GENE
Global Education
Network Europe

Learning for a Global Society

Evaluation and Quality in Global Education

Proceedings of the GENE Conference
London 23-25 September 2003

Learning for a Global Society

Evaluation and Quality
in Global Education

**Proceedings of the GENE Conference
London, 23-25 September 2003**

Editors
Eddie O'Loughlin and Liam Wegimont

Compilation and editorial support
Josefina Löfgren

The GENE Conference "Learning for a Global Society"

Organised by
The Development Education Association (UK)
InWEnt (Germany)
The North-South Centre of the Council of Europe

In association with
Institute of Education, University of London
Institute for Educational Science
Friedrich-Alexander Universität, Erlangen-Nürnberg

On behalf of
GENE (Global Education Network Europe)
and participating GENE members:
Austria (KommEnt);
Finland (The Ministry of Foreign Affairs; the Finnish Board of Education);
Germany (B.M.Z., InWent);
Ireland (Development Cooperation Ireland);
Norway (the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Rorg);
Netherlands (National Committee for Sustainable Development Education NCDO);
Portugal (CIDAC) and
The United Kingdom (DEA)

With financial support from
InWent, Germany
North-South Centre of the Council of Europe
Department for International Development (DfID), UK
Government of Japan

North-South Centre of the Council of Europe

www.nscentre.org

For details of GENE members see www.globaleducationeurope.net

North-South Centre of the Council of Europe
Lisbon, January 2004

CONTENTS

Section 1   QUALITY AND EVALUATION IN GLOBAL EDUCATION: AN OVERVIEW

Section 2   CONTEXTS FOR QUALITY AND EVALUATION IN GLOBAL EDUCATION (I): POLICY CONTEXTS

Section 3   CONTEXTS FOR QUALITY AND EVALUATION IN GLOBAL EDUCATION (II): LEARNING AND AWARENESS RAISING

Section 4   IMPROVING GLOBAL EDUCATION

Section 5   SHARING INNOVATIONS FOR EVALUATION
AND QUALITY IMPROVEMENT

Section 6   LOOKING FORWARD

APPENDIX

Abbreviations

BMZ	German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development
CIDAC	Centro de Informação e Documentação Amilcar Cabral (Portugal)
COE	Council of Europe
DAC	OECD Development Assistance Committee
DCI	Development Cooperation Ireland
DE	Development Education
DEA	Development Education Association (United Kingdom)
DEAR	Development Education Association and Resource Centre (Japan)
DEEEP	Development Education Exchange in Europe Project
DeSeCo	Definition and Selection of Competencies (of the OECD PISA)
DFID	Department for International Development (United Kingdom)
EC	European Commission
ESD	Education for Sustainable Development
EU	European Union
GAIA	GAIA Education Centre (Greece)
GATT	General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade
GE	Global Education
GENE	Global Education Network Europe
GEW	Global Education Week
ICT	Information Communications Technologies
IHE	Institution of Higher Education
IMF	International Monetary Fund
InWent	Capacity Building International, Germany
ITECO	NGO for Development and International Solidarity (Belgium)
KEPA	Service Centre for Development Cooperation (Finland)
KommEnt	Society for Communication and Development (Austria)
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MoE	Ministry of Education
MFA	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
NCDO	National Committee for International Cooperation and Sustainable Development (Netherlands)
NEPAD	New Partnership for Africa's Development
NGO	Non-governmental Organisation
NSC	North-South Centre of the Council of Europe
ODA	Overseas Development Assistance
OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
PISA	The OECD Programme for International Student Assessment
RORG	NGO DE network
SD	Sustainable Development
TAKSVÄRKKI	Operation a Day's Work Finland
TRIPS	Trade-Related aspects of Intellectual Property Rights
UCODEP	NGO for Development and Co-operation (Italy)
UK	United Kingdom
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNESCO	United Nations Organisation for Education, Science and Culture
USA	United States of America
WSSD	World Summit on Sustainable Development (Johannesburg)
WTO	World Trade Organisation

Acknowledgements

Preface

"In an era of globalisation all nation-states need to co-operate and collaborate if they want to best represent their citizens interests. Such co-operation works best among those who share values and goals; and it works most efficiently if it is entrenched in permanent institutions so that each act of collaboration does not have to start on a Greenfield site."

(Will Hutton)

This report contains the proceedings and papers from the GENE London Conference *Learning for a Global Society*, which brought together key practitioners, academics and policymakers from countries of Europe and further afield. The Conference shared perspectives and good practice around issues of evaluation and quality in global and development education.

The report gives access to a wide variety of papers and perspectives, from experts and practitioners on issues such as:

> ➢ The national and international policy contexts for evaluation in global education;

> ➢ The Millennium Development Goals and evaluation in global education;

> ➢ Learning contexts for improving global education;

> ➢ Learning through evaluation;

> ➢ Global education, public opinion, public awareness and campaigning;

> ➢ Innovative practices in evaluation in global education;

> ➢ Southern involvement in evaluation of Global Education in Europe.

Learning for a Global Society is part of a growing virtual resource base on the theory and practice of evaluation in global education, and should prove useful to students, practitioners, theorists and policymakers. Other contributions to the resource base include papers from a preparatory expert meeting hosted by InWEnt and the Friedrich-Alexander Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg[1]. The resource base welcomes other relevant contributions.

The London Conference forms part of the work of the GENE (Global Education Network Europe). GENE is the European network of national organisations for the funding and support of global education. The purpose of the GENE network process is two–fold: to share learning between existing and emerging national structures of funding and support for global education in Europe; and, through the development of a common European agenda, to share such learning with other countries in Europe.

Liam Wegimont
Lisbon, January 2004.

---

[1] The virtual resource base on the theory and practice of evaluation in global education, and the papers from the expert meeting, along with access for further contributions are currently available at www.nscentre.org.

Section 1

QUALITY AND EVALUATION IN GLOBAL
EDUCATION: AN OVERVIEW

CHAIR: *Professor Angela Little,*
International Pro-Director and Chair of Education,
Institute of Education, University of London, UK

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Professor Angela Little,
International Pro-Director and Chair of Education,
Institute of Education, UK

"Welcome to the Institute of Education of the Federal University of London and the conference 'Learning for a Global Society'. I know that many of you will have travelled many miles to be here today. Thank you for making the effort.

My name is Angela Little.   I hold the Chair of Education (with particular reference to developing countries) here at the Institute, a chair that was established over fifty years ago, to develop our knowledge and understanding of educational policy and practice in developing countries. I am also the Pro-Director (International) of the Institute, a post recently created to lead the development of the Institute's international strategy- and here, international means not only developing countries, but international in its true sense of the term-awareness of and relations between ourselves and *all* countries of the world.

This two-day conference has been organised by the North-South Centre of the Council of Europe, The Development Education Association of the UK, and InWent of Germany; in association with colleagues here at the Institute of Education, London and the Friedrich-Alexander Universität, Erlangen-Nürnberg. The organisers have themselves been working on behalf of a much larger set of institutions working together as the Global Education Network Europe (GENE for short).

No conference these days can be mounted without financial support from many sources, from the personal as well as large organisations. The organisers would particularly like to acknowledge the support received from the UK government's Department For International Development (DFID), from InWent and BMZ (the Federal Ministry for Economic Co-operation and Development) (Germany), the Government of Japan, and the North-South Centre of the Council of Europe.

The aim of our conference is to bring together policy-makers, thinkers and practitioners, from across Europe and beyond, to share perspectives on issues of quality in global and development education and to identify the role that the evaluation of development and global education can play in the improvement of their quality and delivery. One of our opening speakers Liam Wegimont will set the more specific objectives for the conference a little later.

I am particularly pleased that the North-South Centre, the Development Education Association UK and InWent chose to locate their conference here at the Institute

of Education. During last academic year, 2003-2003, our Institute celebrated its centenary. This Institute was established in 1902 to deliver high quality training for teachers. Over the years our teaching and research activities have expanded and diversified enormously and this was reflected in a rich series of celebratory events, some of which saw Institute alumni flying in from all over the world. One series of seminars, Global Perspectives in Education was organised by Doug Bourne of the DEA together with our geographers, building on several other joint initiatives in the past. Today's conference represents a continuation of that collaboration. During last year we also developed, together with the DEA, a new Advanced Certificate course in Training for Development Education. This is a one-year flexible course for development education trainers commencing this coming term.

Another reason why I am pleased that the organisers selected our Institute as a venue has to do with the development of our own International Strategy. I appreciate that most of you are deeply involved in global, international and development education *in schools*. But universities too are beginning to reflect more and more on whether and how to internationalise the curriculum they develop and offer. While specialists in international and comparative education have always adopted an international orientation to their research and teaching, specialists in educational policy and practice in England have usually adopted a stronger national orientation. Here in the Institute of Education we have recently embarked on a policy of internationalising our pedagogy and curricula across the Institute's entire programme of teaching. Whether we succeed in merging local, national and international orientations and how, may provide a theme for a future conference.

Not only am I pleased that the organisers selected the Institute as its venue, I am also pleased they chose England and these particular dates. Earlier this week the Secretary of State for Education and Skills, the Right Honourable Charles Clarke MP, presented his Ministry's *Action Plan for Sustainable Development in Education and Skills.* The action plan sits within the UK's broader Sustainable Development Strategy with its main objectives to ensure effective management and sustainable growth in society, the environment, resources and the economy. The Secretary of State has set out a number of international objectives for the Department including:

- Raising the level of international awareness in schools
- Increasing the awareness of developing countries in schools

Action is promised by the Department of Education and Skills, working together with the Department for International Development. And it is in this regard that I would now like to welcome and introduce Katherine Quigley from the European and International Programme division of the Department for Education and Skills. Katherine will speak about her department's plan for raising the level of international awareness in schools."

PUTTING THE WORLD BACK INTO WORLD CLASS EDUCATION: THE UK EXPERIENCE

Ms Katherine Quigley,
International Relations Division,
Department for Education and Skills, UK

"Our young people must develop the competence, confidence and contacts which will secure their place and influence in an increasingly global society. The new century demands that we develop international understanding, heighten awareness of Europe and the wider world, and strengthen the concept of world citizenship in our schools and colleges."

Tony Blair, Prime Minister, UK

"We're putting the "world" back into "world class education". We are not just individuals but members of an international community and we need to prepare young people for working, living and being part of the global society. We need to make sure that education raises the level of international awareness."

Charles Clarke, Secretary of State for Education and Skills, UK

THE INTERNATIONAL OBJECTIVES OF THE DfES

Ms Quigley's presentation dealt with the international objectives of the Department of Education and Skills (DfES). She pointed out that the DfES covers only England, not the whole of the UK.

She emphasised that it is a burning issue that we do more to encourage young people to look outwards and see themselves as global citizens.

The following seven objectives were listed:
1. To focus the work of the Education Council on the EU's Lisbon goals.
2. To develop strong bilateral strategic relationships with key EU countries.
3. To raise the level of international awareness in UK schools and Higher Education institutions.
4. To learn from other countries and to exchange good practice.
5. To increase UK education exports.
6. To contribute to meeting the education needs of African countries.
7. To increase awareness of developing countries and development issues in schools.

She pointed out that four were especially relevant to the conference, and elaborated on these objectives.

Objective 3:

To raise the level of international awareness in UK schools and Higher Education institutions:

- Working with the British Council to develop a global gateway portal site for schools.
- Linking programmes: The need to focus on curriculum and guidance and recognition of what schools do – new school partnership links- was emphasised, also the need to get more schools and teachers involved.
- Further development of the International school award.
- International Education Week – this will be the first one –10-14 November 2003.
- Encouraging HE students to study abroad for part of their course.

Objective 4:

To learn from other countries and to exchange good practice, e.g.

- US/UK Seminar on "Improving Urban Schools"
- Joint Anglo/French Policy Seminars – Violence and Indiscipline in schools

Objective 6:

To contribute to meeting the education needs of African countries

- Encourage teacher placements in Africa
- Chevening scholarships
- Commonwealth fellowships
- Working with DfID

Objective 7:

To increase awareness of developing countries and development education in schools

- Global Gateway website (with British Council)
- Sustainable Development in Education and Skills (an action plan for England)

CONCLUSION

Ms Quigley outlined the need to promote awareness, to make sure that what we do is based on knowledge and evidence. She stated that we need to consider evaluation of our initiatives from the outset and to see what we need to change in order to be more effective. She emphasised the need to provide:

- Training for teachers heads and others
- Toolkits and guides for evaluation
- Performance frameworks

Ms Quigley concluded by stating that there is enthusiasm within the DfES for such initiatives and visions and she looks forward to seeing these being implemented.

SHARING LEARNING IN EUROPE
FOR A GLOBAL SOCIETY:
ISSUES OF QUALITY AND EVALUATION

Mr Liam Wegimont,
Head of Global Education,
North-South Centre, Council of Europe

Colleagues and Friends from Ministries of Education and Development Co-operation, from Civil Society organisation and Educational institutions; from national co-ordinating bodies for development education; from Council of Europe member States from Cyprus to Finland and from Russia and Moldova to Ireland and the United Kingdom; and also from Observers states of the Council of Europe, particularly from Japan and the United States; and also from as far afield as Australia, and a particular welcome to friends from South Africa, Kenya, and India;

It gives me great pleasure to welcome you all here from near and far, on behalf of the North-South Centre of the Council of Europe and on behalf of the GENE network. In a moment I will make a few introductory comments about the issues which bring us together and which we will discuss today and tomorrow, and I will take us through the agenda of our Conference. Before that – what brought us here? I'd like to tell you a little about the genesis and background to this Conference.

This meeting was born of an evaluation. The reason we are here today is because of an evaluation carried out by Helmuth Hartmeyer and his colleagues in KommEnt – the organisation which co-ordinates the funding and support of development education in Austria. Helmuth, working on behalf of the governments of Switzerland, Sweden and other member states of the North-South Centre of the Council of Europe, in 1999 engaged in a root and branch evaluation of the North-South Centre. Now KommEnts evaluation isn't the first evaluation of the North-South Centre, nor will it be the last but its certainly the most useful to date.

For those of you unfamiliar with the work of the North-South Centre of the Council of Europe, please allow me a few words now regarding our work. The Centre is a part of the Council of Europe – an organisation established after the 2nd World War; which has at its basis the core values of human rights, democracy and social cohesion; it has 44 member states spanning the wider Europe, and as well as a Council of Ministers includes the European Court of Human Rights and the representative Parliamentary Assembly.

The North-South Centre itself was established by the Council in 1990 with a dual mandate, to strengthen in European countries policies of solidarity with the South through political dialogue, and to increase public awareness and critical public engagement in development policy and global social cohesion, through global education. The Centre, while part of the Council of Europe, has a "quadrilogue" governance structure comprising governments, local and regional authorities, parliamentarians, and civil society organisations.

In the field of global education, our work is focused on increasing and improving global education throughout Europe. Our role is modest – we facilitate international networking at European level between national actors who are already doing the work at national level.

The reason we are here today is because of an evaluation of the Centre carried out by Helmuth Hartmeyer and his colleagues in KommEnt. The report of this evaluation proposed that in the work of the Centre there should be a greater focus on networking, and greater commitment to long-term processes, and a focus on bringing together national structures. Soon afterwards we developed the GENE project. Global Education Network Europe, facilitated by the NSC, is a partnership network of national agencies responsible for the co-ordination, policy-making and/or funding of global education in Europe. It now includes KommEnt from Austria, InWent (Germany) the Development Education Unit of Development Co-operation Ireland, the NCDO in the Netherlands, the RORG-Network and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Norway), the Swiss Foundation Education and Development and the Development Education Association in the U.K.; and CIDAC in Portugal. These organisations have, along with a number of observers and some more recent members, since Summer 2001, been working together in a number of fields with a view to sharing learning between existing structures and with countries in which such structures do not yet exist.

This GENE network has a number of common work areas – you can see the fruits of some of our labours in the publication "Structures for the Support and Funding of Development Education" which is available at back of the room[2]. The GENE network, built on the basis of a critical evaluation, chose evaluation and quality as one core area of its work. Apart from the North--South Centre facilitating the process, these organisations are for the most part involved at national level in funding or co-ordinating global education. And so, we are concerned with the generally low levels of funding of global education. But we are equally convinced that commitment to increase global education: increase funding, increase integration into education systems; increased policy and political support; must be accompanied by, and surpassed by, commitment to innovation and improvement, if we are not to suffer from a political credibility gap. More global education, yes please; better global education, yes definitely.

