



FINAL REPORT

Visegrad Regional Seminar on Global Development Education

5-6 September, 2013

Unio Hotel, Budapest, Hungary



FINAL REPORT

Visegrad Regional Seminar on Global Development Education

North-South Centre of the Council of Europe
in collaboration with

HAND - Hungarian Association of NGOs
for Development and Humanitarian Aid

5-6 September, 2013

Unio Hotel, Budapest, Hungary



Collaboration between the NGO platforms:

FoRS – Czech Forum for Development Co-operation

GRUPA ZAGRANICA – Poland

PMVRO – Slovak NGDO platform

HAND – Hungarian Association of NGOs for Development and Humanitarian Aid

INDEX

INTRODUCTION.....	4
I - CONCEPT OF THE SEMINAR.....	5
II - OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY	10
III - INTRODUCTION OF ORGANIZERS AND PARTNERS.....	11
IV - RECOMMENDATIONS.....	13
V - SUMMARY OF SPEECHES	19
VI - KEYNOTE SPEECHES.....	25
Keynote speech: The importance of Global Education in formal education system, Karen Pashby PhD, University of Oulu (FI)	25
Keynote speech: Importance of Global Education in the context of V4 countries, Katalin Czippán, Senior Expert, Education for Sustainability (HU)	29
Introductory Lecture: Global Education Strategies of V4 countries, and their stakeholders, Ágnes Rajacic, Consultant civil sector and media (HU)	30
VII - REPORTS FROM WORKSHOPS	40
WORKSHOP 1: National strategy, development and implementation	40
WORKSHOP 2: Curricular reform and continuing professional development of educator	47
WORKSHOP 3: Quality support and monitoring	48
WORKSHOP 4: Campaign and outreach specially focusing on Beyond 2015 Process	52
VIII - REGIONAL ISSUE 1: Water Summit	56
IX - REGIONAL ISSUE 2: Hungarian Presidency of V4 and Hungarian Presidency of Central European Initiative: Increasing Regional Coherence - The Role of Education in the V4 Cooperation	59
X - REGIONAL ISSUE 3: Global – environmental education side by side or education for sustainability: What do V4 countries experienced and recommend to Hungary?	61
XI - EVALUATION.....	64
APPENDIX	65
PROGRAM.....	65
LIST OF REFERENCES & LINKS TO RELEVANT SOURCES	67
DIGITAL STORIES.....	67
CONTRIBUTIONS	70
IMPRESSUM	71

INTRODUCTION

In the last couple of years the Visegrad countries have identified the need to give GDE a more comprehensive structure, to clarify the concept of GDE and to work on the improvements to integrate GDE in school curricula. Recent initiatives leading to the development of national GDE strategies or equivalent approaches have been supported in all four Visegrad countries. In some cases, some countries have advanced to a larger extent with the conceptualisation of a strategic approach to GDE.

This process was supported by the Joint Management Agreement (JMA) signed between the North-South Centre of the Council of Europe and the European Commission for raising awareness of global interdependence and solidarity through global/development education and youth cooperation in Europe and beyond.

In the framework of this JMA, a series of national and regional seminars were organised in the new EU member states between 2009 and 2011. These seminars brought together different stakeholders, among practitioners and policy-makers, with the aim to discuss the situation of global/development education in the respective country and promote national policy recommendations and practices.

In 2012, as a follow-up to this process, the 2nd Global Education Congress – *Education, Interdependence & solidarity in a Changing World* - gathered practitioners and policy-makers in Lisbon to assess the work achieved since the first Global Education Congress held in Maastricht in 2002 (which established an European strategy framework for the enhancement of global education to 2015) and to reflect on issues at stake to be prioritised until 2015.

In order to assure the continuity of this successful process, a second JMA was signed for the period 2013-2015.

A series of regional seminars will be organised to assess the work developed so far, namely the implementation phase of the GDE national strategies adopted in Czech Republic and Slovakia, and to follow up on the recommendations of the 2nd European GE Congress. In addition, kick-off seminars will be organised in EU acceding and candidate countries. A closing conference, meant to be the 3rd GE Congress, will take place in 2015.

The outputs of the regional seminar shall also contribute to the implementation strategy of the Lisbon GE Congress recommendations, namely to the foreseen annual multistakeholder meeting, and to the definition of the agenda of the 3rd GE Congress foreseen in 2015.

I - CONCEPT OF THE SEMINAR

Background Information on the Countries of the Visegrad Group

The very first initiatives in Global Development Education (GDE), originated already in the 1990s in some of the four Visegrad countries (V4), Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland and Slovakia. However, the very first attempts to develop comprehensive programs in this area, in the formal and non-formal education fields, go back to the years 2004-2006. Only in the last couple of years, different stakeholders started to engage more intensively in GDE, namely non-governmental organisations (NGO's), schools, pedagogic institutions, universities, ministries of foreign affairs and education among others. Initial multi-stakeholders initiatives have been established with the crucial support of national governments, development NGO platforms, European Commission (EC) and the North South Centre of the Council of Europe (NSC).

More recently, the Visegrad countries have identified the need to give GDE a more comprehensive structure, to clarify the concept of GDE and to work on the improvements to integrate GDE in school curricula. Recent initiatives leading to the development of national GDE strategies or equivalent approaches have been supported in all four Visegrad countries.

In some cases, some countries have advanced to a larger extent with the conceptualisation of a strategic approach to GDE, such as Czech Republic and Slovakia which adopted national strategies respectively in 2011 and 2012.

This process was supported by the Joint Management Agreement (JMA) signed between the North-South Centre of the Council of Europe and the European Commission for raising awareness of global interdependence and solidarity through global/development education and youth cooperation in Europe and beyond. In the framework of this JMA, a series of national and regional seminars were organised in the new EU member states between 2009 and 2011. These seminars brought together different stakeholders, among practitioners and policy-makers, with the aim to discuss the situation of global/development education in the respective country and promote national policy recommendations and practices.

In 2012, as a follow-up to this process, the 2nd Global Education Congress – *Education, Interdependence & solidarity in a Changing World* - gathered practitioners and policy-makers in Lisbon to assess the work achieved since the first Global Education Congress held in Maastricht in 2002 (which established an European strategy framework for the enhancement of global education to 2015) and to reflect on issues at stake to be prioritised until 2015.

Among the GDE activities developed since 2002, the outputs of the national and regional seminars were taken into consideration in the drafting of the Lisbon Congress Strategic Recommendations covering the following five areas of work: 1) national strategy development and implementation; 2) curricular reform; 3) continuing professional development of educators; 4) quality support and monitoring; 5) campaigning and outreach. The recommendations of the Lisbon GE Congress were also built up on the recommendation of the Council of Europe Committee of Ministers to member States on education for global interdependence and solidarity, the first legal framework for global education, adopted in May 2011.

In order to assure the continuity of this successful process, a second JMA was signed for the period 2013-2015. A series of regional seminars will be organised to assess the work developed so far, namely the implementation phase of the GDE national strategies adopted in Czech Republic and Slovakia, and to follow up on the recommendations of the 2nd European GE Congress. In addition, kick-off seminars will be organised in EU acceding and candidate countries. A closing conference, meant to be the 3rd GE Congress, will take place in 2015.

The regional seminars intend to tackle 1) how the global development paradigm has developed in the Visegrad countries, 2) what have been the outcomes of the adopted GDE national strategies and what are the lessons to be learnt so far, 3) what is the vision of the respective key actors in the field on GDE, 4) how can the V4 countries cooperate to foster joint efforts in advancing the development of GDE national strategies, 5) how can such strategic approaches be put successfully into practice, namely in the framework of the Central European Initiative and the Visegrad Group Presidency; 6) what can the V4 countries learn from more experienced partners in the EU context (peer learning) as well as from the global South, 7) what were the impacts and lessons learnt from the different European initiatives initiated by the NSC, EC, CONCORD/DEEEP or GENE in the V4 countries.

The outputs of the regional seminar shall also contribute to the implementation strategy of the Lisbon GE Congress recommendations, namely to the foreseen annual multistakeholder meeting, and to the definition of the agenda of the 3rd GE Congress foreseen in 2015.

Objectives

Having the recommendations of the Lisbon GE Congress as an overarching framework in relation to: 1) national strategy development and implementation; 2) curricular reform; 3) continuing professional development of educators; 4) quality support and monitoring; 5) campaigning and outreach, the objectives of the regional seminar are:

- to exchange and jointly discuss existing perspectives on the concept and practice of GDE, both in terms of policy making and curricula development;
- to identify common challenges in the Visegrad countries and exchange information on best practices with GDE experts from the V4 region, other European countries/institution as well as with experts from the global South;
- to promote GDE as an integral part of education;
- to provide the space and opportunities to develop joint action and collaboration within and beyond the Visegrad countries;
- to elaborate recommendations for furthering GDE in the V4 countries and establish priorities, and if possible benchmarks, until the 3rd GE Congress in 2015.

Taking into consideration importance of Budapest Water Summit 2013, the Hungarian Presidency of V4 and Hungarian Presidency of Central European Initiative further objectives of the regional seminar are:

- to provide the space and opportunities to develop joint recommendations within and beyond the Visegrad countries;
- to exchange and jointly discuss importance of water, GDE, country/European Union/global policies;
- to elaborate recommendations for national decision-makers

REGIONAL ISSUES FOR DISCUSSION:

BUDAPEST WATER SUMMIT:

Areas covered

Striving for universal access to water and sanitation: Critical issues of access to water and sanitation, urban water infrastructure planning, waste water management, development and maintenance from technological, financial, public health and human rights aspects, with a view to providing sustained access;

Integrated water resources management for the 21st century: The challenges of adaptation and resilience in face of a growing population and a changing climate – complex solutions for pollution prevention, soil and groundwater protection, food security, disaster risk management including floods and droughts and man-made disasters, water storage and recycling, the water, food and energy nexus;

Good water governance: International cooperation, trans boundary river basin and aquifer management, integrated institutional strategy in planning and implementation, stakeholder participation in the preparation of water policies; capacity development, education, research, data management, monitoring and assessment;

Green economy for blue water: Traditional and innovative water technologies and techniques in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication; practical, affordable, local solutions in the various regions of the world;

Investment in and financing of the implementation of water and sanitation SDG: The availability and best use of national and international financial resources and institutions; best practices, lessons learned. In addition to official development policy, special attention is to be paid to investment in water and sanitation as a regular course of business.

CENTRAL EUROPEAN INITIATIVE

The Central European Initiative (CEI) is the oldest and largest intergovernmental forum for regional cooperation in Europe, with an observer status in the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Its origin lies in the creation of the Quadrangular in Budapest on 11 November 1989, the founding fathers of which were Austria, Hungary, Italy and the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. On that occasion, the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the four founding members adopted a joint declaration stating the readiness of their Governments to strengthen good-neighbourly relations and to develop manifold cooperation among their respective countries.

II - OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY

The seminar intended to contribute to these objectives:

- to exchange and jointly discuss existing perspectives on the concept and practice of GDE, both in terms of policy making and curricula development;
- to identify common challenges in the Visegrad countries and exchange information on best practices with GDE experts from the V4 region, other European countries/institution as well as with experts from the global South;
- to promote GDE as an integral part of education;
- to provide the space and opportunities to develop joint action and collaboration within and beyond the Visegrad countries;
- to elaborate recommendations for furthering GDE in the V4 countries and establish priorities, and if possible benchmarks, until the 3rd GE Congress in 2015;
- to provide the space and opportunities to develop joint recommendations within and beyond the Visegrad countries;
- to exchange and jointly discuss importance of water, GDE, country/European Union/global policies
- to elaborate recommendations for national decision makers

The seminar was structured in order to follow its objectives. It covered theoretical conception on Global Education as well as policy and strategy debates and some practical implications for teachers and other educators. The context in the V4 countries ran through the seminar as across-cutting issue. Different methodologies were applied as presentations, round-table discussion with questions and answers and workshops.

III - INTRODUCTON OF ORGANIZERS AND PARTNERS

Main partners for organising the seminar

Implementing partner:

Hungarian Association of NGOs for Development and Humanitarian Aid (HAND) is a platform of 15 member NGOs that aims at contributing to the formulation of an effective, transparent and sustainable development cooperation policy in Hungary. The Association through its work promotes common interests, active cooperation, communication and partnership with governmental bodies, the European Union or international and foreign institutions involved in the area of development cooperation and humanitarian aid. It aims at raising public awareness as well on development and humanitarian issues, sustainable development and on the promotion of volunteer participation in civil society. It's been involved in GE activities since its establishment. A working group dedicated to global education was established in HAND in 2007. One of the core activities of the working group is advocating for a national GE Strategy therefore it has also commissioned a research and based on the outcomes outlined recommendations related to that.

Contact persons:

Timea GEDEON, Managing Director: timea.gedeon@hand.org.hu

Györgyi ÚJSZÁSZI VÉDEGYLET, Board Member Hand Association:

gyorgyi.ujszaszi@hand.org.hu

Partner organisations:

FoRS - Czech Forum for Development Co-operation is a platform of Czech non-governmental non-profit organisations (NGOs) and other non-profit institutions, involved in development cooperation, development education and humanitarian assistance. FoRS represents more than 50 organisations, which share the common interest of pursuing more relevance and effectiveness of both Czech and international development cooperation and enhancing its positive impact on people living in developing and transforming countries. FoRS has been strongly focusing on GDE on the national level since its inception in 2004.

More than two thirds of FoRS members are active in this area and therefore formed the following working groups: “Global Development Education” for formal education in primary and secondary schools, “Public Awareness” for non-formal education (both groups have merged recently) and “Development studies” for formal education at universities. With respect to public awareness, FoRS has acted as a partner in the campaign Czech Against Poverty that has been running since 2005 and is the most widely known campaign related to development cooperation in the Czech Republic. FoRS also contributed to the development of the national GDE strategy in 2009-2010.

Contact person: Jana MILEROVA, director: jana.milerova@fors.cz

The Slovak NGDO Platform (PMVRO) is an association of 33 NGOs which deal mainly with foreign development and humanitarian aid. In cooperation with stakeholders, it also contributes to improving the Slovak system of providing development assistance and humanitarian aid as well as increasing the awareness of the public by educating about global and development issues. PMVRO is also an implementation body which carries out development education projects supported by SlovakAid, EuropeAid and other donors. Since 2007 there have been working groups focussed on development education which brought remarkable results in 2012 when the National GE strategy was approved by the Government. The Platform is also active in the process of on-going monitoring of the implementation of the current annual action plan of the National GE Strategy, but also drafting the plans for the years to come.

Contact person: Lenka NEMCOVA, Executive Secretary: lenka.nemcova@mvro.sk

Grupa Zagranica is an association of 58 Polish NGOs involved in international development cooperation, democracy support, humanitarian aid and global education. All the members of the platform are conjoined by the will of acting together in order to create better conditions in Poland and Europe for developing supportive activities for the countries in need.

Grupa Zagranica undertakes actions in these fields, in which close cooperation and common position are indispensable for producing a change in the system and reaching the goals necessary from the point of view of the member organisations. Grupa Zagranica has led a project on cross-sectorial co-operation on GE with the aim of agreeing on a common understanding and concept of GE.

Contact person: Jan BAZYL, Executive Director: janeb.bazyl@zagranica.org.pl

The seminar took place in the context and with the support of the **Joint Management Agreement signed between the North-South Centre of the Council of Europe and the European Commission** (EuropeAid Co-operation office), which aims at promoting GDE in the twelve new member states of the European Union as well as in EU candidate and acceding countries and is implemented during 2013-2015.

IV - RECOMMENDATIONS

I. An urge for regional cooperation

The need for cooperation, joint actions, knowledge sharing at the level of the V4 countries has been expressed in various contexts of GE during the seminar. It was one of the most frequently and clearly articulated recommendations and affected practically all five areas of the strategic recommendations of the 2012 Lisbon GE Congress. The concrete fields in which V4 collaboration would be welcome by the seminar participants were the following:

- ✦ It was observed that the official V4 process has not tackled the issue of GE yet. Hence participants suggested that **there should be a concerted action to bring on the issue of GE in the V4 process**. The concrete idea was a joint lobby action of NGDO platforms and national multistakeholder groups that could approach V4 representatives through a formal letter suggesting them to put GE on their agenda. The fact that 2015 will be the *European Year of Development* provides an excellent entry point for that.

- ⤴ The **Visegrad 4 Eastern Partnership Program (V4EaP)** was initiated in 2011 by the governments of the Visegrad Group countries to enhance the cooperation between the Visegrad region and the countries of the Eastern Partnership. This project type seems like an underutilized opportunity though the program can show potentials for global education programs in partnership with V4 and EaP countries.
- ⤴ The **Visegrad Scholarship Program** could be used as well as an opportunity to **enhance** cooperation among GE experts within the region.
- ⤴ Related to national strategy development and implementation the first mid-term review of the **Czech national strategy** is taking place in the near future, which provides again good opportunity for regional collaboration since it will be the **first evaluation conducted in the V4 countries and the lessons learnt may be highly useful for the other V4 countries.**
- ⤴ As for shaping the public opinion through **campaigning and other forms of outreach** participants felt that V4 countries share common challenges, which they could address together. Seminar participants recommended all V4 actors to thoroughly consider the potentials for common actions.
- ⤴ The **Central European Initiative (CEI)** was also identified as an interesting and at the same time wider platform of cooperation but priority was given first to the V4 process to be explored.

Though unanimously approving the idea of closer V4 collaboration participants agreed also that in any of the above areas it is inevitable for GE actors in all Visegrad countries to have a better understanding of the structure of the Visegrad Group with its key actors, processes and institutions. Hence, participants concluded that the first and **most important task is to undertake a mapping exercise** assessing all these aspects of potential V4 (and also CEI) cooperation.

II. The strategic recommendations of the Lisbon Congress

Besides emphasising the need for regional cooperation the outcomes of the seminar clearly reinforced and further specified the various strategic recommendations of the Lisbon Congress.

1. National strategy development and implementation

- ⤴ Based on the experience of the countries (Czech Republic, Slovakia) having already adopted global education strategies participants agreed that only a **multi-stakeholder process** could lead to the desired results.
- ⤴ The **mapping of key institutions and persons** is essential for such a multi-stakeholder process.
- ⤴ Establishing a **working group on Global Education** at national level serving as a **multi-stakeholder** platform for sharing ideas, enhancing quality and influencing decision making could be catalyst in the progress. The process may be initiated by a government body or a civil society actor.
- ⤴ Inter-ministerial **collaborations especially between the ministry of education and the ministry of foreign affairs** is of key importance as well and where not in place already first this should be established in order to accelerate the process.
- ⤴ It is essential that **political support** at the national level goes beyond mere **acknowledgement** of the importance of global education, moreover, **financial support ought to be more systematic and stable** as well.
- ⤴ In national strategy development and implementation the following specific **challenges** should be addressed since they pose serious threats to successful execution:
 - ⤴ Relations between NGOs and state or other public institutions are not stable, they depend on political affinities and changes in administration dissolves a significant part of NGO-state cooperation;
 - ⤴ there is no solid ground for NGOs in influencing policies;
 - ⤴ limited funding is available for GE at the national level;

- ⤴ a significant proportion of NGOs do not solicit or receive private funds but are donor dependent;
 - ⤴ there are few initiatives and projects aiming structural changes;
 - ⤴ there is a limited diversity in activities and innovation.
- ⤴ The importance of international cooperation was stressed again through the example of **GENE** that allows for engaging in bilateral learning programs and peer reviews. In certain countries the level of involvement in GENE is rather limited, which therefore needs reinforcement.
- ⤴ In all above mentioned aspects of strategy development and implementation the mid-term **review of the Czech national strategy** could provide learning points for other countries.

2-3. Curricular reform, education at the national and local levels and continuing professional development of educators (these two areas of the Lisbon recommendations were addressed in one workshop during the seminar)

- ⤴ The **conceptualization of GE needs to take into account the societal changes** one is witnessing at the moment therefore GE needs to continuously change in a self-reflexive manner to better respond to the needs of contemporary societies. It needs to reflect complexity, uncertainty, inequalities and various worldviews and to engage with the knowledge society so that our youth will emerge as responsible citizens.
- ⤴ As observed **NGOs** should overcome their weakness of being often **stuck within an outdated and dogmatically normative paradigm** related to global education that does not reflect the state of the art of education and pedagogy.
- ⤴ It is of utmost importance to have **more academic institutions offering teachers training** related to GE, which issue should be addressed through a multi-stakeholder process.

- ⤴ Participants concluded that **GE actors should make use of existing structures, identify and emphasize common values with other areas of education**, while engaging in meaningful dialogue and debate with them about differences in approaches and practices.
- ⤴ **GE is not a subject in itself but a crosscutting issue** that can be integrated in diverse subjects, which could make its acceptance and adaptation easier.
- ⤴ Experience shows that instead of debating about the term and the concept of GE and its relation to other areas of **education teachers should be provided with very practical, hands-on methods and easily adoptable tools** to use.
- ⤴ **GE could be introduced to community service and other existing youth programs** as it was introduced as a national priority in the Youth in Action program in Slovakia. The added value of creating highly motivated future GE practitioners and development workers by sending volunteers overseas should be exploited as well.

4. Quality support and monitoring

- ⤴ V4 countries should invest more in **research** that could enhance the quality and effectiveness of GE programs. V4 cooperation could have an added value in this regard too. The following **methods and tools** are essential to utilize in quality support and monitoring:
 - ⤴ peer learning at national and regional level
 - ⤴ peer review of educational materials created by the NGOs
 - ⤴ providing self-evaluation tools for teachers
 - ⤴ review and analysis of the content of handbooks available for secondary schools with regards to global education
 - ⤴ development of e-handbooks
- ⤴ **National level working group on Global Education** could play pivotal role in enhancing quality by giving space for conceptual discussions and quality check among practitioners at the same time contributing to the creation of a common

pool of know-how and resources.

