Characteristics of Target 4.7 and The Importance of its Inclusion to the Sustainable Development Goals

16th August 2019

Contents

Abstract

This paper, the first in a series of three, explores the characteristics of Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) Target 4.7 and the importance of its inclusion in the SDGs. In doing so, it takes a broad look at relevant definitions, providing an overview of the inherent key concepts of the Target. It will also explore the data collection and monitoring progress of Target 4.7. The paper first sets out a brief introduction regarding the context and aims of commissioning this piece of research and an introduction to the core concepts of SDG Target 4.7, as well as definitional elaboration for the relevant terms within the Target area. It also provides the methodology undertaken to fulfil the brief, several exemplars of good practice on the mainstreaming of GCE into the four dimensions of education, as outlined within the Target, and an exploration of promising practices in the realm of non-formal learning for Global Citizenship Education (GCED) and Education for Sustainable Development (ESD). Furthermore, given that Goal 4.7 refers explicitly to the overarching concept of GCED, underpinned by human rights and gender equality, this paper attempts to examine and respond to these questions using Andreotti's (2006) theoretical approach.

This paper notes that much of the measurement of learning around the broader SDG 4, and specifically SDG 4.7, has been conducted in the realm of formal assessment, translating to a significant gap in measurement learning of GCED and ESD, much of which can and does take place in the non-formal and informal sectors.

Historically, because non-formal and informal education has not been well understood, clearly identifiable, or measurable within the same parameters as formal education, it has not been as highly valued.[1] However, we argue that the inherent connectivity of these non-formal and informal education practices regarding the wider and broader concept of lifelong learning makes both practices and programmes a very suitable pedagogical match for the competencies embedded in GCED and ESD. This conceptualisation lends non-formal GCED or ESD–based programmes the potential to be particularly impactful in affecting life-long changes.

Finally, this paper dedicates discussion to the pertinent and pressing questions regarding what data on Target 4.7 should and can be collected, what institutions can be responsible and how this data can be gathered. We suggest two distinct reporting pathways, leveraging and boosting existing actors in the process, and make ten practical recommendations for activation of these pathways. This Bridge 47–commissioned research has been undertaken against the backdrop of the challenge presented by the lack of indicators for Target 4.7 and within the broader context of the work of the Bridge 47 Project. The impetus for this research stems from the fact that the limited number of indicators currently formulated for measurement of Target 4.7 do not have (in most countries) easily accessible forms of previously collected data through which to measure indicator progress, in contrast to some of the other sub-indicators based on learning outcomes, such as literacy and numeracy rates. This state of affairs is making it very difficult to measure potential success or otherwise against Target 4.7 nationally, while also making it almost impossible to offer regional or international comparison.

---

1 Lockhart, Ashley Stepanek. 2016. Education for People and Planet. Non-formal and informal programs and activities that promote the acquisition of skills and knowledge in the areas of GCED and ESD. Background paper prepared for the 2016 Global Education Monitoring Report. UNESCO 2016. p.9

Introduction

The Bridge 47 – Building Global Citizenship Project mobilises global civil society to contribute to global justice and the eradication of poverty through Global Citizenship Education (GCED). The project provides a space for civil society organisations, activists and other interested people to interact with one another, exchange information and resources and develop new and innovative approaches for global citizenship education. The project focuses on joint advocacy efforts and building new partnerships, while also supporting civil society to develop new and effective approaches designed to reach out to new stakeholders and provide tools for promoting and acting upon Global Citizenship Education. The project works closely with partners engaged in informal and non-formal education, as well as life-long learning, with a view to promoting transformative change in society. [2]

The Global Education Meeting in Brussels in December 2018 had as its overarching message the symbiosis between education and development. The first of the Brussels Declaration's nine key messages declared, "the right to inclusive quality education and the fundamental role of education, training, lifelong learning, higher education and research as key drivers for sustainable development, including for climate change adaptation and mitigation". [3]

SDG 4.7 is a therefore critical goal, both in its own right and also in its potential to enable the meeting of all other SDGs. No other Goal has as many integrated conceptual links with achieving the other Goals, reinforcing its criticality to the overall success of Agenda 2030. Its importance to the agenda was highlighted most recently in February 2019, when UN Secretary General (UNSG) António Guterres reiterated that, "The 2030 Agenda is our roadmap and its Goals and Targets are our tools to get there." The centrality of the education Goal was confirmed in data visualisation research related to the interlinkages between the Goals published in 2017 by Moinuddin and Zhou, who stated that although many of the Goals are purported to be mutually supportive, there are cases in which they can conflict with the aims of one another, leading to policy incoherence and a lack of genuinely joined up planning and implementation. However, after undertaking in-depth interlinkage research using data visualisation and social network analysis, education represents a simple example that can be employed in order to show that measures to ensure inclusive and quality education (Goal 4) can "reinforce progress in many-if not all- other SDGs". [4]

As a sub-target of the ambitious SDG Goal 4 on Education, Target 4.7 offers a potentially transformative way to inspire inclusive, value and skill-based action designed to promote a sustainable world. The SDGs elevate the centrality of education as an anchor Goal and boost its visibility, augmenting the Target of the Education Millennium Development Goals (MDG) of providing expanded access to quality education for those most disadvantaged in the world, as well as to an overall goal for learners globally, at all life stages, via a conceptual shift catalysed by the UNSG's Global Education First Initiative (GEFI) of 2012/2013. Evidently, mutuality exists between the overall SDG Agenda and Goal 4, particularly Target 4.7. Not only can the global vision offered by the SDGs benefit quality and equity in education systems, but those educated with/through the ethos of ESD and GCED can also develop the knowledge, skills and attitudes required to contribute to the successful delivery of all 17 Goals. [5] However, should the sorely needed

2 Bridge 47 webpage notes accessed via https://www.bridge47.org/global-citizenship

3 Global Education Meeting 2018 Synthesis Report 3-5 December 2018, Brussels, Belgium UNESCO ED-2018/ME-GEM, p.9.

4 Moinuddin and Zhou, 2017. Sustainable Development Goals Interlinkages and Network Analysis: A practical tool for SDG integration and policy coherence. IEGS, June 2017.

5 Carloni, Elena and Crosier, David. EACEA National Policies Platform: "Focus On: Sustainable development: what's in it for education?" 19 March 2019.

target clarification on 4.7 and its related indicator framework not be realised, it risks being relegated beneath other more easily quantifiable Goal successes and achievements.

2. Global Education Target 4.7

economy. In many countries, certain industries consistently hire workers from other countries because local graduates are perceived as lacking the technical skills required for the job. Employer satisfaction surveys or skills gap surveys may also reveal problems at a more basic level, such as insufficient abilities to communicate and collaborate. Education planners can use these data to reconsider the content of subjects being taught in school as well as their overall pedagogical approaches.

*B*y 2030, ensure that all learners acquire the knowledge and skills needed to promote sustainable development, including, among others, through education for sustainable development and sustainable lifestyles, human rights, gender equality, promotion of a culture of peace and non-violence, global citizenship and appreciation of cultural diversity and of culture's contribution to sustainable development.

The competencies laid out in Target 4.7 can be said to transcend the inherent tensions between local and global commitments, issues and priorities, and require students to engage in exploration and learning which inspires them to make informed decisions and take socially and ethically responsible actions.

The Global and Thematic indicators for Target 4.7 are currently structured as follows:

Global: 4.7.1 Extent to which (i) global citizenship education and (ii) education for sustainable development, including gender equality and human rights, are mainstreamed at all levels in:

(a) national education policies, (b) curricula, (c) teacher education and (d) student assessment.

4.7.2 Percentage of schools that provide life skills-based HIV and sexuality education

4.7.3 Extent to which the framework on the World Programme on Human Rights Education is implemented nationally (as per the UNGA Resolution 59/113)

4.7.4 Percentage of students by age group (or education level) showing adequate understanding of issues relating to global citizenship and sustainability

4.7.5 Percentage of 15-year-old students showing proficiency in knowledge of environmental science and geoscience.

It is the intention of this paper (the first in a series of five) to frame analysis and discussion at the level of the proposed global indicator. This is done for three key reasons: (1) the second paper in this research series, entitled Monitoring Progress Towards SDG 4.7, examines the thematic level indicators and suggests a framework for analysis; (2) it appears that this global level indicator is not in fact a true global indicator, but instead aims to capture change at the national level across the four education dimensions, lending further credence to the widespread agreement on the challenge of formulating a universally applicable global indicator; and (3) it is currently possible to collect and report data on the proposed thematic indicators of 4.7.2, 4.7.3, 4.7.4 and 4.7.5, however the greater challenge lies in the lack of indicators that can measure the more complex dimensions of the Target.

3. Definitions of Education for Sustainable Development (ESD) and Global Citizenship Education (GCED)

It is not the intention of this paper to examine in detail the competing definitions and challenges of defining GCED, or ESD, but it is considered noteworthy by these researchers that measurement of Target 4.7, and the persistent challenges therein, is attributable to a complexity of factors, including the inherent tension between universalism and cultural relativism in GCED itself. Universalism supposes that human rights apply equally to all humans, while cultural relativism argues that such rights are culturally dependent and produced from a hegemonic standpoint.[6]However, for the purposes of this paper, the researchers have chosen to employ Andreotti's (2006) theory of critical versus soft GCED. Andreotti presents an alternative, more inclusive, equal, just and informed conceptualisation of GCED, challenging the prevailing GCED set up which is Western-dominant in terms of its origins, language, motivations, objectives and, indeed, agents.