Hence this conference, which the GENE network has been planning for some time now. The GENE network works on the basis of a lead agency model, with particular agencies taking responsibility for particular areas of work. This conference –and the preparatory processes that have led to it - have been led on

---

[2] Also available to download in PDF form at www.nscentre.org.

behalf of the GENE network by three agencies: BMZ and later InWent in Germany (who have provided substantial support and funding for the Conference); the Development Education Association here in the UK who have also provided support, funding and are responsible for the excellent logistics (with thanks also to the Department of International Development of the government of the United Kingdom for funding), and the North-South Centre. The contribution of the Centre to this Conference is made possible by the member states of the Centre and by the European Union.

BMZ and InWent had the great insight to delegate their leadership of the project to Professor Annette Scheunpflug from the Friedrich Alexander Universität, Erlangen Nürnberg, who, together with Doug Bourn and the North-South Centre, has been responsible for developing the process to date and inviting you all here. The DEA also had the wisdom to involve Professor Little and the School o Education here at London University. Finally, the DEA involved the government of Japan through the embassy of Japan her in London; we are grateful for their generous contribution.

So, in preparation for this Conference, early in 2003, we brought together a number of experts in the field of evaluation in global education in order to prepare and do the ground work for this Conference. Their deliberations – the fruits of which I hope you might have had an opportunity to read as they were available in the form of concept and discussion papers on the web-site[3] – suggested that this forum should bring together practitioners, theorists and policy-makers in the fields of global education, evaluation and quality improvement. And I think you'll agree with me that if we can already identify one quality aspect of this Conference it is in the choice of participants; and also in your choice to spend your valuable time here.

A number of key issues are raised in these preparatory papers; key issues that I hope we will address together in the coming days. I will outline just 5 key questions that our preparatory workshop dealt with and that I hope might stimulate discussion in the coming days.

KEY QUESTION 1

Global education is an ethical and education imperative in these times of unequal globalisation. Global education is growing, but global education is still theoretically and conceptually underdeveloped. We need to develop better theory from practice to ground global education – and any evaluation and quality processes we wish to strengthen. **The key question is: what are our ultimate ends, educationally and in terms of social change**. This is an underlying question for the Conference, and we do not expect it to be answered, but we expect varieties of the question, and the contours of possible answers, to be hinted at during the Conference.

---

[3] See www.nscentre.org.

KEY QUESTION 2

Global education takes place in the context of national educational policies, national and international development polices, and concerns regarding everything from strengthening public awareness of, and support for ODA or the Millennium Development Gaols, to issues of educational relevance and learning for global citizenship. **The key second question: Where do we situate global education and its improvement and evaluation?**

And here I might lead us to the Agenda, where we have much to look forward to. This afternoon, we are honoured to have with us Minister Tom Kitt, Minister of State for Development Co-operation Ireland. I am truly delighted to welcome Minister Kitt, not only because he is a compatriot, and not only because I have seen first hand his successful initiatives for and commitment to development education in Ireland in two different terms, but also because his presentation on Irelands recent national policy on development education will, I believe, challenge all of us to re-think issues of quality and evaluation in the context of a national policy.

I also look forward to hearing from our host Doug Bourne, who will move us from a national policy context to one International policy context; and in particular begin to focus on the Millennium Development Goals, which many begin to see as a clear international context for our work, not just in terms of content but in terms of quality assessment and long-term evaluation of the global change agenda. I believe that Doug will tackle the question "where to situate global education improvement" in this context. Finally on this key question, we are honoured with the presence of Professor Annette Scheunpflug, who will approach the question from the other end, the pedagogical or learning context of global education.

KEY QUESTION 3

Questions of theory and of context cannot be ignored if our efforts for improvement and evaluation are not to be counterproductive. But many of us are here for more practical intent –to share strategies, policies and perspectives on the why, what and how of global education.

So a third key question: **What models of evaluation should we use in global education? And are they consistent with, and useful to, our overarching (educational and social change) aims?**

Here, we have a plethora of challenging inputs, workshops and reflection lined up. This afternoon, we look forward to an example of partnership in practice, when we will hear about the Africa 2002 initiative in Finland, from Christian Sundgren from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and from Jari Kivisto from the Finnish Board of Education which situates the improvement of global education within the public awareness context. This evening, with the kind support of the Embassy of Japan in London, we will hear of another type of partnership in action – between UK and Japan. Tomorrow we also have much to look forward to in response to this question: with inputs on issue of improvement focusing on the role of public opinion, learning, and models of evaluation in global education.

KEY QUESTION 4

There are a plethora of methodologies for evaluation in development, for example; and it is perhaps easier for global educators to draw on these resources than on those associated with education. *Lets draw from all the available storehouses* – from participatory evaluation and action research in education, from results based management and empowerment evaluation. But let us not fall into the trap of what the American philosopher Mary Daly calls "methodolatry". I believe that the choices to be made - in debates about the nature, political context, power relations, and use of evaluation, not to mention the plethora of methodologies from which to choose, these choices can only be appropriately taken if we are coming from well thought out models of global education, of the relationship between theory and practice in global education, and of our ultimate goals.

In the global education community we have, I believe, something of a dual tension – between resistance to evaluation, and the need to innovate and develop new models of evaluation appropriate to global education. On the one hand, there is, in some quarters in which we work, a resistance to evaluation. Perhaps this is born of years of having evaluations foisted on organisations, from inappropriate paradigms. Perhaps, to use a distinction of one Canadian evaluation theorist, Brad Cousins, it comes too much evaluation as "proving that it works" and not enough evaluation as "working to improve".

But this should not be used, as it sometimes is, as an excuse for inaction. We need transparency, *and we need more and better evaluation if we are to improve global education.* The fact that evaluation in global education has a long way to go, is no excuse for not evaluating. As Elliot Eisner, the curriculum theorist from the US once said, critical educators have been very good at critique, but not so good at positing alternatives – like we can spot the weeds and pull them up, but are not very good at planting flowers.

This leads to a 4th Key Question: **How do we Improve Evaluation in Global education? What models and experiences of best practice – at micro (project and programme), meso (national co-ordination) and macro (global reach) levels – should be shared for improvement and innovation?**

Our agenda reflects this question in a series of workshops which focus on the nuts and bolts, the how to of evaluation, sharing innovation and good practice in a variety of dimensions of global education.

KEY QUESTION 5
Finally, there is a fifth question. **Where do we go from here?**

I hope that we will approach answers to this question during the course of the Conference – recollecting the words of Paulo Freire that "we make the road by walking". How might we travel along that road.

Last night I had the pleasure of the company of Professor Tanaka from Japan, with whom I was reminded of the ancient Japanese form of poetry, the Haiku. I recall that this form of poetry – with only seventeen syllables in three lines, captures so much of the world and our place in it. I recall that Basho wrote

River in summer
River in summer
There is a bridge, but my horse
Walks in the water

And I think it was Kobashi Isso who wrote

Repairs
This morning-glory vine
All blossoming
Has thatched this hut of mine

The US poet and humourist, Ogden Nash, on the other hand, wrote

Haiku
To write a poem
In seventeen syllables
Is very diffic

Now, why do I tell you about haiku. The US religious educator Maria Harris quotes a haiku which was entitled "Teaching", but which could also be entitled "Evaluation" and might be an emblem for our work together over the coming days, and for the ways in which we might walk the road together towards more and better global education, and towards the day when all people in Europe will have what we believe is theirs by right – access to quality global education.

Teaching/(Evaluation)
We meet awkwardly
I invite you to walk
I find that you're dancing

Looking forward to working together in the coming days. And to dancing together. Thank you.

References

CARR, W. and KEMMIS, S. (1986) *Becoming Critical: Education, Knowledge and Action Research* Basington: Falmer.

COUSINS, J.B and EARLS, L. M. (eds) (1995) *Participatory Evaluation in Education* Falmer, London.

DUNNE, J. (1993) *Back to the Rough Ground: Phronesis and Techne in Modern Philosophy and in Aristotle*. Notre Dame: University Press.

DUSSEL, E. (1996) "World System, Politics and the Economics of Liberation Philosophy" in Dussel, E. (1996) *The Underside of Modernity: Apel, Ricoeur, Rorty, Taylor and the Philosophy of Liberation* New Jersey: Humanities.

JACKSON, E. (1998) "Indicators of Change: Results Based Management and Participatory Evaluation" in Jackson, E. and Kassam, Y. (eds) *Knowledge Shared: Participatory Evaluation in Development Co-operation*. Connecticut: Kumarian.

HABERMAS, J. (2001) *The Postnational Constellation.*Cambridge: Polity.

HEDLEY, R.A. (2002) *Running Out of Control: Dilemmas of Globalization* Bloomfield, CA.: Kumarian

LOBKOWICZ, N. (1967) *Theory and Practice: History of a Concept from Aristotle to Marx.*

MCDONNELL, I., SELIGNAC-LECOMTE, H.B. and WEGIMONT, L. (eds) (2003) *Public Opinion and the Fight Against Poverty*. Paris: OECD.

HUTTON, W. (2002) *The World We're In.* London: Little, Brown.

Section 2

CONTEXTS FOR
QUALITY AND EVALUATION
IN GLOBAL EDUCATION (I):
POLICY CONTEXTS

CHAIR: Mr Liam Wegimont,
Head of Global Education,
North-South Centre, Council of Europe

STRATEGIES FOR DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION:
THE NATIONAL POLICY CONTEXT

Minister Tom Kitt T.D., Minister of State for
Development Co-operation and Human Rights, Ireland

Mr Chairperson, Ms Quigley, ladies and gentlemen,

I am grateful to the Council of Europe's North-South Centre for having invited me to take part in this conference on "Learning for a Global Society". It has the laudable purpose of exchanging information and views, based on our different experiences and practices, concerning better ways of evaluating, improving the quality of and of delivering development or global education. I thank the organisers: the North-South Centre, the UK's Development Education Association and InWent in Germany as well as the Institute of Education, our hosts, the Friedrich Alexander University, Erlangen-Nuremberg and the Governments which are giving financial support.

Nowadays people in developed countries have access to more information than ever before through the Internet, satellite television, various other forms of communications technology and the print media. However, it is clear that despite, or perhaps because of, the sheer volume of information available, people are not necessarily really better-informed about global issues such as the root causes of poverty, inequality and exclusion and what is being and can be done to address these issues.

As Minister with special responsibility for development cooperation and human rights, and as a former Trade Minister, I am very conscious of the consequences – positive and negative – of increasing globalisation in both the developed and the developing parts of the world. The crucial importance to developing countries of access to markets in developed countries is a good topical example. Just two weeks ago I attended the WTO Ministerial meeting in Cancun where, regretfully, an opportunity to advance the integration of the developing countries into the world economy was missed. The current situation in this regard is dismal. The 49 least developed countries constitute less than 0.5 per cent of total world trade, but small as this figure is, these same countries earn eight times more from trade than they receive in development assistance. In a study published before the Cancun meeting the World Bank argued that a "good" WTO agreement that addressed the concerns of developing countries could spur global growth and generate income gains sufficient to reduce poverty for 144 million people by 2015. At the Cancun meeting and again in Nairobi last week where I discussed the outcome with Kenyan Ministers I was encouraged by the widespread support that exists in developing countries for the multilateral system. We have to allow further

developing country access to our markets and help them to build up their internal capacity to engage in international trade.

To what extent is the general public in our countries aware of the vital significance of this to millions of the poorest of the poor? How can we best inform and enlighten them so that there will be stronger support for the efforts of Governments and NGOs? We know that there is much untapped goodwill out there. That is the challenge we as protagonists of development education face and which I am sure this conference will contribute to addressing.

Development education is an important underlying and supportive aspect of development work; it is crucial to enlarging public understanding of development issues, global and local; it seeks to challenge attitudes which perpetuate poverty and injustice and to encourage people to act to bring about more equal development; effective development education stimulates public interest in and contributes to a greater understanding of the underlying causes of poverty and underdevelopment. While from a strictly purist point of view it is not part of development education, a valuable spin-off of a more enlightened public awareness of the causes of underdevelopment could be greater public appreciation of, and support for, our national official development cooperation programmes.

Last year my Department commissioned a nation-wide survey by professional market researchers of Irish adults to measure and evaluate the level of knowledge of and attitudes to development issues, development cooperation in general and Ireland's role in international development cooperation in particular. We envisaged that this research would be – among other things - a basis for more effective and targeted development education.

The findings of the research did not come as a big surprise but they are interesting nevertheless. Overall, the attitude of Irish people to development cooperation is positive but understanding of it is incomplete and rather vague. Most people associate negative images ("Africa", poverty, famine, disease, misery, overcrowding and war) with developing countries. The vast majority (90%) of those surveyed are either very much for, or on the whole for, helping developing countries. The reasons most frequently mentioned for why developing countries are poor are disease and lack of healthcare, war and conflicts, better-off countries taking advantage of them, lack of education and training, corruption, their own Governments not doing enough and the prevalence of AIDS. A majority (66 per cent) believe that Irish financial support for development is channelled through charities, while only 32 per cent are aware of what the Government does. A similar proportion (62 per cent) say they never heard of the Government's development cooperation programme.

As a public representative, I am very much aware that the economic growth and social change which we have witnessed in Ireland in the past twenty years could not have come about in the absence of a solid partnership between Government and what we call the "social partners" (employers, employees, farmers and civil society). It was sustained by widespread public understanding of the measures that were necessary for progress. A similar partnership approach understood and supported by public opinion will maximise the prospect of achieving objectives

such as the Millennium Development Goals. This is where development education – or learning for a global society – is absolutely vital. To achieve change, we must increase knowledge.

With this in mind, in May of this year I launched a strategy plan for my Department's development education DCI's development education activities in the three years to 2005. The intention was to chart a course for development education in Ireland over the next three years. The plan "Deepening Public Understanding of International Development" commits us to a number of new approaches to the promotion of development education.

Our objectives are:

- to integrate a development education perspective in education policies;

- to integrate and support the delivery of development education in both the formal and non-formal sectors;

- to provide support to civil society organisations which aim to deepen public understanding of development issues;

- to strengthen capacity in the development education sector;

- to promote more effective use of communications, including the internet, to increase public understanding of development issues; and

- to identify and maximise opportunities for public engagement with the Government's Development Cooperation Ireland programme.

The strategy plan builds on the considerable achievements and contributions of development education practitioners in Ireland over the past thirty years. It is the result of a broad and inclusive consultation process with the key stakeholders in development education in Ireland. In working out the strategy we consulted development education organisations, educational organisations and the Department of Education and Science. We received written submissions from a wide range of individuals and organisations.

We are committed to working in continued partnership with these organisations and individuals in putting the plan into practice. Our funding guidelines are being revised, in consultation with all the stakeholders, to target our funding more specifically towards support of development education and capacity building in the formal and non-formal education sectors. We are introducing a threshold as well as a ceiling on grant amounts in different sectors. We are moving to greater use of multi-annual funding to allow partner organisations scope to maximise the impact of their programmes around particular issues. Projects with a "multiplier effect" are being given priority in funding decisions; educational activities such as those involving a group of schools, a community, a town or a particular sector such as the trade unions is much more effective and worthwhile than "one-off" activities. We have a "Global Teacher Education Project" which involves

financing the inclusion of part of a module about development education in the syllabus for training primary school teachers.

The objective of making more effective use of communications to increase public understanding of development issues takes account of the finding in the national survey that, for the general public, the media are the single most important source of information concerning developing countries. We are engaging proactively with the media, especially radio and television, giving them financial incentives, in the form of a special "Media Challenge Fund", to make and broadcast more programmes concerning matters relating to development.

We are in discussions with some of the development NGOs in Ireland to explore the possibility of setting up a source of funding like the International Broadcasting Trust here in Britain, which would encourage more television programmes about significant development challenges.

Having as an objective identifying and maximising opportunities for public engagement with the Government's Development Cooperation Ireland programme, reflects our recognition that, if the programme is to continue to grow, it will require sustained support from the Irish public. In order for the public to become involved actively and critically they must be well informed. It would be difficult to draw a line between, on the one hand, heightening people's awareness of the problems facing the world's poor countries, the underlying reasons and how those problems are being and should be addressed by the international community and, on the other, adding to people's knowledge about what the Irish Government's position is and what action we are taking.

We also wish to encourage development education built on approaches to deepening understanding of the cross-cutting development policy issues which an effective development co-operation programme must address. Building on this common ground, we will identify key educational opportunities in both the formal and non-formal education arenas in Ireland where key development concerns, such as HIV/AIDS, gender, agriculture, debt, sustainability and governance, can be explored.

There are a great many people in Ireland who care deeply about the environment, about human rights and about global inequality and who very much want to make a difference in today's world. These are the people that our development education strategy is intended to reach. In preparing our strategy plan, we came to realise the large number of people who volunteer their time and energy in the cause of development education, people who go into our classrooms to explain to our children the realities of child labour or who spend evenings in draughty parish halls giving presentations on human rights in Latin America. These people are building the global citizens of today and tomorrow – what our development education strategy is all about.

