

【Panel Session】

Globalization and Development of Global Governance in Education: Implications for Educational Development of Developing Countries and for Japan's International Cooperation

Kazuo Kuroda

Professor, Graduate School of Asia-Pacific Studies

Director, Center for the Study of International Cooperation in Education, Waseda University

Introduction

With socioeconomic globalization, many issues now cross national borders. It has become impossible for single nations to recognize the full picture of these cross-border issues, find solutions and seek appropriate directions by implementing their policies alone. In order to address these issues, various frameworks of global governance are being formulated by the international community, composed of various actors including international organizations, multilateral cooperation entities, markets and civil society, to identify issues, find solutions and seek appropriate directions. Education, which used to be discussed and conducted by individual states, is also a subject of global governance today.

In this presentation, I would like to first categorize the diversified activities of global governance into four types to show how they function in the field of education, using specific examples, and consider issues and directions. Based on these understanding, I would also like to discuss implications for the educational development of developing countries and for Japan's policies of international educational cooperation.

I. Types of global governance in education and the current situation

1. Global governance by formulating principles through international laws, conventions and charters (Traditional approach)

The earliest efforts of the international community to promote global governance in the field of education was to clarify the principles of education, in the Constitution of UNESCO and in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, that education is a basic human right and that education contributes to achieving peace. The principle of education as a basic human right has been repeatedly confirmed by various legal frameworks, including the Convention on the Rights of the Child and the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, and has had a significant impact on domestic laws and educational policies of many nations. Aside from these global agreements, there are regional agreements on education such as the Regional Convention on the Recognition of Studies, Diplomas and Degrees in Higher Education in Asia and the Pacific.

2. Global governance by developing and proposing new internationally influential concepts (Traditional and contemporary approach)

There are also many cases in which international organizations and other actors have taken initiatives to propose new concepts and directions of education to the international community. Although these are not legally binding as international conventions, they have had a significant impact on educational policies and reforms of various countries by creating political trends. The "life-long education" and "recurrent education" proposed by UNESCO and OECD in the 1960s are good examples from earlier days.

The World Bank and other organizations conducted research on "rates of return to investment in education" from the 1980s to the 1990s. It showed that investment in primary education has high social returns. This greatly contributed to securing educational funds to promote Education for All (EFA). On the other hand, while much focus

was given to EFA, the policies on higher education in developing countries were criticized and lost their direction in the 1990's. To address this, a new direction was suggested in *Higher Education in Developing Countries*, published by the joint task force of the World Bank and UNESCO.

In the 2000s, the governments of developing countries and experts on development economics expressed concerns that quantitative expansion of education might not always contribute to economic growth. Eric Hanushek demonstrated that improvement in the quality of education, not quantity, promotes economic growth. His findings had a significant impact on the policy trend surrounding the MDGs and the discussions on the post-2015 framework. The specific policies to promote EFA and the educational MDGs were discussed and consolidated, mainly based on the UNESCO's *EFA Global Monitoring Reports* and various other reports on the research conducted by UNICEF and the World Bank.

The so-called "Delors Report," entitled *Learning: The Treasure Within*, published in 1996 by UNESCO, showed basic concepts for education in the 21st century. In 2009, "ATC21s," an international research project established at the University of Melbourne, proposed the concept of "21st-century skills." Both have come to provide the bases for discussion on formulating future visions of national educational policies in many countries.

3. Global governance by building consensus on the goals of international policies through policy dialogues at international conferences and multilateral fora and by formulating frameworks for policy and financial cooperation (Contemporary approach)

With regard to global governance in education, the most commonly used approach today is to build consensus on the international goals on education and to formulate frameworks for policy and financial cooperation. An earlier example is the International Conference on Education, a forum of education ministers, which was held in Geneva to bring about international cooperation in education with the purpose of maintaining and achieving peace between wars. The UNESCO's International Bureau of Education has continued to convene the conference once in every few years.

