
# Japan Education Forum

## Collaboration toward Greater Autonomy in Educational Development

Thursday, March 4, 2004
U Thant International Conference Hall,
United Nations University, Tokyo

Organized by
Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT)
Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA)
Hiroshima University
University of Tsukuba

Supported by
Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA)
Japan Bank for International Cooperation (JBIC)
United Nations University (UNU)

# Index

# The Background and Aims of This Forum

The need to promote education in developing countries is widely recognized by the international community. Governments of developed countries as well as international organizations have been working with the governments of developing countries to achieve the common goal of “Education for All.” Japan is also expanding its international cooperation in the field of education and, at the Kananaskis Summit in June 2002, announced that as its contribution it would carry out the Basic Education for Growth Initiative (BEGIN). The Japanese Government began to take steps in 2003 to develop the “System for Cooperation Bases” program.

The Japan Education Forum has been established as part of Japan’s international contribution to developing countries in the field of education as part of the “Core Institution System” Program.

Its purpose is to provide an opportunity for in-depth exchanges on the relevant experiences of developed and developing countries and to serve as a platform for constructive discussions on new and innovative ways to promote educational development and cooperation for greater ownership and partnership in developing countries. This inaugural meeting is to focus on reconfirmation by all concerned, through first-hand exchange and communication with educational authorities in developing countries, of the critical importance of educational development to enable greater self-reliance, and on international cooperation in the field of education to support such self-help efforts.

During the first part of the forum presentations will be made by participants from developing countries on efforts at developing education that encourage self-reliance. The second part will focus on the efforts made by universities in both developing and industrialized countries to promote the development of basic education. As a follow-up to these presentations there will be discussion on what roles universities may be called upon to play in the future. The forum does not aim at generating a consensus on international educational cooperation, but at encouraging free and frank discussions among the stakeholders concerned.

# Program

9：00～ Registration

10：00～10：20 Opening Session

Greetings by **Mr. Yoshiaki Harada**, Senior Vice-Minister of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology

Greetings by **Mr. Ichiro Aizawa**, Senior Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs

10：20～11：20 Keynote Lecture

"Educational Development in Afghanistan: Issues and Prospects"

**His Excellency Mr. Younous Qanooni**, Minister of Education,

Transitional Islamic State of Afghanistan

11：30～12：00 A Japanese Perspective

"Educational Development in Afghanistan and Japanese Cooperation"

**Prof. Seiji Utsumi**, Graduate School of Human Sciences, Osaka University

12：00～14：00 Break (Lunch)

14：00～15：45 <u>Panel Discussion</u>

Policy Panel: "Collaboration Toward Greater Autonomy in Educational Development"

Moderator **Dr. Ernesto Schiefelbein**, Visiting Professor, Center for the Study of International Cooperation in Education, Hiroshima University

Former Minister of Education, Chile

Panelists **Dr. Kilemi Mwiria**, Assistant Minister of Education Science and Technology, Kenya

**Dr. Indra Djati Sidi**, Director-General of Primary and Secondary Education, Ministry of National Education, Indonesia

**Dr. Emmanuel Jimenes**, Sector Director, Human Development, East Asia and Pacific Region, The World Bank

**Mr. Hiroshi Nagano**, Director-General for International Affairs, Ministry of Education Culture, Sports, Science and Technology, Japan

15：45～16：15 Break

16：15～18：00 <u>Panel Discussion</u>

New Issues Panel: "The Roles of Universities for the Development of Basic Education in Developing Countries"

Moderator **Prof. Hans J. A. Van Ginkel**, Rector of the United Nations University

Panelists **Prof. Jonathan Jansen**, Dean, Faculty of Education, University of Pretoria, South Africa

**Prof. Emmanuel Adow Obeng**, Vice Chancellor, University of Cape Coast, Ghana

**Prof. Paitoon Sinlarat**, Dean, Faculty of Education, Chulalongkorn University, Thailand

**Prof. David Chapman**, Chairperson, Department of Educational Policy and Administration,

# Opening Session

## Greetings by Yoshiaki Harada, Senior Vice-Minister of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology

It is a privilege for me to have this opportunity to address you on the opening of the Japan Education Forum. It is indeed a great pleasure and honor to have with us His Excellency Mr. Younous Qanooni, Minister of Education, Transitional Islamic State of Afghanistan, and to have an opportunity to learn directly about the state of the restoration and development of education in Afghanistan from a minister who is greatly committed to, and will no doubt be instrumental in its success. I believe his speech, as well as that by Prof. Seiji Utsumi of Osaka University, who was involved in the reconstruction of education in Afghanistan under Minister Qanooni, will be very thought-provoking for proceeding discussions in this forum.

