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“In any society you have conflicts, interests and selfishness. However, when we face disaster, we show solidarity; we become one, we become a community again. At certain times, we are a community, at other times we are a society with our normal issues. However, if you do not have responsibility and solidarity, you do not have a democratic society.”

Edgar Morin
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Introduction

The world is facing ever more complex challenges in all spheres of life. Poverty and inequality, environmental challenges and humanitarian crises, armed conflicts, terrorism, radicalisation, xenophobia and immigration feature in the headlines and are of concern to the peoples of Europe and of the world.

The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and the climate agreement COP 21 may provide hope, and suggest that there is growing political consensus and commitment to create a greater global balance and a political willingness to address global, regional and national inequity. But other recent political developments may suggest that the world might be moving in less sane directions. Critical understanding and engagement with the world are called for. How can a shift in our understanding of democracy, leadership and participation at all levels happen to make transformative change possible?

Global Education is an integral part of this endeavour. What are the specific challenges for Global Education against the backdrop of this ever-changing context? What strategies and solutions have already been proven to work?

One year after the Paris attacks, the organisers invited a diverse range of stakeholders to reflect on how Global Education could play a more central role in developing a long-term response to local and global challenges to solidarity. How can human knowledge, the capacity to learn, public engagement, the wisdom of peoples and the commitment to solidarity evident among differing stakeholders, contribute through policy and practice to a much-needed shift?

The Paris conference on Global Education: towards a world of solidarity took place on Monday, 28th November in Paris, France and was organised by GENE - Global Education Network Europe - in partnership with our French co-hosts, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the French Development Agency (AFD), and in close cooperation with the networks Platforma, CONCORD and the European Youth Forum, with the financial support of the European Commission.
Global Education has grown significantly in European countries in recent years, as policy learning between countries grows. There are five tradi-
tional sets of actors that contribute to this growth, and might, through greater coordination or policy learning, further increase the integration and reach:

- International organisations
- Ministries and Agencies (Foreign Affairs, International Development, Education)
- Civil Society Organisations (Social sectors, youth, human rights, local development, international development, fair trade, etc.)
- Local and Regional Authorities (including town-twinning, North-South Solidarity, green cities, fair trade towns, and global citizenship within local educational authorities)
- Academic institutions – including teacher training institutions, educational research institutes, think tanks and research networks.

The last decade has seen growing networking for policy learning within each of these stakeholders, and bilaterally between particular stakeholders (Ministries and CSOs, Ministries and LRAs, LRAs and CSOs). There has also been opportunity for multi-stakeholder, multilateral development of shared vision, perspectives and mutually enhancing policy perspectives.

In addition, this conference considered a new group of stakeholders, named as New Actors that are increasingly influencing the field of Global Education policy and practice. This group comprises social entrepreneurs, corporate social responsibility groups, non-governmental organisations and networks that function in new and innovative ways.

The conference provided a brief space for these actors to reflect on current local, regional and global challenges and to consider transformative change in and through education. Policy sharing and learning were facilitated; successful strategies were highlighted with inspiring stories from Global Education and related fields; and a way forward that embraces contemporary challenges in an educational frame was imagined.
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Executive summary

The Paris conference on Global Education: towards a world of solidarity took place on Monday, 28th November in Paris, France and was organised by GENE - Global Education Network Europe - in partnership with the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the French Development Agency (AFD), and in close co-operation with Platforma, CONCORD and the European Youth Forum, with the financial support of the European Commission.

This conference coincided with the start of the 15th anniversary of the Maastricht Congress on Global Education and provided a space for key decision-makers and actors in the field to reflect on Global Education in light of contemporary global challenges. It encouraged participants to consider approaches to transformative change through education and sought to facilitate policy learning through sharing successful strategies and practice among stakeholder groups. The conference explored new visions for Global Education in Europe, inspired by emerging actors and existing French and international practice.

The conference began with introductory remarks from Mr. Gauthier Mignot of the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ms. Florence Robine from the Ministry of Education and Mr. Philippe Orliange from the French Development Agency. They all highlighted the central importance of Global Education in the promotion of international solidarity, in the necessary education of citizens and in the cause of sustainable development. The opening session also heard from Mr. Bertrand Gallet, representing Platforma, who observed that policy often seems to be driven by passions and emotions at the moment, with intolerance and racism causing us to look inward. Ms. Paola Berbeglia, representing CONCORD, affirmed the importance of Global Citizenship Education (GCE) as a key tool in gaining a critical understanding of the world and in creating an active global civil society.

A panel discussion then explored the role of Global Education in responding to contemporary global challenges, focusing on social cohesion, climate change and anti-radicalisation. Ms. Monique Borsenberger, a researcher from the Luxembourg Institute of Socio-Economic Research, addressed social cohesion and the possible tensions between the democratic principles of freedom, equality and solidarity. She highlighted the need for institutions that can facilitate dialogue between tensions and manage social conflicts as part of democracy. Ms. Marie-Hélène Nedelec, Vice-President of the Municipality of Nantes, pointed to the importance of people-to-people decentralized co-operation and shared her experience of developing local and regional authorities as partners in fighting climate change. The third panellist, Ms. Elisabeth van der Steenhoven, Director of KARAMA Europe, focused on the challenges for Global Education in the context of radicalisation and tension in the Arab world. She shared her experiences of working with groups of young people coming together in towns and villages in war-torn and post-conflict situations to shape their own futures.

The keynote speaker Mr. Kumi Naidoo, Launch Director of Africans Rising for Justice, Peace and Dignity, reminded everyone that we cannot blame current developments on ‘backward thinking’ or ‘deplorable’ people that we do not class as ‘progressives’. He stated that all people are our brothers and sisters, not our enemies. It is inequality that is the number one challenge of our time and it can only be addressed by a massive educational effort. He called upon educators to
put the most difficult questions into the public domain for discussion and not to walk away from complexity and from difficult choices. Next followed the first working group session. Here groups of participants from similar organisations discussed current challenges they face as well as strategies, means and partnerships to address them.

The Ministries and Agencies present observed a discrepancy between policies and realities on the ground and highlighted the continuing need for an internationalist perspective, stronger Global Education and the continued importance of multilateral diplomacy to enhance global solidarity.

The Local and Regional Authorities (LRAs) suggested that they could play a critical role in achieving transformational change by working with communities to stimulate and support Global Education and people-to-people solidarity. LRAs have the potential and ability to reach everyone, including hard to reach groups and those residing in small municipalities.

Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) are and have been the powerhouses and initiators of Global Education in many countries in Europe for many years. CSO participants at the Paris conference suggested that it is now time to change the planning, funding and working systems at local, national and international levels and to create links between the different levels.

New Actors in Global Education are approaching societal, political and economic transformation in new ways. Their innovation stems from an ability to grow their impact, to create new alliances and organisational models, to empower public, private, and social institutions to (co)-create added value and synergies. It was also pointed out that they still face many challenges in legitimizing their actions.

The group of Researchers and Academics explored the relationship between research, policy and practice and suggested that closer links with policy makers would be useful. They also stated that research could be used to include those that are not being heard in the GE discourse and that academia could contribute to addressing inequality at different levels.

Representatives from International Organisations reflected on challenges with regard to accountability and transparency that go beyond the traditional spending criteria associated with development projects, to include other dimensions, such as the development of global competencies.

A second round of working groups followed, which offered a space for multi-stakeholder dialogue. Participants from different institutions and organisations debates addressed the relationship between Global Education, solidarity, social cohesion and change. They considered issues of quality and shared experiences around strategy and practical tools. Although all workshops addressed different topics, common issues emerged, including the need for:

- More specific approaches and tailor-made practices that go beyond the usual groups that Global Education addresses;
- The SDGs to be considered and used as a learning framework;
- A shift in the way we approach quality in Global Education. Learning needs to be at the centre throughout – including in monitoring and evaluation and funding;
- More opportunities for a structured multi-stakeholder dialogue, similar to that provided by the conference, on different themes and levels.

Finally, the world-renowned French philosopher and sociologist Mr. Edgar Morin offered reflections and closing words for the conference participants.
Section 1  Introductory remarks

The conference began with Introductory remarks that highlighted key institutional priorities with regards to Global Education. Representatives from the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the French Ministry of Education, the French Development Agency, Platforma and CONCORD shared their thoughts and observations regarding Global Education at the local, regional and global levels.

Mr. Gauthier Mignot, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, France spoke about the opportunity to focus on Global Education within the global SDG context and the Agenda 2030 and the concentration of the French MFA on the promotion of education for a world of solidarity.

Ms. Florence Robine, from the Ministry of Education, addressed the importance of inter-ministerial and wider collaboration with other stakeholders, and emphasised the centrality of citizenship education and global solidarity in French schools.

Mr. Phillipe Orliange from the French Development Agency stressed the need to reach out and keep speaking to new audiences that are not convinced of the mission of Global Education and, to understand what different actors and fields can contribute with.

