

# DEAR in Finland 2019: contexts and project observations

---



**Author:** **Veera Pensala**  
*DEAR Support Team for the European Commission*  
October 2019

[www.capacity4dev.eu/dear](http://www.capacity4dev.eu/dear)

This report is based on documentation reviews, two national consultations and a one-day workshop with some of the staff involved in EU grant funded DEAR projects in Finland carried out during September 2019. Reviews, consultations and the workshop aimed to gather information, examples, perspectives, opinions and experiences of the context and work of DEAR projects in the country.

## 1. NATIONAL CONTEXT

<i>National context – public, media, political opinion regarding global development and its relevance to the country and society</i>	<i>Examples from projects and opinions of participants of how public/media/political contexts assist or hinder the work of the project</i>
<i>National context – use of Global Learning</i>	<i>Examples and reflections from participants on how national (formal and non-formal) education policies and curricula assist or hinder the use of participatory learning and the development of competences (skills and critical understanding) relevant to development</i>
<i>National context – use of Campaigning-Advocacy</i>	<i>Examples and reflections from participants on how (global) campaigning and advocacy approaches and tactics are perceived by e.g. the public, businesses, politicians</i>

Is the national context conducive to DEAR? Is the general ambience in the country enabling Campaigning-Advocacy?

- In general, the operating environment for DEAR Programme is conducive in Finland. This was addressed by all workshop participants and two persons consulted.
- Assisting factors
  - ✓ New government started after the elections in spring 2019 in Finland. There was a mutual understanding in the workshop and in the two stakeholder consultations that new government is supportive of development cooperation, including global education<sup>1</sup>. Extra allocations have been promised for development cooperation, as well as increasing the funding in total in coming years.
  - ✓ In one stakeholder consultation, it was brought up that CSOs participated the process of making the new programme of the government in spring 2019. CSOs were able to lobby a mentioning in the programme where the government commits to research how to better support the education of sustainable development (Agenda 2030) in Finland.
  - ✓ In addition, the government programme commits to HRDD legislation (human rights due diligence).
  - ✓ It was discussed in the workshops that Finland has started to highlight its know-how in education also in the development cooperation sector. This is seen to support global education as well.
  - ✓ A Finnish politician, Jutta Urpilainen, was elected for an EU commissioner-designate for international partnerships in autumn 2019. In one stakeholder consultation, it was brought up that her high-level position means a direct communication channel and more possibilities to have impact on global issues for Finnish actors, including CSOs working with global education.
  - ✓ For all approved EU projects, Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland (MFA) covers automatically half of the self-financing for Finnish CSOs (5%).

<sup>1</sup> Please see the discussion of the terminology at chapter 2, page 4; Meaning of DEAR.

