

Julian L. Garritzmann, Leonce Röth, and Hanna Kleider:

Policy-making in Multi-Level Systems:

Ideology, Authority, and Education

Comparative Political Studies

Online Appendix II: The Regional Educational Authority Index

Coding of Regional Authority over Education

Next, we offer brief but detailed profiles of regions' authority over education policy from 1990 until 2010. As we are mainly interested in education spending, our codings focus on authority over education *funding*; it might equally hold for other aspects of education policy (e.g., teaching contents, teaching methods, teacher hiring-and-firing procedures, etc.) but this would need further investigation. We distinguish two dimensions of education policy: "Scope" and "Depth":

- Scope covers the number of education sectors that the regions are responsible for, distinguishing schooling (i.e. primary and secondary education) from post-secondary education (i.e. academic and vocational education). Scope thus covers how 'broad' the regions' influence is. The operationalizations are explained in the header of the table.
- Depth refers to the degree to which the regions are independent of central governments in making decisions about education (funding) decisions. It distinguishes to what degree regions have to follow national frameworks. Depth thus covers how 'deep' the regions' influence is. The operationalizations are explained in the header of the table.

Five general notes are important:

- Following the Regional Authority Project (Marks/Hooghe) we code regions' *de jure* powers. Yet, based on the scholarly literature and experts' evaluations, we also paid attention to circumstances where *de facto* powers differ from *de jure* powers. In the detailed country descriptions below we highlight these cases where necessary (and test for them in the empirical analysis).
- Unless otherwise stated, the codings refer to the period 1990-2010. In cases where there has been change in regions' authority over time, we differentiate further for different time periods.
- Unless otherwise stated, the codings refer to *all* regions within a country. In cases of asymmetric powers within countries, we differentiate these further by region.
- Our measure focuses on *regions'* authority. While it covers decentralization to a certain degree, it should not be confused with a measure of decentralization. For example, if regions' authority is low, this can mean that authority lies at a higher (national) level, but it could also lie at a lower (municipality, school district, or even school) level.
- For seven countries (Australia, Belgium, Canada, Germany, Spain, Switzerland, and the USA) we can disaggregate our spending data by education sector. More specifically, we can disaggregate the data for

higher education (vs. non-higher education) spending (in Canada and the US this data includes community colleges; in the remaining countries it focuses on academic higher education). In addition to the general regional education authority index, we thus also offer a more fine-grained education authority index for these countries, differentiating between tertiary and non-tertiary education.

Table A1_II: Overview REAI

Country	Region	Scope (general)	Scope (non-tertiary)	Scope (tertiary)	Depth (general)	Depth (non-tertiary)	Depth (tertiary)	REAI (general)
Australia	All regions	1	2	0	2	3	1.5	2
Austria	All regions	0 <i>de jure</i> ; but 0.5 <i>de facto</i>	-	-	1	-	-	0 <i>de jure</i> , 0.5 <i>de facto</i>
Belgium (1)	French-, and Flemish-speaking communities and Brussels	2	2	2	2.5	2.5	2.5	5
Belgium (2)	German-speaking community	1	2	0	1.5	2.5	0	1.5
Canada	All regions	2	2	2	3	3	3	6
Denmark	All regions	0	-	-	0.5	-	-	0
France	All regions (except extra-territorial ones)	0.5	-	-	1	-	-	0.5
Germany	All regions	2	2	2	3	3	3	6
Italy (1)	All regions (except special status)	0	-	-	1	-	-	0
Italy (2)	Trentino-Alto Adige/Südtirol (later split in two provinces: Trentino/Province of Trento and South Tyrol/Province of Bolzano), and Valle d' Aosta	2	-	-	2	-	-	4
Italy (3)	Sicily	0.5	-	-	2 <i>de jure</i> 2, 1 <i>de facto</i> .	-	-	1 <i>de jure</i> , 0.5 <i>de facto</i>
Italy (4)	Sardinia and Friuli-Venezia Giulia	0	-	-	1	-	-	0
Japan	All regions	1	-	-	1	-	-	1
Norway	All regions	0	-	-	0.5	-	-	0
Spain	All regions	There is considerable change over time, see the details in the Online Appendix	There is considerable change over time, see the details in the Online Appendix	There is considerable change over time, see the details in the Online Appendix	There is considerable change over time, see the details in the Online Appendix	There is considerable change over time, see the details in the Online Appendix	There is considerable change over time, see the details in the Online Appendix	There is considerable change over time, see the details in the Online Appendix
Sweden	All regions	0	-	-	0	-	-	0
Switzerland	All regions	1.5	2	1	2.5	3	2	3.75
UK (1)	Scotland & Wales	0 until 1997, and 2 since 1998	-	-	0 until 1997, and 3 since 1998	-	-	0 until 1997, 6 since 1998
UK (2)	Northern Ireland	0 until 1999, 2 in 2000-2002, 0 in 2003-2006, and 2 since 2007	-	-	0 until 1999, 3 in 2000-2002, 0 in 2003-2006, and 3 since 2007	-	-	0 until 1999, 6 between 2000-02, 0 between 2003-06, 6 since 2007
UK (3)	England	0	-	-	0	-	-	0
USA	All regions	2	2	2	3	3	3	6

Table A2_II: Coding decisions Regional Education Authority Index

Country	Scope	Depth	Sources
Definitions and operationalization	<p>0 = The regional government does <u>not</u> have authoritative competence over education funding (i.e. authority lies at a higher or lower level)</p> <p>1 = The regional government has authoritative competence over school (i.e. primary and secondary education) funding <u>or</u> over post-secondary (i.e. academic and vocational) education funding</p> <p>2 = The regional government has authoritative competence over school (i.e. primary and secondary education) funding <u>and</u> over postsecondary (i.e. academic and vocational) education funding</p>	<p>0 = A general-purpose administration at the regional level, which has <u>no</u> authoritative competence over education policy.</p> <p>1 = A general-purpose administration, which <u>executes central governments' education policy and has some authoritative competence</u> over education policy (e.g., years of schooling, number of students per class, closing of schools and opening of new schools).</p> <p>2 = A general-purpose administration with authoritative competence over education policy (years of schooling, students per class, subjects, syllabus, closing of schools and opening of new schools) <u>subject to</u> central government frameworks.</p> <p>3 = A general-purpose administration with authoritative competence over education policy (years of schooling, students per class, subjects, syllabus, closing of schools and opening of new schools) <u>not subject to</u> central government frameworks.</p>	<p><i>All coding decisions are based on primary and secondary sources (i.e. on bills/laws and on scholarly literature) as well as – in ambiguous cases – on consultation with country experts.</i></p>
	<p><i>Note: In some countries regions have authority only over some parts of the school system. For example, in Norway regions are responsible for upper-secondary education (but not for primary and lower-secondary education). In these cases, we assign "intermediary" codes, for example 0.5 in the case of Norway.</i></p>		

