



Integrative Mechanisms for Addressing Spatial Justice and Territorial Inequalities in Europe

D6.2 Summary report on multi-level policymaking

Version 1.3

Author: Paul Cairney, Sean Kippin

| | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| Grant Agreement No.: | 726950 |
| Programme call: | H2020-SC6-REV-INEQUAL-2016-2017 |
| Type of action: | RIA – Research & Innovation Action |
| Project Start Date: | 01-01-2017 |
| Duration: | 60 months |
| Deliverable Lead Beneficiary: | U Stirling |
| Dissemination Level: | Public |
| Contact of responsible author: | p.a.cairney@stir.ac.uk |

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under Grant Agreement No 726950.

Disclaimer:

This document reflects only the lead author's view. The Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains.

Dissemination level:

- PU = Public
- CO = Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)

Change control

| VERSION | DATE | AUTHOR | ORGANISATION | DESCRIPTION / COMMENTS |
|---------|------------|-------------|--------------|---|
| 1.1 | 04/03/2020 | P.Cairney | U Stirling | Peer Review draft circulated |
| | 04/03/2020 | L Langstaff | AU | Formatting modifications |
| 1.2 | 30/04/2020 | M Mahon | NUIG | Various suggested edits and clarifications from peer review |
| 1.3 | 17/11/2020 | P Cairney | U Stirling | Final document with all peer review comments incorporated |

Acronyms and Abbreviations

| | |
|-----|------------------------|
| EU | European Union |
| GDP | Gross Domestic Product |
| MLG | Multi-level Governance |
| WP | Work Package |

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Change control | 2 |
| Acronyms and Abbreviations | 3 |
| Table of Contents | 4 |
| Tables and Figures | 4 |
| Summary | 5 |
| Background and Context: building on Work Package 1 | 5 |
| The difficulty of ‘mapping’ policymaking responsibilities | 6 |
| 1. Conceptual mapping: policy tools and instruments..... | 6 |
| 2. The need to combine mapping with expertise regarding each context | 7 |
| 3. The cross-cutting nature of policymaking responsibilities: case study of education..... | 9 |
| 4. Uncertain applications and meaning without engagement..... | 19 |
| Summary of conclusions: | 20 |
| References..... | 20 |

Tables and Figures

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Table 1 Distribution of Energy Decision-Making Competences | 7 |
| Table 2 Education responsibilities in the UK | 10 |
| Table 3 Education Responsibilities in Ireland | 11 |
| Table 4 Education responsibilities in the Netherlands | 13 |
| Table 5 Mapping Education Policy in Greece..... | 15 |
| Table 6 Mapping education policy in Germany | 16 |

Summary

This report summarises the ways in which we are ‘mapping’ multi-level policymaking responsibilities to inform research and practice. Our work helps researchers:

1. examine the ways in which policymakers, at different levels and scales of government, share responsibility for the reduction of territorial inequalities across the European Union.
2. engage with policymakers, and their advisers, to (a) make sense of a complex multi-level policymaking environment, and (b) encourage policy learning between governments at multiple levels or scales of government (described initially in Deliverable 6.1 Conceptual Framework for Empirical Research and further in Deliverable 6.4 Summary Report on Evidence Based Learning).

It is not possible to reduce this exercise to a technical report with a clear blueprint for policymakers. Rather, the mapping exercise exists primarily to identify inescapable complexity (this report) and work with stakeholders to make sense of inequalities policies in their context. As such, this report should be read in conjunction with report Deliverable 6.4.

Background and Context: building on Work Package 1

Our context relates initially to insights from Work Package 1. First, WP1 identifies levels of political commitment to spatial justice in the EU. There is high commitment to general aims, backed by (a) a collection of very broad terms - such as to foster *spatial justice* and *territorial cohesion*, and reduce *territorial or spatial inequalities or disparities* (Deliverable 1.1 Conceptual Review of Scientific Literature) – and (b) policy instruments such as funds to address some economic inequalities. Further, national, regional, and local governments use a similar language to support similar aims.