- ✓ Global education is funded in Finland through (in order of perceived significance of investment 2011-2017): 1) MFA, 2) Ministry for Education and Culture, 3) European Commission, 4) Veikkaus (a Finnish gaming company owned by the Finnish State).<sup>2</sup>
  - ✓ It was discussed in the workshop that due to low level hierarchy of Finnish society, and good relations between third and public sectors, it is easy to get audience, to meet and make contact with politicians and decision makers.
  - ✓ In addition, CSOs actively participate in hearings, commenting, planning and decision-making processes in high level decision making processes in Finland, e.g. in processes in the parliament.
  - ✓ In one of the stakeholder consultations it was addressed that in Finland, donors can be criticized without a fear of losing funding or getting a bad reputation. For example, CSO who gets funding for its global education projects from MFA, may at the same time openly criticize MFA for its policies, activities or any other issues. This is quite exceptional even among Scandinavian countries.
  - ✓ All participants agreed in the workshop that Finland has a strong civil society with more or less 100 000 registered CSOs. As many people belong to associations, they are generally recognized and approved in Finland. The public opinion about CSOs is positive and their work is widely accepted and supported.
  - ✓ One workshop participant stated that private sector and businesses in Finland are conducive to advocacy on global issues. #Ykkösketjuun-campaign (<https://ykkosketjuun.fi/en/>) from last spring is a good example of CSOs and private sector actors working together. More than 100 CSOs, companies and trade unions in Finland participated in the campaign calling for a Finnish law on mandatory human rights due diligence.
  - ✓ All participants agreed that although there is much hate speech in society and especially in the social media about global issues (asylum seekers, climate change, human rights), the Finnish CSOs are not targeted (yet). E.g. directed messages are not received by staffs or CSOs publicly tarred in media.
- Hindering factors
    - ✓ After the severe cuts in development funding in Finland in 2015 (with 60% cut from global education), the funding has not yet been returned to the same level. It was discussed in the workshop that on the other hand, funding for global education (especially from MFA) had been very secured and plentiful in euros for years. Due to the national cuts, Finnish CSOs have been forced to rethink their actions for global education. They have been forced to think on how to use limited resources wisely and in more efficient way, and what kind of actions are making change. CSOs have also been forced to start applying funding from other resources (including EU), which has led to learning and doing things in a different way.
    - ✓ The focus of the Finnish development cooperation has been the private sector for the last 5 years. The funding for the CSO sector has decreased while funding for private sector has increased.
    - ✓ MFA funding calls for global education are held every other year, instead of previous annual calls. MFA remains the biggest funder in global education in Finland.
    - ✓ It was discussed in the workshop that global education is scattered under several ministries in Finland (MFA, Ministry of Education and Culture, Ministry of the Environment) and thus it is in no body's agenda or nobody's priority. Scattering also prevents from seeing and understanding the whole picture of global education in Finland.
    - ✓ It was brought up in the workshop and in one stakeholder consultation that as most of the funding for global education comes from MFA, many Finnish believe and see that

<sup>2</sup> Global Citizenship Education in Europe: How much do we care? Concord 2018. Page 62.

global education is more or less communicating about Finnish development cooperation. This wrong image is partly sustained by CSOs themselves as CSOs use funding for global education for communicating their own development cooperation results for wide public. This is done for marketing purposes, e.g. to get new sponsors for their own work in the South.

- ✓ More political will and leadership is still needed to mainstream the global education in formal and non-formal education in Finland. Also new actors, stakeholders from other sectors than civil society, are needed to join the action.<sup>3</sup>
- ✓ It was brought up in one stakeholder consultation that current Members of Parliament have limited know-how and interest on global issues. There is no particular reason for this, maybe just lack of motivation amongst younger generation who has replaced the old who new and were committed to global issues.
- ✓ Workshop participants discussed that getting funding for global education is time-limited and not supportive of long-term and sustained work in CSOs. Abrupt funding causes e.g. breaking off the employment relationships and disappearing of know-how, which in term result in challenges in learning from what is already done and having bigger impact with the work.
- ✓ Workshop participants also discussed that nature of volunteering has changed. Nowadays people, especially amongst the younger generation, want to take action, but merely on one-time basis, avoiding long-term commitments. Number of volunteers has decreased in CSOs in general.
- ✓ Yet, it was discussed in the workshop that although media has nothing against global issues in general, it is hard to get articles published. As with all news, local matters interest people more than distant. Finnish CSOs tend to have limited resources for communications, but also lack of know-how on how to communicate in an interesting way or how to make interesting local-global links for public.

#### Are education policy and practice (incl. the curriculum) supportive of Global Learning?

- Assisting factors
  - ✓ Global education is included in Finnish national curriculum on education, also on early childhood education. Thus, it is mandatory to address the themes of global education in educational work in schools and daycares in Finland.<sup>4</sup>
  - ✓ In one of the stakeholder consultations it was mentioned that there are several schools in Finland who have included Agenda 2030 at their own agenda, in other words at their school-specific curricula. This means a comprehensive inclusion of global education at these schools.
  - ✓ The city Oulu has a professorship on global education.<sup>5</sup>
- Hindering factors
  - ✓ It was widely agreed in the workshop that although global education is in the national curriculum, it is not defined what and how it should be implemented.
  - ✓ In addition, limited training of global education is available for teachers. It also varies to a great extent on who can attend the vocational trainings, as policies vary on how cover the expenses for teachers who attend the trainings.
  - ✓ In was also addressed in the workshop that teachers have great autonomy in teaching, how and what they teach in Finland. Global education depends on individual teachers

<sup>3</sup> Globaalikasvatus ja kansainvälisyys (<https://www.oph.fi/fi/globaalikasvatus-ja-kansainvalisyys>).