It could be argued that Andreotti's description of soft GCED could more readily describe the conceptualisation of the MDGs, while her theory of Critical GCED speaks to the SDGs and brings them to life in a real and practical way. For Andreotti, the notions of power, voice and difference are central to critical global citizenship education, and within this vision of critical GCED, critical literacy represents a core tool. She conceptualises critical literacy as, "*a level of reading the word and the world that involves the development of the skills of critical engagement and reflexivity: the analysis and critique of the relationships among*

perspectives, language, power, social groups, and social practices **by the learners**".[7] In other words, this approach means providing the space, through GCED, in which learners themselves can reflect on their own context, that of others, and the inherent and constructed assumptions within those contexts, while also being able to examine their own and others' perspectives and the implications of these beliefs in local/global terms in relation to power, social relationships and the distribution of labour and resources.

Andreotti acknowledges that as there is no universal recipe to serve all contexts, soft GCED is appropriate to certain contexts, "*but it cannot stop there, or we run the risk of (indirectly and unintentionally) reproducing the systems of belief and practices that harm that which we want to support*". Andreotti's critical approach is not alone in recognising that change must take place from the inside rather than being imposed, that the overall goal must be to empower individuals to reflect critically on the legacies and processes of their cultures and context, to imagine different futures and to take responsibility for their decisions and actions, but that we are all both part of the problem and part of the solution. This approach conceptualises GCED as a space whereby the *"narrative of 'development' recognises that all our knowledge is partial and incomplete and that there is no non-negotiable vision of how everyone should live/want everyone should want/should be".*[8]

[6] Research in Global Citizenship Education, Jason Harshman, Tami Augustine, Merry M. Merryfield (eds.) Information Age Publishing, Charlotte, 2015.
[7] Soft Versus Critical Global Citizenship Education, V. Andreotti. 2006. p.5
[8] Soft Versus Critical Global Citizenship Education, V. Andreotti. 2006. p.6

Similar in part to Andreotti's theory of critical GCED, Klaus Scwab, author of the Fourth Industrial Revolution, defines GCED as an education that fosters "skills, values and knowledge to empower them as global citizens through the practice and promotion of tolerance, human rights, social justice and acceptance of diversity, allows people to co-exist within diverse spaces and (seek) to fulfill their individual and cultural interest and (achieve) their inalienable rights". He summarises,

> " We need to shape a future that works for all of us by putting people first and empowering them".

His definition stops slightly short of Andreotti's vision of critical GCED, which envisions empowering individuals who will become and act positively as the change agents for a sustainable present and future.

Thus, Andreotti's approach, which is grounded in the work of radical social-justice oriented educationalists who espouse active, child-centred transformative learning, challenges inequality and conceives of GCED as a means of supporting young people to consider their roles and responsibilities in a deeply unequal world. This critical approach to GCED speaks directly to the overall concepts of the SDG agenda and the individual Goals, promoting an underpinning vision of the SDGs in which everyone (including the global south) is an active participant in the development process, and through which traditional notions of power, voice and difference are challenged.

3.1 Education for Sustainable Development

Education for Sustainable Development (ESD) is defined by UNESCO - the lead global body charged with responsibility for its coordination - as a process that empowers learners, by transforming the way they think and work towards a sustainable future, to take informed decisions and responsible actions regarding environ-

mental integrity, economic viability and a just society, for both present and future generations, while respecting cultural diversity. According to UNESCO, ESD concerns lifelong learning and is an integral part of quality education: "ESD is holistic and transformational education which addresses learning content and outcomes, pedagogy and the learning environment. It achieves its purpose by transforming society."[9]

In their Measurement Strategy Proposal for Target 4.7, The Global Alliance for Monitoring Learning (GAML) tentatively proposed that ESD comprises any educational efforts that equip learners with the key learning components of **knowledge** (on ESD topics of lifestyle/sustainable ways of life, climate change, biodiversity, and the greening economy), **skills, values, engagement, attitudes** and **experiences** designed to address the social, environmental and economic challenges of the 21st century through integrating critical issues such as climate change, biodiversity, disaster risk reduction and sustainable consumption and production (2017: 3).

For purposes of this work, we borrow the above definition of ESD.

3.2 Global Citizenship Education (GCED)

Global Citizenship Education (GCED) must be transformative and of high quality in order to foster the shared values needed to address global issues and forge more peaceful, tolerant and inclusive societies (Global Education First Initiative, 2014). After a shift in understanding on GCED, catalysed by the Global Education First Initiative of the UN Secretary General in 2013, UNESCO issued their 2014 report on GCED, defining it as a transformative process: *"Global Citizenship Education (GCED) is a framing paradigm which encapsulates how education can develop the knowledge, skills, values and attitudes learners need for securing a world which is more just, peaceful, tolerant, inclusive, secure and sustainable".* The report posits that GCED, *"acknowledges the role of*

---

[9] https://en.unesco.org/themes/education-sustainable-development/what-is-esd

education in moving beyond the development of knowledge and cognitive skills to build values, soft skills and attitudes among learners that can facilitate international cooperation and promote social transformation".

GCED, as defined above, represents UNESCO's response to the global challenges of today.

> **❝** It works by empowering learners of all ages to understand that these are global, not local issues and to become active promoters of more peaceful, tolerant, inclusive, secure and sustainable societies".

GCED is a strategic area of UNESCO's Education Sector programme and builds on the work of Peace and Human Rights Education. It aims to instil in learners the values, attitudes and behaviours that support responsible global citizenship: creativity, innovation and a commitment to peace, human rights and sustainable development.[10] In a strong UNESCO engagement for Global Citizenship Education (GCED) designed to support that initiative, the UNESCO ABC of GCED described the goal of GCED as, *'to empower learners to engage and assume active roles both locally and globally to face and resolve global challenges and ultimately to become proactive contributors to a more just, peaceful, tolerant, inclusive, secure and sustainable world".*

The Global Citizenship Education Working Group (GCED-WG) (Brookings Institute at al., 2017) defines GCED as, *"Any educational effort that aims to provide the skills, knowledge, and experiences and to encourage the behaviours, attitudes, and values that allow young persons to be agents of long-term, positive changes in their own lives and in the lives of people in their immediate and larger communities (with the community including the environment)".*

Their Measurement Strategy Proposal for Target 4.7, the Global Alliance for Monitoring Learning (GAML, 2017) has also tentatively proposed that

Global Citizenship Education constitutes:

"Any educational effort that aims to encourage the acquisition of skills, values, attitudes and behaviours that empower learners to assume active roles to face and resolve global challenges and to become proactive contributors to a more peaceful, tolerant, inclusive and secure world through cognitive, socio-emotional and behavioural dimensions".

Global citizenship education (GCED) is the term used when situating global citizenship in an educational context, describing the knowledge, skills, values and attitudes fostered through teaching and learning about global citizenship. It inspires global solidarity by supporting people to fully realise their rights, responsibilities and potential as global citizens in order to take meaningful action for a just and sustainable world (World Wise Global Schools).

For the purposes of this work, we borrow from the World Wise Global Schools' definition of GCED, which is defined as *"An educational process aimed at increasing awareness and understanding of the rapidly changing, interdependent and unequal world in which we live".*

Critical GCED and ESD call for a learner-centred pedagogy, which is at times at odds with the teacher-centric approach employed in many countries.

3.2.1. Global Citizenship Education in Practice

Education Above All Foundation's (EEA) field-based experiences, presented in this section, provide a snap shot of what the non-formal 'promising practices' of global citizenship programmes can achieve through partnerships and concerted field-based programmes. As well as the individual lessons learned within each of the programmes, a more general lesson is that when practical global citizenship pays attention to local contexts and takes the voices and experiences of individuals, it provides a basis for a sustainable world (Education Above All Foundation, 2019).

---

10 https://en.unesco.org/themes/gced

3.2.1.1. Education Above All (EEA) Foundation's Reach Out to Asia (ROTA) Programme

The ROTA Programme was launched in Doha (Qatar) in 2005. On a local level, it has a focus on youth empowerment, with initiatives on integrating training, dialogue and action to foster global citizenship among young people across various contexts. It engages and inspires the young people and other community members to actively participate in addressing education and development challenges both at home and abroad.

Its MENA Youth Capacity Building in Humanitarian Action Initiative (MYCHA) has trained young people to design and implement positive contributions in crisis-affected settings. They work towards ensuring that people affected by crises both across Asia and around the world have continuous access to high quality primary and secondary education. Its EMPOWER initiative has supported young people to form youth-led clubs designed to identify issues facing their community and develop their own service projects to address these issues.

The ROTA International Volunteer Trips use intercultural exchange to broaden young people's global perspectives on citizenship. Each of these initiatives has increased youth perception that their actions can make a difference, while also encouraging their service to society. A key lesson is that taking action is essential because it builds transformational leadership skills and provides opportunities for young people to deepen their skills through multiple practice opportunities for learning, action and reflection.

3.2.1.2. Education Above All Foundation's (EEA) Al Fakhoora Programme

Al Fakhoora focuses on the agency of youth and works to provide young people with the skills, knowledge and experience needed to become civic-minded individuals who act in the broader interest of their communities. Its focus makes the crucial connection that global citizenship requires civic mindedness. Al Fakhoora has provided Gaza-based students with a comprehen-

sive, multi-stage civic leadership programme for becoming positive, inspirational global citizens. An analysis of the structure of that programme offers some wider lessons for supporting young people living in (post) conflict settings, as well as how a GCED-focused curriculum can inspire and empower students to become agents of change within their own communities.

The Al-Fakhoora approach includes both theory and actualisation, and is based on the belief that knowledge without practice leads to unfulfilled potential. Another core lesson is that local context matters, and that the needs of young people vary across regions, requiring a flexible tailored approach to curriculums rather than a 'one size fits all' approach. This flexibility has enabled the programme to be adapted when applied in partnerships with UNDP and SPARK in the contexts of the West Bank, Turkey, Lebanon, Jordan and Iraq.

