

# Quality in Global Education

An Overview of Evaluation Policy  
and Practice



# Quality in Global Education

## An Overview of Evaluation Policy and Practice

Compiled and Edited by

Eddie O'Loughlin  
and Liam Wegimont



**GENE** – Global Education Network Europe is the network of Ministries, Agencies and other bodies with national responsibility for Global Education in Europe. GENE supports networking, peer learning, policy research, national strategy development and quality enhancement. GENE works to increase and improve Global Education, towards the day when all people in Europe will have access to quality Global Education.

*The opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the official views of GENE or of the Ministries or Agencies associated with GENE.*

## GENE

Global Education Network Europe

Head Office  
Mauritskade 63  
1090 GA  
Amsterdam  
Netherlands

info@gene.eu  
www.gene.eu

Editors: Eddie O'Loughlin and Liam Wegimont

Design: Largo, Lisbon

Printing: Grafilinha

ISBN 978-989-96024-0-3

GENE, November 2008



Printed on Munken Lynx wood free uncoated paper, fulfilling the requirements for the Swan, The Nordic eco-label.

# Contents

<b>Foreword</b>	7
<b>Chapter 1 . Policy Frameworks for Enhanced Quality in Global Education</b>	9
<i>Liam Wegimont and Eddie O'Loughlin</i>	
1.1 Introduction	11
1.2 Arguments for increased political support and improved policy frameworks	12
1.3 The Maastricht Congress on Global Education (2002)	13
1.4 The Brussels Conference on Awareness-Raising and Development Education (2005)	14
1.5 The Helsinki Conference on European Development Education (2006)	14
1.6 The European Consensus Document on Development Education (2008)	15
1.7 Progress in the Past Decade on Policy Frameworks for Quality.	16
<b>Chapter 2 . Evaluating Global Education in a number of European countries – some case studies</b>	17
<i>Helmuth Hartmeyer and Petra Löber</i>	
2.1 Introduction	19
2.2 Overview	19
2.3 A South Evaluation of Global Education in Norway	20
2.4 The DEA “Measuring Effectiveness” Programme	21
2.5 The BLK Model Project “Education 21” Evaluation Report	23
2.6 The EED Evaluation Handbook	24
2.7 Evaluation and Quantitative Methods in Global Learning: A contribution from the field of Intercultural Sensitivity: DIPE, Germany.	25
2.8 Internalising Evaluation Results through Learning: ECDPM, the Netherlands.	26
2.9 Learning from External Evaluations – the Austrian experience.	28
2.10 Recommendations from the Survey of Evaluations for Evaluation Practice	29
<b>Chapter 3 . Evaluation in Global Education at a European level</b>	31
<i>Eddie O'Loughlin</i>	
3.1 The Nurnberg Seminar	33
3.2 The London Conference	35
3.3 The European Global Education Peer Review process	36
3.4 DEEEP workshops on evaluation in development education	40
<b>Chapter 4 . Issues of Quality and Evaluation in Global Education: Trends and Challenges</b>	45
<i>Liam Wegimont</i>	
1. Introduction	47
2. The Changing Policy and Practice Context of Evaluation and Quality Improvement in Global Education – Trends Emerging	47
3. Other trends in quality and Evaluation in Global Education	49
4. Challenges	49



# Foreword

This short publication brings together a number of summaries, policy excerpts, project reports and overviews of evaluation and quality enhancement initiatives in the fields of global and development education. The volume provides the reader with a broad spectrum of evaluation initiatives in the fields of global and development education. Through a review of summary reports on specific projects and workshops, on national level initiatives, and on international processes, conferences and commitments, it highlights good practice, summarises lessons learnt and identifies key challenges.

It begins by outlining in Chapter 1 the policy context to date in Europe and examines the overall policy framework for increased and improved global education in European countries. Chapter 2 goes on to present a range of Global Education case studies from different European countries, and is based on a survey of such evaluations, previously carried out on behalf of GENE and BMZ – the German Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development. This is followed by an overview, in Chapter 3, of a number of initiatives at a European level aimed at strengthening evaluation. Finally, Chapter 4 presents some trends that can be discerned and some challenges that are emerging in the field of evaluation of Global Education.

As editors we wish to acknowledge BMZ, INWENT, and the OECD for their support in the development of an earlier version of parts of this publication<sup>1</sup>. In particular, the support and work of Anita Reddy (INWENT), and the work of Ida McDonnell (OECD) in related fields, is much appreciated. We would also like to thank Professor Annette Scheunpflug and her team in the University Fredrich-Alexander, Erlangen Nurnberg for her vision in the field of evaluation in Global Education. Finally, Helmut Hartmeyer and Petra Lober, not only for their work in Chapter 2, but also for Helmut's feedback on previous drafts, and for his constant attention to quality and the conversations and inspiration in this regard over many years.

This publication is intended to provide – in an accessible form – a useable summary of some policy and practice resources available in the field of quality enhancement, improvement, and evaluation of global and development education over the last number of years. It follows previous contributions of GENE – in particular through the Nurnberg Expert Seminar on Quality and Evaluation in Global Education (March 2003) and the London Conference Learning for a Global Society (September 2003)

---

<sup>1</sup> An earlier version of parts of this book were originally compiled by the editors in an unpublished Background Paper prepared for the OECD and BMZ Informal Experts Workshop Development Communication, Advocacy and Education: Tips and Tools for Improving Evaluation, Bonn, 19-20 March 2007, entitled Global Education, Public Awareness- Raising and Campaigning on Development Issues: An Overview of Evaluation Practice and Policy.

- to promote networking and policy learning in the field of evaluation, for increased and improved global education.

Five years since the London Conference much has changed. There is increased policy support for evaluation in Global Education – and increased political and funding support for global and development education in many European and OECD countries. But there also remain many challenges to the achievement of universal, quality Global Education.

The assertion that Global Education hasn't yet proved its worth is still voiced in some quarters. This assertion can at times be ascribed to a lack of knowledge of the breath of the field, and at times comes from mistaken assumptions regarding the nature of proof, and the difference between evaluation in development, evaluation in communication, and evaluation in education. We hope that through the forging of alliances, greater understanding can be accomplished.

We also recall the distinction made by the Canadian evaluator, Brad Cousins, who captured aptly the distinction between “evaluation as proving that it works, and evaluation as working to improve”. We may need both, but, in this volume, we concentrate on the latter. It is hoped that this publication might, when read together with other work in the field and in related fields, provide a modest contribution from existing resources to further enhance evaluation for Global Education.

Eddie O'Loughlin  
Liam Wegimont

Editors



▲ *Chapter 1*

Policy Frameworks for  
Enhanced Quality in  
Global Education

*Eddie O'Loughlin and Liam Wegimont*



## ▲ Chapter 1

# Political and Policy Frameworks for Enhanced Quality in Global Education

## 1.1 Introduction

As long as there have been efforts to educate people about justice issues, and to relate peoples particular concerns to more universal and global concerns involving humanity as a whole, there have also been concerns about doing it better, about reaching more people, about quality, about improvement, about, in other words, evaluation.

While these efforts have existed, and been reflected on for millennia, the specific efforts of development and global education have a more recent, if not unrelated history. Some would chart these histories to the 1960s and 70s, with the advent of development discourse and critical reflection on development practice.

During the 1980s and 90s, the work of Non-governmental Development Organisations (NGDOs) and governments began increasingly to focus on development education, information and awareness-raising. Some NGDOs and indeed some governments<sup>1</sup> strongly supported the work of development education, information and awareness-raising. At the same time many involved in these efforts during the 1980s and 1990s – at both NGDO and government levels - would have struggled to ensure that these issues remained visible as pertinent to the development agenda, and would have struggled to ensure adequate budgets and political support. Policy frameworks, while growing, remained weak.

In the mid to late 1990s, work in a number of European and other OECD countries, led in some instances by NGDOs, in others by governments, in some by intermediary agencies<sup>2</sup> or educational institutions, led to increased recognition of the need for strengthened policy frameworks, political commitment and funding for the work. Since the late 1990s, many OECD countries have seen the work of global education, awareness-raising, and information move from the periphery, to a more central role in development discourse, practice, policy and funding.

