY AND DEFINITIONS USED

1.1. Terms

Respondents representing the national platform and the government institution in Bulgaria both use the term “Global Education” [GE] to refer to GCE.

1.2. Definitions

The government institution does not provide a definition. The NP refers to definitions attributed to the “Working Group of Teachers, 2015” and the “Center for Inclusive Education”, outlining the approach to GE as primarily educative and as expanding LS.

2. WAYS OF DELIVERING GCE

When asked about GCE delivery in formal education between 2011 and 2017, the NP describes several ways that it considers GCE is integrated into the national curriculum, particularly highlighting the school and pre-school education law published with input from the NP in 2015 and in effect from July 2016. They emphasise that this legislation includes a national educational standard pertaining exclusively to “civic, citizenship, intercultural, health and environment education,” which, according to the NP, stipulates either the integration of “GC perspectives” in relevant compulsory subjects “and/or” its inclusion in elective and extracurricular courses and activities. The NP further refers to “numerous” GE-related education initiatives developed by NGOs from 2009 onwards, highlighting the governmental accreditation of NGO-led CPD/GE post-graduate teaching courses. The NP describes that since the new education law also requires, and provides investment for, routine teacher training, there is potential for the aforementioned GE-related teacher training initiatives to be included within this framework. Regarding GCE delivery through non-formal education in the same period, the NP refers to “various project-based initiatives related to introducing and disseminating global education,” realised by NGOs without government input, including extracurricular training courses, workshops, and community events.

3. DIFFERENT STAKEHOLDERS INVOLVED IN GCE

Existing analysis surmises that NGOs are chiefly responsible for GCE delivery in Bulgaria. The term GE was included in the new Law for pre-school and school education in force from 2016, thanks to the efforts of the members of the working group on GE within the BPID.

From the perspective of the NP, the main entity involved in GCE delivery and support within the government is the Ministry of Education and Science through its influence over policy and funding, since it is responsible for directing schools to deliver GE classes. They further refer to medium-

level of influence of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs – since it serves as a “communication channel for public awareness related to development cooperation” – and of the networking resources of the Center for Human Resources Development. Regarding international organisation, the NP observes a low-level influence from GENE and UNICEF and their perceived “international networking” resources. Within the NGO sector, the NP considers the members of the Bulgarian Platform for International Development (BPID), with their advocacy and networking resources, as significant stakeholders. The government-accredited organisations for CPD teacher training and the Thracian (Stara Zagora), South-West (Blagoevgrad) and Sofia Universities are listed by the NP as education and research institutions of influence due to their roles in GE teacher training. The Faculty of Journalism and Mass Communication are described as impacting GCE delivery through IR education and “their access to international networks”. The NP perceives the media in general as a mid-level influence on GCE delivery in Bulgaria but does not refer to any particular body. In addition to these categories of organisations, the NP refers to the AR role of the “Global Compact Network in Bulgaria” and its SDG-related activities.

Comparative significance of funding bodies

Table 1.

Organisations funding NGO GCE activities in order of perceived significance of investment, 2011-17

1. Council of Europe
1. European Commission
1. Norwegian financial mechanism
2. International Planned Parenthood Federation

Table 1 shows the NP’s perception of the comparative significance of the primary funding bodies (both national and international) for GCE activities carried out by NGOs in their country. It is significant to note that all organisations they link to GCE investment in Bulgaria are international, as opposed to national, organisations.

4. PUBLIC FUNDING FOR GCE

Having been asked to consider the most significant sources of public funding for GCE in their country, the NP chose to contact the Bulgarian Ministry of Education and Science as the relevant governmental institution. Unfortunately, limited feedback was received. Responses from the ES Ministry received as part of research carried out by the present study finds that there was no specific public funding for GCE in Bulgaria during the period between 2011 and 2015. This finding is in line with existing data regarding Bulgarian public investment in GCE (Krause, European

Development. Education Monitoring Report: “DE Watch” 2010, 39). In line with the NP’s evaluation of GCE delivery (please refer to Section 2), the representative of the government institution referred to the integration of GCE-related activities and objectives in the school curriculum and other government-run projects. School and pre-school objectives are framed from a GCE as LS perspective; for example, goals of schooling are to “improve the skills of the young people about competences and understanding of the global processes, the tendencies and their inter-relations [sic]”. Specifically, they reference a yearly budget of BGN 60.000, for a share of which participants who develop projects “related to the global citizenship [sic]” compete. The representative further mentions extra-curricular activities unsupported by public funding, citing projects “Success” and “Your Class” as examples. It is suggested that an undisclosed “specific fund” for scientific research is “probably” provided to research “related to global education”.

5. FUNDING PATTERNS

Please refer to Section 4.

6. POLICY CONTEXT FOR INVESTMENT

Please refer to Section 4.

7. NGO INVOLVEMENT IN GCE-RELATED POLICY PROCESSES

There is very limited information regarding NGO participation in GCE policy development. Responses from the NP indicate they have mid-level involvement in policy agenda setting, formulation and evaluation, however no information is given about the form of involvement. Moreover, there is no indication any formal policy process regarding GCE specifically.

8. NGO CAPACITY

Regarding Bulgaria's civic society situation and environment, the DE Watch Report cites the importance of civic society in DEAR in Bulgaria, highlighting that, according to the NSC GE/DE Seminar Bulgaria report 2009, the role of NGOs was particularly significant during the 1990s before state organisations became more involved (Krause 2010, 39).

According to the NP, the member organisations are primarily NGOs. Data regarding the members indicates an increase from 17 to 23 between 2011 and 2017.

8.1. Platform activity and influence

The NP has a separate working group dealing with GCE. The NP considers education, AR and advocacy and lobbying activities to be the main focuses of this group. Developing national and international partnerships, as well as supporting policy processes, as previously mentioned, are considered lower priorities for this group. NP organizes since 2012, annual global education conference for teachers. At least 100 teachers attend the event and the offered workshops every year. There is potential for increase and from 2015 an annual prize Global School is awarded to the most dedicated schools to GE. NP also elaborated and maintain a web page with free resources for teachers that are interested to work on GE topics.

8.2. Strategy building

Regarding their organisation's involvement in GCE strategy building, the NP identifies the afore-discussed school and pre-school education law that they developed, which was published in 2015 and effective July 2016. Considered by the NP as having a long-term (5+ years) focus, this law aims to “enhance(s) the inclusion of global education in elective classes and as a horizontal principle across the curricula of all relevant subjects,” and applies to schools nationwide.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

European Union; Council of Europe. 2017. *South-East Europe and Mediterranean Regional Seminar on Global Development Education. Romania: European Union; Council of Europe.*

Krause, Johannes. 2010. “European Development. Education Monitoring Report: “DE Watch”.” *GENE (Global Education Network Europe). January-May. Accessed January 7, 2018. gene.eu/wp-content/uploads/Gene_OtherPublications-DEWatchReport.pdf.*



1. TERMINOLOGY AND DEFINITIONS USED

1.1. Terms

The questionnaire respondent representing the national platform asserts that the term “Global Education within the framework of Civic Education” is used by their institution to refer to GCE. The framing of GE “within the scope of Civic Education” is to avoid undermining the work of the “GOOD initiative” NGO platform, which has advocated since 2008 to introduce civic education as a mandatory subject in the national curriculum.

1.2. Definitions

The NP definition of GE focuses on the global-local nexus and education for youth, to enable them to “become responsible and active members of society.” The approach to X is outlined as AR/GE/LS. It further explains that civic education refers to the development of “skills and attitudes with the aim of empowering a strong and active citizen.” Spajic-Vrkas finds that there is no official government definition of what they refer to as citizenship education (Spajic-Vrkas 2016).

2. WAYS OF DELIVERING GCE

When asked about GCE delivery in formal education between 2011 and 2017, the NP summarises that there is no formal teaching of “GCE or any similar subject which would encompass the topics of GCE,” at any level of the education system. The NP further explains that despite their lobbying for its formal inclusion as a subject, there are “no indications that civic education will be introduced in its’ fullness.”

The NP does not provide any information concerning GCE activities in the informal education sector. This is in line with the Ministry of Environmental Protection’s “Action plan for education for sustainable development,” which describes that “informal education in Croatia is still unrecognized” (Ministry of Environmental Protection - Croatia 2011, 11). In contrast to this, Spajic-Vrkas refers to NGO-led school projects such as “pupil parliaments, project-based learning, community activities, actions against racism, etc.” (Spajic-Vrkas 2016, 3-4).

3. DIFFERENT STAKEHOLDERS INVOLVED IN GCE

From the perspective of the NP, the main governmental entities involved in GCE delivery and support within the government are the MoSE and MFA. Their involvement is considered as very low but the impact of their lack of input is considered significant by the NP. The NP further cites the lack of strategy, funding, and “interest” regarding GCE programmes on the part of both ministries.

Regarding international organisations, the NP cites the North-South Centre and CONCORD as involved entities, with resources in policy, international networking, funding (NSC only), and training (CONCORD only). The NP details that

both have supported the coordination of a “kick-off seminar on GE, regional seminars and [...] online training courses.” They are described as having low-level influence since their recommendations have “mostly been ignored by institutions.” Within the NGO sector, the NP lists the GOOD initiative (platform of NGOs, researchers and professors), the Centre for Peace Studies (GE coordinator), and CROSOL (platform for International Citizen solidarity) as the most significant stakeholders, although their impact is considered to be minimal. Their main resources are summarised as policy recommendations, lobbying power, access to international networks and influence over public opinion.

In addition to these organisations, the church and right-wing organisations are listed as having mid-level influence, protesting and negatively impacting attempts to introduce civic education into the curriculum.

The Institute for Social Research, the University of Zagreb faculties of Humanities and Social Sciences and of Political Science, and the University of Rijeka Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences are listed by the NP as the chief education and research institutions involved, and are described as having low impact on GCE delivery through research and policy recommendations.

Comparative significance of funding bodies

Table 1.

Organisations funding NGO GCE activities in order of perceived significance of investment, 2011-17.

1. European Union – IPA pre-accession funds, EACEA
2. European Economic Area Grants and Norway Grants
3. Open Society Initiative for Europe
4. Ministry of Foreign and European Affairs

Table 1 shows the NP’s perception of the comparative significance of the primary funding bodies (both national and international) for GCE activities carried out by NGOs in their country. It should be noted that although the MFA is listed, the NP clarifies that the MFA has not provided financial support since 2014 grant. It is apparent that the NP perceives international organisations to be the most significant investors in its GCE activities.

4. PUBLIC FUNDING FOR GCE

Having been asked to consider the most significant sources of public funding for GCE in their country, the NP chose to contact the MFA however, no response was received.

As previously mentioned, the MFA has not allocated funding for GCE activities since 2014. According to the NP, MFA investment in 2014 amounted to approximately 0.25 million euros. No data

is available concerning funding between 2011 and 2013. In line with the responses received from the NP in the present study, Spajic-Vrkas finds that there is no “long-term, systematic financial support from the government,” summarising that this is “one of the main obstacles to citizenship education” in Croatia (Spajic-Vrkas 2016).

5. FUNDING PATTERNS

Please refer to Section 4.

6. POLICY CONTEXT FOR INVESTMENT

No specific information was provided to the current study regarding the policy context for GCE investment at a national-level between 2011 and 2015.

More generally, concerning relevant contextual factors for GCE activity in Croatia, according to Spajic-Vrkas, the country’s transition from a communist regime to democratic state led to a lack of understanding regarding the concept of citizenship “in terms of liberties, autonomy and active participation,” and further argues that this is why the attempted integration of GCE into the education system has failed (Spajic-Vrkas 2016).

7. NGOS INVOLVEMENT IN GCE RELATED POLICY PROCESSES

The NP’s questionnaire responses indicate a weak level of NGO involvement in GCE policy processes in spite of the apparent efforts of the NGO sector. From the NP’s perspective, as previously mentioned, the advocacy and lobbying work of the GOOD initiative regarding civic education and GCE matters has been unsuccessful in influencing policy decision makers.

8. NGO CAPACITY

Regarding Croatia’s civic society situation and environment, the work of the Church was significant in its initial development, and civil society has advanced gradually since the 1990s (croatia.eu 2018). NGOs are perceived as significant actors in GCE delivery in the country (Spajic-Vrkas 2016).

The NP was established in 2014. Data regarding its members indicates an overall increase from 24 members in 2014 to 30 members in 2017. According to the NP, the member organisations are primarily NGOs.

8.1. Platform activity and influence

The NP has a separate working group dealing with GCE. The NP considers advocacy and lobbying, and education to be the main focuses of this group. It further cites its roles in developing national networks, and AR. Policy work and international network are perceived as lesser priorities for this working group.

8.2. Strategy building

8.1.2. Regarding their organisation’s involvement in GCE strategy building, the NP does not identify any strategy documents produced during the relevant period between 2011 and 2015. However, it identifies two relevant recommendation documents both revised in 2016. The first document concerns the importance of introducing civic education into the curriculum. Secondly, the NP refers to a policy paper on the same issue, including recommendations for the implementation of civic education as a school subject and for “transforming everyday school life”. Both documents are aimed at all stakeholders and the public, and are perceived as having short-term (1-5 years) goals.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

croatia.eu. 2018. “Land and People: Society and way of life.” *croatia.eu*. Accessed January 20, 2018. <http://croatia.eu/article.php?lang=2&id=46>.

Ministry of Environmental Protection - Croatia. 2011. “ACTION PLAN FOR EDUCATION FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT.” *mzojp.hr*. Accessed January 10, 2018. http://www.mzojp.hr/doc/education_for_sustainable_development_action_plan.pdf.

Spajic-Vrkas, Vedrana. 2016. “Citizenship Education in Croatia: Networking European Citizenship Education report.” *BPB.de*. December 2. Accessed January 11, 2018. <http://www.bpb.de/veranstaltungen/netzwerke/nece/238373/citizenship-education-in-croatia?p=all>.



1. TERMINOLOGY AND DEFINITIONS USED

1.1. Terms

The questionnaire respondents representing the national platform in Cyprus asserts that the term “Global Education” [GE] is used by their institution to refer to GCE. The NP further explains that this term is employed by “all stakeholders in Cyprus”. It should be noted that in the questionnaire responses, numerous terms are used interchangeably by the NP when asked about GCE; that various and overlapping terminology is employed is supported by the GENE report (Global Education Network Europe 2017, 17). The present study does not include a response from any government institution.

1.2. Definitions

The NP references both the DEEEP/CONCORD and Maastricht Declaration definitions of DE. DE is here understood as “an active learning process, founded on values of solidarity, equality, inclusion and co-operation”. The approach is outlined as AR/GE with the aim of creating “a world of greater justice, equity and human rights for all”.

2. WAYS OF DELIVERING GCE

When asked about GCE delivery in formal education between 2011 and 2017, the NP explains that although there is no “GE” dimension to the system, “ESD” forms part of the curriculum at the elementary level. It further summarises that CSOs fill the gap with the provision of teacher training and other GCE-related resources. Specifically, the NP cites EC-funded DEAR projects coordinated by “Future Worlds Center” and “CARDET” CSOs. Regarding GCE delivery through informal education in the same period, the NP again refers to the work of CSOs in coordinating training and other educational initiatives. The NP highlights the following organisations; “NGO Support Centre”, Future Worlds Center, and CARDET.

3. DIFFERENT STAKEHOLDERS INVOLVED IN GCE

From the perspective of the NP, the main governmental entity involved in GCE delivery and support is the Ministry of Education and Culture [MOEC], through policy, access to schools, and their coordination of the multi-stakeholder Interdepartmental Committee for GE for strategy discussions. In addition, the NP refers to the mid-level influence of the MOEC-founded Pedagogical Institute in GCE delivery in their country, with their resources in ESD resources and training. According to the NP, the MFA has a limited role, with some impact regarding policy. Regarding international organisations, the NP cites the minor role of World Vision, which is “focused on global actions,” but also coordinated a local-level teacher-student project in the context of the EYD 2015.

Within the NGO sector, the NP lists Future Worlds Center,

CARDET, and NGO Support Centre as the most significant stakeholders, who are all members of the Interdepartmental Committee for GE and have high-level influence regarding the implementation of “GE projects” such as school and university initiatives, and teacher training and resources.

Concerning education and research institutions, the NP refers to the low-level influence of national universities, described as impacting GCE delivery primarily through the involvement of individual academics in “various Global Learning activities”.

Comparative significance of funding bodies

When asked about the perception of the comparative significance of the primary funding bodies (both national and international) for GCE activities carried out by NGOs in their country, the NP responded that the EC is not only the most significant investor but “the only real source of funding for GCE” through DEAR calls and Erasmus+. No national entities are cited as sources of investment. This perspective is supported by the 2017 GENE Peer Review, which concludes that NGOs in the field “rely solely on international funding and volunteerism” (Global Education Network Europe 2017, 61).

4. PUBLIC FUNDING FOR GCE

Since the NP does not consider there to be any source of national public funding for GCE in their country, the present study does not include a response regarding GCE public funding in Cyprus.

Funding trends


No data is provided regarding government investment in GCE funding. As previously discussed, NGOs receive no public funding, but the 2017 GENE Peer Review finds that government funding for GCE-related activities in the formal sector is provided from the annual education budget for the integration of GE into the curriculum and teacher training, but that “it is difficult to separate that funding information from the overall education budget” (Global Education Network Europe 2017, 26). The NP highlights that the main reason given for the lack of public funding for NGOs for GCE activities is that no economic resources are made available to the MOEC for supporting NGOs and schools.

5. FUNDING PATTERNS

Please refer to Section 4.

6. POLICY CONTEXT FOR INVESTMENT

Regarding the policy context for GCE investment at a national-level, the NP explains that supportive national policies do not exist but “would be helpful” if a GCE-dedicated budget was made available. At the international-level, the NP perceives that international agreements and initiatives currently have no impact due to the lack of public funding available.



Climate demonstration. Source: www.pixabay.com

7. NGOS INVOLVEMENT IN GCE RELATED POLICY PROCESSES

The NP's questionnaire responses indicate a weak level of NGO involvement in GCE policy processes. According to the NP, NGOs have a "close relationship" with the MOEC, and a medium level of participation in policy agenda setting and formulation, primarily through their inclusion in the Interdepartmental Committee for GE. Despite this, the NP highlights that "this does not mean that our suggestions/ opinions will necessarily shape actual policies". From the NP's perspective, NGOs have limited involvement in policy implementation. The NP further explains that although it generally collaborates with the MOEC and MFA, their work is "independent of actual policies," emphasising that "we are not directly implementing, for example, ESD". The NP considers their only participation in policy evaluation to have been through the GENE "Global Education Peer Review" (2017). The NP emphasises the importance of the relationship that has developed between NGOs and government, considering "there was very little trust" a decade ago. They further express hope that this will result in funding in the future.

8. NGO CAPACITY

Regarding Cyprus' civic society situation and environment, a 2017 North-South Centre report highlights the country's tradition in "development cooperation and aid" and the productive relationship between the government and NGOs on GCE-related activities, enabled by the Interdepartmental Committee for GE (North-South Centre 2017, 10-11). A 2017 GENE report concludes that NGOs "display commitment, co-operation and a deep willingness to co-ordinate efforts for greater effect," despite there being only a limited number of them and a lack of legislation regarding their activity (Global Education Network Europe 2017, 36). The NP was established in 2009. Data provided indicates that the number of members remained at 25 between 2011 and 2016, but that the NP has been "dormant" between 2016 and 2017 due to the low number of members. According to the NP, the member organisations are primarily NGOs.

8.1. Platform activity and influence

The NP does not have a separate working group dealing with GCE.

8.2. Strategy building

Regarding their organisation's involvement in GCE strategy building and any relevant recommendation documents developed between 2011 and 2015, the NP cites their 2012 position paper, an AR document aimed at civil society and policy-makers. The organisation considers "citizens' participation in contributing to sustainable development" to be a primary goal of this programme, perceiving this as a short-term (1-5 years) aim.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Global Education Network Europe. 2017. *Global Education in Cyprus. National Report, Global Education Network Europe.*

North-South Centre. 2017. *South-East Europe and Mediterranean Regional Seminar on Global Development Education: Follow-up meeting. Concept Note, Romania: European Union and Council of Europe.*

CZECH REPUBLIC



1. TERMINOLOGY AND DEFINITIONS USED

1.1. Terms

Questionnaire respondents representing the national platform and the government institution in Czech Republic both assert that the term “Global Development Education” [GDE] is used by their respective institutions to refer to GCE.

1.2. Definitions

Both respondents cite the definition provided in the National Strategy for GDE 2011-2015 (MFA Czech Republic 2010). Here understood as “a lifelong educational process” (ibid. p.6), the approach to GDE is outlined as primarily GE and LS with the aim of enabling people to understand processes contribution to the developmental gap. According to the government institution, the combination of English terms GE and DE highlights the need to approach development issues from a “global perspective”.

2. WAYS OF DELIVERING GCE

When asked about GCE delivery between 2011 and 2017, the NP summarises the key initiatives in formal education as teacher training activities and NGO workshops, specifically referring to two EU-funded programmes; the educational innovation project, “One World in Schools,” and European development project, “Football for Development”. Regarding GCE delivery through informal education in the same period, the NP refers to EU-led GE Week, government-funded “World school” and “Development Cooperation Summer School”, and the One World Film Festival organised by Clovek v tísni, an NGO.

3. DIFFERENT STAKEHOLDERS INVOLVED IN GCE

From the perspective of the NP, the main national governmental entities involved in GCE delivery and support are the MoE, the MFA, and the Czech Development Agency [CDA] (entity founded by the MFA). Their primary resources are summarised as curriculum creation (MoE), and funding (MFA/CDA).

Despite referring to EU funding, the NP does not cite any international organisations as influencing factors for Czech GCE. Within the NGO sector, the NP lists ARPOK, Caritas Czech Republic, and NaZemi as the most significant stakeholders, with influence regarding policy implementation, access to international networks, and AR amongst the Czech public. University Palackého v Olomouci is highlighted by the NP as the primary education institution involved, described as impacting GCE delivery through integrating “GDE topics” into the curriculum.



Human Rights Documentary Film Festival, Prague, Czech Republic

Comparative significance of funding bodies

Table 1.

Organisations funding NGO's GCE activities in order of perceived significance of investment, 2011-17

1. Ministry of Foreign Affairs
1. Czech Development Agency
1. European Commission
2. Fund for NGOs (NROS)
2. Regions budgets
2. Visegrad fund
2. Ministry of Education


Table 1 shows the NP's perception of the comparative significance of the primary funding bodies (both national and international) for GCE activities carried out by NGOs in their country. It is apparent that the NP perceives two national state organisations and one international (European) entity to be the most significant investors. Furthermore, they list three further national bodies, as well as the internationally-managed Visegrad Fund, as main funding bodies. It should be noted that the CDA and Visegrad Fund are both at least partly coordinated by the MFA (Visegrad Fund 2018) (Czech Development Agency 2018), meaning that the MFA is a significant stakeholder from the NP's perspective.

4. PUBLIC FUNDING FOR GCE

Having been asked to consider the most significant sources of public funding for GCE in their country, the NP chose to contact the MFA as the relevant government body. Accordingly, the questionnaire was completed by a representative of the Development Cooperation and Humanitarian Aid unit within this institution.

Funding trends

Fig. 1. Government Institution's GCE Funding, 2011-15



As represented in Figure 1, data supplied by the government institution shows that there was an overall increase in their investment in GCE funding during the period considered in the present study. According to the institution, funding is sourced from the state budget. Across the period, funding represents on average 3.3% of the department's total budget; at its lowest, in 2011, it represents 2.6%, as opposed to in 2014, when it represents 4.6%, its highest relative to the total budget. Regarding development following 2015, the data given shows that investment into GCE dropped in relation to the total budget in 2017, representing just 2.3% of the total budget.

5. FUNDING "PATTERNS"

5.1. Types of funding activities

When asked about the activities they provided funding for during the period between 2011 and 2017, the government responded that they invested in various types of AR, GE, LS and network-building events and programs, such as public seminars, development of online teaching materials, nationwide teacher training initiatives, and GCE research. The representative chose not to rank these in terms of the amount of funding allocated, defining them all as equal priorities. Specifically, in the educational and research sector, the government institution refers to funding for the Czech School Inspectorate to carry out "evaluations of impact of GDE in formal education," NGO-created online portals for schools to access GCE materials, and for the University Palackého v

Olomouci for the "Development Cooperation Summer School" and "Scouts for Development" programmes. In addition to these activities, the organisation also mentions funding a documentary series "Czech Mission" and considerable funding to NGO Člověk v tísni for projects summarised as "GDE using audiovisual methods".

5.2. Funding recipients

During the period between 2011 and 2017, the government institution perceives the following to be its most significant recipients of GCE funding; governmental agencies, higher education institutions, local and regional authorities, NGOs, and schools. The government institution provided detailed information regarding funding recipients and activities from 2011 to 2015. As well as numerous NGOs (most significantly, Člověk v tísni), the investees (and the period in which the received funding) listed are as follows; the University Palackého v Olomouci (2011-2015); University Univerzita Karlova v Praze (2011); public TV channel Česká televize (2012-2014); and, the private sector platform for foreign development cooperation, Platforma podnikatelů pro zahraniční rozvojovou spolupráci (2014).

5.3. Funding procedure

The government institution's questionnaire responses give limited information about the accessibility of their funding procedure, but summarise the procedure for deciding recipients of GCE funding as allocations according to responses to open calls for project proposals. According to the institution, several government stakeholders are involved in decisions regarding the provision of funding; the MFA, MoE, CDA, and Czech Forum for Development Cooperation.

6. POLICY CONTEXT FOR INVESTMENT

Regarding the policy context for GCE investment at a national-level between 2011 and 2015, the government institution highlights the following policies and programmes as significant in their organisation's distribution of GCE funding; the Act on Development Cooperation and Humanitarian Aid 2010, the Annual Development Cooperation Plans 2011 – 2015, and the afore-mentioned National Strategy for GDE 2011 – 2015. Of particular interest is the latter document, which outlines GDE concepts, strategies, goals and funding processes for all major GDE stakeholders. From their perspective, the MFA's National Conference on GDE in 2015 had a positive influence on GCE funding in the Czech Republic.

At the international-level, during the same period, the government institution perceives the Declaration of the European Parliament on Development Education and Active Global Citizenship (2012) and the OECD/DAC Peer Review of the Czech Development Assistance (2013) to have positively impacted decisions regarding GCE funding in their country.

7. NGOS INVOLVEMENT IN GCE RELATED POLICY PROCESSES

Comparison of both the NP and the government institution's questionnaire responses indicates a considerable level of NGO involvement in all stages of GCE policy procedure from agenda setting to policy formulation, implementation and evaluation. From the NP's perspective, there is a high level of involvement in implementation of all projects. The NP further explains that the FoRS GDE Working Group is "involved in preparing the National Strategy, Action Plan and other strategic documents" and has representatives in the MFA's GDE working groups.

8. NGOS CAPACITY

Regarding the Czech Republic's civic society situation and environment, GENE research from 2008 concludes that NGOs are significant stakeholders in DEAR (Global Education Network Europe 2008), a perspective supported by the 2010 DE Watch Report (Krause, European Development. Education Monitoring Report: "DE Watch" 2010, 42).

The NP was established in 2002. Data regarding its members indicates a decrease from 55 members and 4 individual observers in 2011, to 41 members and 4 individual observers in 2017. According to the NP, the member organisations are NGOs, Universities, CSOs, academic institutions, volunteer associations, and international organisations.

8.1. Platform activity and influence

As previously mentioned, the NP has a separate "GDE working group," and considers advocacy and lobbying, AR, and policy development to be the main focuses of this group. It further cites its less significant roles in developing national and international networks.

8.2. Strategy building

Regarding their organisation's involvement in GCE strategy building, the NP identifies two relevant recommendation documents developed between 2011 and 2015; firstly, the previously discussed National GDE Strategy 2011-2015, and secondly, a related informational document about this strategy aimed at the general public and NGOs, "Global development education- Why is it necessary for Czech society and sustainable development?". The organisation considers these documents to have a short-term (1-5 years) aim.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Czech Development Agency. 2018. "About Us." Czech Development Agency. Accessed January 10, 2018. <http://www.czechaid.cz/en/about-us/>.
- Global Education Network Europe. 2008. *Global Education in the Czech Republic. National Report, Global Education Network Europe.*
- Krause, Johannes. 2010. "European Development. Education Monitoring Report: "DE Watch"." GENE (Global Education Network Europe). January-May. Accessed January 7, 2018. gene.eu/wp-content/uploads/Gene_OtherPublications-DEWatchReport.pdf.
- MFA Czech Republic. 2010. "National Strategy for Global Development Education 2011-2015." Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Czech Republic. January 4. Accessed January 5, 2018. http://www.mzv.cz/jnp/en/foreign_relations/development_cooperation_and_humanitarian/general_information/national_strategy_for_global_development.html.
- Visegrad Fund. 2018. "About the Fund." Visegrad Fund. Accessed January 8, 2018. <http://visegradfund.org/about/>.



1. TERMINOLOGY AND DEFINITIONS USED

1.1. Terms

The questionnaire respondent representing the national platform asserts that multiple terms are used by their institution and other relevant GCE stakeholders in Denmark. According to the NP, in addition to “GCE,” its working group employs the terms “global education,” “democracy teaching,” “the international dimension in education,” and others. Further terms cited include “citizenship education,” and “enlightenment on development” – used by the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs [Danida] to refer to development AR.