<sup>4</sup> Globaalikasvatus ja kansainvälisyys (<https://www.oph.fi/fi/globaalikasvatus-ja-kansainvalisyys>).

<sup>5</sup> Globaalikasvatus ja kansainvälisyys (<https://www.oph.fi/fi/globaalikasvatus-ja-kansainvalisyys>).

and depends on their interest in subject. What is more, there is no monitoring whether or how global education is taught at schools.

- ✓ One workshop participant stated that global education is often seen by teachers as 'add-on' to their education work. E.g. it is difficult to organize 90 minutes' lesson on global education in a school. It is not seen as integral part of educational work.

## 2. UNDERSTANDING CONCEPTS

*'Quality DEAR', 'public awareness', 'critical understanding'*

Examples from projects on their interpretation of these terms and how they are being applied

How do projects interpret

- a. Quality
- b. Public awareness
- c. Critical understanding?

and how do they apply that interpretation?

- The meaning of DEAR in national context
  - ✓ Global education is the most commonly used term for DEAR in Finland. It consists of Peace Education, Human Rights Education, Intercultural Education and Active Citizenship.<sup>6</sup>
  - ✓ However, it was mentioned in one stakeholder consultation that also other concepts are also used and some would be more relevant and fresh nowadays than global education. A concept of 'Global Citizenship Education' would be more equal in terms of North-South power relations and would also be more in line with the idea of Agenda 2030 where everybody is equally learning and empowering, in the global South and in the North.
- The meaning of Quality
  - ✓ Among the workshop participants, quality was understood as 'quality in management of the project resulting in quality projects' and 'quality in global education actions'.
  - ✓ Quality in management of the project is supported in the following ways in Finnish EU DEAR projects:
    - Lead partner has the right skills and experience. Constant support is given and all questions answered in short time, which result in smooth implementation of the project.
    - Trainings are given for partners in project management and subject issues in a systematic way. Consortium partners are learning together. Partners give trainings to each other on different topics, e.g. outcome harvesting. Partners also share materials and best practices, challenges and lessons learnt among each other on a regular basis. As a result, practices and activities have been changed during the project.
    - An application called 'Basecamp' (<https://basecamp.com/>) has been a useful and functional platform for cooperation between partners.
    - An external consultant helped in the beginning in revising the logframe and to put the monitoring system in place.
    - One project has a critical friend supporting the project all the way.
  - ✓ Quality global education was understood and interpreted in one of the projects in the following ways:

<sup>6</sup> Global Citizenship Education in Europe: How much do we care? Concord 2018. Page 62.