Second, however, there is low agreement about what spatial justice means, and how to cooperate to achieve it. Deliverable 1.1 shows that such terms are ill-defined in research, and Deliverable 1.2 (Review of Discourses of Territorial Inequalities in EU Policies) finds similar problems in policymaking. There appears to be a low likelihood that the problem of ‘territorial inequalities’ can be well-defined and commonly understood by a large collection of policy actors. Instead, Deliverable 1.4 (Systematic Review of Territorial Cohesion Programme Evaluations) shows that both the definition of the problem (including its key elements and causes) and the range of available policy responses are ambiguous and subject to contestation in a highly complex and multi-level policymaking environment.

Key aspects of contestation *could* include: the prioritisation of some forms of inequality over others (such as in relation to class, gender, race, and migration status), and debates on the cause of the problem (a structural problem to be solved by the state, or an individual problem to be solved privately). However, Deliverable 1.4 provides two conclusions particularly relevant to WP6:

1. Respondents were more likely to relate territorial equality to *equal access to public services* (avoiding a ‘postcode lottery’) than to regional differences in GDP per capita.
2. ‘Multilevel governance was referred to as one possible way to integrate the bottom up and top-down approaches for addressing territorial inequality’ (D1.4: p17).

Work Package 6 explores (and questions) this potential for integration by reflecting further on ambiguity in the following ways:

1. The spread of responsibility to reduce territorial inequalities, across many levels of government, amplifies the problem of policy ambiguity. There is scope to agree on the broad meaning and implications of concepts, but also great potential for confusion and contradiction when governments adopt specific policies.
2. Policy problems associated with territorial inequalities tend to cut across different policy sectors, including sectors such as health and education, and cross-cutting themes such as gender mainstreaming and 'health in all policies'.
3. As a result, even the simple mapping of policymaking responsibilities is difficult, and the end result may be an overwhelming list of possible measures that we would struggle to assign to each level or type of government.
4. Further, this *mapping of responsibilities* has no direct correspondence to the *mapping of inequalities* across the EU in Work Package 2.

In that context, this report (Deliverable 6.2) describes the inevitable issues that arise when we seek to map policymaking responsibilities, and in report Deliverable 6.4 we use case studies to explore how to encourage policymakers to learn from such experiences. Combined, they show that it is not possible to reduce this exercise into a technical report with a clear answer.

WP6.2 also informs the WP8 process of developing scenarios - a planning strategy that is particularly aimed at policymakers and political actors - in the following ways: i) confirming the diverse yet interconnected nature of political environments in which the phenomena of territorial inequality and spatial justice are interpreted and converted to policy; ii) identifying how scalar and temporal issues affect policymaking processes; iii) highlighting the need to identify the range and level of stakeholders involved in policymaking and their role in the process; iv) drawing attention to how key drivers and trends lead to the prioritisation of certain policy goals over others, reflecting relative aspirations to achieve territorial inequality and spatial justice; v) highlighting inherent and difficult to resolve tensions in multi-level policymaking systems related to closely defining and accounting for policy progress versus constantly evolving it to achieve new political and societal norms and behaviours (empirical v values-based perspectives); v) providing insights into how closing the gap between policymakers' desired and possible futures might be achieved by proposing a general model for policy learning and transfer that can more strategically inform policymaking on territorial inequality and spatial justice and its successful implementation.

The difficulty of 'mapping' policymaking responsibilities

We draw on our current and previous work to divide the difficulty of mapping into four main categories:

1. Conceptual mapping: policy tools and instruments

What exactly does it mean to 'map' policymaking responsibilities? Policy studies tend to focus on responsibility for the use of policy 'tools' or 'instruments' (an approach summarised in Cairney, 2020: 20-22). They can be categorised broadly in relation to key functions, such as *regulatory*, *distributive*, or *redistributive* (Lowi, 1964), or *nodality* (information sharing), *authority* (regulation), *treasure* (funding), and *organization* (e.g. staffing and capacity to deliver) (Hood and Margetts, 2007). A large number of policy instruments come under these broad, overlapping, categories, including:

- Public expenditure
- Economic incentives and disincentives
- Linking spending/ benefits to entitlement (e.g. to social security) or behaviour (e.g. seeking work)
- Formal regulations versus voluntary agreements
- Public services: universal or targeted, free or with charges, delivered directly or via non-governmental organisations
- Legal sanctions
- Public education or advertising
- Funding science or organisations to advice on policy
- Establishing or reforming policymaking units or departments
- Behavioural instruments, to ‘nudge’ behaviour.

