

**Title:** Global Competence Education strategies: A view from around the world and considerations for implementation

**Lead Author:** Elisa Briga ([elisa.briga@afs.org](mailto:elisa.briga@afs.org))

**Additional Authors:** Dr. Sarah-Louise Jones ([sarah-louise.jones@hull.ac.uk](mailto:sarah-louise.jones@hull.ac.uk)); Dr. Corinna Howland ([corinna.howland@vuw.ac.nz](mailto:corinna.howland@vuw.ac.nz)); Melissa Liles ([melissa.liles@iddifferences.org](mailto:melissa.liles@iddifferences.org))

### **Abstract**

We present the ways in which global competence development is articulated in education strategies across four selected intergovernmental organizations and 12 countries. Educational strategies on global competence education (GComEd) by policymakers might seem to be a topic distant from the reality of teaching in a classroom, and a reader may wonder why teacher education should be concerned with them. We suggest that in order to critically evaluate, contribute to and influence educational strategies, and to know where to look for support and funding for integrating global competence in their teaching, it is fundamental for teachers who promote global competence to be aware of the international and national policy framework and discourse related to GComEd. Having located the essence of GComEd from an international perspective, we then discuss how GComEd has been interpreted in national education policies across a selection of countries. Next, we analyze points of comparison between the international and national strategies. We conclude by proposing considerations related to GComEd implementation in the classroom for future study, planning, or implementation.

**Keywords:** global competence, education strategy, education policy, international perspectives, global citizenship, citizenship education

Educational strategies on global competence education (GComEd) by policymakers might seem to be a topic distant from the reality of classroom teaching, and a reader may wonder why teacher education should be concerned with these strategies. To the extent that strategies and policies influence whether and how teachers frame GComEd within their curricula and have access to tools to implement it, it is fundamental for teachers who promote global competence to be aware of the international and national policy frameworks and discourses related to GComEd. We suggest that to evaluate, contribute to and influence these policies, and to know where to look for support and funding for integrating global competence in their teaching, teachers must recognize the origins of the materials they are using. In this chapter, we present how the ways in which global competence development is articulated in education strategies across four selected intergovernmental organizations (IOs) and 12 countries. The findings are the result of an extensive review that was conducted as part of the European Erasmus+ funded project ‘Global Competence in Teacher Education’ (GCTE)<sup>1</sup>. This project aims to develop cohorts of teachers who are globally competent and have the skills to develop this in their students. Prior attempts to address policy and practice related to global education have not addressed global competence specifically (e.g., Tye, 2014). Our work extends this by recognizing the work of international bodies in informing education policy strategies within national contexts. By studying institutional documents, we build on previous literature (e.g., Reimers & Chung, 2019; Grant & Portera, 2010) that explores national strategies related to GComEd (and similar concepts) and their implementation.

The notion of GComEd has grown in importance since 2005, not least because the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development’s (OECD) developed a Global

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.globalcompetence4educators.org>

Competence Framework including monitoring tools for its Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) tests in 2018. However, the OECD Global Competence Framework (2018) is not the only attempt to conceptualize and guide the provision of educational programs fostering awareness of global issues and intercultural competence; the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO), the Council of Europe (CoE) and the European Union (EU) also have frameworks which appear to inform national-level strategies. Therefore, we begin this chapter by reviewing these IOs in the context of how they define GComEd and related concepts (e.g., global citizenship education). Having located the essence of GComEd from an international perspective, we then discuss how GComEd has been interpreted in national education policies across a selection of 12 countries. Next, we analyze points of comparison between the international and national strategies. We conclude by proposing considerations related to GComEd implementation in the classroom for future study, planning or implementation.

**Table 1**

*Relevant Terms and their Abbreviations*

| Term                                     | Abbreviation |
|--|--------------|
| Citizenship Education                    | CE           |
| Civil Society Organization               | CSO          |
| Council of Europe                        | CoE          |
| Definition and Selection of Competencies | DeSeCo       |
| Education for Democratic Citizenship     | EDC          |
| European Union                           | EU           |
| Global Citizenship Education             | GCitEd       |
| Global Competence Education              | GComEd       |

|  |                    |
|--|--------------------|
| Global Education   | GE                 |
| Human Rights Education   | HRE                |
| International Organisation                                       | IO                 |
| Key Competences for Lifelong Learning                            | EU Key Competences |
| Non-Governmental Organization                                    | NGO                |
| Programme for International Student Assessment                   | PISA               |
| Reference Framework for Competences for Democratic Culture       | RFCDC              |
| Sustainable Development Goals                                    | SDGs               |
| United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation | UNESCO             |

### **International intergovernmental conceptions of global competence education**

In order to situate common elements among the international definitions and to foreground the subsequent section on national contexts, we explored how four major IOs, OECD, UNESCO, CoE, and EU, articulate GComEd or similar concepts. All of them have focused significantly on aspects related to GComEd in the last 20 years<sup>2</sup>. We reviewed their key publications with regard to terms related to global competence development.

It is important to note that understandings of global competence may differ significantly cross-culturally and are “often framed and interpreted differently by diverse stakeholders” (Engel & Sizek, 2018, p. 27). These IOs all have roots that lead back to post-World War II (WWII) reconstruction and an underlying principle of social and economic development. Moreover, they are representative of “Western” or “global North” approaches to global competence, which typically emphasize individual rather than social development, and prioritize “Western” values over other value frameworks (Grotlüschen, 2018). With this

---

<sup>2</sup> A full comparative analysis of international strategies, while important, is not within the scope of this chapter and can be found in other publications (see Auld & Morris, 2019; Vaccari & Gardinier, 2019; Cobb & Couch, 2018; Jooste & Heleta, 2017).

awareness having been now foregrounded, these IOs nevertheless each have a significant presence in GComEd internationally and thus they were selected for inclusion in this study.

#### Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)

Grounded in aid and reconstruction, the OECD was born out of the (US) Marshall Plan to scaffold the direction of American and Canadian aid in Europe following WWII (Bainbridge, 2000). The then-called Organisation for European Economic Co-operation shifted to a global focus in the early 1960s, when it was renamed and repositioned to “shape policies that foster prosperity, equality, opportunity and well-being for all” (OECD, n.d.a, para. 1). Within this new aim, OECD deemed it essential to support countries in shaping education strategies, and in the late 1990s started the Definition and Selection of Competencies (DeSeCo) project (Rychen & Salganik, 2003), which culminated in the launch of PISA testing in 2000.

The OECD’s notion of global competence was developed for inclusion within 2018 PISA testing with the aim of assessing the presence and efficacy of GComEd in national education systems (OECD, 2018). The resulting framework was based on a comprehensive review of literature and research, and the integration of a definition of global competence that had been developed by the Center for Global Education at the Asia Society (OECD & Asia Society, 2017). It identifies four core elements of global competence as “the capacity to:

1. examine local, global and intercultural issues;
2. understand and appreciate the perspectives and worldviews of others;
3. engage in open, appropriate and effective interactions with people from different cultures; and
4. act for collective well-being and sustainable development” (OECD, 2018, p. 7).

These elements are supported by four additional elements:

1. knowledge about the world and other cultures;
2. skills to understand the world and take action;
3. attitudes of openness, respect for people from different cultural backgrounds; and

4. global-mindedness, valuing human dignity and diversity (OECD, 2018).

In 2018, OECD also launched the OECD Future of Education and Skills 2030 initiative (OECD, n.d.). This includes the OECD Learning Framework 2030 or “Learning Compass” which identifies three transformative competencies: creating new value, reconciling tensions and dilemmas, and taking responsibility (OECD, 2019). Taken together, these competencies address the need for young people to be innovative, responsible, and aware, and the latter two recall concepts expressed in the OECD’s definition of global competence.

### **The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)**

UNESCO was established in 1945 with a primary aim of reconstructing education systems to build peace. Today, this IO is concerned with the development of “a genuine culture of peace” (UNESCO, n.d., para. 8) globally to prevent future world wars. To accomplish its peace-building goal, UNESCO identifies global citizenship education (GCitEd) as a key strategy in its education efforts.