1.2. Definitions

The NP does not provide any concrete definitions for the various terms referenced. Its responses indicate confusion and debate amongst stakeholders regarding the semantics of GCE. According to the DE Watch Report, the government is considered to support AR over DE (Krause, European Development. Education Monitoring Report: “DE Watch” 2010).

2. WAYS OF DELIVERING GCE

When asked about GCE delivery between 2011 and 2017, the NP summarises that GCE themes are included in primary and secondary school objectives, however implementation is not supported by management or the government, therefore individual teachers are primarily responsible for this. It further highlights that although “a hint of GCE or ‘cultural competencies’” are commonly integrated into the guidelines of most educational institutions, the GCE teaching that students receive in Denmark varies significantly depending on the institution. Specifically, the NP refers to teacher training developed at an institution in Funen, and a “programme on development in the French classes” in an Aarhus high school.

The NP does not give details regarding GCE delivery through informal and non-formal education in the same period, but mentions that “in Danish Folk High School there may be courses on development, democracy, conflict solution, citizenship, diversity etc.”

The NP cites the annual “Christmas-Calendar” programme for primary school children, that is broadcast on public television. It includes information on children from a different Global South country each year, for example, in 2016 Oxfam/IBIS provided information on Burkino Faso.

3. DIFFERENT STAKEHOLDERS INVOLVED IN GCE

From the perspective of the NP, the main governmental entity involved in GCE funding is Danida. With regards to government organisations with policy power, the NP highlights the high-level influence of both the MoE and regional municipalities. The NP does not cite any international organisations as important GCE stakeholders. Within the NGO sector, the NP lists Oxfam/IBIS, MSActionaid, the Civil Society in Development’s mission and strategy [CISU] member organisations as significant stakeholders, with their networking and lobbying resources; the NP further refers to itself (Globalt Fokus) as a low-level influence in these aspects. CISU organisation are also perceived as having funding resources. The NP perceives World’s Best News [WBN] and their lobbying and network resources as a mid-level media influence in GCE delivery in their country, described as impacting GCE delivery through cooperation with Danida, CSOs, and independent foundations such as the Timbuktu foundation (low-level impact). According to its website, WBN is “an independent news organisation for constructive journalism about solutions and progress in global development” (World’s Best News 2018).

Comparative significance of funding bodies

Table 1.

Organisations funding NGO GCE activities in order of perceived significance of investment, 2011-17.

1. Danida
2. Civil Society in Development’s mission and strategy [CISU]
3. Tipsmidler (a Danish foundation provided money from gambling)
4. Ministry of Education

Table 1 shows the NP’s perception of the comparative significance of the primary funding bodies (both national and international) for GCE activities carried out by NGOs in their country. It is apparent that the NP perceives national entities to be the most significant investors, since no international organisations are listed as main funding bodies.

The NP further explains that the CISU foundation provides AR funding to member organisations and former grant holders through redistributing money from the Civil Society Fund [CSF] that is unused by CSF grant holders. According to the NP, applications to the foundation can be made once yearly for up to approximately 3400 euros per organisation; the committee bases their funding decisions on “the organisation and possible cooperation, target groups, context, relevance and new thoughts, value for money, and learning, gathering of experience and knowledge sharing.”

4. PUBLIC FUNDING FOR GCE

Having been asked to consider the most significant sources of public funding for GCE in their country, the NP chose to contact the MFA, commonly known as Danida. Accordingly, the questionnaire was completed by a representative within this institution. Although the response was limited, some information was also provided by the NP.

Funding trends

Fig. 1. Government Institution's GCE Funding, 2011-15




Figure 1 shows Danida's GCE project funding between 2011 and 2015, and indicates that there was an overall increase in their investment in GCE-related activities during the period considered in the present study, due to a climb in 2015. The 2015 GENE report highlights that the country was provided with 0.13 million euros in the context of EYD2015 (Hartmeyer and Wegimont, The State of Global Education in Europe 2015).

According to the NP, Danida's spending on "information to the Danes about the development activities the CSOs implement" [sic] currently represents 2% of the department's total budget, although the NP had previously negotiated this up to a peak of 3%. According to the GENE report, Danida funding is sourced from National Budget, including a separate budget line for its information activities that totalled 6.5 million euros in 2015 (ibid.). Going forward, it should be highlighted that the information activities budget was targeted for a planned reduction to approximately 2.6 million euros in 2016 (ibid.).

5. FUNDING PATTERNS

5.1. Types of funding activities

The government institution summarises that it provides funding for the following types of GCE activities, predominantly through the Danida Information Grant; AR, networking, educational resource development, teacher training, informal education activities, and media promotion. It considers that these activities are similarly prioritised regarding the level of investment received. According to Danida, funding for GCE in formal

education is a lesser priority for the institution since the MoE and municipalities are responsible for this. The GENE report outlines that the majority of Danida's GCE funding supports educational materials (Hartmeyer and Wegimont, The State of Global Education in Europe 2015).

Regarding specific programmes, in addition to its financial support for NGOs and other stakeholders developing teaching materials for GCE, the government institution refers to its collaboration with NGOs on the aforementioned "Christmas-Calendar" project as further example of its investment in producing educational resources. As mentioned by the NP, the government institution further explains that Danida Information Grant funded a 2014-2016 teaching programme coordinated by Funen Teaching College which aimed to "raise awareness to future teachers about developing countries." According to Danida, the Grant also supports an annual media competition for primary school students to produce newspapers "about a specific subject related to developing countries" [sic]; this is organised in conjunction with media organisations Jyllands-Posten, Ekstra-Bladet and Politiken.

5.2. Funding recipients

During the period between 2011 and 2017, the government institution perceives NGOs and "NGO-umbrella organisations" to be its most significant recipients of GCE funding, provided through the Danida Information Grant, other Danida Grants, as well as a separate line within the National Budget in the case of some organisations.

5.3. Funding procedure

The present study was provided with limited information regarding the government institution's procedure for deciding recipients of GCE funding. According to the government institution, there are between 150 and 200 applications for the Danida Information Grant received across three separate calls per year.

6. POLICY CONTEXT FOR INVESTMENT

Regarding relevant policy documents for GCE investment at a national-level developed between 2011 and 2015, Danida cites the 2012 Law on International Development Cooperation as significant since it pertains to the engagement of the public in "development issues," and the "integration of developing countries and international development issues in the schools and the higher education literature." However, the law does not specifically refer to "global education" or similar.

Danida further cites its 2012 communication strategy for "development cooperation activities" to support the institution's "planning and prioritisation of communication activities."

Significantly, the institution refers to the reduction of the Danida Information Grant budget in 2015 in the context of the formation of the new government. Danida outlines that this resulted in the cancellation of some GCE-related activities that had already been planned, citing a 2013-2015 initiative of International Advisors to enhance and improve "the global perspective in the education" and to offer advice on the implementation of the new primary school reform.

The 2015 GENE report cites the effect of the recent reform of primary and lower secondary school systems on GCE in

Denmark. In particular, the report highlights the introduction of “The Open School” programme to encourage partnerships between schools and external organisations and associations, thereby providing GCE-related CSOs with a government-supported channel for dialogue with schools (Hartmeyer and Wegimont, *The State of Global Education in Europe* 2015). Moreover, under this reform, the “common objectives [...] included strong elements of global citizenship education,” and MoE international advisors advised schools on the integration of GCE into teaching (ibid.).

Another relevant factor to note is the five-year cooperation project between Danida and the MoE since 2014 “to promote GE in the Danish primary schools” (ibid.); in 2015, it was planned that this programme also be implemented in upper secondary education. However the five-year cooperation between Danida and the MoE was cancelled due to the formation of a new government after one and half years.

At the international-level, during the same period, the NP perceives the SDGs to have positively impacted decisions regarding GCE activities and funding in their country, stating that they “created a platform representing a huge opportunity to engage the public and the private sector for a common purpose.” This is in line with the conclusions of the 2015 GENE report that the MDGs represented “the basis for most of the Danish Development Assistance which is implemented through sector programmes in the respective priority countries and the project work of the civil society organisations (CSOs) in their cooperation with the least developed countries” (Hartmeyer and Wegimont, *The State of Global Education in Europe* 2015).

7. NGOS INVOLVEMENT IN GCE RELATED POLICY PROCESSES

Analysis of the NP’s questionnaire responses indicates a low level of NGO involvement in all stages of the GCE policy process, from agenda setting to policy formulation, implementation, and evaluation. According to the NP, it does not have any influence over GCE-specific policy decisions, although it does refer to limited influence over “the overall financing structures of CSOs by Danida,” which includes negotiation regarding the budget dedicated to CSOs for AR development activities.¹

¹ CSOs do not have any influence over the Danida Information Grant

8. NGO CAPACITY

Regarding Denmark’s civic society situation and environment, although NGOs have been historically strong, there was also conflict during the twentieth century between the mandates and financial requirements of associations on the one hand, and of the welfare state on the other (GHK 2010). Since the 1980s, NGOs and voluntary organisations have gained greater legitimacy and support from the public sector (GHK 2010).

The NP was established in 2014 when Concord Danmark with 48 members and NGO Forum with 63 members were merged. Data regarding its members indicates an increase from 62 members in 2014 to 84 members in 2017. The NP identifies these member organisations as “CSOs working with development assistance.”

8.1. Platform activity and influence

The NP has a separate working group dealing with GCE, “the workgroup for international dimension in education.” It should be noted, that the NP explains that the group initially existed outside the platform and, although it did receive funding for one year, it now “exists informally without funding.” The NP considers AR, education, and policy work to be the main focus of this group. It also mentions its significant work in the coordination of the aforementioned WBN. It further cites its roles in national networking, and advocacy and lobbying. Developing international networks is considered a lesser priority for this group.

8.2. Strategy building

The NP did not provide any information or identify relevant recommendation documents regarding their organisation’s involvement in GCE strategy building.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

GHK. 2010. “Study on Volunteering in the European Union.” *EU Citizenship Portal*. Accessed January 15, 2018. http://ec.europa.eu/citizenship/about-the-europe-for-citizens-programme/studies/index_en.htm.

Hartmeyer, Helmuth, and Liam Wegimont. 2015. *The State of Global Education in Europe*. Dublin: Global Education Network Europe, European Union.

Krause, Johannes. 2010. “European Development. Education Monitoring Report: “DE Watch”.” *GENE (Global Education Network Europe)*. January-May. Accessed January 5, 2018. gene.eu/wp-content/uploads/Gene_OtherPublications-DEWatchReport.pdf.

MFA Denmark. 2018. *UDENRIGSMINISTERIET: Støttede projekter*. Accessed January 23, 2018. <http://um.dk/da/danida/oplysning/oplysningsbevilling/stoettede-projekter/>.

World’s Best News. 2018. “About World’s Best News.” *World’s Best New*. Accessed January 20, 2018. <https://worldsbestnews.org/about/>.



1. TERMINOLOGY AND DEFINITIONS USED

1.1. Terms

Information and responses provided by the national platform and the government institution in Estonia indicate that the term Global Education is widely employed to refer to what the present study considers GCE, although the NP explains that GCE has been used in the context of their DEAR working group. The predominant use of GE is in line with the conclusions of the GENE Peer review report (Krause, European Development. Education Monitoring Report: “DE Watch” 2010, 45).

1.2. Definitions

A definition given as part of a statement regarding MFA support for a GE schools project refers to GE as “a learning process founded on values of solidarity, equality, inclusion and co-operation” and indicates a global educative approach to GCE (MFA Spokesperson’s Office 2011). The NP provide this same definition. Moreover, according to the recent GENE report, relevant parties, particularly NGOs, associate work in Education for Sustainable Development (ESD) with GE (Hartmeyer and Wegimont 2015, 37).

2. WAYS OF DELIVERING GCE

When asked about GCE delivery in formal education between 2011 and 2017, the NP refers to MoE-led incorporation into the curriculum in relevant subjects and within elective programs. Moreover, the NP cites two initiatives developed by MTÜ Mondo, a leading GE NGO in Estonia; “in-service teacher training courses” and “Maailmakool,” a teacher-student web portal.

Regarding GCE delivery through non-formal education in the same period, the NP references several programs and the various responsible organisations; youth training courses (the Archimedes Foundation), visitor lectures in schools (AKÜ – the Estonian NP), Green Tea Evenings (Estonian Green Movement), Climate “breakfast seminars” (Peipsi CTC), and Maailmakool movie clubs (Mondo).

Examples of informal educational activities and their stakeholders given by the NP are as follows; televised thematic movie months (AKÜ/Mondo/Estonian Public Broadcasting), photo exhibitions (AKÜ), annual special newspaper (AKÜ), and social media campaigns such as #hoolin (Tallinn Music Week/ Mondo/Telia).

3. DIFFERENT STAKEHOLDERS INVOLVED IN GCE

From the perspective of the NP, the main entities involved in GCE delivery and support within the government are the MFA and Ministry of Education and Science, who are described as having a high-level of influence due their resources in policy control, knowledge, funding (MFA only), and access to schools (MoES only). The Archimedes Foundation is perceived as a mid-

level influence, with access to funding, the youth community and international networks.

Concerning international organisations, the NP cites UNESCO as having high-level impact, with vital resources in policy, AR, expertise and access to national and international networks.

Within the NGO sector, the NP lists Mondo as one of the most significant stakeholders, with high-level influence due to access to national and international networks, a developed system and knowledge, and “PR power”. The Estonian Refugee Council is also described as having high-level influence, with resources in knowledge and national and international networks. Similar same resources are said to be accessed from the following organisations with mid to low-level impact; Estonian Centre for Human Rights, ERL, Peipsi CTC, Estonian People To People, Humana Estonia and Ethical Links. AKÜ as a national platform with the ability to access national and international networks is also perceived to have mid-level effect, as does the Estonian Institute of Human Rights regarding policy.

The universities of Tallin and Tartu are listed by the NP as high and mid-level influences respectively, in the field of primary education and research institutions, and are described as impacting GCE delivery through teacher training and impacting values. The low-level impact of Tallin University of Technology, due to its GCE-integrated curriculum, is also mentioned.

The NP considers Estonian Public Broadcasting and as a mid-level effectual body within the media, given the “power of words and pictures”.

Comparative significance of funding bodies

Table 1.

Organisations funding NGO’s GCE activities in order of perceived significance of investment, 2011-17

1. European Commission
2. Ministry of Foreign Affairs
3. Ministry of Education and Science
4. Ministry of Environment
5. EEA grants


Table 1 shows the NP’s perception of the comparative significance of the primary funding bodies (both national and international) for GCE activities carried out by NGOs in their country. Whilst the NP perceives an international (European) organisation to be the most significant investor, this also indicates that national ministries are perceived as supporting NGOs in their GCE-related activities. As well as these five chief investors, the NP lists two further international organisations as significant providers of funding; the Nordic Council and the Anna Lindh Foundation.

4. PUBLIC FUNDING FOR GCE

Having been asked to consider the most significant sources of public funding for GCE in their country, the NP chose to contact the MFA as the relevant government body. Although limited response was received from the ministry, some relevant information was provided.

Funding trends

Fig. 1. Government Institution's Funding for "information and global education", 2011-15



Sources: (Paet 2015a) (Paet 2015b) (Paet 2015c) (Paet 2015d) (Paet 2015e)

Figure 1 is based on MFA reports of yearly funding, and indicates that there was an overall increase in their investment in GCE funding during the period considered in the present study. Existing data suggests that there has been an increase in comparison to 2009 funding (reported at 0.16 mil €), but a decrease compared with 2008 (reported at 0.94 mil €), following which there were significant financial cuts (Krause, European Development. Education Monitoring Report: "DE Watch" 2010, 45).

5. FUNDING PATTERNS

5.1. Types of funding activities

The key GCE activities receiving public investment include teacher and youth worker training, AR and educational materials (multimedia, printed and online), and diverse public events and campaigns; specifically cited as an example is "Maailmapäev" [World Day], an AR event for "development co-operation and global issues" (Mondo 2018). Support was also provided for Global South volunteers and the World Education Center (Paet 2015c). According to the MFA website, in 2011, the NGO "Humana" received 19.608€ for a program aiming to expand "global and development education," working with pre-schoolers, school and university students, and professors (MFA Spokesperson's Office 2011).

5.2. Funding recipients

According to the NP itself, AKÜ and its member organisations were beneficiaries of MFA investment between 2011 and 2017. Data published online further indicates that the aforementioned NGOs Mondo and Humana have received MFA funding for several GCE-related AR and educational initiatives during the period between 2011, 2012 and 2017 (AKT 2017).

5.3. Funding procedure

Very limited relevant information provided regarding regulations for deciding recipients of GCE funding. The government institution's perspective mentions involvement of NGOs in "developing and adjusting" funding procedures.

6. POLICY CONTEXT FOR INVESTMENT

Limited relevant information provided regarding the policy context for GCE investment at a national-level between 2011 and 2015. According to the NP, the MFA was unconvinced about a "national GE strategy" thus AKU independently formulated a Global Education Paper, a recommendation document aimed at "civil society, ministries and other stakeholders". Going forward, the "Strategy for Estonian Development Cooperation and Humanitarian Aid" is the primary DE-strategy recommendation document for the period between 2016 and 2020; this was developed by the MFA, in collaboration with CSOs and other ministries (Hartmeyer and Wegimont 2015).

7. NGOS INVOLVEMENT IN GCE RELATED POLICY PROCESSES

Responses received indicate a strong level of NGO involvement in GCE policy processes. The governmental perception is summarised as the participation of NGOs in discussions regarding "general development policies". From both viewpoints, there is a high level of involvement in policy implementation; the nature of this involvement is not specified. According to the NP, NGOs also play a role in agenda setting and policy formulation, referring to their participation in relevant consultations and the above-discussed Global Education Paper. The NP further explains a low involvement in policy evaluation, through independently collecting feedback from NP members regarding funding procedures. The DE Watch Report (Krause, European Development. Education Monitoring Report: "DE Watch" 2010, 45) further cites the MFA's close association with the NP.

8. NGO CAPACITY

Regarding Estonia's civic society situation and environment, the North-South Centre report concludes that AKÜ has been a significant stakeholder in the advancement of GCE in recent years (North-South Centre and Eesti People to People 2016, 2). The 2010 DE Watch report finds that the support from the EC is a chief factor in NGOs increasing involvement in GCE (Krause, European Development. Education Monitoring Report: "DE Watch" 2010, 45).

The NP was formally established in 2007. Data received by the NP regarding its members indicates an increase from 21 to 33

between 2011 and 2017, and that the member organisations are primarily NGOs and foundations.

8.1. Platform activity and influence

The NP has a separate working group dealing with GCE. The NP considers advocacy and lobbying to be the primary focus of this group. It further cites its roles in policy development and developing and supporting national partnerships. GCE-related educational and AR activities are not perceived as priorities for this working group.

8.2. Strategy building

Regarding their organisation's involvement in GCE strategy building, the NP explains that relevant recommendation documents were indeed developed between 2011 and 2015, but that due to organisational changes these documents are unable to be identified. The organisation mentions instead several GCE recommendations and commentaries addressed to the MFA and MoE in 2017.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- AKT. 2017. "Estonian Development Co-operation Database: Estonia." *Estonian Development Co-operation Database*. Accessed January 6, 2018. <https://rakendused.vm.ee/akta/andmed.php?country=EST>.
- Hartmeyer, Helmuth, and Liam Wegimont. 2015. *The State of Global Education in Europe*. Global Education Network Europe, European Union.
- Krause, Johannes. 2010. "European Development. Education Monitoring Report: "DE Watch". " *GENE (Global Education Network Europe)*. January-May. gene.eu/wp-content/uploads/Gene_OtherPublications-DEWatchReport.pdf.
- MFA Spokesperson's Office. 2011. "Foreign Ministry Supports Global Education in Estonian Schools." *Republic of Estonia: Ministry of Foreign Affairs*. June 12. Accessed January 5, 2018. <http://vm.ee/en/news/foreign-ministry-supports-global-education-estonian-schools>.
- Mondo. 2018. "Maailmapäev Eestis." *maailmakool*. Accessed January 5, 2018. <http://www.maailmakool.ee/tahtpaevad/maailmapaev-eestis/>.
- North-South Centre and Eesti People to People. 2016. *Baltic Regional Seminar on Global Development Education. Concept Paper*, Tallinn: European Commission; North-South Centre.
- Paet, Urmas. 2015a. "Eesti arengukoostöö ja humanitaarabi arengukava 2011-2015" täitmise 2011. aasta aruanne. Accessed January 5, 2018. https://www.riigikantselei.ee/valitsus/valitsus/et/valitsus/arengukavad/valisministeerium/Arengukoost%C3%B6%C3%B6%20arengukava_2011%20aruanne.pdf.
- . 2015b. "Eesti arengukoostöö ja humanitaarabi arengukava 2011-2015" täitmise 2012. aasta aruanne. Accessed January 5, 2018. https://www.valitsus.ee/sites/default/files/content-editors/arengukavad/arengukoostoo_arengukava_aruanne_2012.pdf.
- . 2015c. 2013. aasta "Eesti arengukoostöö ja humanitaarabi arengukava 2011-2015" täitmise aruanne. Accessed January 5, 2018. http://vm.ee/sites/default/files/content-editors/Taitmise_aruanne_2013_parandatud.pdf.
- . 2015d. 2014. aasta "Eesti arengukoostöö ja humanitaarabi arengukava 2011-2015" täitmise aruanne. Accessed January 5, 2018. https://www.valitsus.ee/sites/default/files/content-editors/arengukavad/arengukoostoo_taitmise_aruanne_2014.pdf.
- Paet, Urmas. 2015e. 2015. aasta "Eesti arengukoostöö ja humanitaarabi arengukava 2011-2015" täitmise aruanne. MFA.



1. TERMINOLOGY AND DEFINITIONS USED

1.1. Terms

Questionnaire respondents representing the national platform in Finland assert that there is not yet an agreed upon term to refer to GCE amongst involved parties, but that events involving “NGOs, ministries and other stakeholders” have been coordinated to deliberate the most appropriate term. The DE Watch Report finds that the term “Global Education” is most commonly used (Krause, European Development. Education Monitoring Report: “DE Watch” 2010, 46). This term is used in the (2014) National Core Curriculum and the Finnish National Agency for Education [FNAE] website (Finnish National Agency for Education 2018)

1.2. Definitions

Since they offer no commonly-used term, respondents to the present study do not outline a definition of GCE or similar. Existing research summarises that “GE” in Finland is understood to not only cover DE, but also “Peace Education, Human Rights Education, Intercultural Education, active citizenship” (Krause, European Development. Education Monitoring Report: “DE Watch” 2010, 46). According to the abovementioned (2014) NCC, “Global education contributes to creating preconditions for fair and sustainable development in line with UN development goals” (cited by (Finnish National Agency for Education 2018)).

2. WAYS OF DELIVERING GCE

When asked about GCE delivery in formal education between 2011 and 2017, the NP refers to the integration of GCE into the new (2016) national curriculum, citing both the FNAE and, to a lesser degree, NGOs as primary stakeholders in this. The “Schools as Development Partners” project (2013-2015), which paired schools in Finland with those in the Global South, was developed by the FNAE, MFA, schools’ network and relevant experts (Finnish National Agency for Education 2018).

The NP mentions that NGOs to work on GCE delivery through informal education, using the MFA as their primary source of investment, however they give no specific details about developed activities.

It is further highlighted that the NP, in conjunction with NGOs, has formally petitioned the Ministry of Education [MfE] for support in developing a “national sustainable development education plan”.

3. DIFFERENT STAKEHOLDERS INVOLVED IN GCE

It should be noted that, across all types of organisations, the NP does not perceive any one entity to have a high-level of influence on GCE activities in Finland. From the perspective of the NP, the main governmental entities involved in GCE delivery and support are the MfE, the MFA, and the FNAE (sub-department of the MfE); respectively, their contributions are summarised as international networking, funding, and directing national priorities.

Regarding international organisation, the NP cites the mid-level impact of UNESCO, and the low-level influence of European Commission as a funding body.

Within the NGO sector, the NP lists numerous NGOs as the most significant stakeholders, along with the NP itself (Kehys). The NP explains their main resource is continued lobbying for inter-organisational dialogue and DE (for example, for the National DE plan), as mentioned in Section 2. ,

In terms of mediatic factors, it is difficult to name any specific media in Finland that concentrates on GCE, but for example Maailma.net (the OneWorld network) can be mentioned as one such media outlet that writes about GCE in Finland.

Comparative significance of funding bodies

Table 1.

Organisations funding NGO’s GCE activities in order of perceived significance of investment, 2011-17

1. Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland
2. Ministry for Education
3. European Commission
4. RAY (Finland’s Slot Machine Association)


Table 1 shows the NP’s perception of the comparative significance of the primary funding bodies (both national and international) for GCE activities carried out by NGOs in their country. It is apparent that the NP perceives the two relevant national ministries to be the most significant investors, and lists just one international (European) organisation as a chief funding body. Specifically, CSOs were provided with investment from the EC’s DEAR call.

4. PUBLIC FUNDING FOR GCE

Having been asked to consider the most significant sources of public funding for GCE in their country, the NP referred to the MFA and the funding data was collected from their website. Although there were limitations on the collected data, some relevant information was provided regarding MFA and MfE investment.

Funding trends

Fig. 1. Government Institution's GCE Funding, 2011-15



Data supplied by the government institution shows that there was an overall increase in their investment in GCE during the period considered in the present study, despite decreasing since its peak in 2013. It should be noted that the exact amount of investment in 2011 and 2012 was unknown but described as “about two million euros”. Existing data suggests that there has been an increase since 2008 and 2009 when the MFA’s DE-specific budget was 2 million euros (Krause 2010, p.46).

A yearly grant is offered by the MFA to CSOs for “development communication” and GE-related activities, the NP considers this to be the main public funding for GCE in Finland. According to the NP, in 2015, there were significant cuts to the “development cooperation” budget and, consequently, to the afore-mentioned grant.

Whilst there is apparently no specific provision for GCE by the MfE, support is offered which may cover aspects related to GCE; for example, approximately 550.000 € in FNAE support to education providers and 5.5 million € in educational support for the integration of asylum seekers and immigrants. However, investment by the MfE in GCE activities is difficult to breakdown.

5. FUNDING PATTERNS

5.1. Types of funding activities

Supported activities, as listed on the official MFA website can be summarised as followed; development of GE/AR materials, educational activities such as “school visits or organisation of training,” and implementation, pay, and administrative expenses for projects and events, including visits from guests from the Global South (Unit for Civil Society, MFA Finland 2017).

5.2. Funding recipients

No relevant information provided for the period between 2011 and 2017.

5.3. Funding procedure

Although no response to the present study was received from the government institution regarding the procedure for deciding recipients of GCE funding, a document outlining the general conditions for successful funding applications is available on the MFA’s official website. According to the institution, decisions regarding the allocation of funding are based upon four main criteria; content strength, target group and means, partnerships (collaborative projects are favoured), and cost-effective and well-proportioned implementation methods (Unit for Civil Society, MFA Finland 2017). It is unclear whether there are diverse stakeholders involved in decision-making.

6. POLICY CONTEXT FOR INVESTMENT

No relevant information regarding policies and programmes for GCE investment between 2011 and 2015 was provided from a governmental perspective.

7. NGOS INVOLVEMENT IN GCE RELATED POLICY PROCESSES

Analysis of the NP response indicates a medium level of NGO involvement in GCE policy processes. According to the NP, NGOs are highly involved in agenda setting to the extent that they “challenge key ministries to have a holistic strategy for GCE,” because of the incoordination of the MFA and MfE in this regard. The NP further considers this to be true in the case of policy formulation and implementation. NP comments that “NGO’s messages have been heard and the process is hopefully moving forward”. With regard to policy evaluation, GCE dimension has been taken into account in an evaluation by the MFA that focused on the NGOs activities in general. The NP expresses anticipation of improvement in all areas going forward.

8. NGO CAPACITY

Concerning Finland’s civic society situation and environment, a 2004 North-South report cites the central role played by NGOs in GE since the 1970s (North-South Centre 2004, 66). The NP’s recommendation document refers to Finland’s strong tradition in this regard but cites that the change of government in 2015 has caused concern with its implementation of cuts to sector and, more specifically, NGOs, without consultation (Jussi Kanner and Kehys 2015, 22).

(The NP was established in 2002. Data provided indicates that the number of members has fluctuated slightly, increasing slightly between 2011 and 2017 when there were 36 and 38 members respectively; the organisation size peaked in 2013 when there were 41 members. According to the NP, the member organisations are several global education networks and groupings in Finland based to certain type of education like global education, education for sustainable development, peace education, Human Rights education etc.).

8.1. Platform activity and influence

The NP has a separate working group dealing with GCE. The NP considers advocacy and lobbying, and developing both national and international networks, to be the main focuses of this group. It further cites its roles in AR and working on policy. Educational activities are perceived as a lesser priority, since they are delivered through members of the NP.

8.2. Strategy building

Regarding their organisation's involvement in GCE strategy building, the NP identifies one relevant recommendation document developed between 2011 and 2015, "On the Road to Sustainable Development". This programme is aimed at development practitioners and works towards five selected SDGs, which the NP perceives as a short-term (1-5 years) aim. In addition, NP refers to the significance of the publication "Education, Learning and the Transformation of Development" (edited by Skinner et. al) in their strategy building efforts.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Finnish National Agency for Education. 2018. "Learning in, about and for development partnerships." Finnish National Agency for Education. Accessed January 5, 2018. http://www.oph.fi/english/publications/2015/learning_in_about_and_for_development_partnerships.