As a result, what we call ‘policy’ is really a complex mix of instruments adopted by one or more governments, and a feature of policy studies is that it is difficult to define or identify exactly what policy is. This problem is magnified by the ambiguity of policy problems such as territorial inequalities, because it is not clear what the policy problem is and how to solve it (described by Work Package 1). Instead, case studies of public policy tend to piece together a story of policy based on (a) the adoption of some instruments rather than others, (b) the overall ‘policy mix’ produced by multiple government departments, and levels of government, and (c) its unclear impact on policy problems. For example, Cairney and St Denny (2020) identify high level political commitment and ambition by the UK and devolved governments to reduce inequalities in the UK, but also a huge gap between their vague expectations and actual outcomes.

2. The need to combine mapping with expertise regarding each context

Cairney et al (2019) show how expertise and context matter to the mapping of each policy sector. Initially, they draw on policy and legal documents to map direct and *formal* multi-level policymaking responsibilities relevant to UK energy policy (to allow us to compare policy before and after Brexit). Then, they identify the large number of competencies with a significant but indirect impact on policy, such as EU state aid rules, UK competition law, and Scottish Government property laws (Table 1). This problem is magnified if we consider the role of each government in *reducing inequalities in access to energy*, since the problem would include (for example) general taxation and social security (shared by the UK and Scottish governments), housing, transport, *and* the responsibility to encourage more sustainable energy production and use. The concept of a ‘just transition’ sums up this combination of policies and responsibilities to (a) produce a more sustainable energy system, while (b) reducing (or at least not exacerbating) inequalities in access to energy for heating and transport (Heffron and McCauley, 2018).

Table 1 Distribution of Energy Decision-Making Competences

| <i>Level</i> | <i>Direct Competences</i> | <i>Indirect Competences</i> |
|-----------------------|---|--|
| European Union | Internal energy market (gas and electricity) Security of energy supply | State aid regulation Competition law Free movement law |

| | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| | Promotion of renewable energy Regulation of biofuels Promotion of energy efficiency/energy efficiency standards Energy networks Trade in and safety of nuclear materials (Euratom) | Greenhouse gas emissions trading Other atmospheric emissions Water quality Environmental Impact Assessment Offshore carbon storage Trans-European networks Innovation/R&D funding Structural funding & strategic funding (e.g. in transport and energy infrastructure) |
| EU Agencies | Cross-border market integration and network harmonisation (ACER) | |
| United Kingdom/ Great Britain | Ownership of resources (coal, gas, oil, gas storage rights vested in the Crown) Regulation of energy markets Licensing of energy producers, suppliers and network operators Security of energy supply Energy taxation Renewable energy subsidies/grants Energy efficiency subsidies/grants Nuclear energy Golden Shares Nuclear licensing and nuclear safety | Competition law Financial services regulation Intellectual property and commercial law Climate change laws Social security (winter fuel payments; energy debt payments) Workplace health and safety Emergency powers Treaty-making powers R&D funding |
| UK/GB Agencies | Gas and electricity market regulation (Ofgem) Coal mining licensing (Coal Authority) Oil and Gas Authority Office for Nuclear Regulation Nuclear Decommissioning Authority | Competition law (Competition and Markets Authority) Financial services regulation (Financial Conduct Authority) Health and safety (Health and Safety Executive) |
| Devolved | Promotion of renewable energy Promotion of energy efficiency Fuel poverty support systems Electricity and gas installations consents Onshore oil and gas licensing Nuclear waste storage | Crown estate (seabed use/storage rights) Marine licensing and planning Property law (access to land/subsoil; nuisance; servitudes and wayleaves) Environmental emissions & water quality Climate change law Environmental Impact Assessment Housing law/building regulations Economic development Social security law Transport policies (including Air Passenger Duty from 2016) |
| Devolved Agencies | | Environmental emissions and water quality (SEPA) Seabed leasing (Crown Estate Scotland) |
| Local | | Land-use planning |

Source: adapted by [Cairney et al](#) from [Cairney et al](#) (2019: 460).