- The global education action should contribute to the enhancement of the public's critical understanding of the interdependent world, and of their roles and responsibilities in a globalized society. It should motivate the public's effective involvement in local and global actions in support of the social, economic, and environmental dimensions of sustainable development.
  - The actions should go beyond the description of problems but also indicating possible solutions or options for engagement to the extent possible. Part of this approach is also to provide a nuanced perspective of the situation or case described, not only telling about the negative local situation but viewing the situation in a broader perspective showing the global dimensions of the situation as well as possible causes and context of the issue depicted.
  - People should be let to tell their own stories instead of telling it for them. Building messages by using real stories of real people from Global South. Using own partnerships and networks to get firsthand information or utilizing the experiences of diaspora people and/or communities in own country or region. By doing this is highlighting that people from the Global South are active agents of change, not passive victims of circumstances. Remembering to take into account complex realities of the Global South and make sure not to reinforce stereotypes.
  - Actions implemented in cooperation with journalists can help the message to get a much wider outreach. The perspective and knowledge of journalists being professional communicators can also help linking global and local dimensions and making the product more attractive and understandable for the recipients. Furthermore, the cooperation can generate debates about ethical issues of development education as well as issues of frames and values. The actions made through cooperation with journalists could e.g. consist of articles, reportages, radio, TV, transmedia, videos for social media, etc.
- ✓ Quality in global education is supported in the following ways in Finnish EU DEAR projects:
  - Training in global education, campaigning, communicating etc. is given for target groups, e.g. transformative learning journey where participants go deep into global learning and transformative learning.
  - Manuals, toolkits and materials on global education, campaigning, communicating etc. produced and disseminated to target groups.
- The meaning of public awareness
  - ✓ The public awareness was discussed in the workshop to be as the first step in the engagement process. Raising awareness lies at the lowest level of the engagement in the project and in understanding of the global issues: (0) A person is exposed to information of the project, (1) A person is aware of the project, (2) A person is interested in the project and keeps or agrees to be kept up to date, without further commitment. These levels were given by one participant as an example how they understand the concept of public awareness.
  - ✓ All projects in question raise public awareness as part of project activities, as raising awareness is the first step in engagement process and in getting any results. All other levels of engagements are built on raising awareness first.
- The meaning of critical understanding
  - ✓ The meaning of critical understanding was understood in the workshop so that people understand their own role and position in wider context, as part of the global world. It requires understanding of causal connections of global issues. A person with critical

understanding is informed and can make informed decisions. This interpretation is in line with the main actors of global education in Finland.<sup>7</sup>

- ✓ All projects represented aim at increasing critical understanding among target groups, as it is the level where changes in attitudes, values and behavior happen.

### 3. COMMUNICATION

<i>Communicating to engage (segments of) the public</i>	Examples of the approaches/tactics used by projects in their outreach activities, and the (internal and external) opportunities and blockages that exist in projects doing this effectively
<i>Disseminating beyond the direct audience</i>	Examples and reflections from participants on how, for example, the results of projects can be used in communication with a wider group of stakeholders (i.e. beyond those directly targeted by or involved in the project)

How do projects interpret 'communication' about and for their project (not just media communications but also e.g. advocacy and more generally promotion) to reach and activate their audience(s)? Who to? How do they measure it?

- Reaching the audiences (direct target groups)
  - ✓ All workshop participants agreed that to reach the right audiences, it is necessary to know the target groups and design the message for each chosen target group. It is essential is to choose the right message for the right target group, not to try to reach all people with the same message.
  - ✓ In addition, it is crucial to use the limited resources wisely and choose the right target groups carefully. Firstly, it is important to engage the change makers, and secondly those people who are interested in the global issues. It is no use to spend limited resources for the target group that is too difficult to reach and engage. In between two extremities ('change makers and right-wing nationalists') there is the majority of people who can be divided into smaller target groups and reached with right messages and right media.
- Reaching the wider audiences (beyond the direct target groups)
  - ✓ This has not been really thought of among workshop participants. According to participants, reaching wider group of stakeholders needs know-how, financial resources and time. This has not really been a target in the projects, and not really addressed now in the projects under implementation.
- Measuring the reached audiences (quantifying people and groups reached and actively engaged by projects)
  - ✓ Examples of measuring the reached audiences were given by two workshop participants.
  - ✓ The first participant divides the target groups in the project into subgroups according to the level of engagement and give numbers in reporting accordingly: 1) Reached (number of newsletter recipients, social media views, newspaper article views), 2) Participating (number of participants in the campaigns, round tables, meetings, events, workshops, those who show interest), social media likes, shares 3) Known supporters (number of

<sup>7</sup> Mikä globaalikasvatus? <https://www.gloaalikasvatus.fi>. Gloaalikasvatus ja kestävän kehityksen tavoitteet. <https://www.opi.fi/fi/kehittaminen/gloaalikasvatus-ja-kestavan-kehityksen-tavoitteet>.

