

ECMI

ISSUE BRIEF



EUROPEAN CENTRE
FOR
MINORITY ISSUES

Minority Rights Governance: Avoiding the Pitfalls of Equal Treatment when Budgeting for Education

Tove H. Malloy

ECMI Brief #37

April 2016



The European Centre for Minority Issues (ECMI) is a non-partisan institution founded in 1996 by the Governments of the Kingdom of Denmark, the Federal Republic of Germany, and the German State of Schleswig-Holstein. ECMI was established in Flensburg, at the heart of the Danish-German border region, in order to draw from the encouraging example of peaceful coexistence between minorities and majorities achieved here. ECMI's aim is to promote interdisciplinary research on issues related to minorities and majorities in a European perspective and to contribute to the improvement of interethnic relations in those parts of Western and Eastern Europe where ethnopolitical tension and conflict prevail.

ECMI Briefs are written either by the staff of ECMI or by outside authors commissioned by the Centre. As ECMI does not propagate opinions of its own, the views expressed in any of its publications are the sole responsibility of the author concerned.

ECMI Issue Brief # 37
European Centre for Minority Issues (ECMI)
Director: Prof. Dr. Tove H. Malloy
© ECMI 2016



Minority Rights Governance: Avoiding the Pitfalls of Equal Treatment when Budgeting for Education

When governments are faced with economic crises, the education sector is often the first sector to experience budget reductions. This may hit educational programmes for minorities disproportionately harder, if austerity measures are applied equally across the board, as positive measures adopted as a result of minority protection schemes are more costly than regular educational programmes. Minority educational programmes incur higher cost per pupil due to additional and extra-curricula topics and activities aimed at preserving and promoting minority cultures. Cutting special programmes may inadvertently or perhaps deliberately lead governments to discriminate against minority pupils, who have enrolled in minority schools or programmes. Unfortunately, there is little guidance for policy makers and school principals in this regard. International human rights law instruments prescribe positive measures without explaining how these should be safeguarded during economic hard times. Only two international soft law documents provide some guidance with regard to education for minorities. This Issue Brief will examine the standards and guidance available in international law and put these in a perspective of actual practice of education for minorities in Europe. The main argument is that equal treatment or equal reductions across the board do not secure equality; equitable processes protecting positive measures are needed.

Tove H. Malloy
ECMI Issue Brief # 37

1. INTRODUCTION

Education for minorities has experienced hardship in some countries due to cuts in public spending. Although education is today considered a goal in its own right as well as a forceful tool for transmitting culture, knowledge, attitudes and values, education sectors also see reduction in funding when economic crises hit. What should be seen as the best financial investment a state would ever make may get downgraded in favour of other sectors? This is particularly hard to cope with for minority education institutions as they are expected to offer more topics than regular public schools in order to cover minority specific needs. Finding equitable solutions that protect education for

minorities against unjustified reduction in resources, therefore, becomes a major challenge in countries that provide positive measures to protect minority identity and culture.

However, even though education for minorities is safeguarded through international and national standards, policy-makers and school principals have little guidance on how to design equitable reforms as a result of budget reductions. Standards are backed up by just a few international documents providing guidelines, all of which are more than ten years old. These do not provide any directives on how to reform in times of budget reductions. This may mean that minority education institutions can be forced to follow directives for majority education in spite of the fact that education for



minorities requires additional resources to ensure equality.

At the same time, the international guidelines on minority education governance are out-dated in a number of aspects. Not only is the increased use of modern technology in education missing from guidelines but also advice on how to adjust to the intensifying complexity of personal identity and belonging. While these aspects are perhaps identical for both minority and majority education, minority students are more likely to require additional support on how to handle issues of inter-culturalism and hybridity. Keeping education for minorities updated is not the only aspect, providing broader options than majority education is another. It is clearly problematic, therefore, to assume that *equal* treatment in educational subsidies will provide *equitable* education for minorities.