GCitEd is grounded in UNESCO’s mission and UN documents such as the Framework for Action Towards Inclusive and Equitable Quality Education and Lifelong Learning for All (UNESCO, 2015b) and Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) Target 4.7 (UN, 2018), among others. GCitEd, as defined by UNESCO, is based on three dimensions of learning—cognitive, socio-emotional and behavioral—articulated thus:

**Cognitive:** To acquire knowledge, understanding and critical thinking about global, regional, national and local issues and the interconnectedness and interdependency of different countries and populations;

**Socio-emotional:** To have a sense of belonging to a common humanity, sharing values and responsibilities, empathy, solidarity and respect for differences and diversity;

**Behavioral:** To act effectively and responsibly at local, national and global levels for a more peaceful and sustainable world. (UNESCO, 2015a, p. 15)

These three dimensions are interrelated and are intended to “be transformative, building the knowledge, skills, values, and attitudes that learners need to be able to contribute to a more inclusive, just and peaceful world” (UNESCO, 2015a, p. 15). They contain seven discrete learning aims:

1. multiple identities;
2. critical skills for civic literacy;
3. beliefs and values as they relate to political and social decision-making, social justice, and civic engagement;
4. care and empathy and respect for diversity;
5. fairness and social justice in relation to inequalities; and
6. how to be engaged, responsible, and responsive global citizens (UNESCO, 2015a).

### ***Council of Europe (CoE)***

The CoE was established in 1949 to promote the principles that foster human rights (Council of Europe [CoE], n.d.). Today, the CoE subscribes to two concepts that appear to overlap with GComEd: global education (GE) and competencies for democratic culture. GE is one of three key aims of the North-South Centre (NSC) created in 1989 by the CoE to “spread the universal values upheld by the CoE—human rights democracy and the rule of law—beyond the European Continent” (CoE, 2018a, p. 1). GE became a core focus in 1991 and is defined as education that

opens people’s eyes and minds to the realities of the world, and awakens them to bring about a world of greater justice, equity and human rights for all [and...] is understood to encompass Development Education, Human Rights Education, Education for Sustainability, Education for Peace and Conflict Prevention and

Intercultural Education; being the global dimensions of Education for Citizenship.

(CoE, 2002, p. 2)

The CoEs's education department developed the Reference Framework for Competences for Democratic Culture (RFCDC) between 2014 and 2017 (CoE, 2016b). The RFCDC is based on the CoE work related to Human Rights Education (HRE), and Education for Democratic Citizenship (EDC) and it promotes a set of competencies that enable students "to become effective participatory citizens and live peacefully together with others as equals in culturally diverse democratic societies" (CoE, 2016a, p. 15). These competencies are split into 20 interconnected values, attitudes, skills, and sets of knowledge and critical understanding. In this model, competence is defined as

the ability to mobilise and deploy relevant values (e.g., valuing cultural diversity), attitudes (e.g., tolerance of ambiguity), skills (e.g., empathy), knowledge and/or understanding (e.g., of the self) in order to respond appropriately and effectively to the demands, challenges and opportunities that are presented by a given type of context. (CoE, 2016a, p. 23)

The RFCDC is meant to be implemented through a 'whole-school' approach<sup>3</sup> (CoE, 2018b).

### ***European Union (EU)***

The EU springs from the European Economic Community (EEC) that was founded soon after WWII. Education was introduced as a field of European-level cooperation in 1992 with the Maastricht Treaty (European Parliament, 2021). Thereafter, the aim of educating for

---

<sup>3</sup> The whole school approach can be defined as a holistic approach in a school that has been strategically constructed to improve student learning, behaviour and well-being, and provide conditions that support these. The approach involves all members of the school community, including school management, school staff, students, parents, and the broader community – working together to promote a sense of belonging and cohesion. A 'whole school approach' implies cross-sectoral alliances and stronger cooperation with a wide range of stakeholders beyond the educational field (e.g., social services, youth services, psychologists, health workers, local authorities, NGOs, businesses, etc.) (EU, 2016, p. 28).



a European citizenship underpinned by common values, encompassing respect for democracy, rule of law, equality, and fundamental rights emerged and has progressively taken a prominent role in the EU's education policies.

A milestone in EU education policy relative to GComEd was the adoption of the Recommendation on Key Competences for Lifelong Learning (EU Key Competences) in 2006. Updated in 2018, the eight EU Key Competences are:

1. literacy competence;
2. multilingual competence;
3. mathematical competence and competence in science, technology and engineering;
4. digital competence;
5. personal, social and learning to learn;
6. citizenship competence;
7. competence; and
8. cultural awareness and expression competence (EU, 2018, p. 7).

In the revised version of the framework, focus was put on *citizenship education* (CE), reflecting the principles of the Paris Declaration on Promoting Citizenship and Common Values that was adopted by EU education ministries in 2015 in response to terrorist attacks in the region.

Each EU Key Competence is described with a set of knowledge, skills, and attitudes. Although all eight competencies can be mapped across the OECD definition of global competence, “citizenship competence” appears most closely aligned with GComEd. Citizenship competence is defined as “the ability to act as responsible citizens and to fully participate in civic and social life, based on understanding of social, economic, legal and political concepts and structures, as well as global developments and sustainability” (EU, 2018, p. 10). The EU also references the CoE's RFCDC as a tool to promote and assess citizenship competence. Within the EU Key Competences, focus appears to be on promoting

political participation (knowledge and interest in socioeconomic and political developments and participation in decision making) and a common European identity.

### **Discussion of Conceptions of Global Competence**

The notion of serving a larger community is present in all the definitions of GComEd, albeit in different manifestations. And, although we observe this area of significant overlap, important differences appear to relate to the underlying interests and orientation of each IO. For example, the OECD global competence definition, whilst located in the discourse of the SDGs, is underpinned by its economic mission (Auld & Morris, 2019). UNESCO's conceptualization appears to be guided by "social justice and equality in the service of a common humanity" (Vaccari & Gardinier, 2019, p. 72). Human rights education is strongly present in UNESCO's and the CoE's work. Meanwhile, the notion of GE as used by the CoE stems from its work on global interdependence, solidarity, and development education (CoE, 2002), with the CoE's RFCDC grounded in their work on education for democratic citizenship and HRE (CoE, 2016b). Finally, both the EU and CoE's latest GComEd efforts emphasize civic values and human rights in response to terrorist attacks and a wave of radicalization that hit EU countries in 2014-2016.

We identified three additional points of interest. Firstly, three of four IOs (OECD, UNESCO, and CoE) have provided competence frameworks and assessment tools intended to guide interventions in practical implementation. Secondly, while implicit in the other organizations' definitions, the OECD and the CoE's RFCDC explicitly emphasize values. Thirdly, although the EU did not provide a framework specific to aspects of GComEd, it includes GComEd concepts across its eight EU Key Competences, putting into practice the notion of global competence as a transversal component of education.

### *From inter-governmental strategies to practical implementation*

In order to effect change, strategies must be applied. One way that IOs have encouraged the implementation of GComEd strategies has been through the creation of frameworks designed to guide educational interventions. Additional tactics for promoting and operationalizing GComEd include funding programs, expert networks, educational tools, and monitoring effort, examples of which can be seen in Table 1. In addition to governmental actors (e.g., ministries), many implementation approaches foresee cooperation with partners in the form of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) or civil society organizations (CSOs) (Wagner, 2012). In the context of this chapter, we refer to these stakeholders as CSOs.

**Table 2**

*Examples of Additional International Organisation (IO) Tactics*

| Organization      | Funding programs                      | Expert networks  | Tools   | Initiatives                    | Monitoring   |
|-------------------|---------------------------------------|--|---|--------------------------------|--|
| OECD              |                                       |  | The OECD PISA Global Competence Framework (2018). |                                | PISA 2018  |
| UNESCO            |                                       | 2013 Learning Metrics Task Force (with UN and Brookings Institution) | Clearinghouse on Global Citizenship Education     | Associated Schools Network     | Routine reporting on adherence to 1974 Recommendation concerning Education for International Understanding, Co-operation and Peace and Education relating to Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms |
| Council of Europe | Joint CoE/EU Democratic and Inclusive | North South Centre (NSC) Global                                      | 2020 Compass Manual for Human                     | NSC Global Education Programme | State of Citizenship and Human Rights  |

|                |  |  |   |   |  |
|----------------|--|--|---|---|--|
|                | School Culture in Operation (DISCO) program  | Education Network  | Rights Education<br>NSC Database of Good Practices on Global Education        | Democratic School Network   | Education in Europe report                           |
|                | Youth and Education sector budgets for democratic citizenship and human rights education |  |   |   |  |
| European Union | Erasmus+ Programme   | DEAR Programme online exchange of good practices                 | 2021 Compendium of Inspiring Practices on Inclusive and Citizenship Education | Education needs of teachers for inclusive education in a context of diversity (INNO4DIV) research project | European Commission reports on Citizenship Education |
|                | Development Education and Awareness Raising Programme (DEAR)                             | 2016-2020 Working Group on Common Values and Inclusive Education |   |   |  |
|                | Joint CoE/EU Democratic and Inclusive School Culture in Operation (DISCO) program        | Global Education Network Europe (GENE)                           |   |   |  |
|                |  | European Confederation of Relief and Development NGOs (CONCORD)  |   |   |  |

### **Selected national conceptions of global competence education**

Because the IOs' initiatives aim to impact national strategies, we now look at the initiatives to promote GComEd nationally across 12 countries. Specifically, we have sought to understand how global competence is articulated in national education strategies, and the

implications of these strategies for classroom implementation and teacher education. We reviewed strategies and, where available, relevant curricula and pedagogy directives. In addition to the six countries where the project team were located: Belgium (Flanders), Finland, Greece, Italy, the United Kingdom (UK), and the United States (US), we selected six non-European countries to include more geographic diversity in our review and because of the authors' access to policy information for them: Brazil, Canada, Egypt, New Zealand, Singapore, and South Korea. Canada and Singapore were selected because of their high rankings in the OECD's Global Competence Assessment (GCA) results of the 2018 PISA (OECD, 2020). These twelve countries are not meant to be representative of the regions in which they are located, but rather to highlight a diversity of national perspectives on GComEd.