I would also like to express my gratitude to Dr. Ernest Schiefelbein, visiting professor at Hiroshima University, and Dr. Hans J.A.Van Ginkel, rector of the United Nations University, who will serve as chairpersons in the two panel discussions, as well as to all the panelists who have been involved in various educational cooperation activities, for coming all the way to attend this meeting.

In developing countries, there are more than 100 million children still out of school, and 860 million people are illiterate. Two thirds of these are women and girls. To improve this serious situation in developing countries, the World Education Forum was held in Senegal in April 2000, and there the Dakar Framework for Action was adopted. The framework set specific goals and targets to ensure the collective commitment of the international community to strengthening support in the field of education.

Japan has historically regarded education as the backbone of national development. Therefore, to promote commitment to a global society, At the Kananaskis Summit held in June 2002. Japan demonstrated its commitment to strengthening assistance for the efforts being made by developing countries to achieve the goals and targets of the Dakar Framework for Action.

This forum is held as an integral part of a program to build the basis of a system for reinforcing cooperation in the field of primary and secondary education. The purpose of holding a forum like this on a regular basis is to share what the program of “Core Institution System” has achieved among stakeholders and to publicize the need for international educational cooperation to people working at different levels in different fields around the world.

In this first forum, discussion in international educational cooperation will be focused on the importance of gearing educational development towards the autonomy of developing countries and the need to provide support for self-help efforts. Discussion will be made from the viewpoint of the governments of developing countries, donor countries, donor agencies and universities.

To achieve the goal of the Dakar framework for action it is essential, above all else, for governments of developing countries to make strong political commitments, and to back these commitments up with strong will, to the goal of expanding the opportunities for basic education and the improvement of its quality.

Between January and February this year, 15 female education leaders from Afghanistan visited Japan. Their stay included visits to educational organizations in various parts of Japan and many discussion sessions. When they

came to bid me farewell before leaving Japan, I sensed the strong determination in their eyes to achieve their task in spite of the difficulties ahead of them, as well as the hope of bringing up the children in their country well and reconstructing their mother country.

I would like to conclude my speech by saying that I trust that this forum will help the people concerned in Japan and abroad to recognize more deeply the importance of educational development for greater ownership and of the need for international cooperation in the field of education.

## Greetings by Ichiro Aizawa,
## Senior Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Thank you very much for coming to the First Japan Education Forum. I would like to say a few words of welcome on behalf of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, a co-host of the forum.

This year marks the 50th anniversary of the start of Japan's ODA activities. We joined the Colombo Plan in October 1954 and began providing technical assistance to Asian countries. A full fifty years since the initiation of our ODA will have passed by October 6 this year. During that time, Japan, with assistance from the international community, has achieved very successful postwar reconstruction. Based on its own experience, Japan has supported developing countries, from the sidelines so to speak, enabling them to become independent and develop on their own with their own priorities. Human resources are crucial for economic development and that is why we have put emphasis on technical assistance. There is no denying that education plays an important role in nurturing responsible individuals. Human resource development, as well as the provision of education, has always been the mainstay of our 50 years of work in ODA

At the same time, we must always be prepared to modify our plans based on evolving needs in order to continuously improve our ODA. Last August, the Japanese Government worked to revise the general framework of the ODA, which outlines Japan s ODA policy. The purpose of the revision was to improve the quality of our ODA initiatives and enhance the strategic awareness and efficiency of our ODA in a changing economy. At the same time, we also desired to provide Japanese people with more information on the inner workings of the ODA. Additionally, we were also aware that our ODA has to be flexible and responsive to the rapidly changing international environment.

More than 1200 million people world-wide continue to live in extreme poverty, forced to survive on less than one dollar a day. Poverty alleviation is a key issue in today's development aid. The UN Millennium Development Goals, established after the UN Millennium Summit in 2000 to alleviate poverty, specify that to which international communities are encouraged to commit in this regard. Some of the specific goals include improving primary and secondary education and achieving gender equality in education.

