



Visegrad Global Development Education Seminar Follow-up meeting

Budapest, Hungary

REPORT

23 May, 2019

Organised by:

Funded
by the European Union
and the Council of Europe



Implemented
by the Council of Europe

In cooperation with:



TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
2. INTRODUCTION
 - 2.1. OPENING SPEECHES
3. KEYNOTE PRESENTATION
4. REGIONAL CONTEXT OF GLOBAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION
 - 4.1. CZECH REPUBLIC
 - 4.2. HUNGARY
 - 4.3. POLAND
 - 4.4. SLOVAKIA
5. THEMATIC WORKING SESSIONS
 - 5.1. CONTRIBUTION OF GLOBAL EDUCATION TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SDGs
 - 5.2. COOPERATION BETWEEN UNIVERSITIES, RESEARCH INSTITUTES AND NGOs, BRIDGING CONCEPTUALIZATION AND EVERYDAY PRACTICE
 - 5.3. TEACHER TRAINING AND CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT
 - 5.4. IMPACT MEASUREMENT ON THE FIELD OF GLOBAL EDUCATION
6. PODIUM TALK
7. KEY OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
8. FACTS AND FIGURES
9. APPENDICES

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The 2nd follow-up meeting of the Visegrad Regional Seminar on Global Development Education (GDE) took place in Budapest on the 23 May 2019, in the Council of Europe Youth Centre. It was organised by the North-South Centre and was hosted by the Hungarian Association of NGOs for Development and Humanitarian Aid ([HAND](#)). It counted with the cooperation of other Visegrad partners, the Czech Forum for Development Co-operation - [FoRS](#); the Polish NGDO Platform [Grupa Zagranica](#); and the Slovak NGDO Platform – [PMVRO](#).

The meeting brought together 24 practitioners and decision-makers from the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland and Slovakia. The aim of the meeting was to assess the level of implementation of the recommendations in the field of GDE policy and curricula development, pedagogical support and advocacy that were agreed in Prague and during the first follow-up meeting in Warsaw in May 2018, in accordance also with the Zagreb Congress strategic recommendations.

The Budapest follow-up meeting provided space for exchange on innovative research initiatives and good practices in global education. Each national delegation included participants from different sectors: formal/non-formal education sector, namely researchers from universities; CSO platforms; Ministry of Education (MoE) and/or of Foreign Affairs (MFA); and the national coordinators of the North-South Centre's Global Education (GE) network.

The one-day event contained different sessions. After the welcome speeches participants reflected in national discussion groups about processes of implementing, promoting and conceptualization of global education in the different Visegrad countries and subsequently shared their insights with the other regional representatives. This session was followed by a keynote speech on the potential impact that research could have on the educational aspects of global social justice and environmental sustainability during everyday practice, policy planning and implementation in global education. The following working sessions gave the opportunity to deepen discussions on specific issues, such as contribution of global education to the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs); cooperation between universities, research institutes and non-governmental organisations (NGOs), bridging conceptualization and everyday practice; teacher training and continuing professional development and impact measurement in the field of global education. Concluding the meeting a podium talk was held about the lessons learnt and the potential future of regional and EU level cooperation in global education with special focus given to the North-South Centre's and Concord HUB 4's activities.

2. INTRODUCTION

In the framework of the Joint Programme between the European Union (EU) and the Council of Europe to promote Global Development Education (GDE) in new EU member States and candidate countries¹, the North-South Centre of the Council of Europe facilitates and coordinates a cycle of regional seminars to monitor the recognition and implementation of GDE in the Balkan, Baltic, South-East Europe and Mediterranean, and Visegrad countries. This monitoring process is based on the strategic recommendations of the 3rd European Congress on Global Education, organised by the North-South Centre in Zagreb in 2015, and on the Council of Europe Recommendation CM/Rec (2011)4 on education for global interdependence and solidarity.