Table 1 presents a complicated but relatively clear picture of multi-level responsibilities. However, Cairney et al (2019) show that it only tells part of the story, because the formal division of responsibilities does not account for the *informal* use of power or explain all relevant policy change. Issues include:

1. An overlap of responsibilities when no level of government claims exclusive powers.
2. A tendency for many EU bodies to promote rather than enforce action.
3. The delegation of EU responsibilities to the Scottish Government, overseen by the UK.
4. A lack of clarity when the UK has overall responsibility for 'energy policy' but devolved governments control relevant aspects, such as planning permission for nuclear and renewable sites.
5. The deliberate choice to share powers in practice, even if not stated in regulations.
6. The delegation of UK powers to devolved government ministers.
7. The general potential for policy incoherence (many instruments undermine or contradict each other), mitigated only partly by intergovernmental relations.
8. The role of non-governmental action, over which governments only have some control.

Overall, such expert case studies, led by legal, economic, and political science scholars in a political system of which they have high knowledge, can piece together a more complete story of the division and impact of policymaking responsibilities. More general mapping exercises, based on documents in the public record, can give us a good initial starting point to compare across countries, but subject to the need for further analysis of policymaking in practice.

3. The cross-cutting nature of policymaking responsibilities: case study of education

In that context, we developed an initial series of tables of policymaking responsibilities in (a) examples of relevant policy sectors or aims (such as to reduce inequalities in relation to educational attainment, and via economic redistribution (Deliverable 6.3 Working Paper on Fiscal Equalisation and Transfers)), and (b) examples of project specific countries (starting with the UK, Ireland, Netherlands, Germany, Greece).

Initially, our aim was to identify the extent of shared responsibilities to reduce inequalities associated with education (and in education attainment in particular) to support a more in-depth case study of policy learning (still in development – see Deliverable 6.4). However, note the layers of problems associated with such an initially simple-looking task:

1. *Identifying relevant responsibilities.* It is one thing to identify all potentially relevant responsibilities in each sector. It is another to identify the specific instruments that are most associated with reducing education-related inequalities. For example, the most important contributor may be tax and social security measures to reduce economic inequalities. However, many governments seek to address inequalities in attainment primarily through schemes directed at schools or pre-school provision.
2. *Comparing responsibilities, to aid policy learning.* It is difficult to envisage how to combine all of the following tables (below) to compare responsibilities across EU member states, and help us make sense of the role of each sector in reducing inequalities.

Rather, at this stage, we provide a table for each country and a narrative of relevant responsibilities which differs each time (Tables 2-6).

Table 2 Education responsibilities in the UK

| Level | Direct Competencies | Indirect Competencies |
|-------------------------|---|--|
| European Union | University student and staff exchange programmes Research funding and support | Encouraging cooperation between member states on education and skills Monitoring EU member states citizen's education levels Promoting coordination between higher education authorities |
| EU Agencies | N/A | Promoting special needs and inclusive education in member states |
| UK/Great Britain Level | Local Education Authority funding allocation English Higher Education system Research and Development English Secondary Education Direct management of Academy Schools (England) Further Education (England) Apprenticeships | Childcare provision and Sure Start Social Security law (child benefit and Universal Credit) Trade Union relations (England) Gender and transgender equality |
| UK/GB National Agencies | Distribution of higher education funding (England) Education and Skills Funding (England) Development and enforcement of national Curriculum (England) Teacher recruitment and training (England) Inspection and regulation of schools, monitoring of school and teaching standards, and regulation of qualifications and examinations (England) Educational infrastructure development and coordination | Infrastructure and land purchase Social care inspection Child Internet Safety Recommendations on social mobility UK statistics gathering and publication Equality and human rights monitoring Scientific and technological research Charity regulation Encouragement of higher education success and 'value for money' Child safeguarding |
| Devolved level | Primary and Secondary Education (Scotland and Wales) Further Education (Scotland and Wales) School Infrastructure (Scotland) Apprenticeships (Scotland) Special Educational Needs | Funding allocations Adoption and fostering Childcare Healthcare provision Trade Union relations Healthcare provision Children's Hearings |
| Devolved Agencies | Funding allocations for higher education (Wales) Qualifications regulation Skills and training strategy | Public sector pensions Criminal records disclosure (Scotland) Schools inspections |

| | | |
|-------|--|--|
| Local | Ownership and management of most (England) primary and some secondary schools (England). School allocations School transport | Children’s Social Care Central government liaison and implementation Coordination between different Local Authorities (Combined Authorities) |
|-------|--|--|

In theory, UK competencies are relatively straightforward as applied to education, with Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland enjoying complete competency over primary and secondary education, and England governed the UK Government. However, each devolved government has different levels of responsibility, while England-wide agencies are accountable to UK ministers whose authority does not extend to devolved matters. Further, the UK Government’s influence on key outcomes – such as inequalities in education attainment - remain high, since it controls other policy areas with a direct impact, including: (a) the tax and spending system to redistribute income and wealth, which (b) determines entitlement for pre-school education for targeted children, (c) the block grant received by the devolved institutions, and (for example) (d) immigration policy, which influences the devolved education systems ability to recruit staff.