The revised General Framework of ODA gives priority to easing poverty, including poverty caused by educational problems. This new ODA states that we will promote peace in developing countries that are, or have recently been, in conflict, by helping with their rehabilitation and reconstruction; we will attempt to see the world from the viewpoint of each individual's security; we will motivate local communities by nurturing people; and we will endeavor to protect each individual and improve their abilities.

The key to tackling poverty and human security issues is the empowerment of each individual. Education is the most important factor for human empowerment and is also our universal right which, when provided, enables us to live a decent life and learn wisdom and ability to choose the future course of our lives for ourselves.

As Mr. Harada, Senior Vice-Minister of Education, Science, and Technology mentioned, Japan announced an educational assistance plan in 2002. For educational assistance to low-income countries, we promised to provide more than 250 billion yen, or two billion dollars, over the next five years. In 2002, we contributed 60 billion yen,

or500 million dollars, of aid for building schools, training teachers, and conducting literacy education. Besides building schools, we spent 20 billion yen, or 160 million dollars, on aid for schooling, such as education planning, material and curriculum development, education in remote areas, and female education. Some of these projects were for Afghanistan, the homeland of Minister of Education Mr. Qanooni, who will give us a keynote speech later.

In January 2002, we hosted the International Conference on Reconstruction Assistance to Afghanistan in Tokyo, and expressed that Japan would offer a maximum of 500 million dollars over the following two years and six months. Two years have passed since then and, as of January this year, we have already decided to contribute a total of 600 million dollars in aid in the field of humanitarian activities, and restoration and reconstruction projects. In the field of educational assistance, we are energetically backing the campaign called “Back to School”, promoted by the transitional government and UNICEF, with the intention of repairing demolished school buildings, and solving the shortage of teachers, textbooks, and stationery. We have also accepted trainees who specialize in female education.

In the end, I truly hope that everybody who has gathered here will take advantage of this opportunity to consider again what self-reliant educational development really is. Specifically, let us consider what action and assistance are required to assist developing countries, and how we should provide educational assistance.

Thank you very much for your attention.

# Keynote Lecture (Summary)

Hon. Younous Qanooni,
Minister of Education, Transitional Islamic State of Afghanistan

## His Excellency Mr. Younous Qanooni

### Minister of Education, Transitional Islamic State of Afghanistan

Hon. Mr. Qanooni graduated from the Faculty of Theology, Kabul University. As one of the leaders of the Northern Alliance, he played a major role in the seizure of Kabul from the hands of the Taliban. In December 2001, he was appointed Interior Minister of the Interim Administration of Afghanistan. He has been in his current post since June 2002.

# Educational Development in Afghanistan: Issues and Prospects

Younous Qanooni

In the name of Allah, the Compassionate, the Merciful

Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen,

I am pleased to participate in the Japan Education Forum this morning. We have come to Japan from Afghanistan, a country that has suffered twenty-three years of imposed war. Our Japanese friends well understand the close similarity between Afghanistan and Japan after the Second World War, and the pains and misfortunes of war.

Within the education system in Afghanistan, one of the areas that has suffered the most damage is infrastructure. The educational system is in disrepair and 85% of educational infrastructure establishments have been destroyed.

During the six years of the ignorant and cruel regime of the Taliban, the education system suffered a lot of damage. Under a targeted campaign of enmity against knowledge and culture they closed all schools for girls and changed all boys' schools to religious Taliban schools and military camps. In short, Afghanistan was taken back to the middle ages.

Three years ago we inherited such a country. But we firmly decided to rehabilitate our educational system from the ruins of war and revive the cultural and historical magnificence of Afghanistan once again.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

Three years ago, the rehabilitation of the educational system in Afghanistan was no more than a dream or a distant hope. Today I can proudly say that with the return of 4.2 million children (boys and girls) back to school, we have changed this dream into concrete reality.

Today 1.2 million girls and 3 million boys have returned to Afghanistan's schools. This represents the highest school enrollment in the history of education in Afghanistan. Having achieved this, the main question now is what kind of education have we considered for the future generations? What is our educational and institutional philosophy?