This annual GDE monitoring process covering the period 2016-2019, is in line with the Council of Europe Action Plan on Building Inclusive Societies; with the Council of Europe Standing Conference of Ministers of Education held in April 2016 under the theme “Securing democracy through education”; and with the Council of Europe Conference organised by the Cypriot Chairmanship of the Committee of Ministers “Education: a safe option to Democracy”, (Nicosia, March 2017). It is also in line with UNESCO efforts to make progress towards Target 4.7 of SDG 4, in the framework of 2030 Agenda, and with the EU DEVCO/DEAR Global Partnership for Development.

By bringing together practitioners and decision-makers to exchange and jointly discuss existing perspectives and further developments on the concept and practice of GDE, in terms of policy making, curricula development, pedagogical support and advocacy, the North-South Centre contributes to the recognition and practice of GDE in the Visegrad region.

Targeted outputs:

- Necessary elements, potential steps based on research results are identified for promoting and enhancing national global education processes;
- Potential next steps for strengthening Visegrad regional and EU level cooperation are identified;
- Visegrad recommendations for the North-South Centre’s future activities are identified.

Targeted outcomes:

- Common challenges and practices in GDE in the Visegrad countries are identified and regular national intermediate monitoring meetings involving the multistakeholder task forces are agreed;
- GDE as an integral part of education and of development policy is promoted through regular assessment of the progress made in the field of Policy Making and Curricula Development;
- Opportunities to develop joint action and collaboration within and beyond the Visegrad countries are discussed and planned through regular meetings between the regional NSC GE network coordinators;
- Operational recommendations and priorities for furthering GDE in the Visegrad countries are established and benchmarked.

¹ iLegend: Intercultural Learning Exchange through Global Education, Networking and Dialogue

2.1. OPENING SPEECHES



In the opening session Ms **Gordana Berjan**, Executive Director of the European Youth Centre ([EYC](#)) welcomed the participants in their institution. The centre is hosted by both the Hungarian authorities and the Council of Europe. She briefly introduced the work of the European Youth Center namely its focus on youth work, human rights and democracy. She also mentioned SDGs being in their focus as well and explained about a recent online campaign aiming to combat hate speech. She presented some materials, such as the Compass and Compasito, which are manuals on human rights used with young people in non-formal education, and a manual called Gender Matters focused on gender equality.

Ms **Györgyi Újszászi**, co-president of HAND Association welcomed the participants to the follow-up meeting and emphasized the importance of sharing experiences and knowledge about Global Education.

Mr **Miguel Silva**, Global Education Programme Manager of the North-South Centre also welcomed the participants to the meeting. He described the course of the current process, explained the iLegend advocacy and pedagogical support stages and how it brought together decision makers and practitioners. He described education as an ongoing process and expanded on its achievements. He mentioned that the current cycle of the iLegend was coming to an end in July 2019 and a new cycle would begin in August 2019 and continue until mid-2022.

3. KEYNOTE PRESENTATION



Ms **Ditta Dolejsiova** from the Global Education Network Europe ([GENE](#)) and the Academic Network on Global Education and Learning ([ANGEL](#)), divided her keynote speech into three parts. The first part was about GENE, which is a network of Ministries, Agencies and National bodies. She explained its work since 2001, originally consisting of six national structures from six countries, currently composed of over 40 ministries, agencies and other national bodies, from over 25 countries. The aim of GENE is that all Europeans have access to global education. She described research activities in GENE about the state of GE, the international peer reviews, the awards GENE gives out annually, and the peer learning processes. She mentioned that peer reviews had been already conducted in almost all Visegrad countries except for Hungary. In the second part of her presentation, she introduced ANGEL, an international network of researchers, which is a partnership project between the Development Education Research Centre (DERC) and GENE and its aim is to create links between policy and research. Among the related activities GENE produces briefing papers introducing research results and organizes events for exchange. She also mentioned the recently published Global Education Digest, which enlist the latest publications on GE. The third part of the keynote speech concentrated on a briefing paper titled *Measuring Global Competencies: A Critical Assessment* written by Joffy Conolly and Elina Lehtomäki from the University of Oulu, Finland, and Annette Scheunpflug from the University of Bamberg, Germany. The paper highlights some of the limitations and challenges of the current competency measurements and competency models. The authors identify four different approaches to global education: neoliberal, global consciousness, critical and advocacy approaches. One of the conclusions of the paper was that nowadays diversity is viewed by many as a threat to their culture, which shows the clear need for GE. It is also important to