Equity in education means fairness in the process to attain learning and knowledge, whereas equality refers to the outcome. Equity thus encompasses a variety of educational tools, programmes and strategies that may be considered fair but not necessarily equal.¹ Distributing education equally may not always lead to equality; certain tools of equity may be necessary, such as special policies and programmes with regard to curriculum design, instruction methods, attainment assessment, teacher skills and training and school staffing. In Europe, international standards have included positive measures for education for minorities in order to overcome some of the barriers that minority pupils may face in achieving equality in outcome.

2. INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS ON THE EDUCATION RIGHTS OF MINORITIES

The sources of the right to education for minorities emanate from both international human rights instruments and European minority rights documents. A combination of the universal right to education and minority rights to learning in one's mother tongue and about one's minority culture create the synergy needed to safeguard the rights of members of minorities

to receive education. Education for minorities should cover the full span from pre-school education to tertiary education.² A short list of international standards include:

- Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948), Article 26
- Council of Europe Social Charter (1961), Article 17
- UNESCO Convention against Discrimination in Education (1960), Article 5
- UN Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1966), Article 27
- UN Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (1966), Articles 13 and 14
- UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989), Article 28 and 30
- OSCE Copenhagen Final Document (1990), paragraph 34
- UN Declaration on Minority Rights (1992), Article 4
- Council of Europe Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities (1995), Articles 12-14

This is not an exhaustive list; suffice to note that international law considers the right to education to be not only an economic, social and cultural right but also a civil and political right. In this respect, the right to education epitomizes the indivisibility and inter-dependence of human rights. Governments that have signed and ratified or adopted these normative instruments have agreed to provide universally recognized standards of education to all members of society.

2.1 International norms and guidance on education management

International normative standards have been supported by soft law norms detailing how best to operationalize and implement education rights. These norms are not set out in any one document. When it comes to education for minorities, one must consult at least four international documents:



- UNESCO World Declaration on Education for All (1990)
- OSCE Hague Recommendations (1996)
- UN General Comments Nos. 11 and 13 (1999)
- Council of Europe Thematic Commentary (2006)

A brief examination of these documents shows that school principals seeking to provide good and equitable education for minority communities will not find answers to many of the questions and challenges that they are currently facing. First of all, the UNESCO and the United Nations (UN) documents are mainly directed towards developing countries and new members of the UN that need to set up state run basic education institutions. Secondly, they address the right to education as a universal right with little discussion of the special needs of minorities. However, the World Declaration of Education for All and its attached Framework for Action to Meet Basic Learning Needs adopted in Thailand in March 1990 does specifically addresses the aspect of minorities in Article 3:

An active commitment must be made to removing educational disparities. Underserved groups: the poor; street and working children; rural and remote populations; nomads and migrant workers; indigenous peoples; ethnic, racial, and linguistic minorities; refugees; those displaced by war; and people under occupation, should not suffer any discrimination in access to learning opportunities.³

With regard to mobilizing and securing resources for education, the World Declaration furthermore suggests in Article 9 that governments should see the public sector as an overarching policy area where reallocation between sectors may be necessary. The Framework for Action provides guidance in all aspects of setting up basic education, including how to design programming and how to ensure consultation and participation in decision-making processes. Unfortunately, the World

Declaration and the Framework for Action are not necessarily helpful to school principals who are tasked with cutting down rather than building up public education programmes.