3.2.1.3. Education Above All Foundation's (EEA) Educate A Child Programme

Educate A Child (EAC) was launched in 2012 with the initial goal of enrolling 10 million out of school children (OOSC) in an attempt to reduce the numbers of children missing out on their right to education. It works with partners in different contexts to reach OOSC in marginalized communities. A number of EAC projects in India (Educate Girls), Pakistan (ILMPOSSIBLE) and Uganda (Building Tomorrow), have promoted global citizenship through youth volunteers sensitising and mobilizing local communities on the need to educate their children. The volunteers are trained in skills such as community mobilisation, empathy, problem solving, decision-making and leadership. The volunteers—known as Team Balika in India, ILM Ambassadors in Pakistan and BT Fellows in Uganda—work with families, communities, schools and education programmes to identify OOSC, before then enrolling them into an education programme. As a result, such young people have gained useful skills, such as critical thinking and communication, that empower them to serve their communities and identify solutions

to local problems. The acquired skills are beneficial to the individual too, as they help build to confidence when applying for college or in their work places.

3.2.1.4. Education Above All Foundation's (EEA) Protect Education in Insecurity and Conflict programme (PEIC)

The Protect Education in Insecurity and Conflict programme promotes and protects the right to education, ensuring that the international community recognises and minimises the harm caused by insecurity. In Northern Uganda and South Sudan, PEIC works to provide art-based workshops in Bidi Bidi Refugee Settlement in Northern Uganda and the Whitaker Peace and Development Initiative in order to ensure that youths living in conflict-affected communities have knowledge of human rights, the rule of law and the importance of the right to education. The programme also develops advocacy skills designed to give them a voice and promote peace.

The PEIC experience shows that whilst the current focus of SDG 4.7 on the curriculum, teachers and the classroom is crucial, it is also important for global citizenship to have a wider reach through volunteering peacebuilding programmes that operate outside the formal classroom. Participant agency and control over defining values such as tolerance, diversity and peace through 'a bottom up' approach rooted in local contexts is also essential for ensuring that a deeper commitment to the values of global citizenship is understood by the whole community.

Such examples demonstrate the potentiality of non-formal programmes, those situated outside formal classroom settings, to inspire knowledge, attitudinal and skill-based changes through participatory approaches that empower young people to become responsible active citizens who are conscious of the world and those around them, both physically and metaphorically.

The participatory and collaborative aspects of exemplars of non-formal education can also provide evidence for the mainstreaming of GCED and/or ESD. Both the Worldwide Association of Girl Guides and Scouts (WAGGS) and the World Organisation of the Scout Movement (WOSM) are, arguably, the largest non-formal education programmes available globally.[11] Both are key, long-standing example of effective practices and programmes of non-formal learning for active citizenship. WAGGS represents 10 millions young women and girls from 150 countries globally. Through their participatory non-formal programmes girls learn about themselves and the wider world, learn how to speak out and take action in order to influence others and affect positive changes in their communities and beyond, helping to support young women's leadership development. Measurement of achievement in such domains is carried out largely through earning particular badges for specific competencies. Similarly, but in far greater numbers (over 50 million participants from 170 countries), the WOSM sets as its mission: "to contribute to the education of young people, through a value system based on the Scout Promise and Law, to help build a better world where people are self-fulfilled as individuals and play a constructive role in society".[12]

---

[11] Lockhart, Ashley Stepanek. 2016. UNESCO. Education for People and Planet. Non-formal and informal programs and activities that promote the acquisition of skills and knowledge in the areas of GCED and ESD. Background paper prepared for the 2016 Global Education Monitoring Report. p.19.
[12] www.scout.org

4. Characteristics and Importance of SDG Target 4.7 to the SDGs

According to UNESCO, SDG 4.7 aims to provide learners with the knowledge and competencies they need to make all of the SDGs a reality. [13] For the first time, 4.7 gives legitimacy [14] to the development of education learning that can take place through awareness development, changes in attitude and behaviour, skills and value enhancement. It is exactly the transformative potential of these aims that can lead to the achievement of the type of skills, values and attitude development required to enable individual-level action for a sustainable, just and equal world. As the Irish Aid Development Education Policy 2017-2023 notes, "In a world where millions suffer from extreme poverty, conflict and humanitarian crises, the need for education that promotes informed responses to these challenges has never been more important". [15]

The importance of SDG 4.7 within *the* overall context of SDG 4 is that it is the Target that speaks to empowering and enabling students to be active agents of positive change, as well as to take the action required to meet the other Goals.

Within the ambitious SDG 4, 4.7 can be viewed as a dichotomous Target in that, of the thematic indicators currently formulated to measure achievement of the Goal, two refer to learning outcomes of GCE and SDE, while the remaining three refer to the provision of GCED and ESD. Target 4.7 falls into the category of Tier III indicators, for which an internationally agreed methodology has not yet been developed, although the

TCG listed them in 2018 as "indicators requiring further development". [16] As per the most recent (9th) meeting of the Inter-agency and Expert Group on Sustainable Development Goal Indicators (IAEG-SDGs) in March 2019, indicator 4.7.1 is one of eight Tier III indicators on which methodological work is expected to be completed by the end of 2019. The monitoring of the SDGs represents a serious challenge even for Europe - arguably one of the most statistically advanced regions of the world — especially concerning data availability for measuring progress. [17]

It can be argued that the three domains of learning within GCED delineated by UNESCO, cognitive, socio-emotional and behavioural, roughly translate to the learning competencies of knowledge, values/attitudes and behaviours/actions.

GCED Domains (UNESCO)	Learning Competencies
Cognitive	Knowledge
Socioemotional	Attitude
Behavioural	Practice

Table 1: GCED Domains regarding Learning Competencies

---

13 UNESCO, Bangkok. A transformative target: SDG 4.7's challenges and promise in Asia-Pacific. Blog post 30 June 2017. Accessed via https://bangkok.unesco.org/content/transformative-target-sdg-47's-challenges-and-promise-asia-pacific

14 Gallwey, Susan, Irish Development Education Association, 2015. Capturing transformative change in Education: The Challenge of SDG 4.7. Presentation, November 2015.

15 Irish Aid Development Education Strategy 2017 – 2023, p.4

16 https://unstats.un.org/unsd/statcom/47th-session/documents/2016-2-SDGs-Rev1-E.pdf

17 Eurostat, 2016. Sustainable development in the European Union: A STATISTICAL GLANCE FROM THE VIEWPOINT OF THE UN SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS 2016 edition, p.12.

5. Mainstreaming GCED and ESD into Education Policy, Curricula, Teacher Education and Student Assessment in Formal and Non-Formal Education and Lifelong Learning

This paper will now use selective case studies to illustrate how the mainstreaming of GCE and ESD into the four core education dimensions of Target 4.7 has taken/is taking place. The selected case studies were chosen due to evidence of interesting practice, the availability of comparable information and the need to illustrate practice from a variety of context. The study does not attempt to provide a systematic analysis of evidence in the field, but provides detailed evidence of the mainstreaming of GCE into the four key dimensions of Target 4.7.

Research has proposed that achieving Target 4.7 can, potentially, be hung upon improved teacher education as a primary anchor. However, the researchers believe that this is too ambitious and requires excessive pressure on both the teacher education sector and the teacher education community in order to carry the bulk of the responsibility. The researchers believe that a holistic approach to education transformation, across education policies, curricula, teacher education and student assessment is necessary in order to establish the foundations for the complex value-based attitudes, action and behaviour changes which ESD and GCED can inspire. A continuum of action on all of these fronts will advance achievement of SDG 4.7. However, it would be remiss of the researchers not to acknowledge the critical influence of political and social trends on policy

and curricular development. Transformational shifts in political, economic and social context across the globe have led to an evident rising and vocal opposition towards diversity and inclusion, as well as some displacement of notions of global citizenship by forms of nationalism. Most notably, shifts in the US, UK, some European countries and Australia demonstrate a move away from global civic values towards greater insularity and exclusion. [18]

5.1 National Education Policies

Thailand: A 2017 UNICEF review, conducted in coordination with Thailand's Ministry of Education, showed that the Ministry has policies mandating the provision of CSE in basic education, with content integrated into subjects such as health and physical education at the primary and secondary levels. (The MoE is strengthening both teacher training and Comprehensive Sexuality Education (CSE) implementation in order to ensure that the content reflects current research on CSE, such as the importance of stressing gender and power relations). Various policies, laws and development plans put in place by the Thai government have supported the provision of CSE in educational institutions at the national level. For example, the National Child and Youth Development Plan of 2012-2016 (Office of Promotion and Protection of Children, Youth, the Elderly and

---

18 Eurostat, 2016. Sustainable development in the European Union: A STATISTICAL GLANCE FROM THE VIEWPOINT OF THE UN SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS 2016 edition, p.12.

Vulnerable Groups, 2011) identifies key strategies for ensuring that all young people receive information and skill development related to sexuality education, reproductive health and family life. The 2014-2016 National AIDS Prevention and Control Policy and Strategy (National AIDS Prevention and Alleviation Committee, 2014), as well as the 2015-2026 Teenage Pregnancy Prevention and Alleviation Strategy (31 July 2016), both overseen by the Ministry of Public Health, also support the role of educational institutions in arranging learning activities related to CSE to ensure that young people have an adequate understanding of safe sex.[19] The review found that high level policy commitment (top-down) has been met with significant grassroots advocacy efforts (bottom-up) for school-based CSE from various partner organisations and implementing agencies. This advocacy was found to have contributed to the development of sexuality educators and a more comprehensive curriculum in pilot schools across the country. There have also been campaign mechanisms designed to garner support for CSE by education administrators at the school, community, educational service area/provincial vocational education administration and ministry levels.