note how GE is conceptualized since the definitions and aims need to be consistent and appropriate. Some alternative terms for GE were suggested, such as global mindedness and global awareness. The paper finished with the statement that global education is the most effective when used through a whole-school approach.

4. REGIONAL CONTEXT OF GLOBAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION



Representatives from the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland and Slovakia formed national discussion groups to discuss the context of Global Education in their own countries. After the 30 minute discussions, each country representative reported back to the audience. The Slovak and Czech groups worked together but reported their situation separately.

4.1. CZECH REPUBLIC

Ms **Zuzana Krulichová** from FoRS: There is an updated National Strategy on GDE - which still need to be presented. It is a strategy for 2019-2030 and is accompanied by an action plan.

Revision of cross cutting issues is currently under preparation and due to its complexity it is being prolonged.

The Czech NGO Platform

FoRS - Czech Forum for Development Co-operation is a platform representing more than 40 Czech non-governmental non-profit organizations, academic institutions, religious-based organisations and other actors operating in the international development cooperation, humanitarian assistance and global development education. More than two thirds of FoRS

members have been active in implementing GDE at the Czech national level. They have formed the FoRS working group Global Development Education and Public Awareness for good practice sharing and GDE-related advocacy in formal, as well as non-formal, education. Since 2010 FoRS members have also been participating in the preparation of the national GDE strategy and related processes. FoRS is among others a member of the inter-ministerial multi-stakeholder working group for GDE coordinated by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Also, FoRS is involved in the structures of the CONCORD (European confederation of Relief and Development NGOs) and, through its HUB4 working group, it is influencing current activities at the EU level, for example commenting on the design of the DEAR programme, policy papers, GDE funding study 2011-15 and other activities.

4.2. HUNGARY



Representatives of the Hungarian national group summarized their discussion by explaining that in 2016 a GE concept was approved by the government but there is no commonly agreed procedure to implement and promote it. Despite the fact that there is openness in the MoE to discuss about the topic, there is a lack of resources for implementation. The problem might be also that even though resources exist, they are labelled differently, e.g. as resources for environmental education, education for sustainability etc. The initiative of the Hungarian National Commission for UNESCO was introduced as well, which is aimed at promoting the SDGs and global education to decision makers. There was a discussion about the terms and words used around GE, since parts of GE can be in the curriculum even if not under that particular name. It was suggested that instead of global responsibility education, the term global citizenship education could be used since it might not be as problematic.

Advocacy for changing the curriculum was mentioned, as well as a new website (www.globnev.hu), gathering GE materials to assist teachers in Hungary. There were good examples mentioned as well:

- the practice of teaching migrant children in communities close to the borders,
- the revision of the National Environmental Education Strategy by the Hungarian Association on Environmental Education,
- a teaching material developed in cooperation with UNESCO and a professor of Human Ecology.

The Hungarian NGO Platform:

The Hungarian Association of NGOs for Development and Humanitarian Aid (HAND) is a platform of 12 member NGOs that aims at contributing to the formulation of an effective, transparent and sustainable development cooperation policy in Hungary. The Association 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'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 was advocating for a national GE Strategy. As the Hungarian government accepted the GE concept now the main aim is to support the execution of the strategy and integrate the existing GE curricula developed by NGOs into the New National Core Curriculum which is being elaborated by the Government.

4.3. POLAND

Global Education is shared responsibility of 4 ministries (Ministry of Education, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Science and Higher Education, Ministry of Environment). The MFA has projects for awareness raising, just last year 11 altogether, e.g. thematic activities, film festivals, projects of schools and educational institutions. Funding partly comes from the EU for such activities. As the MFA sees it, a big concern is that the interest in GE has decreased so there is need for reinforced efforts to promote it. This is connected to the difficulties in explaining and defining what GE is.