5. Campaigning and outreach

- ✦ **V4 countries face common challenges** in influencing the public opinion to which they should effectively respond. These challenges include:
 - ✦ The general public is not aware of even the MDGs;
 - ✦ people in V4 countries are mostly preoccupied with domestic issues ('we have also so many problems and poor people in our own country');
 - ✦ usually in media negative news could find way related to aid and development assistance (e.g. catastrophes, not meeting targets, not fulfilling commitments, lack of transparency etc.);
 - ✦ the campaigns for GE are more of a political sort rather than fundraising activities, (which are more familiar with audiences) and pose bigger challenge in messaging also.
- ✦ V4 actors should thoroughly consider together the potentials for **addressing these challenges together at V4 level** giving preference to innovative, creative and cost effective solutions.



V - SUMMARY OF SPEECHES

OPENING

Welcome by Marton Leiszen on behalf of HAND

Marton Leiszen welcomed all participants and opened the seminar.

Welcome by Adányi László, president of Hand

Mr Adányi stressed the importance of raising awareness about the concept of global education. He pointed out that the general Hungarian public does not support Hungary's engagement for the global South. In other words, domestic issues (such as poverty in Hungary) take precedence over development projects. He also directed the public's attention to the importance of global connections by bringing up the example of the Syrian conflict which – according to some experts- could be related to the phenomenon of global warming and the consequent draughts experienced in Syria. He asserted that this event underscores that all actions have global



links. As for global education activities in Hungary, he stressed that the youth is more and more informed, but there is a lack of educational and informational work among adults. They are not confronted with these themes especially as the media coverage of global issues and development is very low. On the good side, Hungary recently adopted the Development Strategy initiated by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. This result can be surely connected to the awareness raising work among political decision makers undertaken by Demnet, a Hungarian NGO.

Among other aspects, the study trips to African development projects organized by Demnet became the basis of personal engagement. Finally, Mr Adanyi voiced his hope that the seminar would be just as successful in this respect so that more decision makers and stakeholders can be won to the cause of global education.

Greetings by Gábor Tamás Nagy, Co-Chair of Hungarian Parliament's Foreign Affairs Committee, Member of the Hungarian delegation of Council of Europe – passed on by Györgyi Újszászi

Mr Nagy expressed his regrets for not being able to personally attend the seminar due to other engagements. He welcomed all participants and stressed that recently the Parliament accepted the Development Strategy with consensus, and at the moment an action plan is being developed. In this action plan, the role of sensitization, education and awareness raising will be elaborated so all contributions from the seminar could feed into that. Stakeholders will be welcomed in the action group of this consultation and he also stressed that the government will support the process in the future.

First, participants familiarized themselves with a new initiative of the Hungarian government that introduces community service in all high schools. **Mr Márton Bodó**, representative of the OFI (Hungarian Institute of Educational Research and Development) stressed the importance of such a program, sketched past antecedents of community service programs in Hungary and provided detailed information on the practical implementation. The key idea of the speech was that community service may be an important educational tool in order to develop the social sensitivity of youth. He emphasized that the service will be integrated into a pedagogical program encompassing modules of preparation and reflection. In connection with the Lisbon strategic recommendations, this program may be considered as a tool to mainstream global education through a special program in the formal education sector. However, as pointed out by the audience for this to happen it would be necessary that the focus of the program went beyond concerns of the local community and encompassed more global issues by examining global-local linkages.

Thereafter, **Mr Miguel Silva** provided information on the political background of the current seminar, more specifically he elaborated on the role of the Joint Management Agreement signed between the NSC and the EC for the promotion of GE in new EU member States. He evaluated the first JMA cycle as a successful one as it contributed to the initiation of several processes for the development of national GE strategies, resulting with the adoption of national strategies in Czech Republic (2011) and Slovakia (2012). He wished that the second JMA cycle would be as successful in contributing to the *development* and the *recognition* of GE. For the latter, he pointed to the important milestone which was the 2011 Recommendation of the Council of Europe Committee of Ministers to member states on education for global interdependence and solidarity. This recommendation set the political and legal framework for the promotion of global education. The Pan-European multistakeholder GE Congress held in Lisbon in 2012, and its strategic recommendations, was another landmark. He closed his speech by adding that the current event would be a great opportunity to build and follow-up on the 2012 Lisbon Congress strategic recommendations at regional level.

Dr Karen Pashby representing the University of Oulu, continued by focusing on the importance of global education in the formal education system. Her talk offered cutting edge insights into academic research on GE in line with the Lisbon Recommendations on quality support, monitoring and evaluation. The key idea behind her lecture was that a complex idea of GE is needed because it is essential to educate citizens for the 21st century knowledge society. Dr Pashby outlined a new definition of GE that encourages students to relate to perceptions, relationships and flows in three interacting spheres: the self, the other, and local-global contexts. These spheres are related in a dynamic that is influenced greatly by flows and processes (on often unequal terms) of globalisation (Andreotti, Souza, Räsänen & Forghani, 2007). Dr Pashby stressed that the conceptualization of GE needs to take into account the societal changes one is witnessing at the moment, more specifically, the shift from the industrial society characterized by the economy of scale to post-industrial society characterized by the economy of scope.

In the post-industrial era schooling ought to be to prepare learners to adapt to constant change, and even more to question and transform their environment.

Thus, GE needs to be re-conceptualized, as well, in order to reflect this shift in paradigm. Contrasting two metaphors, i.e. understanding GE as a mechanical clock and understanding GE as a living organism can illuminate what conceptual changes this shift would entail. All in all, Dr Pashby concluded that GE needs to continuously change in a self-reflexive manner to better respond to the needs of contemporary societies. It needs to reflect complexity, uncertainty, inequalities and various worldviews and to engage with the knowledge society so that our youth will emerge as responsible citizens.

Reflection was a central tenet to the following lecture by **Katalin Czippán**. The importance of reflection is in line with the Lisbon recommendations on the continuous professional development of educators. She started off by underlining the importance of reflection on personal stories as all learning happens on the personal level. By reflecting on and understanding our personal stories, she suggested that we can help others to reflect on theirs. Referring to the notion of knowledge society, she stressed that our societies can also be considered learning societies – which again underscores the importance of reflection. She closed her talk, by looking at the specificity of the Visegrad region. She underlined the resources of the region: first, its rich nature that enables one to understand the indeed we have one world, and second, its strong tradition of local farming through which one can understand the contrast of global supply chains and regional production. To close, she called upon the audience to reflect on their personal histories, furthermore, to learn from the living history along with the current state of affairs.

Ms Rajacic's lecture offered additional insights into the specificity of the V4 countries as she used a comparative perspective to highlight the particular characteristics of GE in the Visegrad countries. Citing Euro barometer results, she argued that there is a tendency of stronger local orientation both on a European level, but especially in V4 countries.

Having sketched the social, political context, she continued to examine the situation of GE by looking at the participation of NMSs in the development education grant scheme of EuropeAid.

Comparing the success rates of OMSs and NMSs, it is striking that in proportion to their population, organizations in the majority of NMSs are more likely to win projects. However, she argued that looking more closely at the situation in NMSs, the seemingly advantageous picture becomes more controversial. In general, Ms Rajacic argued that NMS organizations are in a trapped situation characterized by instability and donor dependency. Her key recommendations were that it is time that political support in NMSs goes beyond acknowledgement, moreover, financial support on the national level ought to be more systematic and stable. This is in line with the Lisbon Congress reports as it argues that “strengthening global education will require...sustained, and where possible increased, funding, on local, regional, national, international and organisational levels, including civil society organisations and higher education institutions” (p. 29).

The **roundtable discussion** was focusing on outlining the status quo of Global Education in the four Visegrad countries, in order to map positive developments, identify main challenges and point to future developments. The first round tackled the good news with regards to the implementation of Global Education in the Visegrad countries and Austria. From the panellists’ answers it soon became clear that the situation in the four different Visegrad countries is rather different. Some progress has been achieved in all countries however the differences are also quite substantial:

- ⤴ in Czech Republic the national strategy is coming to the first midterm review
- ⤴ in Slovakia there is a strategy with annual action plans
- ⤴ in Poland, instead of a strategy there is a memorandum of Understanding and the MFA provides funding for GE activities and cooperates closely with other ministries such as the Ministry of Education, of Environment, of Higher Education and Science and also with the Polish NGDOs

- ✧ in Hungary there is no strategy yet, but the Parliament has just adopted a new Strategy of International Development in which the important role of global education is mentioned.

The second round aimed at identifying key challenges and possible solutions.

On this matter, the views of the panellist were rather divergent as to what represents the key challenge in their particular national context. The following actions were mentioned:

- ✧ National strategy development and implementation
 - ✧ inter-ministerial collaborations especially between the MoE and the MFA should be initiated
 - ✧ cooperation within the region should be increased
- ✧ Curricular reform and education at the national and local levels more collaboration with teachers is needed
 - ✧ GE material in official school textbooks should be integrated
 - ✧ activities in the youth field should be amplified
- ✧ Continuing professional development of educators
 - ✧ more pedagogical faculties should offer the GE training
- ✧ Campaigning and outreach:
 - ✧ low public awareness on development issues should be combatted
- ✧ Quality support and monitoring
 - ✧ discussion is needed on the conceptual level among all stakeholders
 - ✧ more investment into GE is needed – especially when it comes to research that could enhance the quality and effectiveness of GE programs.

VI - KEYNOTE SPEECHES

Keynote speech: The importance of Global Education in formal education system, Karen Pashby PhD, University of Oulu (FI)

Dr Pashby's talk focused on the importance of global education in the formal education system. The key idea behind her lecture was that a complex idea of GE is needed because it is essential to educate citizens for the 21st century knowledge society. She started her lecture by referring to the recent review of Finland's 2010 Global Education strategy that showed that whereas the importance of GE is unquestioned, the knowledge of what GE is and does is weak.

This underlines the need to engage in theoretical and conceptual discussions on GE.

Dr Pashby argued that conventionally GE is understood as the education about the interconnectedness of global forces and global problems. However, this definition may be seen as problematic for several reasons. First, there are many interpretations of this definition with differing depths of understanding and divergent approaches. Second, this definition is not embedded in today's context, hence a new GE definition is needed. Third, it has been shown that there is a lack of understanding of deeper root causes of global problems such as poverty, which again signals that current practices of GE do not meet a certain quality criteria.



Dr Pashby outlined a new definition of GE that is anchored in different perceptions and relationships which are grounded in different ways of being, knowing and seeing. These perceptions and relationships are embedded in the way one approaches the Self, the Other and the Local/Global Contexts.