Mr. Bertrand Gallet, representing Platforma, suggested that much policy seems to be driven by passions and emotions at the moment, and referred to this as a period in which intolerance and racism are causing us to look inward. He called for a universal action to realise the global goals and to combat climate change.

Ms. Paola Berbeglia, representing CONCORD, affirmed that Global Citizenship Education (GCE) is a key tool in gaining a critical understanding of the world and in creating an active global civil society.
Section 2  Panel: Contemporary global challenges and the role of Global Education

This panel addressed the different challenges facing Global Education in the world in 2017. It is often proposed that education can provide a response to many contemporary challenges. But is it really happening? Is it realistic? To what extent can we rely on education to respond to current realities? Through a facilitated dialogue among three experts in the fields of social cohesion, climate change and anti-radicalisation, the concerns of contemporary global challenges were tackled.

Ms. Monique Borsenberger, researcher from the Luxembourg Institute of Socio-Economic Research, addressed the fragile equilibrium comprehended in the notion of social cohesion, and the possible tensions between the democratic principles of freedom, equality and solidarity. She called for a dialogue that strengthens the understanding of these notions, and for institutions that can facilitate this dialogue and manage social conflicts as part of democracy. Schools were cited as the key institutions in society to facilitate integration by developing citizens who can be responsible and take action, and who can also feel empathy.

Ms. Marie-Hélène Nedelec, Vice-president of the Municipality of Nantes, pointed out to the needs of the metropolitan policy of decentralized cooperation to be a policy for sustainable development, carried out by men and women who act in a spirit of mutual respect and reciprocity. She shared her experience of developing local and regional authorities as partners in fighting climate change given their integral link to key local infrastructure and services such as sanitation, waste management, water and electricity. Local and regional authorities need to turn urban services sustainable. They can choose to support and develop local infrastructure and services that reduce greenhouse emissions and create sustainable solutions. She believes that by working together, education can be part of the answer provided by the international community to the challenges of the 21st century; we have to focus our attention on the young population.

The third panellist, Ms. Elisabeth van der Steenhoven, Director of KARAMA Europe, focussed on the challenges for Global Education as framed by a context of ISIS, radicalisation and tensions in the Arab world. She shared her experiences of working with groups of youngsters, literates and illiterates, coming together in towns and villages in war torn countries. People are very aware of what is going on in their country and around the world and they are coming together to discuss the question that is most important to them: what kind of future do we want? Across the different contexts, whether in Paris or in Beirut, young people are urging others to think for themselves. This is incompatible with scapegoating and easy answers. Social media platforms are facilitating this reflection, while many are being persecuted for their different thoughts. Nevertheless, her message was one of hope, as global educators here, there and everywhere involve, engage and encourage participation through education for justice in the face of extremism and injustice.
Section 3  Keynote: The role of education as a response to global challenges - a dream or reality?

Mr. Kumi Naidoo
Human Rights Activist, Launch Director Africans Rising for Justice, Peace and Dignity

Mr. Naidoo stated that he was feeling nervous addressing the gathering. He said that the main reason for this was that he wanted to convey how serious the current situation in the world is, without painting too dark a picture. He had recently been speaking to a crowd of environmental activists in America and described the current developments in deforestation, the destruction of marine life and other negative trends globally, painting a rather grim picture. At the end of his presentation somebody from the audience commented that Dr King’s most famous speech was about having a dream of the future, but that Kumi’s vision sounded more like a nightmare, not a dream. One of our challenges is to convey the message that ‘things are pretty bad’, without creating disillusion and apathy that results in a lack of action.

The role of Global Education is critical in bringing about action. Louis Althusser had a brilliant idea in his analysis of society. He stipulated that one of our mistakes is to think that those in power control citizens through the repressive state apparatus. Indeed, much of the state apparatus is powerful and can be constraining in public life. However, we need to understand that the more oppressive forms of control are the ideological branches of government and power – schooling, media and public information.

The ways in which education, information and ideology are blended can have very surprising results, which is why we need to look carefully at them. For example, in the USA, the very people who would benefit from a particular public policy change – healthcare – are the ones who oppose it. There are many examples – the Colombian peace referendum, Le Pen here in France, Brexit, Trump – and we must remember that the failure is also ours at this point in history. It is critically important that we put our energies towards solutions and place our anger in the current moment in history. We cannot blame developments on ‘backward thinking’ or ‘deplorable’ people that we do not class as ‘progressives’. They are our brothers and sisters, not our enemies.

Mr. Naidoo stated that before coming to the Paris conference, he had googled Global Education and discovered that unless you are living and breathing Global Education on a daily basis and are thus able to cut through all the material, you will be faced with a lot of jargon that may not be very clear or easy to understand. Part of the challenge we face is that even good, progressive educational efforts fly way above the target audiences. We project our consciousness on people that we want to change. But that is what has to change – or we don’t stand a chance.

You know how environmental activists say ‘save the planet’? Well, it’s actually not the planet that needs saving. Don’t worry about the planet. The planet will survive. The human race will push until we have a situation where human life on the planet will not be feasible if we do not address climate change. The question is whether we can fashion a way of co-existing with the planet for centuries to come, for our children and their children.
If everyone in the world were to have the lifestyle of developed countries and of the elites of developing countries, we will need between 5 and 8 planets.

Ours is a skewed image of consumption: some of us eating, drinking and consuming far too much, while many of us are not getting enough by far. Consumption patterns are not accidental. Marketing starts from childhood and shapes our consumption throughout life. We as a movement must ask the bold and essential questions. This is an opportunity to reflect on our life and to think about all the things that we have done in our lives. Einstein’s definition of insanity offers an interesting clue as to what we need to do: ‘if you dream the same dream over and over again, how can you expect a different outcome?’

Mr. Naidoo looked out at the audience and asked everyone who depended on government funding for their income to raise their hand. About half the audience did so. Mr. Naidoo referenced the requirement to produce results and to show that we are using public money efficiently and stated that although we are required to do this, we cannot judge success by our ability to produce outputs. Not everything that is valuable can be measured, and not everything that is measured, is valuable. If we look at the big picture, we can see a convergence of crises at the moment – a perfect storm. Someone once said, ‘a good crisis is a terrible thing to waste’.

What kind of Global Education do we really need? The Chinese symbol for crisis is also the symbol of opportunity. What can we learn from this? In Africa today, in order to get out of the current social and political mess, we have to rekindle, recapture and re-learn certain indigenous ways of doing things. For example, if we think that a Eurocentric model of education is going to work in all contexts, we are probably going to fail.

Let’s look at how things are changing. An example is the Sustainable Development Goals. The Millennium Development Goals were launched in the year 2000, but it took about three years before they had been picked up by civil society. This was in part because the MDGs were less ambitious than previous international agreements; they were minimalist development goals in the words of former UN Secretary General Kofi Annan. Now we have the SDGs. Let’s use them as a resource – not as a beacon.

When you look at the return on investment in terms of all the effort that went into wholeheartedly promoting the MDGs, it was not worth it for many actors. The three co-chairs of the initiative Tony Blair (United Kingdom), Ellen Johnson Sirleaf (Liberia), Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono (Indonesia) all had different ideas. For example, Tony Blair did not want to include inequality as part of the MDGs. Now, inequality is included in the SDGs.

The biggest disease that we face can only be addressed by a massive educational effort – it is ‘affluenza’. People believe that happiness comes from more ownership and consumption. How much we have and how much we can spend is considered the measure of a person’s success. Moving out of a working-class area or moving up class-wise is more important than our happiness.

Martin Luther King referenced modern child psychology and mentioned the term ‘mal-adjusted’ to describe an inability to conform or fit in. However, there are certain things in the world that are so unacceptable that we have a moral duty to be maladjusted, such as racial discrimination, bigotry and economic conditions that keep millions in poverty. Mr. Naidoo addressed the crowd and said:

You have the responsibility as educators to put the most difficult questions in the public domain for discussion. Don’t walk away from complexity and from difficult choices. The value that we are adding today must be aligned with the extent of the challenges that we are facing now, and with the challenges that we know are coming in the future.
It is very important to maintain our optimism. As a 22-year-old fleeing South Africa, Mr. Naidoo asked his friend ‘what is the most important thing we can do in this struggle? Is it giving our lives?’ His friend answered ‘No, it’s giving the rest of your life’. Two years later, Mr. Naidoo received word that his friend had been murdered. This made him think deep and hard about giving your life versus giving the rest of your life and he decided this: I will live for my country.

What constitutes a good public citizen? Someone who will persevere for decades? Is a good citizen a person who ‘does no harm’? Is giving your life a form of retreat? We can choose to continue with business as usual, but business as usual has not delivered the results that we need for our families, for our futures. We cannot just rearrange the deck chairs on the Titanic while it is sinking.