- petition signed, blogs and posts (incl. on social media, press release, publications, direct contact), 4) Multipliers (number of those who disseminate attention of the project, issues and approaches) e.g. actively sharing their experience and approach.
- ✓ One of the workshop participants reported their project uses the same kind of method having the levels of engagement from 0 to 6.
- Challenges
  - ✓ To be able to get funding from EU DEAR Programme, many participants felt they need to reach large audiences in their projects. This does not encourage for transformative change that reaches only limited number of people. On the contrary, it encourages just reaching lots of people in without deeper impact and change in attitudes, values or behavior.
  - ✓ One workshop participant addressed that reaching and engaging target groups, and making change needs time. The message has to be repeated several times and it takes time.

## 4. MAKING CHANGE

How does the project make a change (given the national context)? What do project representatives see as the main achievement(s) of their project (in the country)?

- Best practices in making change
  - ✓ According to one workshop participant, for global education in schools, teachers ask for ready lesson plans. They also ask for prints. Not e-materials but materials that can be printed. Also, schools are interested in trendy topics, as climate change. If the project's message has anything to do with the trends, schools and also media get more easily interested.
  - ✓ All workshop participants addressed that to reach teachers in Finland, the annual EDUCA Fair is the place to be and disseminate information and materials, and to meet teachers. In the internet, the website [www.globaalikasvatus.fi](http://www.globaalikasvatus.fi) (<https://www.globaalikasvatus.fi/english>) gathers together the global education material in Finland from various actors. The website is managed and coordinated by FINGO.
  - ✓ One workshop participant stated that to reach the young, the social media and cooperation with its famous national YouTubers is one option with some good experience. With the YouTuber who is interested in global issues, it is credible and reaches easily thousands of young people. The downside is that famous Finnish YouTubers are nowadays quite expensive. One video can cost thousands of euros, and more extensive cooperation tens of thousands of euros.<sup>8</sup>
  - ✓ All agreed in the workshop that media is interested, if the news has to do anything with Finland. E.g. Finnwatch gets its messages through because Finnish enterprises are involved in the stories. FINNWID got their news about human trafficking though, as there was Nigerian from Finland involved in the story.
  - ✓ It was mentioned in one of the stakeholder consultations that Agenda 2030 is bringing urgent and actual themes into schools that teachers cannot and don't want to pass. If global education used to be about development cooperation, nowadays the global citizenship education and its themes are wider and concern everybody. Its these themes are topical and interesting.

<sup>8</sup> <https://www.hs.fi/nyt/art-2000002918969.html>

- Main achievements
  - ✓ All DEAR projects represented at the workshop are only halfway through their implementation. Thus, most of the anticipated results are yet to be achieved.
  - ✓ All participants felt that the application process itself strengthened the applicants already. Their capacities were built e.g. in planning the project, international cooperation, project management, budgeting.
  - ✓ One workshop participant told that sub-granting has been a success. Although its management takes time, sub-granting enables action at grassroots level and the first results seem promising. In sub-granting, many CSOs have been testing, innovating and developing new approaches and activities in their projects. As a result, these CSOs have then later applied for long-term funding for these ideas tested and invented in EU DEAR Project.
  - ✓ It has been reported that several CSOs who did not get funding from Frame, Voice, Report, learnt already in application process. The process changed their way of planning projects and ways of communicating with audiences.
  - ✓ This funding has enabled participation of local fair trade town activists in the international annual Fairtrade Conference. Activists from towns have attended the conferences, which have made them more motivated and committed to act for change in their local contexts. This is a new action that has been found through DEAR project. This funding has also been used for participating more in fairs and other events. In these events, presentations and spots have reached people and audiences well.
  - ✓ According to workshop participants, #Ykkösketjuun-campaign was a success (see also chapter 1. National Context). Campaign was coordinated by Finnwatch, an organisation promoting corporate accountability. The law, based on the UN Guiding principles on business and human rights, would oblige companies to map their human rights impacts and to prevent possible negative impacts.