Forsbacka, Nora. 2015. "Finland and the Social Contract of the SDGs." In *On the Road to Sustainable Development*, by Kehys, 21-23. Kehys; Beyond2015.

Jussi Kanner and Kehys. 2015. *On the Road to Sustainable Development*. Kehys; Beyond2015.

Krause, Johannes. 2010. "European Development. Education Monitoring Report: "DE Watch"." GENE (Global Education Network Europe). January-May. [gene.eu/wp-content/uploads/Gene_OtherPublications-DEWatchReport.pdf](http://www.gene.eu/wp-content/uploads/Gene_OtherPublications-DEWatchReport.pdf).

North-South Centre. 2004. *Global Education in Finland. National Report*, North-South Centre.

Unit for Civil Society, MFA Finland. 2017. "Support for civil society organisations' communications and global education projects." Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland. 16 11. Accessed January 7, 2018. <http://www.formin.fi/public/default.aspx?contentid=324661&nodeid=49330&contentlan=2&culture=en-US>.



1. TERMINOLOGY AND DEFINITIONS USED

1.1. Terms

The questionnaire respondent representing the national platform asserts that the term “Education for Citizenship and International Solidarity” [ECSI] is used by their institution to refer to GCE. This term was adopted in January 2015 (Hartmeyer and Wegimont, *The State of Global Education in Europe 2015*) and appears in the NP’s 2015 Guidelines (Educasol 2015); according to the NP, it was formulated by its members following a series of workshops. The present study did not receive responses from any governmental institution but, AFD (French Development Agency) reports use the terminology “education for development and international solidarity” (EAD-SI) (Miguel Sierra, Grega and Ameryckx 2012), as employed in the 2014 Law on Development and International Solidarity Policy (Légifrance 2014). According to the NP, governmental organisations are reluctant to change terminology due to the legislative adoption of EAD-SI although, it notes that recent institutional documents have referred to ECSI as carrying the same meaning as EAD-SI.

1.2. Definitions

The NP provides its definition as outlined in its 2015 Guidelines, according to which, ECSI is understood as “a social and political approach [...] based on a life-long educational process” (Educasol 2015). The approach to ECSI is outlined as GE with the aim of contributing to “a just, united and sustainable world” (ibid.). The 2015 GENE Peer Review highlights the focus on issues of youth, citizenship, migration and climate regarding GE in France (Hartmeyer and Wegimont, *The State of Global Education in Europe 2015*). According to an AFD study, the aim of EAD-SI is to enable people to understand issues of global development and their impact at the individual and local-level (Miguel Sierra, Grega and Ameryckx 2012).

2. WAYS OF DELIVERING GCE

When asked about GCE delivery between 2011 and 2017, the NP summarises the key programmes and initiatives in formal education as “ministerial circulars” and “Teacher’s Guides on the topic,” produced by SCEREN (the former network responsible for publishing in French national education).

Regarding GCE delivery through informal education in the same period, the NP refers broadly to the work of NGO networks to “promote” ECSI in schools and “build teaching modules.” In the non-formal educational sector, the NP cites “popular education” association initiatives in “social centers or collective projects.” More generally, the NP mentions GCE AR activities and campaigns, citing its GE Week, “Festisol,” as an example of this.

3. DIFFERENT STAKEHOLDERS INVOLVED IN GCE

From the perspective of the NP, the main governmental entities involved in GCE delivery and support are the AFD and MEAE (Ministry of European and Foreign Affairs) with their primary resources summarised as funding and policy power, respectively. The NP further explains that the MEAE used to bear responsibility for financial support for “GCE organisations,” until this was transferred to the AFD in 2009. It also refers to the low-level impact of the MoE who are involved in the implementation of ECSI in formal education.

The NP does not cite any international organisations as significant stakeholders in GCE delivery in its country.

Within the NGO sector, the NP lists its Educasol member organisations and Ritimo network members as the most significant stakeholders, with influence regarding funding, access networks and policy.

CANOPE, the publishing network for French education, and its predecessor, SCEREN, are listed by the NP as education and research institutions with low-level impact in GCE delivery in formal education.

Comparative significance of funding bodies

When asked about its perception of the comparative significance of the primary funding bodies (both national and international) for GCE activities carried out by NGOs in France, the NP lists Educasol and its members as the most significant investors, followed by Coordination SUD and its members. It should be highlighted that no national public or international bodies are listed as main funding bodies. However, further information provided by the NP refers to AFD funding for AR initiatives, including the aforementioned “Festisol” GE week.

4. PUBLIC FUNDING FOR GCE

The present study did not receive a response from any government institution regarding public funding for GCE in France, however some relevant information is summarised below.

5. FUNDING TRENDS

Information provided to the present study outlines that financial support for GCE increased from 2 million euros to 3.5 million euros between 2011 and 2014.

According to the AFD, “EAD-SI” projects received 6% (30.6 million euros) of the 510 million euros investment in CSOs through France’s 2013-2016 AFD-CSO partnership scheme (AFD 2018).

The GENE Peer Review states that AFD investment in NGO-led projects increased in 2015, amounting to a total of 8 million euros in 2015, including 4.46 million euros allocated to 8 “GE projects” (Hartmeyer and Wegimont, *The State of Global*

Education in Europe 2015). Moreover, in the context of the EYD2015, it refers to a call for proposals to allocate 0.23 million euros for “development and international cooperation”-related AR activities (Hartmeyer and Wegimont, *The State of Global Education in Europe 2015*).

Regarding funding trends prior to the relevant period, between 2001 and 2011, the MAEE/AFD budget for EAD-SI reduced from 0.07% to 0.02% as a proportion of the total public development budget, despite an overall increase in the public development budget during this period, according to an AFD report (Miguel Sierra, Grega and Ameryckx 2012).

6. FUNDING PATTERNS

The present study did not receive information regarding public funding patterns for GCE in France during the period between 2011 and 2015, but AFD data for the period between 2001 and 2011 is summarised below.

6.1. Types of funding activities

The AFD summarises the types of activities funded between 2001 and 2011, as working towards the professionalisation of stakeholders and improvement and experimentation regarding proposed actions and the network of different actors, including teacher training and AR activities and campaigns (Miguel Sierra, Grega and Ameryckx 2012).

6.2. Funding recipients

During the period between 2001 and 2011, the AFD perceives national, non-governmental platforms, organisations and networks to be its most significant recipients of GCE funding, further stating that the majority of funded initiatives were implemented by multiple NGOs, either collaborating in the context of the specific project in question or as part of a pre-existing network (Miguel Sierra, Grega and Ameryckx 2012). Specifically, the GENE Peer Review cites the following organisations as the most significant recipients of funding for NGO-led “GE projects in 2015”: International Solidarity Week, Etudiants & Développement, Educasol, Frères des Hommes, Peuples Solidaires, Gaïa Education Centre and Starting Block (Hartmeyer and Wegimont, *The State of Global Education in Europe 2015*).

6.3. Funding procedure

The present study did not receive any information regarding the procedure for deciding recipients of public GCE funding in France. According to the GENE Peer Review, the AFD issues an annual call for its co-financing of NGO-developed projects (including GE-related initiatives; going forward, the AFD has increased its maximum rate of co-financing for these projects from 50% to 60% due to a surfeit of applications received in response to the 2016 call for proposals (Hartmeyer and Wegimont, *The State of Global Education in Europe 2015*).

7. POLICY CONTEXT FOR INVESTMENT

Regarding the policy context for GCE investment at a national-level between 2011 and 2015, the present study was provided with limited information regarding policies and programmes significant to public GCE funding. The GENE Peer Review refers

to the 2013 establishment of a multi-stakeholder “National Board on Development and International Solidarity” [CNDSI], concluding that this exemplifies more recent governmental commitment DE (Hartmeyer and Wegimont, *The State of Global Education in Europe 2015*).

Regarding relevant contextual factors more generally, the Peer Review cites the impact of the 2015 terrorist attacks, which have resulted in renewed governmental interest in “questions about citizenship and youth,” positively influencing public action regarding GCE (*ibid.*). It also refers to the focus on migration, a high-profile societal issue in France, in many GE-related initiatives since 2015 (*ibid.*). In line with this, the AFD’s Draft Framework for Interdisciplinary Intervention 2018-2023 refers to the “crucial importance” of development education and citizen mobilisation in the context of “the rise of individualism, inward-looking attitudes and rejection of foreigners and migrants” (AFD 2018).

8. NGOS INVOLVEMENT IN GCE RELATED POLICY PROCESSES

According to the NP, there is no official NGO involvement in ESCI policy processes. Moreover, whilst the NP perceives an established NGO-government partnership as one of the most important factors affecting public funding for NGO-organised GCE activities, the 2010 DE Watch Report highlights the “weak” coordination between these parties (Krause, *European Development. Education Monitoring Report: “DE Watch” 2010*). On the other hand, the more recent GENE Peer Review considers the situation to have improved in this regard (Hartmeyer and Wegimont, *The State of Global Education in Europe 2015*). It further cites the AFD’s coordination of NGO “consultation workshops” in 2014, which covered topics including “the financing of GE and the structuring of the environment of associations” (*ibid.*).

Going forward, the AFD mentions the “CICID’s” (Inter-Ministerial Committee for International Cooperation and Development) 2016 decision to formulate an inter-ministerial roadmap for coordinating “EAD-SI” initiatives (AFD 2018). The NP highlights that since 2016, CICID has determined that the AFD’s Communication Department will be responsible for ESCI and that stakeholders met in October 2017 concerning this; according to the AFD, it will thus “develop its own EAD-SI action aimed at the public and young people in particular” in collaboration with other stakeholders (*ibid.*). The NP states that thus far, no details on any resulting budget or strategy changes have been released.

9. NGO CAPACITY

Regarding France’s civic society situation and environment, the non-profit sector and other NGOs are relatively underdeveloped in comparison to those in other European countries due to their historical suppression although, civil society has grown significantly since the 1980s and organisations now participate in many areas of public life (GHK 2010). It is relevant to note that President Hollande pledged to double public funding for NGOs during his 2012-2017 term (Hartmeyer and Wegimont, *The State of Global Education in Europe 2015*). According to the 2010 DE Watch Report, NGOs working in development

are the primary actors in GCE in France (Krause, European Development. Education Monitoring Report: “DE Watch” 2010). The AFD describes French CSOs as “key players in development education and citizen mobilization,” highlighting the need to support them in their “EAD-SI” work at both local and national levels (AFD 2018).

According to its official website, the NP currently has 24 member-organisations as well as 3 individual experts who are members (Educasol 2018). The member organisations are primarily NGOs.

9.1. Platform activity and influence

The NP has a separate working group dealing with GCE, coordinated in the context of the NP’s partnership with NGO platform “Coordination SUD.” The NP considers AR, international networking and policy work to be the focuses of this group. It further cites its roles in the development and provision of educational resources. Advocacy and lobbying and developing national networks are seen to be lesser priorities for this group.

9.2. Strategy building

Regarding their organisation’s involvement in GCE strategy building, the NP does not identify any relevant recommendation documents developed between 2011 and 2015.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

AFD. 2018. *Cadre d'Intervention Transversal 2018-2023; 09 Janvier 2018 (version provisoire). Draft Framework for Interdisciplinary Intervention [CIT], AFD.*

Educasol. 2018. «24 associations membres et 3 personnalités qualifiées .» Educasol. Accès le January 31, 2018. <http://www.educasol.org/-25-associations-membres-et-3-69->.

Educasol. 2015. *Charte d'Educasol. Official Guidelines, Educasol.*

Enabel. 2018. *Annoncer le couleur. January. Accès le December 29, 2017. http://www.annoncerlacouleur.be/qui-sommes-nous.*

European Union; Council of Europe. 2017. *South-East Europe and Mediterranean Regional Seminar on Global Development Education. Romania: European Union; Council of Europe.*

FPS Foreign Affairs, Foreign Trade and Development Cooperation. 2011. «Development Education: notions and concepts.» Kingdom of Belgium Foreign Affairs, Foreign Trade and Development Cooperation. April. Accès le January 5, 2018. https://diplomatie.belgium.be/sites/default/files/downloads/development_education.pdf.

GHK. 2010. «Study on Volunteering in the European Union.» EU Citizenship Portal. Accès le January 15, 2018. http://ec.europa.eu/citizenship/about-the-europe-for-citizens-programme/studies/index_en.htm.

Global Education Network Europe. 2017. *The European Global Education Peer Review Process: Global Education in Belgium. Global Education Network Europe.*

Hartmeyer, Helmuth, et Liam Wegimont. 2015. *The State of Global Education in Europe. Global Education Network Europe, European Union.*

Hartmeyer, Helmuth, et Liam Wegimont. 2015. *The State of Global Education in Europe. Dublin: Global Education Network Europe, European Union.*

Krause, Johannes. 2010. «European Development. Education Monitoring Report: “DE Watch”.» GENE (Global Education Network Europe). January-May. Accès le December 28, 2017. gene.eu/wp-content/uploads/Gene_OtherPublications-DEWatchReport.pdf.

—. 2010. «European Development. Education Monitoring Report: “DE Watch”.» GENE (Global Education Network Europe). January-May. Accès le January 7, 2018. gene.eu/wp-content/uploads/Gene_OtherPublications-DEWatchReport.pdf.

—. 2010. «European Development. Education Monitoring Report: “DE Watch”.» GENE (Global Education Network Europe). January-May. Accès le January 5, 2018. gene.eu/wp-content/uploads/Gene_OtherPublications-DEWatchReport.pdf.

Légifrance. 2014. «LOI n° 2014-773 du 7 juillet 2014 d'orientation et de programmation relative à la politique de développement et de solidarité internationale.» Legifrance.gouv.fr. 8 July. Accès le February 6, 2018. <https://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/affichTexte.do?cidTexte=JORFTEXT000029210384&categorieLien=id>.

Miguel Sierra, Adélie, Pierre Grega, et Isaline Ameryckx. 2012. *Cartographie de l'Education au Développement et à la Solidarité Internationale. Etude des projets cofinancés entre 2001 et 2011, Walhain: Agence Française de Développement; Ministère des Affaires étrangères; DRIS sprl.*

Ministre de la Coopération au développement. 2012. «Note de stratégie Education au développement.» SPF Affaires étrangères, Commerce extérieur et Coopération au développement. Accès le January 5, 2018. https://diplomatie.belgium.be/sites/default/files/downloads/note_strategie_education_au_developpement.pdf.

GERMANY



1. TERMINOLOGY AND DEFINITIONS USED

1.1. Terms

Respondents representing the national platform and the government institution in Germany both assert that the term “Global Learning” [GL] is used by their respective institutions to refer to GCE. The NP further describes that it employs the terms “Education for Sustainable Development” [ESD] and GCE.

1.2. Definitions

Neither entity provides a definition; according to the NP, an official definition is currently being developed by its working group.

2. WAYS OF DELIVERING GCE

When asked about GCE delivery in formal education between 2011 and 2017, the NP cites the “World Action Programme” as the key initiative on “ESD,” the development of which is led by the Ministry of Education and Science [MoES].

The NP gives no details regarding GCE delivery through informal education in the same period.



Public Dinner next to a supermarket in Cologne, Germany to raise awareness for sustainable production and consumption of groceries

3. DIFFERENT STAKEHOLDERS INVOLVED IN GCE

From the perspective of the NP, the main governmental entity involved in GCE delivery and support is the Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development [MECD], whose primary resources are summarised as funding and policy power. The NP also perceives the MoES to have mid-level influence due to its policy and funding influence.

Although neither the NP or government institution refer to this in their responses to the present study, it should be noted that “InWEnt,” which the 2010 DE Watch Report cites as the “implementation agency involved in DE” (Krause, European

Development. Education Monitoring Report: “DE Watch” 2010, 49), was “merged with the German Development Service (DED) and the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ) to become the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ)” in 2011, according to the official MECD website (Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit 2018).

According to their responses, the NP does not consider any international organisation as significant stakeholders in GCE delivery in their country.

Within the NGO sector, the NP lists itself as the most significant influence, with its primary resources in both policy power and international networks.


The NP gave very limited information regarding its perception of investment in NGO GCE activities and the organisations providing funding, but explains that the MECD and national agency “Engagement Global” [EG] are the key stakeholders for funding NGO activities in GL. According to their official website, EG is a government-commissioned non-profit institution funded by the MECD (Engagement Global 2018).

4. PUBLIC FUNDING FOR GCE

Having been asked to consider the most significant sources of public funding for GCE in their country, the government institution that the NP chose to contact was the MECD. Although the MECD did not respond to the questionnaire that formed part of the present study, a representative did provide limited information regarding their funding for GCE activities.

Funding trends

Fig. 1. Government Institution’s GCE Funding, 2011-15



The data supplied by the government institution shows that there was a steady increase in their investment in GCE funding during the period considered in the present study. According to the institution, funding is sourced from the national budget. Regarding development following 2015, the data given shows that there was an increase in investment into GCE during 2016, when funding amounted to 3.5 million euros, but that funding rates plateaued in 2017, remaining at 3.5 million euros.

5. FUNDING PATTERNS

The government institution provided very limited information regarding its funding patterns for GCE. The present study did not receive a response regarding either the recipients of funding or the procedure for deciding them.

Concerning the types of activities provided with funding, the government institution refers to investment in CSO-coordinated GL AR projects and campaigns. Although no specific examples are cited, the MECD briefly summarises the content of these activities as concerning “fair trade; flight and migration; SDGs; understanding globalization and its effects; Africa”.

Information regarding GL on the official MECD website refers to the following education programmes for which EG is responsible; the “All for One World – One World for All” school competition, the “ENSA school exchange programme” and chatroom “Chat der Welten” which both enable German schools and students to interact with those in Global South countries, and “The Gesellschaft der Europäischen Akademien” initiative connecting schools with development experts. The website further cites GL’s development of teaching materials in both primary and secondary schools (Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development 2018).

6. POLICY CONTEXT FOR INVESTMENT

The government institution did not provide specific information regarding the policy context for GCE investment in Germany between 2011 and 2015, but did highlight that with the change of government in 2014, issues of development funding have been more prominent in German politics.

7. NGOS INVOLVEMENT IN GCE RELATED POLICY PROCESSES

Both organisations gave very limited details regarding NGO involvement in GCE policy processes. The government organisation did highlight the “countrywide negative reaction of CSO on the decrease of funding for global learning and DEAR in 2013” [sic]. According to the government institution, this reaction led to discussions regarding GL issues entering the German parliament. It also referred to the “increased importance of CSOs” due to the MECD’s financing of the One World programme.

8. NGOS CAPACITY

Concerning Germany’s civic society situation and environment, analysis from 2017 refers to the country’s strong tradition in this regard in general, emphasising the productive relationship between NGOs/CSOs and the state (EU-Russia Civil Society Forum 2017, 41). The 2015 GENE report confirms that this positive situation has been replicated within the GCE sector in recent years (Hartmeyer and Wegimont 2015, 52). The NP was established in 1995. Data regarding its members indicates an increase from 120 to 128 between 2011 and 2017. According to the NP, the member organisations are primarily NGOs.

8.1. Platform activity and influence

The NP has a separate working group dealing with GCE. The NP considers advocacy and lobbying, “quality [criteria] development for educators,” and policy development to be the main focuses of this group. It further cites its roles in education and development national networks. AR and international networking are considered less significant priorities for this group.

8.2. Strategy building

Regarding their organisation’s involvement in GCE strategy building, the NP identifies a number of relevant recommendation documents developed between 2011 and 2015, including several aimed primarily at NGOs; the “Strategy for DE” (2012) discussion paper, and the “Global Learning” Yearbooks (2012; 2014) concerning national “GE debates”. The NP further cites the “Global learning as education for sustainable development” discussion paper (2014) considering progress regarding the MDGs, aimed at both policy makers and NGOs.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit. 2018. “Individual players (selection): InWEnt.” Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development. Accessed January 12, 2018. https://www.bmz.de/en/ministry/approaches/bilateral_development_cooperation/players/selection/inwent/index.html.

Engagement Global. 2018. “About us.” Engagement Global. Accessed January 10, 2018. <https://www.engagement-global.de/about-us.html>.

EU-Russia Civil Society Forum. 2017. 2016 Report on the State of Civil Society in the EU and Russia. EU-Russia Civil Society Forum.

Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development. 2018. “Information and education work: Global learning at school.” Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development. Accessed January 12, 2018. https://www.bmz.de/en/ministry/approaches/inlandsarbeit/globales_lernen/index.html.

Hartmeyer, Helmuth, and Liam Wegimont. 2015. *The State of Global Education in Europe*. Global Education Network Europe, European Union.

Krause, Johannes. 2010. “European Development. Education Monitoring Report: “DE Watch”.” GENE (Global Education Network Europe). January-May. gene.eu/wp-content/uploads/Gene_OtherPublications-DEWatchReport.pdf.



1. TERMINOLOGY AND DEFINITIONS USED

1.1. Terms

The questionnaire respondent representing the national platform asserts that the terms “Global Citizenship Education” [GCE] and “Development Education” [DE] are used by their institution to refer to GCE. The present study did not receive a response from any government institution.

1.2. Definitions

According to definition provided by the NP, GCE/DE is understood as a “learning process that puts human rights at the centre.” The approach to GCE/DE is outlined as GE with the aim of educating citizens about “global issues” concerning the environment, gender inequality, and the economy.

2. WAYS OF DELIVERING GCE

When asked about GCE delivery in formal education between 2011 and 2017, whilst the NP does not offer specific examples of initiatives, it refers to the integration of “some material related to DE” into the curriculum, and explains that the MoE has approved the introduction of “some” NGO-led programmes in schools. It further cites Action Aid, Fair Trade Hellas, and WWF Hellas as examples of NGOs involved in these projects.

Regarding GCE delivery through non-formal education in the same period, the NP refers to NGO-led GCE activities and campaigns aimed at both adults and young people.

3. DIFFERENT STAKEHOLDERS INVOLVED IN GCE

From the perspective of the NP, the main governmental entity involved in GCE delivery and support is the MoE (high-level influence) and the MFA’s Aid Agency (mid-level influence), due to their resources in policy.

Regarding international organisations, the NP mentions the EU as impacting GCE activities in Greece through the provision of funding.

Within the NGO sector, the NP lists Action Aid Hellas, WWF Hellas, Fair Trade Hellas and Organization Earth as the most significant stakeholders, due to their “competence,” funding (Action Aid only), and networking (Fair Trade only) resources. It further refers to the “commitment” shown by One Earth, though it considers this organisation to have limited impact.

The NP perceives the University of Peloponnese as a “reliable” stakeholder amongst education and research entities with medium level influence on GCE delivery in its country.

Comparative significance of funding bodies

When asked about its perception of the comparative significance of the primary funding bodies (both national and international) for GCE activities carried out by NGOs in their country, the NP recognises the EU as the only (and, therefore,

the most significant) investor. It further emphasises that there is no national public funding provided.

It should also be noted that when referring to the aforementioned NGO-led GCE activities in the non-formal education sector, the NP also mentions the support of private donors or foundations, specifically citing the Stavros Niarchos Foundation.

4. PUBLIC FUNDING FOR GCE

The present study did not receive responses from government institutions regarding public funding for GCE in Greece. However, the NP highlights that GCE has not received any such support since public spending cuts following the 2008 financial crisis. In fact, according to the NP, the state still owes CSOs money for projects implemented prior to 2008. Until this time, the organisation further details that activities receiving funding mainly consisted of AR and informational initiatives.

Despite the above, concerning government investment in GCE during the period considered in the present study, the NP refers the collaboration of the MoE and MFA regarding EYD2015 and mentions an internally-managed budget. Nevertheless, although the NP describes that the initial proposal for EYD2015 activities was “shaped in common among the Ministries with the support and advice the Hellenic Platform for Development,” it emphasises that neither government institution financially supported CSOs for its implementation.

5. FUNDING PATTERNS

Please refer to Section 4.

6. POLICY CONTEXT FOR INVESTMENT

Regarding the policy context for GCE investment at a national-level between 2011 and 2015, the NP highlights the government’s “lack of strategic approach.” It cites the limited political impact of CSOs in encouraging the MoE to integrate GCE into the national curriculum. More recently, the NP notes that, since 2016, the MoE is “in contact and following with more commitment the works of GENE” [sic].

Regarding other relevant contextual factors, the NP also perceives the 2008 financial crisis to have had a negative effect on GCE investment in their country; as mentioned in Section 5, GCE has not received funding since the budget cuts implemented at this time.

7. NGOS INVOLVEMENT IN GCE RELATED POLICY PROCESSES

The NP’s questionnaire responses indicate a low level of NGO involvement in all stages of GCE policy processes, from agenda setting to policy formulation, implementation, and evaluation. The NP further explains that “National Public Authorities do not



Source: www.pixabay.com

cooperate with CSOs in Greece.” This is in line with existing research which highlights the limited government support for NGOs in Greece (Krause, European Development. Education Monitoring Report: “DE Watch” 2010, 50).

8. NGO CAPACITY

Regarding Greece’s civic society situation and environment, Europa highlights the weak government support for NGOs, and outlines how citizens have traditionally relied on family rather than community-based organisations for support (GHK 2010). The NP provides limited information regarding its organisation. According to the NP, it was made up of 7 active members in 2010, increasing to 14 members following Greece’s 2014 term of Presidency of the Council of the EU.

8.1. Platform activity and influence

The NP has a separate working group dealing with GCE. The NP considers education, AR, and developing national networks to be the main focus of this group. It further cites its role in advocacy and lobbying. International networking and policy work are considered lesser priorities for this group.

8.2. Strategy building

Regarding their organisation’s involvement in GCE strategy building between 2011 and 2015, the NP identifies its 2014 “Development and Democracy Toolkit” as a relevant recommendation document, primarily aimed at Greek teachers. The organisation considers the inclusion of what it refers to as “education for democratic participation” in schools to be a primary goal of this programme.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

GHK. 2010. “Study on Volunteering in the European Union: Country Report Greece.” EU Citizenship Portal. Accessed January 15, 2018. http://ec.europa.eu/citizenship/about-the-europe-for-citizens-programme/studies/index_en.htm.

Krause, Johannes. 2010. “European Development. Education Monitoring Report: “DE Watch”.” GENE (Global Education Network Europe). January-May. Accessed January 5, 2018. gene.eu/wp-content/uploads/Gene_OtherPublications-DEWatchReport.pdf.



1. TERMINOLOGY AND DEFINITIONS USED

1.1. Terms

The questionnaire respondents representing the national platform and government institution assert that the term “Global Education” [GE] is used by their respective institutions to refer to GCE. In addition, the government institution refers to “Global Responsibility Education.”

1.2. Definitions

The NP cites the definition of GE given in the Maastricht GE Declaration (2002), whereas the government institution notes that the definition it provides is based on that of the North-South Centre. The approach to GE is outlined by the latter as AR and LS with the aim of enabling “open thinking, critical approach, global solidarity, undertaking responsibility and conscious cooperative action.” Both definitions emphasise the nexus between the individual citizen and the globalised world.

2. WAYS OF DELIVERING GCE

When asked about GCE delivery in formal education between 2011 and 2017, the NP summarises that there is “no accredited formal global educational curriculum in any level yet.” It further explains that work is ongoing regarding the integration of GE into the national curriculum at primary and secondary level, and that the MFA is supporting the inclusion of International Development as a subject in Higher Education.

Regarding GCE delivery through informal and non-formal education in the same period, the NP refers to the work of NGOs on “subject developments, GE teaching methodology and several other programs, activities etc.”

3. DIFFERENT STAKEHOLDERS INVOLVED IN GCE

From the perspective of the NP, the main governmental entities involved in GCE delivery and support are the MFA and Ministry of Human Capacities (MHC) with their primary resources in policy.

The NP does not consider any international organisations as relevant stakeholders in GCE.

Within the NGO sector, the NP lists Anthropolis, Vedegyilet, Artemisszio and HAND as having low-level influence due to their resources in “educational and policy knowledge.”

The ELTE University is listed by the NP as the chief education and research institution of relevance, described as having low-level impact on GCE delivery through “educational knowledge.” The NP perceives the media as minor stakeholders in GCE delivery in their country to the extent that some media organisations are connected to NGO-led projects.

Comparative significance of funding bodies


When asked about its perception of the comparative significance of the primary funding bodies for GCE activities carried out by NGOs in their country, the NP responds that there is “no such a thing” [sic]. It is apparent that the NP does not consider there to be any GCE-specific funding for NGOs in Hungary either from national or international entities. It should be noted that this contrasts with the responses of the government institution to the present study, and with the conclusion of the 2010 DE Watch Report that “EC funding has been crucial for initiating DE” in Hungary (Krause, European Development. Education Monitoring Report: “DE Watch” 2010).

4. PUBLIC FUNDING FOR GCE

Having been asked to consider the most significant sources of public funding for GCE in their country, the NP chose to contact the Hungarian MFA as the relevant governmental institution. Accordingly, the questionnaire for the present study was completed by a relevant representative of this institution.

Funding trends

Fig. 1. Government Institution's GCE Funding, 2011-15



The data supplied by the government institution shows that there was an overall increase in its investment in GCE funding during the period considered in the present study, with a significant peak in 2013. The institution is unable to provide data for 2011, although it describes that “a series of actions took place [...] that contributed to raising awareness related to international development cooperation at the EU level” in the context of the Hungarian EU Presidency. According to the institution, funding

is sourced from the state budget. It further highlights that the EU also supported EYD2015 with investment of 0.12 million euros. The 2010 DE Watch Report refers to government funding as “low and unreliable” (Krause, European Development. Education Monitoring Report: “DE Watch” 2010).