---

1 Most notably countries that actively supported development education with relatively significant budgets included the Netherlands, Luxembourg, Sweden, Norway, Switzerland, Austria and Germany in Europe, and Australia and Canada.

2 Such as the NCDO in the Netherlands, the NCDE in Ireland, KommEnt in Austria, the Swiss Foundation for Education and Development in Switzerland, etc.

## 1.2 Arguments for increased political support and improved policy frameworks

A number of arguments were put forward in support of this centrality. These arguments have elsewhere been characterised in the following different perspectives:

- ▲ *Global society citizenry arguments:* the needs of citizens in a global society to understand global processes, and the development and international solidarity agenda within these global processes;
- ▲ *Democratic requirement:* public spending on development co-operation requires a public educated in the issues surrounding development co-operation; lack of spending on Global Education can lead to a democratic deficit.
- ▲ *Good sustainable development requirement:* for development to work, it requires ownership – not only by Southern governments and peoples, but also by Northern publics. Critical knowledge by Northern publics ensures greater scrutiny and clearer development priorities.
- ▲ *Public opinion research:* while there are differing levels of support for development co-operation, and knowledge and awareness of development issues, in different countries; public opinion research suggests that there is in each donor country a gap between deep public support for development co-operation (universally strong) and shallow public knowledge of development issues (universally weak);
- ▲ *Human Security Arguments:* since September 11th 2001, there have been increasing calls for greater international solidarity to increase human security in the South, in order to increase public security in the North; and increasingly, a recognition that such solidarity will not be achieved without increased awareness and knowledge in the North of the realities of life, and the underlying causes of inequity, in the South.<sup>3</sup>

The early years of this decade saw increased political will in relation to global development, and some political support for the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). This has added political impetus to the argument that there can be no achievement of particular development goals without an informed and critically aware public in European and OECD countries. This, along with strategic work by global and development education advocates, has led to a strengthened policy climate, at both national and international level.

Together with this growth in centrality, mainstreaming and policy support frameworks, comes a growing emphasis on quality, on improvement and on evaluation, variously understood. A number of Congresses and Conferences early in this decade made sig-

---

<sup>3</sup> This analysis was first suggested in Höck, S and Wegimont, L (eds) ( National Structures for the organisation, Support and Funding of Development Education: A Comparative Analysis KommEnt/North-South Centre, Vienna/Lisbon

nificant strides towards stronger policy frameworks and support for these areas at national and international level, and twinned the need for more and greater development and global education, information and awareness, with the need for better practice, improved quality, and greater visibility of effect. The main achievements in these Conferences and their outcomes in relation to Global Education – particularly in the field of evaluation - are outlined below.

### 1.3 The Maastricht Congress on Global Education in Europe to 2015

The “European Congress on Global Education to 2015”, was convened in November 2002 in Maastricht. It drew on the political impetuses of the need for public support for the Millennium Development Goals, and the possibilities inherent in the World Summit on Sustainable Development and its subsequent Decade of Education for Sustainable Development to focus attention on the potential and promise of Global Education. Drawing together governments, civil society, parliamentarians and local and regional representatives from across Europe, and involving a modest Southern participation, the Congress led to the Maastricht Declaration on Improving and Increasing Global Education in Europe to 2015. This Congress was something of a milestone in the growth of Global Education in Europe in that it:

- Drew attention to the political necessity of support for Global Education as a prerequisite for critical public engagement with global development and sustainability issues;
- Focused commitment on European and national strategies, providing space for national actors to begin the process of development of national strategies, including strategies for improvement, quality and evaluation;
- Called for the establishment of a European Peer Review system for Global Education, and for a target percentage of national Overseas Development Aid commitments to be devoted to Global Education.

The Maastricht Declaration was significant in relation to a policy framework for Global Education in that it firmly embedded the notion of the right to quality Global Education for all citizens as a benchmark for progress in the achievement of Global Education. Increased provision was linked to improved provision. A rights-based, universalist approach to Global Education was wedded to issues of quality, improvement and evaluation<sup>4</sup>.

---

4 For a further analysis of the growth of the universalist, rights-based approach to advocacy in Global Education, see Chapter 4 below.

## 1.4 The Brussels Conference - European Conference on Awareness-Raising and Development Education for North-South Solidarity

The Brussels Conference took place in May 2005. Bringing together a wide range of national administrations, national and international organisations, and civil society representatives, and building on a previous resolution of the Development Ministers of the European Union, the Conference focused on the fact that, in the words of the final conclusions document of the Conference - *“effective development education and awareness raising are essential conditions to mobilise support to reach... targets...such as the MDGS and ODA targets“*.

The Conference focused on a number of issues crucial to the increase and improvement of public awareness-raising on development issues, global and development education, including:

- ▲ The need for coherent national strategies, and for coherence between national and European strategies;
- ▲ The need to integrate these perspectives across policy fields, including education;
- ▲ The need to ensure adequate resources for these areas, including target-setting.

A key focus of the recommendations of the Conference was the issue of quality and effectiveness in the areas under consideration.

The Conference concluded that:

*“As part of the overall need to raise...quality and efficiency, best practices should be actively encouraged and supported, particularly between Member states but also internationally. Ongoing coordination and cooperation, learning from past experiences at the widest possible level is therefore essential to ensure coherence and maximise effectiveness<sup>5</sup>.”*

The Brussels Conference participants also agreed that:

*“Building on existing experiences, increased efforts have to be made to improve monitoring and evaluation of development education and awareness raising activities in order to systematically enhance their overall relevance, efficiency and effectiveness.”*

## 1.5 The Helsinki Conference on European Development Education

The Helsinki Conference, convened under the auspices of the Finnish presidency of the EU in June 2006, again put development education and awareness-raising at the very centre of the development agenda. It was symbolically important that Finland chose

---

<sup>5</sup> See Chapter 3 below for more on international peer learning for quality enhancement.

to launch its presidency in the field of development cooperation with a Conference on development education and awareness-raising. It built on what the final declaration of the Conference described as

*“...the growing political commitment and strengthened policy in the field of development education and awareness-raising, at European and national level, inter alia, through the Development Education Resolution of the EU Council of Development Ministers (2001), the Maastricht Declaration (2002), the Palermo Process (2003), the Brussels Conference (2005) and the European Consensus on Development (2005).”*<sup>6</sup>

Participants from national ministries, agencies, EU institutions, European civil society, international organizations, local and regional authorities, and research institutes, ensured attention was given to a number of issues considered politically crucial to the fields of global and development education and information. First among them was the issue of quality and effectiveness.

## **1.6 The European Multi-stakeholder Task Force and the Consensus Document on Development Education**

Largely as a result of the impetus of the various development education projects and Conferences under the auspices of the various presidencies of the EU, and in particular the Belgian and Finnish Presidencies mentioned above, along with the presidencies of Germany, Portugal and Slovenia, a Consensus document on Development Education and Awareness Raising was developed and launched in late 2007. A European multi stakeholder steering group on development education (DE) was created on the initiative of the 2006 Helsinki conference and included members and representatives from European institutions, member state governments, international organisations and civil society. This steering group developed the Consensus document which outlines objectives, principles, target groups, challenges and recommendations in the field of development education (DE) and awareness-raising. The document identifies:

*“The need to...evaluate and to assess the impact and quality. Including through greater collaboration and shared learning between European, state and civil society actors, in order to increase the scope and impact of the work done”*<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> Helsinki Conference, Final Declaration, Preamble, paragraph 1

<sup>7</sup> Section 9.4. For access to the documents in a variety of European languages see [http://ec.europa.eu/development/center/publication/descript/pub99\\_fr.cfm](http://ec.europa.eu/development/center/publication/descript/pub99_fr.cfm) accessed 30th October 2008. The English version is also available at [www.gene-eu/policy](http://www.gene-eu/policy)

## 1.7 Progress in the Past Decade on Policy Frameworks for Enhanced Quality

The early years of this century have seen a growing recognition of the centrality of global and development education and public awareness-raising of development issues within the development agenda<sup>8</sup>. Starting with the development education resolution of the Committee of Development Ministers in November 2000, and through the Maastricht Congress, the Palermo process, the Brussels Conference, and the Helsinki Conference, is a red thread of growing political and policy consensus.