After WWII, in the early 1960s, when many former colonies became independent, UNESCO held regional conferences in Asia, Africa and Latin America and established action plans (Karachi Plan, Addis Ababa Plan and Santiago Plan), centering on promoting Universal Primary Education (UPE). The policies of UPE lost momentum in the 1970s and 1980s when the world was going through the Structural Adjustment, but in 1990, UPE was once again recognized by the international community, this time as EFA, when the World Conference on Education for All was jointly held by UNESCO, the World Bank, UNICEF and UNDP in Jomtien, Thailand. The Jomtien Declaration adopted at the conference provided a framework for international cooperation in education for developing countries. In 2000, the "Dakar Framework for Action" was adopted at the World Education Forum held in Dakar. In the same year, the Millennium Summit of the United Nations was held to formulate the Millennium Development Goals and succeeded in bringing together the international community to promote EFA. These became the most conspicuous action of global governance in education. In the 2000s, EFA was discussed at various G8 summit meetings, including the ones held in Genoa, Kananaskis, St. Petersburg, and L'Aquila. The declarations of the summit meetings showed the international community's commitment to pursue these goals. The Fast Track Initiative (later renamed the Global Partnership for Education) was launched as a mechanism to provide financial assistance to promote EFA and to achieve the MDGs of education. This showed a new potential approach for global governance in education.

In addition to EFA, there were other actions made by the international community. For example, in 1994, UNESCO hosted the World Conference on Special Needs Education, which adopted the Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action, proposing "inclusive education" as a principle for formulating educational policies. This

principle had a significant impact on the educational policies of many countries. It does not only apply for special needs education but also for other areas to promote inclusion of various diversities in our society.

In 2002, the Japanese government and civil society jointly proposed “Education for Sustainable Development (ESD)” at the Johannesburg Summit. UNESCO served as the lead agency for the Decade of ESD, through which various initiatives were taken in many countries by both the public and private sectors.

This type of approach based on international conferences includes not only global but also regional initiatives. There have been many regional actions, particularly in Europe with the development of the European Community. In Asia, the Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organization (SEAMEO) and ASEAN have launched various frameworks for regional governance, which have grown significantly over the recent years. ASEAN University Network (AUN) (1995), AUN Quality Assurance Framework (1998), AUN/SEED-Net (2003), and ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community to be launched in 2015 are some examples. In the Asia-Pacific region as well, various initiatives have been taken, including the educational activities of Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation (1989), University Mobility in Asia and the Pacific (UMAP, 1991) and its Credit Transfer System (UCTS, 1999), and the Asia Pacific Quality Network (2003). In recent years, education has been included in the agenda of ASEAN+3 (1997-), the East Asia Summit (2005-), the Japan-China-South Korea Summit (2008-) and other fora, which have produced concrete outcomes such as the Higher Education Policy Dialogue (2009-) of ASEAN+3 and the CAMPUS Asia (2012-), which is a joint initiative of Japan, China and South Korea. In this way, many of the frameworks of regional governance in education in Asia are targeting higher education, including promoting educational exchanges in Asia; quality assurance of higher education in the region; and establishing a credit transfer system to promote academic mobility in the region.

4. Global governance by establishing international indicators and standards and conducting monitoring (Emerging approach)

In recent years, establishing international educational indicators and standards to be monitored has come to play a greater role in the global governance in education. Needless to say, UNESCO and other organizations have collected and published educational statistics over the years, and international statistics in education have always been important tools of global governance. Based on these statistics, new indicators have been created and used for policymaking of EFA and the MDGs, including the EFA Development Index, the MDGs Official Indicators and the Human Development Index. These tools have also played significant roles in global governance.

With the advent of TIMSS, PIRLS and then OECD’s PISA, international comparison of students’ performances has become possible, and their impact on the educational policies of each country has grown tremendously. PISA in particular has had much greater success than OECD had expected, as a tool of global governance in education. With the success, PISA has played a leading role in the discussions to formulate new educational policies, proposing PISA-type academic standards and policies to narrow the gaps in learning achievements among classes. OECD has also promoted developing quantitative monitoring tools such as PIAAC and AHELO, targeting adults and higher education. These have also played major roles in the international community. Similar actions are being taken at regional levels. In Africa, academic achievement tests such as SACMEQ and PASEC are expanding as the number of participating countries increases. The results of these tests are used by member states for formulating educational policies and for implementing educational reforms. In Southeast Asia, SEAMEO-INNOTECH and UNICEF are playing leading roles in the efforts to launch regional systems to monitor academic achievements.