Regarding national strategies in the five European countries, information was partly found in publications by intergovernmental institutions, and confirmed by the GCTE Erasmus+ project partners located in those countries. For the non-European countries, information was gleaned from a range of sources, including policy documents, intergovernmental reports, and academic publications. Our analysis is not meant to provide a comprehensive or unbiased picture of global competence strategy implementation worldwide. Rather we aim to identify initial patterns and reflect on the relative success of international and national educational strategies in fostering global competence.

### ***Belgium (Flanders) 417 words***

In Belgium, a rich diversity of learning on GComEd appears to be linked to support from the Directorate General for Development (DGD) of the foreign affairs ministry and “strong commitment from stakeholders at all levels” (GENE, 2017, p. 39). The DGD supports CSOs and the Belgian development agency, Enabel, to run programs, especially in schools. Organizations accredited by the government have access to multiyear co-financing

schemes to implement programs. For example, Enabel's *Annoncer la Couleur/Kruit* ("Speaking Out") program supports training on world citizenship for young people. It helps teachers and youth trainers gain understanding of globalization processes and global development issues and includes a knowledge centre designed to bridge the CSO and academic worlds on GComEd topics. The program is inspired by the pedagogical principles of the Maastricht Declaration, which guides the CoE's GE efforts. Although the program is federal and addresses both the Flemish- and French-speaking communities in Belgium, the website and activities are differentiated in order to match the respective education systems of the two linguistic communities. The promotion of GCitEd comes with support to schools for its assessment. Civic education has historically been the responsibility of religious education teachers in Belgium (Franken, 2014). However, in Wallonia, *philosophy and citizenship* became separate academic subjects within mainstream education in 2015, and in 2018 in Flanders, GCitEd was incorporated into schools as a cross-curricular subject. Our focus here is on the Flemish system.

In Flanders, curricula are based on 16 educational objectives set by the Flemish government in 2019; the EU Key Competences are embedded within them. Five of the objectives address GComEd, including: civic competencies; competencies in sustainability; social-relational competencies; competencies related to historical awareness; and cultural awareness and expression. In Flemish schools, multiple actors support GComEd. For instance, teachers are collectively responsible for deciding how to implement various broad citizenship education (CE) curricular objectives. Local CSOs support schools with international projects and the Flemish government's Association for Development Co-operation and Technical Assistance (VVOB) runs projects such as School Links, "a networking initiative between schools in the Global North and Global South" (GENE, 2017).

In Belgium, GComEd is rooted in the development sector, therefore the concepts of the CoE's GE and UNESCO's GCitEd guide the national educational programs. In addition, in Flanders, alignment with the EU Key Competences means emphasis on intercultural communication; skills needed to live in diverse societies; and knowledge about cultures and cultural heritage

### ***Brazil 495 words***

Federal education strategies in Brazil do not contain specific reference to GComEd. However, the Brazilian national curriculum, the *Base Nacional Comum Curricular* (BNCC), was developed between 2013 and 2017 around ten core competencies, some of which overlap with elements of the OECD's definition of global competence: life-long learning; critical thinking; aesthetic sensibilities; communication skills; digital literacy; entrepreneurship; self-care; empathy; citizenship; and ethics. BNCC competencies are "regarded as essential to preparing the next generations for the challenges of the fourth industrial revolution" (Costin & Pontual 2020, p. 61), and are also aligned to the OECD's DeSeCo project (Rychen & Salganik, 2003).

According to Costin and Pontual (2020), several factors complicate the adoption of the BNCC in schools, even though the education ministry has provided a clear mandate for incorporating it in the initial teacher training curriculum. Chief among these is the organization of Brazil's education system, which is premised on the principle of educational autonomy. National education scholars at the university level (including those responsible for teacher training) take the principle of autonomy seriously and there has been backlash from scholars who believe the BNCC contravenes this. This makes it "very unlikely that they will incorporate it in their curricula" (Costin & Pontual, 2020, p. 58), and that, consequently, its reach into initial teacher training curricula may be limited.

In terms of classroom-based implementation, the BNCC has come under criticism for not clearly linking its core competencies to subject-specific information and skills, instead “leaving cities and states with the responsibility of making the links themselves” (Costin & Pontual, 2020, p. 61). Consequently, a number of CSO initiatives, such as *Movimento pela Base*, *Nova Escola*, and *Inspirare Institute*, have developed resources and materials for supporting subject-specific integration of the competencies. Additionally, the National Textbook Programme published a project-based textbook in 2019 to guide students through the BNCC core competencies. However, this national resource is not aligned with state and local curricula, meaning that this “leaves cities and states with additional materials that do not consider the specificities of their curricula, which they may not have the capacity or means to do” (Costin & Pontual, 2020, p. 58).

The BNCC has not yet been integrated into national methods of learning evaluation, though provision for these changes came into force beginning 2020 with the first BNCC-exclusive cohort graduating in 2032. Rather, the main focus of Brazilian schools’ current concern is the Basic Education Development Index, or *Ideb*, which is premised on literacy and numeracy evaluation: “extremely low learning levels [...] serve as strong deterrents from focusing on [the BNCC] core competencies as school systems feel great pressure to focus on the academic competencies to the exclusion of all else” (Costin & Pontual, 2020, p. 62). In 2019, the shift to a conservative government extended this focus on numeracy and literacy. Although, to date, the BNCC still remains on the educational agenda, these developments suggest that only schools that have reached their literacy and numeracy targets are likely to teach BNCC competencies.

### ***Canada 393 words***

In 2017, the Council of Ministers of Education Canada (CMEC) elaborated a set of six core global competencies, intended to “equip learners with the ability to meet the shifting



and ongoing demands of life, work and learning; to be active and responsive in their communities; to understand diverse perspectives; and to act on issues of global significance” (CMEC, 2017, p. 3). These competencies closely parallel the OECD definition of global competence and are expressly informed by SDG 4: inclusive, equitable, and life-long learning, and the OECD’s Learning Compass and PISA 2018 assessment. Together, they constitute “an overarching series of attitudes, skills, and knowledge that can be interdependent, interdisciplinary, and leveraged both locally and globally” (CMEC, 2017, p. 3). The six competencies are:

1. critical thinking and problem-solving;
2. innovation, creativity, and entrepreneurship;
3. learning to learn and be self-aware and self-directed;
4. collaboration;
5. communication;
6. and global citizenship and sustainability (CMEC, 2017).

Each competency includes a definition, a list of key attitudes and skills, and a further set of student descriptors which clearly outline the outcomes desired. For example, under global citizenship and sustainability, the descriptor reads “students learn from and with diverse people, develop cross-cultural understanding, and understand the forces that affect individuals, societies, and nations” (CMEC, 2017, p. 15).

The implementation of GComEd reforms has been further supported by the CMEC’s development of the Pan-Canadian Systems Level Framework on Global Competencies (CMEC, 2020). This non-prescriptive policy document “maps out broad directions for the integration of global competencies” (CMEC, 2020, p. 2).

However, Canada does not have a national system of education, meaning GComEd has been implemented through varied reforms at different stages of development across thirteen jurisdictions (CMEC, 2020). Some already active strategies constitute explicit variations on the core competencies identified above, such as Alberta which incorporates

these competences: critical thinking; problem-solving; communication; managing information; collaboration; creativity and innovation; and cultural and global citizenship.