The conclusions of these processes – and the growing number of national initiatives and strategies on which they were based and which they reflected - made it clear that issues of global and development education and awareness-raising on development issues had come in from the cold, so to speak. These areas are now recognised as central rather than peripheral to the development agenda – a position that many advocates working in the 1990s might only have dreamt of. Indeed it is no exaggeration to say that there is a recognition that it is impossible to progress a global development agenda without recognising the key importance of an informed and educated public in the developed world.

At the same time, it is also clear that if there is to be universal access to quality global and development education and information, then that requires both *more* and *better*, both *increased* and *improved* provision. Recognition of the need for more adequate resources and stronger political and policy support, goes hand in hand with recognition of the need for more adequate evaluation and quality enhancement.

We now move from the changing policy framework of global and development education and awareness-raising, and the increasing recognition of the need for evaluation and quality within these processes, to look more specifically at some case studies of evaluation of global and development education in a number of European countries. The following section is the work of Helmuth Hartmeyer and Petra Löber, updated by the current editors, with the permission of the original authors.

---

<sup>8</sup> This of course mirrors a similar movement towards the recognition of the importance of issues of global justice to education policy and provision per se, and also to the global financial and economic system, to environment policy, to ethics, etc. On the growing importance of global issues to education policy, see, for example, the OECD Centre for Educational Research in Education (2008), *Trends Shaping Education 2008*, OECD, Paris, 2008. See also Olsen, M. Codd, J. and O'Neill, A. (2004) *Education Policy: Globalisation, Citizenship and Democracy*, Sage, London.



## ▲ *Chapter 2*

# Evaluating Global and Development Education in a number of European countries

Some case studies

*Helmuth Hartmeyer and Petra Löber*



## ▲ Chapter 2

# Evaluating Global and Development Education in a number of European countries

## Some case studies

### 2.1. Introduction<sup>9</sup>

This chapter has two aims:

1. To identify, stock-take and describe partners, organisations, resource persons and publications within European organisations and networks dealing with evaluation of global and development education (GE/DE). Drawing from conceptual papers, reports and face to face discussions, a number of models, concepts and processes in the evaluation of GE/DE within the selected projects and publications are portrayed. Success and drawbacks, questions of ownership and learning processes as well as the various set-ups are described and reflected upon.
2. To draw first conclusions from these experiences and to formulate questions for further discussion.

The main idea is to share experiences and perspectives on issues of quality of global education and development education (GE/DE) and to develop strategies on how to ensure that evaluation and quality improvement become part of our practice.

### 2.2 Overview

#### **The implementation of evaluation in European countries - examples and experiences**

The following overview shows two things:

1. Evaluation in GE and DE is still very young and new, and its future looks very interesting and potentially fruitful;
2. There is a broad variety in concepts and results among organisations and projects in different countries.

It should therefore not be surprising that the basis of the study is also very varied. It relies on evaluation reports, handbooks for evaluation, interim reports and draft papers of lectures.

---

<sup>9</sup> This chapter is based on European study previously conducted by Helmuth Hartmeyer and Petra Löber on behalf of GENE (Global Education Network Europe) & BMZ (the German Ministry of Economic Co-operation and Development).

## 2.3 A South Evaluation of Global Education in Norway

### Background

In Norway development education (DE) is closely linked to development aid projects and has a 50 year old history of 'aid for poor countries' (started in 1953). NORAD (Norwegian Agency for Development Co-operation) was founded in 1968 and was also entrusted with the responsibility for official information on issues related to development, including funding agreements with Non-governmental Organisations (NGOs). Since the 1990s the RORG-network (RORG – acronym in Norwegian for 'framework agreement organisation') has managed to establish itself as the main support structure for development education NGOs in Norway.<sup>10</sup> Today there is close contact and co-operation between NORAD and the RORG network. Basically the RORG network argues for development education to be given a more prominent role in south policy and for it to be based on 'a comprehensive North/South perspective'.

The 'South evaluation' undertaken by the RORG-network in 2002<sup>11</sup> represents an external evaluation by the prime stakeholders of development work. Regarding the fact that RORG deals with North-South issues and wishes to promote 'voices from the South' representing southern views and perspectives in Norway as much as possible, the RORG-network decided in 2001 to subject itself to an evaluation from 'the South'.

The RORG network argues that this kind of approach and process should become a fixture in the organisational life of Northern development organisations. The main goal of the evaluation was to prove the usefulness of the Millennium Development Goals as a common reference for development education as viewed from 'the South'.

### Overview of the Process

The evaluation focused on the development education activities of members of the RORG-network and also on the work of the network itself. The evaluation team consisted of Ms Naty Bernardino from the Philippines, Dr Alejandro Bendaña from Nicaragua and the project co-ordinator Dr Stiaan van der Merwe from South Africa.

Further participation by partners in the South was made possible through questionnaires, discussions and visits. The terms of reference as well as the outlines for contractual obligations were developed in a bilateral and protracted process of mutual consultation. From April to June 2002 responses to a questionnaire developed by the Southern participants were collected and were finally discussed at an interactive round table of Southern participants with RORG member organisations.

In August 2003 the RORG-network steering group discussed a follow-up reflection process in order to ensure that the outcomes from the evaluation remained vibrant and decided to work out three joint documents. These documents were focused on

---

10 For further information on RORG see [www.rorg.no](http://www.rorg.no)

11 RORG-network "A South Evaluation of a Northern development-related organisation", Oslo 2002.

1. The understanding of the concept of development education by the member organisations
2. A common understanding of co-operation with the South (Why, with Whom and How); and
3. A revised “vision and mission” for the RORG-network.

## **Issues Emerging**

Initially there was mutual suspicion from North to South as well as from South to North. Development education in ‘the North’ in general was something to which the participants from ‘the South’ were not only totally unfamiliar with, but also fundamentally suspicious of. In addition to that a language gap existed. High levels of uncertainty and a lack of clarity in the use of various terms had to be removed first. This situation guided the process and forced it to focus on fundamental qualitative issues and questions. The openness towards change, flexibility in management and a “healthy degree of mutual trust” finally carried the project beyond difficulties.

The experiences that emerged from the evaluation raised questions relating to North-South organisational co-operation, e.g. “Who or what represents the ‘authentic voice of the South’? To whom is ‘the North’ accountable to in ‘the South’?”

It also raises the question of why experts from the South should be in a better position to judge upon work in the North and whether this somehow reverses the old concept of development aid “come and tell us how to do it”.

## **Lessons learned**

In the case of South evaluations of Northern development education it is even more necessary to work carefully and cautiously. All participants in the process have to be open to creative changes and not to use an evaluation only to legitimise their own work.

Everyone should be aware that it may be a partly painful process, but “constructive pain”. This is true of any evaluation process but within a South evaluation it gains new and hitherto unknown importance and relevance for participants.

## **2.4 The Development Education Association (DEA) “Measuring Effectiveness” Programme.**

### **Background**

The Development Education Association (DEA) “Measuring Effectiveness in Development Education” project started in 1999 and lasted two years<sup>12</sup>. The results were

---

<sup>12</sup> Further information on the DEA is available at [www.dea.org.uk](http://www.dea.org.uk)

published in a brochure in September 2001. That publication is the basis for the following summarising description.

## Overview of the Process

The project was an action research project and used a consultative approach including seminars and discussions with key stakeholders involved in development education in the UK. A range of differing pilot projects were identified by DEA members – chosen from different sectors, and also chosen in order to show a range of evaluation approaches, such as formative or summative evaluations. An open-end approach was adopted, in which members of the DEA project team worked as ‘critical friends’ with the organisations.