This approach of global governance by establishing indicators and standards is now used not only for studying academic achievements but also for evaluating educational policies. Based on the policy research on the countries

which have achieved EFA, the FTI Indicative Framework was established to provide criteria for mobilizing FTI resources. This has been used to provide benchmarks for the educational financial administrations of developing countries. SABER, on which the World Bank is now working with various international partners, also aims to introduce standards to benchmark educational policies.

Furthermore, it is interesting that the world university rankings issued by the Times Higher Education Supplement, QS, Shanghai Jiao Tong University and others, based on their own calculations, have a major impact not only on determining directions at the university level but also on developing policies at the national level.

II. Issues of global governance in education and developing countries

1. Characteristics of global governance in education

This section discusses the characteristics of global governance in education, which has evolved in various ways as stated above.

First, the formulation of global governance in education affects globalization in two ways: one is to accelerate globalization and the other is to control globalization. Global governance accelerates unification and standardization, which is an intrinsic characteristic of globalization, but global governance can also function to narrow disparities and secure diversities by promoting EFA, MDGs and inclusive education and therefore can reduce the adverse effects of globalization.

Second, regional governance, which is progressing in parallel with the formulation of global governance, also works in two ways: one that complements global governance and the other that functions as a countermeasure against domination of global governance. Regional conferences held by UNESCO in preparation for world conferences are an example of the complementing function. On the other hand, regional cross-border issues, which can be overlooked in global arenas, may be addressed by establishing new regional frameworks, such as the frameworks for higher education established in Asia and in Europe.

Third, there are legitimate and illegitimate governance tools. In many cases of global governance in education, international organizations established jointly by sovereign countries take initiatives. Such global governance, which undergoes the formal processes of concluding conventions and establishing consensus at international conferences and other fora, impacts the educational policies of each country as well as educational cooperation. On the other hand, the “world university rankings” developed by private companies or individual universities and the “21st-century skills” proposed by a university research team supported by private companies have also come to have an enormous influence on global policymaking in education.

Fourth, indicators have become extremely important in global governance. EFA and the MDGs have become the most important frameworks for global governance in education. It is widely recognized in the international community that EFA and the MDGs have succeeded because they clarified the targets and indicators to be achieved. This recognition is having a great impact on the international discussion on post-2015 agenda. It is also recognized that the impact of PISA and that of university rankings have become bigger than initially expected because these also show quantitative indicators. With regard to global governance in education, in addition to the traditional approach of “Governance by Ideas” to formulate principles and trends, we must recognize the growing impact of “Governance by Numbers” to set target indicators and standards and to propose quantitative policy tools for monitoring in order to formulate frameworks for sustainable policymaking and financial cooperation. At the same time, there have also been deep-seated criticisms against the formulation of indicators and quantifications, saying that such a trend may distort policies and have an adverse impact on education because there are important educational aspects that cannot be quantified. When we face these concerns, we can point out the importance of taking the traditional approach of formulating principles and trends together with the new approach of global

governance in education, explaining the usefulness of categorized indicators such as SABER to evaluate policy processes. The education policymakers of each country, however, must recognize the limitations of the approaches taken by the international community, even though indicators are used to clarify the situation. Considering the division of roles, the policymakers of each country may choose to focus on their agenda, particularly the quality of education.

2. Suggestions for developing countries

What are the impacts and issues of global governance in education on the educational development of developing countries?

First, global governance in education has advanced EFA in developing countries by establishing the recognition that education is a basic human right and by positioning education as an important sector for socio-economic development. This is, without doubt, a positive achievement of global governance in education.

Questions, however, remain. Have the governments of developing countries, civil society and educators been able to participate in the process of formulating global governance in education? Have the educational needs and opinions of developing countries been reflected in the process of formulating global governance? Malawi, for example, accepted the global policy of promoting universal primary education by making it free just after the Jomtien Conference. As a result, with the rapid expansion of the enrolment in primary education, the quality of education dropped significantly. This case shows that global governance is not held accountable for its results.