In addition, these 3 spheres are entrenched in globalization with its characteristics processes and flows such as advanced capitalism, the reconfiguration of political power, vast international migration, ecological fragility, technological interconnectivity and cultural hybridity.

From this perspective, GE can be seen as an umbrella term uniting educational paradigms focusing on:

- the Self by exploring themes of identity, culture, power, global citizenship,
- the Other by looking at ethics, intercultural and multicultural education,
- the Local/Global Contexts by bringing in issues of sustainability, human rights, development, peace education.

Dr Pashby stressed that the conceptualization of GE needs to take into account the societal changes one is witnessing. To start with, the profile of learners is changing: their demographics are diversified and their access to information is vast and fast as the digital divide is decreasing around the globe. Second, there has been a shift from the industrial society characterized by the economy of scale to post-industrial society characterized by the economy of scope.

Hence, schooling needs to be changed as it needs to prepare learners for a post-industrial society. The underpinning of schooling in the industrial era was that it needed to prepare learners to adapt and conform to their environment. In contrast, the underpinning of schooling in the post-industrial era ought to be to prepare learners to adapt to constant change, and even more to question and transform their environment.

Thus, GE needs to be re-conceptualized, as well, to reflect this shift in paradigm. Contrasting two metaphors, i.e. understanding GE as a mechanical clock and understanding GE as a living organism can illuminate what conceptual changes this shift would entail.



All in all, Dr Pashby concluded that GE needs to continuously change in a self-reflexive manner to better respond to the needs of contemporary societies. It needs to reflect complexity, uncertainty, inequalities and various worldviews and to engage with the knowledge society so that our youth will emerge as responsible citizens.

To close her lecture, Dr Pashby offered the example of the Canadian province, Alberta as a best practice, where the Social Studies Program of Studies focuses on Global Connections. The Program states that “critically examining multiple perspectives and connections among local, national and global issues develops students’ understanding of citizenship and identity and the interdependent or conflicting nature of individuals, communities, societies and nations. Exploring this interdependence broadens students’ global consciousness and empathy with world conditions. Students will also acquire a better comprehension of tensions pertaining to economic relationships, sustainability and universal human rights.”

Questions, remarks by the audience

Q: Instead of talking of global education, why don't we talk of a global schooling system?

A: It is true that globalization is the new world order that benefits particular groups; hence we need to be self-reflective and continuously examine power structures. Unfortunately, it may be the school system itself that reproduces inequalities instead of fighting against them.

Q: How much does the example of the province of Alberta describe the general situation of GE in Canada?

A: The educational system in Canada differs from province to province. GE programs can be found in all the provinces in western and northern territories, but it is absent in others, for instance, in Ontario.

**Keynote speech: Importance of Global Education in the context of V4 countries,
Katalin Czippán, Senior Expert, Education for Sustainability (HU)**



Katalin Czippán started off by underlining the importance of reflection on personal stories as all learning happens on the personal level. By reflecting on and understanding our personal stories, we can help others to reflect on theirs. Referring to the notion of knowledge society, she stressed that our societies can also be considered learning societies – which again underscores the importance of reflection.

She offered her personal story as an example which could be described as linear evolution passing through and incorporating distinct, yet complimentary paradigms such as environmental education, education for sustainability, system dynamics and the theory on the limits to growth. She underlined that all these key concepts deal with the same issue that is on how to educate responsible citizens on a local and global level.

By offering a short simulation game, she also highlighted the importance of choosing the right frame, the right perspective so that one can truly see the bigger picture of reality. Global education – as she explained, can be an important tool to be able to set the right frame. She closed her talk, by looking at the specificity of the Visegrad region. She underlined the resources of the region: first, its rich nature that enables one to understand the indeed we have one world, and second, its strong tradition of local farming through which one can understand the contrast of global supply chains and regional production. To close, she called upon the audience to reflect on personal histories and learn from the living history along with the current state of affairs.

Introductory Lecture: Global Education Strategies of V4 countries, and their stakeholders, Ágnes Rajacic, Consultant civil sector and media (HU)

Link to prezi: http://prezi.com/nnk6jy9rvk4v/?utm_campaign=share&utm_medium=copy

Ms Rajacic offered a comparative perspective to highlight the specific characteristics of GE in the Visegrad countries. She started off by reviewing the 2013 Euro barometer results that – among other issues- investigated what issues Europeans feel the most problematic. Unemployment ranked the highest: EU-27 average was 51% with V4 countries usually having higher percentages. Whereas, environmental issues came last in the list of problems: EU-27 average was 4% with V4 countries having lower percentages. These figures may signal a tendency of stronger local orientation both on a European level, but especially in V4 countries. On the good side of the news, the majority (78%) of Europeans feel that it is out most important to help the poor and the socially excluded to play an active part in society, which signals high level of social sensitivity.

As for figures pertaining to attitudes towards political participation, an interesting contrast can be observed. 2/3 of all Europeans feel that their voice is not heard within the EU and less than half (41%) do take any political action. The figures for the V4 are not that unidirectional in this respect: Hungary and Poland ranks below the EU average in terms of active political participation of citizens, whereas Slovakia and Czech Republic show more activism than the EU-27 average.

On the other hand, Europeans are rather optimistic when it comes to evaluating the political weight of the EU in the global political arena. ^{2/3} thinks that the EU voice is heard outside of Europe, and more importantly, citizens assure that the EU should keep its promises towards developing countries despite the financial crisis.

Having sketched the social, political context, she continued to examine the situation of GE by looking at the participation of NMSs in the development education grant scheme of EuropeAid. Comparing the success rate of OMSs and NMSs, it is striking that in proportion to their population, organizations in the majority of NMSs are more likely to win projects. Hence, the preferential treatment of NMSs may be questioned in the EuropeAid scheme. However, when looking more closely at the situation in NMS, the seemingly advantageous picture becomes more controversial. In general, Ms Rajacic argued that NMS organizations are in trapped situation:

- ⤴ Limited funding is available in NMSs (CZ 0,66 M, 2010; HU: 51 000, MFA co-finance, PL 0.8 M, 2009, SK 0.06 M, 2010) vs. OMSs (UK 27 M, Spain 34.2 M)
- ⤴ Relations between NSAs, LAs, and other public institutions are not stable, they depend on political affinities and changes in administration dissolve a significant part of NSA-state cooperation. (Survey shows that few projects have achieved a non-partisan institutional cooperation)
- ⤴ A significant proportion do not solicit or receive European private funds but are donor dependent
- ⤴ LAs are not well-adapted to this co-financing mechanism

- ✧ Overwhelming lobby work for the inclusion of GE with MoEs and MFA causes more dependency in NMSs



She suggested that it is time that political support in NMSs goes beyond acknowledgement; moreover, financial support on the national level ought to be more systematic and stable. Last but not least, she analysed the situation by looking at the development of GE national strategies in NMSs. The current situation is rather diverse in V4 countries:

- ✧ Czech Republic: in 2011, in collaboration with the DE working group, the MFA has taken the initiative to develop a DE National Strategy, approved by the cabinet of Ministers
- ✧ Slovakia: in 2012, a GE strategy has been prepared by NGDO Platform with MoE Methodological Centre and Pedagogical Institute and it is valid until 2016
- ✧ Hungary: the Development Strategy is underway, but there is no separate GE strategy

- ✦ Poland: a multistakeholder process (2009-2011) was initiated with support of MFA, MoE. The result is a Memorandum of Understanding on Global Education.

She closed her lecture by identifying best practices and key gaps in current practice. Best practices include:

- ✦ The national multi-stakeholder approach has led to strategies (CZ, SK)
- ✦ Linking the topic with general interest of the local public (such as the financial crisis) may enhance the efficiency of the projects
- ✦ Conditional link to the principles of human rights, good governance and gender equality will enhance EU support but will not necessarily engage the public
- ✦ The separation of Global learning and Campaigning approach in the EuropeAid grant scheme will deliver more focused projects
- ✦ Stronger stakeholder engagement on behalf of EU has been observed

On the other hand, some gaps in practice are visible:

- ✦ there is no definition of clear outputs and goals for impact measurement
- ✦ There are few projects aiming structural changes
- ✦ there is no solid ground for NGOs in politics
- ✦ there is a limited diversity in activities and innovation

Roundtable: Representatives of Ministries of V4 countries and Helmuth Hartmeyer GENE

Czech Development Agency

Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Poland

Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports, Czech Republic

Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Hungary

Facilitator: Rilli Lappalainen KEHYS (FI)

The roundtable discussion was focusing on outlining the status quo of Global Education in the four Visegrad countries, in order to map positive developments, identify main challenges and point to future developments.

Please note that due to a visa major situation, the Slovak government representative could not attend the panel. Update on the Slovak situation was provided by the NGO members. In sum, the GE strategy of 2012-2016 has been approved and annual action plans are drawn up and monitored. Some key challenges mentioned were the absence of communication with the MoE and the lack of GE content in text books approved by state.

The first round tackled the good news with regards to the implementation of Global Education in the Visegrad countries and Austria.

From the panellists' answers it soon became clear that the situation in the four different Visegrad countries is rather different. In general, it is positive that there has been progress on many fields: e.g. in recent years, global education strategies have been elaborated in the Czech Republic and Slovakia. Additionally, it is also positive that there has been a reflection on achieved progress concerning GE programs.

As to the specific country situation, Czech representatives from the Ministry of Education and Ministry of Foreign affairs shared the news that their national global education strategy is coming to its first mid-term review. The strategy was elaborated by a multi-stakeholder group and accepted in 2011 for the period of 2011-2015.

Additionally, the panellist highlighted that the MFA has been able to provide stable funding for global education activities some of which has been used for co-financing of EC initiatives. The representative of the Ministry of Education added that the Czech GE strategy focuses on all educational domains (basic, secondary and higher education, youth work), but progress has mainly been achieved in basic and secondary education. GE topics have been included in the educational frameworks and additionally, methodological support has been elaborated on how to tackle them in the everyday practice. The current challenge is to bring these methods to the widest range of schools possible; so far only a specific number of schools have been familiarized with the GE methodology. The involvement of the pedagogical faculty of the Charles University in the training of teacher students in GE methodology has also been an important instrument, however, it would be highly desirable to involve more pedagogical faculties in this process.

The Hungarian situation is rather distinct as a global education strategy has not yet been elaborated. On the good side, the representative of the Hungarian MFA stated that the Parliament has just adopted a new Strategy of International Development in which the important role of global education is mentioned. In addition, there is an effort to offer funding for GE activities on an annual basis.

In Poland, the GE strategy is also missing, but the MFA provides funding for GE activities and cooperates closely with other ministries such as the Ministry of Education, of Environment, of Higher Education and Science and also with the Polish NGOs who are often the most active agents of Polish civil society. The MFA is, on the other hand, not responsible for educational development and support. For that aim, an educational development centre within the Ministry of Education exists, which is responsible for the in-service training of teachers. This centre is supported financially by the MFA, as well. The centre has trained teachers in 16 different Polish regions and has provided educational materials to support teachers. At the moment, an external evaluation is being conducted on the efficiency of the programs in order to identify best practices. Results will be available in the fall of 2013.