Other provinces and territories have aligned their competency curricula to fit the regional or local context. In Nunavut, for example, the curriculum was developed in consultation with Elders and other community members and revolves around eight key Inuit *Qaujimajatuqangit* principles which emphasize “doing” over “only knowing” with the overall goal of “creating an able human being” (CMEC, 2020, p. 8). Still others, such as Newfoundland and Labrador, are at the beginning stages of GComEd integration.

### ***Egypt 393 words***

Egypt was characterized by political instability during the 2011 Revolution and its aftermath, which has subsequently had a significant effect on the ability to be consistent in educational policy (Ewiss et al., 2019). Furthermore, the social context is one of high population density leading to classroom overcrowding, poverty, increasing economic inequality, high illiteracy rates, and low school attendance rates (Egypt Strategic Plan for University Education, 2014). This, coupled with low teacher salaries in public education and comparatively low state education expenditure, meant that Egypt’s primary-school educational quality was ranked 133 out of 137 countries by the 2017 World Economic Forum Report on Global Competitiveness (Johnson, 2018). Policy efforts have therefore been directed at providing holistic improvements to the country’s educational outlook, with a special focus on information communications technology resourcing and competencies.

Although GComEd is not explicitly featured in national policy, concepts with values comparable to some of the core values espoused in articulations of global competence and citizenship are nonetheless evident in it. Egypt’s Strategic Plan for Pre-University Education (2014-2030), a first attempt at educational reform after the Revolution, identifies a series of

goals for education: “to build the Egyptian character, preserve the national identity, consolidate the scientific method of thinking, develop talents and promote innovation, establish cultural and spiritual values, and lay foundations of citizenship, tolerance and non-discrimination” (MoE Egypt [MoEE], 2014, p. 11). The strategy also identifies the development of national identity as being “inseparable from global approaches” (MoEE, 2014, p. 2) though does not elaborate on this further, and lists long-term goals for the sector as fostering “the principles and values of citizenship, tolerance, renunciation of violence, freedom and justice, taking in consideration related rights and obligations in addition to the sense of responsibility towards nation and fellow citizens” (MoEE, 2014, p. 2).

In 2017, the government embarked on further reforms with support from the World Bank, progressively introducing a new competency-based national curriculum, called “Education 2.0,” to replace the rote-learning system. Modeled on the Japanese *Tokkatsu* education system, it is in line with the UN’s Education 2030 Framework for Action Toward Lifelong Learning (Oxford Business Group, 2019), which is centered around the development of 14 core life skills. Of the targeted life skills, active citizenship and learning to live together (the latter including respect for diversity, empathy, and participation) are most closely aligned with GComEd .

### ***Finland (403 words)***

The Finnish National Agency for Education (EDUFI), which oversees curriculum development and CSOs are the core stakeholders in GComEd provision in Finland (CONCORD, 2018). Citizenship education (CE) is identified as a separate subject in the Finnish curriculum (Eurydice, 2017). In addition, the National Core Curriculum for General Upper Secondary Schools implemented in 2021 includes six transversal competencies, four of which—interaction skills; civic skills; ethical and environmental competence; and global

and cultural competence—appear to overlap with components in the OECD definition of global competence.

According to the Finnish National Agency for Education (2020), Finland’s objective in the development of global and cultural competence, is to deepen the knowledge and understanding of the pupil’s own identity as well as the diversity of their school community and society. Students are encouraged to strengthen their international competence and multilingual skills by using culturally and linguistically diverse networks, media, and source materials. Students identify and reflect on cultural heritage, values, people’s varied operating environments, and other aspects on the basis of which cultural identities and lifestyles are built in one’s daily life and in Finnish, European, and global societies. Finally, students receive a wide range of opportunities to explore, practice, and increase the skills and ethics of global citizenship according to the SDGs, and strengthen their knowledge and role in promoting human rights, equality, justice, and ethics.

Clear learning outcomes are defined within each subject for these transversal competencies. Additionally, all schools are required to implement multi-disciplinary learning modules relevant to CE, with pupils taking an active part in planning the learning content and process (Eurydice, 2017). In addition, the Finnish upper secondary education system is structured in study units, rather than in school years, making it possible for individual students to include international projects as well as studies abroad within their academic careers (Eurydice National Reports, 2021a).

For GComEd carried out by CSOs in cooperation with EDUFI, whether inside or outside of school, the ministry of foreign affairs is the main funder. For example, in 2013-2015 the “Schools as Development Partners” project paired Finnish schools and schools in the Global South (CONCORD, 2018).

In addition to close alignment with the OECD definition of global competence, the six transversal competencies include elements of the EU Key Competences and integrate aspects present in UNESCO's GCitEd as well as CoE's GE definition, pointing more to analyzing and acting on global issues, and using the SDGs as a reference.

### ***Greece 185 words***

In Greece, GComEd falls within CE and "development education" initiatives in schools and is also promoted outside of school by CSOs active in the field of development cooperation (CONCORD, 2018). The Cross-Thematic Curriculum Framework for compulsory education foresees that issues related to GComEd in schools are embedded across the curriculum within the subjects of social and citizenship education; social and political education; environmental studies; and environment and sustainable education, school and social life (GENE, 2018). Two or three teaching periods per week are devoted to interdisciplinary project-based activities related to CE, including media literacy, gender equality, intercultural communication and interaction, and environmental sustainability (Eurydice, 2017).

In addition, the education ministry approved the introduction of CSO-led programs, such as Action Aid and Fair Trade Hellas, in schools between 2011 and 2017 (CONCORD, 2018). In the context of the 2007-2008 Greek economic crisis, as well as a large influx of refugees and newly-arrived migrants in the country since 2015, multiple public and civil society stakeholders have initiated activities related to EDC and HRE (CoE, 2017). Accordingly, in Greece, GComEd seems most closely aligned with the CoE's work.

### ***Italy 352 words***

In Italy, ministries, regional authorities, development cooperation agencies, and CSOs are the main stakeholders that promote GComEd. The National Program for Competencies and Learning Environments for 2014-2020 opened an opportunity for GComEd to be

included within Italy's formal education sector, by foreseeing interventions aimed at developing transversal competences, social and civic competences. Regional authorities have then played an especially prominent role. In 2016, the Conference of Regions and Autonomous Provinces approved a policy document which urged Italian educators to integrate a systemic/transversal approach to addressing the different topics dealing with GCitEd at school (Conferenza delle Regioni e delle Province Autonome, 2016, p.3). As a follow up, a GCitEd multi-stakeholder working group developed a national strategy document, which was approved in 2018.

In 2019, a new law on citizenship education (CE) mandated its inclusion in primary and secondary schools beginning in 2020. It prescribed interventions “aimed at developing transversal competencies and social and civic competencies that are included in the broader concept of promoting global citizenship” (CICS, 2018, p. 9).

Currently, the Italian focus on CE is based on adherence to the principles of rule of law, knowledge of the national and European institutions and the SDGs, basic knowledge of national law, promotion of active citizenship (including digital citizenship), volunteering, sustainable development and protection of cultural heritage, and the right to wellbeing.

Italy's GCitEd national strategy appears to be based on UNESCO's GCitEd definition and positions CSOs that are active in the field of development cooperation in the forefront, focusing particularly on acting for collective well-being and sustainable development. Cross-curricular CE, on the other hand, appears to be linked to the *citizenship competence* of the EU Key Competences, with the inclusion of additional aspects particularly relevant in Italy, such as labor law and raising awareness of the rule of law against mafia, and the promotion of cultural heritage, and focusing on digital competencies linked to active citizenship. Notably, however, HRE and intercultural diversity are not mentioned. Both the national strategy for GCitEd (2018) and the law requiring the teaching of CE (2019), foresee ongoing professional

development for teachers, although there is no mention of any incorporation of the topic in initial teacher education (Gazzette Ufficiale, 2019).

### ***New Zealand 320 words***

The New Zealand Ministry of Education (NZME) has incorporated the language of global competence within its 2018-30 International Education Strategy (NZME, 2018), which was developed by the government in consultation with education providers, international and domestic students, and community groups. The vision for the strategy is to “produce global citizens who are well equipped for the world in which they will be living and working. However, global citizenship must be based on knowing who we are, what we stand for and where we sit in the world” (NZME, 2018, p. 22). The strategy further provides goals and actions for global competence development. Under the heading “developing global citizens”, the plan defines success as ensuring that “all students gain the knowledge, skills, and capabilities needed to live, work and learn globally,” international education helps New Zealand to foster global connections and partnerships, and all New Zealanders “understand and embrace the benefits of international education” (NZME, 2018, p. 21).