5. FUNDING PATTERNS

5.1. Types of funding activities

Table 1.

Types of funding activities in order of amount of funding allocated, 2011-17.
1. Awareness raising activities about the importance of GCE
2. Development of teaching materials and publishing in GCE
3. Building partnership networks in the context of GCE (national, regional, international)
4. GCE in formal education
5. Informal education activities focused on GCE (outside a structured curriculum)

Table 1 shows the government institution’s perception of its funding prioritisation of different GCE-related activities. Specific examples of funded AR activities cited by the government institution include 2012 AR project “Angola Today, In the footsteps of László Magyar,” involving lectures and “media activity” and the 2012 “Fighting Against Global Poverty- International Development Cooperation” travelling photo exhibition on CSO-led IDC projects. As an example of investment in GCE in formal education and teaching resources, the government institution refers to the “Global Fairness: Schools as Agents for Change” project. In addition to the activities listed in Table 1, the organisation also refers broadly to investment in projects for teacher training, work with policy makers and the media describes. It further cites its financial support for a study on GE in Hungary, published in an IDC special issue of the foreign policy monthly “Külpolitika.”

5.2. Funding recipients

During the period between 2011 and 2017, the government institution perceives the following to be its most significant recipients of GCE funding; research institutions and think-tanks, NGOs and governmental agencies. Specifically, it refers to its support in 2015 provided to governmental agency Education Development Support for the coordination of teaching resources. The NGOs Kultúrafrika Foundation, DemNet Foundation, Baptist Aid, Demokratikus Jogok Fejlesztéséért Alapítvány Anthropolis Association, Artemisszió Foundation and the NP are cited as beneficiaries. The government institution further explains that some higher education institutions receive its GCE funding indirectly through their involvement in NGO-led projects.

The government institution also highlights the following organisations as having received GCE funding through the EYD2015 Call for Proposals funded by the EU; the NP, the Hungarian Charity Service of the Order of Malta, the For Africa

Foundation Hungary, the Artemisszió Foundation, the National Society of Conservationists – Friends of the Earth Hungary and the Taita Foundation for Africa.

5.3. Funding procedure

The government institution’s questionnaire responses outline that recipients of grants for “GE projects” are decided either through a “Call for Proposals procedure” or a “regulated application procedure.” According to the institution, MFAT and IDC Coordination Committee representatives are the involved parties in decisions regarding the allocation of funding, with “external experts” involved in some cases, such as in the context of the EYD2015 Call for Proposals. It further refers to the consultation of the NP’s GEWG in the Call for Proposals procedure, and further explains that CSO representatives were invited to meetings in advance of the EYD2015 Call for Proposals to give guidance on “priority areas” that should be included. This suggests that it is a relatively transparent and accessible procedure involving diverse stakeholders.

6. POLICY CONTEXT FOR INVESTMENT

Regarding the policy context for GCE investment at a national-level between 2011 and 2015, the government institution notes highlights several policies and programmes as significant in their organisation’s distribution of GCE funding. It refers to the positive influence of the 2011 Act on Public Education, which “fosters GE through supporting school volunteership and awareness raising activities” and the 2011 Act on the State Budget and the decree on the execution of this act, which informs funding procedures. Of particular interest is the 2014 Act outlining the “legal framework and basic principles of international development and humanitarian assistance.”

Moreover, the government institution cites the Government Decision on the IDC Strategy (2014), calling for collaboration between the MFA and MHC on the integration and promotion of GE in formal education, as well as the “Draft Government Decision on Government Proposal on the Concept of the Use of Global Education Methods in Formal and Non-formal Education in the Context of Raising International Development and Humanitarian Affairs Awareness,” aiming to ensure the introduction of GE in “both formal and non-formal education,” the final version of which was adopted in 2016.

At the international-level, during the same period, the government institution perceives EYD2015 to have positively impacted decisions regarding GCE funding in their country, both through direct investment in 2015 and in encouraging “communication skills of awarded NGOs necessary for future GE awareness raising activities,” national and international networking and the development of resources.

7. NGOS INVOLVEMENT IN GCE RELATED POLICY PROCESSES

Comparison of both the NP and the government institution’s questionnaire responses indicates a mixed level of NGO involvement in GCE policy processes. According to both institutions, NGOs are highly involved in agenda setting and policy formulation. The NP explains that it lobbied for years for government policy agenda setting in this area. The government institution specifies that it has worked with the NP’s Global

Education Working Group (GWEG) on a “regular and meaningful” basis since 2007, particularly through its participation in MFAT, the International Development Cooperation (IDC) department’s multi-stakeholder GWEG established in 2015. Specifically, the government institution refers to the GWG’s involvement in the aforementioned IDC strategy decision and the aforementioned draft and final versions of the “Government Proposal on the Concept of the Use of Global Education Methods in Formal and Non-Formal Education in the Context of Raising International Development and Humanitarian Affairs Awareness.” From the NP’s perspective, there is low-level involvement in policy implementation. The government institution considers NGOs to be involved in this level of GCE policy process since they are the primary recipients of “GE funds” from the department’s call for proposals. Both institutions do not consider NGOs to participate in policy evaluation and, according to the NP, there is no evaluation process. Nonetheless, the government institution cites the involvement of CSOs and MFAT in assessment concerning EYD2015 projects.

8. NGO CAPACITY

Regarding Hungary’s civic society situation and environment, there is a strong tradition in this sector in spite of the negative impact of the communist system and the number of NGOs and other associations grew significantly during the 1990s, following the regime change (GHK 2010). It should be noted that the governmental institution refers to NGOs as playing “a pioneer, central and highly effective role in the promotion of GE in Hungary.” The 2010 DE Watch Report concluded that Hungarian NGO’s strong “DE performance” contrasted with low “governmental commitment” (Krause, European Development. Education Monitoring Report: “DE Watch” 2010). The NP was established in 2003. Data provided regarding its members indicates a decrease from 17 members in 2011 to 14 members in 2017. According to the NP, the member organisations are primarily NGOs.

8.1. Platform activity and influence

The NP has a separate working group dealing with GCE. The NP considers advocacy and lobbying, and AR to be the focuses of this group. It further cites its roles in policy work and providing educational activities and resources. Developing international and national partnerships are considered lesser priorities for the working group.

8.2. Strategy building

Regarding their organisation’s involvement in GCE strategy building, the NP identifies one relevant recommendation document developed between 2011 and 2015, the National GE Concept Paper. Initially published in 2009 but updated in 2015, this document is aimed at the MFA and MoE. The organisation considers the primary goal of this document to be making GC central to “formal, non-formal, informal and lifelong learning processes from kindergarten education to higher education, including teacher training and adult education,” perceiving this as a short-term (1-5 years) aim.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

GHK. 2010. “Study on Volunteering in the European Union.” *EU Citizenship Portal*. Accessed January 15, 2018. http://ec.europa.eu/citizenship/about-the-europe-for-citizens-programme/studies/index_en.htm.

Krause, Johannes. 2010. “European Development. Education Monitoring Report: “DE Watch”.” *GENE (Global Education Network Europe)*. January-May. Accessed January 5, 2018. gene.eu/wp-content/uploads/Gene_OtherPublications-DEWatchReport.pdf.



1. TERMINOLOGY AND DEFINITIONS USED

1.1. Terms

Questionnaire respondents representing the “Irish Association of Non-Governmental Development Organisations” [Dóchas], the “Irish Development Education Association” [IDEA] and the government institution “Irish Aid” [IA] (under the responsibility of the MFA) all assert that the term “Development Education” [DE] is used by their respective institutions to refer to GCE. Moreover, the National Youth Council of Ireland [NYCI], also cites the use of this term. The representative for the Department of Education and Skills [DES] states that the term “Education for Sustainable Development” [ESD] is employed within their organisation. IDEA and Dóchas also mention that the terms GCE, ESD and Human Rights Education [HRE] are used by some of their member-organisations, according to different contexts in which they work.

1.2. Definitions

Respondents provide distinct definitions. The approach to DE in the IA definition is outlined as AR and GE, DE is understood as “a lifelong educational process” with the goal of “help[ing] people to critically explore how global justice issues interlink with their everyday lives.” The DES definition of ESD also refers to the micro-macro nexus, but the outlook is primarily GE and LS, educating learners to become “informed active citizens” for “a more sustainable future, at local, national and indeed global levels.” The IDEA understanding of DE similarly connects the global to the local, referring to how it “works to tackle the root causes of injustice and inequality, globally and locally”; DE is framed from a GE, LS and AR perspective in this definition, described as “a process of interaction, reflection and action towards supporting Global Justice”. According to Dóchas’ definition, DE is framed as GE and AR, encouraging citizens’ awareness of “the social, cultural, political and economic structures” impacting them. NYCI’s definition of DE focuses on youth, with the aim of “challeng[ing] perceptions of the world and encourage[ing] young people to act for a more just and equal society.”

2. WAYS OF DELIVERING & GCE

According to Dóchas and IDEA, GCE programmes are implemented at all levels of the formal education system from early years (under 5 year olds) and primary (age 5 – 12 years) to post-primary school (12 – 18 years) and at third level/further education. Respondents cite the work of NGOs and CSOs as key stakeholders, examples include “WorldWise Global Schools,” who work in the Post Primary sector; Development education. ie, and “Suas”, who work in the Third Level Sector.

The national DE and intercultural education initiative “DICE project”; the Ubuntu Network, who work in Initial Teacher Education, the DE Journal “Policy and Practice”, and education research centres including those based in DCU, University of Maynooth, and University of Limerick and others, are listed as education and research institutions impacting GCE delivery.

Regarding GCE delivery in non-formal and informal education during the same period, reference is made broadly to NGO-led and CSO-led initiatives in youth, adult and community sectors and outreach programmes, referring to the work of “Afri (Action from Ireland),” “Development Perspectives”, the National Youth Council of Ireland, ECO- UNESCO and community development project “Lourdes Youth and Community Services ” and others (<https://www.ideaonline.ie/what-we-do/illustrate/>).

3. DIFFERENT STAKEHOLDERS INVOLVED IN GCE

From the perspective of Dóchas and IDEA, the main governmental entity involved in GCE delivery and support is Irish Aid, with their primary resources summarised as funding and policy power. The Department of Education and Skills (DES) and Department of Children and Youth Affairs (DCYA) are considered mid-level influences due to their policy power – particularly regarding the ESD National Strategy, in the case of the DES – and noted potential as funding sources (no direct funding currently given by these Ministries for DE). There is future potential impact by the Department of Communications, Climate Action and Environment (DCCAE) and Department of An Taoiseach (Prime Minister) concerning the SDG National Implementation Plan and this will be determined as the SDG NIP and Voluntary National Report (VNR) is rolled out. Ireland presents its VNR to the UN in July 2018.

Regarding international organisations, Dóchas and IDEA cite the EU as a high-level influence due to funding and policy power, and refers to the impact of GENE, UNESCO and CONCORD in relation to policy work and international networking.

Within the NGO sector, in terms of GCE, church-founded development agency “Trócaire” and humanitarian agency “Concern Worldwide” are listed as significant stakeholders in GCE policy and funding. Others working on DE and related agendas (though not funders) include Community groups, faith based organisations, school networks, regional DE centres, local authorities, and small-medium size youth clubs and development organisations that have DE programmes.

Comparative significance of funding bodies

Table 1.

Organisations funding NGO GCE activities in order of perceived significance of investment, 2011-17.
1. Irish Aid
2. Trócaire and Concern Worldwide
3. European Union
4. Local authorities
5. DES

Table 1 shows respondent's perception of the comparative significance of the primary funding bodies (both national and international) for GCE activities carried out by NGOs in their country. In addition to the sources listed above, there are "very limited" provision of financial support from the DES, Department of Children and Youth Affairs, and the Department of Communications, Climate Action and Environment. There is "potential for a lot more" investment from these government ministries. Although it is apparent that the EU provides funding for GCE in Ireland, it is nevertheless clear that national funding bodies are more significant and accessible sources of investment than international organisations for most Irish NGOs.


4. PUBLIC FUNDING FOR GCE

Having been asked to consider the most significant sources of public funding for GCE in their country, Dóchas and IDEA identified IA as the relevant government institution. Accordingly, the questionnaire was completed by a representative of the DE Unit within this institution. A representative of the DES' Curriculum and Assessment Policy Unit also provided information for the present study though the DES does not directly fund civil society DE or GCE in Ireland.

A new report, currently unpublished, will provide information on State investment in DE (Barry, Irish State Investment in Development Education 2011-2017, advanced draft – publication spring 2018).

Funding trends

Fig. 1. Irish Aid's GCE Funding, 2011-15.



Although total funding prior to 2013 is not provided, the data supplied by IA, the government institution shows that there was an overall increase in their investment in GCE funding during the period considered in the present study. According to the institution, funding is sourced from the ODA budget. Between 2013 and 2015, funding represents on average 0.64% of the total ODA budget; at its lowest, in 2013, it represents 0.6% as opposed to in 2015, when it represents 0.71%, its highest relative to the total budget. Regarding developments following 2015, the data given shows that there was a decrease in investment in GCE in 2016 (3.35 million euros), but there was a relative increase to represent 0.69% of the total ODA budget. Existing data indicates that MFA "DE-specific funding" amounted to 4.74 million euros in 2009. However a breakdown of this figure to demonstrate IA-specific funding is unavailable (Krause, European Development. Education Monitoring Report: "DE Watch" 2010, 52).

5. FUNDING PATTERNS

5.1. Types of funding activities

When asked about the activities funded by its respective organisation between 2011 and 2017, both the IA and DES cite the provision of financial support for diverse types of activities, summarised as follows: AR, national and international networking, development and implementation of resources, GCE through both formal, non-formal and informal education initiatives, research, teacher training, policy work, and the promotion of GCE with the media.

Specifically, IA cites its own AR programme aimed at primary and secondary schools, and teacher training institutions, and support for other DE programmes at all levels of education. In addition to funding individual organisations developing educational resources for use in both formal and non-formal education, IA also refers to investment in an online DE portal to facilitate access to relevant resources – www.developmenteducation.ie. Regarding its "limited" financial support for research, IA explains that this is done through funding the e-journal "Policy

and Practice.” IA did fund research historically, and NGOs have continued to support DE research work.

Regarding its support for GCE-related research, DES cites the consultation work coordinated in the formation of the National Strategy for ESD, as well as the Department of Children and Youth Affairs’ 2016 research on “attitudes to ESD in school.” DES refers to the coordination of the National Advisory Group for ESD in 2014 and national ESD forum as examples of support for GCE-related networks. DES further explains its investment in the integration of GCE in formal education, through funding for primary and secondary curricula with “a greatly increased emphasis on ESD [...] include[ing] both subjects with very strong links to aspects of ESD [...] and] subjects which now contain aspects of ESD although the links are not as immediately apparent.”

5.2. Funding recipients

During the period between 2011 and 2017, IA considers the following types of organisations to be its most significant recipients of GCE funding; higher-education institutions, NGOs, schools, community groups, youth organisations, and education centres. Specifically, according to data from IA, it provided €3,335,426 to 46 different organisations between 2013 and 2015, through its Development Education Annual Grant call. The five most funded recipients were UBUNTU Network, University of Limerick; The National Youth Council of Ireland; Eco-Unesco; Lourdes Youth and Community Services (LYCS), and Latin America Solidarity Centre (LASC).

In addition to this, IA provided the following organisations with €5,032,793 between 2013 and 2015 as part of its Strategic Partnership Programme: IDEA (Irish Development Education Association), developmenteducation.ie Consortium (80:20 Educating and Acting for a Better World as lead agency), The DICE Project, Suas, and Irish Aid World Wise Global Schools Programme.

During the period between 2011 and 2017, DES perceived governmental agencies and NGOs to be its most significant recipients of GCE funding.

5.3. Funding procedure

IA’s questionnaire responses outline the main streams through which recipients can apply for GCE funding as follows: “multi-annual funding for DE programmes working on key priority areas”, “annual funding for DE projects,” and “multi-annual funding for international NGOs as part of wider development programme funding.” According to the institution, the DES (in the case of DE Annual grants only), IA staff, and external consultants are the involved parties in decisions regarding the allocation of funding. This suggests the procedure involves diverse stakeholders. Funding calls are widely circulated and open to organisations who wish to apply.

DES explains that since it is primarily concerned with the integration of ESD into the educational system and networks through “underpinning activities, such as curriculum development,” national agencies are the natural focuses of the organisation’s financial support. The DES is responsible for decisions regarding funding, and makes these “based on processes that are well embedded in the system.”

6. POLICY CONTEXT FOR INVESTMENT

Regarding the policy context for GCE investment at a national-level between 2011 and 2015, the government institutions highlight several policies and programmes as significant in their organisation’s distribution of GCE funding. IA cites the Development Education Strategy 2007-2011 (extended to 2016) as guidelines for DE funding, and the IA Policy for International Development (2013), a recommendation initiative to identify DE priorities. DES considers the National Strategy for Education for Sustainable Development 2014-2020 as an influential guiding document for relevant stakeholders. It adds that the Framework for Junior Cycle 2015 impacted funding decisions through “linking CE to overall curriculum” [sic].

At the international-level, during the same period, the governmental organisations and NYCI refer to the impact of the UN MDGs and/or SDGs regarding DE projects and policy in Ireland. NYCI considers international agreements and initiatives to be a highly significant factor in policy making and public funding for youth organisations for GCE activities in Ireland, describing the SDGs as a “Development Educators Dream” despite being implemented at the “best and worst time” due to “many global and local challenges.” IA perceives UNESCO documents to have positively influenced policy development and DE project content.

When asked more generally about other relevant contextual factors, the IA cites that Ireland’s hosting of the European Year for Development (EYD) 2015 (Dóchas as the lead agency) had a positive effect on GCE investment in their country. The IA considers the national economic crisis to have had a negative impact. DES considers the funding and attention given to “citizenship projects” in the context Ireland 2016 – on the centenary of the Irish 1916 Rising – to have positively impacted the provision of funding for ESD activities.

Both education policy developments and reform, such as the National Strategy on ESD, as well as national and international policy developments such as the adoption of the SDGs and the Paris Agreement and European responses to the migration crisis in the Mediterranean have had direct and indirect consequences for investment in DE books and resource productions, as is evidenced in two national research survey ‘audits’ conducted in 2013 and 2017 by developmenteducation.ie

See: <https://developmenteducation.ie/resource/learning-change-world-audit-development-education-resources-ireland-2013-2016/>

When asked more generally about other relevant contextual factors, the IA cites that Ireland’s hosting of the EYD2015 had a positive effect on GCE investment in their country. The IA considers the National economic crisis to have had a negative impact. DES considers the funding and attention given to “citizenship projects” in the context Ireland 2016 – on the centenary of the Irish 1916 Rising – to have positively impacted the provision of funding for ESD activities.

7. NGOS INVOLVEMENT IN GCE RELATED POLICY PROCESSES

Comparison of the questionnaire responses of both the NGO networks and platforms, and the government institutions, indicates a mid to high-level of NGO involvement in all aspects of

GCE policy-making, from agenda setting to policy formulation, implementation and evaluation.

Regarding agenda-setting, Dóchas refers to its “key role in setting the overall agenda” in terms of development, and through its Development Education Group (DEG) works in partnership with IDEA regarding DE and other areas of policy-making. IDEA is the main body for DE policy in Ireland working with members through its working groups. NYCI explains that it coordinates and presents written and oral recommendations on DE to government departments and further cites involvement in IDEA for cooperating with Irish Aid. IA describes that NGO engagement in policy is primarily through membership of IDEA. The DES refers to multi-stakeholder consultation whilst developing the National Strategy for ESD, and the participation of NGOs in the ESD Advisory Group.

NYCI cites high involvement in policy formulation through “face-to-face engagement” with government entities. IA refers to “extensive consultation” on the DE Strategy and Performance Measurement Framework with IDEA-coordinated “task groups representing the formal education; youth sector; adult and community sectors.”

According to all perspectives, NGOs are significant stakeholders in policy implementation and evaluation. Specifically, IA refers to NGO consultation for feedback on previous strategies and the involvement of task groups in the development and implementation of the current DE Strategy. From DES’ perspective, NGO participation has been through membership of the ESD Advisory Group for the 2017 review of the National Strategy on ESD. NGO engagement has also been active as part of an array of curriculum reform work in primary and post-primary education through forum discussions and joint subject submissions work. Much of the NGO engagement has been financially supported by Irish Aid.

8. NGO CAPACITY

Regarding Ireland’s civil society situation and environment, as described in a 2015 GENE report refers to a “strong history of volunteerism in Ireland,” further explaining that NGOs and missionaries as the initial stakeholders in “DE” and “GE,” before state involvement since the mid-1970s (Global Education Network Europe 2015, 53). IDEA was established in 2004, Dóchas in 1974 and NYCI in 1967. Information regarding IDEA and Dóchas membership indicates that the number of members for each organisation remained approximately the same between 2011 and 2016. In 2016, Dóchas had 65 member organisations – primarily NGOs, Solidarity Groups, third level networks and UN-affiliated agencies. IDEA had approximately 100 member-organisations – categorised as NGOs, CSOs, youth sector organisations, community development organisations, adult

education organisations, third level networks and researchers and school networks.

8.1. Platform activity and influence

Dóchas has a separate working group dealing with GCE – the Development Education Group (DEG), which “provides a platform for learning and sharing of best practice examples of development education.” It considers policy and advocacy work in partnership with IDEA and the development of educational activities and resources through its Capacity Development Programme to be the focus of this working group. It perceives the working group’s role in forming both international and national networks as significant, specifically citing its collaboration with IDEA. It further cites AR – including “public awareness activities” and “private lobbying” – and advocacy and lobbying IA for “a strong strategy to address DE within its programming” as priorities for this group. IDEA is the national network for Development Education in Ireland. It focuses on ensuring an enabling environment for DE in Ireland through policy work, advocacy, representation and partnership building for DE, providing capacity development and effective networking for the DE sector in Ireland, and communicating DE’s essential role in achieving global justice, global citizenship and sustainability.

8.2 Strategy building

Regarding their organisations’ involvement in GCE strategy building between 2011 and 2015, Dóchas and IDEA identify several relevant recommendation documents. Between 2011 and 2013, they made submissions to “the mid-term review of IA’s DE Strategy” aimed at aiding DE practitioners and policy makers in developing the new DE Strategy. IDEA developed Good Practice Guidelines on DE between 2013 and 2017 to “support DE practitioners and institutions.” In 2015, IDEA published a number of recommendations aimed at policy makers; there were IDEA policy submissions on the GENE Review, and IDEA and Dóchas submissions on the IA’s DE Strategy 2017-2022. In 2016/7, IDEA and Dóchas (and their member organisations) were heavily involved in consultation processes on a proposed new DE Strategy for Ireland with Irish Aid, as well as the external strategic review with the GENE Network, working group meetings and a national stakeholders forum, which culminated in the publication of IA’s DE Strategy for Ireland 2017-2023: <https://www.irishaid.ie/media/irishaid/allwebsitemedia/20newsandpublications/publicationpdfsenglish/Development-Education-Strategy-2017-2023.pdf>

And Performance Measurement Framework: <https://www.irishaid.ie/media/irishaid/allwebsitemedia/60aboutirishaid/Irish-Aid-DevEd-Strategy-PMF.pdf>

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Global Education Network Europe. 2015. *Global Education in Ireland. National Report, Global Education Network Europe.*

Krause, Johannes. 2010. “European Development. Education Monitoring Report: “DE Watch”.” *GENE (Global Education Network Europe). January-May. Accessed January 5, 2018. gene.eu/wp-content/uploads/Gene_OtherPublications-DEWatchReport.pdf.*

Barry, M, *Irish State Investment in Development Education 2011-2017: Dochas Development Education Working Group (advanced draft – publication spring 2018)*

Policy and Practice: a Development Education Review. See <https://www.developmenteducationreview.com/>



1. TERMINOLOGY AND DEFINITIONS USED

1.1. Terms

The questionnaire respondent representing the national platform asserts that their organisation uses the term “Global Citizenship Education” [GCE]. It further reports that “development education” and “world education” have been employed in the past. The present study did not receive responses from any governmental institutions.

1.2. Definitions

The NP explains that the development of an official definition of GCE is “in discussion” in the context of implementing a GCE strategy. It cites a 2016 Conference of Regions [CoR] report on GCE, which outlines the chief goal of GCE as enabling young people to “act consciously in an increasingly interdependent world” regarding issues of international development (Conferenza Delle Regioni E Delle Provice Autonome 2016).

2. WAYS OF DELIVERING GCE

When asked about GCE delivery between 2011 and 2017, the NP provides limited examples of GCE-related activities. Concerning formal education programmes, the NP refers to the “Competences and Learning Environments” MoE program (2014-2020) relating to the promotion of GCE, which aims to develop “social and civic competences, covered by the broader concept of promoting global citizenship, in order to form conscious and responsible citizens in a modern connected and interdependent society.” Moreover, the NP again refers to the 2016 CoR report, citing that it advocates the need to position GCE “at the heart of both national and international policies, concerning education and development cooperation” (Conferenza Delle Regioni E Delle Provice Autonome 2016 cited by the NP).

3. DIFFERENT STAKEHOLDERS INVOLVED IN GCE

From the perspective of the NP, the main entity involved in GCE delivery and support within the government is the MFA, with their primary resources summarised as funding and policy power; the NP further refers to the mid-level impact of the MoE in the same areas.

Regarding international organisations, the NP cites UNICEF as a mid-level influence in GCE due to their access to international networks and influence regarding policy. The NP also considers NGOs and CSOs to share these same resources; in particular, the NP cites the influence of the European Anti-Poverty Network [EAPN], and international network of CSOs engaging in issues of poverty and social exclusion.

Universities are listed by the NP as the main education and research institutions, described as impacting GCE delivery through international networking and policy work.

In addition to these categories of organisations, the NP refers to the low-level impact of private sector companies, with their access to international networks. Similarly, the DE Watch Report refers to the importance of private foundations in GCE in Italy (Krause, European Development. Education Monitoring Report: “DE Watch” 2010).

Comparative significance of funding bodies

Table 1.

Organisations funding NGOs’ GCE activities in order of perceived significance of investment, 2011-17.

1. Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation Agency [MFA]
2. Ministry of Education [MoE]
3. Regional authorities

Table 1 shows the NP’s perception of the comparative significance of the primary funding bodies (both national and international) for GCE activities carried out by NGOs in their country. It should be noted that the NP does not cite any international entities as the main funding bodies. The NP further highlights that although the MFA is historically the primary source of GCE funding, in 2017 the MoE provided most financial support due to “economic reason” [sic]. Although the NP lists regional authorities as main funding bodies, it explains that in fact it “declined” to invest.

4. PUBLIC FUNDING FOR GCE

The present study did not receive a response from any governmental organisation, nor did the NP provide any data on public investment in GCE during the period considered.

However, as indicated on the MFA’s InfoCooperazione website, there was funding allocated for development education activities in 2013 (in the amount of 1.750.000 EUR) and 2014 (1.000.000 EUR) and for global citizenship education in 2015 (in the amount of 1.000.000 EUR).

Regarding funding in the past, the DE Watch Report stated that the government’s “DE” budget was cut significantly from 7 million euros in 2008 to 1.09 million euros in 2009 (Krause, European Development. Education Monitoring Report: “DE Watch” 2010).

5. FUNDING PATTERNS

Please refer to Section 4.

6. POLICY CONTEXT FOR INVESTMENT

The present study was provided with limited information regarding the policy context for GCE investment at a national-level between 2011 and 2015. The NP highlights that although supportive national political priorities are “important” for sustaining public GCE funding, it is “not so frequent.” Regarding international initiatives, the NP considers that although they might impact perspectives on GCE investment, they have limited influence since they are not binding.

Regarding the wider political context for GCE investment in Italy, the 2010 DE Watch Report highlighted the significant negative impact of the change of in 2008 on funding and the governmental approach to GCE more generally (Krause, European Development. Education Monitoring Report: “DE Watch” 2010), and it should be noted that the country experienced multiple changes of government during the period of 2011 and 2015.

7. NGOS INVOLVEMENT IN GCE RELATED POLICY PROCESSES

Whilst the DE Watch Report highlighted the weakening of MFA-NGO/CSO relations in 2010, analysis of the NP’s questionnaire responses indicates a high level of NGO involvement in most GCE policy processes, primarily in the agenda setting and consultation regarding the ongoing development and implementation of a National Strategy for GCE. Nevertheless, the NP notes there is no coordination regarding policy evaluation, except on an individual project-basis.

8. NGO CAPACITY

Regarding Italy’s civic society situation and environment, non-profits and NGOs have been significant actors in “achieving social policy goals” since the 1990s and the state has recognised their important role, evidenced by the country’s supportive legal framework for organisations (GHK 2010). However, the 2010 DE Watch Report reported that although “DE in Italy is driven by non-state actors and local authorities,” there is a lack of governmental support in this sector (Krause, European Development. Education Monitoring Report: “DE Watch” 2010). As mentioned in Section 7, the NP perceives that this has recently changed in the context of collaborative work towards the National Strategy.