The Hague Recommendations regarding the Education Rights of National Minorities issued by the High Commissioner on National Minorities of the Organization of Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) in 1999 were the first to address education of minorities directly.⁴ They were issued just a year after the Council of Europe's Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities (FCNM) but before it came into force in 1998. They were seen as complementary to the international human rights regime. The Hague Recommendations are very normative and prescriptive; they adhere to a very diplomatic language and are restricted to discussing general issues, such as decentralization and participation, public versus private institutions at the three levels of education as well as curriculum development. The latter is somewhat helpful in that it details which topics should be included in the curriculum. With regard to resources, The Hague Recommendations have little to say except that states are allowed to seek international assistance. The Explanatory Note that accompanies the Recommendations elaborates on the general issues but does not offer operational considerations. Specifically, the Explanatory Note does not offer any institutional examples or guidance on policy-making during times of economic crises, nor does it address issues of modernity, such as mobility, hybrid identity and modern technology. The value of The Hague Recommendations to school principals is, therefore, limited unless they are updated and revised.

The two UN General Comments, Nos. 11 and 13, each address different issues. Whereas General Comment 11 follows the World Declaration in providing guidance on establishing basic education in developing societies, General Comment 13 focuses on the normative content of Article 13 of the UN International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and the obligations arising from this. With regard to minorities, Comment 13



argues that states are obligated “to take positive measures to ensure that education is culturally appropriate for minorities and indigenous peoples.”⁵ It also notes that “failure to repeal legislation which discriminates against individuals or groups, . . . , in the field of education” and “the failure to take measures which address *de facto* educational discrimination” would violate the right to education.⁶ Although, Comment 13 discusses mainly the normative aspects of education, it draws on many years of committee deliberation to provide a good structure from which to analyse and monitor good policies and their implementation. It provides the so-called Four A-Scheme, which sets out four principles that can be used as guiding principles for operationalizing the right to education. These will be discussed in detail in the next section.

The most recent document of the norms and guidance instruments is the Council of Europe’s Thematic Commentary on Education issued by the Advisory Committee on the FCNM in March 2006.⁷ This document draws on accumulated experience from the monitoring process, which is an advantage compared to the other documents in that it provides referenced examples of actual practice. The Commentary addresses the three main articles on education in the FCNM, Articles 12-14 but it also stresses the importance of Articles 4-6. In general the Commentary is much more hands-on than the previous guideline documents; it discusses planning, implementation and evaluation of educational policies and legislation of relevance. In addition to discussing in great detail each of the relevant articles and providing examples from countries monitored as well as a summary discussion, the Commentary also provides an Appendix with an inventory of specific issues observed during monitoring. Moreover, unlike the previous documents, the Commentary is helpful in addressing the fluidity of identity and societies in modern day life. The biggest drawback of the Commentary is that it relies only on experience from the first cycle of monitoring (roughly 1998-2003), and the FCNM is now in its fourth monitoring cycle. This means that it does not address the aspect of modern technology or budget cutbacks; two of

the most difficult issues for school principals in minority education institutions.

2.2 The four A-scheme

The Scheme proposed in UN Comment 13 consists of four principles or features, which address education governance in all its forms and at all levels in an inter-related and overlapping manner.

(1) *Availability* refers to the functioning of educational institutions and programmes which have to be available in sufficient quantity.⁸ To function they will require numerous factors, such as the development context, the infrastructure of building and other structures, sanitation facilities and safe drinking water as well as trained teachers receiving domestically competitive salaries, teaching materials, libraries, computer facilities and information technology.

(2) *Accessibility* refers to the provision of education without discrimination and with no physical or economic barriers to accessing the right to education.⁹ Non-discrimination as part of access to education means both in law and *de facto*. Physical accessibility requires that infrastructure is within safe physical reach either in the neighbourhood or via modern technology through distance learning programmes. Economic accessibility means that education has to be affordable to all with the caveat that there can be a differentiation between primary, secondary and tertiary education. Governments are nevertheless supposed to progressively introduce free secondary and higher education.