Sometimes we feel powerless. Sometimes we feel like the effort we invest does not result in anything. But we must persevere and think anew. The world would be a much more pessimistic place if it were not for people like you who struggle for justice. It is going to take tremendous perseverance if we are going to face the challenges of our times.
Section 4  Single stakeholder workshops: Global Education responses to current challenges

The conference brought together a wide range of stakeholders to discuss and suggest solutions and opportunities for Global Education in the face of current challenges. To enable different types of conversations to take place, the conference included two intensive working sessions that involved actors in two different ways. The first of these sessions divided participants according to the type of organisation they represented, with the following working streams:

- Civil Society Organisations
- Local and Regional Authorities
- Ministries and Agencies
- International Organisations
- New Actors
- Researchers and Academics

Each set of stakeholders debated the same set of questions, with a view to understanding priorities, challenges and solutions from the perspective of each different group. Together they addressed the following questions:

- What are the key contemporary challenges which Global Education must address?
- To what extent is Global Education related to current contemporary challenges?
- How does Global Education / learning work in relation to these challenges?
- Inspiring solutions in policy and practice: What works well within each stakeholder group? How to make a shift from pilot projects to large-scale impact?
- What resources/strategies are required to enable GE to make a more significant contribution?
- Is there adequate investment in education considering the global education / learning needed?
- How to work together towards transformative change? New partnerships, new visions, new strategies?
Workshop feedback: Ministries and Agencies

Current challenges

Ministries and agencies of national governments that participated in the Paris conference identified the following challenges in contemporary society, where Global Education may have a role to play:

- Extremism
- Populism
- Lack of trust in governments
- Lack of political will
- Lack of clear definitions

- Globalisation
- Migration
- Legacy of enlightenment
- Simplification by the media
- Inclusion by valuing diversity

Means, strategies and partnerships

How can Global Education contribute more and better towards solving some of today’s challenges? How do we achieve transformative and lasting change? Participants debated these questions and came up with a range of suggestions.

To tackle these challenges, participants discussed a range of inspiring practices. In particular, social cohesion was identified as a key factor, with efforts required to create more spaces and opportunities for dialogue in society as well as within the media sector. It was suggested that media could play an important role in giving nuanced, rather than over simplified, accounts of events and developments.

Ministries and agencies observed a discrepancy between policies and realities on the ground. They suggested that there is a need to use diplomacy and to look at all territories where Global Education could play a role.

Moving forward it will be important to think outside the box and not only work with particular groups – the audience should be as broad as possible and should include young people, new actors as well as the general public.

There is also a need for stronger and better cross-sectoral co-operation, and Global Education needs to start from the local level, bringing the global and local together in a way that makes sense to people; citizenship education is meant to be global, but it must start from the local. We also need to work in a way that enables us to address people from outside our own territories in a useful way.
Ministries and agencies listed the following specific suggestions and strategies:

- In order to achieve transformative change, young people need to gain knowledge of the world at a young age. Being exposed to and experiencing the world can happen in a number of ways, including through youth exchanges.

- If we provide an enabling environment for education, innovation and creativity can be part and parcel of the everyday – a holistic approach to education.

- Our strategy could be to develop in learners the ability to reflect critically and to facilitate access to financial resources for new actors and innovative models.

- As ministries and agencies, we could facilitate dialogue instead of competition among the parties involved in Global Education.

- We need to move from global issues of populations toward introducing global issues locally.

- In terms of partnerships, the emphasis also needs to be on local actors, including the role of families and communities. We could enable people to get involved in specific local projects (learning by doing), multi-actor partnerships, and networking using new means of communication.

Observations

- Regarding the lack of political will identified above, it is not only about being directly opposed to issues. There are many different agendas competing for time, space, political attention and financial resources.

- Within this larger challenge, the disconnect between everyday life and the meta level of political discourse also needs to be addressed; this is necessary in terms of bringing people together.

- Root causes also need to be considered. Is there a lack of understanding? Are we understanding the trends and effects of globalisation, migration, diversity? How can we move away from seeing the people we need to reach as obstacles?

- The learning process has to be allowed to be fluid, not rigid.

- To face current challenges, we need to look far beyond the previous paradigm of Development Education, i.e. justifying development cooperation. We now have a completely different set of learning priorities to add to the equation. Inclusion and social cohesion must be at the core.
Workshop feedback: Local and Regional Authorities

Participants at the Paris conference representing Local and Regional Authorities (LRAs) identified a range of challenges and a multitude of suggestions for how they could play a critical role in achieving transformational change. In the words of one actor:

With planning and political will, we could try to construct a new public policy at the intersection of different areas like sustainable development, education, environment, culture, youth, city politics and ICT.

Current challenges

- A key consideration for the actors from LRAs was the need to understand what kind of impact they could have as actors in Global Education.
- One of the main challenges is how to adapt (as an administration) the current (local) policy or politics and how to deepen these politics in order to reach citizens?
- Everything depends on the context you are working in – the (party) political framework.
- There are two main directions for this approach (Global Education): top down or bottom-up. How can we increase the participation and involvement of citizens? How can we communicate effectively?
- LRA actors stated that the key obstacles to collaboration were institutional, budgetary and political aspects of their work.
- In concrete terms, there is a lack of formal mechanisms in place to influence the formal curriculum and to introduce and make new resources available to teachers.
- From this stems the need to understand the lay of the land (mapping), to create internal awareness and dialogue and to establish an action plan for a multi-faceted approach.
- The long-term goal as well as challenge is to achieve social cohesion in the local territory in light of current global challenges: climate change and environmental degradation, inward orientation and right-wing politics and the need to rebalance values in favour of solidarity, equality and freedom.
Means, strategies and partnerships

• LRA can be the motor and facilitator of communities to stimulate and support local actions. They have the potential ability to reach everyone, including hard to reach groups and small municipalities.

• LRAs can be part of providing inspiring solutions in policy and practice and to play an active part in GE in the local setting. For example, LRAs have experience acting as match makers in the realm of Global Education at the local level, connecting schools and educational NGOs, organising activities and providing strategic information and support to help coordinate and facilitate local stakeholders.

• As the responsible bodies for education, LRAs have deep knowledge of the education system, including curriculum reforms. There are real opportunities here in terms of e.g. strengthening partnerships between local communities and schools (e.g. agriculture schools).

• Global Education actions could be included in educational school projects. We could try to integrate Global Citizenship Education into the fundamentals of education (curriculum content and learning outcomes).

• LRAs could be the go-between and connector for a range of different actors, e.g. by organising training and encounters for educators.

• With planning and political will, we could try to construct a new public policy at the intersection of different areas like sustainable development, education, environment, culture, youth, city politics and ICT.

• We could create new multi-stakeholder partnerships for the purpose of reaching new and broader audiences. There is a need for advocacy and promotion to mobilise a multitude of actors and to find new gateways to action. We need to take account of the richness and plurality of the different actors and to try to reach beyond the ‘inner circle’ of ‘internationals’. It could be as simple as using the LRA’s proximity to local actors and to provide meeting rooms for events and new encounters.

• LRAs can also play a role by introducing novel themes into the Global Education offer, such as Remembrance education (in connection with World War I), Fair Trade and also by linking the local with the global.

• Another approach is to ‘make the local story global (and vice-versa).

Observations

• If you want to build a world of citizens, it is easier to start from the cities - there are fewer obstacles that hinder the discourse on GE.

• It is important to take into consideration the needs and characteristics of different target groups, so that Global Education can be offered across the population.

• Dialogue – it is not enough to convey a message (I am right). To have a genuine dialogue, it has to be a meeting of equals.

• We should define a common vocabulary and make sure that we communicate systematically about global citizenship education. We need to clarify, fine-tune and popularise what Global Education means.

• Transformative change means giving attention to the need for ‘transversality’; enabling different policies to come together in a cross-cutting fashion.

• It is not enough to put forward a message of what values others should have versus every day gaps.

• Active Citizenship: enhance capacity for individual and collective involvement (engagement); encourage action (as active citizens). Starting from life at local level and introduce the international dimension as an eye-opener and a way of mobilising.

• Policy coherence cannot be achieved by any actor alone; many must work together.
Workshop feedback: Civil Society Organisations

Civil society organisations (CSOs) have been actively working to address current challenges for many years and participants at the Paris conference felt that it is now time to change the planning and working strategies at local, national and international levels and to create links between the different levels. They identified the following challenges, strategies and observations about the role of Global Education in today’s world.