The NP was established in 2012 but is not a legally recognised entity. Data provided regarding its members indicates an increase from 47 members in 2011 to 55 members in 2017. According to the NP, the member organisations are diverse in nature, consisting of “NGOs, CSOs, training and educational organisations, local and national networks, [and] human rights associations”.

8.1. Platform activity and influence

The NP has a separate working group dealing with GCE. The NP considers advocacy and lobbying and, developing both national and international networks to be the main focuses of this group. It further cites its role in AR. Educational activities and policy work are considered lesser priorities for the working group.

8.2. Strategy building

Regarding their organisation’s involvement in GCE strategy building, the NP does not identify any relevant recommendation documents developed between the period between 2011 and 2015 considered in the present study. However, it cites the aforementioned 2016 CoR report on GCE, aimed at citizens and relevant government ministries. The organisation considers “establish[ing] a common point agreed by Italian Regions” to be a primary goal of this document, perceiving this as a short-term (1-5 years) aim.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Conferenza Delle Regioni E Delle Province Autonome. 2016. *Educazione Alla Cittadinanza Globale*. February 4. Accessed January 10, 2018. <http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:BnobTKfHtZoJ:www.regioni.it/download/conferenze/443208/+&cd=1&hl=it&ct=clnk&gl=it>.

GHK. 2010. “Study on Volunteering in the European Union.” *EU Citizenship Portal*. Accessed January 15, 2018. http://ec.europa.eu/citizenship/about-the-europe-for-citizens-programme/studies/index_en.htm.

Krause, Johannes. 2010. “European Development. Education Monitoring Report: “DE Watch”.” *GENE (Global Education Network Europe)*. January-May. Accessed January 5, 2018. gene.eu/wp-content/uploads/Gene_OtherPublications-DEWatchReport.pdf.



1. TERMINOLOGY AND DEFINITIONS USED

1.1. Terms

Questionnaire respondents representing the national platform and the MFA in Latvia both assert that the term “Global Education” [GE] is used by their respective institutions to refer to GCE. On the other hand, the response from the MoES indicated that the term “Citizenship Education” [CE] is employed by the institution. The NP further explains that “development education” was in use until 2015 and that both DE and GE feature in MFA policy guidelines.

1.2. Definitions

The NP responds that it does not have an official definition, but the approach to GE is summarised as “glocalisation – explaining the impact of the global world on local processes and vice versa”. The MFA provides the definition from its “National Policy Guidelines of Development Cooperation 2016-2020”. The “glocal” aspect of GE is similarly emphasised here, and GE is here understood as an “active learning process based on the principles of solidarity, equality, inclusion and cooperation”. According to the MoES, the approach to CE is outlined as AR/GE/LS with the aim of “promot[ing] individual responsibility for national development” and “strengthening national and civic identity”.

2. WAYS OF DELIVERING GCE

When asked about GCE delivery in formal education between 2011 and 2017, the NP summarises that this mainly occurs through teacher training offered by NGOs. It cites teacher-led projects for integrating GE into the curriculum, and the willing support and participation of schools in NGOs’ GE activities in general. The NP considers the “low recognition of GCE in formal education” to result from the lack of MoES support.

Limited specific information is provided regarding GCE delivery through “non-formal” education in the same period, but the NP refers again to NGO teacher training projects, as well as the successful coordination of the annual GE Week.

The NP is generally positive regarding GCE delivery through informal education between 2011 and 2017. The NP cites GE youth programmes, and AR relating to the “migration crisis” and “individual sustainable behaviours”, considering this to have been “boosted” by the EYD2015.

3. DIFFERENT STAKEHOLDERS INVOLVED IN GCE

From the perspective of the NP, the main governmental entity involved in GCE delivery and support is the MFA. Their primary resources are summarised as development policy responsibility, and funding (generally co-financing). The NP also considers the MoES and its Center of School Curriculum, the Ministry of Environmental Protection and Regional Development, and local

government to have mid-level involvement concerning education policy and implementation, funding and AR for climate change, and policy impact, respectively.

Regarding international organisations, the NP cites the significant impact and resources of UNESCO in policy, GENE in funding, CONCORD in networking and the North-South Center in networking, funding and policy.

Within the NGO sector, the NP lists itself (LAPAS), the Centre of Education Development (IAC) and Green Liberty as the most significant stakeholders, with influence regarding policy, AR, and national and international networking. It further refers to the mid-level impact concerning funding and skills of environmental NGOs, the Centre of Educational Initiatives, and the Union of Local Municipalities.

Universities and schools are listed by the NP as the primary education and research institutions involved, described as impacting GCE delivery through teacher training and curriculum development.

The NP perceives journalists as relevant influences within the media, mentioning that their involvement in GCE has been encouraged through NGO projects.

In addition to these categories of organisations, the NP refers to the low-level influence of the National Library and library network in communities.

Comparative significance of funding bodies

Table 1

Organisations funding NGOs’ GCE activities in order of perceived significance of investment, 2011-17.

1. European Commission
2. Ministry of Foreign Affairs
3. North-South Centre
4. CBSS project facility
5. National Environmental fund


Table 1 shows the NP’s perception of the comparative significance of the primary funding bodies (both national and international) for GCE activities carried out by NGOs in their country. It should be noted that the NP perceives international organisations to constitute the majority of significant funding bodies. The NP further comments that the EC provides “95% of funding” for “various” GCE programmes, whilst describing the MFA’s contribution as “small co-funding” for “some actions”.

4. PUBLIC FUNDING FOR GCE

Having been asked to consider the most significant sources of public funding for GCE in their country, the NP chose to contact the MFA as the relevant government institution. Accordingly, the questionnaire was completed by a representative within this institution. The MoES also provided some information but this report refers primarily to the MFA's responses, unless otherwise stated.

Funding trends

Fig. 1. Government Institution's GCE Funding, 2011-15



The data supplied by the government institution shows that there was an overall increase in their investment in GCE funding during the period considered in the present study. According to the institution, funding is sourced from the national budget. Across the period, funding represents on average 7.29% of the department's total budget; at its lowest, in 2014, it represents 5.4% as opposed to in 2013, when it represents 9.16%, its highest relative to the total budget. Regarding development following 2015, the data given shows that there was a decrease in investment into GCE to €25,800 during 2016, representing 4.36% of the department's total budget.

5. FUNDING PATTERNS

5.1. Types of funding activities

When asked about different GCE-related activities it funded between 2011 and 2017, and the relative levels of financial support offered, the MFA outlines that there is no prioritisation of different activity types. The MFA refers to its investment in media promotion, and AR and informal education initiatives in the context of the EYD2015 – specifically citing a “travelling exhibition”. The organisation also states that it provides funding for teaching resources, formal educational initiatives, and research as part of its annual call for co-funding. Moreover, higher education institutions received funding in the context of EYD2015, for developing “an online training course on development cooperation”. In addition to these activities, the MFA refers to contributions to developing networks through the LAPAS

membership fee in CONCORD, and to policy makers, in collaboration with the MoES.

The MoES also provided the present study with information regarding the institution's GCE investment. It considers it funding priority to be GCE-related research, achieved through its participation in “education quality equality monitoring” OECD PISA 2018 and the International Civic and Citizenship Education Study 2016. It also cites funding of AR activities through its annual investment in the Latvian National Commission for UNESCO, which the MoES supported in coordinating activities relating to the “UN Decade for ESD” (2005-2014) and the “Global Action Programme for ESD”. The MoES further explains that although it does “not specifically” provide financial support for GCE in formal/informal education and teacher training, education programmes and resources which receive its funding “include relevant issues”.

5.2. Funding recipients

During the period between 2011 and 2017, the government institution perceives the following to be its most significant recipients of GCE funding; higher education institutions, local and regional authorities, NGOs, private companies, and schools. Specifically, “Papardes zieds” Association (2013), Education Development Centre (2013; 2015), Latvian Association of Local and Regional Governments (2013-2015), Green Liberty (2013-2017), and LAPAS (2015) are cited as beneficiaries. It should be noted that provision for schools is primarily indirect, through NGO-led activities. Private companies are beneficiaries of an “annual reward on Sustainable Business, cooperation on CSR and development cooperation” [sic].

5.3. Funding procedure

The MFA's questionnaire responses outline the procedure for deciding recipients of GCE funding is as follows; a selection committee considering project proposals and cooperation agreements received in response to an annual open call. Proposals are “evaluated towards criteria of sustainability and impact.” It is unclear whether diverse stakeholders participate in the selection committee.

6. POLICY CONTEXT FOR INVESTMENT

Regarding the policy context and relevant programmes for GCE investment at a national-level between 2011 and 2015, both the MoES and MFA cite the Development Cooperation Policy Guidelines 2016-2020 [DCPG 2016-2020] as significant in their organisation's distribution of GCE funding. In addition to referring to the AR aims of this document, the MoES considers its goal to be “high-quality and inclusive education for personal development, human welfare, and reaching sustainable national growth”.

No international policy or programme is highlighted as impacting GCE investment in Latvia during the relevant period.

7. NGOS INVOLVEMENT IN GCE RELATED POLICY PROCESSES

Comparison of both the NP and the MFA's questionnaire responses indicates a mixed level of NGO involvement in GCE policy processes. From both perspectives, there is a high level of



Workshop organised by LAPAS, Latvia

involvement in agenda setting; NGOs provide recommendations, and participate in regular meetings with relevant stakeholders. NGOs are also considered to play a significant role in the policy implementation; the MFA refers specifically to NGO cooperation in EYD2015, whilst the NP considers NGOs to implement “90% of actions”. Regarding participation in policy formulation, although the NP states that “no policy is developed,” both entities highlight that NGOs were consulted concerning the development of the DCPG 2016-2020. According to both institutions, there is no NGO involvement in policy evaluation since there is no formal process regarding this, in spite of NP lobbying.

8. NGO CAPACITY

Regarding Latvia’s civic society situation and environment, a 2015 GENE report finds that, despite the high dependency of all NGOs on national and international organisations for funding, “Latvia has quite many NGOs working with GE” (Hartmeyer and Wegimont 2015, 57). A 2016 North-South Centre report refers to the practical success of Latvian NGOs in realising GCE-related projects (North-South Centre and Eesti People to People 2016, 3).

The NP was established in 2004. Data provided regarding its members indicates an increase from 26 to 34 members between 2011 and 2017. According to the NP, the member organisations are primarily NGOs.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Hartmeyer, Helmut, and Liam Wegimont. 2015. *The State of Global Education in Europe*. Dublin: Global Education Network Europe, European Union.

North-South Centre and Eesti People to People. 2016. *Baltic Regional Seminar on Global Development Education. Concept Paper*, Tallinn: European Commission; North-South Centre



Workshop organised by LAPAS, Latvia



Workshop organised by LAPAS, Latvia

8.1. Platform activity and influence

The NP has a separate working group dealing with GCE. The NP considers developing policy and national networks, and advocacy and lobbying to be the main focuses of this group. It further cites its roles in AR and educational activities.

8.2. Strategy building

Regarding their organisation’s involvement in GCE strategy building, the NP identifies two relevant recommendation and strategy documents published between 2011 and 2015; the Development Education Guidelines 2008-2015 (2011) for all GCE-related stakeholders, and LAPAS Strategy 2013-2015 (2013) for LAPAS members, which includes goals concerning AR and developing an “ideas community”. The organisation considers that the implementation of the education guidelines was a short-term (1-5 years) aim, as opposed to the long-term focus (5+ years) of the 2013 strategy document.



1. TERMINOLOGY AND DEFINITIONS USED

1.1. Terms

Respondents representing the national platform and government institution in Lithuania both assert that the term “Global Education” [GE] is used by their respective institutions to refer to GCE.

1.2. Definitions

Neither respondent provides an official definition. The NP references Oxfam’s definition of GCE (Oxfam GB 2018). The approach to GCE is here outlined primarily as GE and LS with the aim of “enable[ing] young people to develop core competencies which allow them to actively engage with the world, and help to make it more just and sustainable place.”.

2. WAYS OF DELIVERING GCE

When asked about GCE delivery between 2011 and 2017, the NP summarises that the concept of GE has only recently been introduced at a government level. The NP cites that, according to the new “Concept of Global Education,” developed by the MFA and MoSE-led working group, although “themes of GE” are included in the curriculum, teachers lack resources and skills to teach these. The NP further mentions that a “very small number” of schools implement GE-related “social and emotional education programmes”.

Regarding GCE delivery through informal education in the same period, the NP explains that “various” NGO-led initiatives are “implemented frequently.” Specifically, it refers to the education institution, “Lithuanian Children and Youth Centre (LCYC), which supports children, young people, and educators, coordinating the annual GE Week and other activities with the support of the “North-South Center”. The MSoE is responsible for LCYC.

3. DIFFERENT STAKEHOLDERS INVOLVED IN GCE

From the perspective of the NP, the main entities involved in GCE delivery and support within the government are the MFA and MoES, whose primary resources are summarised as “policy power”. The NP further considers LCYC to have mid-level influence regarding funding and access to national network.

Regarding international organisation, the NP cites the mid-level influence of CONCORD and its policy influence and funding resources. It also considers the North-South Center as a minor stakeholder concerning funding.

Within the NGO sector, National NGDO Platform lists itself and network organisation LITDEA as the most significant stakeholders, with significant influence due to their access to local, national and international networks.

The Vytautas Magnus University is listed by the NP as the primary education and research institution involved, described as impacting GCE delivery through funding and programmes offered.

Comparative significance of funding bodies


The NP only considers two entities as primary funding bodies for GCE activities carried out by NGOs in their country, one international (European) and one national; the European Commission is the most significant investor, followed by the MFA, according to the NP’s perception.

4. PUBLIC FUNDING FOR GCE

Having been asked to consider the most significant sources of public funding for GCE in their country, the government institution that the NP chose to contact was the MFA. Although no response was received, some relevant information regarding public funding for GCE in Lithuania was provided by the NP. They also provided limited information concerning MoSE investment in GCE, however this report refers primarily to details regarding the MFA, unless otherwise stated

Funding trends

Fig. 1. MFA GCE Funding, 2011-15




As shown in Figure 1, the limited data supplied by the NP regarding the MFA’s investment in GCE activities indicates an overall increase during the period considered in the present study. Existing data suggests that there has been a significant increase since 2008, when MFA funding amounted to 0.39 million euros (Krause 2010, 56).

Regarding development following 2015, the data given indicates there was a decrease in investment into GCE during 2016, when GCE activities receives 1.08 million euros in MFA investment. The NP perceives that this decrease was partly due to the government’s “lack of strategy,” explaining that the MFA was unable to manage the high number of project proposals received in response to their initial call and then did not publicise a follow-up call which NGOs missed.



Image created by Kreativkolors - Freepik.com

Fig. 2. MoSE GCE Funding, 2011-15



As shown in Figure 2, the data supplied by the NP regarding the MoSE's investment in GCE activities indicates an overall increase during the period considered in the present study. It is clear that limited financial support is provided by the institution, and that this is relatively low in comparison to MFA funding. Regarding development following 2015, the data given indicates MoSE investment into GCE decreased in 2016 (7000 €), before rising again in 2017 (9500 €).

5. FUNDING PATTERNS

5.1. Types of funding activities

No information is given regarding the comparative investment in different types of activities. The NP describes that initiatives granted funding in response to the MFA's call for proposals from NGOs were primarily either film festivals or youth education programmes concerning the SDGs. It outlines other GL-related activities supported by the government institution as follows; AR, NGO and CSO programmes, and "support to social and economic development".

A North-South Centre report cites several specific "GDE" AR projects as recipients of public funding in 2015; the "Inconvenient Films" festival, the "Global Education in School's Life" enabling teachers to develop "a draft on a new teaching programme on SD," and the "One World" comic-strip project aimed at young people (North-South Centre and Eesti People to People 2016, 4).

5.2. Funding recipients

Very limited details are given regarding the most significant recipients of GCE funding, however the above-mentioned responses concerning MFA support suggest that NGOs and CSOs are beneficiaries. Specifically, the LCYC is mentioned as a significant recipient of MoSE funding.

5.3. Funding procedure

Very limited information is given regarding the MFA and MoSE's procedures for deciding recipients of GCE funding. As previously mentioned, the issue of "GL" has only recently entered discussions at a government-level. According to NP, the MFA's annual call for NGO proposals for GCE funding (since 2014) is for a maximum investment of 0.15 million euros per initiative. The NP details that funding is provided for a period of six months during the following year; it considers that this limits NGO's potential for developing initiatives with long-term effect. It is unclear whether any outside parties are involved in the decision-making process.

6. POLICY CONTEXT FOR INVESTMENT

The present study did not receive any information from the NP or government organisations regarding the policy context for GCE investment at a national-level between 2011 and 2015. Whilst research from 2010 indicates the low-profile of GCE and lack of public strategy in Lithuania (Krause 2010, 56), the North-South centre more recently described the "very evident" "political commitment and real involvement in the implementation of the GDE," particularly since 2016 (North-South Centre and Eesti People to People 2016, 4). It highlights that a 2016 working group, coordinated by the Ministry of the Environment, worked on producing a recommendations document "on the inclusion of SDGs and Agenda 2030 into the National Legislation," and that an MA and MoSE-coordinated working group of government and NGO entities has recently developed a draft concept of the "Action Plan on Global Education," outlining the "integration of GDE in all levels of formal and non-formal systems of education" (ibid.).

7. NGOS INVOLVEMENT IN GCE RELATED POLICY PROCESSES

The NP's response indicates a weak level of NGO involvement in GCE policy processes. According to the NP, NGOs have low-level involvement in all aspects of policy-making, from agenda setting to policy formulation, implementation and evaluation. The NP further explains that some members are more active in current preliminary involvement in agenda setting than others, but concludes that although the government officially recognises NGOs, they "don't trust them," indicating a difficult relationship between government and civil society regarding GCE issues in Lithuania. However, it also highlights the involvement of NGOs in the development of the previously mentioned draft concept of the "Action Plan on Global Education".

8. NGOS CAPACITY

Regarding Lithuania's civic society situation and environment, according to the 2010 DE Watch Report, there is limited engagement of NGOs in GCE (Krause 2010, 56). The 2015 GENE report finds that NGO activity in this sector has increased since the European Year of Development 2015 (Hartmeyer and Wegimont 2015, 102).

The NP was established in 2010. Limited data provided indicates a total number of 10 members in 2016 and 2017. According to the NP, the member organisations are primarily NGOs.

8.1. Platform activity and influence

The NP does not have a separate working group dealing with GCE.

8.2. Strategy building

When asked about their organisation's involvement in GCE strategy building, the NP does not identify any relevant recommendation documents developed between 2011 and 2015.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Hartmeyer, Helmut, and Liam Wegimont. 2015. *The State of Global Education in Europe*. Dublin: Global Education Network Europe, European Union.

Krause, Johannes. 2010. "European Development. Education Monitoring Report: "DE Watch"." GENE (Global Education Network Europe). January-May. gene.eu/wp-content/uploads/Gene_OtherPublications-DEWatchReport.pdf.

North-South Centre and Eesti People to People. 2016. *Baltic Regional Seminar on Global Development Education. Concept Paper*, Tallinn: European Commission; North-South Centre.

Oxfam GB. 2018. "What is Global Citizenship?" Oxfam: Oxfam education. Accessed January 6, 2018. <https://www.oxfam.org.uk/education/who-we-are/what-is-global-citizenship>.



1. TERMINOLOGY AND DEFINITIONS USED

1.1. Terms

Questionnaire respondents representing the national platform and the government institution in Luxembourg assert that the term “development education” is employed by their respective institutions to refer to GCE. Moreover, whereas, the government institution refers to “development education and awareness raising,” the NP also uses “education for sustainable development” [ESD], GE, and GCE when coordinating with other CSOs.

1.2. Definitions

MFA and NP developed a common definition of development education and awareness raising in 2013 :

Awareness raising projects: projects aimed at raising the awareness of the general public or a group targeted by the applicant NGO of the situations of inequality that exist in the world. Information is provided on the causes and consequences of poverty and on the conditions and structures that perpetuate them. Themes related to development cooperation are thus presented and questioned.

Development education projects: projects with the objective of organizing citizens’ dialogue conducive to an in-depth analysis of the causes and consequences of poverty from a social, political, economic, historical and structural perspective of inequalities in the world. Development education projects integrate an active learning process based on values of solidarity, equality, inclusion and cooperation. This process paves the way for personal commitment and concerted action.

2. WAYS OF DELIVERING GCE

Significantly, when asked about GCE delivery between 2011 and 2017, the NP summarises that there is room for further engagement in the field of formal education.

Regarding GCE delivery through informal education in the same period, the NP refers to “typical NGO activities”. Specifically, they highlight NGO-led public conferences, campaigns, and school workshops. The NP also refers to the joint CSO-coordination of ESD week, and the establishment of Luxembourg’s Center for Political Education in 2016.

3. DIFFERENT STAKEHOLDERS INVOLVED IN GCE

From the perspective of the NP, the main governmental entities involved in GCE delivery and support are the MFA and Ministry for SD. The main resources made available are funding, and national networking, respectively. They also highlight the very low involvement of the MoE, explaining that so far there has been very minimal coordination and engagement regarding GCE in curriculum and teacher training.

The NP does not cite any international organisations as major stakeholders.

Within the NGO sector, the NP summarises that all GCE NGOs as significant stakeholders, highly active in all areas of GCE delivery.

The NP further refers to itself as an important influence in GCE delivery, with their resources in establishing and supporting networks, projects and working groups, and “follow[ing] up international developments about the topic”.

Comparative significance of funding bodies

Table 1.

Organisations funding NGOs’ GCE activities, in order of perceived significance of investment, 2011-17.

1. MFA
2. Private donations
3. Corporate donations
4. EC
5. Ministry for Sustainable Development


Table 1 shows the NP’s perception of the comparative significance of the primary funding bodies (both national and international) for GCE activities carried out by NGOs in their country. MFA is the major funding body. The NP perceives that other funding is coming from private and corporate donations, the European Commission and the Ministry of Sustainable development. Significantly, the NP lists private donors as main funding bodies. Only one international (European) entity is perceived as a significant stakeholder.

4. PUBLIC FUNDING FOR GCE

Having been asked to consider the most significant sources of public funding for GCE in their country, the government institution which the NP chose to contact was the MFA. Accordingly, the questionnaire was completed by a representative of the Directorate for Development Cooperation and Humanitarian Affairs within this institution.

Funding trends

Fig. 1. Government Institution's GCE Funding, 2011-15



The data supplied by the government institution shows that there was an overall increase in their investment in GCE funding during the period considered in the present study. According to the institution, funding is sourced from the state budget. The annual budget for development education activities is not always fully used by the NGOs. Across the period, disbursements represent on average 94.76% of the directorate's total budget allocated to development education; at its lowest, in 2014, it represents 91.94% as opposed to in 2012, when it represents 100.1%, its highest relative to the total budget. Existing data suggests that there has been an increase when compared with 2008 (1.6 million euros) and 2009 (1.8 million euros) (Krause 2010, 57).

5. FUNDING PATTERNS

5.1. Types of funding activities

The government institution states that they have invested in the following GCE activities between 2011 and 2017; building of national, regional and international networks, development of teaching materials, integration of GCE in formal education, GCE-related research, and policy development. Their responses indicate that they consider these activities to have received similar levels of funding. Specifically, the government institution refers to signing “a memorandum of understanding for financial support from Luxembourg for the GENE work programme 2016-2018” as an example of network-building funding activities. The institution further describes that it invests in research activities through the provision of funding to GENE, since this body carries out significant research into GCE. Regarding investment in GCE policy, the MFA explains that it co-finances the “Fair Politics barometer,” published by the NGO NP (Cercle de Coopération des ONG de développement). More generally, the institution cites the co-financing of NGO for the development of GCE-related resources and initiatives.

5.2. Funding recipients

During the period between 2011 and 2017, the government institution perceives NGOs to be its most significant recipients of GCE funding. Additional funding is given to research institutions/think-tanks (specifically the afore-mentioned financial support for GENE). According to the information provided, the budget-heading dedicated to NGO-led DEAR activities was allocated 2 million euros in 2014.

5.3. Funding procedure

The government institution's questionnaire responses outline the procedure for deciding recipients of GCE funding for annual projects as following the successful submission of proposals by accredited NGOs in response to an annual call. Calls for proposals for framework agreement subsidies occurs every three years. According to the institution, the Minister and Directorate for Development Cooperation and Humanitarian affairs are the only involved parties in decisions regarding the allocation of funding.

6. POLICY CONTEXT FOR INVESTMENT

Regarding the policy context for GCE investment at a national-level between 2011 and 2015, the government institution notes highlights two key policies as significant in their organisation's distribution of GCE funding. Firstly, Article 17 (2012) of the 1996 modified Law on development cooperation and humanitarian affairs, which determines “the eligibility criteria for actions to raise public awareness”. Secondly, the “General Terms and Conditions” (revised 2013), which governs relations between the MFA and GCE NGOs, inclusive of decisions regarding granting subsidies. They further refer to the positive impact of a government programme (2013-2018) “specifying the significant importance given to development education and awareness raising”.

At the international-level, during the same period, the government institution perceives The United Nations agreement on the Sustainable Development Goals, and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development to have positively impacted decisions regarding GCE funding in their country. They further describe that the European Development Year 2015 had a positive effect on GCE investment in Luxembourg, for example leading to the monthly meeting of a national coordination group set up in May 2014.

7. NGOS INVOLVEMENT IN GCE RELATED POLICY PROCESSES

Comparison of both the NP and the government institution's questionnaire responses indicates a strong level of NGO involvement in all stages of GCE policy procedure from agenda setting to policy formulation, implementation and evaluation. According to the NP, they are particularly highly involved in policy formulation through the working group for GCE policy set up between the MFA and NP. Regarding policy implementation, the government institution highlights their reliance on NGOs, and describes the MFA's “strong commitment” to NGOs and AR/DE projects. The NP emphasises that the MFA is “strongly supporting GCE”, whilst MoE support is “lacking”.

8. NGOS CAPACITY

Regarding Luxembourg's civic society situation and environment, the 2015 GENE report concludes that NGOs and the state developed a productive relationship in recent years and are working together to have greater impact regarding GCE issues (Hartmeyer and Wegimont 2015, 64)

The NP was established in 1993. Information provided indicates that the number of member has remained at "around 80" between 2011 and 2017. According to the NP, the member organisations are exclusively NGOs.

8.1. Platform activity and influence

The NP has a separate working group dealing with GCE. The NP considers the development of national partnerships and exchange to be the main focus of this group. It further cites its roles in education, peer-to-peer training, and policy.

8.2. Strategy building

Regarding their organisation's involvement in GCE strategy building, the NP identifies two relevant recommendation documents developed between 2011 and 2015; Compendium of ESD Actors (2012), an informational document for teachers about NGO-led ESD activities, and "Strategy for ESD" (2012), a recommendation document for ESD NGOs to follow. The organisation perceives these documents to have short-term (1-5 years), and long-term (5+ years) aims, respectively.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Hartmeyer, Helmuth, and Liam Wegimont. 2015. *The State of Global Education in Europe*. Dublin: Global Education Network Europe, European Union.

Krause, Johannes. 2010. "European Development. Education Monitoring Report: "DE Watch". " GENE (Global Education Network Europe). January-May. gene.eu/wp-content/uploads/Gene_OtherPublications-DEWatchReport.pdf.

Le Gouvernement du Grand-Duché de Luxembourg. 2018. "Espace ONG." *Gouvernement.lu*. January 5. Accessed January 10, 2018. <http://www.gouvernement.lu/4690722/espace-ong>.



1. TERMINOLOGY AND DEFINITIONS USED

1.1. Terms

Questionnaire respondents representing the national platform and the government institution, i.e. the Ministry for Education and Employment, indicate that, although both institutions have recently adopted the term GCE, distinct terms are also used within their respective institutions; the government institution refers to “Citizenship Education,” whereas the NP discusses “Development Education” and, more specifically, “DEAR”.

1.2. Definitions

The respondents provide distinct definitions. The focus in the government’s definition of CE is on childhood education in becoming “clear-thinking and enlightened citizens who participate in decisions concerning society”. The approach to DE by the NP is primarily outlined as AR and the DEEEP definition of DEAR is referred to.

2. WAYS OF DELIVERING GCE

Regarding GCE delivery between 2011 and 2015, the NP summarises that there were “various” key programmes and initiatives in formal education. Primary examples given are the yearly “Global Education Week”, organised by the Maltese Focal Point for the NS Centre of the Council of Europe in conjunction with the CoE GE Department, and “Forest in the World” (2011-2014), a DEAR forest conservation program endorsed by the Ministry of Education and implemented by the Maltese NGO (and member of the NP) Kopin. Between 2015 and 2017, Kopin’s “EAThink 2015” and the NGO Nature Trust’s “We Eat Responsibly” initiatives concerning sustainable food production were implemented. Regarding GCE delivery through informal education in the same period, the NP summarises the approach as NGO-developed AR projects. They refer to numerous projects aiming to address various GCE issues within the framework of the MDGs or SDGs through non-formal public events, educational activities, knowledge-development, social media campaigns, and festivals; for example, Kopin-implemented programs “Global Action Schools 2 Communities” (2008-2012), “Global Campus – Students for Social Justice” (2013-2015), “ClimATE Change” (2013-2016), and others. The government institution’s questionnaire responses further reference “EkoSkola”, a GCE programme whose aims are summarised as “empowering students in sustainable decision making and actions”.