Helping “students to develop global competencies through the delivery of the national curriculum” (NZME, 2018, p. 21) falls under the remit of the NZME directly. The curriculum, in turn, maps out five key competencies or “capabilities for living and lifelong learning,” adapted from the OECD’s DeSeCo project: thinking; using language, symbols and text; managing self; relating to others; and participating and contributing (Te Kete Ipurangi, 2021).

Although global competence is not explicitly mentioned as a standalone competence, the government provides suggestions and curriculum resources for how to foster global

competence and international citizenship<sup>4</sup>, including mapping how the above five key competencies might be applied in “intercultural and international contexts” (NZME, 2014, p. 9), and providing materials for lesson design (Te Kete Ipurangi, 2014).

### ***Singapore 255 words***

The Singaporean government adopted competency-based curricula in CE beginning in 1997 (Lee, 2013; Tan et al., 2017) when it introduced the Thinking Schools, Learning Nation policy, aimed at preparing students to meet challenges in the knowledge economy in a new global era, which set the educational agenda for the 21<sup>st</sup> century. This, in turn, prompted changes such as the introduction of social studies as a compulsory subject in upper secondary schools in 2001, emphasizing the core values of being rooted and living global; promoting “reflective inquiry, thinking, and criticality” (Tan et al., 2017, p. 251); building interethnic understanding and appreciation of cultures; and balancing global and national values.

In 2010, the Ministry of Education introduced the Character and Citizenship Education Framework. This framework was a “pivotal 21<sup>st</sup> century curriculum policy thrust” (Tan et al., 2017, p. 429) that articulated a plan for the introduction of Curriculum 2015. Curriculum 2015 aimed at developing core competencies underpinned by five key values—respect; responsibility; integrity; care; resilience; and harmony, which “shape the beliefs, attitudes, and actions of a person” (Lee, 2013, p. 253). Taken together, the values aim to help learners develop socio-emotional competencies: self-awareness; self-management; social awareness; relationship management; and responsible decision-making. The values are also the foundation for four skills: information and communication skills; civic literacy; global awareness and cross-cultural skills; and critical and inventive thinking. Finally, these skills aim to produce the following attributes: a confident person; a self-directed learner; an active

---

<sup>4</sup> Both terms are used in the same strategy document, however “international citizenship” seems to be the broader framework under which global competencies sit.



contributor; and a concerned citizen. Although not expressly articulated as such, these socio-emotional and behavioral competencies share multiple aspects with the UNESCO GCitEd concepts.

### ***South Korea 399 words***

Several successive iterations of the South Korean national curriculum have promoted GComEd or related ideas, notably GCitEd (Jungwoo et al., 2015). The concept of global citizenship was first introduced in the 1997 curriculum, and was primarily emphasized in the social studies curriculum, notably “the history and activities of our people [...] including ethnic identity as a Korean and values as well as attitudes as a global citizen” (Jungwoo et al., p. 34). The 2009 curriculum also incorporated reference to global citizenship and GComEd-aligned ideas, stating that students should be a person who can:

- develop his/her own individuality and career as a whole person;
- show creativity with new ideas and challenges based on his/her abilities;
- pursue a fulfilling life with an understanding of diverse cultures and values; and
- make a commitment to the development of a community by understanding and sharing with others while communicating globally. (Jungwoo et al., 2015)

The 2009 social studies curriculum explicitly addressed globalization, international cooperation, and sustainable development, emphasizing the development of respectful attitudes toward other cultures and an “attitude to actively participate in settling problems” (Jungwoo et al., 2015, p. 35). These three elements align with the UNESCO articulation of GCitEd.

The revised national curriculum effective from 2018 espouses an explicit competency-based framework, premised on the foundational principle of *Hongik Ingan*:

“contributing to the overall benefit of humankind” (Kim & Eom, 2017, p. 1)<sup>5</sup>. To achieve this, school students aim to develop six competencies: self-management; knowledge/information processing; creative thinking; aesthetic-emotional [regulation]; communication; and civic [engagement]. Civic competencies appear most closely aligned with the idea of GComEd, being defined as “the ability to actively participate in community development with values and attitudes required for being a member of local, national, and global communities” (Kim & Eom, 2017, p. 2). This is enhanced through a focus on creative experiential learning (CEL), a combination of “discretionary activities and extracurricular activities” focused on “learning through doing,” and centered around themes that include character education, career education, education for democratic citizenship, human rights education, multicultural education, unification education, and education for sustainable development. These aim to foster creative, well-rounded people who will “cultivate their talent and potential, . . . and develop a sense of community . . . necessary for being a global citizen” (Kim & Eom, 2017, p. 2).

### ***United Kingdom 326 words***

In the UK, *citizenship* is not compulsory in primary/elementary schools, but is compulsory for secondary schools for students ages 11 to 16 (Eurydice National Reports, 2019b). Citizenship includes global dimensions, especially related to political systems, human rights, and international law and relations.

The main GComEd initiative in the UK has been the Global Learning School Programme (GLSP) (CONCORD, 2018). The program was launched in 2013 to coordinate GComEd in schools and integrate aspects of global learning in school life and learning, following the whole-school approach. The GLSP provides tools such as the Whole School

---

<sup>5</sup> *Hongik Ingan* is a foundational philosophical principle of South Korea incorporated in multiple state policies including education.

Framework (WSF) which supports schools in embedding global learning in pupil achievement, in teachers' practice, behavior, and relationships, and in leadership and the community. The WSF is linked with the evaluation framework set by the UK's government department responsible for school inspection, which thus provides support for systemic integration of GComEd aspects within education. Additionally, in Wales, school inspections ensure that Education for Sustainable Development (ESD) and GCitEd content is embedded in everyday classroom life and as a cross-cutting theme in the curriculum (CONCORD, 2018). And, since 1997, Oxfam's Curriculum for Global Citizenship is implemented in England, Scotland, and Wales (UNESCO, 2014).

In England, Northern Ireland, and Wales, students taking their General Certificate of Secondary Education (GCSE) must complete an active citizenship profile, recording their participation in citizenship activities in school settings or within the wider community. These actions taken locally could also take into account global issues. (Eurydice, 2017, p. 123).

In Scotland, the Curriculum for Excellence applies to students aged 3-18 and global citizenship is embedded across the curriculum, bringing together education for citizenship, international education, and ESD (Eurydice National Reports, 2019c).

GComEd programs in the UK appear aligned with the OECD's definition of global competence and UNESCO's GCitEd. Notably, UK programs emphasize the ability to analyze global issues and act accordingly. Intercultural communication and interaction, which are present in the CoE's RFCDC and EU Key Competences, are less prominent.

### ***United States 386 words***

The U.S. Department of Education's (USDoE) 2018 international strategy argues for the inclusion of global competence from early learning to post-secondary education through its first objective: "Increase global and cultural competence of all U.S. students" (USDoE, n.d., headline). The USDoE defines people who are globally and culturally competent as:

proficient in at least two languages; aware of the differences that exist between cultures; critical and creative thinkers, who can understand diverse perspectives; and able to operate at a professional level in intercultural and international contexts. These competencies are not isolated skills, but rather interrelated skills and areas of knowledge that are used together to enable individuals to understand the world and take action. (USDoE, n.d., para. 2)

The USDoE definition aligns most closely with the OECD global competence definition. It also incorporates an earlier framework (USDoE, 2017), called the Framework for Developing Global and Cultural Competencies to Enhance Equity, Excellence and Economic Competitiveness (FDGC). The FDGC is the product of a working group with representatives from across the USDoE and discussions with the education community. The framework is designed to help educators consider how global and cultural competencies are developed over time and at various stages of education. The framework highlights four key areas of development: collaboration and communication; world and heritage languages; diverse perspectives; and civic and global engagement (USDoE, 2017).

It should be noted, however, that school curricula are developed at a state, rather than federal/national, level in the US (Engel & Sizcek, 2018). This means the USDoE's strategy and framework are not directly binding on state curricula but rather are intended to act as a guide. Accordingly, uptake in state policy and practice has been patchy and partial. Over 50% of U.S. state departments of education have embedded global education into their policies, curricula, and activities in some form, though in a number of cases (e.g., California, North Carolina, Washington) these preceded the publication of the USDoE's international strategy (California Department of Education [CDoE] 2016; see also Tichnor-Wagner 2016; Global Washington 2015). As an example, the Kentucky Department of Education (KDoE) primarily premises GComEd offerings on its 21st Century Skills framework, which it has incorporated

into its Academic Standards, but as of 2020 also draws explicitly on the USDoE's 2018 definition of global competence and the FDGC (Kentucky Department of Education [KDoE], 2020).