According to Grupa Zagranica, schools are more afraid to realise such projects, as GE is being discussed in right wing media as dangerous for Polish identity. Secondly - the situation of NGO sector is difficult, so many organisations which were active in GE no longer exist, or they do something else. In addition the MFA has not announced any call for proposals for GE this year.

Two Polish researchers introduced their research work on GE within universities. They mentioned that GE is slowly becoming more visible within academia and that they are publishing their research in Polish so that it is more easily accessible to Polish teachers and researchers. They have written a handbook as well on GE for teachers in Polish. Even though there are good examples, they stressed the need for strengthening the cooperation between academia, NGOs and teachers. The goals for GE in Poland are to have more visibility and GE to be more understandable and more accessible topic for more audiences.

The Polish NGO Platform

Grupa Zagranica is an association of 53 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 has led a [project on cross-sectorial co-operation on GE](#) with the aim of agreeing on a common understanding and concept of GE.

4.4. SLOVAKIA

Mapping has been carried out extensively around global education in schools, youth organizations and companies etc. to gain data about the current status of GE in Slovakia. There are hopes to have cooperation with the MoE, there have been two higher level meetings already. There were discussions about granting opportunities as well. The Slovak Platform is part of Bridge 47, an international CSO project network aiming at advocating for GDE.

The Slovak NGO Platform

The Slovak NGDO Platform (PMVRO) is an association of 27 NGOs which deal mainly with foreign development and humanitarian aid, global (citizenship) education and sustainable development. In cooperation with a broad range of 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. Since 2007 there have been working groups focused 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.

5. THEMATIC WORKING SESSIONS

5.1. CONTRIBUTION OF GLOBAL EDUCATION TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SDGs

The group discussion was summarized by referring to the experiences of each country and CONCORD. In all V4 countries the national implementation of the SDGs has reached a level where SDG strategies have already been or are being developed. It varies though from country to country whether global education is incorporated in any way into the general SDG-implementation strategy and even if it is, whether actual steps to carry out the strategy plans have been made already or not.

Slovakia

- In 2017, Slovakia started the process of developing its SDG implementation plan
- Education was determined as one of the six priorities of SDG implementation
- Global Citizenship Education (GCE) was incorporated within education strategy concluding in 2027
- Major breakthrough for global education is to be implemented through the already existing education structure

- Environmental assistants/teachers have been appointed in schools, ideally they are responsible for a wider concept of sustainability than merely for environmental issues
- In the government's approach global education is linked to the goal of increasing IT literacy: there are more initiatives to implement IT in the classroom and to increase digital literacy; this will benefit young people as they become a more digitalized workforce.

Hungary

- Until now the MFA has been responsible for SDG implementation in Hungary. A recent and unexpected development is that the Ministry for Innovation and Technology would like to co-lead the process. This slows down even further the on-going strategy and action planning process and the set-up of a multistakeholder consultation body, which have been in the pipeline for couple of months already.
- It is not clear what the new strategy will bring to global education. The existing national GE concept is also not being implemented. The MoE and the MFA are responsible for it together but none of them have a feeling of ownership and there are no actual steps identified to deliver on the plans.
- The revision of the national curricula is now underway (due in every five years), a first version was prepared but the government was not satisfied with it. A new version under a newly appointed ministerial commissioner is to be developed but not much is known about the process.
- One trend is noticeable though: merging IT and digitalization with sustainability
- Strategy to fight school dropout: part of the strategy includes global education, but is not clear what steps will be taken.