3. DIFFERENT STAKEHOLDERS INVOLVED IN GCE

From the perspective of the NP, the main entities involved in GCE delivery and support within the government is the Ministry for Education and Employment (high-level influence in the establishment of policy and curriculum) and the Ministry for

Foreign Affairs and Trade Promotion (medium-level influence in policy and funding). Within the NGO sector, the NP lists Kopin and SOS Malta as having high-level impact due to “expertise, international networks, advocacy, capacity”, and Say It! and Koperattiva Kummercġ Gust (KKG) as medium-level influencing bodies with “thematic expertise”. As regards thematic expertise in Education for Sustainable Development, NP lists three other organisations: Nature Trust, and two organisations - BirdLife Malta and Friends of the Earth Malta – that are part of international/European networks; all of them are running educational programmes, but they aren’t members of the NP.

The University of Malta is listed by the NP as the chief education and research institution impacting GCE delivery through “thematic expertise” and “international networks”. The NP does not cite any international, media or other organisations as influential stakeholders in GCE delivery in their country.

Comparative significance of funding bodies

Table 1.

Organisations funding NGOs’ GCE activities in order of perceived significance of investment, 2011-17

1. European Commission
2. Ministry for Social Dialogue Consumer Affairs and Civil Liberties (NGO Co-financing Fund)
3. Malta Council for the Voluntary Sector
4. Ministry for Environment, Sustainable Development and Climate Change
5. Ministry for Foreign Affairs and Trade Promotion

Table 1 shows the NP’s perception of the comparative significance of the primary funding bodies (both national and international) for GCE activities carried out by NGOs in their country, indicating that the NP considers the international investment from the European Commission to be more substantial than provisions from national funding bodies. It is important to note that they explain that the NGO Co-financing Fund is now under the responsibility of the Parliamentary Secretary for Youth, Sports and Voluntary Organisations, which falls under the Ministry of Education. Significantly, the NP emphasises that the national institutions cited do not provide specific GCE or DEAR funding, rather their roles in co-financing either EU or national-level (primarily NGO-led) projects addressing issues such as the environment and youth incidentally result in some level of investment in GCE or DEAR-related activities.

4. PUBLIC FUNDING FOR GCE

Having been asked to consider the most significant sources of public funding for GCE in their country, the NP chose to contact the Ministry for Education and Employment's Department for Learning and Assessment Programmes as the relevant governmental institution. Accordingly, the questionnaire was completed by the Assistant Director of this department.

Responses from the governmental institution to the questionnaire research carried out by the present study finds that there was no specific national public funding for GCE in Malta during the period between 2011 and 2015. This finding is in line with existing data regarding Maltese public investment in GCE (Krause 2010, 58).

5. FUNDING PATTERNS.

Please refer to Section 4.

6. POLICY CONTEXT FOR INVESTMENT

When asked about the policy context for GCE investment at a national-level between 2011 and 2015, the government institution refers to the aforementioned AR events "GE Week" and "EkoSkola" as relevant programmes that have influenced GCE funding, however, no specific funding is provided.

Despite the NP highlighting the European Commission as the most significant investor in GCE in Malta, no relevant information is provided by the government institution regarding international-level policy that has impacted decisions regarding GCE funding.

When asked more generally about other relevant contextual factors, the government institution cites the impact of work carried out by the aforementioned NGO "Kopin," confirming nonetheless that this organisation does not receive official public funding.

7. NGOS INVOLVEMENT IN GCE RELATED POLICY PROCESSES

Comparison of both the NP and the government institution's questionnaire responses indicates discord regarding the perceived level of NGO involvement in GCE policy processes, likely resulting from the NP's wider understanding of GCE and DEAR activity. According to the government institution, there is no involvement of NGOs in national policy processes regarding GCE since no such policy exists. From the NP's perspective, whilst there is a lack of "access to decision makers" concerning agenda setting, they are consulted to a small degree regarding policy formulation and any "sporadic" policy evaluation. Moreover, the respondent perceives that "SKOP," the NP of Maltese NGOs, is highly involved in "policy implementation," since its members are "key providers of DEAR/GE/ESD" in Malta.

8. NGOS CAPACITY

Regarding Malta's civic society situation and environment, the 2010 DE Watch Report finds limited involvement of NGOs in GCE issues, and further describes the apparently informal nature of NGO meetings as "meetings of the same group of friends" (Krause 2010, 18). However, a 2017 concept report highlights the significant role of the NP in GCE, both at a national and international level (North-South Centre 2017, 7).

The NP was established in 2001. Data regarding the number of members indicates an increase from 17 to 26 between 2011 and 2017. According to the NP, the member organisations are primarily NGOs and social cooperatives.

8.1. Platform activity and influence

The NP has a separate working group dealing with GCE (DEAR working group was established in 2014). The NP considers AR activities, as well as advocacy and lobbying, to be the main focuses of this group. It further cites its roles in the "mapping of DEAR/GCE actions at national-level and policy monitoring". Developing national and international partnerships is considered as lower priorities for this group.

8.2. Strategy building

Regarding their organisation's involvement in GCE strategy building, the NP identifies as relevant two recommendation documents published internally for SKOP NP members between 2011 and 2015, both with a short-term (1-5 years) focus: The 2014 Draft Policy and Strategy Paper aimed to provide DEAR organisations with an advisory framework to organise their work. The goal of the 2016 mapping of DEAR/GCE actions and policy literature review was an overview of DEAR/GCE-related activity in Malta and DEAR/GCE-related policy implementation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Krause, Johannes. 2010. "European Development. Education Monitoring Report: "DE Watch"." *GENE (Global Education Network Europe)*. January-May. Accessed January 5, 2018. gene.eu/wp-content/uploads/Gene_OtherPublications-DEWatchReport.pdf.

North-South Centre. 2017. *South-East Europe and Mediterranean Regional Seminar on Global Development Education: Follow-up meeting. Concept Note, Romania: European Union and Council of Europe.*

THE NETHERLANDS



1. TERMINOLOGY AND DEFINITIONS USED

In the limited response received from Partos, the NP or development, it refers to both “development education” and “global citizenship activities.”

2. WAYS OF DELIVERING GCE

The present study did not receive responses from the NP or government regarding GCE delivery between 2011 and 2017 however, existing research cites some relevant examples. Schools in the Netherlands were “relatively inactive when it came to citizenship education” until reforms were initiated in 2014 (Hartmeyer and Wegimont 2015). The 2010 DE Watch Report describes that although DE objectives were included in primary and secondary education by the MoE, there was no guidance regarding their implementation (Krause 2010). In 2014, the MoE initiated the platform #Onderwijs2032 (Education2032) to renew the government goals in primary and secondary education so the curriculum developed students to “become qualified and involved (global) citizens” and increased support for teachers and schools in this (Hartmeyer and Wegimont 2015).

3. DIFFERENT STAKEHOLDERS INVOLVED IN GCE

Two significant stakeholders are Partos, though this organisation does not focus exclusively on GCE issues, and the National Committee for International Co-operation and Sustainable Development [NCDO], a former MFA-subsidised GCE foundation that finished working in 2017, following the termination of its subsidisation (Global Education Network Europe 2017). According to the GENE 2017 Report, Kaleidos (NCDO’s research platform) will cease to function whilst Samsam (NCDO’s magazine and online platform) and OneWorld (NCDO’s “multimedia platform on global development and sustainability”) will continue (Global Education Network Europe 2017).

From the perspective of a representative for Partos, the main entity involved in GCE delivery and support within the government is the MFA, cited as responsible for the allocation of funding, though it considers this institution’s support to be decreasing. The GENE Report refers to the MFA’s roles in “development cooperation policy, coordination, implementation and funding,” specifically referring to its past subsidisation of the NCDO (Global Education Network Europe 2017). It further cites the entity’s collaboration with other government departments in developing a “strategy for the national implementation of the global goals,” having appointed a specific co-ordinator and SDG ambassador (Global Education Network Europe 2017).

The MoE is also mentioned as a relevant influence in GCE through the educational platform #Onderwijs2032’s work towards greater inclusion of GE in primary and secondary school curriculum (Global Education Network Europe 2017).

4. PUBLIC FUNDING FOR GCE

The present study did not receive a response from any government organisation regarding public funding, but the limited information given by Partos and existing research is summarised below.

The 2017 GENE report states that there is no specific budget for “development education or Global Education,” but cites the 3.7-billion-euro budget for “development co-operation” (Global Education Network Europe 2017).

According to the 2010 DE Watch Report, the government decreased its budget for NGO co-financing and “government-implemented DE activities” from 60 million euros in 2010 to 30 million in 2011 (Krause 2010). Responding to the present study, Partos cites further, more recent reductions in government funding for “GC activities” from 5.3 million euros in 2016 to a planned 0.25 million euros per year from 2019 onwards. Specifically, it refers to the aforementioned ending of MFA-subsidisation for NCDO. Partos further mentions SBOS, an MFA subsidy scheme for “global citizenship” which was stopped in 2011, ten months after its introduction.

The representative for Partos expresses some hope for the future, highlighting that the new minister of Foreign Trade and Development “seems more positive about development education.”

5. NGOS INVOLVEMENT IN GCE RELATED POLICY PROCESSES

Analysis of the present study’s response from Partos and existing research indicates a weakening relationship between NGOs and the government regarding GCE issues and policy processes. Partos’ response does not indicate any consultation of NGOs regarding governmental decisions to cut funding for GCE. According to the 2010 DE Watch Report, although NGO-government relations improved from the 1980s onwards, the political situation in 2010 was “not very favourable for DE” (Krause 2010). The 2015 GENE Report refers to the multi-stakeholder discussions led by the Platform #Onderwijs2032 regarding ideas for the aforementioned education reforms, the conclusions of which were presented in 2016 (Hartmeyer and Wegimont 2015).

6. NGO CAPACITY

Regarding the Netherlands' civic society situation and environment, Bijl describes the country as having a developed system, with a significant number of NGOs given the relatively small population and a high rate of public involvement (Bijl 2010).

Partos was established in 2004. Information from its official website indicates an increase in membership from 60 civil society organisations in 2004 to a current membership of “over 100 development NGOs” (Partos 2018).

NCDO was established in 1970 with the aim of creating “awareness and public support for development cooperation in general”; this mandate was expanded by the MFA in 2010, to “strengthen global citizenship/citizenship in relation to sustainable global development” (Forghani-Arani, et al. 2013, 108). However, as previously mentioned, this organisation ceased to work following the MFA's decision to retract funding (Global Education Network Europe 2017).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bijl, R. 2010. *The Social State of the Netherlands*. The Hague: The Netherlands Institute for Social Research.

Forghani-Arani, N, H Hartmeyer, E O'Loughlin, and L Wegimont. 2013. *Global Education in Europe: Policy, Practice and Theoretical Challenges*. Waxmann Verlag GmbH.

Global Education Network Europe. 2017. *The State of Global Education in Europe 2017*. GENE Peer Review, Global Education Network Europe; European Union.

Hartmeyer, Helmut, and Liam Wegimont. 2015. *The State of Global Education in Europe*. Dublin: Global Education Network Europe, European Union.

Krause, Johannes. 2010. “European Development. Education Monitoring Report: “DE Watch”.” GENE (Global Education Network Europe). January-May. Accessed January 5, 2018. gene.eu/wp-content/uploads/Gene_OtherPublications-DEWatchReport.pdf.

Partos. 2018. *Partos: About us*. Accessed February 22, 2018. <https://www.partos.nl/en/about-us/>.



1. TERMINOLOGY AND DEFINITIONS USED

1.1. Terms

The questionnaire respondent representing the national platform asserts that the term “Global Education” [GE] is used by primary stakeholders to refer to GCE.

1.2. Definitions

The NP provides their official definition, explaining it was agreed between multiple stakeholders in 2010/11. GE is here understood as “part of civic education and formation.” The approach to GE is outlined as AR/GE with the aim of preparing citizens for global challenges including “human rights protection” and “ensuring sustainable development,” emphasising Global South perspectives. The NP further notes that CSOs are currently lobbying the MFA for the definition to be updated.

2. WAYS OF DELIVERING GCE

When asked about GCE delivery between 2011 and 2017, the NP summarises that GE was integrated into various subjects in the national curriculum until recent 2017/18 reforms which have “almost totally deleted” GE from the curriculum, although some reference remains in geography and civic education topics in upper secondary school education. The NP further cites teacher training in GE at the Center of Education Development [CED], although notes that GE experts are concerned the training activities sustain “stereotypes about the Global South”. Another key initiative mentioned is the coordination of multi-stakeholder GE meetings with representatives of the MFA, MoE, Ministry of Environment, NP, and CED since 2011.

Regarding GCE delivery through non-formal education in the same period, the NP refers to the prominent role played by CSOs, who work with schools and communities on AR projects. It notes that these projects are primarily funded through the MFA’s Development Cooperation Plan.

3. DIFFERENT STAKEHOLDERS INVOLVED IN GCE

From the perspective of the NP, the main entities involved in GCE delivery and support within the government are the MFA and the MoE, with their primary resources are summarised as funding and policy influence, respectively. The NP also cites the low-level influence of the Ministry of Science on teacher training and the Ministry of Environment on funding.

Regarding international organisations of relevance to GCE in Poland, the NP cites UNIC, due to their impact regarding the SDGs. Within the NGO sector, the NP lists Amnesty International, the Center for Civic Education, the Education for Democracy Foundation, the Institute for Global Responsibility and the Polish Humanitarian Action as the most significant stakeholders, all NP member organisations with high-level influence regarding funding.



Workshop about Global Citizenship Education in the formal education sector implemented during the LADDER Tool Fair - Torun (Poland) 2017

The CED and various universities (Dolnośląska Szkoła Wyższa, Warsaw University, Polish Academy of Science, Jagiellonian University, University of Marie Curie-Skłodowska in Lublin, Pedagogical University in Cracow) are listed by the NP as the chief education and research institutions involved in GCE in their country. The CED is described as impacting GCE delivery through access to the national network of teachers and teacher training resources. Concerning the universities, the NP refers to the impact of individual researchers at the institutions who are “interested in GE issues.”

Comparative significance of funding bodies

Table 1.

Organisations funding NGO GCE activities in order of perceived significance of investment, 2011-17.

1. European Commission
2. Ministry of Foreign Affairs


Table 1 shows the NP’s perception of the comparative significance of the primary funding bodies (both national and international) for GCE activities carried out by NGOs in their country. It is apparent that international (European) investment is considered to be more significant than the MFA’s provisions.

4. PUBLIC FUNDING FOR GCE

Having been asked to consider the most significant sources of public funding for GCE in their country, the NP chose to contact the MFA. The present study received very limited response from the government institution regarding public funding for GCE, however it provided figures (illustrated below).

Funding trends

Fig. 1. Government Institution's GCE Funding, 2011-15



The data supplied by the MFA shows that there was an overall increase in their investment in GCE funding during the period considered in the present study. Comparison of these figures with those from existing data indicates a decrease since 2009 when the MFA stated that it provided 0.8 million euros of “DE-specific funding” (Krause, European Development. Education Monitoring Report: “DE Watch” 2010).

Regarding development following 2015, according to the NP, funding allocated through the call for projects on GE was reduced in 2017. It considers that the current lack of government funding is detrimental to the sector, concluding that “the needs are great, but there is no money.”

5. FUNDING PATTERNS

5.1. Types of funding activities

Limited information available but according to the official MFA website, the funding allocated through the Development Cooperation Programme is directed at projects “to raise awareness and understanding on global issues and interdependencies” (Ministry of Foreign Affairs Republic of Poland 2012).

5.2. Funding recipients

During the period between 2011 and 2017, the NP cites the Center for Civic Education and the Education for Democracy Foundation as two among many recipients of MFA funding for GCE-related activities. It further notes the Center for Civic Education and Amnesty International as beneficiaries of EC investment.

6. POLICY CONTEXT FOR INVESTMENT

The present study received limited information regarding the policy context for GCE investment at a national-level between 2011 and 2015. In 2010, the DE Watch Report highlighted Poland as a country in which support for GE was increasing due to the commitment and collaboration of NGOs, the MFA, MoE and other stakeholders (Krause, European Development. Education Monitoring Report: “DE Watch” 2010). However, according to the responses of the NP to the current study, this is no longer the case since the current political situation and aforementioned education reform has led to increasing reluctance amongst schools to work with NGOs on GCE issues. At the international-level, the NP is not convinced of the impact of international initiatives regarding GCE funding in their country. It explains that the results of the MFA’s implementation of EYD2015 in Poland “were not satisfactory, especially from the educational point of view,” due to a lack of understanding regarding the initiative’s potential AR role and an absence of dialogue with NGOs.

Concerning other relevant contextual factors, the NP cites the negative effect of misrepresentations of GCE in the media and online on GCE investment in their country. It refers to “fake reports created to fake-blame donor organisations (like Stefan Batory Foundation) of financing “wrong” projects” [sic].

7. NGOS INVOLVEMENT IN GCE RELATED POLICY PROCESSES

Comparison of both the NP and the government institution’s questionnaire responses indicates high to mid-level NGO involvement in all GCE policy processes from agenda setting to policy formulation, implementation and evaluation. According to the NP, the MFA involves the NP in consultation regarding drafts of the annual Development Cooperation Plan, “other documents regarding GCE public funding,” and “strategic documents regarding GCE public support”. The NP explains that it observes and evaluates the MFA’s calls for proposals, formulates annual monitoring reports on GCE activities and develops recommendations.

However, whilst it highlights the significance of the established relationship and cooperation between government and NGOs in Poland, from the NP’s perspective, GE is still not a priority for governmental institutions; in particular, the NP perceives this to be true in the case of the MoE. The NP further states that “the government is not open to NGOs recommendations”, specifically regarding the omission of GE from the new curriculum and the poor relationship between schools and NGOs.

8. NGO CAPACITY

Regarding Poland’s civic society situation and environment, the sector rapidly expanded during the 1990s, following the fall of communism, although public attitudes to NGOs “remains rather restricted” (GHK 2010).

The NP was established in 2004. Data provided indicates that there were 54 members in 2011, rising to 61 members (2012-2015), before falling again to 55 members in 2016 and 54 in 2017. According to the NP, the member organisations are only NGOs.

8.1. Platform activity and influence

The NP has a separate working group dealing with GCE. The NP considers advocacy and lobbying and developing national networks to be the main focuses of this group. It further cites its roles in research on “GE status” in formal and non-formal education and policy work. It perceives developing international networks as a lesser priority for this group, and further explains that AR and educational activities are responsibilities of its member organisations, rather than the NP’s working group.

8.2. Strategy building

Regarding their organisation’s involvement in GCE strategy building, the NP identifies two relevant recommendation documents developed between 2011 and 2015. The first is a 2011 summary report on meetings regarding “multi-stakeholder process on GE” compiled in conjunction with the 2011 Cooperation Agreement signed between the MFA, MoE and the NP, Zagranica Group. The organisation considers the “development of GE in Poland” to be a primary goal of this report and agreement, perceiving this as a long-term (5+ years) aim. Secondly, the NP cites a 2012 report summarizing “conclusions and recommendations from the first peer review of materials and activities in the field of global education”. This peer review was coordinated by global education working group, and this document was aimed at the NGO sector, educators, GE authors and consultants, and sought to “identify the challenges faced by authors of publications concerning GE issues” and to “provide practical advice”.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

GHK. 2010. “Study on Volunteering in the European Union.” *EU Citizenship Portal*. Accessed January 15, 2018. http://ec.europa.eu/citizenship/about-the-europe-for-citizens-programme/studies/index_en.htm.

Krause, Johannes. 2010. “European Development. Education Monitoring Report: “DE Watch”.” *GENE (Global Education Network Europe)*. January-May. Accessed January 5, 2018. gene.eu/wp-content/uploads/Gene_OtherPublications-DEWatchReport.pdf.

Ministry of Foreign Affairs Republic of Poland. 2012. *Polish Aid: Our Assistance*. Accessed January 25, 2018. http://www.msz.gov.pl/en/foreign_policy/polish_aid/our_assistance/?printMode=true.

PORTUGAL



Source: www.pixabay.com

1. TERMINOLOGY AND DEFINITIONS USED

1.1. Terms

Questionnaire respondents representing the national platform and the government institution in Portugal both assert that the term “Development Education” [DE] is currently in wide-use within their respective institutions to refer to GCE. However, the NP explains it is currently moving towards a “DEAR/GCE narrative,” aiming to adopt this formally from March 2018.

1.2. Definitions

Respondents for the NP and Government Institutions provide the same definition using the term Development Education. The definition highlights the processual nature of ED/DE and the inclusion of Global South perspectives in learning about development issues. This approach is outlined as AR and GE, with the NP emphasising that PR for development initiatives does not constitute DE.

2. WAYS OF DELIVERING GCE

When asked about GCE delivery in formal education between 2011 and 2017, the NP gives limited information, referring to its integration into the national curriculum. Specifically, the NP cites the MoE’s CE referential guidelines (Direção-Geral da Educação 2013) which advocates the inclusion of “different dimensions of GE” “in subject areas and subjects and in activities and projects, from preschool to upper secondary

education”. The NP gives no details concerning GCE delivery through informal education.

3. DIFFERENT STAKEHOLDERS INVOLVED IN GCE

From the perspective of the NP, the main governmental entity involved in GCE delivery and support is Camões IP, the Institute for Cooperation and Language, whose primary resources are summarised as funding, international network access, and policy influence. Within the government sector, the NP also cites the MFA and MoE as mid-level influences due to their policy control.

Regarding international organisation, the NP cites CONCORD and GENE as mid-level influences with resources in expert knowledge and consulting.

Within the NGO sector, the NP perceives the Working Group on Development Education (GTED) as having low-level impact through its consultancy with the government and wide recognition as an authority in the field. In education and research, the NP refers to two key entities as significant stakeholders in GCE delivery within “DEAR academia”; the School for Superior Education of Viana do Castelo, and Coimbra University Social Studies Centre, which is “supporting the upcoming new DEAR National Strategy Framework”.

Comparative significance of funding bodies

The NP gives limited information about how they perceive the significance of investment made by organisations funding

for GCE activities carried out by NGOs in their country. The NP perceives Camões IP to be the most significant investor. According to their official website, this national organisation is “a public institute, integrated in the indirect administration of the State, with administrative and financial autonomy and its own assets” (Camões, I.P. 2018). Additionally, the NP consider the European Commission’s Directorate-General for International Cooperation and Development (DG DEVCO) to have provided “mid-level” investment.

4. PUBLIC FUNDING FOR GCE

Having been asked to consider the most significant sources of public funding for GCE in their country, the government institution that the NP chose to contact was the aforementioned Camões IP. Accordingly, the questionnaire was completed by a representative within this institution.

Funding trends

Fig. 1. Government Institution’s GCE Funding, 2011-15.




Figure 1 shows GCE funding allocated by the institute in response to annual calls for NGO-developed project proposals. The data supplied to the present study shows that there was an overall increase in their investment in GCE funding during the period considered in the present study, with no formal funding for GCE activities by the institute in 2011.

5. FUNDING PATTERNS

5.1. Types of funding activities

The government institution states that they have invested in the all listed types of GCE activities between 2011 and 2017; AR, media and promotional work, building of national, regional and international networks, development of teaching materials and teacher training, integration into formal education, research, and policy development. Their responses indicate that they consider these activities to have received similar levels of funding. There is no information given regarding specific projects funded.

5.2. Funding recipients

During the period between 2011 and 2017, the government institution perceives the following to be its most significant recipients of GCE funding; higher education institutions, international organisations – specifically, GENE, NGOs – specifically, NGDOs and the NP for NGDOs, and schools.

5.3. Funding procedure

The government institution outlines decisions regarding recipients of GCE funding for projects follow the successful submission of proposals by legally-recognised NGOs in response to annual calls. They further explain that funding for the integration of GCE into formal education occurs within “the framework of the National Strategy for Development Education (ENED) and the MoJ Camões (MFA)-DGE (MoE)”. Further funding for NGDO activities is provided since the NP is co-financed by Camões within “the framework of the DE co-financing scheme” (2009-2013; 2014-2018). Whilst the government organisation does not state whether there are diverse stakeholders involved in the decision-making process, it emphasises that the NP is “always consulted on the rules and procedures related to the DE co-financing scheme”.

6. POLICY CONTEXT FOR INVESTMENT

Regarding the policy context for GCE investment at a national-level between 2011 and 2015, the government institution notes highlights the following policies and programmes as significant in their organisation’s distribution of GCE funding; the aforementioned “National Strategy for Development Education 2010-2015” (ENED) and “ENED Action Plan 2010-2015” (both extended to 2016) MFA/MoE strategy documents for GCE AR activities, the GENE “Global Education in Portugal” report (2014) concerning “GE-engagement” at a national and European level, and the MoE “CE Guidelines” (2013) on the integration of “CE” into school curricula. The government institution further cites the positive influence on GCE funding of the “national conferences on DE” (2010-2013, 2015) and “forum on DE in Parliament (2014).

At the international-level, during the same period, the government institution perceives various policy documents and agreements to have positively impacted decisions regarding GCE funding in their country. Relevant documents cited at a European-level are; Recommendations of the European Congresses on Global Education (Maastricht, 2002; Lisbon, 2012; Zagreb, 2015); GENE’s Hague International Symposium on Global Education in Europe (2012); European Parliament written declaration on development education and

active global citizenship (2012); Commission Staff Working Document on Development Education and Awareness Raising (DEAR) in Europe (2012); Commission Communication “The roots of democracy and sustainable development: Europe’s engagement with Civil Society in external relations” and the Council Conclusions (2012); Decision 472/2014 of the European Parliament and of the Council on the European Year for Development (2015); and, Joint declaration of the European Parliament, the Council and the European Commission on the Legacy of the European Year for Development 2015 (2015). The government institution further highlights that the European Year for Development (2015) had a positive effect on GCE investment in their country.

Regarding policy context at an international, non-European-level during the considered period, they cite the importance of the UN Global Education First Initiative (2012) and UNESCO Forums on Global Citizenship Education (Bangkok, 2013; Paris, 2015), and UN 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (2015).

7. NGOS INVOLVEMENT IN GCE RELATED POLICY PROCESSES

Comparison of both the NP and the government institution’s questionnaire responses indicates a strong level of NGO involvement in all stages of GCE policy procedure from agenda setting to policy formulation, implementation and evaluation. Both entities further explain that the NGO’s involvement in policy is enabled through inclusion of the NP’s working group in the “Creation, Implementation and Follow-up Commission” for “DE National Strategy”. According to the government institution, the NP’s membership of the Cooperation Forum, “a consultative forum of civil society on DC,” is also significant.

8. NGO CAPACITY

Regarding Portugal’s civic society situation and environment, a 2014 GENE report explains that NGOs have been crucial in the coordination of DE activities from the end of the 1970s onwards, prior to the more recent increase in governmental support (Global Education Network Europe 2014, 43). The report further highlights the significant role played by the NP in GCE, particularly regarding the National Strategy of DE (ibid., 24). This positive perspective is supported by the 2010 DE Watch Report (Krause, European Development. Education Monitoring Report: “DE Watch” 2010, 20).

The NP was legally registered in 1999 (established since 1985). Data provided indicates a decrease from 67 to 60 members between 2011 and 2017. According to the NP, the member organisations are primarily NGOs.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Camões, I.P. 2018. “Who We Are .” Camões, I.P. Accessed January 11, 2018. <http://www.instituto-camoes.pt/en/institutional/about-us/who-we-are>.

Direção-Geral da Educação. 2013. “Citizenship Education – Guidelines.” DGE.pt. Accessed January 10, 2018. http://www.dge.mec.pt/sites/default/files/ECidadania/Docs_referencia/citizenship_education_guidelines.pdf.

Global Education Network Europe. 2014. *Global Education in Portugal. National Report, Global Education Network Europe*.

Krause, Johannes. 2010. “European Development. Education Monitoring Report: “DE Watch”.” GENE (Global Education Network Europe). January-May. gene.eu/wp-content/uploads/Gene_OtherPublications-DEWatchReport.pdf.

8.1. Platform activity and influence

The NP has a separate working group dealing with GCE. The NP considers “peer learning” to be the main focus of this group. It further cites its roles in policy, development of national networks, and advocacy and lobbying.

8.2. Strategy building

Regarding their organisation’s involvement in GCE strategy building, the NP identifies several relevant recommendation documents developed between 2011 and 2015. They summarise that during the period from 2011 to 2013, they internally published a number of recommendations, feedback and evaluation reports “reinforcing DEAR priorities [...] in terms of funding, programs, policies,” aimed at the MFA, MoE and Camões IP. Other key documents mentioned are the “DEAR Argument” (2014) publicising the NP’s position on the suspension of DEAR funding, the EYD Position of the Portuguese Platform (2015) for all GCE stakeholders, to “support the EYD as DEAR year”, and a development sector recommendations document (2015) aimed at the MFA and affecting policy change in the short term (1-5 years).



1. TERMINOLOGY AND DEFINITIONS USED

1.1. Terms

The questionnaire responses of the representative for the national platform indicates a lack of clarity regarding terminology in the GCE sector in Romania. It asserts that the terms “Development Education” [DE] and “Global Education” [GE] are both used by their institution to refer to GCE. In addition, it notes that “GCE” is used by some member organisations in the context of their DEAR projects.

1.2. Definitions

The NP does not provide its own definition, instead referring to the CONCORD and North-South Center definitions. DE is here understood as “an active learning process, founded on values of solidarity, equality, inclusion and co-operation”. The approach is outlined as AR/GE.