Compulsory and higher education arrangements differ markedly. Local government is strongly involved in the former, but in a different way and to a different extent in each territory. For example, it owns and manages the vast majority of state schools in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland. In England, there is more of a mix, with many schools (mainly ‘Academies’) in England enjoying nominal independence with a direct accountability link to central government. Each government has its own agencies for schools inspections and curriculum development. The UK and devolved governments have established different models of higher education (in areas such as student) fees, but subject to a tendency for UK policy to have a major spillover on devolved government policy.

Table 3 Education Responsibilities in Ireland

| Level | Direct Competencies | Indirect Competencies |
|----------------|--|---|
| European Union | University student and staff exchange programmes Research funding and support | Encouragement of cooperation between member states on education and skills Monitoring of EU member states citizens’ education levels Promotion of coordination between HE authorities |
| EU Agencies | N/A | Promotion of special needs education and inclusion in member states |
| National level | Pre-school education Primary and Secondary Schooling Broad control of higher education policy Recognition and regulation of schools | Central government budget Science and skills Public Service reform advice and management Skills and training provision |

| | | |
|---------------------|---|---|
| | School curricula and standards Resourcing and staffing of schools, Teachers' salary scales Higher Education Further education and training Adult education School inspections | Encouragement of participation in sport and physical activities Childcare provision and regulation Child welfare provision and regulation Family support Adoption management Youth crime advice and monitoring |
| National agencies | Regional administration of national departmental affairs Examinations and qualifications | Higher Education research and policy advice Development and implementation for National Framework of Qualifications Child welfare provision and monitoring |
| Provincial level | Management of Further Education colleges Prison education Psychological services Vocational education Post-primary education outdoor education Adult education and guidance | Regional planning and spatial strategy Allocation of EU funding such as regional growth funds |
| Provincial agencies | N/A | N/A |
| Local level | Higher education grants Administration of some elements of education | Planning Libraries Economic development Heritage and conservation Recreation and cultural services Parks, playgrounds, sport and recreation Arts and culture |

Education policy is formally centralised in Ireland around the Government Department for Education and Skills. The department and its ministerial team enjoy formal competency over most elements of education, from pre-school education to higher education and research. Between these two sits the system of compulsory and further education, managed in policy teams - including school curricula and standards, inspections, resourcing and staffing of schools, and admissions. Indirectly, central government plays a large role in shaping the larger framework in which the education system operates, including core areas such as government funding and public service administrative reform. Additionally, central government enjoys competency over education-adjacent policy areas such as skills and training, youth crime, and youth participation in sport. There is also a separate children's ministry which seeks to coordinate between different levels of government in areas of relevance to children and children's services while maintaining some executive functions of its own.

Higher Education Institutions have a large degree of independence from the centre although the Government plays a large role in formulating policy related to qualifications and admissions. Furthermore, Agencies of the central government also play a considerable role in education provision, including in advising the government on higher education policy, and also on qualifications. Regional Assemblies are concerned largely with spatial planning and the implementation of European Union funds, which may operate in areas with spillover for schools provision.

Local government is involved with education provision heavily through its participation in the Local Education and Training Boards. These are responsible for several elements of education provision, including Further Education Colleges, prison education, vocational education, and adult education and guidance. Otherwise, its role is limited largely to administering and allocating higher education grants, some peripheral elements of compulsory education, and a number of areas relevant to education such as maintaining and funding libraries, parks and playgrounds, economic development, conservation of local heritage, and local planning. The European Union also plays a role in education policy but limited to facilitating cooperation between member states and providing funding for higher education. The education system in Ireland is distinctive for the degree of collaboration facilitated by different tiers of government and the interplay between different agencies of central and national government and the different bodies that require collaboration at the local and regional level. As such, identifying a dominant power within the system is difficult, with influence and authority located at different levels of government.