The representative of the Austrian Development Agency (ADA) underlined that political activism, educational practice, civil society work and good governance all play a crucial role in promoting and implementing GE. The European Multi-stakeholder group on Development Education is a concerted effort to bring together key stakeholders from the spheres of government, academia and civil society on the European level. On the national level, there is a Strategy Group of Global Learning in Austria, which elaborated the strategy for the formal education. At the moment, new strategies are being developed for youth work and adult education. Fortunately, the funding available for GE programs by the ADA is also relatively high and stable.

The second round aimed at identifying key challenges and possible solutions.

The Czech representatives stressed the need for closer collaboration with teachers for which Czech NGOs have great expertise to be offered both in in-service training as well as in implementing courses at the university. It would be highly beneficial if the ministry would finance such initiatives. Additionally, they stressed the necessity to amplify activities in the youth field and called for closer cooperation within the region. One worrying trend however is that due to the increasing domestic political instability, the Czech public is focusing more on domestic issues. The increasingly inward-looking attitudes can endanger both support for development cooperation and global education activities.

In Hungary, the main challenge according to the MFA representative lies in the low public awareness on development issues. Hence, greater dissemination is needed to inform the public about the activities undertaken by the MFA.

The Polish representative referred to the external evaluation undertaken on GE activities and pointed out that this ought to map the main challenges in the Polish global education landscape. One challenge is surely the lack of GE material in school textbooks despite the fact that global education has been approved as a crosscutting issue in the curriculum.

Related to that, she mentioned the project run by the Ministry of Education that focuses on the development of e-handbooks. She pointed out that this could be an opportunity to incorporate GE themes in the forthcoming new e-materials, but of course, the more traditional printed text books should be reformed as well.

The Austrian representative stressed two main challenges. On the one hand, he suggested that there is a need for more investment into GE – especially when it comes to research that could enhance the quality and effectiveness of GE programs. On the other hand, he claimed that more discussion is needed on the conceptual level. Referring to the keynote lecture by Karen Pashby, he also backed up the idea that often times NGOs are stuck within an outdated and dogmatically normative paradigm that does not reflect the state of the art of education and pedagogy.

Questions, remarks by the audience

Q: How can we ensure that global education takes a genuinely global approach?

A: The importance of intra-ministerial cooperation was brought up through the example of GENE that aims to bring on board both representatives of the Ministries of Education and of the Ministries of Foreign Affairs. It was also stated that GE should be viewed as a pedagogical approach. Neither is it a niche, nor is it an extra subject. Even more schools should not be seen as the only and maybe not even as the primary forces of youth education as nowadays the role of informal learning is becoming more and more important. Additionally, the importance of international cooperation was stressed again through the example of GENE that allows for engaging in bilateral learning programs and peer reviews. These encourage critical reflection across and beyond borders.

Q: In what way, does GE respond to immigration trends and changing demographics?

A: The Austrian representative shared that migration (consciously defined as including both immigration and emigration) was a priority issue for global learning in 2012 in Austria.

The aim was to highlight how the world we live in is in fact a “migrating world and through this program also African communities in Austria were encouraged to become involved in educational programs.

The Czech representative offered a different take on the issue. In his view, migration is not a topic high on the Czech agenda for two reasons: first, the number of migrants is low due to the restrictive migration policy, second, at the moment domestic political issues monopolize the public discussion.

Q: As representatives of ministries, where would you place GE in the school context?

A: The Czech representative stressed that in the Czech framework GE is understood as a crosscutting issue and it is part of their framework educational plan.

Q: In the panel, why is only one person from a Ministry of Education is represented? What are the underlying reasons? And, in what ways, does it challenge your work?

A: Several panellists provided feedback. The Czech representative of the MFA stressed that it was a long process to establish the connection and cooperation, and also emphasized that it is important to find an entry point to the institutions. E.g. it is the department of international affairs that deals with the issue of GE within the Ministry of Education. The Polish representative also stressed that interministerial collaboration is not an easy task, yet it is absolutely essential. At the moment the MFA and the MoE cooperate on a daily basis; there is regular communication. A comment from the audience referred to the Hungarian situation, where one of the biggest challenges is the lack of communication between NGOs and the MoE. Unfortunately, the fluctuation within the Ministry is quite high so it is difficult to establish permanent connections. Another commentator from the audience stressed that the involvement of all stakeholders is indeed a must as GE is much more than awareness raising about development aid. It implies learning about global challenges, which permeates our daily lives. Hence, it would be one of the most important issues to communicate to people that even domestic issues and problems cannot be understood without placing them in the global context.

The Austrian panellist shared this view and stressed that the traditional divide that equated the North with the place for global education and the South with the place for development is outdated. Simply put the causes of inequality are the same everywhere hence GE should always start with the concern of the citizens around you.

Q: Can you provide with some figures as to the evaluation of GE programs and practices?

A: The midterm evaluation as the Czech participants explained focuses more on principles. Hard data about the scope of GE within the basic and secondary educational system is not yet available in the Czech Republic. E.g. it is not assessed to what extent the methodological guidelines that define the competences and values at the level of the basic and secondary school has been implemented by the schools themselves. The situation in Poland is quite similar as the process of evaluation has just been started. The current evaluation aims to identify good practices, and it will not provide statistical data on the general situation either. As from the European perspective, it was stated that the growth of GENE clearly signals that there is a growth in GE structures and international collaboration, however, research on GE quality especially in the formal educational sector is missing. Often time evaluation only looks at educational practices of NGOs.

VII - REPORTS FROM WORKSHOPS

WORKSHOP 1: National strategy, development and implementation

Key lessons of the workshop: National strategy, development and implementation

Representatives of all four Visegrad countries participated in the workshop on national strategy development and implementation. The workshop aimed at mapping the status quo in all countries, identify good practices and look at the strategic recommendations of the Lisbon Congress in order to assess their relevance for the regional context.

Key lessons:

- ⤴ Participants concluded that GE actors should make use of existing structures, identify and emphasize common values with other stakeholders, while engaging in meaningful dialogue and debate with them about differences in approaches and practices. In the case of the Czech Republic and Slovakia this process had been concluded when drafting the national strategies.
- ⤴ It was suggested that such a multi-stakeholder approach is essential. The process may be initiated by a government body or a civil society actor. Getting different stakeholders on board requires that basic principles of successful lobbying are respected (e.g. involving a well-positioned figure, timing).
- ⤴ All participants agreed that the participation of MoE is vital, however, it had been a rather difficult task to engage representatives of the Ministry of Education in several countries.
- ⤴ All participants agree on the fact the GE should not be a separate subject. Rather they viewed it as a crosscutting issue that can be integrated in diverse subjects. The centralization of educational systems was mentioned as a hindrance to integration.
- ⤴ International cooperation has been evaluated positively with regards to the programs of Concord/DEEEP and the NSC. However, it was also stated that the V4 institutions lag behind in this respect, they should be approached to bring GE their agenda.

- ⤴ The process of GE national strategy in Slovakia and Czech Republic is much more advanced, hence it was requested that their experience would be shared with Hungary and Poland so that they could transfer good practices. It is important that the Czech national strategy is coming to its first midterm review. This will be the first evaluation conducted in the V4 countries, the lessons of which may be highly useful for the other countries.

Representatives of all four Visegrad countries participated in the workshop on national strategy development and implementation. The workshop aimed at mapping the status quo in all countries, identify good practices and look at the strategic recommendations of the Lisbon Congress in order to assess their relevance for the regional context. The summary of the workshop is organized around the Lisbon strategic recommendations on national strategy.

1. To review the legal acquis and practices with a view to implement strategies and measures for mainstreaming global education at local, regional, national and international level.

All participants agreed that it is highly relevant to map existing practices so that the case for GE can be rightly argued for. In the case of the Czech Republic and Slovakia this process has been concluded when drafting the national strategies. Additionally, it was suggested that this review may identify particular subjects that are ideally apt for the introduction of GE themes. For instance, ethics classes have been recently introduced in Hungary which may be an entry point to mainstream global education. Similarly, religious education is very powerful in Poland as it shapes attitudes towards charity, development and aid. Thus, Polish civil society actors could use this channel to introduce GE themes while being critical of current aid practices. All in all, participants concluded that GE actors should make use of existing structures, identify and emphasize common values with other stakeholders, while engaging in meaningful dialogue and debate with them about differences in approaches and practices.

2. To strengthen a multi-stakeholder approach to, and support the development, implementation and monitoring of relevant national strategies, through adequately resourced action plans that mainstream global education and make it an integral part of education systems and policies.

It was suggested that such a multi-stakeholder approach is essential. The process may be initiated by a government body or a civil society actor: e.g. in the case of the Czech Republic it was the MFA that coordinated the GE National Strategy process, while in Slovakia it was an NGO. Getting different stakeholders on board requires that basic principles of successful lobbying are respected. For example, several participants noted that an influential and well-positioned person may be key to engage several stakeholders to whom she/he has personal networks. This was the case in Czech Republic and in Poland. In case no such person is available, it may be advisable to hire a communication expert to ensure quality lobbying. Timing is another key issue. For instance, the Czech national strategy was prepared when the educational system was undergoing a major reform, hence there was more room to manoeuvre. Simple as it sounds, but language is utmost important. It is recommended to avoid dogmatism, instead GE actors should use the words of their interlocutors without giving up their ideals. Last but not least, one needs to learn how the system works, map key stakeholders, their rights and responsibilities. On this note, when engaging with government officials it is useful to approach at first lower rank officials who later are likely to move to more influential positions. The mapping of key institutions and persons is also essential for the development and implementation of GE strategies: one needs to know what other (educational) actors may be required to do: as the Czech representative explained, the process was coordinated by the Czech MFA, but a multitude of other actors (MoE, Ministry of Environment, pedagogical faculties etc.) were responsible to develop actions in their specific fields.

3. To support and strengthen the inter-ministerial dialogue with respect to the mainstreaming of global education in different sectors and at all levels of governance.

All participants agreed that the participation of MoE is vital, however, it had been a rather difficult task to engage representatives of the Ministry of Education. Progress has been made in two countries: interministerial dialogue in the Czech Republic and Poland is regular, whereas, in Slovakia and in Hungary, the MoE is almost absent from all GE consultations.

In the Czech Republic, it is the MFA and the MoE that is engaged in continuous dialogue, whereas in Poland the MFA cooperates closely with the Ministry of Education, of Environment, of Higher Education and Science.

4. To strengthen strategies for the support and acknowledgment of non-formal global education approaches and methodologies and ways to encourage dialogue and exchange between formal and non-formal global education actors.