Current challenges

- A practical challenge for many CSOs is the struggle for funding and survival in a changing political and financial climate, and this seems likely to continue, unless new ways of working and financing can be created.
- CSO participants identified a range of global phenomena as challenges in the Global Education arena, including a lack of work and unemployment, xenophobia, homophobia and intolerance.
- At school level, many CSOs are wondering how to better integrate Global Education into the school curriculum. It seems that some countries are succeeding at this, while others are far behind. Many CSOs felt that there is a lack of a ministerial framework to support the integration of global citizenship education.
- At the level of the individual, the main challenges were identified as a lack of motivation, the need of resilience and commitment (especially for young people), lack of media literacy.
- Among GE practitioners, a personal challenge was highlighted: how we feel about GE and what motivates us? How do we feel when we fail in our work? We need to consider our confidence and motivation to keep them high.
- Communications challenges were also identified: how we reach out to segments of the population that are not engaged or whom we have difficulty communicating with? How do we make our messages clear, understandable and compelling?
- A more general challenge was voiced regarding resources as well – the continuing need to make sure that we do not waste precious resources. We need to have more impact, create more synergies and find ways of avoiding duplication; ensuring we have concrete outputs and measurable impact and that we simplify the spread of Global Education.
- How do we do needs assessments?

Means, strategies and partnerships

- There is a need for dialogue among actors to cover gaps and catch up. A multi-actor space is needed.
- Building networks and stronger connections, especially strengthening of local networks; local networks need to be involved in structured
global networks working for particular purposes.

- We would like to continue to make training and tools available to educators, but also to everyone else – reaching a broader audience.
- How do we improve our engagement? There are few options that provide as intensive a learning process as direct experience. Therefore, it would make sense to enable as many people as possible to be exposed to international experiences. For example, mobility could be simplified by making travel less restrictive (e.g. visa processes) to let people experience and experiment with solidarity.
- Training all the main stakeholders of Global Education, with particular emphasis on teachers and the media would be another important part of any strategy to improve the role played by Global Education in tackling current challenges; providing people with appropriate tools that are suitable for different audiences, contexts and communications channels to transmit useful messages.
- Promoting critical thinking for pupils as part of normal education curriculum.

**Observations**

- Everything costs money. That money needs to be used efficiently and effectively, but it needs to be there in order to enable longer term processes and planning.
- The link between education and employment should be acknowledged. This is particularly pertinent among young people who often volunteer for different causes and for work experience.
- Confidence, motivation and shared knowledge go far if used well.

*Increasing the links between formal and non-formal education to bring in skills and critical thinking from the non-formal sector, including training for teachers and trainers.*

- Connecting Global Education with action – enabling people to be actively involved.
- Promoting engagement of all stakeholders and trying to propose different solutions for and dialogue with different groups. Producing simple, but not simplistic, messages to reach a wider audience, especially groups no traditionally involved. Consider the use of languages as well as the potential need for communication in different languages.
- Build togetherness with other NGOs, and with other types of actors.
- Engage with authorities to create partnership and dialogue, particularly with the ministries and other international organisations from where the funds come.
Workshop feedback: New Actors

New actors in Global Education are approaching societal, political and economic transformation in new ways. The innovation of new actors stems from their ability to grow their impact beyond their traditional role to create new alliances and organisational models to achieve systemic changes. New actors are uniquely placed to empower public, private, and social institutions to (co)-create added value. However, although new actors are increasingly playing an important role in the Global Education field, they still face many challenges in legitimizing their actions.

Current challenges

- The recent rise of populist, nationalist discourse, its acceptance or influence on society and the educational paradigm can have negative effects and we need to work against these trends. There are increasing divisions in society, between elites and non-elites, youth and Elders, and between the vision of the new institutions that we need and the existing institutions that we have.
- The new actors also face systemic lethargy in how they can facilitate change: the actors are concerned about how schools have become stuck in rigid structures, which are less flexible to systems thinking, lack critical thinking approaches and are less able to create experiences for transformative learning.
- New actors also find that the lack of definition, comprehension, and specific purpose of GE can lead to ambiguity. Also because of differences in international and national frameworks, there is a lack of recognition of what is good quality GE and what are its objectives.
- We also see obstacles such as the difficulty of measuring GE competences such as soft qualities – how do we measure impact and different levels (student, teacher, institutional and policy)? We sense that there is lack of proper measurement standards. In some instances, we also question the paradigm itself – do we really need to measure everything?

Means, strategies and partnerships

- New actors can collaborate with stakeholders from different sectors to co-create opportunities and partnerships that could result in systemic impact. Particularly, they should inform and partner with ministries of education regarding the GE agenda.
- New actors can become repositories of knowledge as there is a need to create best practices of GE. The GE agenda, pedagogy and practices, revolving around critical thinking and covering socio-economic, political, and environmental issues along with humanistic values, should be a lifelong learning process.
- New actors can support initiatives and create increased visibility, awareness as well as market existing or create new initiatives to highlight unique solutions.
- New actors can also help to rethink the architecture of our schools, the organisational structure, the pedagogy, research, and institutional practices in terms of aligning these with present challenges.
Observations

- GE is about creating lifelong learning experiences, building existential human competences through innovative pedagogy and curriculum.

- New actors should develop a systems perspective so that they have the ability to connect and synergize impact through multi-stakeholder partnership. They also need to be empowered by government and social institutions.

- New actors advocating GE face considerable challenges, but they are very much purpose-driven, and especially the Millennial generation have the network and technological advantage.

- The group of new actors and civil society organisations felt they had gained new insights, but that further exchange would be needed at a deeper level to get to the bottom of specific issues and to initiate tangible partnerships. The group summarised the characteristics of its approach in the diagram below.
Workshop feedback: Academics and Researchers

Current challenges

Just as we are all networking and mobilizing and using the crisis as an opportunity, so is the far-right of politics and populism. We need to be strategic and have strategies and responses in place in case future elections go the way they have been recently.

Inequality has grown inside our countries. Populism and inequality have come hand in hand – disaffection is enabling manipulation and pitching people against migrants and minorities. We cannot create a world on a democratic basis while inequality is growing. Many are looking to the extreme right for answers. Is that because there are no alternative answers? What is the role of academia in communicating around some of these challenges?

- In view of the political shift/reaction to the far right, can academia help make intelligible what is silent (e.g. through the immediate impact of higher education)?
- How can we communicate the public role of the university but then not be reduced to how we have to communicated that message (e.g. autonomy of research vs. branding)?
- How can research support other sectors (e.g., NGOs/CSOs) from the privileged space of higher education, while also recognizing that higher education is in a precarious place.
- Drawing on work that has been done; but not repeating the same mistakes.
- The impact of climate change is something largely invisible that is happening and impacting on our lives and we cannot ignore it. We need to figure out how to address it in a positive way and to empower people to go beyond all the negativity surrounding the topic.

There are also challenges and interesting developments in the area of conceptual development and the language that gets used. Quite a lot of the language that comes from higher education is starting to get used, including some of the terms that we have been working with for a long time - global citizens, responding to globalization. However, it is taking a specific, narrow, instrumentalist form. One of our challenges is that, in the past we wanted acceptance of some of the words and now that they are used, they are used in different ways for different needs.

One reason for this is that historically, academic research in Global Education has been theoretically and conceptually quite weak and as a consequence lacks a strong narrative to intervene from an evidence based experience. The use of terms without solid understanding or agreement of what they mean leads to certain terms being cherry picked, modified and sometime ‘flavour of the month’.

Our challenge is also to engage and provide leadership that talks about a narrative of Global Education that is conceptually robust and builds on evidence and also addresses the agendas of students. In many universities, students are increasingly angry about what is happening around the
world and in their societies and they want to learn how to affect developments and affect change. For example, medical students are increasingly opting to take a course on the determinants of health. As academics, we have a responsibility to respond to student voices, especially when what they want to talk about is not in the curriculum or among the courses on offer.

Means, strategies and partnerships

In terms of how Global Education can respond, we need to adapt our approaches to realise that the public institution of education and knowledge making and the position of the student has totally changed towards individualisation; it’s hard to educate for a collective world when competing in a market place of privileges.

At several universities, it is felt that reform is necessary in terms of what is on offer for students, both in order to better prepare for a hyper complex world, but also because students, and also segments of our wider societies, are hungry for what is really going on in the world and want to engage with that. Different courses can be offered combining creative elements, impact and scenarios from the real world, collaboration exercises, but in addition to reforming what we offer students, reforming the education system more widely is probably also needed. This is harder, as we are organised and funded to a large extent by government.

In terms of our links with other actors, there are many potential areas of collaboration, some of which we have not yet explored in practical terms, or not achieved. For example, academics and research are trusted by both policy makers and practitioners in terms of providing scientific evidence and data, but studies show that only a small proportion actually use such evidence in their everyday work and life. It seems that opinion makers and content from the media and from social media are more listened to.

Research is needed to capture the voices that feel they aren’t being heard. We keep coming back to the prevailing inequality within our community. Perhaps we could connect with other sectors who are working on this to figure out what we might have to offer. For example, it was mentioned by one participant that only NGOs are actively addressing inequality at societal level. NGOs and the wider CSO community are often vulnerable in times of crises, particularly in the area of funding. What can academia contribute in terms of supporting collaborations that are on a much more equal footing (participatory parity)? What can academia do to complement NGOs and non-formal education activities more generally?