Czech Republic

- The national SDG implementation strategy and the national goals are set.
- The Educational Strategy 2030 is being prepared
- The problem with global education is that the agenda is split up between several different ministries which inhibit progress.
- A similar environmental coordinator program is in place in schools as in Slovakia.
- Use SDGs to promote global education

Poland

- SDG implementation is assigned to the MFA, an implementation strategy has been adopted
- To support the implementation Poland is involved in the #Agenda2030 campaign
 - Each country responsible to choose a day to implement this campaign/project
 - Examples of initiatives
 - Projects to tell a human story
 - Wall with digital tools so people can have a hands-on opportunity to learn about the SDGs

CONCORD's view on the European situation

- On the European level, the DEAR multi-stakeholder group has not been active particularly during the past year
- With the new European multiannual financial framework (MFF), there is a question on whether or not there will even be an office dedicated to global education or whether it will be grouped with other offices
- Right now, it is just a waiting game until the new commissioners take office. Even so, the first thing on their agendas will not be sustainability.
- There is hope for global citizenship education, but, as of now, it is unclear whether or not it will truly be implemented

5.2. COOPERATION BETWEEN UNIVERSITIES, RESEARCH INSTITUTES AND NGOs, BRIDGING CONCEPTUALIZATION AND EVERYDAY PRACTICE

The session started off with a short presentation by Ms **Dorottya Rédei**, representing the [Central European University](#), which is part of a project aimed at developing an assessment tool. The project is titled *The Gender Equality Charter Mark (GECM) - A European Partnership between NGOs and Universities*. GECM is to be used to assess and help realize gender equality in schools. The charter mark had been adapted for 3 countries and for a pilot project used in 3 schools in each country. One NGO and one University (from Hungary, United Kingdom and Italy) participated in the project from each country. Some of the major findings of the study were that gender equality is often viewed only as numerical equality and gender inequality often remains invisible.

After the presentation there was a general discussion mainly around the topic of gender and gender inequality, since many of the participants had worked around these issues in one way or another.

Main observations of the discussion around gender:

- There is often a misunderstanding around the concepts of gender, gender equality and gender studies
- Since gender is becoming a politicized issue, the environment is hostile to the topic
- Due to the above mentioned observations, it is difficult to approach schools/teachers with the topic of gender

The discussion was directed toward collaborations between different actors and identifying the benefits and drawbacks. Participants from universities pointed out differences in perspectives between those working in academia and those working in the NGOs and they would find it helpful for everyone to share those differing concepts, knowledge, opinions. There was mutual agreement on the advantages of collaboration. Another problem is how people understand what GE is and it was mentioned that GE is still a new topic to some of the academics. NGOs have a longer experience of working with GE, but academics have suspicions towards representatives of NGOs and don't always trust their knowledge. NGO representatives' foreign language skills can be better than academics', which can limit the participation of academics in conferences and international initiatives.

The last part of the discussion was about the positive benefits of collaboration between NGOs and universities. Many schools for instance can be more eager to participate in projects when academic support is connected to the efforts of NGOs. Ms Dorottya Rédei highlighted the importance of translating the language used to be suitable for different audiences, since the way things are explained is important.

Main observations of the discussion:

- There isn't much research available from the Central European area - ANGEL was referred as a potential tool for this
- Project funding is often an issue, since stability and continuity are often lacking
- There is a possibility to learn a lot from working with different partners, although there can be differences in e.g. academic sector planning for longer term while NGOs cannot plan for equally long
- Differing level of knowledge of foreign languages and differing capacity needs of people arriving from different sectors (academia, civil society, government etc.) can also hinder cooperation among them especially at the international level but it is inevitable nevertheless.
- The collaboration between NGOs and universities can help projects to better enter schools. Academic language can be problematic for other readers; it might be easier to approach when papers are shared in a shorter format.

5.3. TEACHER TRAINING AND CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The discussion took place within small groups of five participants. They presented the observed issues, dynamics and good practices from their own countries. The conversation circulated around difficulties with being a teacher and teaching in general and also about teaching topics connected to GE. For instance participants mentioned that there are difficulties with teachers' salaries and gender inequality by numbers (female dominated profession). The discussion touched also upon the co-operation between NGOs and universities in projects and in-service training of teachers and how difficult it can be to entice teachers to join in if they don't get credits for it.

