

# **Council of Ministers of Education, Canada**

## **Canadian Education Delegation Report**

**30<sup>th</sup> Session of the UNESCO General Conference  
(Paris, November 9-13, 1999)**

## Introduction

The Canadian Delegation to Commission II (Education) clearly played a leadership role in the discussions of the commission. Canada's influence became evident early in the debate, as many other delegations echoed the major points of our first intervention:

- need for a strategic plan, as recommended by the External Auditor
- concerns about the reduction in the proportion of the budget devoted to education
- concerns about the continued decentralization of the education sector
- need for coordination among the institutes and headquarters to ensure coherence and consistency
- importance of follow-up to international conferences

The importance and relevance of Canada's concerns were recognized by the Assistant Director General, Mr. Colin Power, in his response to the debate on Major Program I.

Canada's continued influence on the organization will become increasingly important in the months to come as member states reflect on the role and functions of UNESCO in the twenty-first century.

### 1. Canadian Education Delegation

The Canadian education delegation included four official members and five resource persons.

#### **Delegation members (4):**

- The Honourable Andrew Petter, Minister of Advanced Education, Technology and Training, Province of British Columbia
- Mr. Robert Bisailon, sous-ministre adjoint à l'éducation préscolaire et à l'enseignement primaire et secondaire, Ministère de l'Éducation du Québec
- Mr. Boyd Pelley, Director, Administration and Communications, Secretariat of the Council of Ministers of Education, Canada
- Professor Jacques Proulx, Chair, Education Commission, Canadian Commission for UNESCO

#### **Resource persons (5):**

- Ms. Eva Egron-Polak, Vice-President, International and Canadian Programs, Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, and Vice-Chair, Education Commission, Canadian Commission for UNESCO
- Mr. Daniel Richer, Director, Office of Learning Technologies
- Mr. Richard Martin, Senior Program Manager, International Academic Relations Division, Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade
- Ms. Diane Laberge, Project Officer, Education, Canadian Commission for UNESCO
- Ms. Anyle Coté, Assistant Program Officer, Education, Canadian Commission for UNESCO

The delegation's effectiveness was enhanced by the presence on site of resource persons able both to provide liaison with the Office of Canada's Ambassador to UNESCO, to analyse new and emerging situations, and to organize a quick response, while monitoring debates, circulating informally obtained information, and forging alliances required to pass our proposals and amendments. The delegation's effectiveness was also due to the synergistic pooling of skills by delegation members, to the quality of ministerial-level representation, and to ministers' communications skills.

## **2. Debate on Major Program I : Education for All throughout Life (Tuesday, November 9 [afternoon], Wednesday, November 10 [morning and afternoon])**

The debate on Major Program I, "Education for all throughout life," included more than 70 interventions. While member states' interventions broadly reiterated their support for Major Program I, some states expressed concern about UNESCO's working methods and management, while others pointed out problems or pressing needs in their own countries.

Canada's intervention by the Hon. Andrew Petter, British Columbia Minister of Advanced Education and Technology, set the tone for the debate and was one of the highlights of the session (see Appendix, Intervention I). The intervention was well received by member states, as evidenced by the applause that followed. A number of countries expressed points of view close to Canada's concerns. For example, Switzerland strongly supported Canada's intervention on the need for strategic planning, follow-up, and continuous assessment, as well as a coherent and strategic approach to decentralization (a position supported by Cyprus). A number of countries, including Germany and New Zealand, also expressed strong concern about the fragmentation caused by decentralizing without a strategic vision. As well, a number of member states were concerned about the decrease in the education sector budget.

On the issue of more specific concerns related to Major Program I, some countries (France, Vietnam) stressed the need for better coordination of activities, while France and Norway expressed their wish that activities be followed up and evaluated more rigorously and called for UNESCO to review criteria for setting up UNESCO Chairs (see DR. 43) and to avoid an excessive increase in the number of institutes. Canada and other countries, including Germany and Australia, stressed the need to ensure follow-up to the Second International Congress on Technical and Vocational Training (Seoul, April 1999) and to the World Conference on Higher Education (Paris, October 1998). Saudi Arabia underlined Canada's experience in the area of technical and vocational training.

A number of interventions stressed literacy and basic education for all, including marginalized groups, while expressing the wish that this area for action remain a priority for UNESCO. Finally, a number of developing countries requested that UNESCO continue supporting them in their efforts to reform their education systems. In this vein, a number of countries expressed the desire to host new UNESCO institutes or specialized centres: Gabon, for example, presented a draft resolution (DR. 61) to establish a regional centre of the International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP) in Libreville, Gabon. A number of countries from the South stated the need for international cooperation and reiterated their own need for funding. Others, led by Venezuela and supported by Norway, invited UNESCO to play an active role in the area of measures to stem the brain drain.