Table 4 Education responsibilities in the Netherlands

| Level | Direct Competencies | Indirect Competencies |
|----------------|--|---|
| European Union | University student and staff exchange programmes Research funding and support | Encouragement of cooperation between member states on education and skills Monitoring of EU member states citizens' education levels Promotion of coordination between HE authorities |
| EU Agencies | N/A | Promotion of special needs education in member states |
| National level | Setting of overall educational standards for schools and Higher Education School financing kindergarten, primary, secondary, vocational training and higher education Collaboration with other countries on education and skills | Setting of Federal budget State policy on religious integration Education inspection |

| | | |
|---------------------|---|---|
| National agencies | Education inspection Coordination between provinces on education | Child-care and Protection Cultural heritage inspection Industry, Heritage and Arts and International Policy Vocational education |
| Provincial level | Educational institution supervision and legal monitoring Administrative functions related to education | Economic development Welfare administration Research and Innovation Partnerships Sports and recreation |
| Provincial agencies | N/A | N/A |
| Local level | Curriculum design (schools) School management and education, including meeting the attainment targets (school boards) Translation of broad government objectives into teaching and examination regulations (Universities) Liaison between local education organisations Adult education funding | Sports and Leisure Local culture Social welfare Employment interventions |

The Netherlands operates an education system which is centralised *and* decentralised, with competencies split between the national and local level. While local and provincial governments play a significant role, the central education ministry is the decisive institution within the education system in determining outcomes, while schools and school boards enjoy a large amount of freedom in designing an approach which meets with the centrally set objectives, including setting the school curriculum, and school management. This dynamic is present in all levels of state education provision, encompassing pre-school education, primary and secondary education, and is mirrored in the provision of higher education, where central government sets the broad objectives of higher education in the Netherlands whilst Higher Education institutions are required to translate these objectives into teaching and examination plans.

Beyond this, national government plays an indirect role in its setting of the overall fiscal framework in which the education system operates, with education policymakers inevitably constrained by the budgetary and broader fiscal environment. There are also other national policy competencies held at the national level, such as state competency over religious matters, which is significant given the societal cleavages caused by religion and the manner in which governance structures have evolved to take account of these factors. National Agencies contribute to the formulation of education policy in the Netherlands, and are required to carry out school inspections. Indirectly, agencies contribute to education provision through management of childcare, and cultural and heritage policy, which link to differing extents into the state education system.

The provinces of the Netherlands enjoy few competencies directly relevant to education, where their role is largely administrative and limited to supervision and legal monitoring, and some elements of administration. However, provincial government does possess some powers which influence in different ways the overall education system, including economic and regional development, and sports and education. Municipal government is more directly involved, fostering collaboration and coordination between different local education institutions, as well as an involvement in employment and welfare policies and local cultural policies. However, education in the Netherlands is fundamentally defined by a relationship between central government and the one hand, and those institutions which actually carry out education on the other, with the two tiers of government in between peripherally influential. The European Union also plays a role, but limited to monitoring, coordination, and funding at the Higher Education level. In sum, the picture of education policy competencies in the Netherlands reveals a complicated and interdependent system in which clear lines of competence are obscured by the broader picture of policymaking.

Table 5 Mapping Education Policy in Greece

| Level | Direct Competencies | Indirect Competencies |
|-------------------|--|---|
| European Union | University student and staff exchange programmes Research funding and support | Encouragement of cooperation between member states on education and skills Monitoring of EU member states citizens' education levels Promotion of coordination between HE authorities |
| EU Agencies | N/A | Promotion of special needs education in member states |
| National level | Broad direction of higher education policy General oversight of education system National curriculum, Funding of educational institutions | Government budget allocation Research and development policy Ownership of land and resources Health and social services Religious affairs |
| National agencies | Implementation of educational policy Primary and secondary school coordination and organisation Teacher recruitment and management of teacher training and development Educational research | Research and technology |

| | | |
|---------------------|---|--|
| | Collaboration with community and businesses Regulation of private schools | |
| Provincial level | Lifelong learning and employment Cultural policy | Economy and spatial policy Distribution of European funds Child protection |
| Provincial agencies | N/A | N/A |
| Local level | Nurseries and pre-school education Physical maintenance of all schools Elements of adult education Administrative support to local schools | Theatres, museums, libraries Parks, sports and leisure facilities |

Education policy in Greece is largely the concern of the central government, and in particular its Ministry of Education. It oversees the entirety of the state education system, decides the national curriculum, allocates public funds to educational institutions, and is responsible for educational and cultural affairs (which connect to the role played by religious institutions in shaping education more broadly). The national level is also responsible for the broad fiscal framework and policy areas with a link into education (such as research and development). Higher Education institutions enjoy a high level of independence from central government, but in this context of overall budget and policy responsibility.