The case of Slovakia seems to be interesting as the Slovak MFA mainly focuses on formal education. However, Slovakia also has a special program of sending volunteers overseas, under this initiative non-formal educational programs are also run. Recently, global education was introduced as a national priority in the Youth in Action program and a new national project was launched by the National Agency to prepare multipliers on GE. These initiatives taken by the National Agency can be explained by the personal lobby efforts of particular individuals who are simultaneously active in the GE and in the youth field.



5. To encourage interconnected and inter-disciplinary global education programmes at all levels of the education system and allocate resources for their implementation, monitoring and evaluation.

From the discussion, it became apparent that all participants agree on the fact the GE should not be a separate subject. Rather they viewed it as a crosscutting issue that can be integrated in diverse subjects. The centralization of educational systems was mentioned as a hindrance to integration. For instance, in Poland and in Slovakia there is a state monopoly on textbooks. Since GE content is missing from these textbooks, teachers face a difficulty on how to integrate GE themes into their everyday practice. Fortunately, projects reviewing the official textbooks will be conducted in the near future in both countries. In Hungary, the educational system underwent drastic changes.

At the moment, instead of the local municipalities, one state institution is responsible for the management of all primary and secondary schools. Hungarian NGOs experience this level of centralization as a hindrance as it makes it more difficult for NGOs to engage particular schools in GE activities.

6. To support and strengthen a multi-stakeholder approach to cooperation and coordination between international, national, regional and local governmental and civil society actors, with regards to global education mainstreaming and good practice sharing.

Three levels of cooperation were discussed: regional, European and global level. As for the regional level, it has been stated that the V4 process has not tackled the issue of GE yet. Hence participants suggested that there should be a concerted action to bring on the issue of GE in the V4 process. Related to this, an idea was to initiate a joint lobby through a formal letter that would invite the V4 representatives to put GE on their agenda.

As for the European level, several cooperations were mentioned: GENE, Concord/DEEEP, NSC, and Trialog. Out of these, NSC is also active on the global level as it offers pedagogical and policy support in the field of Global Education to educators and stakeholders on a European and global scale. DEEEP has also engaged in bringing its activities in the field of Development Education on a global platform as it has initiated cooperation with CIVICUS. The emerging South-to-South development cooperation may signal that in the near future GE practices in Europe will be impacted by Southern practices. For instance, Latin America has had a long history of participatory citizenship what could be fruitfully integrated in GE practices.

7. To encourage the development of adequate transparent and sustainable support mechanisms for quality policy-making and programming in global education at local, national, regional, and international levels.

This issue has not been high in the agenda in the V4 countries. The Czech national strategy is coming to its first midterm review. This will be the first evaluation conducted in the V4 countries, the lessons of which may be highly useful for the other countries.

8. To encourage the development of national quality approaches for global education mainstreaming.
9. To support international coordination, strategy sharing and peer review processes of global education in order to enhance quality in the field.

From the discussion it also became clear that the process of GE national strategy in Slovakia and Czech Republic is much more advanced, hence it was requested that their experience would be shared with Hungary and Poland so that they could transfer good practices.

10. To recognise the importance and support of civil society organisations, such as development and other civil society organisations, media and journalist associations, youth organisations and trade unions, in further developing global education within the non-formal education field, with a view to strengthen democracy and the awareness of the interconnectedness of global and local (glocal) realities. In particular, youth organisations and networks should be involved and supported throughout the policy-making process with regards to both formal and non-formal education.

In Slovakia, the national youth strategy was drafted this year. Some professionals who had been consulted on this strategy were also active in GE activities, consequently, global education is now included in the youth strategy.

11. To recognise and support academic institutions in promoting a rigorous and independent debate on global education, including the new possibilities that quantum sciences and quantum computers will offer all us in the closed future.

WORKSHOP 2: Curricular reform and continuing professional development of educator

1. Global education in the formal education system (curricula, primary, secondary levels as well as universities and teacher training institutes, the role of authorities and key stakeholders in this regard)
2. Global education in the non-formal education system, civil society and youth organisations
3. Educational resources and support services, good practices

The participants of the workshop represented Poland, Canada, Finland, Azerbaijan-Hu, Czech Republic and Hungary. They shared good and bad practices.

They shared their GE experiences in their own countries in secondary schools, in higher education and in NGOs activities in schools.

In **Poland** there are good practises – since 2008 reform teachers have to participate in projects. They can choose any subjects to integrate GE into them in school curricula.

In **Hungary** GE is a new challenge – teachers don't know much about GE
Teacher trainings are needed – there is lots of potential in it. NGOs work on educational materials – running trainings for teachers, visiting classes in schools. (limited numbers)

Azer-Hungarian represented an NGO with low budget:
Good practise (in HU): they train teachers, give certificate and have very positive feedback. They reach limited number of schools

Canada is a very multicultural country with changing disciplines. GE has great perspectives. Subjects shouldn't compete, all issues are connected to globalization.

In **Czech Republic**, there are good examples. 12 schools work on methodology setting an example.

Important questions:

What is the aim of GE?

React to changes, get competences not only one way

What to put in the curricula?

The V4 countries should cooperate, share knowledge and best practices

Should be clarified:

1. Who could be the stakeholders?
 - a. NGOs, teachers, teacher trainers, authorities, ministry of education
2. How to get them involved?
 - a. the task is to make the stakeholders interested - cooperation of 4V
3. How to improve fundraising?
 - a. to work out a good motivating strategy – “Honey on the string” policy

WORKSHOP 3: Quality support and monitoring

Firstly the participants tried to identify what is their experience and involvement in activities related to global development and then more specifically support and monitoring in global education.

The result of this activity showed them that they are a rather mixed group, with people having very extensive knowledge on both global education and quality and people who are new comers and willing to absorb the knowledge in a learning process.

Interactive getting to know each other questions:

1. I've been working in development education/global education since
(long/short)

2. I'm involved in national groups/platform/ in work on development/global education

(not at all/very intensively)

3. I've experience in working on quality support and monitoring with regards to global education (not much/much)

What is the topic exactly? What does it mean: quality and quality control?

How do you measure impact or sense?

The courage to reflect what you do and how you are doing it. Courage to be modest.

4. Quality in global education is an easy task or a difficult one to implement

It's a complex topic and the answer to this question depends on personal experiences.

It is difficult to measure impact and the crucial parts (e.g. emotional impact) are the hardest to measure.

It is not only about this, you can measure the hard indicators: materials, activities and not just on evaluation.

Education is not just a product it's about the environment and common sense.



Outcomes of the small groups with regards to the question: What do they need to better support quality and monitoring?

Tools: methodology and framework.

Resources: money, people and data.

Support from above, whoever that might be for you (e.g. the headmaster).

Tools: how to get data (methodological tools).

More need for data and tools.

What are considered to be data and tools: the question is not specific enough for some participants.

Good resources, books but also that you/ teachers are able to handle these books.

Control to see if your efforts have the impact that you are aiming for in order to create new strategies.

They should be clear about what the outcome should be and this should be discussed before. How the teachers will work and what will the students learn.

How can you measure the competences of pupils? It is easier to reproduce what the teacher tells you, you will forget it as soon as you can. Competence is what you acquire yourself and if you want to change that you will have to use indoctrination.

You can't measure competence.

As a teacher you have to be modest, not to want to change the person. The students are a free subject. Allow education to make its own sense!

What is the difference between output and outcome?

Output= after project

Outcome= could be 20 years later, it can't be measured.

What can you measure? Letting students be free?

What promotes/ fosters learning? The freedom to be slow or fast the biodiversity in the classroom, to allow process of participation.

To be a critical consumer and a critical thinker. Trust people.

Sometimes you can only measure a project by indirect indicators: did people volunteer, how many people attended etc.

There should be room for experiment and this should not be blocked by the expected outcomes.

Open approach to education. How do we work on this? What do we need?

Solution to missing tools / data

Czech Republic:

What is quality? What are criteria? Evaluation should be based on the pedagogical point of view and not on money. If sponsoring organizations are involved the fear exists that it is about the numbers and money and future projects will be based on that.

But you need hard indicators as well because you need to know if something is working.

The multi approach

Evaluation and monitoring are two different things. They are linked but not the same.

Good practice example from Austria: resource centre Vienna.

During the 2nd day of the workshop we focused on good practices.

The group formed different groups according to the countries present.

- ✦ Monitoring of how the 10 point UEFA Rules of having racism free stadiums work out;
- ✦ Code of Conduct on Images and Pictures

As a tool to monitor if materials and campaigns are in line with the rules set in the code of conduct and in this way follow the quality criteria set in the code of conduct

We found out that in this situation there was cooperation between Polish and Slovak NGOs, where Polish NGOs shared good practice with the Slovak colleagues

- ✦ having a national strategy on global education is a way of ensuring that quality standards are available and can be;
- ✦ working group on Global Education (sharing ideas and checking quality between NGOs);
- ✦ peer review on educational materials created by the NGOs;
- ✦ self-evaluation tools for teachers;
- ✦ review and analysis of the content of handbooks available for secondary schools with regards to global education

WORKSHOP 4: Campaign and outreach specially focusing on Beyond 2015 Process

1. The post-2015 UN process and the CSO campaign Beyond2015

Participants became familiar with the Post-2015 UN process and the Beyond2015 global civil campaign on the development framework replacing the MDGs after 2015.



Participants from the different countries also shared information on national level CSO activities related to the Beyond2015 campaign. The impression is that not much is going on among CSOs in this regard or else it's not visible to the public. In case of Hungary there are certain activities (advocacy and not campaigning) going on since Hungary is the co-chair of the so called Open Working Group on Sustainable Development Goals, which is the official UN process on the follow-up of the Rio+20 conference in 2012.

2. A theoretical V4 campaign linked to the Beyond2015 campaign

Participants through working on different aspects of a theoretical V4 campaign linked to the global Beyond2015 campaign identified challenges, potentials and specific points for consideration when planning any such kind of action in V4 counties.

Challenges:

- ✦ The general public is not aware of or familiar even with the MDGs
- ✦ People in V4 countries are mostly preoccupied with domestic issues and the general counterargument against helping developing countries is that 'we have also so many problems and poor people in our own country'
- ✦ Usually in media negative news could find its way related to aid and development assistance (e.g. catastrophes, not meeting targets, not fulfilling commitments, lack of transparency etc.)
- ✦ It would be a campaign of a political sort rather than a fundraising activity, which means bigger challenge in messaging also

Potentials of a V4 campaign:

As for the potentials for a common V4 campaign participants identified advantages and disadvantages of such cooperation:

Advantages:

- ✦ V4 countries share common challenges so they can address and come up with solutions to them together
- ✦ Cost effectiveness
- ✦ Reflects stronger position if developed and represented together at international level as well as at the national level
- ✦ Existing forms of cooperation could serve as good bases for such common initiative (e.g. partnerships in Visegrad Fund and EuropeAid supported projects)

Disadvantages:

- ✦ No common media and language
- ✦ More time could be spent on coordination than on content
- ✦ Previous experience: often there is no real cooperation among partners in V4 partnerships, it means simply implementing national level activities side by side

Goals, possible messages, methods of a hypothetical campaign

Participants considered the possible goals, messages and methods of a hypothetical V4 campaign.