Guatemala, supported by many countries, called for UNESCO to pay particular attention to linguistic diversity and multilingual education (DR. 95), while Iceland expressed concern about the influence of English on local cultures. Canada played a strategic role in the debate on that draft resolution, which led to wording adjustments consistent with Canada's DR. 13 on cultural diversity.

### **3. Debate on the UNESCO Institutes on Education (Wednesday, November 10, 1999 [afternoon & evening])**

The session on the UNESCO institutes in the education sector was divided into two parts. First, a series of presentations by the chairs of the governing boards of four institutes, namely the International Bureau of Education (IBE), International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP), UNESCO Institute for Education (IUE), and the new UNESCO Institute for Information Technologies in Education (IITE). No formal report was presented by the very recently established UNESCO International Institute for Higher Education in Latin America and the Caribbean (IESALC) and UNESCO International Institute for Capacity-Building in Africa (IICBA), a fact that was questioned by several delegates who were not offered an adequate explanation for the absence of these reports.

All institutes' reports summarized written and distributed documents, thanked the Director General for his support, and encouraged the Commission II to approve the resolutions relative to their operations. The IITE, more than any other institute, stressed cooperation and coordination as an absolute pre-requisite for success.

During the second part of the session, 29 countries asked to speak, with Canada's intervention coming third (refer to Intervention 2, Appendices). Canada's position in support of the work of existing institutes cautioned that UNESCO should avoid establishing a plethora of new institutes in the absence of a strategic plan for education.

New Zealand, whose presentation followed immediately, took a much stronger approach, criticizing the proliferation of institutes, deploring the lack of strategic planning, urging UNESCO to stop the setting up of any new institutes as this trend undermined UNESCO's credibility, and calling for an evaluation of the usefulness of the institutes given that 43% of the education budget is devoted to their operations.

In support of Canada's position, several other countries (Germany, France, Romania, Switzerland) made reference to the auditor's report and recommendations, cautioned UNESCO about duplication and lack of strategic direction, and expressed concern over the great diversity of structures and formats that these institutes and other units were adopting.

Support was voiced exclusively for individual institutes, most frequently in the respective delegate's country or region.

In light of the cumulative effect of the criticisms voiced, the Assistant Director General for education took the floor at the close of the session. Using a rather defensive and sarcastic tone, he expressed his surprise over the demands for a strategic plan when, in his view, the 30C/5 was UNESCO's strategic plan, which had been developed in consultation with the member states.

He also indicated that an external evaluation of UNESCO and of the institutes had been undertaken, and all should have received it. He stressed that the education sector worked closely with the Director General in the decentralization and that he considered the institutes as important partners and members of one large family. The external evaluation undertaken by UNESCO meets many aspects of the Canadian position.

#### **4. Debate on the Trans-disciplinary Project for a Culture of Peace (Thursday, November 11 [morning and afternoon])**

Most Member States expressed satisfaction, as did Canada in its intervention (see Appendix, intervention 3) with the integration of the trans-disciplinary project "Towards a Culture of Peace" in the education sector. They endorsed the project's overall policy orientation, while stressing that the culture of peace must be integrated into the entire formal and informal education process at all stages of life. Several member states stressed the importance of early childhood. The content of that program runs the gamut from multilingual education and rights education to physical education and sport. Several countries presented various practices that appear to converge towards citizenship education. Finally, the announcement of an International Year for a Culture of Peace in 2000 is perceived as a good way to start off the 21<sup>st</sup> century, as long as the initiatives taken during the year are followed up over the coming years.

#### **5. Debate on Draft Resolutions (Thursday, November 11 [afternoon] and Friday, November 12 [morning])**

The debate on draft resolutions took place during two successive sessions. The debate focussed on adopting a draft resolution contained in Major Program I (30C/5), decisions required for other agenda items, and draft resolutions (DRs) proposed by member states. The debate included three steps:

- the first step consisted in adopting resolutions contained in the various agenda documents, including related DRs;
- the second step dealt with Major Program I DRs;
- the third step was concerned with Major Program I resolutions and related paragraphs in 30C/5.

Prior to dealing with draft resolutions, Mr. Colin Power, representative of the Director General, responded to the points raised in the three previous program debates. In his response, Mr. Power echoed several concerns raised by Canada in its interventions: the priority that education must reassume within UNESCO; the importance of ensuring follow-up to the conferences and linking them with sectoral strategic planning; long-term support to the vocational and technical education program, including the creation of the Bonn Center; member states' concerns with follow-up to the World Conference on Higher Education; the program's consistency with integrated Culture of Peace activities; recognition of lifelong learning and complementarity between formal and informal education networks; efforts to avoid duplication between headquarters and institutes; and the importance of considering education reforms in the perspective of the transition to the knowledge society.