<p>Australia</p>	<p>The regions in Australia score 1 in general. Disaggregated for educational sectors, the regions in Australia score 2 for non-postsecondary education and 0 for post-secondary education (the regions have some authority over vocational post-secondary education but not over academic higher education – as our disaggregated spending data focuses on higher education, we thus code a 0).</p> <p>Authority over education funding varies in Australia depending on the educational sector and the type of school:</p> <p>Primary and secondary education are compulsory, but the number of years varies across regions. There is a major difference between public (“government”) and private (“non-governmental”) schools. Public schools are mainly (90+%) funded by the regions, private schools are heavily supported (despite their name) by the federal government but also receive some funding from the regional governments. Around 65% of the pupils attend public schools.</p> <p>Funding of vocational education and training varies across regions and is co-funded by the federal and the regional governments. The system is rather complex due to a high number of different VET institutions (e.g. the national level funds VET via support of firms that conduct apprenticeships).</p> <p>Authority over funding higher education lies with the federal government (largely provided through the “Commonwealth Grant Scheme”). Yet, a</p>	<p>The regions in Australia score 2 on depth. Disaggregated for educational sectors, Australia scores 3 for non-post-secondary education and 1.5 for post-secondary education (much authority over VET, but little/none over academic higher education).</p> <p>The regional governments make most education decisions regarding schools and vocational education and training (VET) and in many regions also regarding preschools (see discussion for “scope”). Yet, more authority has been granted to the schools themselves since 2003 (according to an OECD study, schools take 49% of decisions and the regions take 51%).</p> <p>Authority over higher education lies with the federal government (although the higher education institutions themselves have a high degree of autonomy).</p> <p>There are intermediary bodies to facilitate/ensure exchange and cooperation between the different governmental levels (e.g., the “Council of Australian Governments”, “the Standing Council on School Education and Early Childhood”, and “the Standing Council on Tertiary Education, Skills and Employment”), but these rather create voluntary regulation</p>	<p>- OECD. (June 2013) Education Policy Outlook: Australia. Retrieved from: http://www.oecd.org/education/EDUCATION%20POLICY%20OUTLOOK%20AUSTRALIA_EN.pdf</p> <p>- several English-speaking Wikipedia pages (e.g., https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Education_in_Australia and https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Australian_Curriculum)</p> <p>- see also the detailed case study in (the online appendix) of Kleider, Hanna, Leonce Röth, and Julian L. Garritzmann. 2017, Ideological Alignment and the Distribution of Public Expenditures. West European Politics, Online First: https://doi.org/10.1080/01402382.2017.1395634</p>
------------------	---	---	--

	<p>considerable share (50+%) of total higher education spending comes from private sources, mainly from tuition fees.</p>	<p>and variation between the regions remains very strong. In 2010 a reform (“Australian Curriculum”) was made to harmonize and standardize curricula across regions, but it was only implemented (in some regions) as off 2014, so it is not relevant for our sample.</p>	
Austria	<p>The regions in Austria score 0 <i>de jure</i>; but <i>de facto</i> 0.5. The coding of 0.5 is thus more realistic and should be used empirically.</p> <p>Authority over education policy-making in Austria is quite complex to understand and there is a difference between <i>de facto</i> and <i>de jure</i> powers: <i>De jure</i>, the regional governments in Austria do not have authoritative competence over education policy (according to Art. 14 of the constitution). Instead, the federal government is responsible for primary, secondary, and post-secondary education. Formally, the regional governments just administer federal funding, which is almost completely earmarked. Thus, <i>de jure</i> the regional governments hardly have any authority over funding.</p> <p><i>De facto</i>, however, the regions do have a couple of opportunities to shape funding, e.g., because the federal government <i>de facto</i> bails them out even if they overspend (e.g., by hiring more teachers) via fiscal transfers (Nusche et al. 2016: 89). An OECD expert team on the politics of education in Austria concluded: “The current funding arrangements allow province governments to spend more than</p>	<p>The regions in Austria score 1 on depth.</p> <p>The regional government executes central education policy and is responsible for maintenance and staffing matters at compulsory schools. However, the major part of funding is contributed by the federal government, either by directly funding upper secondary schools and colleges, or by covering the personnel expenses of the compulsory schools which are maintained by the provincial governments.</p>	<p>- Eurydice. (December 2016) Country profile Austria. Retrieved from: https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/fpfis/mwikis/eurydice/index.php/Austria:Overview</p> <p>- Nusche, Deborah, Thomas Radinger, Marius R. Busemeyer, and Henno Theisens. 2016. OECD Reviews of School Resources: Austria 2016. Paris: OECD Publishing. http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/docserver/download/9116061e.pdf?expires=1497467726&id=id&accname=guest&checksum=53B94A75329192281C3BE8BB27CB6CE6</p>

	<p>budgetary planning actually allows for, with little consequences. [...] On the other hand, the province governments feel constrained by the existing regulations. From the perspective of the provinces, the current fiscal arrangements grant them little flexibility in devoting more resources to particular priorities as identified by local stakeholders since all earmarked funding for specific educational needs has to be formally agreed upon in the fiscal adjustment negotiations“ (Nusche et al. 2016: 102).</p> <p>More specifically, <i>Bundesschulen</i> (= general academic secondary schools and upper secondary schools and colleges) are financed directly by the federal government, whereas <i>Landesschulen</i> (= general compulsory schools = “APS”) are financed by individual provinces and municipalities, mainly via financial transfers from the central government (Nusche et al. 2016: 80). Financial transfers for teaching personnel are negotiated between the federal and the regional level (Nusche et al. 2016: 83). But 90% is just based on teacher-student-ratios and 10% are earmarked for special-needs students and other factors, e.g., language teaching (ibid.). Thus, there seems little leeway for politics. Yet, in practice this looks different: “Even though transfers are based on agreed staff plans, the federal government has no control on the use of funds after the transfer has occurred. Therefore, provincial governments can and do use these funds to pursue individual policy priorities such as supporting small rural schools. This may lead to overspending on the part of the provinces, which is partly compensated by the federal government” (ibid.).</p>		
--	---	--	--