According to the project, there is an easily accessible definition for measuring effectiveness. “To measure effectiveness is to assess the extent to which shifts have taken place that support our goals”<sup>13</sup>. One of the main goals of the project was to develop the capacities of organisations and practitioners in development education to plan and evaluate their development education work effectively. The result, nevertheless, provides “no checklist”, but instead an adaptable framework. It should help development educators to improve their practice.

The project proposes tools to assist practitioners in devising ways of measuring the effectiveness of their programmes. Therefore it should help to identify evaluation priorities and enable those involved to be able to recognise and differentiate between key performance areas.

## Issues Arising

The Measuring Effectiveness project proposes to the practitioners to consider the three principles of ‘WHY’, ‘WHAT’ and ‘HOW’. Within this framework, various evaluation questions and types of evaluation need to be recognised. Why is an organisation embarking on a development education programme; what is the programme trying to achieve; and how are you going to achieve your targets and goals? Asking “why?” encourages thinking regarding the rationale for the initiative, its desired impact, the values, attitudes and actions it wishes to be seen. Considering “what?” helps to decide the focus of the initiative in terms of knowledge, key skills, the learning process and outcomes, and the agendas that form the content of the work. Looking at the “how?” prepares for the implementation of the initiative, and the level of organisational performance that needs to occur. What is needed in any programme is to ensure that the links and connections with the bigger ‘why’ of development education are made. Practitioners should recognise that evaluation is by its very nature a political process.

---

13 Measuring Effectiveness in Development Education. DEA, London, 2001. P. 8.

## Outcomes and Lessons Learned

One outcome of the project “Measuring Effectiveness” (Sept. 2001) is the provision of a user’s guide – an electronic user’s pack.<sup>14</sup> From 2002 onwards the DEA has developed an ongoing training programme.

At the end the authors point out that what is needed is a project to measure the effectiveness and impact of the proposals on the work of development education practitioners over a longer time span - five to ten years.

## 2.5 The BLK model-project “Education 21” – Evaluation Report,<sup>15</sup>

### Background

In 1999 the concept of ‘Education 21’ was officially approved by the German government (Ministry of Education and Science) and 15 federal states (BLK) and equipped with about 12 million Euro for five years. The activities and the structural network are coordinated by the Free University Berlin. The programme should translate both environmental and developmental aspects of the Agenda 21 (International Declaration on Environment and Development, Rio de Janeiro 1992) into action in German schools. The concept of environmental education developed within the framework of universities was transformed into a programme for German school education. In its centre it saw the adoption of the concept of ‘shaping development for sustainability’.<sup>16</sup>

### Overview of the Process

The primary educational goal for the participants was “shape their competence for the future”. On the other hand the main goal for the programme itself was the integration of education for sustainable development into regular school practice – based on the concept of Agenda 21.

Three different modules were developed to implement the concept in school lessons: the principle of organising knowledge by linking different scientific areas; participatory learning; and innovative structures. As for the latter, the programme provides connections with general tendencies in innovative school development.

A first evaluation report on the programme was published in spring 2003, a second in 2004. It documents the whole process, poses questions and answers and draws a first analysis. Teachers in selected schools had been interviewed by questionnaires twice: regarding changes *before* and *after* the project. At the programme start in August 1999

---

<sup>14</sup> Guide: “electronic user’s pack” - web site is one outcome of the project “Measuring Effectiveness”:  
[www.dea.org.uk/info/projects/effectiveness/intro\\_backg.html](http://www.dea.org.uk/info/projects/effectiveness/intro_backg.html)

<sup>15</sup> BLK, Berlin, 2003. Note a second evaluation took place in 2004, partly based on the 2003 evaluation. For further information on BLK21 see: [www.blk21.de](http://www.blk21.de)

<sup>16</sup> Within the framework of the BLK-programme “Education 21” a ‘summer university’ is organised every year for pupils and teachers.

and one and a half years later in 2001 a) about 175 schools and b) about 750 teachers were asked for the significance and frequency of certain elements and capacities (e.g. co-operation structures between teacher colleagues, parents and NGOs; teaching methods and topics/contents in lessons).

## **Issues Emerging**

The final evaluation examines the participation of schools (teachers and students) in the whole process and the understanding of students regarding the lessons in sustainability. The question remains open, whether through this methodology the schools and teachers could achieve ownership of the evaluation.

## **Lessons Learned**

One significant outcome/result is that the personal commitment and mission of the single teacher has to be recognised as one of the most important elements for any success in implementing development education in school practice. A second line of investigation concerns the organisational structures which are needed for the reform of school practice.

The BLK programme and its evaluation led to an intense debate about concepts, theories and quality in German development education, Global Education (GE) and campaigning. Although aspects of Global Education and sustainable development are closely linked, the question of whether the objectives of GE can be incorporated into a concept of sustainable development, is being discussed. There also remains the question of whether there exists unspecified key competences for Global Education (like shaping your own future) and how they can be evaluated.

## **2.6 The EED Evaluation Handbook**

### **Background**

The suggestion for this handbook was first mooted at an evaluation conference in Kassel in November 2002. The ABP (Action for Education and Publication of the Protestant Church in Germany) intended to implement evaluation for all funded projects. A working group of the ABP on evaluation started its work with a seminar and finally edited the handbook on behalf of the ABP. The authors are Annette Scheunpflug with the assistance of Claudia Bergmüller and Nikolaus Schröck<sup>17</sup>.

### **Overview of the Process**

NGOs contributed to the writing of the book. Methods and concepts were regularly reflected upon and tested during periods of 6 months after each step. The results out of this practice were included in the further development of the models and concepts.

---

17 "Handbook: Evaluation in Global and Development Education - Guide for evaluation practice" (EDD) Bonn 2003



Such a participatory procedure is not easy and is time-consuming, but the results are positive and worth the effort. It has promoted the success of the book and guarantees its use by groups, schools and NGOs after its publication.

## **Outcomes**

The book is a systematic overview and useful handbook for evaluation, including a short definition of the different types of evaluation: process-, product evaluation, concept- (intention), implementation- ('how') and effect (results) evaluation, also: self- and external evaluation.

The handbook contains practical hints and useful examples for NGOs, groups and DE-practitioners. It should encourage them to improve the quality of their educational work and practice by evaluation and to raise awareness about it. Examples for questionnaires, patterns and 'good practice' invite readers to transfer and apply them to their own work and to find appropriate forms of reflection and review. The concept of an 'evaluation circle' is explained, the steps within such a circle and three different examples (self-evaluation of a weekend seminar, an external evaluation of a service- and information centre and the self-evaluation of a partnership travel project) are described in detail.

The last chapter gives useful hints and tips for a successful evaluation, explains different instruments for evaluation and gives examples of mistakes which should be avoided. Furthermore, examples of "good practice" are described and a list of further reading is added for background information.

## **Lessons learned**

Global and development education has a special quality and therefore needs specific instruments for evaluation. It often takes place in specific working situations which need to be recognised.

## **2.7 Evaluation and Quantitative Methods in Global Learning: A Contribution from the Field of Intercultural Sensitivity**

### **Background**

The DIPF (German Institute for International Educational Research), based in Frankfurt documents, describes and analyses educational development in Germany and in other European as well as non-European countries. It supports communication in the field of research and education, contributes to the further development of theoretical, empirical and methodological educational research by permanent analyses, and sponsors the work of young academics.

The research project carried out by Hermann-Günter Hesse and Kerstin Göbel (both from the DIPF) is based on two pillars: The developmental model of intercultural sensitivity by Milton Bennett (1993) is brought together with the research work of Alexander Thomas (1998) on critical incidents during intercultural encounters. The model of Bennett outlines six stages along a continuum of intercultural development of which three are ethno-centric (denial, defence, minimization), and the other three are ethno-relative (acceptance, adaptation, integration).

## **Overview of the Project**

The aim was to transform aspects of Global Education into observable behaviour. At the beginning of the project there was the challenge to construct situations, which can elicit individual behaviours interpretable as indicators of outcomes of global learning. The task was difficult.