In Hungary the following challenges were identified:

- Aging of the teacher population
- There are many people who have had teacher training but aren't working as teachers
- Many teachers have a lot of studies and theory around their subject area but not much around actual teaching methodologies
- Four different salary categories exist for teachers in Hungary, depending on the teachers' qualifications and achievements and it creates polarization among them
- Teachers tend to follow too strictly the curriculum and leave not much space for individual approach though the curricula is not at all that much prescription-like, it very much leaves space for own initiatives
- Special courses are also not provided for students by the universities due to lack of funding e.g. for gender sensitizing future teachers, though when students have the chance to participate they respond very positively

In the Czech Republic, the situation is pretty similar. But it is also possible to take a one-year course and qualify as a subject teacher. In the Czech Republic there are no requirements for teachers to do further training but they are motivated to do that. There are also accredited courses available. It was also explained how the trainings don't reach teachers equally, since in Prague there are many trainings available, but in other parts of the Czech Republic not much so.

An innovative NGO-run project for teacher training is offered in the Czech Republic, in which professionals with an interest in teaching are encouraged to join the project for two years to learn more about teaching and to teach at schools. Such an initiative could help to overcome the problem of the low number of teachers. A similar system is in place in Austria called Teach Austria. Of course the quality of these short term trainings is key.

Main observations of the discussion:

- Becoming a teacher is not a promising career because salaries are still not competitive and the profession is not respected
- Some of the teachers have gone abroad
- Because of low salary many teachers need to overwork with two teaching jobs
- In many countries there are problems with the quality of teacher training, the methodology being outdated
- General problem of teacher training is that the focus is mainly on the subject and not enough on pedagogical skills
- However students and some teachers/professors would be open for topics connected to GE, there is a lack of money to finance occasions to get familiar with new approaches
- Short term, good quality trainings for professionals interested in teaching could increase the number of teachers
- Teaching in many countries is mainly female-dominated field, at the same time male teachers are usually regarded better teachers and tend to receive disproportionately more reward for their work
- There is also a problem with the sustainability of the projects addressing certain aspects of teacher training. There are already good initiatives but they might come to an end after project funding expires.

5.4. IMPACT MEASUREMENT ON THE FIELD OF GLOBAL EDUCATION

The working session started with a short presentation by **Györgyi Újszászi**, representing HAND about a UK-developed self-assessment tool in GE. During the presentation she circulated the questionnaires and introduced the methodology:

- The questionnaire should be completed by students before and after a lesson on a particular topic to measure improvement
- Can be adapted depending on the country and the learning outcomes

Main observations of the discussion:

- These kind of questionnaires and the methodology can be useful tools to evaluate the trends and learning patterns of students, there are limitations of measuring the impact of global education activities:
 - It is always a question whether we can attribute the change in attitude or knowledge of students to our activity or not, when students could get information, knowledge, experience from other sources as well.
 - Everyone is looking for quantitative data to prove the impact but every class is different and it is difficult to do any generalization when it comes to impact
 - It may be better not or sometimes even impossible to measure impact because measuring itself can lead to unfair expectations and unrealistic goals because students have not an even level of knowledge, competences etc
 - It may be better to measure not at the level of the individual students but at the level of the school by measuring through several routes of evaluation on different pillars of education. An Irish example for this approach: www.worldwiseschools.ie
- Global education is imperative to broaden views and prevent radicalization and it is important to look at how we can reach people who are stuck in radical views
- Global education should promote social understanding; there is a need to bridge gaps between two given positions, teachers should know how to help work out problems between students that have opposing views, that's an immediate impact.

6. PODIUM TALK

The podium talk was about the lessons learnt and the potential future of regional and EU level cooperation in the field of global education with a special focus given to the future of the North South Centre's activities and Concord HUB 4's activities.