<p>Belgium</p>	<p>The regions in Belgium score 2 on scope (both in general as well as disaggregated for post-secondary and non-post-secondary education), except for the German community which scores 1.</p> <p>The Belgian federation consists of three language-based communities (Flemish, French, and German-speaking) and three territorial regions (Flemish, Walloon, and Brussels), which overlap to a large degree, but are politically and analytically distinct. Authoritative competence for education in Belgium has been transferred to the three linguistically based communities (partially in 1981 and fully in 1988). All three communities have strong competences over education funding and thus all three score 2 on scope. The central government only plays a very minor role (defining, for example, the compulsory school age).</p> <p>In the following, we thus provide analyze the authoritative capacities of the three language-based communities, but also consider the Brussels-Capital territorial region (as spending data is provided on this level).</p> <p><u>a) Flemish community</u></p> <p>The responsibilities and competencies of the Flemish speaking community and of the Flemish territorial region have been combined from the very beginning on, when the constitutional reform that turned Belgium in into a federation entered into force in 1995. They are formally recognized as one unit. The government in the Flemish community has authoritative competence over primary, secondary,</p>	<p>The regions in Belgium score 2.5 on depth (both in general as well as disaggregated for post-secondary and non-post-secondary education), except for the German-speaking community, which scores lower (=0) for post-secondary education and therefore receives the general score 1.5</p> <p>The communities have a high degree of authority over all aspects of education policy (e.g., teaching methods, curricula, timetables, staff appointments, etc.). Yet, the central government retains three competencies: The determination of the starting and finishing ages for compulsory education, minimum requirements for diploma conferrals, and the regulation of retirement for employees in the education system (cf. Eurydice). The Belgian regions thus score 2.5 on depth.</p>	<p>- Eurydice. (October 2016) Country profile Belgium (German-speaking Community). Retrieved from: https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/fpfis/mwikis/eurydice/index.php/Belgium-German-Speaking-Community:Overview</p> <p>- https://eacea.ec.europa.eu/national-policies/eurydice/content/belgium-german-speaking-community_en (accessed 10 May 2018)</p> <p>- Eurydice. (November 2016) Country profile Belgium (Flemish Community). Retrieved from: https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/fpfis/mwikis/eurydice/index.php/Belgium-Flemish-Community:Overview</p> <p>- https://eacea.ec.europa.eu/national-policies/eurydice/content/belgium-flemish-community_en (accessed 10 May 2018)</p> <p>- Eurydice. (September 2011) Country profile Belgium (French Community). Retrieved from: https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/fpfis</p>
----------------	---	--	--

	<p>and postsecondary education.</p> <p><u>b) French community</u> The French speaking community and the Walloon region have kept their respective representative bodies separate. Although the language communities – not the regions – are theoretically responsible for the education, this responsibility is shared in practice in the case of the French speaking community, since it has encountered financial problems in recent years. In this dataset the expenditure of the French-speaking community and the Walloon region have therefore been combined. All education policies are organized, decided upon, and financed by the French Community.</p> <p><u>c) German-Speaking community</u> The German speaking community is located within the Walloon region, which takes over some services from which the German speaking community benefits, i.e. school transport. Yet, (almost) all educational facilities in the German-Speaking Community are organized and financed by the Community or are subsidized by the Community. The German community does not, however, fund and organize its own higher education institutions. The German-speaking community thus receives a lower general score on the scope dimension (=1) than the other communities (= 2). Disaggregated, this community receives a 2 for non-postsecondary education and a 0 for post-secondary education.</p> <p><u>d) Brussels</u></p>		<p>/mwikis/eurydice/index.php/Belgium-French-Community:Organisation_and_Governance</p> <p>-</p> <p>https://eacea.ec.europa.eu/national_policies/eurydice/content/belgium-french-community_en (accessed: 10 May 2018)</p> <p>-</p> <p>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Education_in_Belgium</p> <p>-</p> <p>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/State_reform_in_Belgium</p>
--	---	--	--

	<p>In the case of Brussels, the representative body of the region as well as councils representing the language communities (Flemish and French) in Brussels decide about spending. Their expenditure is therefore combined in this dataset to make up a single Brussels region.</p>		
Canada	<p>The regions in Canada score 2 on scope (both in general and for post-secondary and non-postsecondary education separately.)</p> <p>Under the Canadian Constitution (“The Constitution Act” 1867) educational policy for all levels of education is under the jurisdiction of the ten provincial and –in contrast to most other policy fields – the three territorial governments. A ministry or department of education at the federal level does not exist. As all the provincial and territorial legislatures have developed their own educational structures and institutions, there are 13 education systems in Canada with many similarities and some differences. Post-secondary education in Canada also lies within the responsibility of the individual provinces and territories.</p> <p>The federal level only has minor tasks in education policy, e.g., it is responsible for the “Royal Military College of Canada”, for funding of education of indigenous peoples, and it contributes some funding to other forms of education (partly via transfer payments to the regional governments [“Canadian Social Transfer”]), but these are not ear-marked and mainly unconditional).</p>	<p>The regions in Canada score 3 on depth (in general as well as disaggregated) as the federal government does not possess any authoritative competence over any facet of educational policy.</p> <p>The Canadian provinces have authoritative competence over education policy curriculum, personnel, number of students etc. that is not subject to central government frameworks.</p> <p>Educational policy is decentralized in Canada, as each of its 13 jurisdictions is responsible for the organization, delivery, and assessment of the education system. School boards or school districts are entrusted with decision-making competencies, yet the level of delegated authority is at the discretion of provincial/territorial government. Following OECD statistics Canadian schools have less autonomy, as only 19% of decision-making takes place at school level, vis-à-vis 49% at the board/district level and 31% at provincial/territorial level.</p>	<p>- OECD. (January 2015) Education Policy Outlook: Canada. Retrieved from: http://www.oecd.org/edu/EDUCATION%20POLICY%20OUTLOOK%20CANADA.pdf</p> <p>- The Council of Ministers of Education, Canada. (2008) Education in Canada: An Overview. Retrieved from: http://www.cmec.ca/299/Education-in-Canada-An-overview/</p> <p>- several Wikipedia pages in English, German, and French (e.g., https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Education_in_Canada and https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Provinces_and_territories_of_Canada and https://fr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Éducation_au_Québec)</p> <p>- The Council of Ministers of Education’s website: https://www.cmec.ca/11/About_Us.html</p>

	<p>There is an intergovernmental body, the Council of Ministers of Education, Canada (CMEC), founded in 1967 that aims to coordinate and discuss policy issues and functions as a de-facto representation of the education interests both vis-à-vis the federal government and internationally.</p> <p>The “Learn Canada 2020 framework” of 2008 aims at enhancing Canada’s education systems, learning opportunities, overall education outcomes and notably life-long learning capacities, While it constitutes a joint declaration by provincial and territorial ministers of education this does not limit the regional authority and rather represents a voluntary coordination attempt that is exceptional neither in scope nor depth.</p> <p>In short, the Canadian provinces and territories have authoritative competence over all forms of education. The federal government has only very limited authority.</p>	<p>Regulation and policies in early childhood education and care also rest with the provincial and territorial governments.</p> <p>In general, post-secondary scale publicly funded universities enjoy higher degrees of autonomy, more so than publicly founded colleges.</p> <p>Secondary education funding is provided directly by provincial/territorial governments. On post-secondary education, however, the federal government allocates indirect funding through transfer payments to the provinces and territories (the Canada Social Transfer), the latter in turn combine this federal funding with their own support for post-secondary education and can freely allot these resources.</p> <p>Canada spends more on education in relative to its GDP than most OECD countries. Notably, on post-secondary education only 48% of the overall expenditure comes from public sources, well below the OECD average of 70%. This is largely due to the much higher household contributions compared to other OECD members.</p>	<p>- https://www.cicic.ca/1301/Ministries-Departments-responsible-for-education-in-Canada/index.canada</p>
--	---	---	--