The following are highlights of the debate on draft resolutions:

- DR. 51, supported by Canada, and proposing an International Week of Adult Education, was adopted.
- Several DRs supporting the creation of the UNESCO Associated Centres and Institutes were also adopted:
  - DR. 47 — Sub-Regional Centre for Science Education in Central and Western Asia
  - DR. 61 — Regional Centre of the International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP) in Gabon
  - DR. 76 — UNESCO Institute for Quality Education in Central and Eastern Europe
  - DR. 86 — Asia-Pacific Centre for Education for International Understanding
  - DR. 90 — Training Centre for Trainers in the Arab Region

Canada expressed reservation about all the DRs that called for the creation of centres and institutes, based on its overall position set out during Debate II on the issue of institutes. This discussion highlighted the tension between UNESCO's work in developing and creating institutes on the one hand and cooperation agreements with existing organizations within member states on the other. This debate reinforced as well the need to clarify the criteria and conditions for this development process.

- DR. 95, submitted by Guatemala and Ecuador and supported by many delegations, proposed that UNESCO promote and encourage learning of at least one second language, referred to in the DR as "linguistic plurality" or multilingualism.

Canada proposed four amendments to this DR:

- eliminating the reference to "a new linguistic order"
- eliminating the reference to "bilingual education"
- transforming the list of prescriptive measures contained in recommendation 2 into a list of possible strategies to achieve the goals
- moving recommendation 4 (dealing with the establishment of a "national and/or regional committees to study and make recommendations on linguistic plurality") into recommendation 2, so that it became one of the possible strategies to achieve the goals of the resolution

The proposal stimulated one of the rare real discussions during the commission meetings. Canada's proposed amendments were widely supported, and the DR was adopted with the amendments.

## **6. Debate on UNESCO in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (Saturday, November 12 [afternoon] and November 13 [morning])**

Delegates stressed the importance of reinforcing the role of education in contributing to the solution of current problems. Participants stressed UNESCO's ethical and moral role as well as its function as an intellectual forum and its humanitarian mission. Among the concerns expressed were multilateral partnership, the need for education for all, and the integration of young people in UNESCO's processes and democratization.

Working document 30C/49 was very well received. UNESCO's special Task Force on the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, chaired by Mr. Michel Agnaïeff, Chair of the Canadian Commission for UNESCO, was mandated to bridge the need to ground the future in UNESCO's past (i.e., recommendations, conventions, etc.) on the one hand, with the necessity of reinventing and reinvigorating the organization on the other. In its intervention (see Appendix, intervention 4), Canada dealt with most of these themes, while recalling as well the need for a strategic vision and democratization. Other countries expressed agreement with those views.

## APPENDICES

### Appendix I: Joint Report — World Bank/UNESCO on Higher Education

**Chaired by: Mr. Serageldin (World Bank)**

**Participants:**

- **Henry Rossousky (US)**
- **Karl Tham (Sweden)**
- **Kamal Ahammad (US, Bangladesh)**
- **Colin Power (UNESCO)**
- **Karl Seddoh (UNESCO)**

On November 12, a panel discussion on the topic “Higher Education in Developing Countries” was organized bringing together members of the Task Force on Higher Education and Society convened by the World Bank and UNESCO and co-funded by several agencies and Swedish International Development Agency (SIDA) in partnership.

An overview of the report on the task force, which will be available in February 2000, was presented by the task force co-chair, Professor Rossousky. He highlighted that higher education had been neglected in favour of primary and secondary education and that it is high time to reverse this policy since economic and social development in the South is strongly link to the level of development of their higher education systems. Economists have failed to account for indirect benefits of higher education in looking at the role of higher education in development, and at the obstacles standing in the way of improving this role.

The report focussed on five topics:

- higher education and the public interest and the means to protect those aspects the market cannot provide
- need for a systemic view of a rational, stratified, and supervised higher education system
- a focus on governance and some basic principles of good governance of higher education institutions
- the place of science and technology in higher education and its centrality in narrowing the gap between North and South
- a strong emphasis on the development of general intellectual capacity through strong general nation-specific education as complementary to specialization

The link to the World Conference on Higher Education (WCHE) was drawn by the Assistant Director General for Education, Mr. Colin Power, and the Director of the Higher Education Division, Mr. Komhlavi Francisco Seddoh, who stressed the consultative process and consensual approach that led to the basic Declaration of the World Conference. The UNESCO representative agreed with the task force statements, expressed pleasure at seeing such meeting of minds, and hoped that as a result, the World Bank would be an active partner in the World Conference follow-up now under way.

The question period had speakers from Nigeria, Libya, Kenya, the International Association of Universities (IAU), the International Union of Catholic Students, India, Austria, the Dominican Republic, Jamaica, Zambia, and the International Organization of University Women. The debate helped to clarify that the task force did not speak for the World Bank, but rather addressed its report to national authorities and institutions as well as the World Bank. It was hoped that those efforts, Task Force, and World Conference on Higher Education will mobilize greater support for and work in the higher education sector.