The talk started off with a presentation of Mr **Stefan Grasgruber-Kerl**, Co-chair of CONCORD Hub on Global Citizenship Education and People's Engagement ([Hub 4](#)). He described how the Hub's activities target the EU institutions as well as the development actors, challenging the classic approach to international development and addressing the root causes of inequality. The key tool is the use of global citizenship education, teaching critical thinking skills. CONCORD is a learning space for members, where they can see examples of GCE from the national level and share best practices and lessons learnt. He also talked about the CONCORD Strategy 2016-2022 on Citizens Engagement, highlighting critical dialogue on the intrinsic, universal values of the global justice agenda. He introduced the strategic goals of Hub 4 to be reached by 2022, in relation to SDG 4.7, the European policies at EU and member state level and the commitment to GCE and gender equality. As a very important output CONCORD published in 2018 a report investigating the investment (government resources) of EU member states and of Norway dedicated to GCE. The data was not easy to be collected since it's not equally available in all countries and the terminology for GCE varies from country to country. A crucial prerequisite for citizen engagement and for GCE is a secure and open civic space, which is shrinking in many countries not only in other parts of the world but in Europe as well. There was also talk about Bridge 47, an international network and its work for promoting GCE. At the European level currently not much can be done in advocacy till the new commission is in

place. A good action point will be a meeting on GCE organised by the Hub in Helsinki in November 2019 as part of the Finnish Presidency of the EU.

The podium talk revolved mainly around the North-South Center's GE program.

- V4 Participants expressed concerns first of all about the regional global education seminar process. Ideally this process would be the regular meetings of the national level members of multistakeholder groups working towards the promotion of GE. But these groups don't really exist, there are no activities carried out by them and there is hardly any continuity in people attending the seminars.
- V4 representatives highlighted also the need for more communication between the North-South Centre and the partners and more involvement of partners in designing the plans for the iLegend project implementation. The regional exchange events should also go beyond generalities and go more in-depth into jointly selected topics. Apart from the regional seminars specialized workshops and trainings should be offered for the region too.
- In relation to the Global Education Week one feedback was that in 2018 it didn't work out as it could have. There was a delay in producing the common media kit and communication materials and the materials themselves did not meet the expectations of the partners. It might be the case that instead of a centralized approach small grants/support and bigger national independence in the form of re-granting could generate more outreach.
- Re-granting for national activities in general - not only in the framework of the Global Education Week - would be a welcome addition to the program's activities.
- The potential revision of the [e-learning courses](#) of global education offered by the North-South Centre was raised as well. Some participants present took part in the courses and appreciated them but for years now they have not changed much. There should be courses for different levels, for beginners and for more advanced learners as well. This topic should be further explored since creating or adapting courses would be a very resource intensive process.
- As an example of potentially useful activities is the assistance GENE has been and is providing to Slovakia. This has taken three forms of support. One is for the national consultation process by organising national forums or seminars. The second one is a co-funding of a GE programme in SlovakAid . The third part is technical support.
- V4 partners expressed their interest in learning about and participating in shaping the plans for the future cycle of the Joint Programme of the EU and the Council of Europe.

The representative of the North-South Centre highlighted that the program is designed to meet the needs of partners and there is a consultative process to ensure the ownership of the activities and to help to form the process and the goals collectively. He also emphasized the importance of maintaining the dialogue between partners and within the country groups throughout the year. As for the future plans upon the suggestion of the V4 representatives the North-South Centre will share the draft concept for the next cycle so that partners can share their views on it. The current cycle ends in July and the new one starts in August.

7. KEY OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Budapest follow-up meeting focused on the exchange of innovative research initiatives on global education and promotion of good practices. Therefore it targeted mid-term results (outcomes) and the structure of the follow-up meeting was developed in line with them. The first targeted output was to identify the necessary elements, potential steps for promoting and enhancing national global education processes. The second was to determine the next steps for strengthening the Visegrad regional and EU level cooperation. And the third was to identify Visegrad recommendations for the North-South Centre's future program.

During the meeting participants mapped and reported about the GDE context in their own countries and exchanged their experiences and good practices. A common observation was the difficulty of the definition and used terms of GE. For instance the concepts of "gender" and "sustainability" are commonly misinterpreted or narrowed. Sometimes the perspective of GE can be found in the curriculum, but not as a coherent and holistic approach with specific terms.