Denmark	<p>The regions in Denmark score 0 on scope.</p> <p>Education policy in Denmark is decentralized and delivered by municipalities (and not regions). The municipalities finance pre-primary and childhood education as well as (public and mostly private) lower-secondary schools. The national government funds upper-secondary education (via a taximeter systems, i.e. funds are distributed to schools based on per-capita/enrollment rates). The national government also funds post-secondary education (especially academic higher education; vocational education and training is partly co-funded by companies via the dual apprenticeship system).</p> <p>The regions' (amter/regioner) role in education funding is very limited. Regions are mainly responsible for other policy areas (health care and some transfer policies) and hardly have responsibilities in education policy. The exception is special education, which is funded by the regions (via the other government levels), but this is only a very small part of the education system both in terms of enrollment levels and educational funding.</p> <p>Denmark thus scores 0 on scope.</p>	<p>The regions in Denmark score 0.5 on depth.</p> <p>The national government's Ministry of Education establishes goals and content for educational policy, and the 98 (before 2007: 271) municipalities (and not regions) are responsible to maintain and monitor the overall quality of the schools. Post-compulsory education institutions (upper-secondary education schools) have autonomy to develop educational opportunities and pedagogy. They are self-governing, although they operate under rules established by the Ministry of Education. Post-secondary institutions similarly are autonomous but operate under rules established by the education ministries. The regions have only very limited influence over education policy (e.g., on the design of special education and adult education). Denmark thus receives an intermediary score of 0.5 on depth.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - OECD. (April 2014) Education Policy Outlook: Denmark. Retrieved from: http://www.oecd.org/edu/EDUCATION%20POLICY%20OUTLOOK%20DENMARK_EN.pdf - Eurydice. (November 2016) Country profile Denmark. Retrieved from: https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/fpfis/mwikis/eurydice/index.php/Denmark:Overview - The Danish Regions' website: www.regioner.dk - The Danish Ministry of Education's website: www.uvm.dk - Cf. Also the Legislative provisions of Act No. 575 of 9 June 2006
---------	---	---	---

<p>France</p>	<p>The regions in France score 0.5 on scope.</p> <p>Historically, authority over education policy has been – and to a certain degree has remained – highly centralized. The central government has taken most funding and governance decisions. Yet, in 1982/83 ('Acte I') a decentralization reform granted some authority over education policy to lower-level regions; another reform in 2003/04 ('Acte II') cemented the subnational levels' authority. The 1982/83 reform granted the regions some authority over some forms of secondary education and over apprenticeship trainings; the 2003/04 reform added some opportunities to shape adult learning.</p> <p>The central state still decides over and contributes the largest share of funds (covering, for example, salaries of the teaching staff and their pensions). Yet, the subnational entities also co-finance and partially decide over education policy: Regions co-finance upper-secondary education (being responsible for the construction and maintenance of school buildings, for pupil transportation, and for non-teaching staff); départements (co-)finance lower-secondary education; municipalities (co-)finance primary education.</p> <p>Thus, the regions in France score 0.5 as they can decide over some education sectors, but do not score higher because they do not have the final word on either school or post-secondary education funding. We assign the value 0.5 for the entire period of analysis (1990-2010) because the 2003/04 reform did not considerably change the distribution of power.</p>	<p>The regions in France score 1 on depth.</p> <p>Authority over education policy remains highly centralized in Paris. The central government defines and organizes and decides over curricula, teaching contents; it is responsible for teacher education and recruitment and for quality controls in the education system. The regions have some administrative capacities and have some authoritative competencies, but overall these remain very limited and always under the control of the central government. The French regions thus score 1 on depth. We assign the value 1 for the entire period of analysis (1990-2010) because the 2003/04 reform did not considerably change the distribution of power.</p> <p>Note: Our measure concentrates on the intra-territorial regions and excludes the five extra-territorial regions: French Guiana, Guadeloupe, Martinique, Mayotte, Réunion. Their authority might differ.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Eurydice country report on France: https://eacea.ec.europa.eu/national_policies/eurydice/content/funding-education-27_en (accessed 10 May 2018) - Cole, Alistair (2005) Territorial Politics and Welfare Development in France. In: Nicola McEwen and Luis Moreno (eds.) <i>The Territorial Politics of Welfare</i>. London & New York: Routledge. - Cole, Alistair (2006) Decentralization in France: Central Steering, Capacity Building, and Identity Construction. <i>French Politics</i> 4(1): 31-57. - Several wikipedia pages on regions and decentralization in France: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Decentralisation_in_France (accessed 10 May 2018) and https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Regions_of_France (accessed 10 May 2018) and https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Politics_of_France#Local_government (accessed 10 May 2018)
---------------	--	--	---

	<p>Note: Our measure concentrates on the intra-territorial regions and excludes the five extra-territorial regions: French Guiana, Guadeloupe, Martinique, Mayotte, Réunion. Their authority might differ.</p>		
Germany	<p>The regions in Germany score 2 on scope (both in general and for post-secondary and non-postsecondary education separately).</p> <p>Due to the constitutionally guaranteed “Kulturhoheit der Länder” (i.e. authority of the Länder in cultural and education policy), the Länder are and have been the most important political authority level for education policy since 1949. The federal level has only very limited options to engage in education policy, as many activities are restricted by the constitution (e.g., the constitutional court famously ruled that the federal government overstretched its authority when it tried to forbid tuition fees, ruling this a matter of the Länder). Thus, the Länder remain the main funder of education for primary, secondary, and post-secondary education. The partial exception is early childhood education and care, which officially is not part of “education</p>	<p>The regions in Germany score 3 on scope (both in general and for post-secondary and non-postsecondary education separately).</p> <p>Similarly to the discussion on “scope”, authority over education governance, contents, etc. are decided by the Länder level and are not subject to central government frameworks. There are some attempts and mechanisms to achieve coherence and comparability across German Länder (mainly with the Kultusministerkonferenz, i.e. a regular meeting of the education ministers of all Länder), but the Länder are legally unrestricted in their decision-making authorities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lange, Hermann (2007). Föderales Handeln in einer nicht-föderalen Gesellschaft? Föderalismusreform und Bildungspolitik. <i>Erziehungswissenschaft</i> 18: 137-164. - Hildebrandt, Achim and Frieder Wolf (2016). Die Politik der Bundesländer. Zwischen Föderalismusreform und Schuldenbremse. 2. Auflage. Wiesbaden: VS. - Wolf, Frieder, and Dominic Heinz. (2016). Schulpolitik: Neue Koordination und neue Unterschiede. In: Achim Hildebrandt and Frieder Wolf