Whilst challenges remain, and are being addressed, good practices have also emerged. Model schools have been identified and one such school, in Northern Thailand, is undertaking the Teenpath programme with support from the Thai MoE. The review found that, "The important precondition of enabling students to understand sexual and gender diversity and sexual rights so well that they can teach others about these matters is creating a good learning environment in the class, promoting positive attitudes, and getting students to practice voicing their opinions. Combined with learning from outside sources, these factors help students to think further and apply the knowledge gained from external sources. As a result, the students acquire good analytic thinking skills and become more sensitive to sexual and gender diversity and sexual rights."[20]

Ireland: Through its Development Education Strategy 2017-2023, Ireland has identified 5 key outputs designed to enable increased accessibility, quality and effectiveness of development education in Ireland. Consultation for the strategy identified a coherent policy environment as the foremost priority area in both enabling the successful implementation of the four other strategy outputs and supporting practitioners in the effective delivery of cross-departmental development education in Ireland. The Development Education Strategy aims to foster an enabling and coherent policy environment for developing education at all levels - local, national and European.[21]

Furthermore, Ireland, through its Irish Aid Strategy for Education for Sustainable Development 2014-2020 states that: "A key objective of this strategy is to provide learners with the knowledge, dispositions, skills and values that will motivate and empower them to become active citizens and take measures to live more sustainably".[22]

The strategic partnership approach to development education, as undertaken by Ireland through its Irish Aid Development Education Strategy, was described as 'exemplary' by the Global Education Network of Europe (GENE) National Report and has proven very effective. In 2015, Irish Aid invited GENE to conduct a Peer Review of Global Education in Ireland designed to assess the national context for development education in Ireland and to make recommendations for the successor Development Education Strategy. This review formed part of the European Global Education Peer Review Process, which was initiated at the Maastricht Congress on Global Education in 2002 and facilitated by GENE. It was intended that the review would provide contributory considerations for the drafting of the

---

19 UNICEF and Ministry of Education, Thailand. Review of Comprehensive Sexuality Education in Thailand, October 2016, p.37.
20 Op.cit. p.33
21 Irish Aid Development Education Strategy 2017 – 2023, p. 23.
22 Irish Aid Strategy for Education for Sustainable Development 2014-2020, p.12.

new Development Education strategy, building on those set out in the previous two strategies. The newest version covering the period from 2017-2023 commits to extending this strategic partnership model to the informal education sector through both the youth and adult and community education sectors.[23] The review recognised and admires the great diversity of approach and strategy concerning development education in formal, non-formal and informal education.[24] It also found that the National Strategy on Education for Sustainable Development, as well as its development, provides a base for visionary and systematic planning and the potential for more cooperation with the DES (Department of Education and Skills).[25]

The review noted that the move towards a greater focus on competencies and skills within the Irish education system at all levels provides new opportunities for transversal approaches and systemwide integration of DE.[26]

The review process allowed an external assessment and observation on the efficacy, status, efficiency and trajectory of Ireland's primary policy vehicle for the mainstreaming of GCED and ESD. The current set up regarding policy assessment for GCED must be regarded with caution, as noted in the GEM report 2017/2018, "However, self-assessment of policy implementation may not be objective, credible or nuanced enough for policy purposes, and may be insufficient to establish whether policies are implemented. UNESCO recognizes the need to further fine-tune the guidelines for preparation of national reports so they better meet the requirement of monitoring the global indicator".[27]

Thus, peer-review mechanisms, such as that provided by GENE, can prove a very useful tool in supporting consistent, comparable of evaluation national efforts towards meeting the Goals and indicators of Target 4.7, bolstering the monitoring

value of these mechanisms.

5.2 Curricula

Evidence from the ICCS 2016 shows that over 85% of participating countries reported including human rights and fundamental freedoms in education policy and curricula, but only 51% integrated education for sustainable development in policy and 33% in curricula. In teacher education, about half of the countries covered peace, non-violence, human rights and fundamental freedoms and 16% discussed cultural diversity and tolerance, while only 7% included education for sustainable development.[28]

The Eurydice report of 2017, like the 2016 ICCS report, shows that in all 28 education systems analysed across the EU, three main curriculum approaches towards GCED are being used:

I. Cross-curricular themes: citizenship education objectives, content or learning outcomes are designated as being transversal across the curriculum and all teachers share responsibility for delivery.

II. Integration into other subjects: citizenship education objectives, content or learning outcomes are included within the curriculum documents of wider subjects or learning areas, often concerned with the humanities/social sciences.

III. Separate subjects: citizenship education objectives, content or learning outcomes are contained within a distinct subject boundary primarily dedicated to citizenship.

The value-based knowledge, skills and actions that GCED aims to inspire are often defined not as traditional stand-alone subjects, but as a set of transversal competences not unlike digital literacy, for example. The perception and treatment of these "transversal" competencies within GCED

23 Irish Aid Development Education Strategy 2017 – 2023, p. 19
24 GENE Review of Global Education, Ireland, 2015.
25 Ibid.
26 Ibid.
27 UNESCO, GEM Report Summary 2017/2017 Accountability in Education, Meeting our Commitments, p. 43
28 Ibid.

poses an important challenge in enhancing their status in order to bring them more into line with traditional subject-based competences.[29] This is in direct contradiction with the reality that many education systems are set up as subject based. Universalised frameworks can be at odds with the often local and national considerations taking centre stage in subject-siloed national curricula.

Eurydice data across the EU has shown that several innovative pedagogies and approaches regarding the teaching and learning of GCED are being employed, in addition to the more traditional model of teacher-directed learning. For example, active learning, whereby students can plan and initiate their own citizenship action projects, is found both in Ireland and other countries. Cyprus has invested in interactive learning by issuing a learning guide designed to support debates in schools. This may focus on a number of sensitive topics, such as animal euthanasia. In Latvia, short films on real cases of discrimination are screened in order to encourage critical thinking and self-reflection. In Greece, students can use the online 'School Press' to facilitate collaborative learning, while in the Netherlands community volunteering can be accredited as part of the curriculum.[30]

The 2016 GEM Report highlights the different types of evidence available that are related to the global indicator. For example, it developed a coding protocol designed to analyse the prevalence of relevant terms in national curriculum frameworks and related curricular materials. In collaboration with UNESCO's International Bureau of Education, the GEM Report reviewed over 110 national curriculum frameworks in primary and secondary education across 78 countries from 2005-2010. The review focused on five topic areas in Target 4.7: human rights; gender equality; peace, non-violence and human security; sustainable development; and global citizenship/interconnectedness. For the study, a coding scheme

was developed and applied, based on key ESD and GCED knowledge, skills, behaviours and pedagogies, in order to find out the extent to which ESD and GCED content is present in National Curriculum Frameworks (NCFs) and Education Sector Plans (ESPs) around the world. A total of 108 NCFs and ESPs from 78 countries for general basic education (primary and lower secondary), as well as 48 social studies curricula from 25 countries (also encompassing three Canadian provinces and four US states) were evaluated. The analysis reveals that sustainable development seems to be prevalent in the NCFs and ESPs evaluated, with 90% of the countries referring to at least one of the terms related to this category. Sustainable development was the most frequently used key term, while climate change was the least used (73% and 36%, respectively). The analysis of terms related to Interconnectedness and Global Citizenship revealed that 92% of the countries refer to national identity/citizenship in their curricula, while only 42% refer to the term global identity/citizenship, with Australia, Bhutan, the Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Nepal, Serbia, Canada/Ontario and the USA/New York, being the most "global-looking" countries.[31]

Australia: While Australia has a comprehensively supportive policy environment regarding GCED and ESD, it faces similar challenges to other "developed economies" in terms of maintaining the delivery of life-long learning on GCED. The Australian education system has struggled with the international and national top-down policy-led GCED efforts, as well as the removal of funding to support GCED in schools (a reflection of the shifted political priorities, and a sharp move towards 'Australia First'), and the marginalisation of GCED in the school curriculum. However, Australia offers many examples of good practice, particularly in terms of bottom-up, local school and curriculum-level progress.

---

29 (European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2012b, quoted in Eurydice 2017.).
30 Eurydice report 2017, p.16
31 UNECSO /IBE "Global Monitoring of Target 4.7: Themes in National Curriculum".
ESD and GCED in National Curriculum Frameworks, May 2017, accessed via https://en.unesco.org/news/esd-and-gced- national-curriculum-frameworks.

The Australian Global Education framework clearly articulates both underlying assumptions and a distinct set of global values. [32] Together with the GCED UNESCO learning guide (UNESCO 2015), it supports the delivery of GCED in Australian schools. The Australian framework was developed in order to provide a philosophical and practical reference point through which to help "clarify the goals, rationale, emphases and processes of global education". Importantly, the framework provides a basis for teaching about and for global citizenship, offering "opportunities to develop the values, knowledge and skills and capacity for action to become good global citizens". Five key themes are to be addressed: interdependence and globalization; identity and cultural diversity; social justice and human rights; peace building and conflict resolution; and sustainable futures. In order to assist teachers, there are a number of subject-related links to specific Australian Curriculum learning areas across Years K-12.

The newly developed Australian Curriculum offers a number of substantial entry points for GCE, principally through its Cross-Curriculum priorities, General Capability statements and the curriculum in a number of learning areas/subjects. Cross-Curriculum priorities comprise a set of three key areas to be applied across all learning areas: (1) *Asia and Australia's engagement with Asia* (ACARA, 2013), which specifically reaches out to the world beyond Australia's shores. It does so, arguably, with mainly instrumentalist motives, while references to Australia's Pacific neighbours or other parts of the world are notably absent; and (2) *Sustainability* overtly includes a focus on global issues. *The third area is Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander histories and cultures*, which can help deepen understanding of other Indigenous peoples.

The General Capabilities statements focus on seven capabilities that students are expected to develop across each learning area. Of these seven, *Intercultural Understanding* arguably offers

the most scope for focusing on global citizenship. Other potential entry points include Critical and *Creative Thinking and Personal and Social capabilities*, while the *Information and Communication Technology*, *Literacy* and *Numeracy* capabilities can be leveraged to globally-related ends. Coupled with the many cross-curricular opportunities for GCED, stand-alone subjects also offer vehicles for GCED mainstreaming through the subjects of *Civics* and *Citizenship*, *Geography* and *History*. However, the Australian systematic policy and curricular approach has not been matched with correlated initial or in-service teacher training education on and for GCED. The next section will provide some exemplars in the mainstreaming of GCED and ESD in teacher education.