## **Appendix II: International Conference on Education (ICE)**

The Round Table on the International Conference on Education (ICE), organized to brief delegates on progress to date in the planning of the conference to be held in 2001 and to obtain their input, had to be cancelled because of a strike by the UNESCO technical support staff. Consequently, Mr. Jean-Pierre Regnier, Secretary of the Working Group on the Organization of the ICE, presented a brief oral report in Commission II (Education) summarizing the theme, structure, and proposed participation in the ICE. The 15-minute report was presented at the end of one of the Commission II sessions.

11/22/99



**NOTES FOR INTERVENTION BY  
THE HONOURABLE ANDREW PETTER**

**MINISTER OF ADVANCED EDUCATION AND TECHNOLOGY  
BRITISH COLUMBIA**

Chief Spokesperson for Education  
Canadian delegation

*Major Programme I - Education for all throughout life*

UNESCO GENERAL CONFERENCE

COMMISSION II (EDUCATION)  
PARIS, NOVEMBER 9-13, 1999

Mr. Chair  
Distinguished delegates

## Introduction

This debate provides us with an opportunity to examine ways that we can work together to improve the quality of life for the members of our societies. All over the world, as decision makers, we are looking for ways to meet the challenges of an increasingly complex world that is changing rapidly. We must be able to make adjustments in our education strategies to ensure that our education services are responsive to learner needs, that we are maintaining high quality education services, that our programs at all levels are accessible, that we facilitate mobility, and finally, that we are accountable to our stakeholders.

## Major Programme I - Education for all throughout life

In the context of the re-examination of UNESCO's future role, I am very pleased, on behalf of the Canadian delegation, to be able to make some comments on *Major Programme I - Education for all throughout life*. Since time will not permit me to review the entire program, I shall limit myself to a few aspects that are particularly significant for Canada.

The Canadian delegation would like to congratulate the Director General and his staff for the hard work that has gone into the preparation of the Draft Programme and Budget. With respect to Major Programme I, we were particularly pleased and satisfied to see that a number of the concerns that we have expressed in past years have been addressed.

The two transdisciplinary projects «*Education for a Sustainable Future*» and «*Towards a Culture of Peace*» have now been integrated into the education sector, as had been requested many times. This seems to us a step in the right direction. Much, however, remains to be done to integrate these projects into the program proper.

In Canada, we devote particular attention in our actions to the follow-up of conferences organized by UNESCO, as well as to work involving reflection on education. We note with satisfaction that the Draft Programme and Budget give considerable attention to this dimension, especially to the follow-up of the Report of the International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century, the World Conference on Higher Education, and the Second Congress on Technical and Vocational Education, as well as to the follow-up to the 5<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Adult Education, under the auspices of the UIE in Hamburg.

Canada also welcomes the addition of a new intersectoral project on «*The Status and Training of Teachers*.» Indeed, how could we contemplate a renewal of education without giving pride of place to teachers, who are at the heart of the act of educating? Nonetheless, although this project refers to the work of the 45<sup>th</sup> session of the ICE on «*Enhancing the Role of Teachers in a Changing World*,» it appears to us to bear little relation to that work. The strategy for action focusses largely on new information and communication technologies, a focus for action that appears too narrow, given UNESCO's own diagnosis in this area.

The appearance of regional strategies is also to be commended, although we are concerned about the overall consistency among these regional strategies, the education institutes' action plans, and the areas on which action is focussed within the education program.

With respect to the content of the programme, we are pleased to see the strategy for addressing illiteracy through education and community development, and for integrating early childhood and family

education. It is also, in our view, highly appropriate to focus on ways of reaching those who are excluded, marginalized youth, girls and women, as well as refugees and displaced persons from countries ravaged by war. However, we noted that no mention is made, in this regard, of the 5<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Adult Education, held in Hamburg in July 1997, nor of the UNESCO Institute of Education (UIE) as a possible partner for implementing these strategies.

We are encouraged by the fact that UNESCO is beginning to place more emphasis on secondary education. We welcome the intention to improve, diversify and develop secondary education, in collaboration with the International Bureau of Education, which has taken on a new direction as a centre for educational content.

The 2<sup>nd</sup> Congress on Technical and Vocational Education, held in Seoul, put forward proposals for the renewal of technical and vocational education. We are pleased to see that the follow-up to this Congress has been so rapid and broad. In this area, it is essential to work in concert with the International Labour Organization (ILO).