2. WAYS OF DELIVERING GCE

When asked about GCE delivery in formal education between 2011 and 2017, the NP summarises the key initiative as the MoE-led teacher training courses on “global education and democratic citizenship education.” It further mentions the MoE-led GE Week.

Regarding GCE delivery through non-formal education in the same period, the NP refers to the work of its NGO member organisations on the development of DEAR projects and provision of GCE-related resources for “schools and educators.” According to the 2015 GENE report, NGOs coordinated numerous GCE-related initiatives in 2015, such as a “Romanian Development Days” summer camp and AR for volunteering (Hartmeyer and Wegimont, *The State of Global Education in Europe 2015*).

3. DIFFERENT STAKEHOLDERS INVOLVED IN GCE

From the perspective of the NP, the main governmental entities involved in GCE delivery and support is the MoE, as the main stakeholder influencing policy and the national education system and curriculum, and as the coordinating body for the country’s GE Week. It further highlights the influence of the MFA in funding and policy. Although the NP explains there is currently lack of resources and interest in this department, it cites the establishment of the Agency on Development Cooperation (RoAid) in 2016, involved in developing a new National Strategy on Development Cooperation.

Regarding international organisations, the NP refers to the North-South Centre as a stakeholder with low to mid-level impact on GCE delivery in their country, due to its organisation of regional, multi-stakeholder “seminars and meetings providing space for exchange between different countries.” The NP explains that these are funded through the NCS’ EC Grant,

and cites a recent meeting between Cyprus, Malta, Bulgaria, Romania and Slovenia as an example.

Within the NGO sector, the NP cites that its members and other NGOs have low to mid-level influence through their provision of “support and resources to hands-on educators.”

Comparative significance of funding bodies

Table 1.

Organisations funding NGO GCE activities in order of perceived significance of investment, 2011-17.

1. European Commission
2. Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Table 1 shows the NP’s perception of the comparative significance of the primary funding bodies (both national and international) for GCE activities carried out by NGOs in their country. Significantly, it considers just two organisations to be “main funding bodies.” It is apparent that an international (European) entity is perceived to be the most significant investor, further highlighting that EC funds are primarily provided through DEAR and Erasmus+ programmes. The NP explains that MFA investment is allocated for AR activities through small grants, although it emphasises that the ministry does not use the term “GCE” to refer to the grants and funded projects.


It should also be noted that, according to the NP’s understanding, although the MoE offers its expertise for some “GE projects,” it does not provide any financial support.

4. PUBLIC FUNDING FOR GCE

The present study did not receive a response from the MFA but was directed to its annual reports on official development assistance by the NP for information.

Funding trends

Fig. 1. Government Institution's GCE Funding, 2011-15



Source: (RoAid, MFA Romania 2018)

Figure 1 shows the MFA's ODA funding towards "DE and AR" provided annually between 2011 and 2015 and shows that there was an overall increase in their investment in DEAR during the period considered in the present study, with a significant peak in 2015. Across the whole period, funding represents on average 3.44% of the department's total ODA budget, though this varies considerably year-on-year data, as follows; 2011 (1.09%), 2012 (4.97%), 2013 (4.07%), 2014 (1.32%), 2015 (5.76%).

5. FUNDING PATTERNS

5.1. Types of funding activities

In the context of EYD2015, the MFA supported the implementation of a National Work Plan which included AR events aimed at "youth, media, students, civils society and the academia on development issues," such as the "Romanian Ambassadors for Development" programme, the "OneWorld" Human Rights Film Festival in Bucharest and "World Solidarity Tent" representing EYD2015 at the NGO Fest (RoAid 2018, RoAid/DEVCOM 2015). The MFA also funded the aforementioned (Section 2) NGO-led GCE projects implemented in 2015 (Hartmeyer and Wegimont, The State of Global Education in Europe 2015).

In its annual reports, the government institution refers to the SNIECODA programme, organising post-graduate education in International Development and the first three editions (2008-2010) of the annual Romanian Development Camp (RDC), as the "most important programme" receiving funding in this sector (RoAid, MFA Romania 2018).

It has collaborated with the NP in the organisation of the RDCs which "bring[s] together main national stakeholders and international partners and stakeholders active in the field of development cooperation" (RoAid, MFA Romania 2018).

5.2. Funding recipients

During the period between 2011 and 2017, the government institution perceives NGOs to be its most significant recipients of GCE funding. Specifically, the MFA cites the UNDP Regional Center for Europe and Central Asia, the Civil Society Development Foundation and the RDC (7th edition) as the main beneficiaries of its "DE" investment (RoAid, MFA Romania 2018).

5.3. Funding procedure

The present study was not provided with any information regarding the procedure for deciding recipients of GCE funding by the MFA. The NP mentions an annual call for project proposals, including those "for development education and awareness raising."

In the context of the EYD2015, the MFA provided six "micro-grants" for "projects covering communication activities and development education," allocated on the basis of responses to its 2014 call for project proposals (Hartmeyer and Wegimont, The State of Global Education in Europe 2015).

6. POLICY CONTEXT FOR INVESTMENT

Limited information was provided regarding the policy context for GCE investment at a national-level between 2011 and 2015. According to the NP, the establishment of RoAid in 2016 resulted in the 2017 call for project proposals being cancelled. Regarding other relevant contextual factors, the NP further highlights that the recent unstable political landscape in Romania has negatively impacted the potential for NGOs to influence policy.

At the international-level, the GENE report highlights the positive effect of the EYD2015 on the MFA's distribution of GCE funding (Hartmeyer and Wegimont, The State of Global Education in Europe 2015).

7. NGOS INVOLVEMENT IN GCE RELATED POLICY PROCESSES

Analysis of the NP's questionnaire responses indicates a low level of NGO involvement in GCE policy processes. As mentioned in Section 6, the NP perceives the policy influence of NGOs to have decreased in recent years due to the country's political climate. According to the NP, NGO participation in agenda setting for GCE policy is "almost non-existent." Regarding policy formulation, the NP highlights its "regular communication" with the MFA and MoE. It further explains that consultation is on an "ad-hoc" basis when issues arise, for example when the NP and MoE collaborated in the organisation of the EYD2015. From the NP's perspective, there is a low level of involvement in policy implementation and evaluation.

8. NGO CAPACITY

Regarding Romania's civic society situation and environment, the country does not have a strong tradition in establishing associations; its development was halted by the communist regime, as in many countries, but the country's traditional reliance on family units for support and its unstable economy are also cited as significant factors (GHK 2010). Whilst the sector has grown post-communism, since the 1990s, Romania has consistently had relatively few NGOs in comparison to other formerly communist countries (ibid.).

The NP was established in 2006. Data provided regarding its members indicates an overall decrease from 42 members in 2011 to 33 members in 2017. According to the NP, the member organisations are primarily NGOs.

8.1. Platform activity and influence

The NP has a "Development/Global Education Working Group" The NP considers the provision of educational resources and "sharing tools among the NGOs" to be the main focus of this group.

8.2. Strategy building

Regarding their organisation's involvement in GCE strategy building, the NP does not identify any relevant recommendation documents developed between 2011 and 2015.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

GHK. 2010. "Study on Volunteering in the European Union." EU Citizenship Portal. Accessed January 15, 2018. http://ec.europa.eu/citizenship/about-the-europe-for-citizens-programme/studies/index_en.htm.

Hartmeyer, Helmuth, and Liam Wegimont. 2015. *The State of Global Education in Europe*. Dublin: Global Education Network Europe, European Union.

RoAid. 2018. *RoAid: EYD2015*. Accessed January 27, 2018. <http://www.roaid.ro/en/page/eyd2015-106>.

RoAid, MFA Romania. 2018. "ODA Annual Reports." RoAid. Accessed January 29, 2018. <http://www.roaid.ro/en/page/annual-reports-36>.

RoAid/DEVCOM. 2015. "EYD2015 FINAL NARRATIVE REPORT." RoAid. Accessed January 28, 2018. http://roaid.ro/uploads/documents/85/Annex%20VI%20Romania_EYD2015_Final%20Narrative%20Report.pdf.

SLOVAKIA



Source: Ben White photography - unsplash.com

1. TERMINOLOGY AND DEFINITIONS USED

1.1. Terms

Questionnaire respondents representing the government institutions in Slovakia, the National Institute for Education [NIE] (under the responsibility of the MoE) and the Agency for International Development Cooperation [SlovakAid] (under responsibility of the MFA), both assert that the term “global education” [GE] is used by their respective institutions to refer to GCE. The representative for the national platform states that it uses “global development education” [GDE].

1.2. Definitions

Definitions provided by the NIE and SlovakAid outline the approach as AR and GE. According to SlovakAid, the aim is to gain “deeper understanding of the diversity and inequality in the world”. According to the NIE, what is referred to as “GDE” is understood as education concerning issues of “poverty, environmental education, multicultural education, peace education, [and...] human rights”. The NP understanding of GDE understands it as education on the “lived experiences of globalisation”.

2. WAYS OF DELIVERING GCE

When asked about delivery in formal education between 2011 and 2017, the NP summarises that GE is not formally integrated into the national curriculum, although NGO and school-led activities do take place. In non-formal education, the key initiatives are considered NGO-coordinated development of educational resources, projects and courses for all levels of the education system; the NP further refers to the Slovak Youth Institute as “relatively active in this area of GE”.

Regarding informal education for GE in the same period, the NP refers to “numerous small to medium scale NGO AR campaigns”. It also cites “less formalized citizen initiatives” in which GE is not the chief focus, but is covered indirectly.

3. DIFFERENT STAKEHOLDERS INVOLVED IN GCE

From the perspective of the NP, the main entities involved in GCE delivery within the government are the MoE and MFA regarding policy, and SlovakAid in respect to funding. The influence of these entities is described as low; concerning the MoE, the NP considers this is due to a “lack of interest”. The NP explains that NIE was recently made responsible for Slovakia’s GE agenda but that its impact is not yet known.

Regarding international organisations, the NP cites GENE and the UN as having low-level impact concerning policy, specifically due to their development of the SDGs, in the case of the UN. Moreover, CONCORD and the North-South Centre and their access to international networks are cited as low-level influences.

Within the NGO sector, the NP considers itself as having influence regarding policy and international networks. NP also cites CEEV Zivica, People in Peril, Milan Simecka Foundation, Pontis Foundation and PDCS as significant stakeholders in GCE delivery in their country, due to their work with schools and the development of resources. The NP describes NGOs as having only “medium impact, understood relatively to the general performance and scope of GDE in the country”.

Comenius University, Zvolen Technical University, Matej Bel University in Banska Bystrica, University of P. J. Safarik in Kosice, Presov University and Trnava University are listed by the NP as the primary education and research institutions involved, and are described as having limited impact on GCE delivery through research and offering related programmes.

Within the media, The NP perceives the newspapers SME, Pravda, and Dennik N as low-level influences for “outreach”.

The NP does not consider any stakeholder cited to have “high-level” influence in GCE delivery.

Comparative significance of funding bodies

Table 1.

Organisations funding NGO GCE activities in order of perceived significance of investment, 2011-17.
1. EuropeAid
2. SlovakAid
3. Private sector partners
4. Norway grants

Table 1 shows the NP’s perception of the comparative significance of the primary funding bodies (both national and international) for GCE activities carried out by NGOs in their country. It should be highlighted that two of these are international entities, whilst only one is a source of national public funding.

4. PUBLIC FUNDING FOR GCE

Having been asked to consider the most significant sources of public funding for GCE in their country, the NP chose to contact SlovakAid as the relevant government institution. Accordingly, the questionnaire was completed by a representative within this institution. The NIE also provided some information, but this report refers primarily to the SlovakAid’s responses, unless otherwise stated.

Funding trends

Fig. 1. Government Institution’s GCE Funding, 2011-15

Limited data was supplied by SlovakAid regarding their funding for GCE during the period considered in the present study; there is no data prior to 2015, when it invested 130 000 €. According to the institution, funding is sourced from the state budget. Regarding development following 2015, the data given shows that investment into GCE decreased in 2016 (100 000 €) before it rose again in 2017 (135 000 €). Existing data indicates that financial support for GCE provided by the MFA as a whole institution amounted to 295 000 € in 2007 (Krause 2010, 67).

5. FUNDING PATTERNS

5.1. Types of funding activities

Table 1.

Significant types of funding activities in order of amount of funding allocated, 2011-17.

1. Global Citizenship Education in formal education
2. Awareness raising activities about the importance of Global Citizenship Education
3. Work with media to promote Global Citizenship Education

Table 1 shows the MFA’s prioritisation of the main types of GCE-related activities that it supports. In addition to these activities, the organisation also refers to investment in network-building, and teaching resources and training. The MFA does not detail any specific examples of funded initiatives.

Although the NIE does not give information regarding the priority of GCE-activities for which it provides financial support, it does refer to its funding for teaching resources and training, formal education projects, and policy work on the implementation of the National Strategy on GE 2012 – 2016 (2012). Specifically, the NIE refers to the development of teaching methodology recommendations concerning “New challenges and needs of a globalized world in education; Education to the values of national and world cultural and historical heritage; Applying the global dimension in education; Activating teaching methods in global development education”. Moreover, the organisation cites the “Teaching about the United Nations and sustainable development goals” workshop on teacher competency, and the “Slovak and Czech Regional Academy: Inclusive school environment for all. Diversity - Recognition – Equality” project aimed at “promoting a democratic and inclusive school climate,” supported by NIE through EEA and Norwegian Grants.

5.2. Funding recipients.

During the period between 2011 and 2017, the MFA perceives the following to be its most significant recipients of GCE funding; higher education institutions, media organisations, and NGOs. It further explains that only NGOs and universities receive direct investment through its annual call for proposals, the provision of funding for other organisations is indirect, in the case that they are involved in a university or NGO-led project.

5.3. Funding procedure

The government institution's questionnaire responses outline that the recipients of GCE funding are decided through an annual open call for project proposals. According to the institution, SlovakAid and the MFA are the involved parties in decisions regarding the allocation of funding. Given that the MFA is responsible for SlovakAid, this does not imply diversity of stakeholders.

6. POLICY CONTEXT FOR INVESTMENT

Limited details are provided by the government organisations regarding the policy context for GCE investment between 2011 and 2015. The MFA mentions the GENE Increase Programme as a positive influence on their organisation's distribution of GCE funding.

The NP considers supportive national policy be the most important factor in public funding for NGO GCE-related initiatives, but states that this "has not yet happened. Ever."

7. NGOS INVOLVEMENT IN GCE RELATED POLICY PROCESSES

Comparison of both the NP and the government institution's questionnaire responses indicates discord regarding the perceived level of NGO involvement in GCE policy processes. The NP and MFA agree that NGOs participate in agenda setting and policy formulation. According to the NP, the MFA and SlovakAid offer the NP "space for input," for example concerning the development of the National Strategy on GE 2012 – 2016. Despite their limited scope, the NP considers NGOs to be highly involved in policy implementation, as the "primary bodies implementing GE in the country". Cooperation regarding evaluation is perceived by the NP to be less successful since there is no official framework, but consider that they have mid-level participation in project-based assessment. In contrast, the MFA does not consider NGOs to take part at all in either implementation or evaluation stages of national policy process, however this is likely since there is no official process in these cases.

8. NGO CAPACITY

Regarding Slovakia's civic society situation and environment, a 2013 GENE report highlights the significant role of the NP and its members in GCE implementation, particularly through initiatives supported by SlovakAid, and in regard to the progress towards a National Strategy (Global Education Network Europe 2013, 22). A 2017 report cites the NP and other NGOs as main stakeholders in GCE, considering there to be "ongoing" coordination amongst them, as opposed to the "weaker" cooperation between NGOs and relevant government institutions (North-South Centre 2017, 10-11)

The NP was established in 2003. Data regarding its members indicates a decrease from 32 to 26 members between 2011 and 2017. According to the NP, the member organisations are primarily NGOs and higher education institutions.

8.1. Platform activity and influence

The NP has a separate working group dealing with GCE. The NP considers advocacy and lobbying, and policy development to be the main focuses of this group. It further cites its roles in developing national networks, education, and AR. Developing international networks is considered a lesser priority.

8.2. Strategy building

Regarding their organisation's involvement in GCE strategy building, the NP identifies one relevant recommendation document developed between 2011 and 2015, the National Strategy on GE 2012 – 2016. The organisation considers the goals put forward in this "framework document for development of global education within the Slovak educational context," aimed at all main stakeholders in GCE in Slovakia, to be short-term (1-5 years).



1. TERMINOLOGY AND DEFINITIONS USED

1.1. Terms

Questionnaire respondents representing the national platform and the government institution in Slovenia both assert that the term “Global Education” [GE] is used by their respective institutions to refer to GCE. The NP further states that ESD is used in some schools and by the MoE, and GCE is used at the EU level.

1.2. Definitions

Both respondents provide the same definition, developed by the NP’s GE working group. GE is here understood as a “a learning process, with the focus on interdependence and involvement of every individual in global challenges”. The approach to GE highlights the need to develop both “formal and non-formal education and learning programs”.

2. WAYS OF DELIVERING GCE

When asked about GCE delivery and the key initiatives in formal education between 2011 and 2017, the NP refers to Project “Konzorcij NVO: Z globalnim učenjem do globalnih ciljev!” (NGO consortium: With global education towards global education!), funded by MFA and implemented by NP and NGOs (2016-2017), with workshops on GCE, closely linked to SDGs, teachers and students from primary and secondary schools and university were trained, and awareness raising campaign, motivational day for GCE teachers, national GCE conference, handbook on GCE and SDGs were implemented and produced. Project “Le z drugimi smo” (2016-2021), teacher training programme for “social and civic competences”, is financed by the MoE and coordinated by the Educational Research Institute [ERI], in cooperation with NGOs.

Regarding GCE delivery through informal education in the same period, the NP cites three workshop programmes which introduced GE-related issues into schools, besides mentioned NGO consortium: With global education towards global goals!, also two funded by the Government Communication Office and coordinated by NGO “Association Humanitas”; “Through a refugee’s eyes” (2016-2017), and “Introducing GE to the school system” (2015-2016).

3. DIFFERENT STAKEHOLDERS INVOLVED IN GCE

From the perspective of the NP, the main governmental entities involved in GCE delivery and support are the MFA and the MoE. Their primary resources are summarised as funding and policy influence. The NP further refers to the mid-level impact on policy of the National Education Institute.

Regarding international organisation, the NP perceives the European Commission and the UNESCO to have high-level influence concerning funding and policy.

Within the NGO sector, the NP considers Humanitas to have high-level influence regarding access to international NGO networks, but a limited source of funding. Moreover, the NP perceives itself and the GE working group as significant stakeholder in GE policy development, with important access to international NGO networks.

The aforementioned ERI is cited by the NP as the primary education/research institution of relevance, described as impacting GCE delivery to a limited degree through policy.

Comparative significance of funding bodies

Table 1.

Organisations funding NGO’s GCE activities in order of perceived significance of investment, 2011-17

1. European Commission (DEAR programs)
2. Ministry of Foreign Affairs
3. MOVIT, Institute for Development of Youth Mobility
3. CMEPIUS, Centre for Mobility and European Educational and Training Programmes


Table 1 shows the NP’s perception of the comparative significance of the primary funding bodies (both national and international) for GCE activities carried out by NGOs in the country. Whilst an international (European) organisation is perceived as the main funding body, the NP considers national entities to constitute the majority of main GCE investors.

4. PUBLIC FUNDING FOR GCE

Having been asked to consider the most significant sources of public funding for GCE in their country, the government institution which the NP chose to contact was the MFA. Accordingly, the questionnaire was completed by a representative of this institution.

Funding trends

Fig. 1. Government Institution's GCE Funding, 2011-15



The data supplied by the government institution shows that there was an overall increase in their investment in GCE funding during the period considered in the present study, but that this figure has fluctuated year-on-year. According to the institution, funding is sourced from the state budget. They further explain that the 2015 figure does not include funds provided by the European Commission in the context of the European year for development. The MFA responds that there was no specific GCE funding in 2011, and data from 2010 suggests that there was indeed a general lack of co-financing from the MFA and other public entities in Slovenia (Krause 2010, p. 68). Regarding development following 2015, the data given shows that there the MFA investment into GCE rose once again during 2016, to 0.68 million euros.

5. FUNDING PATTERNS

5.1. Types of funding activities

Table 2.

Types of funding activities in order of amount of funding allocated, 2011-17
1. Informal education activities focused on GCE (outside a structured curriculum)
2. Teacher training activities
3. Awareness raising activities about the importance of GCE
4. Development of teaching materials and publishing in GCE

Table 2 shows the government institution's perspective on the priority of different GCE-related funding activities. The government institution further explains that the majority of NGO initiatives which received their funding were concerned with informal education; most of these are summarised as AR workshops "on different GE topics: human rights, child

rights, clean and safe environment, sustainable development, peace education, prevention of peer violence, equality". More specifically, the MFA refers to the "Cultural Bazaar" GE workshop and lecture programme (2015, 2017) for students and educators, organised by the MFA in collaboration with the Ministry of Culture and the MoE.

5.2. Funding recipients

During the period between 2011 and 2017, the government institution perceives international organisations and NGOs to be its most significant recipients of GCE funding. The MFA asserts to funding the international "North-South Centre" between 2010 and 2015 through its membership fee. Concerning NGOs provided with support, the government institution cites the following organisations as beneficiaries between 2011 and 2015; UNICEF Slovenia, the SLOGA NP, Humanitas, Amnesty International Slovenia, African Center of Slovenia, and the Institute for African Studies.

5.3. Funding procedure

The government institution outlines that until 2017, decisions regarding recipients of two-years of GCE funding for projects followed the successful submission of proposals by legally-recognised NGOs in response to annual calls. According to the MFA, funding will now be provided for three-year periods.

6. POLICY CONTEXT FOR INVESTMENT

Regarding the policy context for GCE investment at a national-level, the government institution highlights the following programmes as significant in their organisation's distribution of GCE funding: the "Resolution on International Development Cooperation of the Republic of Slovenia until 2015" (2008), and the "The Resolution on Development Cooperation and Humanitarian Assistance of the Republic of Slovenia" which was adopted by the National Assembly in September 2017 and is currently the chief strategic document in GCE for all relevant stakeholders; and the "Framework Programme on International Development and Humanitarian Aid" (an instrument for multi-annual planning of ODA, including global education). During the period of 2011 - 2015, the MFA does not indicate that any international policy or programme has positively impacted decisions regarding GCE funding in their country. In relation to this, it should be noted that the NP finds international agreements and initiatives to be the most influencing factor in public funding for NGOs in the GCE field.

7. NGOS INVOLVEMENT IN GCE RELATED POLICY PROCESSES

Comparison of both the NP and the government institution's questionnaire responses indicates a mixed level of NGO involvement in GCE policy processes, and weak coordination between the two organisations. According to both, NGOs have very limited involvement in agenda setting and policy evaluation. By contrast, they agree that NGOs are highly involved in policy implementation since, according to the MFA, they are the only entities receiving funding for implementing "GE" projects. They further agree that NGOs have some involvement in policy formulation; for example, according to

the MFA, NGOs have assisted in developing the new Strategy of Development Cooperation and Humanitarian Assistance, including “one chapter [is] dedicated to GE”. Communication between government, specifically MFA, and NGO sector slightly improved after 2010, especially in the last period, covered by this report.

8. NGOS CAPACITY

Regarding Slovenia’s civil society situation and environment, a 2015 GENE report emphasises that NGOs are the main stakeholders involved in coordinating GCE-related projects, in particular in the formal education sector due to the lack of “systemic approach” (Global Education Network Europe 2017, 86).

The NP was established in 2006. Data provided indicates an increase from 36 to 46 members between 2011 and 2017. According to the NP, the member organisations are primarily NGOs.

8.1. Platform activity and influence

The NP has a separate working group dealing with GCE. The NP considers educational activities, developing national networks, and policy to be the main focuses of this group. It further cites its roles in international networking, and advocacy and lobbying. AR is seen as a lesser priority for this group.

8.2. Strategy building

Regarding their organisation’s involvement in GCE strategy building, the NP does not identify any relevant recommendation documents developed between 2011 and 2015. However, the organisation does refer to a number of 2017/18 documents, including the ongoing preparation of GE guidelines, the development of which the NP successfully lobbied the MFA for in 2017.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Global Education Network Europe. 2017. The European Global Education Peer Review Process: Global Education in Belgium. Global Education Network Europe.

Krause, Johannes. 2010. “European Development. Education Monitoring Report: “DE Watch”.” GENE (Global Education Network Europe). January-May. gene.eu/wp-content/uploads/Gene_OtherPublications-DEWatchReport.pdf.



1. TERMINOLOGY AND DEFINITIONS USED

1.1. Terms

The questionnaire respondent representing the national platform asserts that the term “Global Citizenship Education for Sustainable Development” [GCESD] is used by their institution to refer to GCE. However, it should be noted that it also uses the term “Development Education” frequently in its responses. The present study did not receive a response from any government institution.

The Unit in charge of GCE (DE) within the Agency for International Cooperation did not respond to the questionnaire presented both by the NP.

1.2. Definitions

According to the definition provided by the NP, GCESD is understood as the analysis of development models and the “root causes” and outcomes of developmental “problems,” with the aim of developing “alternatives based on social justice and sustainability.” The approach to GCESD is outlined as GE.

2. WAYS OF DELIVERING GCE

When asked about GCE delivery in formal education between 2011 and 2017, the NP does not give specific examples of activities but summarises the key programmes and initiatives in formal education as follows; “teacher training, engagement in campaigns, learning materials, [and] assessment in Global Citizenship education”. According to the 2010 DE Watch Report, an MoE-organised working group introduced the subject of “Education for Citizenship” into the curriculum in 2008, specifically included “DE,” though the report noted issues with its implementation (Krause, European Development. Education Monitoring Report: “DE Watch” 2010). The 2015 GENE peer review highlights the successful “Teachers for Development” Programme introduced by the Spanish Agency for International Cooperation and Development (AECID) and the MoE in 2009 to develop teaching networks, resources and recommendations (Hartmeyer and Wegimont, The State of Global Education in Europe 2015).

Regarding GCE delivery through informal education in the same period, the NP refers to youth and community programmes and, in the context of education in the non-formal sphere, cites “mass media, influencers, [and] action in social networks” [sic].

3. DIFFERENT STAKEHOLDERS INVOLVED IN GCE

From the perspective of the NP, the main governmental entities involved in GCE delivery and support are local authorities, with high-level influence due to their resources in policy. The NP further cites the mid-level impact of the MoE and MFA and their primary resources in policy and funding, respectively. Specifically, the MFA body responsible for GCE in Spain is the

forementioned AECID.

The NP does not cite any international organisation as influential in the development of GCE in Spain.

Within the NGO sector, the NP lists itself and regional platforms as the most significant stakeholders, with influence regarding AR, coordination and international networking. NGOs implement the majority of “DE work in non-formal and informal DE” (Hartmeyer and Wegimont, The State of Global Education in Europe 2015).

Universities are mentioned by the NP as the primary education and research institutions, and are described as impacting GCE delivery through lobbying, AR and international networking.

Comparative significance of funding bodies

Table 1.


Organisations funding NGO GCE activities in order of perceived significance of investment, 2011-17.

1. Regional authorities and local entities
2. Ministry of Foreign Affairs
3. EuropeAid

Table 1 shows the NP’s perception of the comparative significance of the primary funding bodies (both national and international) for GCE activities carried out by NGOs in their country. It is apparent that the NP perceives national funding bodies, and particularly local entities, to be the most significant investors.

Autonomous Communities (regional governments) have specific weight in funding DE. In fact, in 2013 their investment in DE projects added up to more than 75% percent of the total ODA in this area. If the percentage invested in this year from the General State Administration for EpD represented a bare 1.30% of the total ODA, in the Autonomous Communities and in the Local Entities, this figure reaches around 10%.

SPAIN Government GCE Funding



Source: <https://www.entreculturas.org/sites/default/files/comprometidos.pdf>

4. PUBLIC FUNDING FOR GCE

The present study did not receive a response from any government institution regarding levels of public funding for GCE delivery in Spain. Limited funding data and information on the type of activities funded is available, but the GENE report finds that AECID invested 0.6 million euros towards its GCE-related strategic plan in 2015, and further cites the provision on 3.5 million euros for “partnership agreements” (Hartmeyer and Wegimont, *The State of Global Education in Europe 2015*). Data cited in the 2010 DE Watch Report indicates that the MFA’s “DE-specific funding” was significantly higher, amounting to 34.2 million euros in 2009 (Krause, *European Development. Education Monitoring Report: “DE Watch” 2010*). The analysis of the NP reveals that DE funding has dropped by 8 points between 2010 and 2016 (from 16 to 2.6 million euros, out of which only 1.6 million euros were channeled through NGOs in 2016).

5. FUNDING PATTERNS

Please refer to Section 4.

6. POLICY CONTEXT FOR INVESTMENT

Regarding the policy context for GCE investment at a national-level between 2011 and 2015, the present study did not receive any response from any government institution or the NP.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

GHK. 2010. “Study on Volunteering in the European Union.” *EU Citizenship Portal*. Accessed January 15, 2018. http://ec.europa.eu/citizenship/about-the-europe-for-citizens-programme/studies/index_en.htm.

Hartmeyer, Helmut, and Liam Wegimont. 2015. *The State of Global Education in Europe*. Dublin: Global Education Network Europe, European Union.