As academics, we can play a role in terms of reaching out to young adults who are not in education, training or connected to formal structures. We can create channels and projects that reach out to provide an alternative narrative to groups that may otherwise be at risk of being recruited or convinced that far-right groups and ideology is their only or most convincing option. There are examples of doing this as a mechanism of empowerment.

When we shift Global Education into schooling, it’s treated as simply formal education. What is the relationship between formal and non-formal? Is there appreciation of how nurturing non-formal Global Education benefits and fosters GE in formal education? The link between the two could be highlighted through research.

Academia could have a role with regard to having a more formalised ‘north-south’ dialogue by trying to be more diverse in how we discuss and debate these issues and how we communicate and bring this into formal education: how do we speak and is this intelligible? We should consider how we could help mainstream genuine dialogue and make it transversal in terms of the approach used.

The need for dialogue among us will continue after this event. The network of Global Education researchers (ANGEL) currently being developed by GENE with the Development Education Research Centre can serve as a conduit for this.
Observations

Using fear as an instrument is an age-old method of creating division and cementing support for extreme viewpoints, often embodied in specific individuals.

We have two fundamental assumptions that underline Global Education and that are eroding: First, the rule of law and humanitarian decencies. All around the world populations, schools, education facilities are under attack. Perhaps we haven’t understood that our human decency has been eroded. Second, gender inequality. We are witnessing the popularization of misogyny and increasing public acceptability of misogyny and deeply racist and xenophobic tendencies. We need to answer the bigger questions and acknowledge the intersecting structures of domination.

Regarding inequality and its negative effects, the country of Luxembourg offers an interesting insight into the correlation between equality and lack of fear and scapegoating. Luxembourg is a very small country made up of 45% foreigners. It is also a rich country with low levels of inequality. There is little or no fearmongering regarding immigration and immigrants in Luxembourg. It is clear to most people that without immigration, the country could not develop. Recently, as refugees started to arrive, this was extensively debated in the press. Various points of view can co-exist, even the far right, in a situation where resources and jobs are not competed for in what often feels like a zero-sum game. The debate needs to happen and people are better equipped to deal with them when inequality is low.

Many of the developments we are seeing today are the result of more long term processes, both good and bad, and we need to acknowledge that longer perspective. In terms of education, there are standards and good practice for inclusive education out there, but there is no global standard or agreement. For example, in the United States, there are no national standards, as education is determined locally. Perhaps we need agreement at least on what values we embed. What are we trying to say to the world? How can diverse and multifaceted networks come together to raise the Global Education voice?

Regarding results and evidence-based discourse, it is both useful and hampering. For example, on one hand the drive for consensus around the SDGs and what we need in order to share the vision of the world we want (i.e. transformative action) and on the other we don’t see policy makers using evidence to formulate this. Similarly, the drive towards evidence based accountability is hollowing out education and there is a risk of instrumentalising of our educational structures and purposes – a massive meta-problem.

While there are many challenges, we also have reason to be optimistic in our field of work. There are a number of academic journals that are starting to share their ideas and thinking and that is becoming quite important. For example, Sinergias in Portugal launched in January 2015, focusing initially on collaboration with other journals and on how to fight against the privatisation of knowledge. There are also at least 10 books out on the topic of Global Education in the last 10 years in the English language alone, with a wealth of published material in the pipeline – people have a lot to say!
Workshop feedback: International Organisations

Current challenges

Among representatives from international organisations, an overcrowded curriculum was highlighted as a key challenge, with the consequence that it is difficult to find entry points for new topics and approaches, whatever they are. There are limits to teacher capacity as well, and sometimes unrealistic demands on their time.

In terms of teacher training, competencies are always difficult to teach, as are socio-emotional skills. Teacher training is traditionally subject matter based. There is room for improvement and innovation in this area in order to enable teacher to facilitate the type of Global Education conversations and learning that we would like to see.

There is a challenge around identity that comes from education. In many countries citizenship education is closely linked to patriotism. It can be under many guises, such as peace education or another social change label.

There is a need to think beyond schools; we need to include those who aren’t/haven’t been in school as an audience. Similarly, there is a need to engage the critics; we communicate with the converted but lack understanding in terms of how to engage with those who don’t believe in this work.

There is some urgency to reach more segments of the population in countries around the world, especially if we want to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals within the next 14 years. When we way we want to target everyone, we need to be specific about who we mean and with what message or for what purpose.

There are challenges around broadening the accountability and transparency discourse in the field of development co-operation and Development Education. Moving from a perspective that focuses on how money is spent on aid, to one that takes into account e.g. global competencies related to citizenship is quite a leap. If we are looking for aid transparency, we know we can achieve this by communicating about official development spending and results. If we want to include global citizenship, how do we approach it? PISA? We should also remember that money spent on DEAR and communication about global issues is a drop in the ocean compared to the money spent on commercial marketing and media messages.

Means, strategies and partnerships

EU – the opinion tracker, UK civil society looking at public opinion of the population, segmenting the population to target the messages, six colour variation of people from ‘converted to completely disconnected’. Need to be reached differently. Sending the wrong message can be counterproductive if we don’t differentiate the message. Preaching to the converted is easy if we want to achieve our targets.

Understanding different audience groups is key. For example, when it comes to Development Education and Awareness Raising (DEAR), we are not just talking about a sliding scale of development co-operation sup-
porters or non-supporters. Opinion polling mechanisms like the Eurobarometer measure support for development co-operation, but it doesn’t segment the target audiences, nor does it ask more specific questions. We need to think about additional ways of listening better.

We can look at different aspects of Global Education being introduced in a cross-curricular fashion across different subjects, i.e. plugging GE into maths, English etc. However, given the challenges highlighted in terms of overcrowded curricula, we may also consider Global Citizenship as a standalone subject.

What do young adults and children want to learn? Co-designing with learners is essential. If we want to reach e.g. young adult women who are not connected to the ‘grid of services and education’, how do we start communication?

The Pan-European Congress of the Council of Europe brings all kinds of actors together into a joint process of reformulation and strategizing at different levels by discussing the same issues. How do we translate recommendations into policies? How do we monitor progress? The North-South Centre is monitoring by developing regional congresses looking at local implementation processes. Specifically, task forces from each regional seminar is monitoring implementation.

Innovation and creativity can play an interesting role in changing behaviours. New approaches like learning labs and immersive experiences allow participants to experiment with their own values and to question and modify their opinion. In this context, we also need to see teachers as facilitators rather than all knowers who share everything top-down.

GENE Peer Reviews work. But we need more. Multi-stakeholder dialogue is imperative in order to move GE forward. It can also be used for monitoring purposes at it enables us to hold one another to account. Such dialogue initiatives could also include the private sector – to reach some of the groups we are not reaching and to seek out synergies in terms of resources and innovation.

To track progress and to show what results anything is having in this and other areas, we need to bring data and make it accessible to the public, both qualitative and quantitative. That’s what international organisations could contribute; bring research together and package it in a useful way. Organisations like the OECD could play a more targeted role in doing this – can we think about how to do this together? The way we present data and communicate around it could be a real game changer.

Observations

UNESCO’s Mahatma Ghandi Institute highlighted the lack of a forum where the different strands of Global Education can come together – Education for Sustainable Development (ESD), Development Education and Awareness Raising (DEAR), Human Rights Education etc. GENE provides a space for ministries and agencies that address these different strands in terms of policy and funding in Europe, with budding new structures in other regions of the world in the coming years. Does anything exist at the level of practitioners or for other types of organisations to come together across education strands?

How do we introduce innovative pedagogies into the curriculum? As international organisations we bring together practitioners and educators. Our role is to make a link between the external mechanisms and the curricula. Good practice for us is the process itself – when you want to introduce a new approach, the process is maybe more important.

In terms of achieving real outcomes, it appears that the educational process in school more important than we previously thought – making learning person centred yields different results from the traditionally overloaded curriculum and homework model. Countries like Finland are focusing on what and how children do and learn in school most of all.

The SDGs provides opportunities for a more realistic and more holistic discussion.

The private sector is jumping on the SDG bandwagon. Big companies are talking about the global goals and launching their own initiatives. Some of
this may be useful for reaching audiences we do not currently reach or do not communicate well with.

It is easy for different actors to adopt and use terms for their own purposes. A lot of time is spent on discussing concepts, not moving on to how they translate into behavioural change.

The need for accountability continues. We can’t stop communicating about results of policies; we have to do that as well.
Section 5  Multi-stakeholder dialogue on Global Education

The purpose of the second working group session at the Paris conference was to offer a space for multi-stakeholder dialogue, where participants from different institutions and organisations could come together to debate solutions and strategies to improve and increase Global Education. Specifically, the workshops addressed the relationship between Global Education, social cohesion and change, quality considerations, sharing experiences around strategy and practical tools. The sessions brought diverse groups together to reflect and learn, and to move on from the conversations from the morning session.