### **Comparing national strategies**

Our aim here was not to conduct an exhaustive comparative analysis of national GComEd strategies. Instead, we looked at GComEd implementation across 12 countries from the lens of policy approaches to the concept and to implementation practices, key actors, and teacher preparation. In doing so, we identified points of commonality and interest across national strategies – and in relation to international GComEd conceptions.

### ***Approaches***

In all countries analyzed in this study, with the exception of Egypt, global competence – or elements of it – are considered transversal competencies to be embedded across the curriculum and subjects. Additionally, in Greece, Finland, Italy, and the UK, GComEd is linked specifically to CE, with the aim of promoting civic identity and responsibility, while in Singapore and South Korea – countries that adopted competence-based curricula early on and have promoted GComEd concepts since 1997 – the latest GComEd strategy emphasizes values such as responsibility, respectfulness, and caring.

We also observe European vs non-European phenomena. While all EU countries<sup>6</sup> are moving to align the curriculum with the EU Key Competences, each EU country focuses on different aspects of global competence. For example, Greece focuses primarily on HRE, especially in the context of immigration, while Finland and Belgium focus on the SDGs and GCitEd. Outside of the EU, although they vary by country, national strategies appear more focused on the development of so-called 21st century skills. Non-EU strategies appear

---

<sup>6</sup> Due to Brexit, it is unclear whether the UK will follow the EU Key Competences pathway.

generally aligned with the varied IO approaches to GComEd: Brazil, Canada, New Zealand, and the US seem to follow the OECD's notion of global competence; Singapore and South Korea can be said to subscribe to UNESCO's GCitEd framework. And, while we did not profile the UN's overall policy towards education improvement here, that direction appears also to guide policy in Egypt.

Despite a commitment to GComE at a high level in many countries, corresponding curricular reform has lagged. In several countries, reforms to include aspects of global competence across the curriculum have only been recently adopted (in 2021 in Finland, Belgium-Flanders, and Italy, in 2018 in Canada, New Zealand, and US), therefore data on implementation is limited. In Egypt, the new curriculum is to be fully implemented by 2030. From the analysis of Brazil and Egypt, both with low levels of attainment in school and high poverty, the focus of educational reforms is on improving numeracy and literacy and the overall educational outlook, rather than specifically on transversal and global competencies.

Furthermore, implementation of GComEd strategies "on the ground" is significantly varied. In part, this is due to the organization of the education systems. In the three largest countries analyzed (Brazil, Canada, and US), each federated or regional authority has a degree of autonomy in the provision of school education. Therefore, the national level authorities can only provide nonbinding recommendations. However, if the national level authority provides clear guidelines and educational tools, in some places these are adopted (or adapted) at a state or regional level (e.g., US and Canada). At a school level, GComEd interventions and assessment also vary widely, ranging from the promotion of a whole-school approach where school inspectors evaluate GComEd integration (e.g., Wales), to embedding global competence in specific subject-based learning outcomes (e.g., Finland), to including citizenship education as a separate subject taught cross-curricularly (e.g., Italy), to special GComEd-focused projects conducted during school hours (e.g., Greece).

### ***Key actors***

In all of the European countries analyzed, several ministries—education, development cooperation, and foreign affairs—initiated strategies to promote global competence development, yet cooperation among these is not always guaranteed (except in Italy where cooperation is ensured by institutional bodies and in Finland where there are established practices of cooperation between ministries on this topic). Outside of Europe, GComEd is primarily promoted by education ministries through initiatives concerning the curriculum. Interestingly, in multiple countries, CSOs are the primary stakeholders in the provision of GComEd. For example, in Finland and Belgium, CSOs receive state funding for this purpose, and in other countries they inform some aspects of GComEd or related approaches as a complementary resource to aid implementation in schools (e.g., Greece, UK, and Brazil).

Alongside their role as education providers, CSOs appear to influence GComEd strategies in some countries (e.g., Canada, Brazil, Egypt, EU-countries,). For instance, we observed that in European countries, CSOs belonging to the development cooperation sector, such as Oxfam and Caritas, have successfully developed widely implemented programs and educational resources (e.g., Oxfam’s Curriculum for Global Citizenship), and European IOs support networks of CSO experts in GComEd (CONCORD, GENE). From our analysis, we observed that CSOs cooperate with schools for GComEd provision and advocate for better inclusion of GComEd in curricula. However, most CSO interventions happen outside the remit of policy and on an *ad hoc* basis. Belgium is the only country in our review that systematically and explicitly integrates CSO interventions to support GComEd goals in the curriculum.

### ***Teacher preparation***

Somewhat surprisingly, explicit mention of teacher preparation in national GComEd strategies is mixed. In some countries (e.g., Italy and Scotland), training happens primarily in

the context of ongoing professional development for in-service teachers. Others, such as New Zealand and Scotland, have set up networks to link teachers and their schools internationally as a means of support. Yet other countries make no explicit references to GComEd teacher training in their education strategy documents (e.g., US national level).

### **Considerations for successfully embedding global competence in school education**

Our goal in this research was to discover how global competence development is articulated in education strategies across four IOs and 12 countries respectively, and how the strategies of the former are evident in the latter. In reflecting on this process, we have identified three categories of considerations that we suggest be further explored.

#### ***Stakeholder alignment***

First, if strategy and practice are to match, adoption and implementation of GComEd initiatives at school require close cooperation between all school and GComEd stakeholders, from the decision makers to CSOs to classroom teachers. This is particularly relevant in countries where school education is a decentralized responsibility and regional and local authorities are the main decision makers and implementers: the latter should be included in the national level discussion shaping GComEd strategies, to ensure both their provision of expertise, and their ownership of the strategy which they will then adapt to the local context.

#### ***Holistic approach***

Next, in considering GComEd within school curricula, we contend that global competence and related concepts are multidimensional and must be addressed holistically, taking into account that different IOs and disciplines address elements of GComEd using a variety of terms. Our review suggests that if strategies are to be integrated into practice, they must be integrated in curricula in a systematic manner, across a variety of subject disciplines using a whole school approach. To aid in both efforts—fostering stakeholder participation and true integration of GComEd within school systems and curricula—the global



competence-related frameworks, funding, resources and other tactics offered by IOs may be useful nationally or locally and should be leveraged.

### ***Professional development for teachers and teacher trainees***

Lastly, beyond stakeholder cooperation and curriculum adjustments, international and national strategies give little if any attention to the provision of GComEd in initial or ongoing teacher training. We assert, and the literature supports (OECD, 2020), that facilitating GComEd opportunities for teachers before and during their classroom tenure is a crucial, if overlooked, area for global competence development to be successfully implemented at any level. Educators themselves have acknowledged the need to improve their own global competence and learn how to embed this in their teaching (OECD, 2020 by linking it both to subject teaching and within a larger whole-school approach. To this end, a growing body of international and national educational resources are available (see Table 1 for a few example). However, existence does not equate to accessibility or implementation. Therefore, we suggest that teachers and teacher trainees can benefit additionally from training on how to identify and use these educational resources, as well as the promotion of effective GComEd resource hubs by IOs. Finally, as suggested in both international and national strategies, in addition to formal education stakeholders, other parties (including CSOs, parents, community members, and learners themselves) can help educators enhance their global competence and learn to facilitate this in their students.

### **Summary**

This review demonstrates that multiple GComEd linkages can be found between the education directives of IOs and those of national education authorities. In analyzing the education strategies of 11 countries, we observed a clear resonance of IO GComEd conceptualizations and strategies within most national strategies. We suggest that IOs' GComEd and related definitions and frameworks aim to influence the national strategies of

their constituent members. At the same time, we acknowledge that national concepts inevitably inform international efforts, creating a continual tension and evolution between the local and the global realms.

At the international level, in addition to the core act of asserting a definition of GComEd, we have identified five tactics for promoting the implementation of GComEd strategies: enacting competency frameworks, funding programs, developing and disseminating educational tools, encouraging assessments, and monitoring efforts. However, we observed major differences in how the strategies and tactics have been implemented at national levels and within countries. This dissonance is seemingly related to the multitude of ministries and other stakeholders dealing with different aspects related to global competence and, in the case of Brazil, Canada, and the US, the decentralization of national education strategies.

Additionally, in three of the countries profiled, GComEd educational interventions appear disjointed. Our research suggests this is related to at least three phenomena. In some cases (e.g., Greece), GComEd appears to be promoted in strategy through specific occasional projects rather than broadly and on an ongoing basis. In other cases (e.g., Brazil and New Zealand), although nominally present in education strategies, GComEd may not be considered a top priority in practice. Thirdly, strategies are sometimes written broadly enough to give educators wide discretion in incorporating GComEd (e.g., New Zealand, US).