The two major proposals formulated by the Seoul Congress are the launch, starting in 2000, of a long-term international program on technical and vocational education at UNESCO headquarters, and the creation of an international centre in Bonn, Germany, to stimulate information exchange among national UNEVOC centres. It will be essential to distinguish clearly between the role and the tasks of the long-term program at UNESCO headquarters and those of the Bonn International Centre. This is not made sufficiently clear in the documentation provided for the Conference. Headquarters could provide orientation and overall coordination for the program and the Bonn International Centre could direct the network of UNEVOC centres. Without such clarification, duplication is inevitable. It will be necessary to ensure that the work of the Bonn Centre complements that of the Hamburg Institute in adult education.

Finally, as part of the follow-up to the Seoul Congress, we must aim to revise standard-setting instruments in the area of technical and vocational education.

While we are pleased to see that follow-up to the World Conference on Higher Education is being given priority attention, we note that the follow-up program that has been established focusses mainly on structure and dissemination. Although we recognize that dissemination of conference findings is essential at this stage, Canada had hoped that content and themes would be emphasized. In Canada, we are pleased to be involved in the follow-up by participating in the international committee and we are examining ways that we can follow-up within Canada.

I would like to point out that Canada has undertaken the preparation of our first report on the implementation of the Recommendation Concerning Higher Education Personnel.

In the area of international cooperation in higher education, we agree with the focus on evaluation and the viability of the UNITWIN/UNESCO Chairs network. Based on our concern for regional balance and the viability of this network of UNESCO-associated educational institutions, we believe that it would be wiser to look at an external evaluation during this biennium, in order to plan for future development on a solid basis. In this regard, Canada supports Draft Resolution 43, proposed by France, Denmark, Finland, Senegal, Spain and Greece, in order to review and define the criteria for granting UNESCO Chair status.

Despite the strengths identified in 30C/5, we would like to point out a major oversight. The education program makes no reference to the audit performed by the External Auditor in 1998. That audit identified significant problems in the education sector that are not taken into consideration in the

program submitted for this 30<sup>th</sup> General Conference. As well, 30C/5 contains nothing about implementing the auditor's recommendations. This is all the more alarming, since the main recommendation – developing a strategic plan for the education sector -- seems to us deserving of the highest priority.

In that connection, we would also like to raise a few other important issues. The lack of strategic planning in education concerns us all the more since the program is growing ever more decentralized, as can be seen by the increasing number of institutes, and the proportion of decentralized funds in the budget, which reaches 81.1%, the highest proportion in any UNESCO sector of activity.

While decentralization may have some advantages, it could lead to a dismantling of the education sector, despite assurances to the contrary by the Director General. At the very least, it is likely to lead to a lack of consistency and coherence in UNESCO's actions in education. This is a concern that was raised by Canada and other member states at the last General Conference in 1997 and it continues to be an issue that we in Canada feel must be addressed.

We are particularly worried about the consistency of the education program and the complementarity and synergy among actions, at headquarters and the various education sections, in the ever-increasing number of institutes, as well as within regional strategies and intersectoral and transdisciplinary projects. In this regard we would again stress the importance of evaluating and monitoring projects, an imperative that we feel is still lacking in UNESCO's work culture, although it is essential to the adjustment of programs in order to maintain their relevance.

Finally, I would like to mention a serious concern that Canada has about the decrease in the share of the UNESCO budget devoted to education. At a time when UNESCO's discourse waxes eloquent about the central role that education plays in building a culture of peace and in strategic development, at a time when all major United Nations conferences are recognizing the fundamental role of education in meeting the challenges of the next century, it is regrettable that UNESCO is giving less and less priority to education in its overall program.

Although 30C/5 states that education occupies a central place in UNESCO's work, the education sector's budget has shrunk from 40% to 30% of program funds over the past decade. This decrease in the education budget is accompanied by a growing reliance on extra-budgetary resources, which currently amount to 47.8% of the education program budget. It might appear that this concern about decreased funding in the basic budget is addressed by outside funding. However, given the lack of a strategic vision, the increasing number of institutes, and the apparent haphazard decentralization that is taking place, there is a considerable risk that external funders will exert growing influence on the development of UNESCO's education work and divert the organization from its original mandate.

Mr. Chair, thank you for the opportunity to make these remarks. Canada will have some comments later on other matters on our agenda.

Thank you Mr. Chair

Notes d'intervention

**Débat sur les Instituts de l'UNESCO pour l'Éducation**  
Grand Programme I : L'éducation pour tous tout au long de la vie

Allocution prononcée par  
**M. Jacques Proulx**  
Président de la Commission sectorielle de l'Éducation  
Commission canadienne pour l'UNESCO

**Porte-parole en éducation**  
**Délégation canadienne**

30e Conférence Générale de l'UNESCO  
Commission II (Éducation)  
Paris, 9 au 13 novembre 1999

Monsieur le Président,  
Mesdames, Messieurs les délégués,

Nous voulons tout d'abord souligner notre appréciation ainsi que la pertinence de ce débat spécifique consacré aux Instituts de l'UNESCO pour l'éducation.