Workshop feedback

The first multi-stakeholder workshop focused on a more conceptual reflection on the role of education with regards to social cohesion. Participants observed that in many societies today there is a backward trend when it comes to inclusion, rather feelings of exclusion predominate. At the same time, it has been shared that at the political level, it is becoming harder to justify and fund Global Education because politicians do not want to be challenged. A joint action may be necessary in order to break the status quo and strengthen Global Education policies and strategies that go beyond the institutional competition and rivalry. Different contexts and publics require different strategies and actions, there is a need for more specific approaches and practices that shall go beyond the usual groups that Global Education addresses.

The second multi-stakeholder workshop discussed the SDG4 implementation in policy and practice. There are many examples of policy and practice all over Europe that promotes and implements SDG4 in practice already. The challenge is how to use the SDGs as a framework for Global Education work and as a tool for enhancing a dialogue on Global Education issues at the international, national and local levels. It is critical to focus on different audiences and approaches that reach out to specific societal and age related publics. Young people need to be at the heart of this endeavour. The importance of the development of national action plans and the opportunity for Global Educators to be part of this process has been mentioned as well, together with the need for monitoring and accountability measures.

The third workshop addressed the issues of policy learning for Global Education and DEAR strategies in practice. One of the key issues addressed is the evaluation that forms part of the funding criteria for GE that it is often stipulated by funding bodies and focuses on measuring predetermined outcomes. The challenge in the field of policy learning and evaluation is partly how we can move beyond this narrow approach that focuses on
outcomes rather than on Global Education learning. Examples from the UK show that if learning is placed at the heart of the process, which can be done by systematically collecting data as well as stories as evidence – then the learning becomes more important than just pure outputs and also allows for different outcomes than those that were expected. This requires a paradigm shift among many funding institutions and education organisations. Participants also called for the development of specific indicators for learning engagement. The need for more networking and regular dialogue, involving the Ministry of Education and stimulating a broader discussion and reflection on Global Education, while creating more opportunities for inter-sectoral co-operation were highlighted. More emphasis on learning is needed also by considering the SDGs as a learning framework.

... if you put learning at the heart of the process ... then the learning becomes more important than just pure outputs and also allows for different outcomes than those that were expected.

Finally, the fourth workshop contemplated on the instruments to guarantee quality Global Education. It facilitated a reflection on the notion of quality in Global Education and collected examples of instruments that enhance quality in Global Education. It also addressed the question on how to move towards more appropriate models to measuring quality and learning in Global Education. It is still a challenge for donors and funders of Global Education to adopt a systematic approach to track Global Education impact and to understand how to improve results. The question related to the type of tools that are needed to capture learning outcomes and the challenges that lead to learning, was raised. It has been agreed that this area needs further work to define key quantitative and qualitative approaches that are suitable for GE. Also, ways to facilitate a multi-stakeholder dialogue were discussed and experiences shared. More opportunities for a multi-stakeholder meetings that deal with topics such as policy, curricula, quality, funding, awareness, etc. are needed.

Although all workshops addressed different topics, common issues across the workshops include the need for:
- more specific approaches and practices that shall go beyond the usual groups that Global Education addresses;
- the SDGs to be considered and used as a learning framework;
- the shift in the paradigm of quality enhancement in Global Education by putting learning in its centre, to be transversally implemented in monitoring and evaluation measures, as well as throughout the process of funding;
- more opportunities for a multi-stakeholder dialogue on different themes and levels.

A summary of the proceedings of each workshop group is available as an annex to this report.
Section 6  Learning and conclusions

Shared learning among key stakeholders in Global Education

Mr. Liam Wegimont
Chairperson GENE

The Chairperson of GENE introduced the final session; appreciating the contribution of all involved – particularly the conference hosts and partners – and sought to gather some of the policy learning that had been shared. It was clear from the tone and the content of the conference that:

• The need for a renewed and unashamed focus in solidarity – local, national, European and global – is a necessary antidote to current concerns and trends;
• Our work is education – which is at the heart of social change, but which we do not confuse with a prescribed programme. We educate as a practice of freedom;
• Our guarantee that we are not “preaching to the converted” is based on our attempts to reach more people, and to do it better. The presence of “new actors” in this Conference gives us hope for renewal.
• There is a thirst for greater alignment and cooperation between differing actors, in pursuit of the vision of quality global education for all. GENE is committed to working in partnership – and to strengthening partnerships with other stakeholders – in pursuit of this common mission;

GENE has been working for 15 years in pursuit of the vision that we work towards the day when all people in Europe – in solidarity with people globally - will have access to quality global education. The work has only just begun; now, more than ever, it is a necessity for our future. To borrow and adapt the words of the Irish poet, Patrick Kavanagh:

To be really alive
Is to never stop believing
In the masterpieces
We will create
Tomorrow
Mr. Michel Tarran  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs, France

Mr. Tarran began his introduction of Mr. Edgar Morin with a few comments on behalf of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, France:

The way this day unfolded has convinced me that it was the right decision to support this initiative. Our ministry supports civil society to a great extent. Do you know of any other ministries that have a charter for engaging with civil society? This is an acknowledgment of the role played by civil society. We also have a parallel process that acknowledges the role of local and regional authorities.

Today’s conference has really served to illustrate what civil society and LRAs can contribute to Global Education and Development Education. By bringing such different actors from academia, civil society, LRAs, ministries and agencies, international organisations and new actors, we are bringing our experiences together. In this way, we can begin to achieve a world of solidarity.

Mr. Tarran then thanked the GENE team, and also the colleagues at the Ministry who led the process of preparation of the conference, before introducing Edgar Morin as one of the world-renowned intellectuals of France.
I would like to mention how paradoxical teaching or education is. It’s about introducing in young minds a certain number of notions and knowledge. But as the fundamental mission of education was to make sure that education would lead to free, critical minds getting out of the system. It is certain that by teaching we mean to teach students to become self-educated. One always has to combine educational pedagogy with certain didactics. My own message today expresses my feeling deeply. I had a history teacher that passed on some of the ideas that are most fundamental to me.

The education system should allow us to move on and to discover oneself. There are necessary topics for the education system that are often lacking, such as the question ‘What is citizenship?’ This is extremely important, as being citizen implies that there is democracy where the citizen can assert control and action vis-à-vis the government, and also to have duties and responsibilities. The difference is being a subject, or an active person.

We know that the Athenian army pushed back the Persian army. Persia came back, but again Athens was able to push them back through a very improbably sequence of events. From this stemmed the earliest forms of democracy. It was very fragile and only lasted a short while and it took a very long time before the nations with democratic governance system emerged. French democracy collapsed in 20th century after the attacks of the Nazi army.

So, we have to teach pupils and learners what the system is all about. It is not just about majority rule – it is for a certain period in time and it is about the plurality of antagonistic ideas. This is what vitalises democracy. It also implies not only some sort of moral pain or suffering, because you have to tolerate ideas that you do not agree with, but also power going to people you don’t agree with. It also entails respecting minorities.
One thing that is not so well known that I want to mention: “Democracy has no truth”. Let me explain. Totalitarian rule claims truth from the gods or a higher power. In democracy, truth is fluid, truth is there, and it is temporary, it is of the citizen. I keep coming back to the term citizen as it implies feeling responsible for the national fate of the own country and feeling solidarity towards a community.

This also applies when we ponder ethics – thinking that what’s good and what’s bad can be defined. The fundamental terms are responsibility and solidarity – society cannot live as a democratic society without these two factors.

Our societies were founded on the feeling of community and on solidarity – feeling that all our children are of one common ancestor. How can we in the modern day achieve this? It has to take a different shape – perhaps through a motherly and a fatherly aspect of the nation? We turn the country into the motherland. We view the father as the governor, the state, the government.

In any society you have conflicts, interests and selfishness. However, when we face disaster, we show solidarity; we become one, we become a community again. At certain times we are a community, at other times we are a society with our normal issues. However, if you do not have responsibility and solidarity, you do not have a democratic society.

Europe is quite ill at the moment. What does globalisation mean? It means that all humans have become interdependent – we have to face common fundamental issues and dangers. What are they?

- Deterioration of the biosphere and environment threatening our lives as civilized people.
- We have unregulated economies that produce crises – it is not only unregulated; they are driven by financial speculation.
- We have anguish – we used to think that tomorrow would be better than yesterday – is that still the case? Is there still the belief in progress?
- Hate, fanaticism, withdrawal.

This should make us push the notion of solidarity beyond our national borders, but we have a problem here. Instead of a community of faith, a new humanism, a global humanism, we see instead that anguish and crises foster the focus on national identity, on religious identity, on physical identities that focus on specific aspects. Of course, we all have identities, but some of these aspects blur the feeling of having a joint community, a joint fate.

The notion of citizen virtues can make us think of ourselves as global citizens. Unfortunately, these notions are very weak; our institutions cannot create them. There is something missing in all our official systems and that is an education that enables us to understand ‘the other’. It is not only a European or global problem, but also a problem that we experience ourselves daily – what does it mean to understand ‘the other’?