Regional directorates of the Education Ministry are responsible for the implementation of government policy, and other elements of policy delivery including teacher recruitment and training, the regulation of private educational institutions, and collaboration with local stakeholders. Their role is supplemented by other regional/provincial tiers of government which role in some elements of lifelong learning and cultural policy, and the distribution of European Union funding takes place along provincial/regional lines. Local government plays a large role in maintaining a network of nurseries and other forms of pre-school education, and in ensuring the physical maintenance of all schools within the state system. Local government has an adjacent role in local cultural policy and with local cultural institutions, such as theatres, museums, libraries, and sports and leisure. The European Union also plays a peripheral role, in terms of exchange, research, and cooperation between member states.

Table 6 Mapping education policy in Germany

| Level | Direct Competencies | Indirect Competencies |
|----------------|--|--|
| European Union | University student and staff exchange programmes Research funding and support | Encouragement of cooperation between member states on education and skills |

| | | |
|-------------------|--|---|
| | | Monitoring of EU member states citizens' education levels Promotion of coordination between HE authorities |
| EU Agencies | N/A | Promotion of special needs education in member states |
| National level | Coordination of provincial education ministers In-company vocational training and vocational further education Higher education admissions policy Financial assistance for pupils and students Research and development Youth welfare Correspondence courses Sponsorship of technical schools | Allocation of federal budget Certain professional qualification regulations Employment regulation Immigration policy |
| National agencies | Population and demographic research | Vocational education and training Coordination of public administration functions Federal personnel and payroll Promotion of German culture abroad and overseas educational partnerships |
| Provincial level | Primary and Secondary School management School inspections Adult education Higher education Adult and continuing education Co-operation between public and private schools Regulation of private education Management of higher education institutions Organisation, planning, management and supervision of the entire school system, | Budget and finance Public welfare Healthcare Local government finance |

| | | |
|---------------------|---|--|
| | Regulation of the schools' mission Recruitment and remuneration of teachers in schools and universities Specialist schools Setting individual school objectives Managing 'internal' school resources Curriculum development | |
| Provincial agencies | Coordination between Lander on education matters including in inspection, holidays, curriculum, and higher education performance and targets Teacher training School sport | School quality and education research Personnel management School counselling coordination |
| Local level | Social aid and youth Social services School buildings Procurement of teaching and learning materials; Non-personnel budgeting Management of administrative staff, school organisational matters Legal supervision of schools; | Local taxation Childcare |

The Lander are powerful regional governments that control much of domestic policy within the German federal system. The 'basic law' of Germany, analogous to a constitution, allocates legislative primacy to the Lander, who control the key elements of education policy. This includes the management and funding of schools, qualifications, admissions, teacher recruitment and training at pre-school, primary, and secondary level. The Lander also take responsibility for higher education institutions in most regards, though these institutions enjoy a higher degree of operational independence than do schools.

Still, the national level remains significant, with the Federal Government overseeing higher education admissions policy, financial assistance for students and pupils, research and development, elements of youth welfare, and correspondence courses. It also plays a role in facilitating the coordination of the Lander's education structures under the auspices of the federal government. This important

coordination role (categorised in Table 6 as an agency but really an institutionalised collaboration between Lander governments) has led to institutionally independent Lander taking similar decisions for similar reasons, with this coordination role partially responsible for the relative uniformity of structure and policy nationwide including over issues such as school holidays and language proficiency. This perhaps explains the high degree of similarity that can be found in terms of educational structures across nominally independent Lander education systems. Beyond this, there are also indirect competencies over education at the federal level, including national taxation policy, budgeting, and economic redistribution by regions, as well as immigration policies affecting resource allocation, staffing, and school places, which each play a significant role in shaping the broad context in which education policy is carried out.