D'entrée de jeu, nous nous réjouissons de constater l'**intégration** de plus en plus soutenue entre les programmes des Instituts et le Grand programme en éducation, ce qui est un pas dans la bonne direction pour une meilleure coordination entre le Siège et les Instituts. Nous tenons également à souligner l'**apport des Instituts à l'action de l'UNESCO** et la qualité du travail accompli. À ce titre, nous avons noté l'engagement concret des Instituts dans le suivi des Conférences en éducation.

Nous aimerions citer quelques exemples:

Le leadership de l'**Institut de l'UNESCO pour l'éducation (IUE)** dans le suivi de la 5e Conférence internationale sur l'éducation des adultes est particulièrement actif et stimulant. Le rôle de l'IUE comme catalyseur de ces activités y est pour quelque chose. On peut le constater à la lecture du projet de résolution déposé par le Royaume-Uni (DR.51) visant à créer une Semaine des Nations Unies pour les apprenants adultes que le Canada appuie puisqu'elle est introduite en respectant la Journée internationale de l'alphabétisation.

Dans le cadre de ce suivi, la Commission canadienne pour l'UNESCO a publié une trousse d'animation intitulée « *Renouveler notre vision de l'éducation des adultes* », trousse qui vous est distribuée aujourd'hui dans cette salle.

La nouvelle orientation du **Bureau international d'éducation (BIE)** comme centre international chargé des contenus de l'éducation est prometteuse. De même, le rôle du BIE dans le suivi du rapport Delors sera mis en valeur dans le cadre de la préparation de la 46e session de la Conférence internationale de l'éducation (CIE) qui permettra de mettre en commun et de partager les réalisations en matière de curriculum, de stratégies d'apprentissage et de moyens d'enseignement.

Le rôle de l'**Institut international de planification de l'éducation (IPE)** dans le cadre de la réforme et de la reconstruction des systèmes éducatifs n'est plus à démontrer. Dans le cadre du suivi de la Conférence mondiale sur l'enseignement supérieur, l'IPE pourra jouer un rôle essentiel en regard de la gestion des institutions d'enseignement supérieur.

Enfin, il faut se réjouir de voir l'**Institut international pour l'application des technologies de l'information à l'éducation (ITIE)** engagé dans le nouveau projet intersectoriel sur la « *Condition et la formation des enseignants dans la société de l'information* ». Ce projet se situe également dans le suivi des recommandations de la 45e Conférence internationale de l'éducation sur le rôle des enseignants.

Ceci dit, il nous faut réitérer notre inquiétude face à la décentralisation du secteur de l'éducation et au **développement accéléré de nouveaux Instituts** dont la création ne semble pas répondre à une vision d'ensemble. La présence de l'UNESCO dans les diverses régions du monde peut être perçue positivement. De notre point de vue la multiplication des acteurs, sans une vision stratégique proposée, débattue et convenue entre les États membres de l'UNESCO, fait de la coordination d'ensemble un exercice aussi difficile que périlleux.

Face à cette situation, le **Conseil exécutif** a demandé que soit examiné avec soin la question de la coordination entre les Instituts et entre les Instituts et le Siège en se fondant sur la résolution 29 C/7 de

la Conférence générale et sur l'audit du Commissaire aux comptes. S'il faut reconnaître les efforts réalisés par l'UNESCO en vue d'assurer une meilleure coordination, cette coordination ne peut cependant tenir lieu de vision et de planification stratégique tel que recommandé par le Commissaire aux comptes dans l'audit du secteur de l'éducation.

En conséquence, nous souhaiterions que l'UNESCO prenne en considération les suggestions suivantes :

- mettre en oeuvre la Recommandation du Commissaire aux comptes concernant le développement d'une vision stratégique pour le secteur de l'éducation,
- clarifier les critères et conditions devant mener à une décentralisation des activités, comme l'a également demandé le Conseil exécutif (30C/20) lors des travaux de la Commission administrative, c'est-à-dire consolider les Instituts existants et faire en sorte que le développement de nouveaux Instituts et centres associés à l'UNESCO découle de cette vision stratégique et des critères et conditions préalablement définis.

Monsieur le Président,

En terminant, nous tenons à dire que notre intervention se veut une critique constructive en vue de renforcer la cohérence de l'action de l'UNESCO et d'assurer la viabilité financière et la pertinence des Instituts actuels et de ceux à venir afin qu'ils constituent un réel bénéfice pour les citoyennes et citoyens des pays et des diverses régions du monde. C'est notre souci de l'efficacité et de la crédibilité de l'UNESCO qui a inspiré nos propos.

Merci monsieur le Président.