The new Global Education Monitoring Report, published to mark the High-Level Political Forum on Sustainable Development Education Goal Review, which will review SDG 4, notes that curricula are being updated in order to promote sustainable development, human rights, gender equality, a culture of peace and non-violence, global citizenship and cultural diversity. It also notes that curriculum development needs to be participatory to encourage national ownership, from the central to the school level. It mentions that in Germany, multiple stakeholders took part in a new national action plan for sustainable development, while Mexico ran a national consultation for its new curriculum. Importantly, the report stresses that curricula, teacher preparation and assessment need to be aligned, as is the case in Portugal, where the new citizenship curriculum is being monitored in an effort to assess how schools respond to additional autonomy, and the Republic of Korea, where curriculum changes are being combined with teacher education. [33]

5.3 Teacher Education

The centrality of teachers to all social transformation was reiterated by multiple organisations at the Global Education Meeting (GEM) in Brussels

---

32 Buchanan, John, et al. Maintaining Global Citizenship Education in Schools: A Challenge for Australian Educators and Schools. Australian Journal of Teacher Education. Volume 43, Issue 4. p.62.

33 UNESCO, Global Education Monitoring Report, 2019. Beyond Commitments: How countries implement SDG 4. P.2.

in late 2018. There is often a form of social contract between teachers and society [34]. They act as a conduit for the inculcation and adaptation of values, skills and competencies related to active global citizenship, and have the trigger effect of igniting these skills and actions in students of all ages. Evidence provided in the Summary report of the 2018 GEM showed that through qualitative interviews, all 28 education authorities stated that they attempt to ensure that all prospective primary and secondary teachers acquire the essential knowledge and competences required for teaching citizenship education through ITE.

Ireland: Currently, of the 28 member states analysed in the Eurydice report, only nine education systems have defined competencies to be acquired by all teachers which are specific to citizenship education. Of these nine, Ireland has succeeded in mainstreaming mandatory Development Education teacher education to 100% of primary-level student teachers. This has been achieved through the Development and InterCultural Education (DICE) project, a strategic partnership between four higher education institutions providing initial teacher education (ITE) at primary level. The Irish Aid Development Education Policy, under which this partnership was forged, has supported the provision of DE to all affiliated primary student teachers. Since September 2012, 6,817 student teachers have completed mandatory modules in DE, while 10,890 student teachers have undertaken integrated learning on DE. Since 2014, DICE has successfully embedded DE in the undergraduate primary teaching programmes of the four participating institutions, engaging 100% of undergraduate primary student teachers. [35]

A similar funding agreement for the initial training of teachers at secondary level has also been existence since 2006 with the Ubuntu Network. This network is made up of teacher educators from Higher Education Institutions, NGO representatives and partner organisations

with a commitment to education for social justice, equality and sustainability.

Ubuntu aims to support the integration of Development Education into post primary ITE in Ireland. Its mission is to support teacher educators to embed a living understanding of and commitment to education for global citizenship, sustainable development and social justice into their work, enabling student-teachers at post-primary level to integrate both into their teaching and into the schools where they work. These perspectives will consequently encourage active engagement in building a more just world. [36]

5.4 Student Assessment

This paper serves to explore the characteristics of SDG Target 4.7 and the importance of its inclusion in the SDGs, take a broad look at relevant definitions and provide an overview of the inherent key concepts of the Target and to set out both a brief introduction to the context and aims of commissioning this piece of research and an introduction to the core concepts of Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) Target 4.7, as well as definitional elaboration for the relevant terms within the Target area. Furthermore, it also aims to explore the methodology undertaken to fulfil the brief, as well as exemplars of good practice on the mainstreaming of GCE into the four dimensions of education as outlined within the Target. It is intended to be read in order to complement the researchers' second paper regarding the challenges of using learning assessment for measuring Target of 4.7. Therefore, student assessment will be dealt with in more detail in other papers in this series on Using Learning Assessment Data.

The Eurydice 2017 report focuses on two main ways in which education authorities provide a framework for student assessment in citizenship education: through central guidelines for classroom assessment by teachers and through national tests, both of which are situated within

34 Global Education Meeting, Brussels, December, 2018: Synthesis Report, 2018.
35 Irish Aid Development Education Strategy 2017 – 2023, p.15
36 (http://www.ubuntu.ie/about.html)

the formal education realm. This report, like so many others, attests to the complexity of measurement for citizenship education, stating that the *"objectives and learning outcomes assigned to the citizenship curricula by European countries include the acquisition by students of a wide body of theoretical knowledge, the development of skills such as analytical skills and critical thinking, the adoption of certain values and attitudes such as a sense of tolerance and, last but not least, the active participation and engagement of students in school and community life"*. [37]

It is apparent from reviewing much of the literature related to 4.7 that in order to measure the impact of GCED and ESD, a combination of indicators capturing both provision of education and learning outcomes must be devised and applied to learning that is taking place within both formal and non-formal settings. In order to capture and convey the values-based learning espoused by critical GCED to enhance behavioural capacities to act responsibly and for the greater and collective good [38], this learning assessment requires

evidence compilation on a variety of competencies, including both cognitive and non-cognitive skills, as identified by GCED-Working Group of UNESCO:

1. Empathy

2. Critical thinking/problem solving

3. Ability to communicate and collaborate with others

4. Conflict resolution

5. Sense and security of identity

6. Shared universal values (Human rights, peace, justice, etc.)

7. Respect for diversity/intercultural understanding

8. Recognition of global issues-interconnectedness (environmental, social, economic, etc.)

Similarly to the competencies outlined above, below are the GCED domains and learning objectives as delineated in the UNESCO Framework:

Topics	Cognitive domain	Socio-emotional domain	Behavioural domain
	1. Local, national and global systems and structures.	4. Different levels of identity.	7. Actions that can be taken individually and collectively.
	2. Issues affecting interaction and connectedness of communities at local, national and global levels.	5. Different communities people belong to and how these are connected.	8.Ethically responsible behaviour
	3. Underlying assumptions and power dynamics.	6. Difference and respect for diversity.	9. Getting engaged and taking action.

Table 2: Competencies and Learning Objectives

37 Eurydice 2017, p. 18
38 UNESCO Global Citizenship Education Report. 2014. P.9

6. Monitoring SDG Target 4.7

6.1 How should data about Goal 4.7 be gathered?

SDG 4 has been repeatedly hailed as central to the ambition of achieving the overall SDG agenda, and within the Goal, Target 4.7 has been cited as a critical connection to other Targets and indicators, with Global Citizenship Education at its core. However, a consensus has yet to be reached regarding a universal agreement on what GCED should promote[39] and how it should achieve its ends, as well as how its effectiveness can actually be usefully and meaningfully captured and conveyed. Illustrating the challenge in devising suitable, workable and universally measurable indicators for this Target is the fact that no data at all, or even reference to the Target of 4.7, is included in the SDG 4 Databook on Global Education Indictors, 2019[40]. This follows three years of compiling data and discussions around measuring the indictor and its Targets. The Target is also absent from the EU-SDG Indicator Set for 2019. One might conclude that the intention concerns the upcoming High-Level Political Forum scheduled for July 2019, at which it will be determined that Goal 4 will be reviewed and that further development of the Targets and its indicators will also take place.

Indeed, even in the 2017 Strategy Proposal for Measurement of Target Global Alliance for Monitoring Learning (GAML), Target 4.7 has been lost in translation and its lack of significant linkage to other Target indicators has left it overlooked. While the 2017 UNESCO-GAML 4.7 Measurement Strategy Proposal and Action Plan acknowledges that, with Sustainable Development Goal (SDG 4), the international community has pledged to, *"ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong opportunities learning opportunities for all"*, the report states that, at the time of writing, UNESCO was *"currently in the process of finalizing the measurement methodology for the global indicator 4.7.1 using the most recent round of 1974 recommendation data collection in 2016"*.

However, progress on this point is not readily available.

The existing reporting regarding the global indicator depends solely on the mechanism of the UNESCO 1974 Recommendation 1 concerning Education for International Understanding, Co-operation and Peace and Education relating to Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms. Both 4.7.4 and 4.7.5 are thematic indicators that cover learning outcomes achieved as a result of the educational inputs presented under the global indicator. Therefore the GAML document elected to elaborate on measurement solutions in order to address the challenges of monitoring only indicators 4.7.4 and 4.7.5, as these are learning-related outcome indicators that are inspired by large scale international assessments and existing data, ICCS and PISA. ICCS was used as a means for the collection of data/tool regarding 4.7.4, as agreed by GAML.

Resolution 47th session of ECOSCO, Report of the Inter-Agency and Expert Group on Sustainable Development Goal Indicators states that, at point 30, "Global monitoring should be based, to the greatest possible extent, on comparable and standardized national data, obtained through well-established reporting mechanisms from countries to the international statistical system. Where needed, such mechanisms should be improved, in particular by strengthening the coordination function of national statistical offices and/or other national institutions. Efforts should be made to fill data gaps and improve international comparability by increased adoption of internationally agreed standards at the national level, strengthening national statistical capacity and improving reporting mechanisms". [41]

At the UNESCO Global Education Monitoring Meeting of December 2018, it was agreed that more comprehensive and reliable data is a prerequisite for policy Guidance, and that the improvement of educational systems serves to

---

39 https://www.bridge47.org/sites/default/files/2018-12/20_unesco_gce_2.pdf UNESCO GCE
40 http://uis.unesco.org/sites/default/files/documents/sdg4-databook-global-ed-indicators-2019-en.pdf
41 https://unstats.un.org/unsd/statcom/47th-session/documents/2016-2-SDGs-Rev1-E.pdf

deliver inclusive and equitable quality education and lifelong opportunities for all. [42] Wide-ranging advancements have been made regarding the development and measurement of SDG 4 and its 10 Targets covering 11 global and 32 thematic indicators. The UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS) continues to lead the development of clearly defined, valid and internationally comparable data with a broad geographical coverage. The global indicator framework is slated for further review in 2019-2020. However, challenges regarding the monitoring of SDG 4 progress remain, most notably in terms of the measurement of Target 4.7. Challenges identified at the GEM meeting in December 2018 included:

(i) incomplete methodological development

(ii) limited data availability in many countries/regions and on various sources of information

(iii) lack of integration between data sources across sectors (e.g. health)

(iv) lack of good data for policy guidance for countries seeking to reform their systems

(v) insufficient funding both for countries to implement the SDG4 indicator framework and for global international agencies and regional organizations to develop indicators – including through the Technical Cooperation Group (TCG).