The local level plays less of a role, but enjoys responsibilities over school maintenance and related procurement, as well as some administrative tasks. It also provides certain social services relevant to children and provides childcare, which interact in significant ways with the broader education system. At the European level, there are few direct competencies worth mentioning beyond structures which exist to facilitate university and staff exchange programmes, and which support an extensive array of research support and funding for higher education institutions. The EU also plays a role in promoting coordination between member states and their education authorities at provincial, regional, and local level.

4. Uncertain applications and meaning without engagement

Overall, we show that (a) these mapping exercises help develop an initial sense of policymaking, but also (b) highlight the difficulty of providing a simple comparison of responsibilities. Each country has its own narrative about the relationship between policy sectors and levels of government, and we can only identify that narrative somewhat from documents in the public record. A fuller discussion of each country requires (for example) interviews with experts and policymakers, to examine the ways in which they describe and navigate policymaking with these maps (Deliverable 6.4).

This limitation accentuates the issues about policy learning and ambiguity that we raise in Deliverable 6.1 and in our summary of WP1 issues in this report:

1. We seek to learn from one government's success (in reducing inequalities) and share lessons with other governments.
2. Deliverable 6.1 describes the ways in which we can establish comparability by, for example, establishing how a government describes success on its own terms, and establishing what lessons would be relevant to others.
3. This report Deliverable 6.2 adds an additional exercise, to establish which level or type of government is responsible for providing or taking lessons, and the extent to which multiple governments are involved in each case.

As we describe in Deliverable 6.4, when policymakers seek lessons from other governments, they address such complexity in simple ways. In Case Study 1, the relevant advisory group asked for a short and superficial report on recent trends in three countries. In Case Study 2, the relevant group combined a focus on (a) a literature review of international activity, and (b) direct lessons (via interviews) with three countries. Our analysis suggests that such measures, while clearly limited in scope, are necessary

to make the process of learning manageable. In other words, our direct engagement with policy actors warns us against producing too much nuance when comparing political systems and cases, since that level of detail may be counterproductive to policy learning in practice.

Summary of conclusions:

1. A focus on mapping policymaking responsibilities is essential to policy learning, but it also highlights the complexity of the overall IMAJINE project.
2. WP1 already identifies high levels of ambiguity regarding aims such as spatial justice and to reduce territorial inequalities.
3. WP1 also identifies hopes for ‘multi-level governance’ (MLG) to address territorial inequalities. In other words, encourage many levels and types of government to cooperate to reduce the size of the policy problem.
4. However, we identify key ways in which MLG can exacerbate the problem, in which there is high uncertainty about who is responsible for policy instruments and outcomes, and intergovernmental relations only address coordination issues somewhat.
5. This uncertainty begins when policymakers seek to identify (a) which policy tools and instruments are most relevant to inequalities, and (b) which level or type of government has responsibility for each instrument.
6. It continues when we use case studies to identify the need to map (a) formal responsibilities, and (b) the informal powers that are not described well in the public record.
7. This exercise in complexity is complete when we try to (a) produce simple and manageable tables to summarise levels of responsibility, and (b) compare responsibilities across countries. Rather, each country has its own rich narrative that does not correspond directly to another.
8. Policymakers manage complexity in simple ways, by limiting their focus to a small number of countries from which they would like to learn. In that context, our next report (Deliverable 6.4) uses case studies to illustrate the ways in which our analysis can aid this process.

References

Cairney, P. (2020) *Understanding Public Policy* 2nd ed (London: Red Globe)

Cairney and St Denny (2020) *Why isn't government policy more preventive?* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Cairney, P., McHarg, A. McEwen, N. and Turner, K. (2019) ‘How to conceptualise energy law and policy for an interdisciplinary audience: The case of post-Brexit UK’, *Energy Policy*, 129, June, 459-66

Lowi, T. (1964) ‘An American Business, Public Policy, Case-Studies, and Political Theory’, *World Politics*, 16, 4, 677–715

Heffron, R. and McCauley, D. (2018) “What is the ‘Just Transition’?” *Geoforum*, 88, January 2018, 74-77

Hood, C. and Margetts, H. (2007) *The tools of government in the digital age* (Basingstoke: Palgrave)