The impact measurement of GE activities brings up a whole range of questions related to the methodology and accurateness of the measuring tools. This area of work needs more analysis given the opposing perspectives on the one hand, of seeing impact measurement almost impossible, and on the other hand - specially on the donors' and decision makers' side - of wishing to see the tangible results and long term effects of GE activities.

Stronger collaboration between academia and the NGO sector seems to have several advantages. It is a useful way to approach schools, which might be sometimes problematic for NGOs. It could also make GE more visible. To enhance the collaboration more space should be created for exchange and common work. A very important desired outcome of this collaboration would be producing more research on particular aspects of global education specifically in the national contexts.

The following recommendations were outlined both during the seminar sessions and through written inputs from partners in relation to the next cycle of the Joint Programme of the EU and the Council of Europe:

- National partners called for greater involvement of the partners in the design and implementation of the program as a whole and its particular activities.
- For the above end an advisory body or organ alike could be appointed to the program comprising the representatives of the national partners.
- The regions could have one regional coordinator selected from among the national coordinators to enhance the cooperation among regional partners and the North-South Centre.
- At national level the multistakeholder groups should be reinforced by providing support for their coordination.
- The concept and the format of the regional exchange seminars should be revisited and should provide space for more in-depth treatment of the selected topics.
- Apart from the regional seminars capacity building in the form of specialized workshops, trainings etc. should be also at the core of the program.

- Partners recommend the revision of the on-line e-learning courses in order to reach out to more participants at varying levels of experience with GE. Gradual adaptation to national languages should be considered as well since it prevents many from participating.
- In case of certain program elements greater independence should be given to the national partners executing the actions.
- Re-granting through small scale grant schemes is a much needed form of support in partner countries both in case of the Global Education Week and other activities. Its implementation details should be determined in cooperation with the partners.
- The North-South Centre, GENE and CONCORD should cooperate more closely and work towards greater synergy within GE and this should be reflected in their dealings with the EU as well.

8. FACTS AND FIGURES

The regional seminar targeted key stakeholders from the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland and Slovakia, including representatives of governmental and educational institutions and civil society organizations in the field of global education, 24 of them in total. There were 20 female participants and four male. When it comes to country representation, 11 participants came from the host country, Hungary, two from Slovakia, three from Poland and one from the Czech Republic. The keynote speaker came from Slovakia, the representative of CONCORD from Austria. Interns came from Finland and the United States.

9. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS & APPENDICES

State of play in the region

Presentation of Ditta Dolejsiova, GENE

Presentation of Dorottya Rédei, CEU

Presentation of Stefan Grasgruber-Kerl, CONCORD

Visegrad GDE Seminar [Report & recommendations](#)

Visegrad GDE Seminar [1st follow-up-meeting report](#)

[3rd GE Congress Strategic Recommendations: Final Recommendations](#)

3rd GE Congress Report: Final Report

3rd GE Congress Background documents

GE national seminars: 2013-14 overview

GE regional seminars: 2013-14 overview

Global Education Survey - Evaluating the 2012 Lisbon Congress Thematic Recommendations

Youth Global Skills Survey - Exploring Youth Skills for the 21st Century from a Youth Perspective

North-South Centre [Global Education Guidelines](#)—a Handbook for Educators to Understand and Implement Global Education, Lisbon 2012 (2008)

Council of Europe Recommendation CM/Rec(2011)4 of the Committee of Ministers to member states on education for global interdependence and solidarity, Strasbourg 2011;

Council of Europe [framework of Competences for Democratic Culture](#), Strasbourg 2016

White Paper on Intercultural Dialogue: “Living Together As Equals in Dignity” Strasbourg, Strasbourg 2008

Disclaimer

The contents of this publication are the sole responsibility of the North-South Centre of the Council of Europe and can in no way be taken to reflect the views of the European Union.