In total 472 students, 9- and 10-graders in German schools in foreign language classes, took part in the investigation in autumn 2002. They were confronted with critical incidents chosen out of a pool of the prototypical intercultural critical encounters. Then they were asked to evaluate the protagonists' cognitions, affects and intentions to act by first answering 3 questions "what happened?", "how do the protagonists feel?" and "how would you react?" and second by rating the probabilities.

## **Issues Emerging**

The study is scientific work based on both quantitative data and a substantial amount of qualitative work. It works out profiles of people's reactions to critical incidents within intercultural situations; there was no participation by the examinees to the creation and use of the instruments or to the shaping of the research process.

The question emerges - to what extent is the underlying concept of 'culture learning' adequate for development education and amenable to such forms of testing.

## **Lessons Learned**

This study by DIPF is an innovative and emerging approach to testing instruments for Global Education. It is important to continue to develop such instruments even if it does not immediately translate into everyday practice.

## **2.8 Internalising Evaluation Results through Learning: the European Centre for Development Policy Management (ECDPM)**

### **Background**

ECDPM, the European Centre for Development Policy Management based in Maastricht, has been working on EU- ACP relations since 1986.<sup>18</sup> With its wealth of knowl-

---

<sup>18</sup> For further information on ECDPM see [www.ecdpm.org](http://www.ecdpm.org)

edge, learning approach and diversity of staff, the Centre continuously adapts to the changing environment.

## Overview

The paper by Charlotte Carlsson, Dr Paul Engel and Arin van Zee<sup>19</sup> is one outcome of a workshop “How can we learn more from what we do? Evidence-based communication for development” in December 2002. It forms the basis of this analysis. According to evaluations as learning opportunities plus “development understood as learning our way into a sustainable future” the paper focuses on “three progressively more comprehensive perspectives on learning for development”: 1. improving feedback to development policy and planning; 2. organisational learning by development partners and 3. learning in society at large.

Within the field of development policy and programming the authors identify *policy innovation networks* as instruments to mobilise Southern partners and stakeholders to engage in existing learning and feedback routes. They point out 3 streams of action: participatory monitoring and evaluation, results-based planning and management and the sharing of experiences.

In organisations and among partners all actors are recognised as players in the same game – “part of a joint learning effort” with a need for critical self-reflection (“from talking to listening”) in order “to build in reality checks”.

## Issues Emerging

On the level of society at large conflicts of interest are common, consensus is the exception. According to Niels Röling and others from the Communication & Innovation Studies Group of Wageningen University their *knowledge systems approach* poses innovation as an “emergent property of social interaction and learning among multiple stakeholders”. A participatory action-research methodology is proposed.

Within the second part of the paper questions are asked regarding *dilemmas at the evaluation – learning interface*. A number of lessons are drawn from the analysis carried out by the ECDPM-team. “These are not new” – so the authors, who chose and underlined those which seemed to them central to the intentions to enhance learning through evaluation: - to evaluate the actual learning processes instead of measuring which learning processes should have taken place due to the programme objectives - to be responsible for your own learning, not for the learning of others

## Lessons Learned

In development work, North-South exchange is pointed out as “where most can be learned”. The last sentence of the paper leaves the reader with a challenge: “Some of

---

<sup>19</sup> Internalising Evaluation Results through Learning: Complementary Perspectives, Dilemmas and some Lessons Learned, (2003) ECDPM, Maastricht.

*the most inspiring collections of reviews of experience span cultural boundaries between countries as well as continents. International cooperation might have a distinct competitive advantage in furthering this field of study.”*

## 2.9 Learning from External Evaluations: the Austrian Experience

External evaluations carried out by the Austrian authors of the current section, and their discussion with evaluation experts in some other European countries (like Germany, Ireland, Italy, Switzerland or UK) have led to a number of important insights into the nature and working of evaluation, which could be summarised as follows:

- ♣ Evaluations are an important contribution to the improvement of Global Education/ development education.
- ♣ At best, 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 *one* set of criteria, *one* 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, and 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 from 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).
- ♣ The question is not whether we believe in progress when we evaluate, but whether 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.

## **2.10 Recommendations from the Survey of Evaluations for Evaluation Practice**

From the variety of evaluations surveyed and the lessons outlined in this section, the following points are recommended:

- ▲ It is important to differentiate between the aims of an evaluation and the aims of the process that is being evaluated. It is important to define indicators, when the aims have been agreed upon, but also be aware of the factors surrounding the evaluation. Evaluators should be aware of the difficulty of defining value-criteria and should be open regarding 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 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 who 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 the 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 often 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 train the trainers: to define qualifications and to develop a certification; to develop a culture of recognition of competence; to organise workshops for the support of evaluators; to initiate team-visits.
- ▲ To embark on international evaluation projects (co-operation of two or more evaluators from different countries) and to publish more reports in English to make knowledge and experiences better accessible throughout Europe.

## ▲ *Chapter 3*

# Evaluation in Global Education at a European level

*Eddie O'Loughlin*





## ▲ Chapter 3

# Evaluation in Global and Development Education at a European level

In recent years a number of Seminars, Conferences and processes have built on the growing work of evaluation in global and development education at national level, and developed common frameworks or shared national experience in an international framework.

This chapter summarises the key outcomes and challenges of each of these processes.

### 3.1 The Nurnberg Seminar

In 2001 a number of existing national structures for support, funding and policy-making in the field of global and development education came together to establish GENE – Global Education Network Europe. The purpose of GENE was to share best practice between such structures, and, through networking, to support existing and emerging structures. GENE started with 6 national structures, and was at first facilitated by the North-South Centre of the Council of Europe. GENE has grown to include most existing national structures in Europe, with a significant combined national spend on development and Global Education and awareness-raising.

At the core of GENE's work is support for sharing good practice in the field of evaluation and promotion of quality in global and development education. That is why in March 2003 an expert seminar was organised, hosted by BMZ, with the support of the DEA (UK) and organised by Friedrich-Alexander-University Erlangen-Nürnberg, focused on issues of quality and evaluation in Global Education.

One commentator, Doug Bourn, summarised the key questions of this seminar thus:

#### **Why Learning for A Global Society Is Important?**

For over 20 years there has been some excellent work taking place in many countries under the umbrella of global and development education, but there is little evidence to demonstrate why NGOs and others have stated why they see this area of work as important. We need to address the question why it is important in this era of globalisation, increasing divisions between the rich and the poor in the world, abuse of human rights, degradation of the planet and global insecurity.

### **What do we mean by Learning for Change?**

Definitions of global and development education throughout the world have referred to education linked to social change. What does this mean? Does it suggest there is a causal relationship between this form of education and change or something much more about providing the space for the learner to critically assess their own role in society? To what extent are we talking about political education or education for personal development?

### **What are the Skills Required for a Global Society?**

Globalisation poses major challenges for educationalists. All too often however the debates have been polarised between a narrow skills for a global economy agenda versus a broader rights and social justice perspective. How can we ensure that there is a convergence of the discussions and debates?

### **What are the essential components of Good Practice?**

Central to good global and development education are participatory learning methodologies and a strong values base as well as knowledge and skills. To what extent must all of these elements be components of good practice? What needs to be developed to encourage greater debate with policy makers and funders that sees good practice as linked to learning?

### **Why there is a need to address evaluation, measuring effectiveness and impact.**

Evaluation and reflection are important components of helping to improve the quality of global education. Without evaluation, how do you know whether what you are doing is any good and any value? How do you know without evaluation how to improve on what you are doing? There is a need to encourage policy-makers and funders as well as practitioners to incorporate reflective practice, develop models and forms of evaluation and tools for measuring effectiveness and impact. How do we encourage greater debate on these matters and secure recognition of the need for resources in this area within programmes and projects?

The Nurnberg seminar identified a paucity of reflection on practice and theory as hampering evaluation in global and development education. While there are a plethora of examples of evaluation practices, there is also evidence of confusion, of importation of inappropriate models of evaluation, and of a lack of adequate theory in the field from which to draw on adequate theoretical framework for evaluation<sup>20</sup>.