Krause, Johannes. 2010. “European Development. Education Monitoring Report: “DE Watch”.” *GENE (Global Education Network Europe)*. January-May. Accessed January 5, 2018. gene.eu/wp-content/uploads/Gene_OtherPublications-DEWatchReport.pdf.

Concerning other relevant contextual factors, the 2015 GENE peer review highlights the negative impact of Spain’s financial crisis on the “DE budget,” due to the resulting significant decrease in the Development Cooperation budget as a whole (Hartmeyer and Wegimont, *The State of Global Education in Europe 2015*).

7. NGOS INVOLVEMENT IN GCE RELATED POLICY PROCESSES

Analysis of the NP’s questionnaire responses indicates some level of NGO involvement in all GCE policy processes. According to the NP, it is involved in agenda setting through participation in the “National Development Education task force” in congress, thus attempting to impact the government’s decision-making on the DE policy and activities. From the NP’s perspective, there is a high-level of involvement in policy evaluation, referring to itself as a “watchdog” for the government’s “actions in DE.” The DE Watch report highlights the positive relationship between the NP and the MFA (Krause, *European Development. Education Monitoring Report: “DE Watch” 2010*).

8. NGO CAPACITY

Regarding Spain’s civic society situation and environment, the sector has been considerably shaped by the country’s development in the post-Franco period of the late 1970s; since this time, the number of associations and non-profits has grown considerably, although the number of development-related organisations has been proportionately low (GHK 2010). The NP was established in 1986. Data provided regarding its members indicates an overall decrease from 106 members in 2011 to 92 members in 2017. According to the NP, the member organisations are primarily NGOs, as well as 17 regional platforms.

8.1. Platform activity and influence

The NP has a separate working group dealing with GCE. The NP considers advocacy and lobbying to be the focus of this group. It further cites its roles in developing national networks and educational and AR activities and resources. It considers policy work and international networking to be lesser priorities of the working group.

8.2. Strategy building

Regarding their organisation’s involvement in GCE strategy building, the NP identifies two relevant recommendation documents developed between 2011 and 2015. The first is the 2011 National DE Strategy paper, which outlines a framework for cooperation between governmental institutions and other relevant stakeholders for the delivery of GCE in Spain. Secondly, the organisation mentions a lobbying “position paper on DE” aimed at the public administration, which was published in 2014.



1. TERMINOLOGY AND DEFINITIONS USED

1.1. Terms

The present study was not provided with official definitions from either the relevant government institution or NP, since it received limited responses from the government institution and no response from the NP. Responses from the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA) to the present study clearly indicate that the term GCE “is not used in Sweden or in Swedish,” instead its representative refers to “education and information about Global issues.” According to the 2010 GE Watch Report, “ESD” features on the school curriculum (Krause, European Development. Education Monitoring Report: “DE Watch” 2010).

1.2. Definitions

No official definitions are available from the NP or government institution. Regarding the general approach to GE/GCE in Sweden, according to the 2015 GENE review, the Swedish Global School programme aims “to strengthen the school’s ability to educate young people to take responsibility for sustainable development in a multicultural society and prepare them to function in a global context” (Hartmeyer and Wegimont, *The State of Global Education in Europe 2015*). Moreover, the NP CONCORD Sverige described in 2010 that the guidelines for CSO communication implemented from 2011 onwards advised “that the general public has good knowledge about the situation in developing countries, Swedish development aid and its results, and questions that deal with the driving force of development in development countries” (cited in Krause 2010).

2. WAYS OF DELIVERING GCE

Regarding the integration of GCE into formal education, the national curriculum directs that “teaching should illuminate how the functions of society and our way of living and working can best be adapted to create conditions for sustainable development” (The Swedish National Agency for Education 1994, cited in Chung 2013). According to the Swedish International Center of Education for Sustainable Development (SWEDES), “Sustainable Development” is “integral to educational policies at different levels of the educational system”. The organisation collaborates with others to provide teachers with training and enable them to put these policies into practice “through programmes and projects at universities, as well as by knowledge exchange at conferences, seminars and workshops in both Sweden and in SIDA’s partner countries, mainly in southern Africa” (Uppsala Universitet 2018).

The aforementioned Global School initiative is responsible for the integration of ESD into GE (since there is no existing strategy in Sweden), and aids schools with coordinating development programs and coordinate (Krause, European Development. Education Monitoring Report: “DE Watch” 2010, Hartmeyer

and Wegimont, *The State of Global Education in Europe 2015*). Based at the Swedish Council for Higher Education, the initiative receives support from SIDA for coordinating teacher training, and educational activities such as “free seminars in learning for global sustainable development and intercultural understanding” and the Global School/SIDA “annual national GE conference,” which runs “lectures, seminars, workshops and other participatory activities” for education professionals in line with the chosen theme for each year (Hartmeyer and Wegimont, *The State of Global Education in Europe 2015*). The Global School programme is also involved in implementing the 2014 UNESCO Global Action Programme (GAP), to work on a set of recommendations to improve “education and learning for sustainable development,” both in “policy and practice” within Sweden, and concerning the country’s role at the international-level (ibid.).

Regarding NGO’s GCE-related activities, the NP ForumSyd refers to its coordination of seminars and reports, negotiation of grants for stakeholders, and support for AR campaigns and for local organisations who provide “education on development issues” (ForumSyd 2018).

3. DIFFERENT STAKEHOLDERS INVOLVED IN GCE

Existing research summarises the main entities involved in GCE support within the government as the MFA’s International Co-operation Department, and the Swedish International Development Co-operation Agency (SIDA) (Krause, European Development. Education Monitoring Report: “DE Watch” 2010). A further entity of importance cited is the aforementioned “Global School” (ibid.).

The 2015 GENE report highlights local-level actors as the chief stakeholders in GCE delivery and decisions, since local government and schools are primarily responsible for the funding and implementation of primary and secondary education (Hartmeyer and Wegimont, *The State of Global Education in Europe 2015*).

Specifically, Chung (2013) cites the following organisations as relevant entities in GCE; the aforementioned SWEDES, RCE centres (Regional Centre of Expertise), and CEMUS (Uppsala Centre for Sustainable Development).

Comparative significance of funding bodies


The current study was not provided with information regarding the NP’s perception of the comparative significance of the primary funding bodies (both national and international) for GCE activities carried out by NGOs in their country.

4. PUBLIC FUNDING FOR GCE

Having considered the most significant sources of public funding for GCE in Sweden according to existing literature, the present study chose to contact the governmental department of Swedish International Development Co-operation Agency (SIDA). Some limited responses were received from a representative within this institution.

Funding trends

Fig. 1. Government Institution's "Global education and information" Funding, 2011-15



The data supplied by SIDA shows that there was an overall decrease in their investment in what it refers to as "education and information about global issues" during the period considered in the present study; this is in part due to fluctuations in the EUR/SEK exchange rate. SIDA were very clear that this support should not be referred to as "GCE" funding. According to the institution, funding is sourced from the national budget. Regarding development following 2015, the data provided shows that investment into global education rose again in 2016, when it amounted to 7.73 million euros.

5. FUNDING PATTERNS

5.1. Types of funding activities

The government institution gives very limited information regarding the types of activities funded, and explains that it is not possible to give specific examples since "there are so many projects." It highlights that, according to a new strategy of "information and communication" introduced in 2015, advocacy projects can now receive SIDA funding where this was not possible in the past.

5.2. Funding recipients

During the period between 2011 and 2017, the government institution perceives CSOs to be its most significant recipients of GCE funding. According to SIDA, it has official agreements with a total of 17 CSOs, but smaller organisations also receive SIDA funding indirectly through these. Specifically, it cites the NP ForumSyd as the recipient of the largest investment for

development information and communication, and outlines that the NP redistributes this support amongst a forty CSOs.

5.3. Funding procedure

The present study did not receive any information regarding the government institution's procedure for deciding recipients of GCE funding.

6. POLICY CONTEXT FOR INVESTMENT

Regarding the policy context for GCE investment at a national-level between 2011 and 2015, SIDA does not give any specific examples of relevant strategy or policy documents, but considers that funding has been positively impacted by the Social Democrats and Green Party coalition government formed in 2014, since support for CSOs has been "high on the agenda." According to other sources, the country's migration "crisis" has had a considerable effect on the government's provision of financial support for GCE-related activities. On the one hand, "xenophobic tendencies in society" have highlighted the requirement for more education on societal and global issues which "from a teacher's perspective merge perfectly with Global Education" (Hartmeyer and Wegimont, *The State of Global Education in Europe 2015*). On the other hand, the aid budget supporting GE-related exchange programmes also finances migration work, which has required greater public investment in recent years, thus leading to uncertainty regarding "the future of the budget" for GE (Hartmeyer and Wegimont, *The State of Global Education in Europe 2015*).

7. NGOS INVOLVEMENT IN GCE RELATED POLICY PROCESSES

The government institution's responses indicate a strong level of NGO involvement in GCE policy processes. In particular, according to SIDA, NGOs played a significant role in changing the strategy to enable the provision of SIDA investment for advocacy work.

According to existing literature, there has been a strong relationship between GCE stakeholders, and there were "regular meetings of the International Co-operation Department, SIDA, CONCORD Sverige, and major NGOs" in 2008 (Krause, European Development. Education Monitoring Report: "DE Watch" 2010).

8. NGO CAPACITY

Regarding Sweden's civic society situation and environment, there has a strong tradition of the population's involvement in NGOs in the past, supported by a strong policy framework, although membership of these organisations has declined somewhat since the millennium (GHK 2010).

Existing literature highlights the significant influence of CSOs in "development and humanitarian issues" through their AR and advocating (Krause, European Development. Education Monitoring Report: "DE Watch" 2010). Krause further refers to the role of the Church of Sweden and trade unions in DE-related activities (ibid.).

The NP did not provide the present study with any response. According to the DE Watch Report, 200 NGDOs were members of the Platform ForumSyd in 2008, however there was no GCE/DE working group since this "is not a priority for most members" (Krause, European Development. Education Monitoring Report: "DE Watch" 2010). According to the platform's official website, there are currently "around 140 member-organisations" (ForumSyd 2018).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Chung, Youngeun. 2013. *Education for Sustainable Development (ESD) in Sweden: A study of ESD within a transition affected by PISA reports*. Master Thesis, Uppsala: Uppsala University.

ForumSyd. 2018. ForumSyd. Accessed January 23, 2018. <http://www.forumsyd.org/int/>.

GHK. 2010. "Study on Volunteering in the European Union." EU Citizenship Portal. Accessed January 15, 2018. http://ec.europa.eu/citizenship/about-the-europe-for-citizens-programme/studies/index_en.htm.

Hartmeyer, Helmuth, and Liam Wegimont. 2015. *The State of Global Education in Europe*. Dublin: Global Education Network Europe, European Union.

Krause, Johannes. 2010. "European Development. Education Monitoring Report: "DE Watch"." GENE (Global Education Network Europe). January-May. Accessed January 5, 2018. gene.eu/wp-content/uploads/Gene_OtherPublications-DEWatchReport.pdf.

Uppsala Universitet. 2018. *SWEDES: Education for Sustainable Development*. Accessed January 23, 2018. <http://swedesd.uu.se/education/>.

UNITED KINGDOM



1. TERMINOLOGY AND DEFINITIONS USED

1.1. Terms

Respondents representing the national platforms for the UK assert that the terms “education for global citizenship” and “global citizenship education” [GCE] are “widely used” by governments and CSOs/NGOs in all four UK countries to refer to GCE.

1.2. Definitions

Respondents do not provide any official definition of GCE. According to the GENE Peer Review, the approach to GCE is outlined as GE/LS (Hartmeyer and Wegimont, *The State of Global Education in Europe 2015*).

2. WAYS OF DELIVERING GCE

When asked about GCE delivery between 2011 and 2017 in formal, informal and non-formal education, the representatives for NGOs in the UK summarise the key programmes and initiatives as “capacity building and profile” (Scotland only), the development of educational resources including “web support,” “continuing professional development in schools” and “research/impact assessment.” Specifically, the NPs refer to two key initiatives for GCE in the UK; the Connecting Classrooms Programme [CCP] (England only) and Global Learning School Programme [GLP]. The GLP was established in 2009 to coordinate the delivery of GCE in schools under one project, following a review of DFID’s “development awareness and education programmes” (Hartmeyer and Wegimont, *The State of Global Education in Europe 2015*).

3. DIFFERENT STAKEHOLDERS INVOLVED IN GCE

The present study received limited information regarding the main entities involved in GCE delivery and support in the UK, but the NPs provided some relevant information, outlining that funding is managed by the Centre for GE in Northern Ireland, by the IDEAS platform in Scotland, by a consortium in Wales, and a consortium managed by Pearson (“an independent publisher and education provider globally”) in England. NGOs are cited as significant stakeholders for GCE delivery in all countries and, in Scotland only, Development Education Centres [DECs] are also responsible for much GCE-related activity. According to the GENE Peer Review, the contractors coordinating the GLP in each UK country are as follows; Pearson (England), Centre for Global Education (Northern Ireland), IDEAS (Scotland) and CfBT (Wales) (Hartmeyer and Wegimont, *The State of Global Education in Europe 2015*). Concerning relevant funding bodies, the NPs refer to Department for International Development [DFID] financing for the GLP and CCP and British Council co-financing for CCP in England. Regarding main investors involved, it should be noted that representatives for the UK NPs make no reference to international sources of financial support.

4. PUBLIC FUNDING FOR GCE

The present study did not receive a response from any government institutions in the UK but relevant information provided by the NPs is provided below.

Funding trends

Fig. 1. Government Institution's GCE Funding, 2011-15

Funding for GCE per country in millions (€)				
Year	England	Northern Ireland	Scotland	Wales
2011			0.370	
2012			0.440	
2013			0.777	
2014	4.962	0.248	0.602	
2015	5.511	0.276	0.882	0.012

Figure 1 shows data compiled by the NPs in the UK regarding public investment in GCE and refers to DFID funding through the GLP for each country, as well as Scottish Government funding for Scotland. Although data between 2011 and 2013 was only available for Scotland, it is nevertheless apparent that there was an overall increase in investment in GCE funding for the years provided in all countries. Regarding development following 2015, the data provided by the NP shows that there was a decrease in investment into GCE in England (4.881 million euros in 2016, 4.563 million euros in 2017), NI (0.244 million euros in 2016, 0.228 million euros in 2017) and Scotland (0.861 million euros in 2016, 0.835 million euros in 2017). By contrast, the amount increased to 0.033 million euros for both 2016 and 2017. It should be highlighted that data presented for NI does not include money provided through Irish Aid.

5. FUNDING PATTERNS

Types of funding activities

The GENE Peer Review cites GLP and CCP as the main GCE-related initiatives receiving public funding in the UK (Hartmeyer and Wegimont, *The State of Global Education in Europe 2015*). As mentioned in Section 2, the NP responses also refer to these as the key funded GCE projects but highlight that the CCP is specific to England. The aim of GLP is to integrate DE at “whole school, curriculum and classroom level within 50% of schools at Key Stages 2 and 3,” providing GCE AR to UK students and enabling them to “develop the skills needed to work in a global economy through learning about key themes of development education” (Hartmeyer and Wegimont, *The State of Global Education in*

Europe 2015). The NPs emphasise that DFID operates under separate contracts for GLP in each of the four countries of the UK and its implementation varies according to the different national curriculum. In 2015, GLP had been implemented across more than 4000 schools, trained more than 17000 teachers and was worth 28.79 million euros in total (Hartmeyer and Wegimont, *The State of Global Education in Europe 2015*). BC/DFID co-financed, England-based project CCP “supports schools in the UK to form partnerships with schools in developing countries and also invests in teacher training both in the UK and overseas” (Hartmeyer and Wegimont, *The State of Global Education in Europe 2015*). Between 2012 and 2015, the initiative received 23.42 million euros from DFID and 34.33 million euros from BC, partnering more than 5000 schools and providing training to around 37500 educators, during the same period (Hartmeyer and Wegimont, *The State of Global Education in Europe 2015*). In addition to DFID funding, the NP for Wales mentions the provision of funding for an International Education Programme by the Welsh Government, outlining that around 10% of this budget (equivalent to approximately 0.06 million euros) covers “GC activities specifically.” It should be noted that this is not included in Figure 1.

6. FUNDING RECIPIENTS

According to the NPs, NGOs are the main recipients of GCE funding in England, Northern Ireland and Wales, whilst DECs are the primary beneficiaries in Scotland, although small contributions are made to “other providers.”

Funding procedure

The present study did not receive any information regarding the procedure for deciding recipients of public funding for GCE in the UK.

7. POLICY CONTEXT FOR INVESTMENT

Regarding the policy context for GCE investment in the UK between 2011 and 2015, the NPs refer to the positive impact of governmental commitment to the SDGs. The representative for Scotland further cites the positive influence on GCE delivery of the UN-recognised “Learning for Sustainability Scotland” centre, established in 2013. In the Northern Irish context, the NP highlights that the UK government did not provide funding for any new GCE-related projects from 2010 until its support for GLP commenced in 2014. The GENE Peer Review explains the general agreement of the UK’s political parties regarding the significance of international development issues and GCE funding, citing the UK government’s target of investing a minimum 0.7%

BIBLIOGRAPHY

CADA. 2018. *CADA: Coalition of Aid & Development Agencies NI*. Accessed February 1, 2018. <https://www.cada-ni.org/>.

DEA. 2006. “DEA Evidence to Education and Skills Committee on Citizenship Education.” *Think Global*. March 24. Accessed February 1, 2018. <https://think-global.org.uk/resource/dea-evidence-to-education-and-skills-committee-on-citizenship-education/>.

GHK. 2010. “Study on Volunteering in the European Union.” *EU Citizenship Portal*. Accessed January 15, 2018. http://ec.europa.eu/citizenship/about-the-europe-for-citizens-programme/studies/index_en.htm.

Hartmeyer, Helmut, and Liam Wegimont. 2015. *The State of Global Education in Europe*. Dublin: Global Education Network Europe, European Union.

IDEAS. 2018. *IDEAS for global citizenship*. Accessed February 1, 2018. <http://www.ideascotland.users39.interdns.co.uk/>.

Krause, Johannes. 2010. “European Development. Education Monitoring Report: “DE Watch”.” *GENE (Global Education Network Europe)*. January-May. Accessed January 5, 2018. gene.eu/wp-content/uploads/Gene_OtherPublications-DEWatchReport.pdf.

Think Global. 2017. “Cyfanfyd.” *Think Global*. Accessed February 1, 2018. <https://think-global.org.uk/member/cyfanfyd/>.

of the national income in international development, first achieved in 2013 and since protected through legislation (Hartmeyer and Wegimont, *The State of Global Education in Europe 2015*). More generally, regarding relevant contextual factors, the review mentions the positive effect of an increased emphasis on youth in development issues since the 2015 general election, which has “increased the relevance of the development education and active citizenship work” (Hartmeyer and Wegimont, *The State of Global Education in Europe 2015*).

8. NGOS INVOLVEMENT IN GCE RELATED POLICY PROCESSES

Comparison of both the NPs’ responses and existing research indicates a mixed level of NGO involvement and influence in GCE policy processes and governmental activity regarding GCE. According to the representative for Northern Ireland, NGOs have “a very limited role in influencing government because international development is a reserved matter in Northern Ireland.” By contrast, the Scottish representative refers to its successful lobbying for public investment in DECs and “co-financing of EC projects.” Moreover, the 2010 DE Watch Report described that “generally there is a high level of co-operation” between NGO and governmental actors regarding DE in the UK (Krause, *European Development. Education Monitoring Report: “DE Watch” 2010*).

9. NGO CAPACITY

Most significantly, regarding the United Kingdom’s civic society situation and environment, it should be highlighted that devolution implies that the condition of this sector depends on the different policies and responsible associations in England, Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales, although these countries share significant government involvement in the work of non-governmental associations (GHK 2010). The DEA (England), Coalition of Aid and Development Agencies [CADA] (Northern Ireland), Cyfanfyd (Wales), and IDEAS (Scotland) form the UK DE Network, which is responsible for NGO-led GCE activity in the UK (Krause, *European Development. Education Monitoring Report: “DE Watch” 2010*). No information was provided to the present study regarding these organisations, but relevant, available details are summarised below.

- DEA was established in 1993 (DEA 2006).
- CADA currently has 19 member-organisations and has a separate working group dealing with GCE, its “Development Education Group” (CADA 2018).
- Cyfanfyd was established in 1991 (Think Global 2017).
- According to IDEAS, its members are 12 NGOs, 6 DECs and a number of individual experts (IDEAS 2018).



1. TERMINOLOGY AND DEFINITIONS USED

1.1. Terms

The questionnaire responses from the representative for the national network [NN] indicate some uncertainty regarding terminology in the GCE field. The NN asserts that the term “Information Work” [IW] is most commonly used to refer to GCE by the institution and other relevant stakeholders in Norway. In addition, it notes that the terms “information about developing countries” and “North/South information” were used in the past and highlights that now “ESD” is being used in the context of the ongoing curriculum reforms. The present study did not receive any response from a government institution in Norway.

1.2. Definitions

The respondents for the NN refers to the parliament-approved guidelines for funding, which outline that IW should “contribute to the promotion of democratic participation, critical debate and knowledge about development policy issues.” It further identifies IW as similar to DEAR.

2. WAYS OF DELIVERING GCE

When asked about GCE delivery in formal education between 2011 and 2017, the NN summarises the key programmes and initiatives as NGO-led development and provision of school resources and activities, such as the “Global School” web portal providing online resources for teachers and students, developed as part of the national “global.no” web portal. It further refers to its cooperation with other stakeholders on the current reforms which will integrate “DEAR/ESD” into the national curriculum through the introduction of “citizenship” as a cross-curricular subject.

Regarding GCE delivery through informal and non-formal education in the same period, the NN refers to “a wide variety of activities” implemented by NGOs but, gives no specific examples.

3. DIFFERENT STAKEHOLDERS INVOLVED IN GCE

From the perspective of the NN, the main entities involved in GCE delivery and support within the government are the Ministry of Education and Research and its Directorate for Education and Training, the MFA and its relevant directorate the “Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation” [Norad] and parliament. Their primary impact is summarised respectively as the integration of “ESD” in formal education, DEAR funding for civil society and directing guidelines for DEAR funding.

The NN does not consider any international organisations as significant stakeholders in GCE delivery in Norway.

Within the NGO sector, the NN lists the Norwegian UN Association [UNA] and itself as the most significant stakeholders, which both have high-level influence regarding the aforementioned

curriculum reforms to integrate “ESD” into formal education. It explains that instead of one national NGDO platform, currently Norway has separate networks for DEAR (the NN RORG) and advocacy (ForUM). It adds that the MFA/Norad provide significant financial support to UNA Norway.

The “Oslo and Akershus University College of Applied Sciences, Department of Journalism and Media Studies” is listed by the NN as the chief relevant education and research institutions, described as impacting GCE delivery through the expertise of individual academics who participate in “DEAR” evaluation for Norad.

Comparative significance of funding bodies

Table 1.

Organisations funding NGO GCE activities in order of perceived significance of investment, 2011-17.

1. Norad
2. Ministry of Foreign Affairs
3. Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation

Table 1 shows the NN's perception of the comparative significance of the primary funding bodies (both national and international) for GCE activities carried out by NGOs in their country. It is apparent that the NN perceives two national governmental entities to invest more than international bodies. It further explains that Norad is coordinates “main DEAR funding for NGOs and CSOs,” whilst the MFA directs Norad and provides financial support to UNA Norway’s “DEAR-related” activities.

4. PUBLIC FUNDING FOR GCE

The present study did not receive a response from any government organisations regarding public funding for GCE in Norway.

Existing data indicates that MFA/Norad funding for DE amounted to 13.8 million euros in 2009 (Krause, European Development. Education Monitoring Report: “DE Watch” 2010). Comparison with more recent data indicates a decrease since this time; the 2015 GENE Peer Review finds that the government’s budget for “GE/DEAR” was maintained at 91 million NOK in 2014 and 2015, equating to 10.89 million euros in 2014 and 10.17 million euros in 2015 (Hartmeyer and Wegimont, The State of Global Education in Europe 2015).

It should be highlighted that the NN states that it successfully lobbied against the current government’s wish to “reduce and even cut funding all together,” mobilising a parliamentary majority against this action. According to the 2015 GENE Peer Review, the proposed reduction would have resulted in a “GE/DEAR” budget equating to 6.7 million euros for 2015 (Hartmeyer and Wegimont, The State of Global Education in Europe 2015).

5. FUNDING PATTERNS

Please refer to Section 4.

6. POLICY CONTEXT FOR INVESTMENT

The present study did not receive information regarding specific policies and programmes significant to public GCE funding in Norway between 2011 and 2015.

Regarding other relevant contextual factors, the NN explains that the change of government following the 2013 elections have had a negative effect on GCE investment in their country, citing the “blue-blue” coalition between the conservative and far-right parties as responsible for the aforementioned, recent attempts to reduce government funding for DEAR. Prior to this, the NN considers “DEAR funding” to have been positively perceived by “a majority in Parliament.”

The NN further refers to the negative impact of the weakening cooperation of Norad with the NN and unspecified changes to the application procedure that have resulted in public investment in fewer NGOs; some NN member organisations are receiving more funds whilst some receive less, which in turn leads to conflict within the NN.

7. NGOS INVOLVEMENT IN GCE RELATED POLICY PROCESSES

Analysis of the NN’s questionnaire responses overall indicates a high level of NGO involvement in GCE policy processes. According to NN, NGOs are involved in all stages of policy processes from agenda setting to policy formulation, implementation and evaluation. From the NN’s perspective, its network has been highly involved in formulating funding recommendations aimed at the government; moreover, these recommendations have been successfully implemented and have led to increased “DEAR” investment. It further cites its significant role in analysing the results of “DEAR funding”, including its involvement in formal, Norad-commissioned evaluations in 2013 and 2017. Concerning policy implementation, the NN’s responses indicate concerns that its involvement has declined since 2012 as, from its perspective, “new people” at Norad “have increasingly considered the previous forms of cooperation as “challenging” and cooperative relations have declined.”

8. NGO CAPACITY

Regarding Norway’s civic society situation and environment in general, there is a strong tradition in the country, and the sector remains an import one which receives significant financial support from governmental institutions (Norwegian Helsinki Committee 2018). The 2010 DE Watch further emphasises

the “long tradition of critical civil society participation, volunteerism, concern for justice and equity, inclusion, diversity and international solidarity” (Krause, European Development. Education Monitoring Report: “DE Watch” 2010). Regarding development policy-related issues, a Norad-funded report found that NGOs’ capacity as “watchdogs and advocates” had developed during the period between 2011 and 2013 (cited in Hartmeyer and Wegimont 2015).

The NN was formally established in 1999, although the network first developed at the beginning of the 1990s. Data provided regarding its members indicates a decrease from 48 members in 2011 to 42 members in 2017. According to the NN, the member organisations are primarily NGOs and CSOs.

8.1. Platform activity and influence

The NN does not have a separate working group dealing with GCE, rather the RORG network itself is dedicated to DEAR. Currently, the NN considers “securing government funding” and management of its role to be its focus. It further cites its roles in advocacy and lobbying and policy work. AR and national networking are considered lesser priorities.

8.2. Strategy building

Regarding their organisation’s involvement in GCE strategy building, the NN explains that it has not developed any “strategies or recommendations” between 2011 and 2015 since it has been occupied with evaluating previous efforts and thus refers to three evaluation documents aimed at policy makers, the MFA, Norad, NGOs and the academia; 2011 and 2013 overview reports on “activities and results of Norad DEAR-funding” and a 2014 “results of Norad DEAR-funding” report compiled by NGOs.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Hartmeyer, Helmuth, and Liam Wegimont. 2015. *The State of Global Education in Europe*. Dublin: Global Education Network Europe, European Union.

Krause, Johannes. 2010. “European Development. Education Monitoring Report: “DE Watch”.” *GENE (Global Education Network Europe)*. January-May. Accessed January 5, 2018. gene.eu/wp-content/uploads/Gene_OtherPublications-DEWatchReport.pdf.

Norwegian Helsinki Committee. 2018. “Norwegian civil society.” *Active Citizens Fund*. Accessed January 31, 2018. <http://www.ngonorway.org/bilateral-partnerships/norwegian-ngos>.

LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

AR	Awareness Raising
CoE	Council of Europe
CONCORD	European NGO Confederation for Relief and Development Creditor
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
DE	Development Education
DEAR	Development Education and Awareness Raising
DG DEVCO	Directorate-General for International Cooperation and Development
ESD	Education for Sustainable Development
EC	European Commission
EU	European Union
GCE	Global Citizenship Education
GE	Global Education
GENE	Global Education Network Europe
GNI	Gross National Income
LA	Local Authorities
LS	Life Skills
MFA	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
MoE	Ministry of Education
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NGDO	Non-Governmental Development Organisation
NP	National Non-Governmental Development Cooperation Organisations' Platform
NSA	Non-State Actors
ODA	Official Development Assistance
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
OECD DAC	Development Assistance Committee of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
PISA	Programme for International Student Assessment, study by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)
PR	Public Relations
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
UN	United Nations
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
NGDO	Non-Governmental Development Organisation

OUR MEMBERS



CONCORD is committed to the Code of Conduct on Messages and Images and respects its principles in all publications.

Copyright: This work is available under a Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial 4.0 International license. More info on <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/legalcode>