(3) *Acceptability* refers to the form and substance of education. Curricula and teaching methods have to be acceptable to both students and parents, and they must be relevant, culturally appropriate and of good quality. Thus, curricula must cover three aspects: the human personality’s sense of dignity, it must enable all persons to participate effectively in a free society, and it shall promote understanding among all ethnic groups, nations, racial and religious groups.¹⁰ They must also refer to gender equality and respect for the environment.¹¹ In addition, acceptability requires state sensibility towards the teaching of world



religions and common morality in that it is not confined to one particular religion or belief,¹² and it allows for parents to select private school education provided that it conforms to the educational objectives of the human rights regime.¹³ Finally, it provides for the liberty to establish own institutions for non-nationals.¹⁴

(4) *Adaptability* requires that education programmes and institutions are flexible and able to adapt to the needs of changing societies and communities as well as respond to the needs of students within their diverse social and cultural settings.¹⁵ This point is also elaborated in the Thematic Commentary on Education, which argues that both minorities and majorities experience changes, and all identities need to be constantly discussed and reassessed as they are not frozen, nor are languages and religions frozen phenomena.¹⁶

There are undoubtedly other methods to assess education governance, but the four principles provide a good starting point for assessing minority institutions facing reforms. In the following, the four principles are discussed in practical terms drawing on examples from minority education governance in Europe.

3. EUROPEAN MINORITY EDUCATION GOVERNANCE IN PRACTICE

Educational programmes for minorities in Europe are as diverse as the number of minorities. Depending on the historical and cultural backgrounds of minorities, governments and minority leaders have developed models for providing education that have been feasible for each context. Examples described in this section are taken primarily from the documentation provided by the Council of Europe's Secretariat on the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities (FCNM). These include state reports submitted by countries party to the instrument and opinions adopted by the Advisory Committee on the FCNM.¹⁷ The monitoring of the FCNM is mainly qualitative, and given the very diverse approaches adopted

in member states, the examples are not comparable, nor are they categorized as good or bad examples. Moreover, they do not constitute an exhaustive list; rather, they should be seen as providing specific information in support for the international soft law documents discussed above, specifically the OSCE Hague Recommendations and the Council of Europe Thematic Commentary.

3.1 Availability

When examining educational programmes for minorities in Europe from the perspective of *availability*, the good functioning of institutions hinges not so much on infrastructure issues but on the availability of good teachers, good textbooks, new technology and facilities, such as libraries. Moreover, creating a good body of teachers for education for minorities requires teacher training specifically tailored for education for minorities. Teachers of minority children will have to be conversant and fluent in both the minority language and the main state language. In addition, they must have skills in inter-cultural communication and ethical issues. These subjects are not always available in standard teacher colleges. Special teacher colleges for minority educators are thus a requirement for developing good tutoring of education for minorities. Unfortunately, special colleges or special courses for minority teachers exist only in a small number of countries.

Minority school teachers, who have been accredited as teachers, may still find obstacles to employment. In some countries public authorities do not recognize their diplomas. This can have ramifications for their options for employment; full-time, permanent positions may not be available for them, or they may have to accept part-time positions paid lower pay than their colleagues in majority public schools. This is another serious issue that impacts on the adequate availability of teachers and thus on the opportunity for minority children to access equitable education.

Availability of textbooks and the quality of textbooks is another aspect of minority education governance that can lead to unequal treatment of minority children. The practice of



procuring textbooks varies considerably from country to country. A general problem in many countries is funding; a second is bureaucratic restrictions. Thus, minority schools and minority programmes often have to do with less teaching materials than majority public schools. And the quality of textbooks may be inferior to majority school textbooks. Minority educators often make translations of materials voluntarily; in other cases majority teaching materials and textbooks are simply translated into the minority language. This is not ideal in cases where there are large disparities between cultures; translating history books from a majority language to a minority language would most likely be insensitive to divergent views of historical events. For this reason, many minority education programmes opt for procuring textbooks from kin-states. Whichever solution is found, it is not likely to provide the minority students with equal opportunities to study on the basis of good learning tools. Nor is it likely to promote good inter-ethnic and inter-cultural understanding.