All human beings have common identity – brain capabilities, affections, feelings of joy, sadness etc. These are common human feelings that enable us to feel empathy and solidarity. On the other hand, we are also very different psychologically and ideologically. We must recognise that we are both identical and different.

Even though we are in the information society, it is incredible the number of misunderstandings that happen in communications between people in society, even within the same society. To teach understanding implies that you should fight against self-deception – to think that you are the one who is right. It also implies the fundamental idea which is implicit in human rights – that we should all be respected for our humanity and that there are no humans who are superior or inferior.

Hegel wrote about our need for recognition, i.e. the fact that we want others to recognise us as fully human. Nothing is worse than the feeling of being humiliated, which is experienced by many. On top of that humiliation, there is indifference. Saying ‘hello’ to a person, recognising that they are a human being can change that feeling. Human recognition is essential.
How can we cope with uncertainty? Life is like cruising an ocean of uncertainty. Right from birth we know that we are going to die. We don’t know when we are young if we are going to be happy, if we will enjoy our work, if we will find a significant other, if we will have good health. We are in a society which is faced with uncertainties and unexpected events. In human history, we have had two world wars, 9/11 and other awful events, but still people are surprised when people like Trump win elections. Are we blind or just looking with one eye? Here, there is something we need to teach: the unexpected will increasingly occur and we have to acknowledge this.

It is important that we look at the past. We think of the 20th century and say ‘how could people be so stupid?’ but our society today, or neo-liberalism as a phenomenon, is it not a complete illusion? In France, we made numerous mistakes until we were invaded by the enemy in 1940. Did we learn anything? Do our political leaders never make mistakes? What about us? We should equip ourselves with knowledge.

When you convey a message to a recipient, it goes through a lot of noise and there is a risk of misunderstanding and error – this is part of all communication and perception. In “The Witness”, a book describing English and German soldiers during the first world war, the accounts of the same events experienced by both sides are completely different. Hence, perception could be completely different based on an emotion.

When you shut yourself into your own ideology, fanaticism can develop. We are not taught to recognise the illusions, the fake knowledge, that which is not knowledge. I believe we should be taught this from primary school.

As homo sapiens, we are supposed to have reasoning, but this is a misconception. Madness, insanity, anger, hubris – people rationalise all kinds of things, even in madness (e.g. concentration camps). The Soviet Union tried to remove religion from society, but as we can see, the Orthodox church is still strong. The human problem is to combine reason with passion. These ideas should be taught; they are issues for our daily lives.

In conclusion, I believe that this is a great, huge mission for the education system that requires a huge reform like the one that took place in the late 18th and early 19th century (when the first university in Berlin in the early 19th century paved the way for the school systems of the western world) as our current system is obsolete. We need to understand what human beings are, we need to introduce data that is unknown to us now, but essential to our understanding.

We never teach what we are as human beings – this is missing from the education system. We forget about ourselves and what we are. The species is inside ourselves in our genes. We need to be able to continue to breathe. Species, society, culture, individuals, those realities are omni-present and you cannot ignore the individual for society. We are also mammals, vertebrate, we have billions of cells which are the heirs of the first cells, which are atoms, made up of the first particles from billions of years ago. The fact is that the living world and the physical world are part of us. Since 1970, thanks to the rise of environmental awareness, we know this more now.
Section 7 Outcomes, evaluation and follow-up

Conference Outcomes

The Paris Conference on Global Education: Towards a World of Solidarity intended to offer a space for reflection on global challenges that education faces today. It also sought to facilitate learning and integration within and between particular stakeholders in Global Education, and to strengthen the commitment to Global Education by exploring new visions and strategies, inspired by emerging actors and existing French and international practice.

Among the key Conference achievements and outcomes, the following elements can be highlighted:

- Excellent multi-stakeholder engagement in the process, networking and converging agendas among the different actors with regards Global Education;
- Enhanced coordination;
- Policy and practice learning among the participants;
- Strengthened political commitment towards Global Education;
- The Paris Statement on Global Education 2030;
- Visibility and recognition of Global Education;
- Clarity of the challenges to be addressed.

Multi-stakeholder engagement, networking and converging agendas

Excellent Multistakeholder engagement in the process was considered as one of the great value added of this conference. The fact that the conference brought together Ministries, Agencies, CSOs, LRAs, researchers and other emerging actors in Global Education in an orchestrated manner, where by focusing on our shared values, our common concerns and our mutual agenda, and by providing a clear framework for single stakeholder and multi-stakeholder dialogue, a more profound engagement took place. The need to move towards a common agenda, with aligned but separate roles, forward has become evident. Ministries and Agencies, and other partners in the field demonstrated a great interest in aligning strategies, and with the other international organisations in overlapping or adjacent fields – with OECD, UNESCO, COE, etc. all inspired and interested to work together.
Enhanced coordination

Through the process of partnership development among the organisers of the conference, in particular, Platforma, Concord, European Youth Forum, as well as other International Organisations, there is a willingness to work together. The EC recognised that GENE is in pole position to enhance coordination. Offers for co-hosting similar events and for continued partnership were developed.

Learning

The conference facilitated a learning process with regards to policy and practice. The responses on the key lessons learned have confirmed clearly that learning took place. Some of the key reflections pointed out to the following:

- There is an urgent need to mobilize multiple approaches to global education, but we need the space for critical reflexivity so that we are not repeating what we’ve done before and expecting something different;
- People working in the Global Education field share similar challenges. Cooperation among the different stakeholders is the key to meaningful practices. Sharing good practices and meeting people in the field is very important because it provides the inspiration needed to keep moving on.
- It is important to talk about results and impact of our daily actions - global interconnectedness and appreciate differences between people, cultures, societies in order to reduce discrimination, violence, xenophobia.
- It is not always easy for the different stakeholders to understand each other when they talk about GCE: LRGs, CSOs, researchers etc., all have their own concepts and practices; although one day conference is not enough to bring them together it is very important to conduct regularly this kind of multi-stakeholder dialogues to foster exchanges and on the longer term strengthen each other and improve each other practices.
- Cross-sectoral, multi-stakeholder dialogue and collaboration is essential to create more momentum, synergies and coherence for implementing GE. We need to be bold in asking the right questions and address the issues we face in the appropriate dimension, with boldness and innovation.
- The importance of including NEW ACTORS in this agenda and the importance to include non-formal education and lifelong learning in the global education agenda.
- That personal leadership is needed every day even without clear answers to all the questions that the change is bringing about.
- DEAR is developing further to include issue of marginalisation/ alienation/ populism.
- Importance of making connections between global education policies and current political and educational realities.
- Sometimes is very useful to look at the Global education issues not from local/or regional perspective, but from holistic point of view.
- Movement towards the importance of presenting a united front across different stakeholders / groups on global education; really building a movement. Need more concrete outcomes now to show the impact of working cross sector. Also consider bringing on board private sector who engage on CSR projects in this area for example.
- SDG can be a good opportunity to engage new actors in GE. It is a tool and an opportunity more than a new agenda or a new paradigm to work GE.
- To extend GCE in non-EU countries, especially those with authoritarian regimes.
- Action is more and more relevant; sharing knowledge is empowerment.
- We have to learn how to argue in order to convince people, it is not enough to make our point of view public.
Strengthened political commitment

Throughout the process the French MFA and AFD confirmed in their support of GE and of GENE. Hierarchies clearly and publicly committed and political will reinforced, not only in regard to French involvement in GENE but, more importantly, French political support for GE strengthened, including public announcement of increased financial support. Also, stated publicly that outcomes of the conference will be brought to highest political level (Prime Minister).

The involvement of the French Ministry of Education, which was brought to the table together with the MFA and AFD, opens new doors for a dialogue and cooperation. Furthermore, the Ministry of Education announced strong support for curriculum reform in favour of GE.

THE PARIS STATEMENT ON GLOBAL EDUCATION TO 2030
TOWARDS A WORLD OF SOLIDARITY AND SOCIAL COHESION FOR ALL

The conference has also created the opportunity to endorse the Paris Statement on Global Education to 2030 – Towards a World of Solidarity and Social Cohesion for All. The process of the statement development gathered perspectives from different stakeholders and conference participants, prior to the conference. The Statement is understood as work in progress and those interested in endorsing it, can sign up to it on GENE website. The Statement proposes the following commitments:

The stakeholders in Global Education here present, commit ourselves/our organisations, to:

• Develop long term strategies to 2030 on strengthening commitment to and support for GE at local, regional, national and European levels;
• Ensure adequate attention within GE to immediate and contemporary issues of concern: poverty eradication, conflict and extremism, climate change and the movement of people; and to a fundamental focus on long-term causes: social inequity, the need for greater social cohesion, and the need for strengthened local and global solidarity and for better living together in our common world;
• Recognise the need for critical engagement with models of development, manipulation of public opinion, incoherence of public policies and the need for great coherence in public policy;
• Cooperate to ensure adequate funding levels including through the means of the international cooperation and ODA devoted to awareness raising and education for citizenship and international solidarity and continuous improvement in the quality of Global Education, particularly in the formal, non-formal and informal education sectors;
• Reaffirm the role of public authorities and the State in guaranteeing the right to quality education, and recognise that global education is at the heart of this process.