In order to address these issues and questions, it is necessary to invite active participation of the governments of developing countries and civil society in the process of formulating global governance and to communicate the local educational needs and opinions to the international community. For this purpose, the international community must also make sure to devise appropriate processes. Regional governance must be actively promoted, too, as it is relatively easier for developing countries to participate in the formulation process. Regional governance can not only complement global governance but also function as a countermeasure against domination of global governance. Furthermore, developing countries must consider how to selectively use the approaches of global governance in determining and implementing their national policies.

III. Suggestions for Japan's international cooperation in education

In conclusion, I would like to discuss how Japan must promote international cooperation in education as we see the formulation of global governance and its growing impact.

First, Japan must actively participate in formulating the overall framework of global governance in education, particularly in the deliberations of the international community on the vision, targets and indicators. Japan's international cooperation is in general "field-oriented," which is good. But the educational policies, which determine the future of developing countries, are being formulated not only locally in developing countries but also at international organizations and conferences. Japan must recognize this and make efforts to communicate the local needs and opinions to be correctly reflected in the process of formulating global governance. In doing so, Japan must bring together its expertise in educational cooperation, conduct strategic research and disseminate the results in the international arena. In this process, it is also strategically important for Japan to pay attention to the significance of establishing indicators and standards to be used by the international community. In the early 2000s, the Japanese government and civil society proposed a new concept of ESD to the international community and have put significant efforts to follow up this direction. This was one of the major contributions of Japan to global governance in education. Japan, however, must conduct further research to provide appropriate indicators for ESD so that ESD will be fully integrated in global governance and effectively used in the discussion on the educational

targets beyond 2015.

Japan can also make contributions by committing itself to formulating regional governance in education to complement global governance. Japan has already played a leading role in establishing a working group on mathematics and science education in the Association for the Development of Education in Africa (ADEA) by implementing SMASSE and other projects. Japan has implemented the “School for All” projects widely in Africa. In the field of higher education, the AUN/SEED-Net (ASEAN University Network/Southeast Asia Engineering Education Development Network) in Southeast Asia has been highly regarded, and the government of Japan is taking the initiative to formulate a regional quality assurance system of higher education, an endeavor promoted by ASEAN+3. Japan’s educational cooperation can play its own role in globalization by having a clear vision of contributing in the formulation of such regional governance.

In order to make a greater contribution to the process of formulating global governance in education, Japan must make more efforts to communicate its policies of educational cooperation as well as JICA’s strategies in education to the international community. The government of Japan announced “Japan’s Education Cooperation Policy 2011-2015” in 2010 at the United Nations Summit on the MDGs. In this policy document, Japan positioned educational cooperation as an “integrated approach for ensuring human rights, achieving sustainable development and fostering world peace” and explains that Japan’s cooperation is based on such concepts as “promoting human security,” “supporting self-help efforts and sustainable development,” and “respecting diversity and mutual understanding.” It also introduces the concept of “School for All,” to show the ideal image of schools, proposing “quality education,” “safe learning environment,” “school-based management,” “openness to the community” and “inclusive education.” This policy statement was made to communicate Japan’s message to contribute to formulating global governance in education. Japan can make important contributions if such policy documents can effectively convey its message. Japan can also strategically conduct relevant empirical research on policies and communicate the findings.

The international community is now actively discussing post-2015 frameworks. How can Japan contribute to the process? Communicating Japan’s expertise and policy of educational cooperation is the key.

11th Japan Educational Forum: International Cooperation toward Self-Reliant Educational Development

At the Assembly Hall, MEXT, on February 19, 2014

Globalization and Educational Issues of Developing Countries —Japan's Educational Cooperation



Panel Session

1. Impact and Issues of Globalization in Education of Developing Countries
2. Japanese Educational Cooperation in the Global Society

Kazuo Kuroda, Ph.D.

Professor, Graduate School of Asia-Pacific Studies

Director, Center for the Study of International Cooperation in Education

Waseda University



Globalization and Development of Global Governance in Education

- ✪ With socioeconomic globalization, many issues cross national borders. It has become impossible for single nations to fully recognize these cross-border issues, find solutions and seek appropriate directions by implementing their policies alone.
- ✪ “Global governance” is the joint efforts of the international community, composed of states, international organizations, markets, civil society and other actors, to address these cross-border issues by recognizing and solving them and finding new directions.

(Commission on Global Governance 1995, Weiss and Thakur 2010, Weiss 2011, Sinclair 2012, etc.)