	<p>policy” but of “social policy”, rendering different authorities. Moreover, the federal government has found ways to (co-)fund some education policies, e.g., financial student aid (BAföG), which however only is a very minor spending share; more recently the federal level has launched a more considerable investment package with the “Excellence Initiative” / “Excellence Strategy”.</p> <p>Over time, the level of authority has not changed much. There was one important reform (“Föderalismusreform I”) in 2006 which affected education policy, but it basically (at least for our period of observation) only strengthened decentralization processes even further. Thus, we code Germany “2” both before and after this reform. A more fine-grained, qualitative analysis would reveal that there have been some changes (e.g., after 2006 the Länder were (almost) solely responsible for construction of education buildings, which earlier on was co-funded by the federal level), but overall these changes do not justify coding Germany differently before and after 2006.</p>		<p>(2016). Die Politik der Bundesländer. Zwischen Föderalismusreform und Schuldenbremse. 2. Auflage (pp. 11-34). Wiesbaden: VS.</p> <p>- several Wikipedia pages on the German education system and the Föderalismusreformen</p>
--	--	--	--

<p>Italy</p>	<p>The regions in Italy generally score 0 on scope, but there is some within-case variation, as explained below.</p> <p>The federal government is responsible for the general funding and organization of the education system and takes most decisions. This means that the national level defines educational standards regarding quality, personnel, and funding.</p> <p>State schools are funded through the budget of the national Ministry of Education, University and Research (MIUR). Regions have to provide funding for some minor aspects (social and health assistance for students as well as taking care of financing plans for new school buildings), but the regions do not hold funding competences over any education level.</p> <p>Regional authorities do hold have legislative competence over some vocational education and training (IFP), i.e. a more dual apprenticeship type. Yet, only a minority of students chooses this track (more choose academic education or school based vocational training) and it only constitutes a minor part of the education system. Moreover, the regions are responsible for some higher education student aid spending (and differ in how much they distribute here), but again this only constitutes a minor part of the total spending (cf. Garritzmann 2016).</p> <p>The Italian regions thus generally score 0 on scope.</p>	<p>The regions in Italy generally score 1 on depth, but there is some within-case variation, as explained below.</p> <p>The national level (Ministry of Education, University, and Research [MIUR]) sets all the guiding standards. On the regional level, the decentralized offices of the national government (called Regional School Offices) are responsible for the implementation of general educational provisions and standards. Moreover, regions establish the annual school calendar as well as the distribution of schools in their region. Regional and national authorities meet and coordinate in the State-Region Conference. Yet, the regional level mainly holds operational tasks and the important decisions are made by the national policy-makers (or the schools themselves).</p> <p>Regions are responsible for some smaller organizational issues (school premises, organization of the school network, etc.), but overall the regions remain largely powerless and they always work together with the national ministry via the State-Region Conference.</p> <p>The Italian regions thus generally score 1 on depth.</p>	<p>- Eurydice. (January 2015) Country profile Italy. Retrieved from: https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/fpfis/mwikis/eurydice/index.php/Italy:Organisation_and_Governance</p> <p>- Cf. also: https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/fpfis/mwikis/eurydice/index.php/Italy:Administration_and_Governance_at_Central_and/or_Regional_Level</p> <p>- OECD (2017) Education Policy Outlook: Italy.</p> <p>- several German and English Wikipedia articles on education policy in Italy (e.g., https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Regions_of_Italy and https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Education_in_Italy and https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Secondary_education_in_Italy#Scuola_secondaria_di_primo_grado and https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ministerium_für_Unterricht,_Universitäten_und_Forschung_(Italien) and https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Italienische_Regionen#cite_note-7)</p> <p>- Grimaldi, Emiliano, and Roberto</p>
--------------	---	---	--

	<p>There is, however, some within-case variation: The five (later: six) regions with a special status differ to some degree from the other regions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the regional governments in Trentino-Alto Adige/Südtirol (later split in two provinces: Trentino/Province of Trento and South Tyrol/Province of Bolzano), and Valle d'Aosta have larger authorities over more education areas than the other regions (e.g., about kindergartens, VET, higher education, and other cultural policies). For example, Bozen-Bolzano funds its own university, the Free University of Bozen-Bolzano, founded in 1997. But overall, most universities are public and funded by the central government. They thus score 2 on scope. - The regional government in Sicily has authority over primary schools and shared authority with the central government over secondary education. Sicily thus scores 0.5 on scope. - In Sardinia and Friuli-Venezia Giulia the central government remains responsible for funding. They thus score 0 on scope. <p>Over time change: There has been some change in the governance system, for example with a reform in 1997, but these reforms only decentralized authority to the school level and did not affect authority of the regional level. There have been attempts to grant the regions more authority over education policy (e.g., under Berlusconi), but these failed (in referenda). Moreover, there have been some reform attempts</p>	<p>There is, however, some within-case variation: The five (later: six) regions with a special status differ to some degree from the other regions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the regional governments in Trentino-Alto Adige/Südtirol (later split in two provinces: Trentino/Province of Trento and South Tyrol/Province of Bolzano), and Valle d'Aosta have wider authorities over the design of education policy. They thus score 2 on depth (but not 3, because they still have to follow the central government's framework). - The regional governments in Sardinia and Friuli-Venezia Giulia have some authorities, but basically can only implement the central government's decision. They thus score 1 on depth. - Sicily de jure has quite similar competences to e.g. Trentino-Alto Adige, but de facto it is similar to Sardinia and Friuli-Venezia Giulia. Sicily de jure thus scores 2, de facto 1. 	<p>Serpieri (2012) The transformation of the education state in Italy: a critical policy historiography from 1944 to 2011. <i>Italian Journal of Sociology of Education</i> 1: 146-180.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cedefop (2014) Vocational education and training in Italy: Short description. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union. - http://www.secondowelfare.it/primo-welfare/diventare-duali-struttura-e-riforma-della-formazione-professionale-in-italia.html - Garritzmann, Julian L. (2016) The Political Economy of Higher Education Finance. The Politics of Tuition Fees and Subsidies in OECD Countries, 1945-2015. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
--	---	---	---

	and reforms, but they fall behind our period of analysis (after 2010).		
Japan	<p>The regions in Japan score 1 on scope.</p> <p>The regional government in Japan has limited authoritative competence over primary and secondary education (some more authority over upper-secondary education). Post-secondary education is governed by the national level.</p> <p>Primary & secondary education: There is a major difference between public and private schools. <i>Public</i> schools are funded jointly by the national, regional, and municipal level (teacher salaries, e.g., are funded 2/3 by the regional level and 1/3 by the national government). <i>Private</i> schools (which are more common in urban areas) also receive public funding (the national government pays 50% of the teachers' salaries), but they charge higher tuition. At the primary and lower-secondary level, 95-99% of the schools are public; at the upper-secondary level</p>	<p>The regions in Japan score 1 on depth.</p> <p>The regions have some administrative tasks and some decision authority, but education policy-making remains highly centralized and regions always have to comply with national standards and decisions.</p> <p>Educational frameworks and standards are provided by the national government and are heavily centralized. The national Ministry of Education (MOE/MEXT) determines curriculum standards and other national educational requirements for teachers and programs from the level of early childhood education to upper secondary schools and post-secondary education. For VET, the national Ministry</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - OECD. (November 2015) Education Policy Outlook: Japan. Retrieved from: https://www.oecd.org/edu/Japan-country-profile.pdf - http://ncee.org/what-we-do/center-on-international-education-benchmarking/top-performing-countries/japan-overview/japan-system-and-school-organization/ - several Wikipedia articles (e.g., https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Prefectures_of_Japan and https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ministry_of_Education,_Culture,_Sports,_Science_and_Technology and