---

<sup>20</sup> See [www.gene-eu/evaluation](http://www.gene-eu/evaluation) for the papers from this Seminar.

Following on from the Nurnberg Conference, the GENE network organised the London Conference “Learning for a Global Society” which had a similar focus on quality and evaluation in Global Education, but opened up the issue to a wider political, state administration and civil society participation.

### 3.2 The London Conference

This Conference, entitled *Learning for A Global Society: Improving Global Education in Europe, Issues of Evaluation and Quality*, brought together stakeholders from across Europe to consider key issues regarding evaluation and quality.

Situating the issues of quality and evaluation within both the theoretical context of the lack of theory and research in the field – a weakness not unrelated to lack of funding - and the political contexts of the development of national strategies and the challenges and opportunities presented internationally by the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and the decade of Education for Sustainable Development, the Conference drew participants attention to a number of challenges.

A number of key issues, challenges and questions were addressed; the following gives a taste of some fundamental *key questions*:

- ▲ The need to develop better theory from practice to ground Global Education – and any evaluation and quality processes we wish to strengthen. **One key question is: what are our ultimate ends, educationally and in terms of social change.**
- ▲ 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 Goals, to issues of educational relevance and learning for global citizenship. **A second key question: Where do we situate Global Education and its improvement and evaluation?**
- ▲ **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?
- ▲ The question of the 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, - that perhaps too much evaluation is about “proving that it works” and not enough evaluation is about “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 another 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?

The Conference heard papers on a number of issues including

- ▲ 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<sup>21</sup>.

### 3.3 The European Global Education Peer Review Process

The European Global Education Peer Review Process is one practical review/evaluation mechanism which has clearly resulted in learning through international peer review and reporting processes. The process was initiated by the partners of the Maastricht Congress on Global Education mentioned above. The secretariat for the process was initially provided by the North-South Centre of the Council of Europe, from 2001 – 2005, with support from GENE (Global Education Network Europe). Since 2006 GENE has facilitated this process and provides the secretariat. This peer review process could be described as something between a review mechanism and an evaluation, with peer organisations or national ministries or agencies participating as the experts for the international peer review teams.

This process arose out of the Europe-wide Maastricht Congress on Global Education held in the Netherlands in 2002, attended by delegates from over 50 states. At this Congress a Declaration on Global Education was adopted calling for a number of initiatives aimed at bringing about improved and more Global Education in Europe, including for a Peer Review process.

---

21 For the papers from this Conference see [www.gene.eu](http://www.gene.eu)

In response and as part of the follow-up to the Maastricht Congress, a Global Education Peer Review feasibility study was carried out in 2003.<sup>22</sup> The study began with a reflection on relevant existing country review processes; key questions and issues were then tested, tried and reflected upon through a pilot review of Cyprus, leading to the first Global Education Peer Review country report.

To date five reviews have been completed, on Cyprus, Finland, the Netherlands, Austria and in 2008 the Czech Republic. Global Education experts have been involved from Ministries and Agencies and associated with GENE from the following countries – Austria, Finland, Germany, Ireland, Portugal, Slovakia, the Netherlands, Norway and the United Kingdom.

The overall aim of the European Global Education Peer Review Process is to improve and increase Global Education (GE) in Europe. The purpose of the initiative is to provide a peer support and learning process, resulting in National Global Education Reports developed in partnership with national actors.

Apart from being a national comparative reporting process on Global Education, it became clear in the course of the feasibility study, that the Peer Review process can play a useful role in helping key national stakeholders develop national strategies for better and more Global Education. In the case of the Peer Review of Finland, a clear recommendation was made to develop a national strategy. This was acted upon and a comprehensive national strategy for Global Education has been developed for Finland. In the case of Austria, a national strategy is being developed. There is strong evidence to show, for example, that the process has resulted in greater national coordination, improved funding structures and bilateral learning initiatives in several of the countries reviewed, all contributing to better quality and more Global Education.

The Process is guided by 3 Principles

1. The process starts with the existing Global Education situation in each country, affirming good practice and supporting new learning for improving and increasing Global Education.
2. The process also involves bringing international experts in the field of Global Education to act as “critical friends” to the national process. Bringing comparative experience from other contexts enhances the learning possibilities.<sup>23</sup>
3. Each national peer review reflects the overarching aim of the process (which is to bring about better and more Global Education in Europe).

---

22 O'Loughlin, E., Feasibility Study Report: Global Education Peer Review and Support Process, Lisbon NSC, December 2003

23 Our understanding of the notion of critical friends and critical learning is influenced by the literature on Action Research in Education. See Carr, W. and Kemmis, S. (1986) *Becoming Critical: Education, Knowledge and Action Research*, Falmer Press, Basingstoke, Hants.

The following is a summary of the key steps in a Global Education Peer Review and national Reporting process:

1. Agree practicalities of how the process will be carried out / Terms of Reference, with the main partner(s) in the country to be reviewed, following formal engagement.
2. The lead partner(s) in the country concerned, along with the Global Education Peer Review Secretariat, gathers background information on Global Education in the country to be reviewed. This background information will take varied forms depending on the country structure and will provide the basis for a briefing document for the team.
3. The lead partner(s) in the country to be reviewed will assist the Global Education Peer Review Secretariat in identifying key individuals and organisations for the upcoming international team visit to the country, and with scheduling such meetings (in most cases an initial Peer Review Secretariat visit will be arranged to gather initial information and documentation from organisations, and to develop contacts, in advance of the main international team visit).
4. The material gathered above (background briefing material) is made available to the International Peer Review team who will be participating in the visit to the country under review (the team will usually comprise two or more international Global Education experts along with the peer review secretariat).
5. The international team visit to the country will involve briefings from key Global Education actors and stakeholders in the country concerned, along with other relevant actors, and possible visit(s) to see Global Education in practice.
6. The team visit to a given country could also involve the facilitation of a national process, or hearing, which can inform the country report. Conversely, national actors can use the presence of the International Peer Review Team to hold a national conference in keeping with national priorities. The International Peer Review Team will be available to input into such agreed processes.
7. Following the team visit the draft national report will be further developed based on the findings of the country visit. Relevant sections of this draft will then be sent to the key stakeholders in the country concerned for feedback and comment, before a final draft is prepared for print by the Peer Review Secretariat.
8. Some partners may wish to have an official launch of the report.
9. Agreed follow-up by the secretariat and international peer review team will take place to assist the national partners with their response to the report and recommendations.

## Lessons Learned

National actors have emphasised that the external Global Education peer review process is both unique and is needed – producing national reports focused on the state of Global Education in both the formal and non-formal sectors. A number of national actors have indicated their particular interest in having an independent external review being carried out on Global Education in their country, and in seeing it as a mechanism in assisting them in developing a Global Education national strategy.

In all cases the review process has acted as a critical external support mechanism, supporting national events and processes for the increase and improvement of Global Education, as well as reviewing the current Global Education situation in the country. The process has also provided opportunities for comparative learning, insight, motivation and encouragement for the ongoing and further development of Global Education.

The importance of building up trust and confidence between the key actors in the process – the process coordinator and secretariat, the international peer review team, the key national stakeholders – has been the key to the success of the process to date. As in many other evaluation processes, credibility is crucial.

While the peer review has produced tangible results, and is clearly recognised as being a useful practical tool to help bring about more and better Global Education throughout Europe, it should also be recognised that it is a relatively young process. From 2005 a number of national processes were delayed or postponed, largely due to limited institutional capacity for the process and changing institutional arrangements. However, since 2006, GENE is providing the Secretariat for the process, and the process has been strengthened, with further reviews embarked upon and planned for Norway (mid 2009) and Poland (2009 – 2010) while other countries are scheduled for review from 2010 – 2011<sup>24</sup>.

The process itself is still very much in the learning stages. To date each process has learned heavily from the previous review, making adjustments and improvements after careful reflection by those involved. It is planned that after two to three more national processes, a review or meta-evaluation of the process itself will be carried out to see what lessons can be learned.