With the arrival of modern technology in the classroom, minority educators may be faced with obstacles to ensuring tutoring in minority languages. Digital programming is often produced only in the main languages and the majority languages of the country. While digital programming may be available, if there is a kin-state producing it in the minority language, education establishments for smaller minorities covering small languages may face serious problems of how to introduce new technology into teaching. The risk of assimilating minority students into large language groups, such as English, is high. Small languages are at risk of disappearing if the minority students cannot avail themselves of digital programming in their minority language. They are thus facing assimilation of their identity at the same time as they are suffering unequal treatment in the classroom.

The last aspect of availability in terms of good functioning of education for minorities is supportive facilities, such as libraries including digital libraries. Libraries holding books and materials in the minority language are an essential part of providing education and good teaching. Many minority libraries start as private

initiatives maintained by volunteers. While this is commendable, it is not ideal in the long run. Minority education establishments need well-functioning and well-funded libraries that stock books and materials in the minority language. Such libraries should be subsidized or publicly funded and managed. Very small education establishments often have to do with smaller libraries receiving loans from larger libraries on a timeframe based system. Rural areas are particularly at risk of not having access to books at all. This may be solved through the concept of “books on wheels,” such as a library bus visiting once a week. Having no access to libraries and additional teaching materials will put minority student in an unequal position of learning.

3.2 Accessibility

Putting the *accessibility* principle into practice is increasingly drawing attention among human rights monitors because of the recent economic crises and the subsequent slashing of funds for minority institutions in some countries. Equity in education requires, as noted above, positive measures for minority children in terms of provisions of additional courses and activities aimed at preserving minority cultures and identities. Positive measures may also be needed in terms of geographic coverage and transportation in case minority families live far from the school. Minority education institutions are often located in remote and rural areas thus requiring extra funding for transportation if certain facilities are not available, such as libraries or sports facilities. In order to avoid discrimination in access to education of minority children in such cases, the principle of territoriality must be reconciled with the principle of non-discrimination.

The principle of territoriality versus the principle of non-discrimination becomes particularly acute when funding cuts result in closing of small schools in rural areas. Many countries have set thresholds for provision of education for minorities dependent on the percentage of minority families residing in districts or counties. Thresholds range from 0 to 20-25 per cent as a minimum to provide education for minorities. Other mechanisms rely



directly on the factual number of pupils requiring education in a given location. Some countries, such as Finland, provide education for minorities if one student is requesting it, whereas other countries set thresholds for how many pupils are needed to start a class, such as five in Lithuania, seven in Poland, eight in Hungary or 12 in Denmark and Germany, or even as high as 30 in Armenia. The numbers also vary from primary to secondary education, and whether minority languages are taught as primary or secondary languages. No system is optimal, and monitoring bodies usually encourage governments to remain as flexible as possible with such criteria. Basically 'mechanical' application of thresholds does not do justice to individual situations. Minority children must not be penalized because they live in rural areas attending small schools receiving less funding due to a smaller number of pupils. The so-called 'numbers game' is, therefore, fraught with problems because nowhere in international law is there a reference to acceptable practice or what numbers warrant positive measures

One exception from the practices described above is the concept of so-called 'protected schools.' This refers to mini minority schools, or schools providing minority classes, that are protected against policies of closing. Usually these are located in rural areas that are remote or difficult to reach (mountains, islands). Some countries overcome the infrastructure problem by housing two schools under the same roof. This is seen in the Balkans. However, it may not necessarily contribute to integration, if the children are kept strictly separated. Finally, some countries overcome the problem of closing small schools or classes by having the teachers commute within rural areas, from village to village. Here it may be an option to use modern technology to provide distance learning, perhaps supplemented with commuting teachers.