Mr Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I thank you for your attention and wish you well in your discussions on this important issue.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

After Minister Kitt's speech, a number of questions were raised by the conference participants. These included the following:

Mr Henny Helmich (Director, NCDO, Netherlands) applauded the Minister for the challenging strategy document from which, according to Mr Helmich, other European countries could learn. He also welcomed the ecxcellent work in Ireland on public opinion. He asked for Minister Kitt's opinion on the scenario where increased levels of critical public awareness might not result in support for the government's own policy on e.g. development cooperation. To this Minister Kitt answered that he would see increased awareness that generates public engagement as a positive development and that real debate in these matters contributes to improving the government's work. As an example, he mentioned his own experience as Trade Minister at the time when the Euro was introduced as currency in Ireland. He was struck by the fact that there was no strong NGO voice on consumer issues in Ireland. There was public debate about price increases in connection with the currency change, but there was no organised NGO voice on behalf of consumers to put pressure on businesses. There is in fact a stronger voice in the development field. Minister Kitt had a different experience during his visit to Cancun as Development Cooperation Minister. He had been involved in the entire process through Seattle and Doha by virtue of his previous ministerial responsibilities. The Government delegation in Cancun, consisting of himself as well as the Trade and Agriculture Ministers also included NGOs. Upon their return to Ireland, the NGOs wrote critical articles on Ireland's 'social partners' approach. Mr Kitt expressed that such critique is valid and to be welcomed. To move forward, the government works with NGOs and the public within the overall system. In addition, the department has a good communications section with contacts into schools etc. The recent change in name of the department from Ireland Aid to Development Cooperation Ireland is also aimed to better reflect the partnership approach, which includes listening to the priorities of people in the developing world before moving to design solutions.

Ms Anisa Doty (Development Education Co-ordinator, KEPA, Finland) asked Minister Kitt about DCI's support for the media in Ireland. This is an expanding area for DCI. Minister Kitt highlighted two initiatives in particular – funding support for an ongoing radio series called 'Worlds Apart' which involves the presenter visiting a number of developing countries and covering a range of development issues; secondly requests have been made for more social programming in the media which includes DE, through the "Media Challenge" fund. The Minister encouraged participants to visit the DCI website for further information – www.dci.gov.ie

THE INTERNATIONAL POLICY CONTEXT:
THE MILLENNIUM DEVELOPMENT GOALS AND GLOBAL AND DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION

Dr Douglas Bourn,
Director,
Development Education Association, UK

'We recognise that in addition to our separate responsibilities to our individual societies, we have a collective responsibility to uphold the principles of human dignity, equality and equity at a global level. As leaders we have a duty therefore to all the world's people, especially the most vulnerable and, in particular, the children of the world, to whom the future belongs.'

(UN Millennium Declaration)

In September 2000 the world's leaders adopted the UN Millennium Declaration, committing their nations to stronger global efforts to reduce poverty, improve health and promote peace, human rights and environmental sustainability. These Goals have been reinforced at the UN Conference on Financing for Development and the World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg.

PUBLIC AWARENESS AND UNDERSTANDING OF MDGs

Central to the UN Millennium Development Goals is the question of engagement of civil society organisations. Civil society are participants in the design of strategies, service providers and are also watchdogs to ensure that government fulfils its commitments. So not surprisingly in many industrialised countries there has been considerable debate about how to ensure public engagement and support for these goals. For example, in the UK one initiative has been the production of booklets on the goals aimed at particular faith groups and one aimed at trade unions. Whilst these have been valuable as introductory tools, they do in themselves beg the bigger and wider questions of *why the goals, what is behind them and how can they be supported*?

VALUES GUIDING THE UN MILLENNIUM DECLARATION AND MDGs

The MDGs are benchmarks for progress towards a vision of development, peace and human rights, guided by certain fundamental values essential to international relations in the 21st Century. These include:

- **Freedom** – men and women have the right to live their lives and raise their children in dignity, free from hunger and from the fear of violence, oppression or injustice. Democratic and participatory governance based on the will of the people best assures these rights.

- **Equality** –no individual and no nation must be denied the opportunity to benefit from development. The equal rights and opportunities of women and men must be assured.
- **Solidarity** – Global change must be managed in such a way that costs and burdens are fairly distributed in accordance with basic principles of equity and justice.
- **Tolerance-** human beings must respect one another, in all their diversity of belief, culture and language**.** A culture of peace and dialogue should be promoted.
- **Respect for Nature-** Prudence must be shown in the management of all living species and natural resources, in accordance with the precepts of sustainable development.
- **Shared Responsibility** – responsibility shared amongst nations requires recognition of the central role of the UN.

To support and understand MDGs there is a need to make connections and linkages with these values. Governments, Civil Society and other organisations involved in developing societies and active citizens need to have these global values at their heart of their domestic programmes. Without these connections there is little hope for securing deep and meaningful engagement with for these Goals.

LEARNING WITHIN, ABOUT AND FOR A GLOBAL SOCIETY

The links between these values and development education practice are close. From an English perspective the following concepts have been agreed by our Education Ministry, Development Ministry, Curriculum bodies and NGOs as the basis for promoting 'global perspectives' in the school curriculum:

- Interdependence
- Citizenship and Stewardship
- Diversity
- Social Justice
- Sustainable Development
- Values and Perceptions
- Human Rights

Now, if we compare these to the values underpinning the MDGs, the correspondence becomes apparent.

Values underpinning GE/ DE	Values underpinning MDGs
Interdependence	Equality
Citizenship and Stewardship	Shared Responsibility & Freedom
Diversity	Tolerance
Social Justice	Solidarity
Sustainable Development	Respect for Nature
Values and Perceptions	
Human Rights	Freedom & Equality

The DE website in Ireland is also of value because it not only refers to the development of dispositions and values:

'gain experience of, develop and practice dispositions and values which are crucial to a just and democratic society and a sustainable world'.

'engage with, develop and apply ideas and understandings which help explain the origins, diversity and dynamic nature of society, including the interactions between and among societies, cultures, individuals and environments'

It also includes critical learning skills*:*

'Engage with, develop and practice capabilities and skills which enable investigation of society, discussion of issues, problem-tackling, decision-making, and working co-operatively with others'

It ends:

'Take actions that are inspired by these ideas, values and skills and which contribute to the achievement of a more just and caring world'

So my first key message is that understanding and support for MDGs has to have as its starting point connections with the values base which underpins the education and learning of the country promoting the goals. There has to be direct connection to the educational goals and objectives.

Particularly important within what has been said so far is the need for educative programmes around the MDGs to recognise agendas and perspectives within societies which in themselves offer opportunities to show the interconnectedness nature of the world in which we now live.

These include connections to agendas therefore of:
- Combating poverty
- Economic Migration, Xenophobia, racism, refugees and asylum seekers
- Cultural Diversity and respect for religious differences
- Active Citizenship –linked to rights and responsibilities
- Quality of Life and Sustainable Development

An example of this is the Sierra Leone Women's Forum in London, which is a community-based organisation carrying out work with local schools; making connections between issues of migration and the experience of refugees in the UK with that people in Sierra Leone. This project is funded by DFID under their small grants programme.

A major programme in this country and in many others is around active citizenship – how to get people engaged in society. We have found that as far as young people are concerned, it has been global and international development issues that have really engaged young people.

DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION AND MDGs

The specific messages linking DE with MDGS are:
- Eradicating extreme poverty and hunger
- Achieving universal primary education
- Promote gender equality and empower women
- Reduce child mortality
- Improved maternal health
- Combat HIV/AIDS
- Ensure environmental sustainability
- Develop a global partnership for development

Does this mean that DE projects must be linked to particular goals? No, what is more important is to ensure the issues within each of these goals are reflected within learning and education.

Let's take two examples:

Science in Schools

People can look at life expectancy, health, health care and preventive care in specific countries and compare illnesses. For example, why is there a higher incidence of heart disease and stress related illness in Northern European countries? Students can also compare and discuss different climatic conditions around the world and their influence on people's choice of crops to grow. They can look at agriculture and the environment, researching and comparing the advantages and disadvantages of some indigenous approaches using appropriate technologies and modern intensive agricultural practices. Much of the food we eat is grown in 'developing countries'. Yet there is a demand in Northern countries to lobby for locally produced and organic products – for good sustainable development reasons. How do we resolve these challenges? What can sciences teach us about this?

KYDEP in Kenya

Hellen Tombo has visited UK youth and NGO projects to look at connections between agendas in Kenya and the UK.

So my second key message is that we need to demonstrate the relevance and connection of the specific goals to learning within our societies – the learning has to be concrete.

Education for Social Change

The third point I wish to make is that central to the Goals are 2 key messages;
- Progress towards achieving these goals is possible but we need to set targets
- Change and progress will only come through engagement and support from all sectors of society.

The first message is that many people in industrialised societies believe that change and progress in the third world is not possible due to corruption, bad management and economic and social conditions. Whilst I would argue that to a large extent the responsibility for securing change rests with the rich

industrialised countries by the level of their commitment to combating poverty, yet to be really demonstrated. I would also argue, as events from the WTO in Mexico have demonstrated, there is a primary task to promote positive images and perceptions about people and societies in third world countries, to tell the positive and good stories whilst not hiding the bad, showing there are 2 sides to the coin. The need to combat negative images and stereotypes.

This means we all have to move from a relationship with the third world that is based on altruism and charitable giving to one of interdependence, solidarity and active engagement. These changes can only be secured by active involvement and participation of all sectors of society from community groups to educational bodies to NGOs. However, change and support does not simply come from communicating messages, it comes from involvement, experience, ownership and skills and knowledge to take things forward.

Global and Development Education by themselves will not secure some magical transformation of societies so they support the MDGs. But they can make a major contribution by concentrating on the relationship between learning processes, values and knowledge behind promoting global perspectives.

So where does this all leave us in the context of the agendas of this conference. Evaluating and measuring success of the impact of global and development education programmes can only be located within learning processes and learning, we can and should not lose sight of the relationship between the 'development' agenda and the 'learning agenda'. However this needs to be framed within a learning process that promotes active and critical learning within a values base.

A useful comparison can be made with recent international comparative work on the current state of environmental educational research. Reid and Nikel in reviewing the current state of environmental educational research identify the following statements:

- Environmental education research attempts to address the environmental predicaments communities face;
- Priorities for environmental education researchers are understanding and promoting key conservation and environmental concepts, investigation and action skills, community problem-solving and environmentally responsible behaviour;
- Intervention in the learning process is legitimate during the learning process as long as it does not contravene the tenets of a pre-test post-test evaluation model for empirical enquiry. (Reid and Nikel)

What this reflection notes is that most of the research has been on students' environmental ideas, perceptions and learning outcomes. It focuses less on educational experiences and the learning process, which are more important.

Scott and Gough have posed an alternative model based on their own research, which challenges the notions and assumptions that educating people about environmental issues will automatically result in more enlightened or pro-environment behaviour.

'We ourselves argue that the challenge for learning in relation to sustainable development is to confront learners with competing accounts of human and environmental reality wherever complexity and uncertainty mean that it is possible for competing rationalities to yield competing versions of the truth. This, we suggest, radically revises our view of learning; from a process which acts on individuals' characteristics in order to change the world; to one which challenges individuals' views of the world as a means of influencing their characteristics and hence ways of thinking and living.'

(Scott & Gough 2003)

We need to encourage debates within education and society which makes connections to the MDGs, but that do so in a way which encourages creativity and new thinking about how people in society can be better equipped to create a world which is more just and equal. That also encourages a better understanding of the causes of inequality in the world, and above all gives some skills and value base to enable people to create their own voices and forms of engagement to secure real societal change at a local, national and global level.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

A number of questions and issues were raised by conference delegates about the MDGs generally; MDGs and the DE curriculum; and about whether progress is being made. Mr Doug Bourn, DEA, answered that there are challenges in trying to set realistic development goals but also dangers too of not being ambitious enough. He emphasised that it is important to look at the long term situation rather than just focusing on short term, perceived achievable goals. He also emphasised that there are some positive developments recently with DE and SD agendas with the links and importance of these now being recognised inside education ministries. There is a greater understanding now that DE can be seen as a lens on how to perceive or study a subject.

References

SCOTT, W. A H. and GOUGH, S. R. (2003) *Evidence to the House of Commons Environmental Audit Committee*, 27.2.03, view at http://www/ac.uk/cree

REID, A and NIKEL, J (2003) *Reading a Critical Review of Evidence: notes and queries on research programmes in environmental education*, Environmental Education Research vol.9 no.2, Carfax.

DE, Ireland website www.dci.gov.ie

DISCUSSION GROUPS

Summary of findings

The conference participants were asked to split into groups of 10-15 in order to discuss the ideas emerging from the panels and share their perspectives on issues of quality and evaluation in global education under the headings:

1. Political Context
2. Partnership and Action
3. Empowerment
4. What kind of Global Education Curriculum?
5. The Role and Tools of Evaluation

At the end of the session, the main conclusions from the discussion groups were shared and summarised by Mr Alessio Surian as follows:

1. THE POLITICAL CONTEXT

- Generally speaking, governments in the North are being more supportive of global education (there are **hopeful signs**).
- NGOs do not always have the ability to translate such new opportunities and policies into action. There is a need for **more strategic work** by NGOs at the national and regional level.
- In fact, **regional networking** and common focus can make the crucial difference (see for example the Australian experience).

2. PARTNERSHIP AND ACTION

- Each country has examples of **democratic and participatory practices** to share (e.g. the Constitution drafting process in Kenya).
- An effective learning approach implies: (a) direct North-South **partnership between people** and (b) direct **action** in our own local community.
- Including **a menu of ideas** for action for every global education topic makes GE materials effective (examples were presented from Germany).
- It is important to place GE within the lifelong learning framework and encourage the **use of ICT as a means for young people to explore their personal questions.**

3. EMPOWERMENT

- **Critical thinking skills** are at the core of the global education process and a crucial dimension in order to avoid conveying (and associating development issues with) only a particular ideological angle.
- There is still tension between a way of describing global education as a way of changing people's mind and global education as means of empowerment: **political goals are not necessarily educational**. Adaptation is required, taking into account learning and participatory conditions. There is a need to further explore the relationship between campaigning action and learning processes.
- This is particularly relevant for the 8th objective of the Development Millennium Goals: on the political side the global partnership needs to point at concrete Northern and Southern governments responsibilities; on the educational side, **goal definition** needs adaptation, translation and to be firmly **embedded in the learning process**.
- While development cooperation seems to need development education in order to gain support, there is a need to be aware of issues of **teachers' bias**.

4. WHAT KIND OF GLOBAL EDUCATION CURRICULUM?

- It is not enough to define good practice criteria: in order to properly evolve GE, its **theoretical framework** needs to be further elaborated and its core issues have to be defined.
- There is a risk that Development Education might be perceived as social engineering. Since the contents of Development Education are not neutral, is there a need to reflect about a "**pedagogy for the rich**"?
- The links between Development and Environmental Education need to be further explored. There seems to be a positive awareness on the part of governments of **global interdependence issues**.
- Are educational proposals running the risk of becoming **too broad in focus**?
- Global education is often **too overloaded** (content-wise) while the **formal education curriculum is still too tight** to properly embrace GE. Potential signs of hope: Modern Studies in the Scottish curriculum.

5. EVALUATION ROLE AND TOOLS

- There is a need to recognise that **evaluation responds to multiple functions** and can be implemented in different ways, including qualitative and participatory ways. Evaluation should involve a self-assessment dimension as well in order to respond to an empowerment perspective (evaluation as part of the learning process, not based on quantitative data alone).
- Making use of qualitative evaluation methods also makes it possible to recognise and explore **complex** (multi-faceted, non-linear) **approaches** to GE.

Section 3

CONTEXTS FOR QUALITY AND EVALUATION IN GLOBAL EDUCATION (II): LEARNING AND AWARENESS RAISING

__CHAIR__: Mr Pete Davis,
President,
Development Education Forum, CONCORD

The Chair of the Session

*Mr Pete Davis introduced this session and talked about the three-year Development Education Exchange in Europe Project, DEEEP, (*www.deeep.org*), which aims to build organisation capacity, exchange knowledge & skills, facilitate communications networks and lobby and advocate for DE. DEEEP is managed by a consortium of four DE NGOs - ITECO (Belgium), UCODEP (Italy), TAKSVÄRKKI (Finland), DEA (United Kingdom) - under the auspices and in co-ordination with the Development Education Forum of CONCORD.*

LEARNING AND SKILLS FOR A GLOBAL SOCIETY: THE EDUCATION CONTEXT

Professor Annette Scheunpflug,
Friedrich-Alexander Universität,
Erlangen-Nürnberg, Germany

The purpose of this conference is to talk about how to improve the quality of global education. To do this, we need a very clear vision of what we mean when we are talking about "good" global education. How can we determine the quality of global education?

