

# Global Citizenship Education in the post 2015 Framework for Action: **Taking the Agenda Forward**

## Summary of Sessions 3 and 4

**Aaron Benavot**  
Director EFA GMR

## Session 3

- 1. Introduction:** Mr Aaron Benavot
- 2. NGO Perspective:** Mr Rilli Lappalainen (Finland) representing EU consortium of NGOs CONCORD/deeep.org
- 3. Regional Perspective:** Mr. Jorge Sequeira of UNESCO Santiago
- 4. National Perspective:** Mr Fady Yarak, Director-General of Education, Ministry of Education and Higher Education, Lebanon
- 5. Learner and Youth Perspective:** Mr Rolando Villamero (Philippines)

## Key Points from Session 3

There are different kind of challenges that the FoA needs to articulate at each level: global, regional, national, sub national.

Authentic stakeholder engagement: Important to speak to the concerns and perspectives of ordinary citizens in relation to GCED to improve FFA

Carefully consider a too close adherence to particular concepts: Perhaps a consensus definition of GCE is difficult and more consensus can emerge about principles (empathy, solidarity, justice, non-violence, etc.).

Need for local contextualization: What does it mean to have GCED in a country where the notion of national identity is contested and under construction due to massive influx of refugees from bordering countries?

How do you develop an idea of citizenship education where there is no peaceful relations and basic enabling conditions of education and schooling are lacking

While key to integrate active participation of young people and youth, is GCED not also relevant to children and out of school children and what can be done to involve them in GCED processes.

These points should be addressed in Framework for Action

## Three concurrent group discussions

- 1. Policy and Governance**
- 2. Quality and Effective Delivery**
- 3. Monitoring Evaluation and Research**

# Key Summary Points for Session 4

## Group 1: Policy & governance

Overarching message is that GCED should involve diverse multi-stakeholder engagement: not just governments, but teachers, young people, community leaders, universities, and others.

Many expressed dissatisfaction with FFA, what was perceived as “too cozy and conventional” UN language, not sufficiently recognizing threats of armed conflicts and violence.

To address such threats need to engage with civil society organization and with actors representing diverse cultures and values.

The wording “actions needed” was seen as misleading and too normative. Actions need reordering.

It was pointed out that GCED rests on non-particularistic principles, and a *secular* foundation that acknowledges plural and distinctive world view.

The strategies miss non-educational actors such as media and non-education NGOs. Need to move away from the ‘comfort zones’ of the education policy community.

# Key Summary Points

## **Group 2: Quality & effective delivery**

There is a need to contextualize learning for greater ownership. For localized delivery and action, ensuring flexibility is necessary so that GCED can be adapted and responsive to different cultural and social contexts.

The key question is how to engage active learning around these topics and issues. Not just an issue of content but also of form of GCED: What is nature of school and classroom climate in which GCED issues are discussed and taught: less text- and teacher-centered; more learner centered

There is a need for a national coordination mechanism involving teacher education institutions, UN agencies, NGOs, CBOs, ECCE institutions, etc. so that GCED can be integrated across the entire education system to ensure capacity building.

Private sector engagement in the GCED discussions is important, eg through World Economic Forum.

As GCED is about challenging the status quo, engaging leadership at the high level is necessary in critical and constructive manner.

GCED intrinsically exemplifies equity, inclusion, social justice and gender equality.

# Key Summary Points

## **Group 3: Monitoring, evaluation and research (1)**

This group carefully scrutinized the FFA, especial section on GCEd, and made detailed suggestions to improve the document:

“Expected changes” (second column) should go beyond “solid data is available...”. What is needed is “Robust systems and institutional mechanisms are in place that support monitoring, evaluation and research on GCED and ESD.”

Building on existing tools is not sufficient. There is a need to contextualize them.

What is missing is monitoring of the education system as a whole (for example, assess whether education sector strategies and plans are ensuring that curriculum, teaching and learning resources, teacher education, etc. are in line with the requirement to foster knowledge, skills, values and attitudes to establish sustainable and peaceful societies [see the second bullet point in the “Policies and Governance” strategic area of the draft Guiding Principles and Strategies for National Implementation]). Monitoring should be mentioned in the “policy and governance” strategic area as well.

## **Group 3: Monitoring, evaluation and research (2)**

In the first bullet point, “widely promote available good policy, practice and good quality learning and teaching materials” should be rewritten as “critically evaluate (or encourage research on) policy, curriculum, practice, learning and teaching materials in order to identify gaps and areas of improvement”. Gap analysis should be part of the monitoring mechanism.

Academics and practitioners are important stakeholders.

A national taskforce consisting of all relevant stakeholders should be established. Young people can be involved in monitoring using ICTs (as it is an effective way to collect micro data and also they are the least corruptible agents). The potential of participatory monitoring should be explored.

# Key Summary Points

## **Specific Recommendations on UNESCO's role to further GCEd emerging from all three working groups:**

An important role for UNESCO is to provide a platform that promotes inter-regional exchanges, intra-regional activities and mutual learning. The newly established Clearinghouse can contribute to this purpose. UNESCO should make GCEd materials widely available, including translating existing materials, and share good practices. All of these actions will help build capacities at the national level.

UNESCO can ensure the legitimacy of GCED and ESD through political processes with Ministers of Education and other high level officials. For example, GCED can build on the Global Action Programme on ESD, which was acknowledged by the UN General Assembly as the follow up to the UN Decade of ESD.

UNESCO can enhance its role as a convener and connector of CGEd related networks.

UNESCO can mobilize UNESCO Chairs, National Commissions, Associated School Project, etc.

UNESCO can engage with other UN agencies and with civil society

# EFA Global Monitoring Report

Education for All

**Thank you!**

To contact **Aaron Benavot**:  
**[a.benavot@unesco.org](mailto:a.benavot@unesco.org)**