	<p>about 77% are public. That is, regional governments co-fund public schools, but not private schools. Yet, as most schools are public, the regional level is involved a lot in education policy.</p> <p>Post-secondary education: The national government is responsible for financing national higher education institutions. There are some differences between public and private universities as well as between national and local public universities, but as most students attend private universities and pay considerable tuition fees, the public spending amounts are comparatively low.</p> <p>VET: As Japan has a dual apprenticeship system, companies/firms cover a considerable share of the costs; the national government via the Ministry of Health, Labor, and Welfare, covers the school-related part. (Note: there are more VET schools in rural areas).</p>	<p>of Health, Labor, and Welfare sets the standards.</p> <p>The prefectural governments are required to implement the national educational frameworks according to school infrastructure on the regional level.</p> <p>The regional and municipal level have several tasks and functions in the education system and make many decisions (see OECD 2015), but in the end, important decisions are made on the national level and are controlled by the MOE/MEXT. The prefectural governments are required to implement the national educational frameworks according to school infrastructure on the regional level.</p> <p>At the regional level, there is a board of five (?) governor-appointed members, which is responsible for some activities, such as teacher appointments (to primary and secondary education), funding municipalities, and appointing a regional super-intendant for education.</p>	<p>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Higher_education_in_Japan#Entrance)</p> <p>- Reed, Steven R. (1986) Japanese Prefectures and Policymaking. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.</p> <p>- Garritzmann, Julian L. (2016) The Political Economy of Higher Education Finance. The Politics of Tuition Fees and Subsidies in OECD Countries, 1945-2015. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.</p>
--	--	---	--

<p>Norway</p>	<p>The regions in Norway score 0.5 on scope.</p> <p>County governments are responsible for upper secondary education (academic and vocational tracks in uppers-secondary education). They fund upper secondary education through own taxes and block grants from the national government.</p> <p>Municipalities have responsibility for managing early childhood education, primary and lower secondary schools, which they finance through local taxes and block grants (which are not ear-marked) from the central government. A school reform in 2006 (“Knowledge Promotion Reform”) granted municipalities larger authority but did not affect regional (county) competences.</p> <p>Universities and other higher education institutions are largely funded by the national government.</p> <p>Norway thus scores 0.5, because the regions have some authority over spending, but only for one (smaller) part of the education system: upper-secondary education.</p>	<p>The regions in Norway score 0 on depth.</p> <p>The Norwegian Government determines the framework and standards (curricula etc.) for the education system and the national education policy through the Ministry of Education and Research. This ministry is also responsible for universities and university colleges. The county governors (and their offices) have some tasks to link the municipalities’ and the central governments’ policy-making, but overall their influence seems rather limited, which is why Norway scores 0.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - OECD (2011) Improving lower secondary schools in Norway. OECD Publishing. - OECD. (November 2013) Education Policy Outlook: Norway. Retrieved from: http://www.oecd.org/norway/EDUCATION%20POLICY%20OUTLOOK%20NORWAY_EN.pdf - the Norwegian Ministry of Education’s homepage: https://www.regjeringen.no/en/dep/kd/id586/ - www.fylkesmannen.no - https://www.fylkesmannen.no/en/Nursery-schools-and-education/Primary-and-lower-and-upper-secondary-education/ - Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research (2006) Kunnskapsløftet. Knowledge Promotion. Information for pupils and and parents/guardians: What is new in the 10-year compulsory school and upper secondary schools from the autumn of 2006? Oslo.
---------------	---	---	---

			<p>- Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training (2012) The education mirror 2012. Analysis of primary and secondary education and training in Norway. Oslo: Wittusen & Jensen.</p>
Spain	<p>Over time, the regions' authority over education policy has changed considerably. Historically, the regions had little influence on education policy; yet, all regions (with the partial exception of Navarre) have subsequently received full authority over education funding – albeit at different points at time. That is, authority has been granted asymmetrically (cf. León-Alfonso 2007).</p> <p>All regions score 0 on scope but change over time as detailed below (according to León-Alfonso 2007, if not otherwise stated):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Andalusia: received authority over school funding in 1982 and over higher education in 1986. It thus scores 0 until 1982, 1 from 1982-1985, and 2 since 1986. - Aragon: received authority over school funding in 1998 and over higher education 	<p>Analogous to the 'scope' dimension the 'depth' scores change over time from 0 to 2 in the respective years indicate in the column on the left. Once they received authority, the regions in Spain score 2 on depth, both in general as well as disaggregated for post-secondary and non-post-secondary education.</p> <p>The Spanish central government sets the general legal framework for educational policies including the organization of all different school levels and their curricula through the Ministry of Education, Culture and Sport. Yet, the regional ministries of education are responsible for managing their education institutions based on the national frameworks in their own territory and have large authorities to</p>	<p>- León-Alfonso, Sandra (2007) The Political Economy of Fiscal Decentralization: Bringing Politics to the Study of Intergovernmental Transfers. Dissertation: Institut d'Estudis Autònoms.</p> <p>- OECD. (April 2014) Education Policy Outlook: Spain. Retrieved from: http://www.oecd.org/edu/EDUCATION%20POLICY%20OUTLOOK%20SPAIN_EN.pdf</p> <p>- Eurydice. (January 2017) Country profile Spain. Retrieved from: https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/fpfis/mwikis/eurydice/index.php/Spain:Overview</p>