We need to know:
- *What should people learn in global education*?
- *Which skills are necessary to live in a global society*?
- *What should global education look like to help people to live in a globalized world*?

In my paper I will
- Firstly characterize global change and speak about the one world we live in.
- Secondly draw from this the learning challenges we need to respond to in a global society
- and thirdly I will formulate learning skills needed to form a global society in regard to justice and sustainability and give some examples drawn from practice.

1. THE CHARACTER OF GLOBAL SOCIETY

It is not easy to describe this complex process we call "globalisation" or "global society". The connotation of this term differs depending on the context in which you use it – it is different if you speak about it in an economic or a cultural context, or whether you use it as a normative or descriptive term. But if you take an overview of the common debates you can find some characteristics of a global society.

The first characteristic refers to *the fact dimension* of the development to a global society (Luhmann 1975; 1995; Stichweh 1995). There are complex challenges that must be addressed: the increasing economic gap between the south and the north and between social groups, the increasing use of resources, migration, wars – civil and non-civil-wars –, and in many regions of the world increasing insecurity. The consequences are very different in South and North, as seen for example in the exponential increase of consumption of natural resources especially in industrialised countries, extreme inequalities in economies and in the

disparate distribution of life-chances between and within nations. The UNDP describes these central challenges as human rights; disparities in and between nations; the reduction of poverty; the maintenance of security; and sustainability (UNDP 1999, S. 2f).

The second characteristic of a global society can be described as a *temporal dimension*. In the temporal dimension globalisation causes a "shrinking of time" (UNDP 1999, p. 1) and an acceleration of social change, which is the consequence and cause of global change. Communication is accelerating and is threatening the life-rhythms of humankind. In some parts of the world the speed of social change has passed the generation-succession which was previously seen in conflicts between modernity and tradition.

The third characteristic is given the *spatial dimension*. In a global society things are losing their proper anchor in space. Globalisation delimits space in new ways. Through new media and the Internet, space looses its importance. People can participate in events without being present. Coffee farmers are communicating directly with fair trade shops and shareholders inform each other directly via the Internet about the fluctuations in rates of exchange. At the same time the importance of space as a local dimension for acting (for example in family-planning) is still given. The British sociologist Robertson (1995; Beck 1997, p. 90) is therefore speaking of "glocal contexts". New structures are arising that are no longer structured by national states or hierarchical order but organised in networks (Castells 2001).

Fourthly, this is closely linked to the social dimension of globalisation. The distinction between what seems strange or familiar is no longer only a geographical or spatial question, hinting at social fragmentation in a global world (Appadurai 1990). Gaps between poverty and wealth become visible between countries of the South and the North as well as within single nations. We see a widening gap between privileged and marginalized people and a polarisation within and between societies.

These four developments are universal but occur in different regions and in different cultural contexts in different ways.

2.   THE CHALLENGES FOR LEARNING

What must be learned to shape our global world (see Scheunpflug 1997; Scheunpflug/Schröck 2002; for concepts in Germany, Lang-Wojtasik 2003). The above analysis suggests the following challenges for learning:

- *The fact dimension: dealing with knowledge and non-knowledge*
  First, from the viewpoint of the fact dimension, we have to know about the global challenges, but at the same time we have to be aware that our knowledge will often be insufficient. The key element of these challenges is their complexity and the way they feed back on each other. Society's knowledge about these challenges is increasing. At the same time the individual's non-knowledge is mounting. Knowledge and non-knowledge are increasing simultaneously. We have to learn to deal with this situation and to

adapt our decisions to the fact of unintended consequences. In short, we have to learn to deal with abstract problems that are part of our personal experience.

- *The temporal dimension: dealing with certainty and uncertainty*
  The speed of temporal change forces us to deal with lack of time (in our personal agenda as well as in actions of nations or enterprises). To deal with time-pressure and uncertainty becomes more and more important. It is also important to learn to make distinctions between those things that are certain and those that are uncertain.

- *The spatial dimension: dealing with local relationships and spacelessness*
  We have to learn to deal with our new spacelessness in a global space. If our control of space is no longer in a clear local relationship we need our abstract imagination to think about the consequences of acting for other regions.

- *Social dimension: dealing with familiarity and strangeness*
  From a social perspective we have to learn that familiarity and strangeness are no longer categories with a geographical connotation. To accept social relationships with absent people may be difficult and has to be learned (Wulf 2002).

Global Education can be understood as the educational reaction to the fact of the development of a world society. Global education is the reaction to these learning challenges.

3. SKILLS FOR A GLOBAL SOCIETY

Which skills does global education then provide to shape our global world society?

In the fact dimension

- *Knowledge about the global world society*
  Good global education provides knowledge about the global world society. People have to know about globalisation. The focuses of global education are social justice and sustainable development to give life chances to everybody. People have to know about the Millennium Development Goals, they have to know about the living conditions in other parts of the world, they have to know about the Convention on the Rights of the Child. They have to learn about economic contexts like the debt discussion, TRIPS, GATTS and the WTO, they have to know about security politics especially prevention politics. People have to learn about globalisation and global society (see Osler et. al. 2002).

- *Dealing with contradictions and changes of perspective*
  But, this knowledge is not all. Dealing with complexity means being aware that you might be wrong, even if you know a lot. Knowledge is increasing and individual non-knowledge is increasing in the same way. A lot of information is contradictory, e.g. Greenpeace is giving different information about Brent Spar, an oil platform in the North Sea, than the oil company does. TRIPS has

dangers and challenges for third world countries. Campaigns and global education activities have to transmit these contradictions as well otherwise they fail the learning goals in a global society. Global education has to give help about how to decide under conditions of non-knowledge.

This is a problem for a lot of campaigns. One-dimensional solutions for complex social problems often correspond with the need for security in the target group or with the necessity of lobby-work for political positions. But it is often not useful in regard to learning-processes. We should create a learning atmosphere where contradictions offer learning opportunities and the need for security is given by the relationships. This is a very crucial point for campaigning.

Global education of appropriate quality means cultivating changes of perspective. Texts and encounters can offer possibilities of giving new structures to one's own thinking and encourage us not to see the world only in black and white.

- *Concrete action and abstract thinking*
  Global education often offers concrete actions. This is a motivating way to work and it helps to put the global dimension in a local context. "Think globally and act locally" is an important perspective. However, global education is more than playing like in Africa, cooking like in China, baking bread like a Bedouin woman, dancing and making music like in Bolivia. This all gives impressions of cultures, and creates social closeness. Global education means more. Global education puts these activities in a context of social justice, in the context of different challenges of a global society. That must mean combining these activities with abstract reflections of living in a global society. Reflections about the complexities of the world help to bring together all the disparate individual experiences. Some good examples for work with regard to these skills is found in the learning opportunities, provided by fair trade shops.

In the temporal dimension

Nowadays social change has become faster than the living span of one generation. Uncertainty is one of the dominant feelings in a global society. Which skills are necessary to cope with this?

- *Competences in structuring and methods*
  To learn structuring methods is an important skill dealt with by global education. To structure complex problems is important. Learning must give the opportunity to build one's own opinions. Global education offers to tackle the insult that there are only a few decisions we can make ourselves. It helps that we assess these possibilities and react. With respect to a lot of problems where individuals cannot help to solve them it is necessary to show constructive possibilities for dealing with these conflicts. One-dimensional solutions for the complexity of a global world society are exposed very quickly. So it is important to show how to deal individually with these problems.

- *To be aware of social change*
  Global education should be aware of social change. It is easier to deal with personal uncertainty if you know that it is part of global development and not the result of individual behaviour. Therefore future education as it is offered by David Hicks (2002) is an important contribution to global education.

In the spatial dimension

- *To learn to accept global challenges without local contexts*
  In a lot of cases "think globally and act locally" is a very fruitful didactic idea. But in some cases you do not find local aspects of global challenges. For example in a campaign against patents on seeds in southern countries (called bio-piracy) it is very difficult to find a corresponding Northern, local activity. Some problems do not have correspondences in local contexts.

- *Identify networks and using encounters*
  People have to develop skills in identifying networks. There are often prejudices about life abroad. Influenced by the mass media we have the idea that life in Africa is characterised by country-life, wild animals and the baobab. But, of course: there are towns with far more inhabitants than the biggest city in Germany, Berlin. We need differentiation in our perspectives and must be aware not to jump into a stereotyping trap for example when campaigning.

- *Using virtual and concrete rooms*
  In a situation of increasing globalisation, it is a necessary skill of global education to use concrete and virtual rooms to communicate and to differentiate between them. E-mail contacts in southern countries are – if there is access – much easier than postal services. Nevertheless, it is still a challenge to create international platforms for global education.

In the social dimension

Learning has to contribute to the fact that the familiar and the strange are no longer arranged by geographical categories. What does this mean for global education? How can we realise this need for skills?

- *Knowledge about different lifestyles, cultures and religions*
  Global education should offer knowledge about different lifestyles, cultures and religions. It is important to have opportunities to meet a variety of lifestyles (Asbrand 2002). Global education gives access to different ways of life. Youth in all parts of the world play, have parents and friends, go to school, they have fun and sorrows. By these connections to their own life contexts it is easier to accept mutuality as well as differences.

- *To acquire a refined language code and intercultural competence in communication*
  People have to learn to deal with language. First they have to explore and enlarge their own language to an acceptable language code. It is important to speak about others without any racism and paternalism. A lot of children do not learn this at home and it is important to make opportunities to learn this.

For example, I use exercises with my students identifying and transforming hidden racism in newspapers into a language of acceptance and recognition.

Second, people have to learn to deal with foreign languages. People have to learn to speak in a way that people from different language contexts can understand and they have to learn to respect the cultural variety of languages. A few weeks ago my Institute gave a movie session for pupils coming from a difficult environment. The movie was about a girl struggling with difficult conditions in Senegal in Wolof. The thirty pupils aged thirteen (considered "very difficult"), were fascinated by this experience. It was important for them to be in a situation to have to follow the film without understanding the language.

Thirdly, global education offers skills in intercultural competencies. It helps to pose questions and to be sensitive to intercultural conflicts.

- *Social experiences*
  Global education should be considered as embedded in social education. It is part of social training in respect, polite questions, open interest and change of perspective and empathy. To learn empathy in a global context is very important.

SUMMARY

Global education offers not only skills to live in a globalized world but also to transform our global world into a world of justice and sustainability. Therefore a lot of skills are needed. Global education of good quality is not a uniform concept but an interrogative attitude towards the need to form a just, globalized world. "Bildung" as we say in German to strengthen the meaning of education for the individual – or education – then means to be prepared to live in a world of contradictions and to be able to realise in this world a bit of justice and solidarity (Beck 1997).

We are talking in these two days about improving global education by better quality and evaluation. To think about the quality of global education and evaluation means to focus on learning outcomes. We do not only want people to have heard about the millennium goals. We want them to become global citizens striving for global justice. Therefore they need the outlined skills. Of course it is not possible that every learning activity serves to build up all these skills. But we should ensure that overall the variety of skills is developed.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Questions were raised by conference delegates following the presentation on issues such as the challenge of northern top-down approaches to education (charity view of the South), while some in the South would like to see a bottom-up approach. Professor Annette Scheunplug replied that GE should be about how young people can live in a global society (not about charity), it should be about having lots of grassroots activity, it is important that we have a vision of what good global education can be. She emphasised that we need to have an education agenda in mind, not just political and economic agendas.

References

APPADURAI, A. (1990): Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Culture Economy. In: FEATERSTONE, M.: Global Culture: Nationalism, Globalization and Modernity. – London, S. 295-310.

ASBRAND, B. (2000): Zusammen Leben und Lernen im Religionsunterricht. – Frankfurt/M.

ASBRAND, B. (2002): Globales Lernen und das Scheitern der großen Theorie. Warum wir heute neue Konzepte brauchen. In: ZEP – Zeitschrift für internationale Bildungsforschung und Entwicklungspädagogik, 25. Jg., H. 3, S. 13-19.

BECK, U. (1997): Was ist Globalisierung? Irrtümer des Globalismus – Antworten auf Globalisierung. – Frankfurt/M.

CASTELLS, M. (2002): Das Informationszeitalter: Wirtschaft, Gesellschaft, Kultur. 3 Bände. – Opladen.

GIDDENS, A. (1995): Die Konsequenzen der Moderne. – Frankfurt/M.

LANG-WOJTASIK, G. (2003): Concepts of global learning – the German debate. In: Development Education Journal , 10.1, 2003, p. 25 - 27.

LUHMANN, N. (1975): Die Weltgesellschaft. In: LUHMANN, N.: Soziologische Aufklärung, Band 2. – Opladen, S. 51-71.

LUHMANN, N. (1995) Social Systems. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

NORTH-SOUTH-CENTER OF COUNCIL OF EUROPE (HRSG.) (2002): A European Strategy Framework. For Improving and Increasing Global Education to the Year 2015. – Maastricht.

OSLER, A./VINCENT, K. (2002): Citizenship and the Challenge of Global Education. – London.

ROBERTSON, R. (1992): Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture, London

ROBERTSON, R. (1995): Glocalization. In: Featherstone, M./Lash, S./Robertson, R. (Hrsg.): Global Modernities. London.

SCHEUNPFLUG, A.: Globalization as a Challenge to Human Learning. In: Education, Volume 54, 1996, S. 7-16. [in spanish: La Globalización como desafío al aprendizaje humano. In: Educación, H. 55, 1997, S. 76 – 86]

SCHEUNPFLUG, A.: Globalisierung und Erziehungswissenschaft. In: Zeitschrift für Erziehungswissenschaft, 6. Jahrgang, Heft 2, 2003, S. 159 - 172

SCHEUNPFLUG, A./SCHRÖCK, N. (2002): Globales Lernen. – Stuttgart.

STICHWEH, R. (1995): Zur Theorie der Weltgesellschaft. In: Soziale Systeme, H. 1, 1. Jg.,S. 29-45.

UNDP (1999): Bericht über die menschliche Entwicklung: Globalisierung mit menschlichem Antlitz. Herausgegeben von der Deutschen Gesellschaft für die Vereinten Nationen e.V. – Bonn.

WULF, C. (2002): Globalisierung und kulturelle Vielfalt. Das Andere und die Notwendigkeit anthropologischer Reflexion. In: WULF, C./MERKEL, C. (Hrsg.): Globalisierung als Herausforderung der Erziehung. Theorien, Grundlagen, Fallstudien. – Münster, S. 75-100.

THE PUBLIC AWARENESS CONTEXT:
AFRICA 2002 –
LESSONS LEARNED FROM A LARGE PUBLIC EVENT

Mr Christian Sundgren,
Deputy Director General, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Finland

Mr Jari Kivistö,
Global Challenge, Board of Education, Finland

Mr Christian Sundgren, MFA Finland, and Mr Jari Kivistö, Global Challenge, Bureau of Education, gave an overview of the Africa 2002 public awareness raising campaign. This was a collaborative effort between the MFA, the Board of Education, a broad range of NGOs and institutes, and took the form of exhibitions, workshops, a website, seminars, films, literature, theatre and music. In addition Finnish TV channels increased their focus on Africa by broadcasting relevant documentaries. The campaign took place in spring 2002 and is one of a series of such initiatives which have taken place in Finland in recent years (the 2000 campaign focused on Latin America, the 1998 campaign on Asia).

The specific aim of the 2002 campaign was to give a more positive and balanced message about Africa, countering a general tendency in Finland and elsewhere to view Africa as a lost cause. All too often Africa is portrayed in the media as only suffering from disasters of various kinds, such as from famines, floods and war. Press and public opinion polls were carried out prior to the campaign and afterwards to estimate the impact of the initiative on public opinion, analysis of this research indicated a 10% increase in support for the need for development education. The campaign reached over 100,000 people. The programme was regional and not just Helsinki-based, involving NGO projects throughout Finland.

The campaign culminated in a four-day large-scale public event "People and Development" in Helsinki. Visitors to this exhibition had the opportunity to learn about the everyday life of people in developing countries through exhibitions and cultural performances. It is estimated that around 30,000 people attended this event, but with the multiplier effect of the media activities, a much wider audience was reached.