In a very short time, we have proposed a modern education system for the future of Afghanistan and we have embarked on a program to achieve this goal. We firmly believe a modern education system will free itself from ideological inspirations and political dictation. It would be free from gender discrimination, and open the way to democracy, the formation of a just civil society and national development, especially economic and cultural development, and provide education for all.

Modern education fights against terrorism, extremism and narcotics. It eliminates the basis of fundamentalism, ignorance and illiteracy. In modern education, there will no more Taliban or terrorists. Girls will not be deprived of the blessing of education. We began laying the infrastructure for a modern education system in Afghanistan only two years ago, starting from scratch. While we have faced many problems and challenges over the last two years, with the cooperation and active participation of the people of Afghanistan and the assistance of our friends around the world, including the friendly people of Japan, we have achieved considerable success. As a result we were able to return 47% of eligible children (girls and boys) back to school and cover about 31% of educational needs.

We replaced the old education curriculum with a new curriculum framework based on modern educational

thought. This new curriculum has been established and approved under the guidance and supervision of local and international specialists in the field. We trained more than fifty thousand teachers in various long and short-term courses. We have started the reform program successfully and we are following it through. However, the process of rebuilding education is still in the initial stages, and we face the following challenges:

1. Retaining 4.2 million children in school
2. Enrollment of 1.5 million additional children in schools
3. Provision of accelerated learning for children who are out of school
4. Increasing learning spaces for all children
5. Teacher development and elimination of illiteracy

In order to successfully overcome these challenges we have set the following priorities for education:

1. School reconstruction
2. Provision of educational materials for schools
3. Teacher training
4. Capacity development
5. Curriculum reform

A large number of our students lack proper educational and learning spaces. They don't have classrooms, chairs or tables. They are suffering deeply from shortage of textbooks and lack of laboratories.

We still have a 25% shortage of teachers and most of the existing teachers have been deprived of higher education and professional skills. We have just recently included computer training in the curriculum for high schools, but we have not yet succeeded in getting computers and other equipment for our high schools. Most of the educational staff need training and skills development in administration and management. We deeply appreciate and welcome with open arms, the valuable assistance provided by external experts and specialists.

Ladies and Gentlemen.

We give special importance and value to education. Education is the only corridor for crossing from backwardness to welfare, and for achieving lasting prosperity and progress. Afghans are interested in having a comfortable and developed society. Without a healthy education it would be very hard to achieve this difficult task.

We want an Afghanistan where people are educated and have comfortable and prosperous lives. We want an Afghanistan where every child has the right and opportunity to obtain a minimum of nine years of free and compulsory basic education of good quality. In order to fulfill the needs and achieve the above targets and to have access to modern education, we are setting up a 12 year educational plan. On the basis of this 12 year plan, Afghanistan's new education system will be designed according to international standards, or at least would be compatible with educational standards in neighboring countries. This can be achieved only with the use of the successful experiences and technologies of advanced countries like Japan. We envisage that in 12 years, the enrollment rate of school age children will have increased from 47% to 85%, and girl's attendance at school will have increased from 35% to 90%. The rate of illiteracy will have decreased from 70% to 15-20%.

Achieving these objectives requires the support and cooperation of both Afghans and our international friends. However, funds received for reconstruction of the education system are insufficient and the Tokyo

commitment has not been fulfilled. Last year we received only 17% of our development budget. Obviously if the remaining 83% of the development budget was funded, we would be in a much better position.

In conclusion, I thank the international community, especially Japan, for their precious support, and I would like to request the continuation of your cooperation and support

# A Japanese Perspective (Summary)

Seiji Utsumi,
Graduate School of Human Sciences, Osaka University

## Prof. Seiji Utsumi

### Graduate School of Human Sciences, Osaka University

Prof. Utsumi was educated at the Faculties of Agriculture and Education, Kyoto University, and has a Ph.D. in Human Sciences. He has worked in the field of international cooperation in various organizations, including JICA and several private organizations, and has been in his current position since 1996. For one year from November 2002, he was the JICA advisor to the Education Minister of Afghanistan. His field of specialization is international cooperation in education

# Educational Development in Afghanistan and Japanese Cooperation

Seiji Utsumi

In April 2002, I visited Kabul for the first time. On two other occasions I also worked there as a JICA short-term specialist for the Ministry of Education. From November 2002, I then spent a year in Afghanistan as a Ministry of Education advisor for cooperation in education. During my time there, I was given the opportunity to work towards the reconstruction of the education system together with His Excellency Mohammed Yunis Qanooni, Minister of Education, the staff from the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Higher Education, and various people from international organizations, aid organizations, and NGOs. Since Minister Qanooni has spoken about the current situation of education in Afghanistan and reconstruction plans, I would like to focus my presentation on the framework of Japan's cooperation in education and its relations with other donors.