Technically, state subsidies for education are usually allocated per pupil, the higher the number of pupils the higher the total amount of funding for a school. This may ensure equality in accessibility but not necessarily equity because minority schools have higher expenses because they must provide additional

tutoring in minority languages and culture. In some countries, the subsidy per child is differentiated based on the size of the school. For instance, in Poland some minority pupils in small schools could warrant a 50 per cent subsidy compared to a 20 per cent subsidy in larger schools. Other countries, such as Denmark and Germany, allow additional subsidies from kin-states. Funding models are, therefore, a crucial aspect of providing equity in accessibility to education for minorities.

3.3 Acceptability

The principle of *acceptability* is relevant to all parents with children in school age. But for parents of minority children it is particularly important because education for minorities promotes the culture that parents deem important for the protection and preservation of their minority culture. Unlike most parents of majority children, minority parents make a deliberate choice when opting for minority education programmes. Issues of the substance of the curriculum and the teaching methods determine the parents' ability to accept the minority schools. Because education for minorities is one of the main developers of cultural capital, it is seen as the avenue for survival of minority cultures. Minority parents are, therefore, likely to wish to participate actively in the decision making processes of school management.

In many countries, the parents of minority pupils are able to participate in school boards. The degree of autonomy of schools boards varies from country to country depending on the level of decentralisation of education management. Participation of parents as well as inclusive decision-making are vital because there are additional aspects that parents and pupils must deal with, such as extra hours per week to allow for classes in the state language, or minority language depending on the model of teaching; decisions on after-school activities aimed at supporting the individual pupil academically as well as culturally. In addition to language education in both minority and majority languages, there may be specific topics that minority children need to learn to preserve



their identity, such as literature in the mother tongue. Thus, curricula must be relevant for the protection and promotion of minority identity.

An important aspect of acceptability is not only the quality of the curricula but also the quality of teaching and number of teachers. As noted above, teacher colleges for minority teachers are not readily available in most countries. Teachers of education for minorities need specific training in both substance and pedagogics. If teachers are not adequately trained, parents may feel forced to opt for majority schools. This can result in assimilation, as the minority pupils may not get the proper cultural knowledge or only on a private basis after hours.

Another aspect is the ratio between teachers and pupils, which also influences on the quality of the delivery of education. Due to the extra burden on pupils to learn at least two languages and two cultures, it may be necessary to have more teachers per pupil than in mainstream public schools. In some minority schools, such as in the Danish minority schools in Schleswig-Holstein, the number of teachers is one third higher in primary and secondary schools and almost twice at high school level.¹⁸ The consent of parents and the safeguard of equity are, therefore, closely linked in good delivery of education for minorities.

3.4 Adaptability

The last principle is perhaps the most important in the current climate of budget reduction and educational reforms. All societies undergo social change, and minority communities are no exception. Issues of modern life affect minorities as well as majorities. Mobility, hybrid identities and new technologies play a greater part of self-identification. Language and religion increasingly become markers of difference, and these too are fluid rather than frozen phenomena. Thus, minority and majority identities need to be constantly discussed and reassessed. The question is what should be reformed in a time of economic crises? The principle of *adaptability* is, therefore, one that overlaps and transcends some of the other three principles of education.

Mobility is becoming a vital part of being a member of a minority, not least due to reduction in accessibility to primary and secondary education but also the fact that higher education facilities are seldom available in the home region of minorities. Thus, access to higher education can be a hurdle for many minority students, especially in terms of affordability due to studying away from home. For that reason and to provide minority students as many options as possible, high school diplomas should be recognized both in the home state and the kin-state, as is the case with Denmark and Germany. Another aspect of mobility is preserving the ties to the minority community when studying abroad or in the capital far away from the homeland region. Digital libraries could be one aspect of maintaining contact with the homeland. Virtual togetherness or connectedness not only globally but also between the homeland/ minority community and the metropolis are new aspects of minority identity that need to be taken into account.