One specific initiative of the programme for schools was 'Images of Africa'. This was intended to make teachers and student more aware of their perceptions of Africa. It included looking at articles, newspapers etc. for different images of Africa and formed the basis for teacher's manuals. In addition 10 drama guides were trained to run 'Black on White' - a series of seminars & training for

educators. This included webpages with study materials for schools; drama workshops for the students; and a book. As part of the drama activity young people were taken through a tour of 6 different historical perspectives of Africa based on drama. Prior to, during and after the Africa 2002 campaign, teachers and students were encouraged to initiate projects in schools. In support of this, relevant NGO's made resources, information and people available for such initiatives.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

A number of questions were raised by conference delegates following the presentation, on issues such as evaluation of the campaign, its connection to the curriculum and whether it raised questions about aid policy. The speakers explained that there were evaluations carried out on the larger events and elements but not the programme as a whole. This was partly because there were so many elements to the initiative. Feedback from the many partners of the programme has been very positive. Concerning the curriculum/mainstreaming, they stated that the programme used very much a Trojan horse approach by focusing on media education. Free materials – print and web-based - were produced for teachers on media matters. So teachers worked on Media Education but these activities also met the Development/Global Education aims of the partners involved in the campaign. The school curriculum in Finland has been revised recently and there are many parts where one can include Development/Global Education. On the issue of policy, seminars on cultural and trade issues were offered as part of the campaign - including seminars for business people who wanted to invest in Africa and NGO/Academic seminars on trade policies.

MUTUAL LEARNING
IN DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION

Mr Hiro Iwasaki,
Deputy Director,
DEAR, Japan

"Good evening,

My name is Hiro Iwasaki, and I am deputy director for DEAR (Development Education Association & Resource Centre, Japan). I'm also tutor at Tezukayama Gakuin University in Osaka, Japan. I have been involved in DE since the Kyoto DE group started with its DE seminar in 1989, but my first contact with this field began in 1981 when Japan UNESCO Association sent Japanese students and teachers, including myself, to refugee camps and villages in Thailand and Cambodia.

DEAR was established in 1982 and the membership is now over 1000. We have an annual gathering. Last year Doug Bourn came to Kyoto to give the keynote speech before 400 participants and had key meetings with ministry officials. Cathy Midwinter from Manchester DEP also gave a series of workshops on media literacy. This year in Tokyo we had Audrey Osler from Centre for Citizenship Education, Leicester University, and John Fien from Griffith University, Australia. DEAR holds six local gatherings a year, which is sponsored by Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

One thing I'd like to mention is the experience and what I learned in Johannesburg last year. Three of DEAR members participated in People's Forum there. On final day one woman from Soweto invited us to visit their churches. What was the message behind it? We realised that we'd missed an opportunity to come face to face with the local realities. Thus one of the outcome in our workshop was "We need to listen to those whose voices are not to be heard for sustainable development." They are the majority of the world. Without their voices the world can't be sustainable, because development means also self-sustaining.

In 1997 when we had the COPIII Kyoto Protocol meeting, a person from the Republic of the Marshall Islands said, "Hurry, hurry. Come and see. Our land is sinking." So we have been visiting the Marshall Islands for five years since then. After five years we now know some key persons and some organisations to work with. What I want to say is that communication and partnership - working together - is very important.

Finally, can I propose an idea of working together with participants here? UNESCO, lead agent of Decade for Education on Sustainable Development, has its general assembly from this coming Monday. The draft for DESD will be discussed and finalised in about a year. So there is some time left for advocacy. UNESCO will be happy to hear more voices of DE practitioners like us. Thank you"

Section 4

IMPROVING GLOBAL EDUCATION

CHAIR: Dr Alessio Surian,
Global Education Consultant, ITALY

The Chair of the Session

Dr Surian reminded participants of the work of the previous sessions and outlined the main points of the discussion groups. He also related the work in global education done of the North-South Centre to work in related fields by other COE bodies, such as the Education for Democratic Citizenship Programme and Human Rights Education Initiatives.

PUBLIC OPINION AND IMPROVING GLOBAL EDUCATION

Mr Christian Wilmsen,
Head of Education and Communication,
German Federal Ministry for Economic Development and Co-operation

I would like to express my heartfelt thanks to all those who planned this conference: for preparing the meeting, but also for providing me with this particular title for the topic I am supposed to discuss! In Germany, it has been our experience that drawing regularly and intensively on the results of opinion polls helps to improve the quality of our own political education work. Fundamentally, this is a matter of taking to heart and practicing the educational principle of "analysing your audience," which is often neglected. By the way, when we refer to that principle in Germany, we use the English wording – "analyse your audience."

The six theses I am going to present to you are based on two sources of information, that is, two types of survey. The first type consists of systematic questions posed to those officers in our Ministry who meet with visitors' groups. These visitors to the Ministry are highly representative of the general German public, as the majority of them do not come because of a specific interest in development policy but rather by chance, at the invitation of one of the members of our national parliament. Our MPs have the right to invite several visitors' groups per parliamentary term to visit Germany's capital at the cost of the Federal Government. In the course of such a visit, participants have to take part in a prescribed program comprising visits to parliament, to the Federal Press Office, and to at least two Ministries chosen by the MP in question.

Our second source of information is representative opinion polls such as the EU Commission's "Eurobarometer" poll, which is held in the member states of the European Union.

My first four theses are based on insights from our Ministry's own surveys of the members of its visitor service. Theses five and six are conclusions for our education work drawn from representative polls such as Eurobarometer.

FIRST THESIS

Citizens only open their mind to development messages if those delivering the message respond very closely to citizens' own questions and concerns regarding development issues. Political communication will always fall short of the mark if it operates solely on a supply-oriented basis, if it only looks at what should be interesting for the public from the organization's own point of view or what should by all means be brought to citizens' attention. In other words, *development education must be, among other things, highly demand-oriented.*

- For instance, the question that interests our visitor groups most is whether the projects in developing countries sponsored by the German government or by churches and nongovernmental organizations are successful. This is why we have decided in our Ministry's development education work to include statistical data in as many media as possible regarding the percentage of development projects and programs that are successful and those marked by serious shortcomings or failure.

- Another aspect addressed as often as possible by the Ministry in its development education is ecological issues, because the protection of the global environment has continuously been one of the three areas of top interest among visitors to the Ministry, out of more than thirty possible topics.

SECOND THESIS

General knowledge is just as high a priority for development education as the provision of up-to-date information on details, such as, this month, on the results of the most recent WTO ministerial conference in Cancún, Mexico. In our discussions with visitors to the Ministry, we frequently encounter a vast discrepancy between amazing knowledge about details and a lack of general knowledge about development policy as a whole. Let me give you one example which is just a few days old. One visitor asked us a highly detailed question regarding developing countries' debt situation and the PRSP process. He was a student majoring in economics and had probably studied this issue for some exam. However, in the same statement the student demanded that development cooperation with Liberia and other African countries be reduced or discontinued so as to "force" the warring factions there to stop the hostilities. When we explained that the combined ODA of all industrialized countries was far below the transfer payments from West to East Germany, our young visitor was quite dumbfounded. He had by far overestimated the volume of industrialized countries' development cooperation with the African countries and with all countries in general, and had thus apparently attached a weight to development cooperation which it simply does not have.

THIRD THESIS

Our language must at least match our development policy motives and goals in the industrialized countries. That is not yet the case. This, too, is an insight we have gained in our discussions with visitors.

- The terms "development policy" and "development cooperation" are often used as synonyms. As a result, people's concept of "development policy" is frequently limited to "development cooperation" or "aid." Once people have made that conclusion, the audience of a message will be confused if they are given information, for instance, on subsidized agricultural exports that harm the developing countries. But insufficient clarity and confusion are the safest way of stifling people's interest, thus killing off voluntary political learning. The term "development policy" should be used as a general term comprising all those policy measures of the industrialized countries that have as their purpose the development process of what is called the "South." "Development cooperation," which is just one part of "development policy," should only be referred to when we speak about what the industrialized countries call Official Development Assistance (ODA).

- At least when we talk about action taken by the government, we should avoid antiquated words such as "aid" and speak of, e.g., "development cooperation" instead. The same goes for the term "assistance," which unfortunately continues to be used in the OECD and its Development Assistance Committee (DAC). There are many reasons for getting rid of this old terminology. One line of argument says that the term "development aid" totally misleads people. Countries which are seen largely or exclusively as recipients of aid cannot appear to our citizens to be of importance to us and hence worthy of our interest. The words aid, assistance, in need of aid, and so on, have a negative effect. They obstruct people's realization that there are countries in the "South" which are already economic powers in their own right, have a political voice in whether, for instance, Germany gains a seat on the UN Security Council, and pursue environmental policies which have a definite influence on the ecological balance of our planet.

FOURTH THESIS

Generally, *all our printed or audiovisual resources should contain one chapter on the ways in which each individual can help to foster development*. Fair trade is a good example. It is alarmingly often that visitors to the Ministry say that after all they are just humble individuals who cannot make any contribution towards solving the major problems of the world. In Germany we often call this the "notion of powerlessness."

Preliminary remark on theses five and six

These theses were derived directly from representative polls, that is, the Eurobarometer polls of the EU Commission or polls conducted on behalf of the Ministry or of large German NGOs. Both theses are based on a *compensatory strategy approach*. As the budget for development education in Germany is currently some ten cents per capita of the population, the Ministry cannot compete with the supply of information provided by television, the press or the internet. This is why our priority at the Ministry is to help reduce those patterns of opinion that discourage people's interest in developing countries and development policy. It is becoming increasingly important to direct scarce staff and funding towards countering those factors which cause lack of interest or feed the public new misinformation that contradicts everything that experts unanimously agree on. *In other words, it is of more use to try to correct certain patterns of opinion than to pile on more and more information.*

FIFTH THESIS

No printed or audiovisual resource on development policy should come without examples that demonstrate that the developing countries are close to us in Europe, that they are not a "far-off" problem. What I have in mind is the problem – which is widespread in Germany – of regarding what is happening in developing countries as a far-off issue. Many people do not believe that changes in the "South" will affect their own lives – their jobs or their children's opportunities in life, for example.

The misconception that developing countries and development policy are far-away matters not only undermines people's interest but also reduces their willingness to have anything to do with them. This problem can be seen from many opinion polls. The scholars who analysed the 1996 Eurobarometer poll say on page 5 of their report:

"... there is a more widespread tendency to underrate developing countries. They are also inclined to play down prospects for private enterprise in developing countries..." On page 6, the authors continue: *"... Germany is also one of a small group of countries to reject the idea that the EU and developing countries are mutually dependent."*

SIXTH THESIS

We must not pretend that there is no suffering or injustice in the developing countries. But *it is the task of development education to encourage people to take a more differentiated approach in their negative blanket judgement of the situation prevailing in the countries of the South.* The predominant negative image erodes people's interest. In our expert community in Germany, we say, "Nobody cares about a losing team."

This thesis relates to the dismissive judgments about conditions in developing countries. No distinction is made between inconceivable poverty on the one hand and astonishing progress on the other. This is the impression gained by all researchers who have evaluated surveys on behalf of the EU, the Ministry and private agencies. To be brief, let me just give you one example: given the similarity between the results of surveys in all EU states, I would like to tell you about the result of the 1998 survey in Sweden. It is all the more striking and alarming as this Scandinavian country is among those states which have for a long time been meeting the 0.7% target. According to OECD figures, it is also one of those countries with the highest spending per annum and per capita on development education.

The pollsters who carried out the 1998 survey for the Swedish government came to the conclusion that the Swedes had a very pessimistic view of developing countries. Fewer than ten percent of them, for example, had a realistic idea of the level of literacy in Asian, African and Latin American countries.

But it is not only people's notions regarding the situation in developing countries that are relatively negative and constitute a barrier to being interested in these countries, unless there are disasters or wars. It is also people's notion of the developing countries' efforts to help themselves – which form, after all, the basis for successful development cooperation – which is largely pessimistic, discouraging people from becoming interested and active. Let me give you just one example from the 1998 UNDP study, "Development aid: what the public thinks," which analysed all 30 representative opinion polls from industrialized countries available at the time. On page 14 it states regarding the situation in Switzerland, and I quote: "Most surveys do not ask direct questions about people's attitudes towards developing countries. One that did asked Swiss respondents whether they thought that developing countries were trying to help themselves... Only eight percent answered 'often'. Sixty-two percent answered 'sometimes' and twenty-four percent said 'never'. These responses raise the possibility that a substantial number of people in the donor countries may have become deeply sceptical that any action by the North could help the developing countries achieve progress..."

Our Ministry publishes materials to counter such negative judgements. In the coming months, the Ministry will co-sponsor a publication by various governmental and nongovernmental development organizations that will provide illustrative information

on the determination of people in developing countries to help themselves, and on the reality there. Our publishing this resource together is intended to enhance its credibility and effect.

CONCLUSION

Once more I would like to express my thanks to the conference's organizers for including the issue of opinion polls in our meeting's agenda. May improved familiarity with *vox populi* help us to even further improve the quality of our work! May we be encouraged in that endeavour by a recommendation by the reformer Martin Luther, who suggested that we listen to the common people. The man who translated the Bible into German knew what you had to do in order to bring an important message to as many minds as possible – I think this is also our own aspiration.

I thank you warmly for your commitment to global learning, and for your attention!

THE IMPORTANCE OF EVALUATION AND REFLECTION WHY, WHAT FOR AND HOW

Dr Aileen McKenzie,
Consultant Evaluator,
Development Education Association, UK

MEDE, Measuring Effectiveness in Development Education, was a two-year project from 1999–2001, funded and supported by the Department for International Development (DFID). It was established to demonstrate, develop and share good practice in evaluating development education programmes in schools, youth, community and adult education. It was co-ordinated by the Development Education Association (DEA) and involved four evaluators working experimentally with eight projects.

The aims of the project were to:
- increase capacity of DE NGOs to develop and use measurable indicators
- provide accounts of the process of developing indicators
- gain an understanding of what evaluation methods are most appropriate in different contexts

Main focus became:
- impact indicators
- performance or process indicators
- learning outcomes

A number of key questions were of particular relevance to the process. First, we must as *why* we are engaged in development education. This involves looking at values, long-term goals and proposed impacts of development education. Second, *how* are we going to plan, organise and manage our activities? Answering this question requires looking at issues of management, organisation and performance. Third, we need to define and specify *what* actions, in terms of education programmes, that we are going to take to achieve our goals. This process involved looking at aspects of learning and change through education programmes.

The outcomes of the MEDE project were positive, at least in the short term. A great deal of learning was done in the realm of devising and measuring indicators. There were also possibilities to share what had been learnt to a certain extent. The long-term outcomes of MEDE are more difficult to ascertain, since its impacts on the eight project organisations, DEA membership and DFID participation have never been evaluated. Therefore, it is difficult to know how well the developments from this process have been embedded in practice. However, MEDE's main emphasis was to

undertake an experiment in the field of evaluation and indicators for Development Education. There is still a need to address how to help organisations sustain a commitment to evaluation.

On the personal level, a few learning outcomes and observations deserve mention. First, focusing on evaluation through whatever means may not be the key to development and progress in Development Education. Evaluation can seem very remote when associated with a specific project or programme. Second, evaluation needs to be embedded into the core business of organisations and to be seen as an activity that they can undertake in order to improve their own capacity and performance. Third, closer attention needs to be paid to how evaluation can help address core organisational and individual concerns. This may mean that we need to spend more time on the relationship between impact, performance and learning.

To conclude, my guess is that the concept of 'organisational learning' may be significant. Roche (1998, p194) puts forward 'possible measures of learning and adaptability' including:

Listening better	Indicators
1. To improve quality	Is the organisation open to continuous quality control by those it seeks to benefit... Do measures of quality exist?
2. Listening management	What is the percentage of time spent with 'front line' staff... and key decision-makers in other organisations?

LEARNING THROUGH EVALUATION

Mr Helmuth Hartmeyer,
Director,
KommEnt, Austria

KommEnt (Society for Communication and Development in Austria) has carried out a number of mainly external evaluations. The following conclusions out of these evaluation processes and out of discussions with evaluation experts in some other European countries (like Germany, Ireland, Italy, Switzerland or UK) summarise the experiences and are meant as an input for further considerations:

CONCLUSIONS

Evaluations are an important contribution to the improvement of global education/ development education.

An evaluation is a continuous process of self-reflection, a way of learning and improving the quality of our work.

Any evaluation includes the definition of the subject, the formulation of criteria and indicators, the collection and interpretation of data, the communication about the results and the development of consequences.

The methods should be appropriate to the subject. There is not <u>one</u> set of criteria, <u>one</u> set of standards.

Learning for social change is more complex than we usually admit. There are a number of hidden aspects like ideological concerns, individual projections, pedagogical restraints. It should be recognised that in global education/ development education we have to deal with uncertainty.

Evaluations are about double-loop learning: to take the learners beyond the quest to find the best solution to a problem, but to reconsider the problem. Learning means to start at the questions, not at the answers.

No evaluation will justify education itself, but it can support its legitimacy.

No evaluation exempts us form the normative question, what we consider right.

Tools and skills should not be introduced without a context (in our case of justice and global solidarity).

It is not the question whether we believe in progress when we evaluate, but that we believe in change. The results of an evaluation should enable us to plan our activities according to our long-term goals.