Important points to keep in mind while developing messages:

- ⤴ Different messages work for different target groups
- ⤴ Difficult to find messages for engaging V4 politicians
- ⤴ What messages could work for general people – it refers back to the problem of having domestic problems:
 - ⤴ We should try to focus on positive aspects, messages: we are in the same situation, but we can help, we can change things;
 - ⤴ domestic poverty can connect people to poverty in other countries

Methods

- ⤴ First step always start with an assessment: mapping stakeholders, their relations and priorities, strengths, weaknesses, threats and opportunities, possible sources, partners, synergies etc.;
- ⤴ Different target groups might need different methods of approach, which is a challenge but we definitely need complex campaigns targeting multiple groups;
- ⤴ different approaches are needed for the different types of decision makers as well (political and institutional decision makers);
- ⤴ Politicians: important to create opportunity for long term involvement for them e.g. through field visits, first-hand experience;
- ⤴ In case of V4 countries: importance of cheap, innovative, creative solutions;
- ⤴ Recently new methods evolved to be exploited: various channels of social media

Resources

During the discussion participants came up with plenty of ideas for concrete actions. In realising them an important question is the availability of the necessary financial resources.

Participants agreed that no need always for plenty of money but rather for creativity.

Points for consideration in our V4 context (recommendations):

1. While planning campaigns we have to always keep in mind the specific challenges we face (e.g. domestic issues vs. global responsibility) and plan accordingly
2. V4 actors should thoroughly consider together the potentials for addressing these challenges together at V4 level

VIII - REGIONAL ISSUE 1: Water Summit

Water and education - Understanding finite resources

What is water? Water is a source of life, it is everything. It is an ecological tool.

After a scientific group quiz about water (7 out of 10 right answers) there was a general introduction about water in Hungary and the water summit to be held in Hungary in October 2013. There are 5 different areas that will be covered during the summit. The one that comes the closest to the field of education is: Green economy for blue water. Unfortunately the truth is that in the entire introduction to the summit the word education is only mentioned once.

The aim of this workgroup is to come up with recommendations: what can education do for the sake of water? How can we cooperate? Good and bad practices.

The discussion started with the question of how it would be possible to transfer knowledge. In the countries of the participants there is no lack of water. The issue is that we feel safe and sound however we are not aware that we are all connected in the cycle of water.

In the south (Congo) the problem is pollution. People drink from the same water which they also use for other purposes. The state of mind of people is that they have been using the same river for centuries and they will continue to use it. The challenge here lays in the changing of traditions and education on how to use water in a safe way (ex.: boil water first).

The problems in the South but also in Eastern Europe are waste management. Rich countries feel no restrictions or morale issues with dumping their waste in poorer countries. The consequences are for these poor countries and the people who live there. Waste management is a matter of money in the North and in the South (someone will get richer from it) but the real problem is that it is not a priority in the South. People in the North should be made aware that their actions (the actions of their country) will have consequences somewhere else.

In Slovakia and in Poland the focus is mainly on encouraging people to drink tap water. To educate people that the water coming from the tap is safe and drinkable and there is no need to buy bottled water.

In Slovakia there are the so called Water Days, children are encouraged to collect rubbish and there are NGO projects about water in connection with overall environment awareness raising and teaching children to be critical thinkers. There is also a focus on virtual water: the water that is needed to produce for example paper.

Teachers and others can find information about water and these projects in a resource centre, websites/ online library.

The ministry of Education is involved in the reform of curriculum: new books and education material. This is cross cutting with environmental and geography lessons.

In Poland the social media has been pretty strong on this issue. It is a grassroots organisation that through Facebook focuses the attention on bad drinking habits and educates people about other options.

There is one leading NGO that develops books for children on the topic.

In The Netherlands drinking tap water is not an issue. People are aware that it is safe and drinking bottled water is not a real fashion. Educational campaigns are focused on how to safe water and use water in a responsible way.

A key factor in for example waste management and the usage of biological products is money.

A campaign should be focused on how you can also help the environment and the preservation of clean drinking water without having to spend a lot of money. For example:

- ✦ Turn off the tap when you are brushing your teeth;
- ✦ Do your laundry at a lower temperature;
- ✦ Switch of the engine of your car when standing still;
- ✦ How to use rainwater.

It is important to look at local opportunities. What can people do to solve their own (local) problems to improve their situation. These good practices should be collected and easily accessible globally. Sharing knowledge is crucial. Learn from each other mistakes.

At the moment the slogan is that water unites. We believe that this is not true. At the moment water divides:

*Cross-Country education initiatives. Don't use water as a tool of revenge / war. Be aware that if you build a dam in country A this will have effects in country B.

Other ideas mentioned during the discussions:

- ✦ Teach children to be proactive
- ✦ Teach that there are consequences to your actions
- ✦ Think of other countries that have less
- ✦ Teach about the eco-fuel print of your country
- ✦ Use resources wisely for future generations

Our recommendations to the water summit:

- ✦ Cross-border education initiatives;
- ✦ Global Education should be a higher priority;
- ✦ Support grassroots initiative;
- ✦ Need for a global institution to create a toll to share knowledge.

IX – REGIONAL ISSUE 2: Hungarian Presidency of V4 and Hungarian Presidency of Central European Initiative: Increasing Regional Coherence - The Role of Education in the V4 Cooperation

The workshop first aimed at looking at in what ways GE actors could engage with the **Visegrad Group** (V4) to promote the recognition and implementation of global education. The discussion identified opportunities and difficulties at the same time.

To start with, it was pointed out that the institutionalization of the V4 is rather weak compared to other international bodies. Nevertheless, it was concluded that for being an existing structure with a substantial force and entrenched future, it should still be seen as an opportunity to lever influence.

Another difficulty is that education is not found among the priorities of Visegrad Group, which mainly focuses on energy policy, infrastructure and security policy. Some participants suggested that this may only be a difficulty at first sight. They argued that it would be the task to GE actors to formulate their objectives in a way that is convincing for decision makers who are not yet familiar with the concept of GE. In order to engage in effective dialogue, GE actors in all Visegrad countries should have a better understanding of the structure of the Visegrad Group with its key actors, processes and institutions. Hence, participants concluded that the most important task is to undertake a mapping exercise. Having identified key persons on the national and regional scene a concerted action can be undertaken to engage with the Visegrad group and even to influence the setting of their agenda. As for a practical action, it was suggested that NGDO platforms and national multistakeholder groups could approach the V4 representatives at the same time with a common letter to raise their awareness about the importance of GE. The fact that 2015 will be the European Year of International Development could be a symbolic resource to do so. However, the message should be carefully chosen and articulated. It was suggested that if necessary external communication experts should be invited to formulate the message.

The workshop facilitators also drew the participants' attention to some opportunities within the Visegrad process that could be strategically used to for GE activities. One suggestion was that Visegrad 4 Eastern Partnership Program (V4EaP) could be used to promote GE activities in neighbouring countries. The V4EaP program was initiated in 2011 by the governments of the Visegrad Group countries to enhance the cooperation between the Visegrad region and the countries of the Eastern Partnership. It soon turned out that very few GE practitioners present have engaged in activities with the Eastern Partnership countries; hence this project type seems like an underutilized opportunity. A similarly useful opportunity is the Scholarship program that could be used as an opportunity to enhance regional cooperation among experts within the region.

The second part of the workshop was a focusing on the **Central European Initiative**, which is an intergovernmental forum with 14 members. The workshop participants concluded that the same mapping exercise should be done with the CEI as with the V4 in terms of key actors, processes and institutions. Given that the CEI focuses on scientific collaboration maybe that could be the first entry point. In the end of the workshop however it was concluded that the priority should be to first engage with the V4 group and after the process is in rolling, other regional bodies such as the CEI can be also approached.

Framework

Not institutionalized; V4 Stakeholders have different priorities; Energy policy; Security policy; Infrastructure development; Current orientation of platform is eastern Europe not the global south; There are difficulties and challenges, but it's an existing structure that should be exploited

Opportunities

- ⤴ Eastern partnership can show opportunities to do global education programs in partnership with V4 countries in Eastern Europe and the Western Balkans

- ✦ Alignment of priorities within the V4 initiative
 - ✦ Political
 - ✦ Economic
 - ✦ Social

Methodology

- ✦ Mapping exercise
- ✦ Identifying existing structures
- ✦ Mapping other platforms within V4
- ✦ Build and extend political and social capital
- ✦ Develop synchronized action on behalf of the V4 stakeholders to bring agenda into V4 consultations
- ✦ Piggyback on international events, such as European Year of International Development and provide contributions to shape decision

Hungarian Presidency of Central European Initiative:

- ✦ Strengthening Human Resource Development through the CEI
- ✦ Platform for Intergovernmental Forum for political economy and scientific
- ✦ Not well known platform, research is needed
- ✦ Identify national actors, coordinators and activities and priority areas
- ✦ Scientific cooperation might be interesting
- ✦ Interesting opportunity, but first should focus on securing V4 position before aiming towards other platforms

X - REGIONAL ISSUE 3: Global – environmental education side by side or education for sustainability: What do V4 countries experienced and recommend to Hungary?

Country experiences:

Czech Republic

Environmental education is well known, well understood, supported and attractive for schools, many has dedicated staff for it and these teachers are the ones who are open for global education (or responsible consumption) in general.

Environmental and global educations are seen as fields that are interlinked rather than competing. Always the same people in the schools are engaged in activities organised by projects. NGOs related to the fields of multiculturalism / cross-culturality are aware of the notion of global education.

Hungary

Decision makers think in „boxes”, overly simplified. Environmental education is labelled as the field of „tree huggers”, therefore blocked. Additionally, it doesn't introduce local initiatives but use far and theoretical examples. As an area it belongs to the Ministry of Environment, not to the Ministry of Education as the latter was not interested. Global education is not understood but there's a growing pressure from EU level to start working with it. Multicultural learning and human rights as topics should be involved.

Poland

Environmental education is perceived fun, non-political, teachers like it. Human rights is close to the hearts because of the notion of solidarity. It could be a good starting point for global education, however, as it's more political therefore more difficult. Education of multiculturalism seems to be superficial, lacks depth.

Student government organisations are engaged in the democracy discourse. All in all, global education is a lot less visible.

Finland

Many teachers still advocate for using a more scientific approach to environmental education. Science education keeps environmental and global education separate.

Why merge or differentiate GE/EE?