Discussions at the GEM meeting of December 2018 concluded that coordination mechanisms at all levels – national and regional for SDG4-Education 2030 implementation – should (insofar as possible) **build on existing coordination mechanisms, systems and processes**, and be linked to broader SDG coordination mechanisms at national, regional and global levels. It was also stated that promotion of the education agenda starts squarely with governments. In order to translate the global education agenda into actionable national policies, plans targets, initiatives and actions, based on their national development

needs, policy and planning cycle, institutional capacity, organization of the education systems and the availability and allocation of resources, it was asserted that implementation of SDG4-Education 2030 must be government-owned and led. The importance of government ownership of the reporting on Target 4.7 cannot be overstated.

The existing, self-selective nature of country participation to some GCED-related data-gathering exercises, such as the IEA International Civic Citizenship Study every seven years, means that this potential for capturing the actual knowledge, attitudes and perceptions of students and schools is not being maximised. Interestingly, the IEA ICCS 2016 (published 2018), capturing data across 24 countries globally, is centred on a 29 - question survey instrument which covers four broad areas [43]. These can be conceptually and potentially more deeply, aligned under the following headings:

1. The education system

2. Civic and citizenship education in the curriculum

3. Teachers and teacher education

4. Assessments and quality assurance

These conceptual areas can be broadly aligned with the four areas of ESD and GCED mainstreaming designed to be measured by SDG Target 4.7, which intends to capture the "extent to which global citizenship education (GCE) and education for sustainable development (ESD) including gender equality and human rights are mainstreamed at all levels into….

1. National education policies

2. Curricula

3. Teacher Education

4. Assessment".

While the IEA and UNESCO have "agreed to collaborate in this area", plus the fact that the ICCS is recognized as one of the major existing sources of data for this vital global mission", [44] the extent and depth of their collaboration has yet to be realised and made visible.

42 Global Education Meeting, Brussels, December, 2018: Synthesis Report, 2018.
43 IEA International Civic and Citizenship Education Study, 2016.
44 IEA International Civic and Citizenship Education Study, 2016.

Although the ICCS is a very comprehensive collection tool, there are current limitations to the content and applicability of the study. Certainly, firm causal relationships are not possible given the cross-sectional design of the study, while the self-selective nature of country participation is also problematic. Both of these problems have been recognised at the outset by ICCS. However, the overall findings identify that education systems should seek to strengthen their capacity to teach inclusive civic and citizenship education. The 2016 study notes the absence of a clear association between observed national levels of civic knowledge and the ways in which counties implement civic and citizenship education in their curricula. The linkage between the ICCS study and UNESCO could prove invaluable and may provide one piece of the data pathway towards improved data gathering for Target 4.7. Mandatory national reporting to ICCS could prove one way of improving the measurement of GECD/ESD and, more explicitly, on SDG 4.7. Alternatively, the OECD could potentially be requested to include SDG 4.7 indicators for future PISAs, building on currently existing mechanisms, as argued and agreed at the Global Education Meeting in December 2018. This would also build on the fact that PISA is now measuring Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) and soft skills, which are relevant to the GCED arena. In further positive steps towards inclusivity and recognition of the importance and value of learning within the non-formal arena, the PISA-D project (PISA for development) is establishing methods and approaches to include out-of-school youth in the PISA assessment as part of the OECD's efforts to make the survey more relevant to middle- and low-income countries, as well as to help develop more inclusive education policies and programmes: *"In addition to measuring the knowledge, skills and non-cognitive attributes of out-of-school youth, PISA-D is collecting data on barriers to school attendance and on factors that may impede students' progress through education – important information in support of the Education Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) with its emphasis on leaving no-one behind".* [45] The

intention of using the PISA-D survey is that it will enable PISA, for the first time, to be able to report on what all 15-year-olds in a population know and can do.

6.2 What is the quantitative and qualitative measurement of Goal 4.7 that can be executed?

Given the scope and range of this question, a pertinent starting point is to reflect on current progress achieved towards Target 4.7. The UNESCO report 'Progress on Education for Sustainable Development and Global Citizenship Education', published in 2018, serves as a generally comprehensive update on the current status regarding the development, implementation and measurement of GCED and ESD. For this, the 6th Consultation on the implementation of the 1974 Recommendation concerning Education for International Understanding, Co-operation and Peace and Education relating to Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, 83 out of 195 Member States responded, a response rate of 43%. At the outset, the response rate (although its highest to date), demonstrates the lack of firm global commitment to measuring, producing and reporting data on GCED and ESD. The data is also self-reported, meaning there is a level of subjectivity impacting its useful interpretation. The findings themselves are broadly positive and demonstrate clear progress on a number of fronts, not least the mainstreaming of Target 4.7 across the four main dimensions:

• 98% of countries (80 countries) reported that the Guiding Principles were reflected, either fully or partially, in the **country's constitution or domestic legislation**

• Nearly all countries (99%, 81 countries) reported that their **curricula** included the Guiding Principles and related Topics

• 88% of countries (72 countries) **took a cross-curriculum approach**, teaching the Guiding Principles across more than one discipline or subject area of the curriculum, as

---

45 PISA-D Development Brief 7, OECD, November, 2016.

opposed to 57% of countries reporting that the Guiding Principles were taught in a separate subject

• Positively, and contradicting other qualitative research, 85% of countries (70 countries) reported that they applied **multiple pedagogical approaches** to teaching the Guiding Principles

• Globally, 75% of countries (61 countries) reported that the Guiding Principles are somewhat reflected in **pre-service teacher** training. The rate is highest in Africa (92%). The 'fully reflected' rate is highest in Europe and North America (19%), followed by Asia and the Pacific (15%), denoting a gap between this provision and policy commitment.

• An increasing number of countries (82%, 64 countries) include the Guiding Principles in student assessment compared to the 4th Consultation in 2008, when just 14% of countries reported doing so, and 46% in the 5th Consultation.

• However, in terms of the different dimensions of learning assessed by countries, 82% of countries assess students' knowledge and 72% assess skills/competencies. Furthermore, fewer countries report the assessment of either values and attitudes or behaviours – 62% and 41%, respectively.

• 86% of countries (67 countries) reported that the Guiding Principles are reflected in **programmes outside the school system**. A breakdown shows that 71% of countries include the Guiding Principles in non-formal and adult education programmes, and that 44-46% do so in **media-based and informal education**.

• New initiatives and political priorities are the most common enabling factors; a lack of resources is the greatest obstacle.

To summarise the above snapshot, strong policy commitment to the dimensions of SDG 4.7 is has not been backed up with progress on the other mainstreaming fronts, and particularly

falls down when it comes to student assessment and mainstreaming outside the formal system. Moving on from the snapshot above, and in order to provide a meaningful and useful answer to 7.2, it is helpful to take a closer look at the currently available evidence of the mainstreaming of GCED into the four key dimensions of Target 4.7. This can be done through the exploration of relevant case studies and viewed using the Andreotti lens of Critical GECD in order to illustrate effective mainstreaming practices, how they are currently being measured and which measures that have been reported/presented. Drawing on these good practice case studies will also provide further evidence in helping to answer to the other two questions.

UNESCO proposed in its comprehensive 2014 document on GCED that measurement can be implemented in many different ways, but that in the main, these forms should take into considerations different aspects, such as **the inputs** (e.g. educators' competencies, resources, tools, learning environment), **the process** (e.g. teaching methodologies, types of actions, learners' engagement) and **the outcomes** (e.g. knowledge, values, attitudes, skills, impact on communities).[46] Currently, the only thematic level indicators to have undergone further development in terms of formal strategizing by any of the globally responsible bodies are the learning outcome-based indicators, as explored by the 2017 GAML Monitoring Strategy and Proposal:

> *One approach to measure GCE suggests the establishment of a globally consistent measure through a composite indicator which includes key questions covering the GCE components and corresponding competencies. It is suggested to then identify these questions and variables available in existing surveys and various types of data materials to identify factors relevant for global citizenship education".* [47]

46 UNESCO Global Citizenship Education Report 2014. p.35
47 op.cit. p.37

The researchers would suggest that the composite indicators be formulated as part of the ICCS or PISA, or by using a combination across both.

6.3 Who should be the responsible institution that will collect and report the data?

In 2018 the OECD proposed the inclusion an assessment in the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) through the Teaching and Learning International Survey on "Global Competence". The proposal identifies how a focus on global issues within primary and post-primary education may become an integral dimension of the PISA: "Whilst this proposal includes a consideration of preparation for employment in a globalised world (concomitant with the problematic conceptualisations of GCE mentioned previously), there is a focus on the development of knowledge of global and intercultural issues, fostering analytical and critical thinking skills, promoting values in relation to diversity and human dignity, and promoting positive attitudes".[48]

Given that the central SDG4-Education 2030 policy focuses on equity and inclusion, efforts to improve monitoring of and reporting on inequalities in education are being made through the WIDE (World Inequality Database on Education) platform. This partnership between the Global Education Monitoring Report and the UIS aims to better understand inequalities in educational access, participation, completion and other outcomes. UIS is "the official source of cross-nationally comparable data on education", as confirmed in the Education 2030 Framework for Action.