By analysing the hard facts, measuring the results and passing judgements, an evaluation may become a most powerful weapon. But it can easily be the case that consequences are never shared, because the actors who are evaluated , are never invited to take over responsibility for the process. However, everybody involved is an important stakeholder of future processes.

The ownership of an evaluation starts before the evaluation. Important steps are the definition of the terms of reference, the discussion of interim reports and the open discussion of the draft final report.

The motivation for an evaluation and the spirit, in which it takes place, is very decisive.

An evaluation is often felt as a threat, which leads to reactions of defence. The attempt to hide away too often means that you also hide away your strengths.

The debate on theory is of great importance to the area of global learning. It will be helpful to use evaluations for this purpose.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended:

- To make a difference between the aims of an evaluation and the aims of the process which is evaluated. It is important to define indicators, when the aims have been agreed upon, but also be aware of the factors around. Evaluators should be aware of the difficulty to define value-criteria and should lay open their decisions about them. Criteria and indicators should depend on the subject, the context and the possibilities of the evaluated.
- To recognise that each evaluation follows one or more aims and to choose the methods accordingly. For example participatory learning asks for a participatory methodology. It would be a absurd to assume that after a line of top-down information emancipation and independent thinking will be the result at the end of the day.
- To introduce methods of self-evaluation into evaluation processes; to initiate participatory learning.
- Not to measure the change of consciousness or attitudes, but to define aims around it and to make them operational in order to assess changes in knowledge and skills.
- To understand that an evaluation is also about the unshown and the unsaid and to develop tools to assess this.
- To be prepared for organisational/ institutional change as the result of an evaluation (change of tasks, of structures, of culture). An evaluation asks for readiness for change.

- To assess after one year whether institutional learning has happened and which consequences have been drawn.
- To recognise the importance of <u>who</u> evaluates; he/she may win influence, should understand the context, should have pedagogical and methodological competence, should keep professional distance, should be able to work in complementary teams, should be able to work in international teams, need not necessarily be from the South.
- To define and see evaluators as "critical friends".
- To recognise that external evaluations are also property of the evaluated. It is important to avoid external control of the results. The evaluated should be included in the whole process of defining the subject, describing value-criteria and indicators and formulating consequences.
- To accept the aim of an evaluation as the improvement of the work of the evaluated themselves. It should therefore open up space for curiosity, participation and decision-making.
- To recognise that an evaluation asks for resources also on the side of the evaluated (time, money). It is part of the working hours of the evaluated
- To recognise the standard of payment in the NGO-sector. NGOs do GE/DE at a cheap rate, they therefore expect evaluations to be carried out at similar rates. NGOs will ask for funding for evaluations at the same rate as for their own work.
- To use existing reports and analyse them;
  to use them for your purposes.
- To build up a databank of tools how to evaluate, of publications and projects; to facilitate the exchange of material.
- To strengthen the North-South Centre of the Council of Europe as a focal point for the international exchange of experiences and thus for the quality improvement if GE/DE.
- To train the trainers:
  - define qualifications and to develop a certificate
  - develop a culture of recognition of competence
  - organise workshops for the support of evaluators
  - initiate team-visits.
- To embark on international evaluation projects (co-operation of two or more evaluators from different countries).
- To publish more reports in English to make knowledge and experiences better accessible throughout Europe.

Section 5

SHARING INNOVATION FOR EVALUATION AND QUALITY IMPROVEMENT

SOUTHERN INVOLVEMENT IN THE EVALUATION OF DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION IN EUROPE

Dr Stiaan van der Merwe,
VDM Consultancy, South Africa

Mr Arnfinn Nygaard,
Co-ordinator, Rorg, Norway

SOUTHERN EVALUATION OF RORG NETWORK IN NORWAY

Mr John Jones from Rorg and IGNIS, Norway, introduced the session. He stated that methods of evaluation have two legs; first, effectiveness – how to do things right – and second, discussing 'do we do the right things/do we do things that matter?'

In Norway, the commercialisation of education is an issue for the Ministry of Education. There is a question of how these issues are reflected in evaluation processes. There are different versions of 'facts'. The evaluation had a focus from a southern perspective. 'Whose Reality Counts' by Robert Chambers was recommended as a useful text on evaluation.

Mr Arnfinn Nygaard raised a number of key points:

- In 1986, research was undertaken on behalf of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs into DE funding. It concluded that DE should support the Aid programme.
- Further evaluation revealed the broader focus and impact of NGO activities funded by government. However, funders initiated both pieces of research. There is a question of 'why are they funding us?' i.e. – what is in it for the government?
- A suggestion from the 2nd evaluation undertaken was that NGOs conduct self-evaluation and develop a tool kit for self-evaluation. This led to an initiative for the whole DE network, where the parameters were set by the NGOs themselves. This proved difficult, as it is a diverse sector.
- The MDGs need evaluation from the South.
- A government white paper from 1995 outlined that DE was coloured with a northern view. Southern perspectives need to be given more weight and resources should be given to involve Southern partners in the delivery and evaluation of DE.
- The programme used contacts to identify expertise on global /development issues (not aid policy). Dr Stiaan van der Merwe from South Africa was commissioned to co-ordinate the evaluation.

Dr Stiaan van der Merwe introduced the layout of the evaluation – the process and basic perspectives, themes and management of the process. The timeframe of the programme was kept, but other aspects were far more fluid. There was some scepticism among people in the south about DE, wondering 'is it another form of

propaganda?'. Feedback from the 'South' and RORG was not simply in the form of a paper report but the beginning of a process of change and a 'fairly messy' process.

PROJECT MANAGEMENT KEY POINTS

- Basic perspectives/themes;
- Wisdom of taking a 'long shot' at the goal;
- Process becomes purpose/DE actor;
- End is the beginning, i.e. the end of the evaluation report process is the beginning of the improvement process;
- There was a fundamental question of 'why do this? ', i.e. include a southern perspective;
- The evaluation become DE activity in itself;
- It was the start of an organic process within RORG;
- 'Substance and process – substance matters;
- Develop mandates and terms of reference;
- Oversight and independence;
- Funding and finance;
- Preparation and orientation – different; context in the south; different relationships and south acting as consultants.

EVALUATION - efficiency of DE in Norway, strategic issues viewed from the south:

- There was a lack of awareness of the MDGs and scepticism about what they actually mean.
- Recommendations/confusions including North/South relationship power relationship in the project.
- The Norwegian experience - to be looked at from 'underneath'.
- Fundamental - Questions raised about the D.E. strategy and the strategic effect. Northern NGOs need to re-image D.E. with south as a change agent/partner and consider the permanent presence of south in Northern NGO's similar to North's presence in southern organisations. This requires true partnership- solidarity from south for struggles in the north (south being in solidarity) offering a different model.
- Difficulties in trust, suspicion and language strategic issues of didactics and pedagogy for solidarity
- What is an authentic voice of the south – who represents this? Can we reflect some of the essence of this?
- Demand uncritical acceptance - to whom is the North accountable in the South?
- South as primary stakeholders in DE.
- Question - 'Do you regard yourself as accountable to the South?' and 'Who are the primary stakeholders?'

CONCLUDING REMARKS

- Southern evaluation is more than purely technical and objective, it is also about setting benchmarks and indicators.
- The process can be difficult, messy, uncomfortable, political, economic, moral and fundamentally challenging.

- South should be vigilant not to be used/co-opted and the North should have the vision and courage to involve the south.
- Southern evaluation is important as primary stakeholders and such evaluation needs to a permanent feature of DE programmes
- What is needed in the North is Solidarity against injustice (self-liberation) including a very clear stance locally involving government, business, NGO's.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

After the presentations, the workshop participants raised a number of questions. One World Week (OWW) shared its experiences with involving people with development experience from the south in its DE programme. The question was raised whether there were any good examples of equal/ proper discourses emanating from the research, i.e. where can the good models be found? The RORG representatives answered that RORG and OWW should network to share these good examples; there is not a lack of good work or passion. However, some organisations have little involvement in the south, others are deeply involved in communities in the south. The involvement of the south in northern organisations is not happening sufficiently but there are good examples of dialogue.

A question was raised regarding the perception that people have about the MDGs, and what DE in the north can do to help the process. Dr van der Merwe answered that there is a suspicion about the MDGs, e.g. people want to know 'why are you asking?' 'Are we living on the same planet?' is this meant to be *this* millennium?' 'No we are not aware and we don't care'. The percentage of money actually given can just be seen as a redistribution of charity. People will benefit and there will be positive results but there is also a lack of good will. The role of DE is the unmasking of MDGs to create debate about what these really mean/should be. There is little sense of ownership in the south of these goals. However this does raise the question about what is the alternative to the MDGs and UN route.

John Jones suggested that one could look at the MDGs not as a positive development, but simply a reduction in the damage being done to the south. E.g. you could reduce the money/subsidy to cattle in the north to save people in the south. There needs to be a serious reframing of the MDGs, as they are designed to help the south *not* to restructure the north.

Dr van der Merwe said in relation to the role of DE, that it must give information about work/life in the south, it should support fundraising and 'self unmasking' – i.e. some information is just not given. There is a groundswell of opinion/a movement – people will throw off injustice and policy/procedures/MDGs will be irrelevant. People in the North need to look at the action that they can take nationally on MDGs. MDGs can be used to get media attention, they can get issues on the agenda. We should not underestimate actions, events, conferences etc., but we need to be critical and work with the resources and peoples of the South.

The Maastricht conference declaration stated that the south should be included in the dialogue about DE; this needs to be institutionalised. There has been the suggestion for an advisory group/council to link NGOs/DE organisations to southern partners for advice. Mr Peter Davis suggested this could be a role for DEEEP, to begin identifying project areas, building a register of southern participants in DE is an opportunity that

could be taken forward. DE providers need to start on organisational programme levels, e.g. schools programmes, where creating a vocabulary and framework is a process in itself.

In conclusion Dr van der Merwe stated that he hoped the evaluation process has highlighted that another form of evaluation is possible, one that is full of surprises, challenges, but is also fascinating and painful. He hoped that this type of process will become established in DE networks/organisations. If the south has a pedagogy for liberation, is this relevant for the north? There needs to exist a common framework/set of concepts for this to takes place.

THE ROLE OF DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION NGOs IN IMPROVING QUALITY

Professor Tanaka,
Director,
DEAR, Japan

DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION IN JAPAN

Professor Tanaka presented DEAR (Development Education Association & Resource Centre) as an example of a Japanese Development Education initiative.

Major projects of DEAR in 2003

- Campaign of learning for peace
- Promotion of ESD
- Joining the world networking of global education and creating the Asian-Pacific network

Membership

DEAR has 980 individuals and 60 organisations including schoolteachers, NGOs, local government staff, community leaders and students as members.

History

Japanese DE started in 1979 with the establishment of the DE Council of Japan. A national conference is held every summer since then. In the 1980s, a major issue was the difficulty in promoting DE in schools because of lack of skills, as well as curriculum restrictions.

Significant turning points

1980s:
- Japanese ODA became world leader in terms of volume;
- A new curriculum was introduced, which emphasised
  a) international understanding
  b) environmental issues;
- DEAR was established and the regional seminars were instituted.

1990s:
- Less populated cities became interested and sought new approaches to international exchange;
- Increasing numbers of foreign workers;
- Schools began to value and look for new teaching materials about international affairs.

Regional seminars

The regional seminars are of strategic importance to DE in Japan. They gained momentum in 1992, with a subsequent development of up to 200 participants annually at 6 seminars in 6 regions.

Purpose

- To increase understanding and awareness of DE issues;
- To achieve face-to-face networking between key people in local and national regions;
- To create partnerships between schools, NGOs and youth workers and Japanese Overseas Voluntary Service etc.;
- To strengthen collaboration between local and national offices.

Outputs and Impact

First 5 years
- DE and international co-operation were introduced to interested individuals and groups;
- Translation of western participatory approaches were achieved;
- The initiative lacked a strong co-ordinating body to follow-up the regional seminars.

Last 5 years
- Ministry of Education announced freedom of curriculum, stressing the value of participatory approaches in education;
- More teachers have become interested were in DE;
- Creation of a strong co-ordinating body.

Impact of 2002 curriculum

- Integrated study introduced into compulsory education;
- Each school is free to organise its curriculum;
- Institution of 2-3 hrs per week to deliver integrated studies;
- Integrated study incorporates interdisciplinary learning;
- Participatory learning is stressed as desirable in integrated study.

Challenges

Local government has established greater ties with DEAR, which is positive for DE and the organisation, but DEAR faces some major challenges:
- Regional seminars as they currently exist will end in 2005
  - There is a need to expand to remote areas;
  - General view that seminars should address specific needs;
  - Lack of funds to sustain co-ordinating bodies;
- How to make the regional co-ordinating bodies stronger, sustainable and engaged in the seminars?
- More teachers recognise the need for new approaches to teaching and learning and want to find out about participatory learning as a result of curriculum changes in the 1990s, government will, a decade of SDE and strong partnerships between schools and NGOs;

- Provision of well-planned follow-up activities to seminars required;
- Developmental support for the regional co-ordinators needed.

The facilitator then invited participants to participate in discussion groups with one of his Japanese colleague to contribute ideas from their experience to the challenges outlined above.

Professor Tanaka ended with the following Haiku:

I am more than happy
To have friends with you all
Under cool London sky

EVALUATING THE NORTH / SOUTH PARTNERSHIP DIMENSION

Dr Katy Newell Jones,
Global Education Consultant, UK

INTRODUCTION

A significant proportion of development education and global education projects are focused around establishing 'learning links between north and south'. North / South partnerships are promoted by NGOs and donors as positive ways of working which enhance learning, develop sustainable practices and promote interdependency.

Much is talked about their value but how often is the North/South partnership included in an evaluation framework? This workshop explored the nature of the partnership dimension. Participants shared insights into how to support the development of effective partnerships from the outset of a project, and into potential evaluation questions as the project progresses.

The workshop was divided into three phases and will draw on the experiences of participants and on two very different projects that involve North/South partnerships:

- **Global-ITE** is a DFID-funded project on incorporating the global dimension into initial teacher education.   It is led by a UK-based NGO Global Dimensions Ltd with partners in Higher Education institutions in three countries, India, Kenya and the UK.

- **Rebuilding Communities in Southern Sudan,** funded by the Community Fund, is involved in developing an integrated approach to literacy and conflict resolution that is being delivered by community facilitators in South Sudan.   The two partners are Education for Development in the UK and Sudan Evangelical Mission in Mundri, South Sudan.

1. THE BASIS OF NORTH / SOUTH PARTNERSHIPS

The scope of North / South partnerships varies enormously from primarily charitable relationships where groups and individuals in the North learn about the context of a chosen community or group in the south with a view to providing resources and/or training to meet their needs, to collaborative learning partnerships based around mutual sharing of expertise. Most if not all projects with a partnership dimension would say one of the aims is for people from the North and South to learn from interacting with each other. However, the nature of the learning is vastly different where the agenda is for the northern partner to learn about the context of the south and

thereby be able to support them, to one where the partners are working in true collaboration to tackle shared issues and concerns which are seen as directly relevant to people in each country.

Developing partnerships is difficult at the best of times. However, when developing North / South partnerships the scope for misunderstanding and conflicting interests can be magnified with different histories and expectations.

The DEA's 'Why, what, how?' framework[4] can be valuable in exploring what we mean by north/south partnerships. Through this activity we can explore the different levels/styles/categories of partnership; those where the balance of power is with one partner, the expectations of the different partners and potential misunderstandings, inter-, intra-country partnerships, complex projects with north/south, north/north and south/south partnerships etc.

When using these questions as a precursor to partnership work we can often identify conflicting agendas and hidden tensions which can compromise effective partnerships if left unresolved. Although this aspect focuses on pre-project activities it also helps identify key evaluation questions for latter stages.

Table 1 Exploring the partnership dimension

Why? What? How?	Pre- and on-going questions	Evaluation questions
Why?	Why are we embarking on, or working in, a partnership? Why have these organisations come together in a partnership? Why has the focus of the work been selected?	How effective has the partnership dimension been? How relevant is the focus of the project to all concerned?
What?	What does each party hope to gain from the partnership dimension? What roles are different people and organisations going to undertake? What actions are we going to take to achieve the goals?	To what extent have the partners gained from the partnership? How effective have the different roles been? To what extent have the goals been achieved? What learning and change has taken place?
How?	How are the various goals going to be achieved? How are we going to work together? How are we going to manage our resources? How are we going to review our progress? How are we going to build sustainability into our work?	How effective have the partnership relationships been? What are the outputs, outcomes and impact?

---

[4] DEA (2001) Measuring Effectiveness in Development Education.

2. INDICATORS OF THE PARTNERSHIP DIMENSION

My experience is that when people come to talk about the benefits from partnerships they are more inclined to talk of *events* which took place, for example exchange visits or joint workshops, rather than about the *learning which took place* or the *impact of the partnership in the wider context*. If we are to include the evaluation of the partnership dimension to a project we need to be able to explore this aspect of the project in greater depth.