## 1. General Situation

In my work I have been involved in international cooperation in education for over 20 years and have seen schools in many countries. However, I was greatly shocked at the state of the schools I saw upon my first visit to Afghanistan in April 2002. Many of the school buildings in Kabul had been destroyed. There were buildings where roofs and walls had been destroyed, classrooms were without windows and doors, and I saw one large school where all of the windows were without glass. The school children were doing their lessons sitting on the floor in classrooms without chairs or desks. Young girls had resumed their schooling and female teachers had taken up their positions again after a long ban, and entering school as first graders were many young girls of differing ages. I was greatly moved by the sight of children sitting in circles in the ruined classrooms or in the schoolyards listening intently to their teachers. At the same time, the sight of these children studying hard in such harsh circumstances convinced me of the promising possibilities for Afghanistan's future.

The current situation of public safety in Afghanistan is still very unstable, but in spite of this I did not have a sense of grave danger in carrying on everyday life. However, we had to refrain from going out after dark and activities like going on picnics on our days off were out of question. This was rather stressful for people like us who were used to life in Japan today. Unfortunately, I think that this situation may last for a while yet.

## 2. The Situation of Education

The system for implementing assistance plans for education was the same as for other areas. A technical working group was organized under a consultative group (CG) to implement policy plans and coordinate assistance activities. In addition, a program secretariat (PS) was organized within the Ministry of Education to provide support for the CG and TWG. However, since the beginning of the year, the PS has been progressively phased out and a Grant Coordination Unit (GCU) established. This measure was taken to incorporate the function of management of grants from the World Bank. A decision was also made to establish the National Academy of Education as a specialist policy advisory body for the Minister.

In terms of budgeting, the upper limit of the development budget for the area of education was set at 250 million dollars for 2003. Although we tried to manage on that amount, we were not able to achieve the desired

outcomes. I understand that the development budget for the year 2004 is to be prepared on the basis of the commitment from the donor countries.

Student enrollment for the year 2003 was reported to be 4.2 million, with female students comprising 1.2 million of the total number. On the assumption that the number of school age children is five million, the total attendance rate is estimated to be 60%, with the attendance rate for female students approximately 45%.

The number of existing schools in Afghanistan is 6,232 and, of these, 1,067 are girls' schools. In regard to the repair and construction of schools, half of the children attending school are still without schools and study in makeshift classrooms in private homes or mosques, or have their classes in tents. The Ministry of Education in Afghanistan has requested the repair or new construction of 85 schools in each of the country's 32 states, which amounts to 2,710 schools nationwide. To date, 758 schools have been newly constructed and 1,271 schools have been restored.

Revision of the school curriculum has commenced with the assistance of UNICEF and UNESCO. However, it will be difficult to achieve the Ministry of Education's 3-year target to complete the revision of the curriculum up to grade 12. I have heard that at present the curriculum for major subjects in grades 1 and 4 has been revised with the assistance of specialists from Columbia University. Trial of the revised curriculum, the development of teaching manuals, and teacher training are still required. To date, 14 teacher training colleges have reopened, but the Ministry of Education plans to conduct teacher training in all 32 states.

### 3. Higher Education

In higher education, UNESCO is the focal point for TWG and is also undertaking the coordination of assistance and other activities. A large research team from UNESCO, International Institute for Educational Planning, Paris, is planning to visit Afghanistan in September 2002 and create a framework for higher education. There are also plans to include within this framework a financial plan which includes the introduction of fee-paying higher education, manpower planning, which includes projections for student number limits for departments in universities, adjustments in laws and regulations relating to qualifications, the introduction of private schools, and a teacher training program.

### 4. Japanese Assistance

I believe the fact that the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology is actively taking part in educational assistance for Afghanistan this time together with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and JICA is a significant characteristic of the assistance program. From the outset of the project there has been close communication and the educational assistance has been implemented on a scale and at a pace not witnessed before.