	<p>in 1996. It thus scores 0 until 1996, 1 in 1996-97, and 2 since 1998.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Asturias: received authority over school funding in 1998 and over higher education in 1995. It thus scores 0 until 1995, 1 in 1995-97, and 2 since 1998. - Balearic Islands: received authority over school funding in 1997 and over higher education in 1996. They thus score 0 until 1996, 1 in 1996, and 2 since 1997. - Canary Islands: received authority over school funding in 1983 and over higher education in 1986. They thus score 0 until 1983, 1 in 1983-1985, and 2 since 1985. - Cantabria: received authority over school funding in 1998 and over higher education in 1996. It thus scores 0 until 1996, 1 in 1996-97, and 2 since 1998. - Castilla y León: received authority over school funding in 1999 and over higher education in 1995. It thus scores 0 until 1995, 1 in 1995-98, and 2 since 1999. - Castilla la Mancha: received authority over school funding in 1998 and over higher education in 1996. It thus scores 0 until 1996, 1 in 1996-97, and 2 since 1998. - Catalonia: received authority over school funding in 1980 and over higher education in 1986. It thus scores 0 until 1980, 1 in 1980-85, and 2 since 1986. - Extremadura: received authority over school funding in 1998 and over higher education in 1995. It thus scores 0 until 1995, 1 in 1995-97, and 2 since 1998. 	<p>do so. This means, that the regional authorities are responsible for maintaining school buildings, and for decisions about funding (e.g., teacher salaries), curriculum, teaching hours, personnel, and student admission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - several English-speaking Wikipedia pages (e.g., https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Politics_of_Spain#Regional_government and https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Autonomous_communities_of_Spain#cite_note-howmuch-70 and https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Education_in_Spain) - The Economist (2008) How much is enough? Devloution is good for Spain, but it might have gone too far. <i>The Economist</i> November 6th 2008. http://www.economist.com/node/12501023#print
--	--	---	---

- Community Valencia: received authority over school funding in 1983 and over higher education in 1985. It thus scores 0 until 1983, 1 in 1983-84, and 2 since 1985.
- Galicia: received authority over school funding in 1981 and over higher education in 1987. It thus scores 0 until 1981, 1 in 1981-86, and 2 since 1987.
- Madrid: received authority over school funding in 1999 and over higher education in 1995. It thus scores 0 until 1995, 1 in 1995-1998, and 2 since 1999.
- Murcia: received authority over school funding in 1999 and over higher education in 1995. It thus scores 0 until 1995, 1 in 1995-1998, and 2 since 1999.
- Navarre: received authority over school funding in 1990 and over higher education in 1987 (cf. Rosselló-Villalonga 2017). It thus scores 0 until 1987, 1 in 197-1989, and 2 since 1990.
- Basque Country: received authority over school funding in 1980 and over higher education in 1985. It thus scores 0 until 1980, 1 in 1980-84, and 2 since 1985.
- La Rioja: received authority over school funding in 1999 and over higher education in 1996. It thus scores 0 until 1996, 1 in 1996-1998, and 2 since 1999.

Since they received full authority over education, the regional governments are responsible for the funding of primary, secondary, and postsecondary education, i.e. they are responsible for the funding

	<p>and administration of education for all ages. The regional governments can autonomously manage their budget and its distribution. Most students attend public or publicly-funded private schools. Primary and secondary education are free of charge. In post-secondary education, some tuition fees are due, but the largest share of the total budget is still publicly funded (about 80%).</p>		
Sweden	<p>The regions in Sweden score 0 on scope.</p> <p>The administration of pre-primary, primary, and secondary education is decentralized to the municipal level. This means that there is no regional administrative level for education (although county councils may have some responsibility for upper secondary school and adult education).</p> <p>The funding for preschool and school is shared between the national level and municipalities. The municipalities are responsible for allocating received funds to individual educational institutions.</p> <p>Postsecondary education institutions receive their funding directly from the national budget.</p>	<p>The regions in Sweden score 0 on depth.</p> <p>The national Swedish government defines regulations and frameworks for the whole education system according to public funding, curricula, and course syllabi through the Ministry of Education and Research.</p> <p>The municipalities are responsible for implementing the national frameworks for preschool, compulsory school, upper secondary school, and adult education.</p>	<p>- Eurydice. (January 2014) Country profile Sweden. Retrieved from: https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/fpfis/mwikis/eurydice/index.php/Sweden:Overview</p> <p>- Gingrich, Jane (2013) Making Markets in the Welfare State. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.</p> <p>- Lundahl, Lisbeth (2002) Sweden: Decentralization, Deregulation, Quasi-Markets – and then what? <i>Journal of Education Policy</i> 17(6): 687-697.</p> <p>- Lundahl, Lisbeth (2002) From Centralization to Decentralization:</p>

			Governance of Education in Sweden. <i>European Educational Research Journal</i> 1(4): 625-636.
Switzerland	<p>The regions in Switzerland score 1.5 on scope in general. The cantons have full authority (score: 2) over non-postsecondary education, but for post-secondary education they share authority with the federal level (score 1). We thus assign the value 1.5 in general.</p> <p>The cantons (states) at the regional level have most responsibilities and authority over education policy. From a long-durée perspective the cantons' authority has increased over the last 200 years until about 1980, limiting authority at the school and municipality level. There have been several attempts to move more powers to the national/federal level, but these have largely been unsuccessful (with the exception of vocational education and training, and partly higher education). The federal level has started to provide some funding in some areas ("Berungsbildungssubventionen",</p>	<p>The regions in Switzerland score 2.5 on depth in general. For post-secondary education, Switzerland scores 2. For non-post-secondary education Switzerland scores 3. We thus assign the value 2.5 in general.</p> <p>Although Switzerland does not have a national curriculum, there are some federal requirements that the different educational systems have to be harmonized according to their organizational structure as well as their teaching contents to make sure pupils fulfill similar requirements to enter higher education ("Maturitäts-Anerkennungsverordnung"). But this concerns only few aspects of education. In addition to this, there have also been</p>	<p>- Eurydice. (October 2016) Country profile Switzerland. Retrieved from: https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/fpfis/mwikis/eurydice/index.php/Switzerland:Overview</p> <p>- the contributions in: Criblez, Lucien (Ed.). 2008. <i>Bildungsraum Schweiz. Historische Entwicklungen und aktuelle Herausforderungen</i>. Bern: Haupt Verlag.</p> <p>- several German and English Wikipedia entries on education policy in Switzerland (e.g. https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Schweizerische_Universitätskonferenzen</p>

	<p>“Primarschulsubventionen”, “Hochschulsubventionen”), but the main authority remains with the cantons and several nationalization attempts have been fought off by the cantons.</p> <p>More disaggregated by sector:</p> <p>Pre-primary, primary, and secondary education: The cantons (and their municipalities) fund compulsory education at state schools including compulsory pre-school as well as upper secondary level schools.</p> <p>Post-secondary vocational education and training: The federal government started engaging in VET already in 1880 and has stepwise (1963, 1978, 2002) expanded its influence (both in terms of fields covered and in terms of decisions made on the federal level). Much of the funding comes from the federal level, which also has considerable authority over funding decisions.</p> <p>Post-secondary higher education: The federal government got the right in 1848 to establish and fund a federal (polytechnical) university (today’s ETH Zurich). Further attempts to move more authority to the national level have been blocked. With the expansion of higher education enrollment in the 1960s the federal level started co-funding higher education institutions in 1965 and installed federal research funds in 1975, so that today academic higher education is co-funded by the</p>	<p>attempts to harmonize education policies across cantons by voluntary horizontal cooperation, but these have had only limited success and are formally not binding for the cantons (although de facto they are).</p> <p>A recent reform in 2006 (neue “Bildungsverfassung”) granted the federal level more authority, but only “subsidiary”, i.e. only in cases where horizontal cooperation between the cantons in the cooperative federalism has failed. How this will be established in practice is still unclear, as the process is still ongoing (at the time of writing, January 2018). So far, there has been rather limited change. Moreover, there were attempts to harmonize school policy between the cantons in 2007: the Schweizer Konferenz der kantonalen Erziehungsdirektoren (EDK), a voluntary horizontal body to coordinate education policy across the cantons, agreed in June 2007 to adopt a law, the „Harmos-Konkordat“, to harmonize compulsory schooling (via horizontal cooperation between the cantons in the cooperative federalism). Thus, the cantons de jure keep full autonomy, but de facto are more constrained by horizontal cooperation between the cantons. Yet, as only a minority of all cantons has accepted and ratified the Harmos-Konkordat, the law</p>	<p>z and https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Harmos-Konkordat)</p>
--	---	---	--