Furthermore, at the global level, the Global Alliance to Monitor Learning (GAML) is an initiative designed to support national strategies for measuring learning and enabling international reporting. Led by the UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS), GAML brings together UN member states, international technical expertise and a full range of implementation partners — donors, civil society, UN agencies, and the private sector — to improve learning assessment globally. GAML is the first initiative of its kind, bringing together different education stakeholder groups for collective action on obtaining better learning data. The key features of GAML include balancing the data needs of countries and the accuracy needed for global reporting, engaging stakeholders through various pathways of participation by national governments, civil society, teachers' organisations, donors, UN agencies and academia, providing actionable guidance to countries in order to improve the monitoring of learning.

In terms of global civil society opinion, at the Global Education meeting of 2018, the Collective Consultation of NGOs Education 2030 Coordination Group (CCNGO) devised the following key policy messages regarding civil society, public reporting and accountability:

More needs to be done to institutionalise and enable meaningful civil society participation in the SDG-SDG4 processes, including holding regular broad-based consultations with education stakeholders, including Civil Society Organisations and CSOs, and enabling CSOs' meaningful participation in the development of Voluntary National Reports (VNRs).

CSO-generated data, or reports developed to feed into the VNR and High Level Political Forum (HLPF) processes, should be accorded with official recognition and status, including through the review session of the HLPF and the VNR reporting system planned for the UNGA in September 2019.

A theme in a number of European countries in particular is that policy initiatives regarding ESD and GCED have not been followed up with the increased resources needed to build capacity and expertise within the teaching profession.

The establishment of the United Nations High-level Political Forum on Sustainable Development (HLPF) was mandated in 2012 by "The

48 PISA 2016, p.1

Future We Want", the outcome document of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20). The Forum was to be universal and intergovernmental, building on the strengths, experiences, resources and inclusive participation modalities of the Commission on Sustainable Development, and subsequently replacing the Commission. The HLPF serves as the platform for follow ups and reviews regarding the implementation of the SDGs, and works to avoid overlap with existing structures, bodies and entities in a cost-effective manner. [49]

Consequently, the researchers suggest that institutional responsibility be entrusted to the agencies and bodies already invested in the collection and communication of results related to the education areas of GCED and ESD at all levels. This will mean:

At global level, UIS of UNESCO in conjunction with GAML;

At regional level, such as within the EU, the PISA survey, with an emphasis on enhancing both the PISA capacity for measurement through the PISA instrument administered in formal education settings and the newer PISA for Development [50] survey, PISA- D, which can capture measures across GCED and SED domains from the non-formal setting;

At national level, VNRs constitute another pre-existing mechanism that provide an excellent vehicle for data responsibility. VNRs also allow the capturing of relevant data measuring GCED and ESD domains, including those from CSOs and NGOs. This is important in conveying the status of the measures achieved through their locally administered programmes and activities, bridging both the **formal and non-formal sectors.** See below for more information related to augmented VNRs.

At local level, data collection and indicator refinement can be carried out in order to capture

contextual definitions of GCED and ESD (Please see Paper 3 of this series).

Potential data gathering and reporting pathway #1 at National Level

With the exception of the data on policy environments, all data can be collected locally at point of provision of ESD or GCE, for example schools and teacher training colleges. Ideally, researchers with relevant experience and technical knowledge can carry this out. The studies can be commissioned nationally by relevant government departments or ministries, or by networks such as Bridge47. This would ensure transparency and objectivity in the data collection process. Once the collected data is analysed, it can be fed into existing platforms like EMIS, through the PISA and PISA-D studies, through shared through respective networks, or indeed through the augmented VNRs. The UNSDG 4 National Coordinators, as national coordinating leads, could manage the coordination via the VNRs. This would ensure that the data is available to technical staff and decisionmakers in relevant government departments/ministries, while also ensuring that the data is stored and managed to enable access as and when needed. Reports can also be shared with relevant stakeholders and authorities at local, national and EU levels.

IEA studies: ICCS 2016 has depended on the critical input, perseverance and enthusiasm of the NRCs and their teams – the important data sets already available within the ICCS could be leveraged and fed via the UN National-Regional Coordinators, linking their work to that of MoEs or PISA and PISA-D in-country. If we consider that a combined measurement approach including both provision and outcomes is required, then both PISA-style data on learning/assessment outcomes will need to be captured, as well as at the ICCS level, the level of the National Coordinator of the SDGs in-country and at the teacher education colleges, as reported by the MoEs. This can then be relayed to UIS/GAML as the bodies charged, currently, with responsibility for monitoring the

---

[49] https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/23291HLPF_BN_1.pdf
[50] PISA for Development: Reaching Out of School Youth. Brief 7

achievement of Target 4.7. This will development of an as-yet-missing global narrative on SDG Target 4.7.

Potential data gathering and reporting pathway #2 at EU Level

We are already aware of the fact that the EU is seeking to establish a European Education Area by 2025, whereby *"learning, studying and doing research is not hampered by borders. A continent, where spending time in another Member State – to study, to learn, or to work – has become the standard and where, in addition to one's mother tongue, speaking two other languages has become the norm. A continent in which people have a strong sense of their identity as Europeans, of Europe's cultural heritage and its diversity".*

According to the European Commission Reflection paper, in line with the first principle of the European Pillar of Social Rights, the aim of this European Education Area is to make innovative, inclusive and lifelong learning accessible to all: *"First concrete actions include developing European universities; making qualifications obtained in upper secondary and tertiary education, as well as learning periods abroad automatically recognised across Member States; improving language learning; promoting quality early childhood education and care; supporting the acquisition of key competences; and strengthening digital learning".* 51

Building upon the development of this EEA may be a potential pathway for reporting, while potentially providing the vehicle for better indicator development based on Target 4.7 by combining measurement of its competencies with existing assessment data on learning outcomes.

6.4 How can these pathways be activated? Ten recommendations:

1) Conceptual clarification needed (as per Global Citizenship Education Network which

took place in Korea in November 2016), echoing much of the literature surrounding Target 4.7. The 'educations' and dimensions listed in the wording of the Target itself should be linked, while the Lack of a universal framework, in terms of a global education pedagogy, should also be addressed.

2) Formulate an integrative conceptual framework within 4.7 itself: a framework that puts at its centre (i) the process of gathering evidence and (ii) the role of teacher trainers in terms of promoting themes such as equity, environmental and global social justice and intercultural understanding. The visibility of education should also be maintained through linking the education dimensions.

3) Leverage the role and potential of regional and national networks. A model that is becoming increasingly influential within Europe is the Peer Review process on Global Education, organised by Global Education Network Europe. This network of government organisations across Europe has valued their peers commenting on current practices in their own countries in order to identify how best to develop strategies. This model could be piloted in other regions through the engagement of not just government ministries, but also higher education bodies and those organisations responsible for validating and accrediting teacher education courses. 52 A range of teacher education networks across the world regarding ESD and GCED could potentially be engaged in this process.

4) Boost VNRs' agency and engagement. Official recognition could be accorded to CSO/NGO data in order to feed into the VNRs and consequently transform their status and validity.

5) Many teacher education programmes appear to focus on one element or facet of ESD or GCED, yet change on a holistic level is subsequently expected. Complex change is impossible without engaging fully with the broader coverage of ESD or GCED. Local and national considerations

51 European Commission, January 2019. Reflection paper: Towards a sustainable Europe by 2030, p.53.
52 A review of Education for Sustainable Development and Global Citizenship Education in Teacher Education. Paper commissioned for the 2017/8 Global Education Monitoring Report, Accountability in education: Meeting our commitments. By Douglas Bourn, Frances Hunt and Phil Bamber (Liverpool Hope University). P.25

should serve as the main focus.

6) Developing modules that include specific emphasis on ESD and GCED themes within training courses for senior managers within schools. To have a sustainable impact within schools, policymakers and bodies responsible for delivering training to senior managers should be encouraged to include sessions on the ethos and mission of the school in terms of addressing global and environmental responsibility. The importance of this has been identified by research in the UK (Birney et al, 2011).

7) The centrality of teachers as the conduit and chief facilitators and enablers of the complexity of skills, attitudes and behaviours required to action global citizenship and sustainable development action by learners cannot be underestimated. Teachers remain central to delivery of education, and education as a process of human interaction can be supplemented, but not replaced, by technology. Teacher training colleges could be mandated to report to their Ministries of education on the extent to which they are including SDG4.7 areas across teacher education.

8) Priority has to be at a national and regional level for networks and policymakers to recognise the value of having one **overarching strategy for GCED**. This will maximise resources and is more likely to have greater impact on learners.

9) One **overarching EU GCED strategy** should also be devleoped in order to provide structure,

focus and legitimacy to the policy commitment made in the EC January 2019 paper Towards a Sustainable Europe by 2030. The paper's commitment to specific efforts around SDG 4.7 currently reads very weakly, stating: "It will remain important to step up efforts to integrate education on sustainable development in curricula at all levels of education". [53]

10) Supporting the **further rollout of the PISA-D pilot** is essential in order to boost the capture range of the PISA data, thus enabling a much fuller picture of the skills, knowledge and perceptions of all young people, both inside and outside the formal education sector.

[53] European Commission, January 2019. Reflection paper: Towards a sustainable Europe by 2030, p.78

7. Conclusion

Although there has been much discourse to date concerning the centrality of education, and indeed of Target 4.7, to achieving the overall 2030 agenda, the vast majority of action has taken place only at national policy level, with significant gaps remaining around conceptual clarity and agreement, agreement on comparable measures and adequate capture of the ongoing learning results being produced by non-governmental actors in the GCED and ESD fields, as well as a lack of recognition of the non-formal space as a key part of measuring success against 4.7. Furthermore, although fragmented and incomplete data collection around Target 4.7 exists, it does not and cannot, in its current guise, provide sufficient evidence to develop a much-needed global narrative.