Call on GENE to:

• Facilitate good reporting instruments, reflect on and share the learning from the SDG work (in particular, SDG 4.7) undertaking by Ministries and Agencies regarding DEAR and GE;
• Cooperate with other international organisations and institutions (EC, UN, OECD, CoE) and with emerging structures in other regions to develop a global approach to the centrality of GE and DEAR to social cohesion, social justice and global solidarity;
• Continue to share policy learning among Ministries and Agencies, and with other stakeholders, working towards the day when all people in Europe – in solidarity with peoples globally – will have access to quality Global Education.
Visibility and recognition of Global Education

The conference was present beyond the premises of the event through its social media and web work. The message that solidarity should be at the heart of education went viral through Twitter and trended in France as the 3rd issue of the day. It even reached the French top level politicians.

Many participants have written blogs and reported on the conference through their organisations. Here are some highlights developed by the Global Education Conference Network in different media:

https://medium.com/gec-network-musings/reflections-on-the-paris-conference-on-global-educationtowards-a-world-of-solidarity-7b995160f561#.nmks3q0vp
https://storify.com/elemenous/paris-conference-on-global-education
https://photos.google.com/share/AF1QipPEVu11BndDjMr31AqAaU_6k3FeyH47dHRVlwvtAVwyZBR4aH0u8Qc7CnADRUsK7w?key=ZWIkajVsRk55V2dHYUZDcjhCyjZreGhzRC1ZSEdn
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NMpyVhqESrQ

Challenges to be addressed

It is clear that in a one-day conference it was impossible to address all the issues in great detail. The Paris conference raised many interesting questions for further thought and elaboration. Participants began to answer and look at ways of moving beyond many challenges, and they also raised more questions, including:

- How do we align strategies and work together towards Global Education for all?
- How to reach other, non-traditional Global Education publics?
- How do we work on standards for quality global education?
- What other spaces can we develop / use for further practice sharing and multistakeholder dialogue?
- How can we use the SDG4 framework to enhance learning in different contexts?
Evaluation

The evaluation data from the conference indicated that participants truly appreciated the choice of speakers, in particular the presence of Mr. Kumi Naidoo and the inspirational speech of Mr. Edgar Morin. The overall programme, as well as the chosen approach and methodology were also well received. Specifically, participants mentioned the balance of the panels and the working groups, the streams with speed-meeting, insightful workshops, and the multi-stakeholder approach, dialogue and breadth. Considering the unsettling political events across the world, the rise of radical right groups, xenophobia and racism, many were delighted to have solidarity as a central theme of the conference. The opportunity to come together with like-minded people who are experts in the field of Global Education and want to reflect and work together to develop strategies to respond to local and global challenges was most appreciated. The choice of participants, a friendly atmosphere and the overall organisation were recognised.

Yet, there is always a space for improvement. More time, more workshops, more interaction, more room for discussion were among the most recurrent elements of the feedback in this regard. A tighter focus and further depth of analysis of the current political situation in presentations was also requested, as well as more specific actions and next steps to be taken after the conference by the whole group. There was a suggestion to invest in the on-line preparation and follow-up of the conference by (1) sharing the final text / conference statement beforehand as google doc and inviting participants and other partners to provide suggestions / comment / change; (2) invite workshop participants to "flipped sessions": invite them to provide/share input beforehand and to identify key questions based on such input in order to run workshop sessions focusing on dialogue on key questions (avoid face-to-face participants’ presentations that take several minutes for each participants and eat 50% of the workshop time).

More than a third of participants contributed written feedback on the event. The organisers have taken note of all the feedback for which they are very grateful; the feedback will inform future GENE-led processes.

Follow-up

There are many different elements of follow up to the Paris Conference, first of all, by GENE, by the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs, by GENE’s partners, as well as by participants and the overall network of organisations that were involved directly and indirectly.

While GENE is following up on the Conference through its actions, it also is taking the opportunity to develop new and strengthen the existing partnerships with Platforma, CONCORD and the European Youth Forum. The questions addressed at the Conference will feed in the future work of GENE through Roundtables, Policy Research as well as its overall communication strategy. GENE will also consider the Conference outcomes and the key messages in the development of its events, such as seminars, symposia and conferences.

THE PARIS STATEMENT ON GLOBAL EDUCATION TO 2030
Towards a World of Solidarity and Social Cohesion for All

As has been mentioned earlier, there will be further work done to promote the Paris Conference Statement, so that it is endorsed, recognized and promoted by as many actors as possible. GENE will work strategically with its partners towards the implementation of the Statements’ actions by 2030. Specific follow up activities will be planned and communicated widely.

ANGEL – Academic Network on Global Education and Learning

GENE, in collaboration with Dr. Doug Bourn and the Development Education Research Centre, is inviting researchers and policy makers with a common interest in moving forward the evidence base and the policy learning in GE to do so through ANGEL. ANGEL is a network of researcher and academics in Global Education, who wish to share their efforts in terms of sharing their learning. For more information, please refer to the section of this report on the Stream of Researcher and Academics.
Other specific follow-up proposed by participants

Here is a sample of other follow-up activities suggested by some of the participants as part of the conference evaluation:

- Foster the links between local governments involved in development cooperation and global citizenship education with other relevant stakeholders, disseminate best practices among the network.
- More networking with European local authorities involved in GE, following joint initiatives to work on SDGs in the local level.
- A need for more radical questioning of the current systems: Is the little value we are adding today as educators on par with the challenges we are facing?!
- Our mission at Centraider will be to make known the Paris Declaration to our partners, members and schools in our regional territory, to implement in its spirit actions to raise awareness of Education for World Citizenship within our framework in the service of decentralized cooperation.
- Information and awareness raising for the importance of global learning within my own organisation, try to enhance multi-stakeholder initiatives and cooperation in my country.
- I became even more aware that our governmental GCE-program should evolve to a platform for knowledge-sharing & innovation. A centre of expertise on SDG 4.7. in Belgium.
- I am already seeking to embed the Conference Statement in the educational and public activities of the University that I represent. I have proposed to the larger operational unit (College of Arts, Social Sciences and Celtic Studies) to explicitly embed a commitment to Global Education and reflect this in the College Aims and curricular outcomes.
- Including GE in the Programming for 2017 for my youth organization AYUDH. Establishing an intergenerational Think Tank and youth leadership program in my organization with GE as one of the key themes. The Think Tank should develop recommendations for Policy Makers and propose youth-led non-formal learning initiatives for GE. Following up the networking with various delegates, especially from Civil Society / New Actors and those working in Non-Formal Education.
- I am in contact with Douglas Bourn about ANGEL; I will include some thoughts of the key-note speakers in my lectures. I will share the key-conclusions and the final report with the network of the project “Synergies ED”.
- To continue to promote GCE at the University level; establish solid links with other colleagues in order to strengthen this area, particularly at the non-formal level; connect GCE concepts and strategies to other Higher Education initiatives, including, for instance, our work with Refugee reception and integration; to promote research in GCE; reinforce partnerships on GCE, including with GENE.
- In our organization, at ARCADIA, I will publish a new issue dedicated to Global education and have interviews with very resourceful persons met during the conference. The material will be published in the online review The Romanian International Development Review.
- Engage Local Authorities in Global Education; Quality aspects concerning Global Education.
- Engage in more multistakeholder thinking.
- Support Southern/Decolonial perspectives in GCE work.
- Feed back to Concord Europe, feed back to our national platforms.
- We have to become a movement!
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Conference programme

Session transcripts:

**Opening statements**
- Mr. Gauthier Mignot
- Ms. Florence Robine
- Mr. Philippe Orliange
- Mr. Bertrand Gallet
- Ms. Paola Berbeglia

**Panel presentations**
- Ms. Monique Borsenberger
- Ms. Marie-Helene Nedelec
- Ms. Elisabeth van der Steenhoven

**Multi-stakeholder workshop feedback**
- From global challenges towards social cohesion – what is the stake of education?
- Implementing SDG4 in policy and practice
- Policy learning for GE and DEAR strategies in practice
- Instruments to guarantee quality Global Education

List of participants

List of speakers, facilitators and rapporteurs

Conference statement
Global Education Network Europe (GENE) is the network of ministries, agencies and institutions with national responsibility for Global Education in European countries.

GENE supports networking, peer learning, policy research, national strategy development and quality enhancement in the field of Global Education.

GENE works to increase and improve Global Education towards the day when all people in Europe - in solidarity with people globally - will have access to quality Global Education.

For more information, please visit www.gene.eu