	<p>cantons and the federal level and authority is shared for post-secondary education.</p>	<p>essentially failed in July 2015 and there is no intensified cooperation.</p> <p>Consequently, the cantons remain responsible for regulation and enforcement for educational matters at the pre-school, primary and lower secondary level. For post-secondary education, authority lies mostly with the federal level: Many important decisions are made by a joint body of federal and cantonal decision-makers in the Schweizerische Hochschulkonferenz (since 2015) or its predecessors, the Universitätskonferenz (2001-2015) and the Schweizerischen Hochschulkonferenz (1969-2001).</p>	
<p>United Kingdom</p>	<p>Scotland and Wales score 0 on scope until 1997, and 2 since 1998. Northern Ireland scores 0 until 1999, 2 in 2000-2002, 0 in 2003-2006, and 2 since 2007. England scores 0.</p> <p>Explanation: Authority over education policy has changed considerably over time in the United Kingdom, due to the devolution process. Nowadays (2018), all educational policy decisions are taken within the four countries and not at the United Kingdom level. The regions are responsible for funding all education levels. Yet, before 1997, authority was centralized on the national level, which granted much autonomy to schools themselves but left no authority to the four regions (countries). With the devolution process the regions have stepwise gained more authority.</p>	<p>Analogous to the “scope” dimension, regions’ “depth” scores also have changed over time and receives the analogous coding, i.e. 0 where scope is 0 and 3 where scope is 2.</p> <p>Scotland and Wales score 0 until 1997, and 3 since 1998. Northern Ireland scores 0 until 1999, 3 in 2000-2002, 0 in 2003-2006, and 3 since 2007. England scores 0.</p>	<p>- OECD. (January 2015) Education Policy Outlook: United Kingdom. Retrieved from: http://www.oecd.org/edu/UKM_profile_final%20draft_EN.pdf</p> <p>- Eurydice. (October 2016) Country profile United Kingdom. Retrieved from: https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/fpfis/mwikis/eurydice/index.php/United-KingdomEngland:Administration_and_Governance_at_Central_and/or_Regional_Level</p> <p>- the Department of Education’s website: www.gov.uk/education</p>

	<p>- Wales: The regional government/parliament of Wales had no authority over education funding until 1997. Starting in 1998, it received some authority with the “Government of Wales Act 1998”. The powers were widened with the “Government of Wales Act 2006”, which granted the Welsh regional government the powers to initiate primary legislation in general and in particular granted Wales full control over education policy. Yet, only since 2011 are decisions made fully autonomous without the requirement to have decisions confirmed by the national government. Thus, Wales scores 0 until 1997, and 2 since 1998.</p> <p>- Scotland: The “Scotland Act 1998” devolved powers to the Scottish Parliament and explicitly devolved authority over education policy. The first education minister in Scotland came into office in May 1999. Thus, Scotland scores 0 until 1998, and 2 since 1999.</p> <p>- Northern Ireland: A Northern Irish Assembly (with limited powers) had existed between 1921 and 1973 and between 1982 and 1986, respectively. Yet, more powers were for the first time “transferred” (i.e. authority is not explicitly granted, but implicitly, as powers are not retained by Westminster) in June 1998 as part of the devolution process (“Northern Ireland Act 1998” and “The Departments (Northern Ireland) Order 1999”), effectively on 2 December 1999. However, the Northern Ireland Assembly has been suspended twice for longer periods, i.e. between 11 February and 30 May 2000, and between 14 October 2002 and</p>		<p>- Wikipedia articles and the primary sources of the “Government of Wales Acts”, the “Northern Ireland Acts”, and the “Scotland Acts”</p> <p>- Rees, Gareth and Sally Power (2007) Educational research and the restructuring of the state: the impacts of parliamentary devolution in Wales. <i>European Educational Research Journal</i> 6(1): 87-100.</p>
--	--	--	--

	<p>7 May 2007. Thus, Northern Ireland scores 0 until 1999, and 2 since 2000; during the suspension powers were moved back to Westminster, so Northern Ireland scores 0 in 2003-2006 (counting the majority of months), and 2 again since 2007.</p> <p>- England: Unlike Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland, England does not have its own devolved government. The UK Government's Department for Education is responsible for England's education sector (Funding, provision of the education service, determining national policies and planning the direction of the system). Political decisions on England's education policy are voted on in the national parliament, implying that MPs from all UK regions have a vote on England's school policy. Thus, strictly speaking England does not have a regional government but is governed by the national government. Thus, England continuously scores 0.</p>		
--	---	--	--

<p>United States</p>	<p>The regions in the United States score 2 on scope (both in general as well as disaggregated for post-secondary and non-post-secondary education).</p> <p>The local and the state government are primarily responsible for educational policy in the United States. State governments, local, and private sources are funding the major part of primary, secondary, and postsecondary education. The federal level provides some funding, especially in post-secondary education (e.g., financial student aid and research funds). In absolute terms, the state governments jointly spend about twice as much as the federal level. Over time the federal relative share has increased, though, as the states' spending levels have decreased/stagnated since the 1980s.</p>	<p>The regions in the United States score 3 on depth (both in general as well as disaggregated for post-secondary and non-post-secondary education).</p> <p>The states and local communities, in cooperation with various public and private organizations, have authoritative competence over education policy, which is not subject to central government frameworks. They are responsible for establishing schools, as well as determining curricula and requirements for education-related qualifications.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Education policy in the United States. (No date of publication available) Retrieved from: https://ballotpedia.org/Education_policy_in_the_United_States - U.S. Department of Education. (July 2016). The Federal Role in Education. Retrieved from: http://www2.ed.gov/about/overview/fed/role.html - League of Women Voters of the United States. (2011) The Role Of The Federal Government In Public Education: Equity And Funding. Retrieved from: http://lwv.org/content/role-federal-government-public-education-equity-and-funding - Chantrill, Christopher. 2018 (website last accessed, April 30): https://www.usgovernmentspending.com/year_spending_2000USbn_19bs2n_20#usgs302
----------------------	---	---	--