Church and Shouldice (2002)[5] define the terms outputs, outcomes, impact from their work on evaluating conflict resolution interventions as follow:

> ***Outputs*** are described as 'the immediate tangible result of an intervention that is necessary to achieve the objectives'. They answer the question 'What activities have taken place?'

> ***Outcomes*** are 'short-term results of a programme or project that is partly generated by the outputs'. They answer the question 'What has been learnt?'

> ***Impact*** is 'the overall or long-term programme effects or changes in a situation'. This is in answer to questions like 'What changes have occurred?'

If we apply these terms to the partnership dimension we can see the increasing depth as we move from outputs to outcomes and finally to impact.

Partnership outputs

A project might have resulted in exchange visits, or an e-learning link involving both north and south participants, or negotiations and agreement of the expenditure for one aspect of the project on an equal basis.

Partnership outcomes

Participants from both (or all) partners might have acquired specific skills and knowledge through working in partnership along with an increased awareness of the pressures and constraints faced by each other. Outcomes are most often expressed in terms of increased skills and knowledge but can (and should) also include attitudes, for example 'I now appreciate the complexity of the role of women in communities of a particular country.'

Partnership impact

This is where 'sustainable practices' are evident. For example a project manager might have changed his/her approach to project management from one where the northern partner dictated the agenda to a more equal partnership, or a teacher might say the examples from the south, which they use in their teaching, now portray a more appropriate balance of strengths and difficulties.

---

[5] Church, C and Shouldice, J (2002) *The Evaluation of Conflict Resolution Interventions: Framing the State of Play.* Ulster: Incore www.incore.ulst.ac.uk.

TOOLS AND TECHNIQUES

Having identified some of the indicators we are now in a position to explore appropriate tools and techniques. When measuring outputs we can gain a great deal of information from reports and quantitative data. As we move to explore outcomes we need to be consulting with participants and determining with them the ways in which they have gained knowledge and skills and how their attitudes have changed as a result of the various interventions. As we then attempt to evaluate the impact of the partnership dimension we need to step away from the activities of the project and involve other stakeholders in the analysis of the extent to which actions and attitudes have been influenced.

CONCLUSION

The potential for conflict in North / South partnerships is significant. By tackling how this aspect of the project is going to be evaluated this might provide the forum for clarifying roles and responsibilities at an early stage and lead the way for a more productive partnership. As more projects include the partnership dimension of the project in their evaluation so this will lead to a greater understanding of factors which promote effective partnerships which assist in the development of sustainable practices for all partners.

WORKSHOP PROCESS

Participants began the workshop by choosing a picture postcard with an image that represented for them a key element of, or concern about partnership.

Key elements or concerns about partnership:

- Consider the role of women – both hidden and overt presence
- Celebrate success and show appreciation for input by considering the context of the project
- Consider roles and skills
- A negotiation or trading/bargaining process – should be a process of open mutual exchange
- Everyone needs motivation
- Should aim for an equal relationship regardless of partners' size/capacity though it is important to recognise partnerships in which stronger/larger elements support smaller/weaker partners
- Dependence and interdependence
- Communication

- Complex ingredients
- Common goals – harambee!
- Support and trust
- A good relationship
- Inside and outside perspectives
- Various stakeholders
- Consider the need and opportunity for personal expression; expressing 'the scream'
- Journey/adventure
- Prepare for hard work
- Obligations
- Dealing with problems and assumptions e.g. shared values
- Shared vision
- Blooming partnerships
- A family

The Global-ITE project was introduced by Greig Whitehead, GlosDEC, UK.

Feedback:
- Need to consider 'WHO' is involved, named individuals, not just organisations and who will initiate the partnership;
- 'WHEN' to get involved;
- Consider creating a logframe;
- Add an 'inputs' box;
- Consider 'WHERE' the partnership is located i.e. geographical location, particularly south-south partnerships.

Other principles to consider
- Recognition that building trust is a delicate operation
- Allow time for building an understanding of different perspectives and goals

The groups also discussed outputs and outcomes and raised the following concerns:
- Who benefits from the outputs and outcomes of the partnership?
- There could be a lack of ownership by some parties.
- A lack of resources for some resulting in unfulfilled potential and/or expectations.
- Expectations need managing to ensure fulfilment or to tackle barriers as they arrive.
- How do we measure learning as an outcome?
- How do we measure attitudinal change and assess actions taken and the opportunities to do so?
- Must consider impacts on individuals as well as organisations.
- Partners must recognise that funding from one source or from one side of the partnership will skew relationships unavoidably.
- An equal evaluation process must be planned from the outset, no matter who funds the project.
- As DE is not part of the assessed curriculum (in the UK), it is harder to evaluate projects.

The discussion concluded with expression of a general concern that DE is still viewed as a northern issue and that the global benefits of North/South partnerships should be more widely promoted and recognised by all stakeholders including project participants, other DE practitioners and funders.

PRACTICAL TOOLS FOR EVALUATING
GLOBAL EDUCATION

Dr Barbara Asbrand and Dr Gregor Lang-WOJTASIK,
University of Nuremberg and
GENE Working Group on evaluation, Germany

THE EVALUATION CIRCLE

The workshop began with a presentation on the main principles and procedure of carrying out an evaluation. To illustrate this, the evaluation circle was used. This tool enables the evaluator to define, step by step, the different stages of the evaluation, from identifying the subject to interpreting the findings. The following steps are included in the circle:

1. Identifying the subject of the evaluation
2. Defining criteria and indicators
3. Selecting method and collecting data
4. Interpreting information
5. Communication about results
6. Developing consequences

Identifying the subject

The first step always has to be *Identifying the subject*. When people evaluate their work, they need to decide what they want to review. It must be pointed out clearly which aspects should be taken into consideration. When evaluating the effects of a project it is necessary to ask - what can be evaluated? For example it is difficult to identify a long-term change of attitudes by simple interviews or to observe learning. Learning as a complex process is not possible to be put down to a single reason. It means that one never can be sure that the results of global learning like awareness of global issues are only due to the impact of the evaluated program. There's no causal connection between intentions and the outcome (Luhmann/Schorr 1999). Rather than this, an evaluation can reflect the concrete results of a measure. For example has the target group been reached? How many people bought the educational material? Have the visitors been content with the seminar? Concrete results like these can be evaluated.

Defining criteria and indicators

The defining of criteria and indicators and the development of consequences are two aspects that are often neglected. First of all we have to differentiate between criteria and indicators. They are not the same. The criteria should be the answer to the question - what is quality? How can quality be described? There should be a discussion that leads to a consensus within the group or organisation on what they consider is good global education. Indicators are the answer to the question - how to

measure the criteria? Obviously indicators often are figures, but they don't have to be. An indicator shows at which point you will be content with the quality of work. For example, a non-governmental organisation takes the decision that a criterion for the quality of a seminar should be that the participants are content. This is the criterion. An indicator to measure contentedness could be, that three thirds of the participants agree in the questionnaire that they will join a similar program again. In order not to have a lot of useless data, it is important that only data is collected which is connected with the identified subject. Defining criteria and indicators is the basis of the subsequent steps. Criteria are the definition of quality, which means that defining criteria is a key step in the process of evaluation if we talk about improving quality.

Developing methods, collecting data and interpreting findings
An important step is selecting and developing methods and collecting data. Methods used include for example questionnaires, observations, learning-diaries, and so on. Often it is not necessary to collect new data but to use those already available. After the collection of data there should be a detailed *interpreting of the findings*. It is important to see that the quality of the work is not just an opinion of somebody but is the result of the application of the agreed criteria.

Communication about results and developing consequences
After this, results should be communicated. That means a discussion with all people involved. Another key step is to always think about the consequences of what is found out in the evaluation. This aspect is too often neglected and evaluations then stop at the point where results are communicated. This might lead to the frustration of both the evaluators and evaluated. Without a clear formulation of consequences, an evaluation easily can come to zero. Also an evaluation is not an end in itself. The results should be used for generating new perspectives and new objectives. After an evaluation has taken place there will be a lot of ideas to improve the quality of work, which leads after some time into a new evaluation. The circle starts again. The interlinkage of all steps is drawn as a circle. Evaluation in this view is understood as a continuing process.

PRACTICAL USE OF THE EVALUATION CIRCLE
After the theoretical session, the participants were asked to divide into groups. Four groups were formed and each group was tasked with creating a practice evaluation process, using the Evaluation Circle. Each group defined an evaluation subject and discussed what type of criteria and indicators might be suitable. The results were displayed on flip chart paper on the walls of the room. Toward the end of the workshop, there was a discussion with all participants about what they had thought of the session. All participants found the learning exercise very useful and many repeated that they could imagine applying it in their own setting.

References
DEA, Effectiveness in Global Education. http://www.dea.org.uk/info/projects/effectiveness
LUHMANN, Niklas and SCHARR, Karl Eberhard (1999): Reflexionsprobleme im Erziehungssystem. Frankfurt/ M. Suhrkamp.
ROLFF, Hans-Günther (1998): Referat der Fachtagung "Qualität und Evaluation der Pädagogischen Schulentwicklung". Nürnberg.
SCHEUNPFLUG, Annette unter Mitarbeit von Claudia Bergmüller und Nikolaus Schröck: Evaluation globalen Lernens. Eine Arbeitshilfe. Stuttgart: Brot für die Welt 2002.
SCHEUNPFLUG, Annette: Evaluation in der entwicklungsbezogenen Bildungsarbeit. In: Zeitschrift für Internationale Bildungsforschung und Entwicklungspädagogik (ZEP) 24 (2001) 1, S.2 – 6.

NATIONAL LEVEL EVALUATION FOR STRENGTHENING GLOBAL EDUCATION

Mr Christian Hugues,
Associate Director,
Evalua, France

INTRODUCTION

In France, the term or concept global education is not widely used. The term used is 'éducation au développement (ED)' or development education (DE)[6]. Sustainable development, citizenship, human rights etc are all treated differently with regard to education. The workshop will look at national level evaluation of development education in France with the main actors at this level – government and NGOs.

NATIONAL LEVEL EVALUATION PRACTICE IN FRANCE

At ministry level, evaluations tend to focus on policy, for example of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs as a funder of DE. The recently commissioned external evaluation, carried out by Evalua and financed by the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs, of state funding for NGO DE programmes was the first such evaluation since the Ministry began support for DE in 1994. It was a real innovation to engage an external evaluator at this level. However, a disadvantage was that the evaluation was 'ex-post' (i.e. a summative evaluation of a programme or project which has been completed) with no baseline indicators or ongoing evaluation available to compare outcomes.

In France there are loose groupings of NGOs in this field, largely organisations focused on similar issues, for example the fair trade network 'Fédération Artisans du Monde'. Within these networks they may undertake one to three evaluations each year, dependent on funding for them and also on the policy of funders such as the European Union, which makes evaluation of their funded programmes compulsory. An example is DE training programmes for fair trade volunteers. Sometimes, although not systematically, French government departments also require external evaluations. Again this evaluation tends to be 'ex-post'.

Sometimes large NGOs working in DE will chose to evaluate individual projects or programmes, such as the 'Terre d'Avenir' DE programme. This may result in ongoing evaluation as well as 'ex-post' and can involve internal as well as external evaluators. Again funding and funding policy have an impact on how and when these evaluations are undertaken.

---

[6] Editors note: The term "Éducation à la citoyenneté mondiale" is used to denote "global education" in French.

DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION THEORY OF ACTION

Each development education project can be divided in 8 parts
1. Problem
2. Development topic
3. Problem solving strategy
4. Identification of a "public"
5. Communication method
6. Ways of learning about the targeted public
7. Communication tools
8. General public

Furthermore there are a number of stages and factors which must be taken into account in evaluating development education.

- State A: (before action)
- State B (after action)
- Audience
- Impacts
- Changes in knowledge, attitude and behaviour

The process of moving from state A to state B then takes place in the following order:

1. Identifying the development problem and the appropriate strategy to solve it.
2. Targeting eligible public and allocating resources to reach this public.
3. Selecting the communication strategy to modify public behaviour (knowledge, understanding, and decision to act).
4. Selecting educational tools to modify behaviour (knowledge, understanding, and decision to act).
5. Output and Result evaluation.
6. Impact evaluation
7. Long-term impact evaluation (modification of policy at national/ international level).

Development education activities are focused on making the public aware of an identified development issue including problems and strategies for resolving them with the main overarching goal to change the public's knowledge, attitudes and behaviour from their initial state A to final state B at the end of the project through the use of appropriate educational and communication tools and teaching and learning approaches.

From a low initial level, the target audience(s) at the end of a successful project should be both aware of the development issues/problems and able to act on that awareness.

For the evaluator in this context, need to ask, "what are the key evaluation questions". It is very rare to be able to cover all the elements/phases, therefore all evaluations need to prioritise the questions asked/areas investigated.

INNOVATIVE PRACTICE – 3 CASE STUDIES

French Platform on Development Education

Evaluation focused programme - since 1999 - more willingness has been shown by DE NGOs etc to bring together examples of good practice by all stakeholders in development education in France. The aim of the programme was to increase the effectiveness of DE projects through sharing information of good practice and enhancing evaluation practice through knowledge of outputs, results and impacts of DE actions.

One of the tools and outputs from this joint programme is a database of several hundred examples of development education practice in terms of both methodologies and particular projects and practice, complemented by training programmes.

However, the tools themselves have not yet been evaluated.

www.globenet.org/terre-d-avenir

Ministry of Agriculture DE network

The Ministry is also involved in development education as funder and actor in its own right although less than the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

This programme specifically focused on good practice in agricultural education and raising awareness of the wider public and in schools of these issues.

Programme delivery and dissemination was through education and communication materials, annual conferences, school twinning initiatives and networks of groups interested in a specific country eg Burkina Faso or 'geographic groups'.

www.educagri.fr/reseaux/educdvlp/sommaire.htm

Introducing DE in the Curriculum initiatives

At the moment there are no national programmes to introduce DE into the school curriculum. However, regional initiatives exist to create cross-curricular space in the national curriculum to cover development education including this one in Franche-Comte since 2002.

This RITIMO project is supported by the regional Ministry of Education and the local authorities international cooperation network in Franche Comte. The guidelines on how to promote DE in primary and secondary education are the first to be published in France. New and innovative approach, includes what and how can be taught at each level and within subjects, linking, partnership projects, and implementing and evaluating projects in the schools.

www.ac-besancon.fr/

Christian then rounded up his presentation by asking participants for their responses to the situation in France as he'd set it out. A detailed discussion among the participants followed.

Section 6

LOOKING FORWARD

THE FUTURE OF GLOBAL AND DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION IN EUROPE: IMPORTANT TO IMPROVE

Ms Anne Baker,
Director of Global Education Alliance and
Global Education and Technology, NPCA, USA

The aims for our closing plenary session are to reflect critically on the conference of the past two days and to look towards the future. In particular, we would like to include different perspectives from those previously heard from this platform. I have been asked to provide a brief US perspective as an outside "critical friend" before opening the floor for further commentary, discussion and reflection.

My comments are in three parts:
1. The context in the United States – what are the issues and challenges we face?
2. Reflections on how that relates to this conference and the situation in Europe
3. Plans for the future

My comments contain some of the key issues as I see them and are to be taken as my own comments as an individual US citizen actively engaged in global and development education in the US.

KEY ISSUES AFFECTING GLOBAL AND DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION IN THE USA

"Development education" as a term is meaningless to most Americans. In some contexts, "development" implies fundraising, while in an education setting, it may imply child or adolescent development. A recent report summarizing some of the recent research on "US Public Opinion on Development Assistance"[7] includes the following: "it is probably fair to say that few members of the adult public know what development assistance is: especially when using the term 'development assistance.' However, there are many polls that ask participants to rate the importance of 'foreign aid' as a federal government program or otherwise seek a sense of the level of approval for such a concept." I do not have time here to go into details on survey results judging American public support for foreign aid, but generally it is quite strong.

Another point to consider is the subsequent US approach to development. I highly recommend the research carried out by the Aspen Institute's Global Interdependence Initiative (http://www.aspeninstitute.org/Programt2.asp?i=70). Their discourse on

---

[7] "An Assessment Report: 1. US Public Opinion on Development Assistance; 2. The USAID Development Education Program", submitted to the US Agency for International Development by Rosemarie Philips and Diana Davis, PhD on behalf of Development Associates, Inc., January 31, 2003, p. 7. (Report can be found at http://www.dec.org/pdf_docs/PNACT061.pdf).

how to frame issues for more impact may be of particular interest and use for those involved in global and development education. Their research as highlighted in the above-mentioned report helps us put the US frame of reference for development into perspective: "GII funded researchers make a number of valid points about the nature of public opinion and how it is formed that should contribute to planning for the future of the Development Education Program. For example, Aubrun and Grady (1999)[8] explain the American public's approach to international issues: 'The average person has no cultural model for international relations, other than that borrowed from the interpersonal domain.' Therefore, 'Americans treat countries as persons, such as parents, children and neighbors and […] often take a parental approach to other countries.'"