- ✪ Education, which used to be discussed and conducted by individual states, is also a subject of global governance today.

→Today's presentation

Types of means of global governance in education

Global governance by:

1. Formulating principles through international laws, conventions and charters (Traditional approach)
2. Developing and proposing new internationally influential concepts (Traditional and contemporary approach)
3. Building consensus on the goals of international policies through policy dialogues at international conferences and multilateral fora and by formulating frameworks for policy and financial cooperation (Contemporary approach)
4. Establishing international indicators and standards and conducting monitoring (Emerging approach)

Formulating principles through international laws, conventions and charters: Traditional approach

Global

- ✪ Constitution of UNESCO (1945)
- ✪ Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948)
- ✪ Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989)
- ✪ Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (2006), etc.

Regional

- ✪ Regional Convention on the Recognition of Studies, Diplomas and Degrees in Higher Education in Asia and the Pacific (1983)

Developing and proposing new internationally influential concepts: Traditional and contemporary approach

Proposing the direction of education and forming policy trends

- ✪ UNESCO, Lengrand “Life-long education” (1965)
- ✪ OECD, “Recurrent education” (1973)
- ✪ World Bank, “Rates of returns to investment in education” (1980s-90s)
- ✪ UNESCO, Delors Report, *Learning: The Treasure Within* (1996)
- ✪ UNESCO and World Bank, *Higher Education in Developing Countries* (1999)
- ✪ Eric Hanushek, “The Role of Education Quality in Economic Growth” (2007)
- ✪ The University of Melbourne, ATC21S, “21st-century skills” (2010)
- ✪ UNESCO, *EFA Global Monitoring Report* (2002-2013)
- ✪ UNICEF, *The State of the World’s Children*, etc. (1999, 2004), etc.

Building consensus on the goals of international policies through policy dialogues at international conferences and multilateral fora and by formulating frameworks for policy and financial cooperation (global): Contemporary approach

- ✿ International Conference on Education (1934-) and the activities of the International Bureau of Education
- ✿ UNESCO Regional Conferences, Karachi Plan, Addis Ababa Plan, Santiago Plan (early 1960s) —UPE
- ✿ World Conference on Education for All, Jomtien Declaration (1990) —EFA
- ✿ World Conference on Special Needs Education, Salamanca Statement (1994) —Inclusive education
- ✿ World Education Forum, Dakar Framework for Action (2000) —EFA
- ✿ United Nations Millennium Summit, Millennium Development Goals (2000) —MDGs
- ✿ Johannesburg Summit, “Decade of Education for Sustainable Development” (2002) —ESD
- ✿ G8 Summit (especially, Genoa, Kananaskis, St. Petersburg, L'Aquila)
- ✿ Fast Track Initiative →Global Partnership for Education

Building consensus on the goals of international policies through policy dialogues at international conferences and multilateral fora and by formulating frameworks for policy and financial cooperation (Asia Regional): Contemporary approach

- ⊕ Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organization (SEAMEO) (1965)
 - ASEAN Education Ministers Meeting (2006)
 - ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community (Target Year 2015)
 - ASEAN University Network (AUN, 1995), AUN Quality Assurance (1998)
 - AUN/SEED-Net (2003) -AUN+3 (2012)
- ⊕ Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation (1989)
 - UMAP (1991) UMAP Credit Transfer System (UCTS) (1999)
 - Asia Pacific Quality Network (APQN) (2003)
- ⊕ ASEAN+3 (1997) →Higher Education Policy Dialogue (2009)
- ⊕ East Asia Summit (2005) →Kuala Lumpur Declaration
- ⊕ Japan-China-South Korea Summit (2008) →CAMPUS Asia (2012)
 - To promote educational exchanges, to seek quality assurance of higher education, to establish a credit transfer system, etc.

Establishing international indicators and standards and conducting monitoring: Emerging approach

Global

- ✦ EFA Development Index, MDGs Official Indicators, Human Development Index
- ✦ TIMMS and PIRLS
- ✦ FTI Indicative Framework
- ✦ OECD—PISA, PIAAC, AHELO
- ✦ World Bank, SABER
- ✦ University rankings (Times, QS, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, etc.)