The researchers conclude that in order to start bridging the aforementioned gaps, work must be undertaken through the practical steps outlined in the recommendations section (7.4) above, coupled with the application of a framework at local level, as is proposed by the researchers in Paper 3 of this series. Deploying this framework will enable results to feed into the mechanisms delineated through the above reporting pathways, allowing for clear transposition and comparability and enabling the development of a global narrative with effective global governance.

The current narrative draws on national reporting, which has significant Gaps and is missing out on both the valuable learning taking place within the GCED and ESD domains in non-formal settings and much of what is currently being practiced and innovated by CSOs and NGOs. Local framework application, coupled with augmented VNRs to supplement the limited national data sets through the larger international instruments, will then allow a more comprehensive development of a global narrative for Target 4.7. It is important to note that carving out such pathways means leveraging mechanisms and data collection process that are already taking place, but in a smarter way, in order to capture and convey GCED and ESD learning that is already happening. References

References

Andreotti, Vanessa. (2006) *Soft Versus Critical Global Citizenship Education*. Policy and Practice, a Development Education Review. Issue 3, Autumn 2006. Centre for Global Education.

Bourn, Douglas, Frances Hunt and Phil Bamber.(2017) (Liverpool Hope University) A Review of Education for Sustainable Development and Global Citizenship Education in Teacher Education. *Paper commissioned for the 2017/8 Global Education Monitoring Report, Accountability in education: Meeting our commitments.*

Buchanan, J., Burridge, N., & Chodkiewicz, A. (2018). *Maintaining Global Citizenship Education in Schools: A Challenge for Australian Educators and Schools. Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 43(4). Retrieved from http://ro.ecu.edu.au/ajte/vol43/iss4/4

Global Education Network Europe Peer Review, Ireland. (2015). https://gene.eu/wp-content/uploads/Gene_NationalReport-Ireland.pdf

https://www.globalreporting.org/resourcelibrary/gri_ungc_business-reporting-on-sdgs_analysis-of-goals-and-targets.pdf

GAML *(Global Alliance for Measurement on Learning) Measurement Strategy and Proposal for monitoring Target 4.7* 2017. Accessed via http://uis.unesco.org/sites/default/files/documents/gaml4-measurement-strategy- sdg-target4.7.pdf

Eurostat, (2016). Sustainable development in the European Union: A STATISTICAL GLANCE FROM THE VIEWPOINT OF THE UN SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS

2016 edition. Accessed at https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/documents/3217494/7745644/KS-02-16-996-EN- N.pdf

International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Attainment. (2018). *International Civic and Citizenship Study, 2016*. IEA October 2018.

Irish Aid Development Education Strategy 2017-2023, Department of Foreign Affairs, Ireland, 2017.

Lockhart, Ashley Stepanek. 2016. UNESCO. Education for People and Planet. Non-formal and informal programs and activities that promote the acquisition of skills and knowledge in the areas of GCED and ESD. Background paper prepared for the 2016 Global Education Monitoring Report.

Mallon, Benjamin. DICE Literature Review: *The Impact and Evaluation of Development Education in Irish Primary Schools, 2018.*

Measuring Global Citizenship Education: A Collection of Practices and Tools,

Brookings Center for Universal Education, April 2017.

OECD (2016). *Teaching for Global Competence in a Rapidly Changing World*. Retrieved from:

http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/education/teaching-for-global-competence-in-a- rapidly-changing-world_9789264289024-en

OECD (2016). PISA-D Development Brief 7. November 2016. Accessed via https://www.oecd.org/pisa/pisa-for-development/7%20-%20Reaching%20out-of- school%20youth.pdf

Performance Measurement Framework for the Irish Aid Development Education Strategy 2017-2023. Irish Aid, 2016.

Progress on Education for Sustainable Development and Global Citizenship Education, UNESCO report December 2018. Accessed via https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000266176

Schugurensky, Daniel. (2017). *From Article 26.2 to Target 4.7: Global citizenship education and international networks Global Commons Review*. February 2017 accessed via https://www.researchgate.net/publication/319255724_From_

Article_26_to_target_ 47_Global_citizenship_ education_and_international_networks

The Eurydice Report, (2017) *Citizenship Education at School in Europe*, 2017. 2017.

http://uis.unesco.org/sites/default/files/documents/sdg4-databook-global-ed- indicators-2019-en.pdf

UNESCO webpage accessed via https://en.unesco.org/themes/education- sustain-able-development/what-is-esd

UNESCO, (2014). *Global Citizenship Education: Preparing Learners for the Challenge of the 21st Century, 2014*. Paris. 2014.

https://unstats.un.org/unsd/statcom/47th-session/documents/2016-2-SDGs-Rev1- E.pdf

UNESCO (2016). Global Monitoring of Target 4.7, *Themes in National Curriculum Frameworks, Background paper prepared for the 2016 Global Education Monitoring Report*. IBE-UNESCO.

Annexes

ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK	SEA-PLM	UNESCO	WorldWiseSchools (IrishAid ProgrammeforDEin post-primary)	EADS Proposed Framework
WORKING DEFINITION OF GCE	Global citizenship education (GCED) is the term used when situating global citizenship in an educational context, describing the knowledge, skills, values, and attitudes fostered through teaching and learning about global citizenship.	Global Citizenship Education (GCED) aims to empower learners of all ages to assume active roles, both locally and globally, in building more peaceful, tolerant, inclusive, and secure societies. Global citizenship education (GCED) is critical for sustainable development. It encourages the acquisition of skills, values, attitudes, and behaviours that empower learners to assume active roles to face and resolve global challenges, and to become proactive contributors to a more peaceful, tolerant, inclusive, and secure world.	Known as development education in Ireland. Global Citizenship Education (GCE) is an educational process aimed at increasing awareness and understanding of the rapidly changing, interdependent, and unequal world in which we live. GCE inspires global solidarity by supporting people to fully realise their rights, responsibilities and potential as global citizens in order to take meaningful action for a just and sustainable world.	An educational process aimed at increasing awareness and understanding of the rapidly changing, interdependent, and unequal world in which we live (World Wise Global Schools).
WORKING DEFINITION OF ESD	Development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.	ESD empowers learners to make informed decisions and take responsible actions for environmental integrity, economic viability, and a just society for present and future generations while respecting cultural diversity. It related to lifelong learning and is an integral part of quality education. ESD is holistic and transformational education which addresses the following:	Education for sustainable development strengthens the capacity of individuals, groups, communities, organizations, and countries to make judgments and choices in favour of sustainable development. It can promote a shift in people's mindsets and in so doing enable them to make our world safer, healthier and more prosperous,	Education for Sustainable Development is any educational effort that equips learners with the key learning components of knowledge (on Education for Sustainable Development topics of lifestyle, sustainable life, climate change, biodiversity, and the green economy), skills, values, engagement, attitudes, and experiences to address social, environmental

	thereby improving the quality of life. Education for sustainable development can provide critical reflection and greater awareness and empowerment so that new visions and concepts can be explored and new methods and tools developed (UNECE 2005, 1; UNECE, 2009, 15). – 2014 National Strategy for ESD in Ireland	and economic challenges of the 21st century through integrating critical issues such as climate change, biodiversity, disaster risk reduction, and sustainable consumption and production (Global Alliance for Monitoring Learning, 2017).

Learning content: Integrating critical issues, such as climate change, biodiversity, disaster risk reduction (DRR), and sustainable consumption and production (SCP), into the curriculum.

Pedagogy and learning environments: Designing teaching and learning in an interactive, learner-centred way that enables exploratory, action-oriented and transformative learning.

Societal transformation: Empowering learners of any age, in any education setting, to transform themselves and the society they live in.

Learning outcomes: Stimulating learning and promoting core competencies such as critical and systemic thinking, collaborative decision-making, and taking responsibility for present and future generations.

CONTENT SUB DOMAINS (Learning Objectives)	• Global citizenship systems, issues and dynamics. • Global citizenship awareness and identities. • Global citizenship Engagement.	1. Local, national, and global systems and structures. 2. Issues affecting interaction and connectedness of communities at local, national, and global levels. 3. Underlying assumptions and power dynamics. 4. Different levels of identity. 5. Different communities that people belong to and how these are connected. 6. Difference and respect for diversity. 7. Actions that can be taken individually and collectively. 8. Ethically responsible behaviour. 9. Getting engaged and taking action.	• Teaching and learning through a global justice lens. • Allowing students to explore the knowledge, skills, attitudes and values necessary to become global citizens. • Cultivating the key skills at Junior and Senior Cycle. • Facilitating students to take action for a more just and sustainable world.	Change in knowledge, skills, attitudes, ethics, and actions arising from ESD and GCE.
MEASUREMENT SUB DOMAINS (i.e. Functions to be assessed)	Cognitive outcomes (remembering, applying, analysing, evaluating) Attitudes and values (feeling, sensing, valuing, believing) Behaviours and skills (acting, participating, presenting, negotiating)	Cognitive skills that enable acquisition of knowledge, understanding, and critical thinking about global issues, as well as the inter-dependency of countries and different populations. Socio-emotional learning that encourages a sense of belonging to a common humanity, sharing values and responsibilities, as well as empathy, solidarity, and a respect for diversity. Behavioural skills to act responsibly at local, national, and international levels to build a more peaceful and sustainable world.	• Knowledge • Skills • Values and Attitudes • Taking Action • Methodologies	Because ESD and GCE are transformational, we propose that change in the following is measured: • Knowledge • Attitude • Practice

BRIDGE 47

Bridge 47– Building Global Citizenship
contact@bridge47.org
www.bridge47.org

This paper is prepared by