Pros

- ✦ they practically „occupy” the same time slots in school schedule, which if we differentiate would add to the competition;
- ✦ the three legs of sustainability only work together;
- ✦ it’s difficult to separate the two;
- ✦ global education is not a subject but a dimension;
- ✦ cooperate to have bigger influence

Cons

- ✦ misses the holistic approach;
- ✦ global education creates specific support for development;
- ✦ problem with the term „global” (terms generally overused)

Other

- ✦ instead of fighting about the term, give very practical help (materials, hands on experience) for teachers. Some Polish organisation got outstanding results with this approach as teachers could easily integrate it to their busy schedule;
- ✦ there are some Polish organisations that use global education to make arguments for aid (and more funds for the organisation)

Conclusion

Formal education in the EU is very much OECD / technocrat and economics driven. We should avoid entering the competition on the „education market” about what provides what list of competencies. It might sound like a good selling point but we need to stay out of that discourse and promote that youth education is to socialise and to give confidence, not to provide a list of competence. The value set of global education is different from the current structure. This also means that instead of bettering PISA using different perspectives, we should be working outside the system with cultural creativeness, alternative schools and the new school movement.

XI - EVALUATION



APPENDIX

PROGRAM

5th Sept, 2013

- 09:00 – 09:30 Registration
- 09:30 – 09:40 Opening: László Adányi, President of HAND Association
- 09:40 – 10:10 Welcome speeches by
Gábor Tamás Nagy Co-Chair of Hungarian Parliament's Foreign Affairs Committee,
Member of the Hungarian delegation of Council of Europe
Márton Bodó PhD, Scientific Researcher, Hungarian Institute for Educational
Research and Development
- 10:10 – 10:15 Interactive introduction Györgyi Újszászi/Védegylet (HU)
- 10:15 – 10:20 Digital storytelling Viktória Mihalkó/Anthropolis (HU)
- 10:20 – 10:40 Lisbon GE Congress – Miguel Silva North-South Centre of the Council of Europe
- 10:40 – 11:00 Keynote speech: The importance of Global Education in formal education system
Karen Pashby, PhD, University of Oulu (FI)
- 11:00 – 11:20 Keynote speech: Importance of Global Education in the context of V4 countries,
Katalin Czippán, Senior Expert, Education for Sustainability (HU)
- 11:20 – 11:40 Introductory Lecture: Global Education Strategies of V4 countries, and their
stakeholders, Ágnes Rajacic Consultant civil sector and media (HU)
- 11:40 – 12:00 Coffee break
- 12:00 – 13:30 Roundtable: Representatives of Ministries and Parliamentarians of V4 countries
and Helmuth Hartmeyer GENE. Facilitator: Rilli Lappalainen KEHYS
- 13:30 – 14:20 Lunch
- 14:20 – 14.35 Introduction to Workshops
- 14:35 – 17:00 4 parallel workshops (including a coffee break)
- WORKSHOP 1: National strategy, development and implementation
- WORKSHOP 2: Curricular reform and continuing professional development of
educator
- WORKSHOP 3: Quality support and monitoring
- WORKSHOP 4: Campaign and outreach specially focusing on Beyond 2015 Process
- 18:00 – 20:00 Joint dinner

6th Sept, 2013

09:30 – 10:45 Continuation of 4 parallel workshops

10:45 – 11:00 Coffee Break

11:00 – 13:25 ACTUAL ISSUES - work in 3 groups

Water Summit: Water and education - Understanding finite resources

Hungarian Presidency of V4 & Hungarian Presidency of Central European

Initiative:: Increasing Regional Coherence - The Role of Education in the V4

Cooperation

Global – environmental education side by side or education for

sustainability: What do V4 countries experienced and recommend to

Hungary?

3 x 10 minutes country reports - workshop facilitators can prepare their
report

13:25 – 14:15 Lunch

14:15 – 15:30 Results of Workshops by facilitators

15:30 - 16:00 Evaluation: interactive by Réka Balogh HAND Association and Miguel Silva North-
South Centre of the Council of Europe

Closing session

LIST OF REFERENCES & LINKS TO RELEVANT SOURCES

- [Report on the Impact of Global/Development Education in the 12 New EU Member States](#) (written on the basis of the global/development education 2012 survey on the outcomes of the 2009-2011 National and Regional Seminars on Global/Development Education) Lisbon 2012;
- [Key Findings and Recommendations from the Country Reports on Global Education - 2011](#) - Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia;
- [Reports of national and regional seminars](#) developed in the framework of the previous JMA (2009-2011);
- 2nd GE Congress [Strategic recommendations](#), Lisbon 2012;
- Council of Europe [Global Education Recommendation](#), Strasbourg 2011;
- North-South Centre [Global Education Guidelines](#) – a Handbook for Educators to Understand and Implement Global Education, Lisbon 2012 (2008)
- White Paper on Intercultural Dialogue : [“Living Together As Equals in Dignity”](#), Strasbourg 2008

WATER SUMMIT

<http://www.budapestwatersummit.hu/budapest-water-summit/overview/>

The Visegrad Group

<http://www.visegradgroup.eu/about>

Central European Initiative

<http://www.cei.int/>

DIGITAL STORIES

To have a look at visit the page:

<http://digitalistortenetmeseles.hu/digitalis-tortenetek/>

LIST OF SPEAKERS AND PARTICIPANTS

Adányi	László	Hungary	HAND, MMSZ
Aleksanyan	Tigran	Slovakia	Slovak NGDO Platform
Balogh	Réka	Hungary	HAND
Bernkopfová	Michala	CzechR	Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports
Bodó Dr.	Márton	Hungary	Oktatási és Fejlesztő Intézet
Boenning	Kinga	Poland	Instytut Rozwoju Obszarów Wiejskich IROW
Čajková	Tereza	CzechR	o. s. ADRA
Carvalho Da Silva	Miguel	Portugal	NSC
Center	Michal	Slovakia	Pontis Foundation
Coertjens	Maarten	Belgium	DEEEP/CONCORD
Czippán	Katalin	Hungary	CzK Consulting
Darvas	Katalin	Hungary	MKNE
Drazkiewicz-Grodzicka	Elzbieta	Poland	Solidarity Fund PL / University of Cambridge
Gedeon	Tímea	Hungary	HAND
Gibril	Deen	Hungary	Mahatma Gandhi Human Rights Organisation
Gombási	Bernadett	Hungary	Volunteer (ELTE Student)
Hajiyeva	Arzu	Hungary	Fundation of Subjective Values
Hársas	Éva	Hungary	MKNE
Hartmeyer Dr.	Helmuth	Austria	GENE/Austrian Development Agency
Hrubanová	Kristýna	CzechR	NaZemi
Huč	Marjan	Slovenia	SLOGA
Hudák	Krisztina	Hungary	HAND
Irimiás	Olga	Hungary	Csoma's Room Foundation
Ivanic	Peter	Slovakia	Slovak Centre for Communication of Development
Kisgyörgy	Péter	Hungary	Árpád Fejedelem Primary and High School
Klačková	Zuzana	Slovakia	Business High School
Koncz Dr.	Mária	Hungary	PR expert
Koppány	Judit	Hungary	Artemisszió
Korsós	Bernadett	Hungary	Volunteer
Kurucz	Krisztina	Hungary	Oktatáskutató és Fejlesztő Intézet
Lányi	Gergely	Hungary	Világ Bolt
Lappalainen	Rilli	Finland	KEHYS
Leiszen	Márton	Hungary	HAND
Martoni	András	Hungary	Global Education Network of Young Europeans GLEN
Mihalkó	Viktória	Hungary	Anthropolis
Moryc	Janina	Poland	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Müllerova	Pavla	CzechR	Czech - UNDP
Nagy	Zsuzsanna	Hungary	Oktatáskutató és Fejlesztő Intézet
Nagy	Viktória	Hungary	Oktatáskutató és Fejlesztő Intézet
Náprstek	Martin	CzechR	Czech Development Agency
Németh	Barbara	Hungary	UNICEF Magyarország
Notora	Michal	Slovenia	SLOGA
Pająk-Ważna Dr.	Ewa	Poland	Pedagogical University of Cracow

Pashby	Karen	Finland	Oulu University
Piazza-Georgi	Barbara	Hungary	MMSZ
Pieniżek	Anielka	Poland	Partners Poland Foundation
Pinczés	Bálint	Hungary	Interpreter
Popper	Eliza	Hungary	National Youth Council of Hungary
Póss	Anett	Hungary	GAU Green Club
Rajacic	Ágnes	Hungary	consultant
Raymond	Irambo	Hungary	African Hungarian Union
Rohonyi	Péter	Hungary	Foundation for Development of Democratic Rights (DEMNET)
Rosielle	Franca	Hungary	Volunteer
Simonyi	Gyula	Hungary	BOCS Foundation
Simonyi	Péter	Hungary	Committee on Sustainable Dev. of the Hung. Parliament
Slepickova	Lenka	CzechR	Institute of Research on Inclusive Education
Sófalvy	Judit	Hungary	Védegylet
Szarvas	Hajnalka	Hungary	Pázmány Péter Catholic University, Political Theory Doctoral School
Szyniszewska	Katarzyna	Poland	Foundation CentrumCSR.PL
Újszászi	Györgyi	Hungary	HAND, Védegylet
Újszászi Ifj.	Györgyi	Hungary	A Világ Bolt
Urbanova	Katerina	Slovakia	CEV Živica
Vernerová	Eva	CzechR	People in Need
Visy	Katalin	Hungary	Institute of Education, University of London
Vylitová	Romana	CzechR	Multicultural Center Pague MKC Prague
Zajac	Lukas	Slovakia	People in Peril Association
Zpevakova	Beata	Slovakia	Slovak Agency for International Development Cooperation

CONTRIBUTIONS

REPORT EDITORS

Réka Balogh, Tímea Gedeon, Judit Koppány, Györgyi Újszászi

MODERATION OF PLENARY SESSION

Márton Leiszen

MODERATION OF ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSION

Rilli Lappalainen

FACILITATION OF WORKSHOPS

Tigran Aleksanyan, Kinga Boening, Marteen Coertjens, Katalin Czippán, Katalin Darvas, Peter Ivanic, Márton Leiszen, Anielka Pieniazek, Péter Rohonyi, Péter Simonyi

WORKSHOP RAPPORTEURS

Réka Balogh, Katalin Darvas, Judit Koppány, Márton Leiszen, András Martoni, Franca Rosielle, Judit Sófalvy

DRAFTING COMMITTEE

Judit Koppány, András Martoni, Viktória Mihalkó, Györgyi Újszászi

INTERPRETER

Bálint Pinczés

SECRETARIAT AND COORDINATION

Krisztina Hudák, Bernadett Korsós, Tímea Gedeon

IMPRESSUM

The report was compiled and edited by: Györgyi Újszászi

Proof-reading: Réka Balogh

Photographs: Krisztina Hudák

Layout: Réka Balogh, Györgyi Újszászi

HAND, November 2013

HAND - Hungarian Association of NGOs for Development and Humanitarian Aid

Address: 1088 Budapest, Szentkirályi utca 6.

Telefon: +3670 397 76 47

Email: info@hand.org.hu (general)

Website: www.hand.org.hu

VAT No: 18249341-1-42