Notes d'intervention

**Débat sur les activités transdisciplinaires**  
**du projet «Vers une culture de paix»**

Grand programme I : L'Éducation pour tous tout au  
long de la vie

Allocution prononcée par

**M. Robert Bisailon**

Sous-ministre adjoint à l'Éducation préscolaire  
et à l'enseignement primaire et secondaire  
Ministère de l'Éducation du Québec

**Porte-parole en éducation**  
**Délégation canadienne**

30<sup>e</sup> Conférence générale de l'UNESCO  
Commission II (Éducation)  
Paris, 9 au 13 novembre 1999



Monsieur le Président,  
Mesdames, Messieurs les délégués,

Nous voulons tout d'abord noter que l'intégration dans le secteur de l'éducation des projets «*Éduquer pour un avenir viable*» et «*Vers une culture de paix*» correspond à la nécessité d'arriver à une vision de plus en plus cohérente au sein de l'UNESCO et du programme en éducation.

Le développement d'une **culture de la paix** rejoint la mission même de l'UNESCO. Il s'agit d'un but fondamental de l'UNESCO à situer au cœur de ses activités. Cependant, cette mission doit prendre appui sur les stratégies en éducation, en sciences et en culture, s'y intégrer et les inspirer plutôt que de se développer en périphérie.

Dans ce cadre, il est essentiel pour l'UNESCO d'établir le fil conducteur qui donnera une **cohérence** aux multiples cadres de référence en ce domaine. Seule l'intégration des termes, des contenus et des interventions, plutôt que leur juxtaposition permettra de développer la cohérence recherchée. En effet, chaque fois que nous éduquons aux droits de l'homme, à la compréhension internationale, à la citoyenneté, à la diversité culturelle, à la tolérance, à la non-violence, à l'environnement et au développement durable, nous contribuons au développement d'une culture de la paix. Chaque fois ainsi nous faisons des pas pour «**Apprendre à vivre ensemble**», ce défi central du 21<sup>e</sup> siècle que le Rapport Delors a su identifier avec tant de pertinence.

Cet apprentissage du vivre ensemble fait partie de cette **vision cohérente**, maintes fois réclamée par le Comité consultatif pour l'éducation à la paix, aux droits de l'homme, à la démocratie, à la compréhension internationale et à la tolérance et d'ailleurs recommandée par le Groupe de travail du Conseil exécutif dans sa stratégie globale sur l'éducation relative aux droits de l'homme (30C/13).

Cette cohérence doit également se traduire au niveau des instruments d'action de l'UNESCO. La **Recommandation 74** sur l'éducation pour la compréhension, la coopération et la paix internationales et l'éducation relative aux droits de l'homme et aux libertés fondamentales demeure l'instrument normatif fondamental en la matière. Lors de la **44<sup>e</sup> Conférence internationale de l'éducation (CIE)**, les ministres de l'Éducation ont réitéré l'importance de cette Recommandation et adopté un cadre d'action intégré concernant l'éducation pour la paix, les droits de l'homme et la démocratie.

Les **rapports Perez De Cuellar et Delors** se sont ajoutés comme des références additionnelles, l'un pour aider à concilier culture et développement, l'autre pour inspirer les réformes de l'éducation au prochain siècle.

Enfin, la **46<sup>e</sup> Conférence internationale de l'éducation (CIE)** dont le thème sera: «*Contenus de l'éducation et stratégies d'apprentissage pour apprendre à vivre ensemble pour le 21<sup>e</sup> siècle: problèmes et solutions*», nous permettra de prolonger cette vision jusque dans les contenus et les pratiques en éducation. Mais déjà nous pouvons identifier quatre stratégies en ce sens.

La culture de la paix ne peut s'enseigner en dehors du curriculum ni même être enfermée dans une matière. Elle doit être une vision qui s'inscrit dans les programmes et en imprègne les **contenus**. Par exemple, un lien doit être établi entre la conquête des droits humains, le développement des institutions démocratiques, l'histoire et la géographie. En ce sens, l'attention apportée dans le document 30C/5 à la **révision des manuels** d'histoire et de géographie nous semble une approche intéressante.

Les **pratiques éducatives** sont aussi essentielles pour «Apprendre à vivre ensemble». Le développement d'attitudes civiques dans la classe, l'utilisation d'une pédagogie de la coopération, ou encore l'exercice d'une citoyenneté active au sein de l'école ont autant d'importance que la révision des contenus.

Reconnaissant que la **diversité culturelle et linguistique** constitue l'une des principales richesses de l'humanité, nous ne pouvons que souscrire à l'enseignement des langues et à la mise en valeur du patrimoine linguistique comme facteurs essentiels pour le développement de la compréhension entre les peuples et du dialogue pour la paix.

Il faut enfin assurer la **formation des maîtres** en conséquence. La mise en place de Chaires UNESCO au sein des facultés d'éducation nous apparaît donc appropriée.