#### What are the main blockages/challenges?

- All workshop participants stated that no major challenges are encountered so far in the DEAR projects in Finland. Some staff turnover, management of financial guidelines for grantees, some minor delays in some activities are the examples of challenges faced.
- It is also noticed in the workshop that advocacy work needs time. Even three years is a short time. The creation of networks and contacts take time, especially if starting from scratch. Knowing structures and processes of target groups, when and whom to contact needs know-how. There was a suggestion of organizing training in advocacy for CSOs in Finland for beginners, but also advocacy in international level.

## 5. LEARNING

#### How is learning from the projects captured and shared – and with who?

- It was mentioned in the workshop that FINGO has coordinated, to certain extent, global education activities among CSOs in Finland. CSOs have cooperated in schoolwork, shared best practices and lessons learnt among each other.
- It was agreed in the workshop that learning has not been shared in a systematic way in DEAR projects in Finland. FINGO is interested in taking the lead and in organizing a study group on EU DEAR Programme in Finland in the future. The study group would be for those implementing

now EU DEAR projects, but also for those interested in applying funding in the next call. In the study group, best practices, lessons learnt and challenges would be shared and discussed among participants, new ones mentored and guided in planning process for DEAR projects and also after funding received.

## 6. ADDED VALUE<sup>9</sup>

Given the national context: what is the added value of the EU DEAR Programme?

- EU support, in this case in form of DEAR, is important to show and to add pressure towards Finnish politicians and decision makers in understanding that DEAR actions are given value and importance, and they are needed in Finland and elsewhere in Europe. DEAR can also add pressure to finance the same actions from our own national sources.
- DEAR Programme enables and strengthens international cooperation between CSOs from different EU countries. The participants mentioned that most valuable have been learning from more experienced' partners, getting peer support, sharing experiences and best practices (and have fun!). In this call, own capacities have been built in diverse ways, e.g. EU project management skills, media cooperation and sub-granting.
- EU DEAR programme gives possibility for Finnish CSOs to be engaged in global education activities in Finland as part of a bigger project and bigger funding scheme. In addition to learning, this may lead to new funding opportunities in the future.
- Joining the DEAR Programme, an international project, has been a step into the discomfort zone for many Finnish CSOs. The experience has been new and a lot of learning has taken place.
- For smaller Finnish organisations 'the EU flag' in the DEAR Programme brings credibility in their national projects.
- Professional and international networks, but also personal contacts from consortiums are valuable and stay after projects. Cooperation and keeping contact continues in the future.
- The DEAR programme builds peace, creates sense of community and adds feeling of belonging to Europe, being part of European family, among Finnish partners involved in the DEAR Programme.

## 7. OTHER ISSUES<sup>10</sup>

*Other significant aspects*

*Examples, reflections, opinions of participants on what defines the state of DEAR in their country, e.g. in respect of its opportunities and blockages and how these can be made use of or addressed.*

- Continuation for ongoing projects?

<sup>9</sup> All comments for added value are from the representatives in the national workshop.

<sup>10</sup> All other issues are from the representatives in the national workshop.

- ✓ Partners have now learnt what works in their DEAR projects. It would be important to get funding for continuation. Is that possible? Is it possible to get funding again for the same work, if it is justified with lessons learnt and evidence of good results?
- Participation in trainings and meetings in EU level
  - ✓ Finnish partners wish that partners in EU DEAR Programme projects would be invited in meetings or trainings given for project leads in the DEAR Programme. Normally only project leads are invited, but it would be so important for partners also to learn and meet EU officials and other actors.
- EU funding encourages for bigger projects with big consortiums
  - ✓ It was mentioned in the workshop that same approaches or same methods cannot be applied in all partner countries. In a big project, there are not enough possibilities to customize the approach and activities for each country. There is a danger that the project will be qualityless, no good for anyone.
  - ✓ In addition, big consortiums take big time to organize themselves. Only after the first year the consortium has organized and everything is put in place in management. Also learning and sharing takes more time in big consortiums. Even three years feels and seems a short time in EU DEAR programme.