Flexibility of approach has been essential to the success of this process due to such different national situations (and because the process is in an early learning phase), but it is also considered by those who have coordinated the process, in consultation with many of the participating peer review experts, that with further reflection and learning, the methodology of the process can be strengthened so as to enable greater comparability and ultimately learning between each national process and between countries generally. In-depth analysis of how the process may have contributed to tangible results such as

---

<sup>24</sup> For further information on the Peer Review process see [www.gene.eu](http://www.gene.eu)

– the development of national strategies; increases in funding; and improvement in funding structures, will also be followed up.

### **3.4 Development Education Exchange in Europe (DEEEP) on Evaluation Reports from 2005**

#### **Background**

DEEEP (Development Education Exchange in Europe) has a training working group whose aim is to devise a European training strategy, promoting training opportunities in Development Education and Development Awareness for NGOs.<sup>25</sup>

This group runs a number of projects including the one described here on evaluation. It focused on exploring concepts and practice around evaluation. What follows are summary outcomes from a number of workshops which were carried out according to a number of separate language groups - English, French and Finnish.

#### **English Language Sub-Group on Evaluation<sup>26</sup>**

This sub-group explored the concept of Peer Learning and its role in evaluation. It identified different broad models of engaging in peer learning in evaluation, and identified recurring themes.

A number of recommendations were identified as follows:

- ▲ Peer learning is highly recommended as a key component of the toolkit for training and supporting new colleagues in the development education (DE) community in evaluation. Peer learning incorporates many of the core values of DE/DA. It is a process that creates opportunities for the DE practitioner, the organisation and the DE community to evaluate personal and organisational practice in a learning context.
- ▲ Undertaking an inventory among the DEEEP network for case study examples of peer learning could provide a valuable resource. The group began to identify some examples but there is a need for more practical materials.
- ▲ The DEEEP network could support a series of peer evaluations with a specific focus on peer learning. The outcomes would include: case studies for dissemination, increased partnerships among the network, enhanced knowledge and skills in evaluation, and sharing of expertise between organisations.

---

25 For further details see: [http://www.deeep.org/english/about\\_deeep/training/index.php](http://www.deeep.org/english/about_deeep/training/index.php)

26 This description is based on a report compiled by the DEEEP English-speaking group: George Anang'a, Gerard Lommerse, Katy Newell Jones, Lizzy Noone, Astrid Perez Pinan, Phyllis Thompson.



## French Language Sub-Group on Evaluation<sup>27</sup>

A total of 16 people participated in this group - from France, Luxembourg, Portugal and Belgium. It came up with a number of interesting recommendations and conclusions concerning the use of evaluation in development education (DE).

Thierry De Smedt, professor in the Department of Communication (Group of Research on Mediation of Knowledge), Catholic University of Louvain-la-Neuve, made a special contribution.

The workshop report made a number of recommendations under the following headings:

:: Alliances and strategies :

- ▲ Better communication with government on evaluation practices
- ▲ Make proposals on evaluation strategies to government
- ▲ Develop North/South educative partnership and show transversality between development education (DE) in the North and in the South
- ▲ Get the South to evaluate our DE practices

:: A constructive perspective on evaluation

- ▲ Evaluation should be a source of learning for educators
- ▲ Choose an evaluation framework and build it together
- ▲ All the parties who take part in the development education action should be involved in the evaluation process

:: Methodological recommendations

- ▲ To facilitate self-evaluation with external expertise
- ▲ Verify coherence and relevance with context and objectives
- ▲ To identify better target groups, intermediary groups and resources

:: Necessary resources

- ▲ Time
- ▲ Resources
- ▲ Training
- ▲ Sharing of methods, especially on innovative methods

---

<sup>27</sup> This description is based on the report of the French-speaking workshop organised in Brussels, on 6/7th of October, 2005, on the practices and methods in the evaluation of development education

- ▲ Database on evaluation resources
- ▲ Evaluation tools and techniques classified by type of action
- ▲ Build a theoretical framework on limits and assets of evaluation

### **Finnish Language Sub-Group on Evaluation<sup>28</sup>**

A one-day workshop was held in November 2005 for Finnish Non-governmental Organizations (NGOs) active in the field of Global Education, organised by DEEEP (Development Education Exchange in Europe), Plan Finland, The Finnish NGDO Platform to the EU - KEHYS ry, and the Service Centre for Development Cooperation – KEPA. This workshop was planned and facilitated by Ms Päivi Korhonen, ISAI Consulting, Finland.

According to the organisers, the purpose of the one-day workshop was to give the participating NGOs an introduction to the key elements required for successful impact assessment of global and development education projects. The participants were also given the opportunity to share their experiences in impact assessment and to identify further needs for improvement and capacity building.

As part of the day the participants worked in groups, in which they analyzed evaluation and impact assessment. The following questions were discussed in the groups:

1. What should be taken into consideration before the beginning of the project?
2. What should be taken into consideration during the implementation of the project?
3. What should be taken into consideration after the project implementation/evaluation?

The central findings concerning each question were presented as follows:

1. What should be taken into consideration before the beginning of the project?
  - ▲ successful timing of projects, timely implementation, significance of preliminary evaluation
  - ▲ more time should be spent on needs analysis, connected with sufficiently extensive and profound expertise
  - ▲ the main objectives of projects should be more explicitly and realistically defined.
  - ▲ projects should strive to have a more innovative approach to their working methods (can everything be developed through the method selection of “website, postcard and workshops”?)

---

28 This description is based on the report by Ms Päivi Korhonen, ISAI Consulting, Finland.



2. Although, evaluation may seem difficult and the level of personal knowledge on evaluation relatively low, it is worthwhile to embark upon the evaluation undauntedly.
3. Development of functioning and adequately consistent evaluation methods is not complicated and implementation of the methods will not encumber the project. Instead, through evaluation the project and its host organization can be shepherded to the path of continuous learning and development.

## ▲ *Chapter 4*

# Issues of Quality and Evaluation in Global Education: Trends and Challenges

*Liam Wegimont*



## ▲ Chapter 4

# Issues of Quality and Evaluation in Global Education: Trends and Challenges

## 1. Introduction

This chapter examines the changing policy context of evaluation and quality improvement in global education, and, drawing on previous chapters, outlines trends and challenges. As can be seen in previous chapters, there is a significantly improved international policy framework. There are a growing number of countries with national policy and strategy frameworks that include a focus on evaluation and quality in global education. There is also a growing focus on international exchange of good practice in policy and strategy for improved and increased global education, and a growing practice of international peer learning and peer review. This is based on a growing body of practice that is being reflected on in a comparative frame.

In this chapter a number of trends in quality and evaluation in global education will be outlined. There is a growing literature in the field – along with a growing number of research journals, a growing number of university chairs or departments with a remit in Global education or learning, a growing recognition of the need for a research base, and for appropriate models of evaluation for global education and a growing professionalism in the field of evaluation in global education. There are many signs of hope, and some of these are elaborated briefly below. But there are also growing challenges, remaining anomalies and possible dead-ends which still need to be addressed. And there is a need for all to be grounded in a broader story, a more detailed vision, and a clearer interdisciplinary model.

## 2. The Changing Policy and Practice Context of Evaluation and Quality Improvement in Global Education – Trends Emerging

In Chapter 1 above we have seen that there is a growth in international policy frameworks – the Maastricht Declaration, the outcomes of the Brussels and Helsinki Conferences, and the European Consensus document on development education. When it comes to issues of quality and evaluation in global and development education, these political frameworks are all moving in one clear direction. There is recognition of the need for global education. There is clear articulation of a movement towards *universality* and a *rights-based approach*.

This approach was originally inspired in the late 1990s by political and policy frameworks in cognate education and communication fields – namely, the Aarhus Conven-

tion on the right to information regarding environmental issues effecting citizens lives, and the work of UNESCO over a number of decades on the right to Human Rights Education. These approaches sought to move education and communication (variously understood) in these fields from a marginal, minority interest approach to a more mainstream, central policy focus.