Ce n'est que grâce à de telles stratégies que nous saurons relever ce défi central du prochain siècle : Apprendre à vivre ensemble, comme condition essentielle de l'établissement d'une culture de paix.

**NOTES FOR INTERVENTION BY  
THE HONOURABLE ANDREW PETTER**

**MINISTER OF ADVANCED EDUCATION AND TECHNOLOGY  
BRITISH COLUMBIA**

**Chief Spokesperson for Education  
Canadian delegation**

*UNESCO in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*

**UNESCO GENERAL CONFERENCE**

**COMMISSION II (EDUCATION)  
PARIS, NOVEMBER 8-13, 1999**

Mr. Chair  
Distinguished delegates

## Introduction

The special Task Force recently approved by the Executive Board will bring forward detailed recommendations for UNESCO in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. However, on behalf of the Canadian delegation, I would like to mention a few of the major issues that we feel should be addressed if UNESCO is to meet the challenges of the future.

### 1. Centrality of education

As we move towards greater globalization and our societies become more and more knowledge-based, the place that education plays in promoting human development and fostering global harmony will become increasingly significant.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights states: «Education shall be directed to the full development of the human personality and to the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. It shall promote understanding, tolerance, and friendship among nations, racial or religious groups, and shall further the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace.»

This role for education will be even more important in the years ahead. In the 21<sup>st</sup> century, access to education will be the currency that will determine the success both of individuals and of nations. And ensuring that that currency is fairly and adequately distributed to all the peoples and countries of the world will be essential to promoting and achieving equality and global peace.

**For this reason, it is critical that UNESCO restores the central role that education plays in its work and provides greater leadership in this area.**

Important steps have already been taken in this direction through the Delors and Perez de Cuellar reports and the major international conferences that UNESCO has organized.

Canada suggests that these steps be further advanced through the development of a comprehensive and coherent strategic plan, of the kind contemplated in the Auditor's Report, to guide UNESCO's educational initiatives in the years ahead. Such a plan should be the instrument for integrating three themes – learning to live together; education throughout life; and cultural diversity -- into UNESCO's future activities.

### 2. Mission and strategic vision of UNESCO

The need for a strategic plan does not imply the need for change in our strategic vision. On the contrary, Canada believes that the mission and goals of UNESCO, as set out in the Act that created the organization, should be reaffirmed. The organization's critical, ethical, and humanist perspective is sufficiently inspiring to carry it into the next century. **In summary, we feel that UNESCO's role as a forum for moral and intellectual leadership should be strengthened.**

**UNESCO should also reaffirm the multilateral character of its work.** UNESCO remains unique among multilateral and international bodies because its *raison d'être* is to build peace by empowering and encouraging the human spirit through intellectual cooperation.

However the way that UNESCO sets about fulfilling this mission needs to be clarified. The proliferation of projects involving support and technical cooperation has resulted in more and more

bilateral arrangements and runs the risk of duplication of effort with the work of other national or international organizations.

**For example, like several member states, Canada thinks that UNESCO needs to address how its role and functions fit with those of other UN agencies.**

Another challenge for UNESCO is the increasing influence of regional intergovernmental institutions, such as the Council of Europe and the OAS. **Assessing the role of these various agencies, and determining their influence in UNESCO's spheres of action, will be essential in developing the organization's strategic plan.**

### 3. Greater democratization of UNESCO

**Canada also feels that UNESCO needs to take steps to modernize and democratise its operations, requiring some fundamental changes in the organization's culture.** In this process, it is critical that UNESCO become **more accountable** through broader public consultation, particularly with NGOs. This broader consultation should utilise existing national networks. In this regard, the status within UNESCO and within member countries of the National Commissions should be strengthened.

**Making UNESCO more democratic also involves changing old and sometimes outdated models of decision-making and management.** To achieve this, we have to encourage openness and transparency, with greater emphasis on engagement with, and accountability to, civil society. Systematic evaluation of UNESCO's activities, and increased transparency in financial management must also become hallmarks of the organization if it is to remain credible in the international community and accountable to its member states.

Finally, UNESCO's planning and programming cycle should be lightened significantly. In particular, the organization could benefit from re-examining, and streamlining, its two principal planning tools – the Medium Term Strategy and the corresponding Biennial Plans.

## Conclusion

Mr. Chair, never has it been more important for there to be an organization at the international level, like UNESCO, with a mandate to promote a compassionate and progressive vision of education and its increasingly critical role in advancing human development and fostering world peace.

Never has it been more critical for UNESCO to provide effective and efficient leadership in pursuit of that vision.

And never has it been more essential for us to make the changes necessary to ensure that this organization becomes an even more dynamic and powerful force for world leadership on education issues in the years ahead.

Canada is confident that, together, we can bring about these changes. And Canada is committed to participating actively in that process.

Thank you Mr. Chair