Finally, we identify three areas of considerations for researchers, policymakers, and practitioners to encourage meaningful adoption of GComEd: greater stakeholder cooperation, embedding GComEd as a transversal competence in the curriculum, and providing focused professional development for pre- and in-service teachers.

## **Acknowledgements**

We gratefully acknowledge the Erasmus+ Programme and the project partners who made up the Global Competence in Teacher Education (GCTE) project team: AFS Intercultural Programs (US), European Federation of Intercultural Learning (Belgium), HAMK University of Applied Science (Finland), Hellenic Open University (Greece), University College Leuven Limburg (Belgium), University of Genoa (Italy), University of Hull (UK).

## References

- Auld, E. & Morris, P. (2019). Science by streetlight and the OECD's measure of global competence: A new yardstick for internationalisation? *Policy Futures in Education*, 17(6), 677-698. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1478210318819246>
- Bainbridge, T. (2000). A brief history of the OECD. *OECD Observer* 221, 111.
- California Department of Education [CDoE]. (2016). Educating for Global Competency: Findings and Recommendations from the 2016 California Global Education Summit. <https://www.mydigitalchalkboard.org/cognoti/content/file/resources/documents/ab/ab4420e5/ab4420e5a514d0bc0e17be13486d7398998f9b20/educateglobalcomp.pdf>
- Cobb, D. & Couch, D. (2018). Teacher education for an uncertain future: Implications of PISA's Global Competence. In D. Heck & A. Ambrosetti (Eds.), *Teacher Education in and for Uncertain Times* (pp. 35-47). Springer.
- Comitato Interministeriale per la Cooperazione allo Sviluppo (CICS) (2018). *Strategia italiana per l'Educazione alla cittadinanza globale*. [https://www.esteri.it/mae/resource/doc/2020/06/strategia\\_italiana\\_ecg.pdf](https://www.esteri.it/mae/resource/doc/2020/06/strategia_italiana_ecg.pdf)
- Conferenza delle Regioni e delle Province Autonome. (2016). *Educazione alla Cittadinanza Globale*. <http://www.regioni.it/home/educazione-alla-cittadinanza-1336/>
- CONCORD. (2018). *Global Citizenship Education in Europe - How much do we care?* <https://concordeurope.org/resource/global-citizenship-education-how-much-do-we-care/>
- Costin, C. & Pontual, T. (2020). Curriculum Reform in Brazil to Develop Skills for the Twenty-First Century. In F. M. Reimers (Ed.), *Audacious Education Purposes: How Governments Transform the Goals of Education Systems* (pp. 47-64). Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-41882-3>
- Council of Europe. (n.d.). *About the Council of Europe*. <https://www.coe.int/>

Council of Europe. (2002). *European Strategy Framework for Improving and Increasing Global Education in Europe to the Year 2015: The “Maastricht Global Education Declaration”*. <https://rm.coe.int/168070e540>

Council of Europe. (2016a). *Living together as equals in culturally diverse democratic societies*.  
<https://rm.coe.int/CoERMPublicCommonSearchServices/DisplayDCTMContent?documentId=09000016806ccc07>

Council of Europe. (2016b). *Reference Framework of Competences for Democratic Culture, Volume 1: Context, concepts and model*. <https://rm.coe.int/prems-008318-gbr-2508-reference-framework-of-competences-vol-1-8573-co/16807bc66c>

Council of Europe. (2017). *Report on the state of citizenship ‘Learning to Live Together’ and human rights education in Europe*. <https://rm.coe.int/report-on-the-state-of-citizenship-and-human-rights-eudcation-in-europ/16809676ab>

Council of Europe. (2018). *North-South Center*. <https://rm.coe.int/09000016802ed00d>

Council of Europe. (2018b). *Reference Framework of Competences for Democratic Culture, Volume 3: Guidance for implementation*. <https://rm.coe.int/prems-008518-gbr-2508-reference-framework-of-competences-vol-3-8575-co/16807bc66e>

Council of Ministers of Education, Canada. (2017). *Pan-Canadian Global Competencies: A Backgrounder*.  
[https://www.cmec.ca/Publications/Lists/Publications/Attachments/401/Pan-Canadian%20Global%20Competencies%20Backgrounder\\_EN.pdf](https://www.cmec.ca/Publications/Lists/Publications/Attachments/401/Pan-Canadian%20Global%20Competencies%20Backgrounder_EN.pdf)

Council of Ministers of Education Canada. (2020). *Pan-Canadian Systems Level Framework on Global Competencies*.  
<https://www.cmec.ca/Publications/Lists/Publications/Attachments/403/Pan->

[Canadian%20Systems-Level%20Framework%20on%20Global%20Competencies\\_EN.pdf](#)

Engel, L. & Sizcek, M. (2018). Framing Global Education in the United States: Policy Perspectives. In L. D. Hill & F. J. Levine (Eds.), *Global Perspectives on Education Research* (pp. 26-47). Routledge.

European Commission. (2018). *Education and Training Monitor*.  
<https://ec.europa.eu/education/sites/education/files/document-library-docs/volume-1-2018-education-and-training-monitor-country-analysis.pdf>

European Parliament. (2021). *Education and Vocational Training*.  
[https://www.europarl.europa.eu/ftu/pdf/en/FTU\\_3.6.3.pdf](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/ftu/pdf/en/FTU_3.6.3.pdf)

European Union. (2016). *Education policies and practices to foster tolerance, respect for diversity and civic responsibility in children and young people in the EU: Examining the evidence*. <https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/abe4b8dc-ffa8-11e5-b713-01aa75ed71a1/language-en>

European Union. (2018). *Council recommendation of 22 May 2018 on Key Competences for Lifelong Learning*. [https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=uriserv%3AOJ.C\\_.2018.189.01.0001.01.ENG](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=uriserv%3AOJ.C_.2018.189.01.0001.01.ENG)

European Union. (2021a). *The EU in brief*. [https://europa.eu/european-union/about-eu/eu-in-brief\\_en](https://europa.eu/european-union/about-eu/eu-in-brief_en)

European Union. (2021b). *Compendium of inspiring practices on inclusive and citizenship education*. <https://doi.org/10.2766/473420>

Eurydice. (2017). *Citizenship Education at schools in Europe*.  
[https://eacea.ec.europa.eu/national-policies/eurydice/content/citizenship-education-school-europe-%E2%80%93-2017\\_en](https://eacea.ec.europa.eu/national-policies/eurydice/content/citizenship-education-school-europe-%E2%80%93-2017_en)

Eurydice National Reports. (2018). *Mobility in Early Childhood and School Education: Italy*.

[https://eacea.ec.europa.eu/national-policies/eurydice/content/mobility-early-childhood-and-school-education-33\\_en](https://eacea.ec.europa.eu/national-policies/eurydice/content/mobility-early-childhood-and-school-education-33_en)

Eurydice National Reports. (2021a). *Mobility in Early Childhood and School Education:*

*Finland*. [https://eacea.ec.europa.eu/national-policies/eurydice/finland/mobility-early-childhood-and-school-education\\_en](https://eacea.ec.europa.eu/national-policies/eurydice/finland/mobility-early-childhood-and-school-education_en)

Eurydice National Reports. (2019b). *Other Dimensions of Internationalisation in Early Childhood and School Education: United Kingdom - England*.

[https://eacea.ec.europa.eu/national-policies/eurydice/content/other-dimensions-internationalisation-early-childhood-and-school-education-77\\_en](https://eacea.ec.europa.eu/national-policies/eurydice/content/other-dimensions-internationalisation-early-childhood-and-school-education-77_en)

Eurydice National Reports. (2019c). *Other Dimensions of Internationalisation in Early Childhood and School Education: United Kingdom - Scotland*.

[https://eacea.ec.europa.eu/national-policies/eurydice/content/other-dimensions-internationalisation-early-childhood-and-school-education-79\\_en](https://eacea.ec.europa.eu/national-policies/eurydice/content/other-dimensions-internationalisation-early-childhood-and-school-education-79_en)

Ewiss, M., Abdelgawad, F. & Elgendy, A. (2019). School educational policy in Egypt: societal assessment perspective. *Journal of Humanities and Applied Social Sciences*, 1(1), 55-68.

Finish National Agency for Education. (2020). *Curriculum for General Upper Secondary*

*Schools*. <https://www.oph.fi/en/statistics-and-publications/publications/core-curriculum-general-upper-secondary-schools-nutshell>

Franken, L. (2014). Religious and citizenship education in Belgium/Flanders: Suggestions for the future. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, 9(3), 255-267.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1746197914545924>

Gazzette Ufficiale. (2019). *Civic Education*.