In Global Education this approach first gained adherence within civil society and NGDO advocates, and, over the last decade, has been increasingly recognised by governments, and intergovernmental organisations, as the cornerstone of an effective approach to global education, and an ultimate benchmark. This approach – coupled with growing political recognition of the conclusion that the local and the global are unavoidably intertwined – has led to a strong base from which to argue not only for the increase, but for the ongoing improvement of global education. Indeed, the policy documents outlined above insist on twinning the call for increased global education with the call for improved global education. If access for all to quality global education becomes an ultimate benchmark, then clearly not only more global education, but better global education, is required.

This requirement is seen not only in international policy frameworks, but also in the increasing number of national strategies that have emerged since the Maastricht Declaration in 2002. These national strategies take many and differing forms – from Ministry of Foreign Affairs or Development Agency led strategies, to NGDO led strategies, to national strategies which involve all relevant stakeholders and a number of national Ministries. A growing number of countries have developed national strategies that are currently being implemented, while a number of other countries are currently embarking on their development<sup>29</sup>.

Along with national strategies that focus on increase and improvement, and, together with a growing attendant commitment to fund evaluation as a normal and necessary part of the funding process within global and development education, there are a growing number of structures with national responsibility for funding, support and coordination of global and development education in European countries<sup>30</sup>. Furthermore, the majority of these national structures are sharing strategies between themselves at European level, through GENE – Global Education Network Europe – with a clear focus on international learning for quality enhancement<sup>31</sup>.

---

29 GENE - Global Education Network Europe – has initiated or supported a number of exchanges focused on national strategy development. See, for example, Hartmeyer, H., 2008, The Austria-Portugal Exchange, GENE Policy Briefing Paper 1, Autumn 2008, Amsterdam. As of publication GENE is also embarking on a process of strengthening or accompanying a number of national strategy initiatives with a view to sharing the learning for national strategy-development across countries in Europe.

30 In 2001, when GENE was established, there were 6 national structures in European countries with such a national mandate and remit. One of the aims of GENE was to share learning between existing and emerging national structures, and to encourage the emergence of such structures in other countries in Europe. There are currently 14 countries with (widely differing) national structures associated with GENE. For a comparative analysis in 2003 of 7 of these national structures then existing, see Hock, S and Wegimont, L., (2003), National Structures for the Organisation, Support and Funding of Development Education. GENE/KommEnt.NSC, Vienna/Lisbon, 2003.

31 For more information on initiatives in regard to policy research and evaluation see [www.gene.eu](http://www.gene.eu)



### 3. Other trends in quality and Evaluation in Global Education

A number of other trends in the field that are noteworthy. These include the following:

- ▲ A *growing recognition of the need for a more solid research base* for global and development education. It becomes clear that clarity of criteria and strengthened evaluation frameworks need to be based on a more solid research and theoretical framework than heretofore.
- ▲ *Growing calls for clarity regarding criteria and evidence*, along with *growing work in the field in specific sectors and with specific content and specific methodologies*.
- ▲ *Growing recognition of the inappropriateness of some models of evaluation for global education*, and of the need to draw on evaluation resources not only from the field of development, but also, and more importantly, from the field of educational research, assessment and evaluation.
- ▲ This has been coupled with the *growing development of more appropriate models of evaluation*, both general models, and models developed for specific educational sectors and particular national settings.
- ▲ There are also, as can be seen in outline in Chapter Two, and in more recent work in the field, *a growing practice of evaluation in global education*, that is being reflected on critically in a comparative, research frame.
- ▲ Growing recognition of the effectiveness of *sector wide strategies* and coordinated learning approaches.
- ▲ Finally, for now, one must recognise *a growing engagement with more long term processes* of quality enhancement, evaluation and organisational learning that can only auger well for the field <sup>32</sup>.

### 4. Challenges

If the above outline of some of the key trends in evaluation and quality improvement in global education auger well, and show clear signs of hope, there are still numerous challenges that abound in the field. These include

- ▲ Lack of recognition of the interdisciplinary nature of global and development education, and of the need for interdisciplinary balance, in planning, implementation and evaluation models and support;
- ▲ A continuing lack of clarity in some quarters regarding the distinctiveness of the

---

<sup>32</sup> Examples of a focus on more long term evaluative, organisational learning and improvement processes now abound. See, for example the "Measuring Effectiveness" approach of the DEA outlined in Chapter 2, or the Norwegian South evaluation. Other recent examples include a Belgian, Ministry of Foreign Affairs initiated 4 year research programme, the Norwegian national peer review process, Irish Aid support for coordination and capacity building in sectors traditionally considered difficult to coordinate, or the Dutch NCDO on the definition and mapping of differing publics within the field of public awareness and global education.

varieties of endeavour along the continuum between development communication, public awareness-raising, and global education. This brings with it attendant confusions in evaluation and quality improvement in the fields;

- ▲ A continuing lack of documentation, of the space for the development of theory from practice, and of history building and writing within development and global education.

There are two further challenges that might be alluded to here, and that go deep. The first is the need, in an emerging field, to “prove that it works”. Global education is funded from public monies – be they statutory or private donations – and require accountability and transparency. At the same time, as Michael Quinn Patton frames the question “How can the need for accountability be balanced against the need for learning?”<sup>33</sup>. Put otherwise, too much emphasis on the need to prove that this is working – sometimes requiring evidence that is simply not (or even should not) be available in an educational domain - can diminish the space for innovation. *Innovation is required if global education is to reach all, and reach them well*. But innovation, like learning, requires the openness to failure. Failure, and learning from failure, is written into models of innovation in other sectors. But in a relatively small, emerging sector such as global education, the room for learning from failure is diminished by the need to prove that it works and even to advertise success. This balance is currently skewed against innovation. In the coming decade, the challenge to provide space for innovation may well be put under further pressure; nevertheless, it is necessary to maintain space for innovation if we are to accomplish ultimate goals.

A second major challenge is the challenge to *build on and move beyond consensus*. For the past decades advocates of development and global education have developed clear processes of political, policymaking, and conceptual consensus, in order to ensure integration within education systems, clarity with civil society sectors, and ownership by various stakeholders, including governments and intergovernmental organisations. This has been, to some extent, achieved. And naturally this consensus needs to be built upon, solidified, implemented and further realised if there is to be universal quality global education as of right. But consensus, combined with defining of strategies and policies, while crucial, can sometimes lead to stultifying of diversity.

We need consensus, to be sure, but we may also require more “*dissensus*”, greater variety, more ecological diversity within the field, more development of differing schools of thought within global and development education, if we are to be more sustainable. Quality and improvement in global education may now require greater differentiation, clearer distinctions, smaller local stories of what works and doesn't work, and further “*dissensus*”, to build upon the consensus already achieved<sup>34</sup>.

---

33 See Quinn-Patton, M. Foreword, in IDRC, (2001) Outcome Mapping. Last accessed 28th October 2008 at [www.idrc.ca/en/ev-28375/201.1.DO\\_TOPIC.html](http://www.idrc.ca/en/ev-28375/201.1.DO_TOPIC.html)

34 For more on Lyotard's notion of dissensus as it applies to education policy see, for example, Fazzaro C. J.; Walter J. E. Schools for Democracy: Lyotard, Dissensus and Education Policy, International Journal of Leadership in Education, vol. 5 no.1 January 2002, Routledge, .





This publication brings together a number of policy excerpts, evaluation studies summaries, project reports and overviews of evaluation and quality enhancement initiatives in the field of Global Education. The volume provides a broad spectrum of evaluation initiatives in the fields of Global Education. It outlines the growing policy framework at European level that supports enhanced quality in Global Education, and presents a range of evaluation case studies from different countries. It also outlines lessons learnt from national and European initiatives, and provides a brief analysis of emerging trends and future challenges in the work of improving, increasing and evaluating Global Education in Europe.

**GENE** – Global Education Network Europe is the network of Ministries, Agencies and other bodies with national responsibility for Global Education in Europe. GENE supports networking, peer learning, policy research, national strategy development and quality enhancement. GENE works to increase and improve Global Education, towards the day when all people in Europe will have access to quality Global Education.

[www.gene.eu](http://www.gene.eu)