So, the terms "development" and "development education" are troublesome in the US. So is the term "global education" – but that is a topic we have already touched upon and so I won't dig into that issue here today.

September 11, 2001. No doubt that the events of that day had a profound and significant impact on all levels, from personal to national. Since that day, there is certainly increased awareness of global issues. More Americans are paying attention to world news. There is increased media attention to global issues. (Is it always the type of attention we would hope for? As one speaker put it earlier today, "good news is no news".) More teachers are requesting more materials. More is being done in classrooms and in communities. However, is it all the "right stuff"? Recently, there have been more critical commentaries on what global education is and the messages portrayed in US classrooms.[9]

This increased attention to global issues in US classrooms is not sustainable, as it is not part of a mandate. Unless/until it is mandated – perhaps at a federal, state or local level - global education will continue to be a struggle to implement in the formal education sector. Having said that, I would also note that there is already a tremendous amount of good global education happening in the US, mostly due to the efforts of extraordinary individuals and some civil society organizations, i.e. integration of GE into the curriculum by Federal decree. While I do not necessarily believe that a federal mandate is a desired course of action, that would certainly get the attention of teachers and administrators in the schools. (After all, what would that mandate for global education look like, as global education is not a curriculum area, but spreads across all subjects?)

Of course, another key issue affecting global and development education in the US is funding. There is very little direct government support available and independent funding from private foundations and individuals is highly competitive.

REFLECTIONS ON THIS CONFERENCE

I would like to refer back to Liam Wegimont's very useful framing questions for this conference, as he outlined them in the opening plenary.[10] In many ways, in my

---

[8] Aubrun, Axel and Joseph Grady, 1999. *American Understandings of the United States' Role in the World: Findings from Cognitive Interviews. October 14, 1999.* The Frameworks Institute. Washington, DC.
[9] For one example, see http://www.edexcellence.net/socialstudies/Contrarians/ContrariansChap3.pdf
[10] The questions are as follows: 1. What are the fundamental purposes for education and social change? 2. Where do we situate global education and its improvement and evaluation? 3. What methods of evaluation should we use in global education? 4. What are the nuts and bolts of evaluation? and 5. Where do we go from here?

opinion, the US is stuck on question one: "what are the fundamental purposes for education and social change?" In terms of evaluation and quality, you cannot assess something until you have a clear idea of what it is you need to assess. In this case, there is general consensus among global education organizations about the goals of global education, but not necessarily the means, the need for it, or even what it is.

I am humbled by everyone at this conference, particularly those sharing the stage with me now, but only because I am more familiar with their work. I, and we in the US, have a lot to learn from all of you here. My charge to you is this: show us how global education is done and done well. Share your experiences and your knowledge with us so that we may learn from you and partner with you.

I have been charged with coming back to the US with a plan and a proposal for carrying out that plan. You are all of great help to me in that process.

VISIONS FOR THE FUTURE

We need a complete assessment of global education in the US to learn what is already happening. Who are the key players, not only the providers and practitioners, but also the audience? How do we then best connect them so that together we may have more impact?

We need to expand the dialog in the US. The first stage is to expand our dialog on the North American continent, with a view towards reaching out more globally.

My goal, in the not-too-distant future, is that all of us – and many more – are convening for an international conference such as this in the US. The presenters include representatives of US government and national education associations supporting US plans such as those presented by Katherine Quigley[11] and Minister Tom Kitt[12] on this stage yesterday.

All of you – and this conference – give me hope. The conference confirmed that there are good things happening in global education all over the world – including in the US. We are heading in the right direction. Thank you all for your support to lead us there.

VIEWS FROM THE CONFERENCE FLOOR

In the final plenary session there was a broad range of discussion and statements made from the floor by delegates from a wide range of countries. These included:

India – Ms Kumar. We need to find a common understanding of the term 'Global Education' and we also need to involve more people from the South. The conference gave a good opportunity for individual expression. She stated that she learned from the organisational aspect of the conference and that this would assist in her own planning back home.

Austria – Dr Steiner. The conference provided continuity from the Maastricht Conference and also offered opportunities for less-experienced people to learn from experienced. There were quite a few new faces at the conference. The emphasis on

---

[11] Department for Education and Skills, United Kingdom.
[12] Minister of State for Development Co-operation, Ireland.

'Quality' and 'Evaluation' as the theme/focus was useful. There was a good mix of theory and practice. Theoretical concepts from the South and more experiences from Eastern and Central Europe would have been good. The workshops and networking was good. A longer conference would have helped with networking. A key question for all of us is what do we want to achieve.

South Africa – Dr van der Merwe. Similarities between the experience of white South Africa and the experience of DE in the North. "I see the passion of hearts, I miss the guts"! We talk about injustice and poverty but miss an important element of DE/GE to take on the powers that create injustice and poverty. Pedagogy for the liberation from power is missing. Part of the partnership in global learning must be for the South to help the North address the corruption of power in the North.

Russia – Mr Kavtaradze. There is a need for a "Shift from belief to practice' – DE/GE is not a legal or structural organisation. Are there any limits to education? What is the connection between GE and power?

Kenya – Ms Tombo. DE is about something we do in the North for our communities to understand the world. There is a need to work on DE more globally to enable all to understand GE and the world.

Japan – Professor Tanaka. Japan is working with Nepalese, Korean, Indian, and Austrian colleagues to extend a similar network to GENE in the Asian-pacific region.

Cyprus – Ms Demetriadou-Saltet. There is a need to find a common definition and objectives for GE. We need to make greater use of the MDGs.

UK – Mr Woollcombe noted need for more professional curriculum evaluators who need to be involved to make GE mainstream.

Australia – Mr Lubett felt the conference has given renewed drive and commitment to building a just and sustainable society. He also pointed out that there is a North/South in each of our countries, and that there is a need to build inclusive models of practice to use as resources in each country.

Doug Bourn - Stated that the organisers tried to ground the conference in reality and not rhetoric. He emphasised the importance of solidarity and the need for international partnership. He also stated the important that such conferences have an impact in local contexts.

Annette Scheunpflug – Stated that GE has two backgrounds: political and educational. At this conference we emphasised our commitment to quality and the learning processes involved.

Liam Wegimont – Stated that an evaluation web page would be established to continue the work of GENE in this area.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Mr Henny Helmich,
Director, NCDO, Netherlands

Mr Henny Helmich congratulated the organisation behind the London GENE conference. He said he was impressed with where this process was coming from and where it was going. Some years ago, he stated, we came together forming the GENE network recognising that we need to share our ideas and learning more, to mobilise our energy together. It is important to know that partners in neighbouring countries are struggling with similar issues as ourselves, that we are not alone.

He stated that in today's world that people are very busy, doing what they have to do. Perhaps not so concerned about their neighbours, or certainly little time to be thinking about others. He alluded to what happened in France in the summer of 2003 during the heat wave. While this is a modern, highly developed, civilised state, many people (approximately 10,000), especially old people, died during the heat wave. It happened at a time when many people were on holidays, including the Government. The media speculated that people didn't really care so much about their neighbours. There is a level of truth in that argument in today's busy modern world. But there is also the case that people expect and want their privacy and distance in today's world - an opinion poll in France asked people what they expected of their neighbours, over a third of people responded – to be left alone. So, while we are living increasingly in a globalising society, many of us are also living in our own cocoons. Many business people travel the world for example, but expect the safe cocoon of the international hotel wherever they go.

But Mr Helmich argued, we should not overlook our interconnectedness, how much we all depend on each other for survival and moving forward. As a group, we in this field should continue to cooperate closely; we should continue to learn from each other, developing peer reviews of what we are doing in each country so international learning can be shared and further developed. We should keep our focus on the international development goals as a group. The progress and targets are never strong enough, but we should not give up what we have achieved, or to underestimate what we can achieve together in the future.

Mr Helmich stated that a very important message to take away with us from this conference is that we should fight cynicism and fight disempowerment. He also emphasised that this group of over 100 GE contacts from across Europe, that has been built up over the years, should maintain this momentum and build on it, we are not alone in our struggles in our own countries, we are all part of this broader group working towards a shared agenda. This conference has been another important step forward in our journey towards a better global society.

Appendix

List of participants

COUNCIL OF EUROPE MEMBER STATES

ALBANIA

Prof. Robert GJEDIA, Albanian Centre For Human Rights

Prof. Erlehta MATO, Institute of Pedagogical Research

AUSTRIA

Mr Franz HALBARTSCHLAGER, Südwind Agentur

Mr Helmuth HARTMEYER, KommEnt

Mr Christian KOGLER, Südwind Agentur

Dr Anna STEINER, Federal Ministry of Education, Science and Culture

BELGIUM

Ms Brigitte GAIFFE, ITECO

CYPRUS

Mrs Valentina DEMETRIADOU-SALTET, Ap. Petrou & Pavlon Lyceum

FINLAND

Ms Anisa DOTY, KEPA Service Centre for Development Co-operation

Mr Jari KIVISTÖ, Board of Education

Ms Rilli LAPPALAINEN, KEPA

Mr Christian SUNDGREN, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA

Ms Emilija PUZDERLIEVA, Active for Independent Initiative – AII

FRANCE

Mr Christian HUGUES, Évalua

Mr Alain MOUCHOUX, CSEE / ETUCE

GEORGIA

Ms Manana DEVIDZE, Caucasus Environment NGO

GERMANY

Dr Barbara ASBRAND, University of Nuremberg

Mr Steffen BEITZ, VENRO

Ms Claudia BERGMÜLLER, University of Nuremberg

Ms Kerstin GÖEBEL, German Institute for International Education

Dr Hermann-Günter HESSE, German Institute for International Education

Mr Matthias HUBER, University of Nuremberg

Prof. Annette SCHEUNPFLUG, University of Nuremberg

Dr Gregor LANG-WOJTASIK, University of Nuremberg

Mr Norbert NOISSER, BMZ

Ms Hannes SIEGE, InWEnt

Mr Christian WILMSEN, BMZ

GREECE

Mr Christos CHRISTIDIS, GAIA Education Centre

Ms Vasiliki MALOTIDI, MIO-ECSDE

IRELAND

Ms Barbara WILSON, Development Co-operation Ireland

Mr Ultan WALDRON, Department of Foreign Affairs

Mr David DONOHUE, Development Co-operation Ireland

Minister Tom KITT, Department of Foreign Affairs

Mr John LAWTON, Development Co-operation Ireland

ITALY

Dr Alessio SURIAN, Consultant

LATVIA

Ms Diana SHULGA, University of Latvia

LITHUANIA

Ms Laima GALKUTE, Regional Environmetal Centre

MALTA

Mr Vince CARUANA, KOPIN network

NETHERLANDS

Mr Gerard LOMMERSE, Alice O

Mr Henny HELMICH, NCDO

Ms Elizabeth VAN DER STEENHOVEN, NCDO

NORWAY

Mr John JONES, IGNIS

Mr Arnfinn NYGAARD, RORG

POLAND

Mr Andrzej JAMIOLKOWSKI, Accreditation Commission - N. Copernicus
University

Ms Irmina ROZKIEWICZ, Ministry of National Education

PORTUGAL

Ms Mariana ALVES, FCT - University of Lisbon

Dr Sérgio GUIMARÃES, IPAD

Ms Alexandra SANTOS, Plataforma Portuguesa NGOs

ROMANIA

Mr Eugen GHERGA, Intercultural Institute Timisoara

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Mr Dimitry KAVTARADZE, MSU

SLOVAKIA

Mr Milan SINDLER, Slovak Development NGO Platform

SLOVENIA

Ms Terrice BASSLER, OSEP-SEE

Ms Zlatka ERNST, Ministry of Education

SPAIN

Mr Esteban DE LA PEÑA MARTÍN – VENTAS, Ministry of Education

SWEDEN

Ms Josefina LÖFGREN, Life-Link

SWITZERLAND

Mr Richard HELBLING, Foundation for Education and Development

UNITED KINGDOM

Mr Julian ASSELIN, Peace Child International

Ms Huda Yoshida AL-KHAIZARAN, Institute of Education, University of London

Mr John ADDISON, Link Community Development

Ms Rachel BIRKBECK, British Council

Dr Doug BOURN, Development Education Association

Ms Frances BURNS, DFID

Mr John CARLESS, Africa Children's Club

Ms Anna COLQUHOUN, Link Community Development

Mr Alan CRANSTON, DfES

Mr John DAVIDSON, Development Education Association Chair

Ms Karen DAVIES, Plan International

Mr Pete DAVIS, CONCORD/ Oxfam GB / Europe DE Forum

Ms Jane EVANS, Institute of Education, University of London

Ms Moira FAUL, Oxfam

Ms Jenny FAWDRY, DEA

Ms Helen GARFORTH, One World Week

Mr Mike GREEN, DFID

Ms Angela GRUNSELL, Oxfam

Ms Sandy HENDERSON, British Council

Ms Sarah HEYES, DEED

Mr Katushige KATAYAMA

Ms Kazuyo IGARASHI, Institute of Education, University of London

Mr Leszek IWASKOW, OFSTED

Ms Greta JENSEN

Ms Patricia KILLINGLEY, British Council

Ms Jeannette LANGI, CODAC/PADEAP

Prof. Angela LITTLE, Institute of Eduation, University of London

Ms Ai MATSUBAYASHI, Institute of Education, University of London

Ms Aileen MCKENZIE, DEA

Ms Nadia MCKENZIE, DEA

Ms Sue MCCABE, VSO

Mr Gerard MCCANN, St Mary's University College

Mr Stephen MCCLOSKEY, One World Centre

Dr Katy NEWELL JONES, Consultant

Ms Kellie PEARSON, DfES

Ms Phillida PURVIS, Links Japan

Ms Katherine QUIGLEY, DfES

Ms Jane RENTON, HMI Scotland

Mr Harry RICE, Glasgow University

Dr Alison SCOTT-BAUMANN, University of Gloucester

Ms Phyllis THOMPSON, DEA

Mr Greig WHITEHEAD, GlosDEC

Mr David Woollcombe, Peace Child International

Ms Hiromi YAMASHITA, University of Birmingham

Ms Helen YOUNG, DEA

OBSERVER STATES TO THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE

JAPAN

Ms Sasaki AKIKO, DEAR

Prof. Hiroyasu IWASAKI, DEAR

Mr Aiichiro YAMAMOTO, Resident Representative, JICA UK

Mr YUMOTO, DEAR

Mr Fujiwara TAKAAKI

Prof. TANAKA, DEAR

Mr Yasu SHIGETA, DEAR

Mr Eno NAKAMURA, DEAR

Ms Kumiko KAITANI, The Japan Foundation

USA

Ms Anne BAKER, National Peace Corps Association / DEA-USA

Mr Stephen GOODIN, NetAid

PARTICIPANTS FROM THE SOUTH

Ms Subha KUMAR,INDIA

Ms Hellen SAMBILI, KENYA

Ms Hellen TOMBO, KYCEP, KENYA

Mr Stiaan VAN DER MERWE, VDM Consultancy, SOUTH AFRICA

Mr Charles NHERERA, Chinhoyi University, ZIMBABWE

OTHER COUNTRIES

AUSTRALIA

Mr Roland LUBETT, LAST-FIRST NETWORKS

NORTH-SOUTH CENTRE

Mr Edward O'LOUGHLIN

Mr Liam WEGIMONT

Contributions

GENE - Global Education Network Europe

is the European network of national agencies for support, co-ordination and funding of global education.

This report contains the proceedings and papers from the GENE London Conference *Learning for a Global Society*, which brought together key practitioners, academics and policymakers from countries of Europe and further a-field to share perspectives and good practice around *issues of evaluation and quality in global and development education*.

The report gives access to a wide variety of papers and perspectives, from experts and practitioners on issues such as:

• The national and international policy contexts for evaluation in global education.
• The Millennium Development Goals and evaluation in global education.
• Learning contexts for improving global education.
• Learning through evaluation.
• Global education, public opinion, public awareness and campaigning.
• Innovative practices in evaluation in global education.
• Southern involvement in evaluation of global education in Europe.

In conjunction with the growing resource base on the theory and practice of evaluation in global education, initiated on the North-South Centre website www.nscentre.org, this report is intended to assist all – students, practitioners, theorists and policymakers – in the quest for improved and increased global education.

North-South Centre

of the Council of Europe
Tel. +351 21 358 40 30 • **Fax** +351 21 358 40 37

Website:
www.nscentre.org
www.globaleducationeurope.net