<https://www.gazzettaufficiale.it/eli/id/2019/08/21/19G00105/sg>

- Global Education Network Europe. (2018). *The State of Global Education in Europe 2018*.  
<https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5f6decace4ff425352eddb4a/t/5fc40dceeaf37e3b641b2214/1606684113510/State-of-Global-Education-2018.pdf>
- Global Education Network Europe. (2017). *Global Education in Belgium*.  
<https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5f6decace4ff425352eddb4a/t/5fc0f5723485235c86e8e09d/1606481274415/Belgium-Peer-Review-Report-with-cover.pdf>
- Global Washington. (2015). GlobalWA 2015 Annual Report. <http://globalwa.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/GlobalWA-2015-Annual-Report.pdf>
- Grant, C. A. & Portera, A. (2010). *Intercultural and multicultural education: Enhancing global interconnectedness* (Vol. 39). Routledge.  
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203848586>
- Grotlüschen, A. (2018). Global Competence - Does the new OECD competence domain ignore the global South? *Studies in the Education of Adults*, 50(2), 185-202.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02660830.2018.1523100>
- Johnson, D. (2018). *Egypt's Long Road to Education Reform*. Tahir Institute for Middle East Policy. <https://timep.org/commentary/analysis/egypts-long-road-to-education-reform/>
- Jooste, N. & Heleta, S. (2017). Global Citizenship versus Globally Competent Graduates: A critical view from the south. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 2(1), 39-51. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315316637341>
- Jungwoo, L., Cho, J., Park, S., Kim, H. & Lee, M. (2015). *A Comparative Study on Global Citizenship Education between Korea and ASEAN (CRE 2015-3)*. Korean Institute for Curriculum and Evaluation.  
<http://kice.re.kr/resrchBoard/view.do?seq=44445&s=kice&m=030103>
- Kentucky Department of Education. (2014). *Every Child Globally Prepared for Success: Kentucky's Global Education Position Statement*.



[https://education.ky.gov/curriculum/conpro/glocomp/Documents/Global\\_Comp\\_WL\\_Position\\_Statement.pdf](https://education.ky.gov/curriculum/conpro/glocomp/Documents/Global_Comp_WL_Position_Statement.pdf)

Kentucky Department of Education. (2020). *Global Competency*.

<https://education.ky.gov/curriculum/conpro/glocomp/Pages/default.aspx>

Kim, H. & Eom, J. (2017). *Advancing 21st Century Competencies in South Korea*. APCEIU.

<https://asiasociety.org/sites/default/files/21st-century-competencies-south-korea.pdf>

Lee, W. (2013). The Development of a Future-Oriented Citizenship Curriculum in Singapore:

Convergence of Character and Citizenship Education and Curriculum 2015. In Z.

Deng, S. Gopinathan & C. Kim-Eng Lee (Eds.), *Globalization and the Singapore*

*Curriculum: From Policy to Classroom* (pp. 241-262). Springer.

Ministry of Education Egypt [MoEE]. (2014). *Strategic Plan for Pre-University Education (2014-2030)*.

<http://www.unesco.org/education/edurights/media/docs/c33b72f4c03c58424c5ff258cc6aeae0eb58de4.pdf>

New Zealand Ministry of Education [NZMoE]. (2014). *International Capabilities: A Summary Report for Schools*.

[https://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0008/148787/International-Capabilities.pdf](https://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/_data/assets/pdf_file/0008/148787/International-Capabilities.pdf)

New Zealand Ministry of Education [NZMoE]. (2018). *International Education Strategy He*

*Rautaki Mātauranga a Ao*. <https://enz.govt.nz/assets/Uploads/International-Education-Strategy-2018-2030.pdf>

OECD. (2018). *PISA: Preparing our youth for an inclusive and sustainable world*. The OECD PISA Global Competence Framework.

<https://www.oecd.org/education/Global-competency-for-an-inclusive-world.pdf>

- OECD. (2019). *Learning Compass 2030*. <https://www.oecd.org/education/2030-project/teaching-and-learning/learning/learning-compass-2030/>
- OECD. (2020). *PISA 2018 Results (Volume VI): Are Students Ready to Thrive in an Interconnected World?* <https://doi.org/10.1787/19963777>
- OECD. (n.d.a). *About Us*. <https://www.oecd.org/about/>
- OECD. (n.d.b). *OECD Future of Education and Skills 2030*.  
[https://www.oecd.org/education/2030-project/contact/E2030\\_Position\\_Paper\\_\(05.04.2018\).pdf](https://www.oecd.org/education/2030-project/contact/E2030_Position_Paper_(05.04.2018).pdf)
- OECD/Asia Society. (2017). *Teaching for Global Competence in a Rapidly Changing World*.  
<https://asiasociety.org/education/teaching-global-competence-rapidly-changing-world>
- Oxford Business Group. (2019). *Reform of Egypt's public educational curriculum begins, Health and Education, The Report: Egypt 2019*.  
<https://oxfordbusinessgroup.com/overview/system-overhaul-extensive-reform-curriculum-enters-its-initial-phase>
- Reimers, F. & Chung, C. (Eds.). (2019). *Teaching and learning for the twenty-first century: Educational goals, policies, and curricula from six nations*. Harvard Education.
- Rychen, D. & Salganik L. (2003). *Key Competencies for a Successful Life and a Well-Functioning Society*. Hogrefe & Huber.
- Skirbekk, V., Potančoková, M. & Stonawski, M. (2013). *Measurement of global citizenship education*. UNESCO. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000229287>
- Tan, J., Choo, S., Kang, T. & Liem, G. (2017). Educating for twenty-first century competencies and future-ready learners: research perspectives from Singapore. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 37(4), 425-436.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2017.1405475>

Te Kete Ipurangi. (2014). *International Capabilities*.

<https://nzcurriculum.tki.org.nz/Curriculum-resources/International-capabilities>

Te Kete Ipurangi (2021). *Key Competencies*. <https://nzcurriculum.tki.org.nz/Key-competencies>

Tenreiro Rodríguez, V., Jabbaz Churba, M., Carmona Rodríguez, C., Aneas, A., Shuali

Trachtenberg, T., Simó Sánchez, M. & Van Driel, B. (2020). *Addressing Educational Needs of Teachers in the EU for Inclusive Education in a Context of Diversity (INNO4DIV)*. European Union Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.2760/811156>

Tichnor-Wagner, A. (2016). *Global education politics and policy: Discourses, coalitions, and coconstruction among globally committed national, state, and district actors*. (Doctoral dissertation, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill).

<https://cdr.lib.unc.edu/downloads/v405sb189>

Tye, K. A. (2014). Global Education: a worldwide movement. An Update. *Policy Futures in Education*, 12(7), 855–871. <https://doi.org/10.2304/pfie.2014.12.7.855>

UN (2018). *Sustainable Development Goals*.

<https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/sustainable-development-goals>

UNESCO. (n.d.). *UNESCO's History*. <https://en.unesco.org/about-us/introducing-unesco>

UNESCO. (2014). *Global citizenship education: Preparing learners for the challenges of the 21st century*. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000227729>

UNESCO. (2015a). *Global citizenship education: Topics and learning objectives*.

<https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000232993>

UNESCO. (2015b). *Incheon Declaration and Framework for Action for the implementation of Sustainable Development Goal 4: Towards inclusive and equitable quality education and lifelong learning for all*. <https://iite.unesco.org/publications/education-2030->

[incheon-declaration-framework-action-towards-inclusive-equitable-quality-education-lifelong-learning](#)

United States Department of Education. (n.d.). *Objective 1: Increase Global and Cultural Competencies of All U.S. Students*. <https://sites.ed.gov/international/objective-1-increase-global-and-cultural-competencies-of-all-u-s-students/>

United States Department of Education. (2017). *Global and Cultural Competency*. <https://sites.ed.gov/international/global-and-cultural-competency/>

Vaccari, V. & Gardinier, M. (2019). Toward one world or many? A comparative analysis of OECD and UNESCO global education policy documents. *International Journal of Development Education and Global Learning*, 11(1), 68-86.  
<https://doi.org/10.18546/IJDEGL.11.1.05>

Wagner, A. (2012). 'Third sector' and/or 'civil society': A critical discourse about scholarship relating to intermediate organizations. *Voluntary Sector Review*, 3(3), 299-328.  
<https://doi.org/10.1332/204080512X658036>

World Bank. (2019). *Improving Teaching and Learning Conditions in Egypt's Public Schools*. <https://www.worldbank.org/en/news/infographic/2019/08/06/improving-teaching-and-learning-conditions-in-egypts-public-schools>