## Conclusions

In the workshop and in the two stakeholder consultations there was a strong consensus that the operating environment for global education is very supportive in Finland. This goes for all contexts in political, public, media and educational environments.

In the political context, the newly elected government from spring 2019 is supportive of development cooperation, and committed to Agenda 2030 and its goals. CSOs are expecting more endorsement and resources for global education in the future years.

In the public context, civil society organisations are still strong and recognized in Finland, although they attract nowadays less members and volunteers than before. Yet, CSOs are active, they look for new target groups in the society, join forces in the advocacy campaigns, they participate actively in the political decision making processes, work with and within the schools and carry out a vast number of small and bigger global educational projects. To sum it up, civil society is strong in Finland and CSOs are active part of it.

In the media, there is not much visibility for global education. The challenge is in CSOs who don't yet have the knowledge or skills how to communicate about global matters in an interesting way.

What comes to the global education at schools, national curriculum requires all schools and daycares to address the themes of global education in their educational work in Finland. On the other hand, the curriculum is quite abstract and teachers have independence on how and what they teach at schools. It varies a lot how global education is taught at schools. Nevertheless, it is seen that Agenda 2030 is bringing urgent and actual themes into schools that teachers cannot and don't want to pass. If global education used to be about development cooperation, nowadays the global citizenship education and its themes concern everybody and these themes are topical and interesting.

No main achievements were reported in the workshop as all DEAR projects represented at the workshop are only halfway through their implementation. Yet, all projects were looking forward to have success in their actions and no major challenges had been encountered so far.

Learning has not been shared in a systematic way in DEAR projects in Finland so far. FINGO is interested in taking the lead and in organizing a study group on EU DEAR Programme in Finland in the future. This would benefit both current actors but also newcomers who would be interested in applying funding in the next call.

Several added values of the DEAR Programme were listed in the workshop from learning experience to the feeling of belonging to the European family. All values mentioned supported the fact that international cooperation and collaboration that brings people together and builds peace is needed more than ever in the current world with growing number of global concerns.

## References

- Literature
  - Globaalikasvatus ja kansainvälisyys. (<https://www.oph.fi/fi/globaalikasvatus-ja-kansainvalisyys>)
  - Globaalikasvatus ja kestävä kehityksen tavoitteet. (<https://www.oph.fi/fi/kehittaminen/globaalikasvatus-ja-kestavan-kehityksen-tavoitteet>)
  - Global Citizenship Education in Europe: How much do we care? Concord 2018. (<https://developtogether.eu/en/recources/category/7-reports-and-studies-from-the-eu-and-international-organisations>)
  - Mikä globaalikasvatus? Globaalikasvatus Suomessa. Globaalikasvatus maailmalla. <https://www.globaalikasvatus.fi>.
  - Plan International Suomen globaalikasvatusohjelman arviointi 2015-2017. ”Tarkastelussa lastenhallitus, Mitä-verkosto ja globaalikoulu”. Veera Pensala ja Elina Tran-Nguyen. 2018.
  - Suomen kehityspoliitiikan tila 2019. Globaalia vastuuta yli hallituskausien ja hallintorajojen. Kehityspoliittinen toimikunta 2019.
  - The State of Global Education in Europe 2018. A GENE Report. (<https://gene.eu/wp-content/uploads/State-of-Global-Education-2018-with-cover.pdf>)
- DEAR projects represented at the workshop
  - FRAME, VOICE, REPORT!
    - <https://www.framevoicereport.org>
  - Bridge47
    - <https://bridge47.org>
  - Trade Fair, Live Fair
    - <https://wfto.com/projects/dear-trade-fair-live-fair>
- Consultations concerning the context of the DEAR in Finland
  - Representative of FINGO
  - Representative of FINGO (from the ex. Finnish NGDO Platform to the European Union)