Regional

- ✦ SACMEQ, PASEC
- ✦ In Southeast Asia, similar activities will be launched by SEAMEO-INNOTECH and others.

Discussion

- ✦ The formulation of global governance affects globalization in two ways: one is to **accelerate** globalization and the other is to **control** globalization. There are concerns on unification and standardization, but global governance can also function to narrow disparities and secure diversities.
- ✦ Regional governance that **complements** global governance vs. regional governance that functions as a **countermeasure** against global governance
 - Strengthening of regional frameworks, which can work in both ways
- ✦ **Legitimate** governance tools and **illegitimate** governance tools
 - Who determines the content?
 - University rankings ▪ 21st-century skills
 - PISA for non-OECD countries, etc.

Discussion

- ✪ EFA/MDGs succeeded because they clarified the goals and indicators.
 - In global governance, in addition to the traditional approach of “**Governance by Ideas**” to formulate principles and trends, we must recognize the growing impact of “**Governance by Numbers**” to set target indicators and standards and to propose quantitative policy tools for monitoring in order to formulate frameworks for sustainable and accountable policymaking and financial cooperation.
- ✪ With this, **formulating indicators is becoming politically more important.**
 - Discussion on indicators is getting heated toward post-2015.
 - What about the important educational aspects that cannot be quantified? This question has not been answered.

Suggestions for educational development of developing countries

- ✦ Global governance in education, such as promoting EFA, has obviously contributed to the overall educational development of developing countries, but...
 - ✦ Have the governments, civil society and educators of developing countries been able to participate in the process of formulating global governance in education?
 - ✦ Have the educational needs and opinions of developing countries been reflected in the formulation of global governance?
 - ✦ Is global governance responsible and accountable for the results?
 - Unexpected effects of changing global trends of thoughts
- Case: FPE in Malawi and the decline in the quality of education

Suggestions for educational development of developing countries

- ❁ Active participation of the governments of developing countries and civil society in the process of formulating global governance and efforts to communicate the local educational needs and opinions to global decision making are needed.
- ❁ Regional governance in which developing countries can more easily participate can function as a countermeasure against domination of global governance.
- ❁ How to “selectively use” the approaches of global governance must be considered in determining and implementing national policies.

Suggestions for Japan's international cooperation in education

Actively participate in formulating the framework of global governance in education.

—Participating in the deliberations of the international community on the vision, targets and indicators is particularly important.

- ✪ Play a role in conveying the local needs to global.
- ✪ Conduct strategic research and disseminate the results in the international arena.
- ✪ Make contributions by proposing useful indicators (e.g. ESD).
- ✪ Be committed to formulating regional governance.
- ✪ Make more efforts to communicate its policies of educational cooperation, etc.

Guiding principles of Japan's Educational Cooperation Policy 2011-2015

To bring about human security and education

— Integrated approach of human rights, development and peace

⊕ Support self-help efforts and sustainable development
(Development)

⊕ Answering the needs of marginalized populations (Human rights)

⊕ Respecting cultural diversity and promoting mutual understanding (Peace)

→ Proposing visions for global governance in education

Model of "School for All"

- ✦ Quality education
(Teacher training, lesson studies, provision of textbooks)
- ✦ Safe learning environment
(School facilities, school health, providing access to safe water)
- ✦ School-based management
(School management involving parents and community members)
- ✦ Openness to the community
(Schools that respond to the educational needs of the community, including adult literacy education)
- ✦ Inclusive education
(Schools that address the diverse needs of children disadvantaged due to poverty, conflicts, disability, etc.)

→The vision (goals) of school that global governance in education should target is proposed

Suggestions for Japan's international cooperation in education

Actively participate in formulating frameworks for global governance in education.

—To participate in international discussion on vision, targets and indicators is particularly important.

- ✦ Play a role to convey the local needs.
- ✦ Conduct strategic research and disseminate the results in the international arena
- ✦ Make contributions by proposing useful indices (e.g.. ESD)
- ✦ Be committed to formulating regional governance
- ✦ Make more efforts to communicate its policies of educational cooperation, etc.

→International community is now actively discussing post-2015 frameworks. How can Japan contribute to the process? Communicating Japan's expertise in education cooperation is the key.



Thank you!