Identity or preserving one's minority identity while also adapting to new cultures is increasingly challenging to minority students. The normative framework for protecting national minorities calls for self-identification and allows for multi-identification. Hybrid identities become the norm in many minority communities, and moving mentally between cultures is everyday reality for minority students. These aspects of modern society have impact on the implementation of education for minorities and should be taken into consideration when adapting curricula, pedagogical approaches and accessibility. This may call for new approaches to education. Educational policies must take into account the changing conditions of the 21st Century and adapt teaching and learning accordingly. In Canada, a 21st Century approach called C21 has been adopted for the entire school system.¹⁹ Hybrid and fluid identities are the new condition that educational policies must address. This may incur higher costs in certain areas, such as inter-cultural programmes.



4. CONCLUSION

Budget reductions and policy reforms in the education sector are commonplace in most countries, and education for minorities cannot expect to be exempted. Most minority communities understand that when economies are shrinking, all members of society may have to accept responsibility. However, equal application of austerity measures across the board is not acceptable when it comes to education for minorities. Equal measures for all schools will not guarantee equitable processes for minority schools, which in turn will not guarantee equal outcomes for minority pupils. Positive measures are needed to secure equal outcomes. This is often not known to policy makers. This means that even in times of austerity, positive measures must be safeguarded and funds allocated appropriately.

Examples discussed in this Issue Brief

show that the complex nature of minority cultures and identity formation requires additional resources to implement special programmes addressing these complex realities. Governments should protect special measures for education for minorities and look for reductions in areas that do not affect one group more than others. These aspects of education governance are missing from the guidance that policy makers and school principals currently find in international human rights law and documents. The OSCE Hague Recommendations and the Council of Europe Thematic Commentary have little to say about budget reductions and education reforms. Without tools to understand the educational needs of minorities and the complexities involved, policy makers and school principals are not well equipped to discuss budget reductions.

Notes

¹ The Glossary of Education Reform, at <<http://edglossary.org/equity/>>

² Explanatory Report to the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, at <<http://www.coe.int/en/web/minorities/text-of-the-convention>>

³ Framework for Action to Meet Basic Learning Needs, at <<http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0012/001275/127583e.pdf>>

⁴ The Hague Recommendations regarding the Education Rights of National Minorities, at <<http://www.osce.org/hcnm/32180>>

⁵ CESCR General Comment No. 13, The Right to Education (Article 13), section 50, at <<http://www.refworld.org/docid/4538838c22.html>>

⁶ *Ibid*, Section 59.

⁷ Commentary on Education under the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, at <<https://rm.coe.int/CoERMPublicCommonSearchServices/DisplayDCTMContent?documentId=09000016800bb694>>

⁸ General Comment No. 13, section 6.

⁹ *Ibid*.

¹⁰ *Ibid*, section 4.

¹¹ *Ibid*, section 5.

¹² *Ibid*, section 28.

¹³ *Ibid*, section 29.

¹⁴ *Ibid*, section 30.

¹⁵ *Ibid*, section 6.

¹⁶ Thematic Commentary, section 2.3.2.

¹⁷ Documents are publicly available on the Council of Europe homepage, at <<http://www.coe.int/en/web/minorities/home>>

¹⁸ Sonja Wolf, “Danish Minority Education in Schleswig-Holstein”, 87 ECMI Working Papers®, at <<http://www.ecmi.de/publications/detail/87-danish-minority-education-in-schleswig-holstein-336/>>

¹⁹ See <<http://www.c21canada.org/>>



ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Prof. Dr. Tove H. Malloy

ECMI Director

Adjunct Professor at the Europa-Universität Flensburg

Member of the Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities (in respect of Denmark)

Contact: malloy@ecmi.de

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION SEE

EUROPEAN CENTRE FOR MINORITY ISSUES (ECMI)

Schiffbruecke 12 (Kompagnietor) D-24939 Flensburg

☎ +49-(0)461-14 14 9-0 * fax +49-(0)461-14 14 9-19 * E-Mail: info@ecmi.de * Internet:

<http://www.ecmi.de>