Japan's educational assistance policy consists of two broad frameworks for the implementation of its educational assistance. One has a focus on basic education with EFA (Education For All) as its aim, and the other is based on the level of development in education. In view of the current situation in Afghanistan, the following points can be considered important.

From the viewpoint of EFA, the construction and repair of schools, revision of the curriculum, and teacher education and training are considered to be vital areas. At the same time, in view of the current situation in Afghanistan, needs in other areas of assistance include capacity building, expansion of education for women, increasing higher

education, including teacher training, literacy education, and education for students with disabilities. In both of these broad areas of assistance, a common issue that needs to be addressed is how to rectify the gap that exists between the cities and rural areas.

In the area of education, Japan's assistance policy for Afghanistan as a country explicitly mentions the provision of informal assistance in literacy education alongside public education and higher education. I would like to speak about the educational assistance our country has been providing by dividing it into these two aspects.

For assistance in the area of public education, we quickly initiated a female teacher training program in Japan. Initially there was some concern about conducting training exclusively for 20 females in Japan, but the program went ahead from January to March 2003 and proved to be a great success in many ways. I would like to express my respect for the consortium of the five women's universities that provided the training.

In Kabul and Qandahar, school construction and repair projects are underway within the framework of emergency development research and cooperation grants, and ultimately 50 schools are expected to benefit from these projects.

In the area of teacher training, we have conducted several workshops using dispatched short-term specialists and we conducted training for those involved in curriculum development. We are also making preparations to develop teacher training and teaching manuals necessary for the curriculum revision in the future.

In view of Afghanistan's current situation, we will continue to provide assistance by dispatching advisors. We are also currently examining assistance for various kinds of literacy education. In the area of higher education, we are considering providing equipment for the science departments of Kabul University and Afghanistan University of Education, and assistance to medical education as well.

Although education for the disabled is an area of high urgency in Afghanistan, initiatives in this area are lagging. We conducted a workshop in October last year and an outcome of this workshop was the establishment of a new teacher training course at Afghanistan University of Education for teaching children with disabilities.

In regard to assistance for rural areas, assistance is being provided in both Qandahar and Bamian. In Qandahar, school construction is already underway and assistance in literacy education is being considered. In Bamian, assistance is being provided on an urgent basis with provision for the training of 200 teachers, the distribution of desks and chairs to schools, and assistance to the provincial education authority.

**5. Reflections on My Involvement in Educational Assistance in Afghanistan**

Providing assistance in education in Afghanistan is a new area and a new challenge for Japan's ODA. This is because assistance to date has been assistance for development purposes with JICA at the center and it now includes in its assistance schemes emergency assistance and reconstruction assistance. Because of this, it was necessary to provide assistance of a different type using the framework established for developmental assistance. In addition, relations between the government and the donors are fluid and there are many areas which cannot be accommodated on the basis of previous experience or theory to date. I feel that my involvement in educational assistance for over 20 years was all in preparation for my work in Afghanistan.

Perhaps this kind of situation will also be a problem associated with international cooperation in education in the future as well. This is because the world has changed greatly since September 11 and the first frontier in

educational assistance in this fluid world is Afghanistan. I believe our experiences there and their implications are of vital importance. This applies to, for example, the need for strategic coordination, a readjustment in the flow of funds, a readjustment of the mandate of the various aid organizations, expansion of the framework for emergency assistance in education and more diverse assistance schemes.

In this sense, I believe that having Afghanistan's Minister of Education in attendance at the first JEF is of considerable significance. From hereon, I would like to continue to contribute in whatever way I can to educational assistance in Afghanistan.

Panel Discussion 1

# Policy Panel:
# “Collaboration Toward Greater Autonomy in Educational Development”
# (Summary)

## Moderator

## Dr. Ernesto Schiefelbein

**Visiting Professor, Center for the Study of International Cooperation in Education, Hiroshima University; Former Education Minister of Chile**

Prof. Schiefelbein received his doctorate in education (Ed. D.) from Harvard University. He has worked in the field of educational policy planning and analysis for forty years. Positions held include: Director of the UNESCO-OREALC Regional Office for Education in Latin America and the Caribbean (1993-1996), and President of Santo Tomas University (1997-2001).

## Panelists

## Dr. Kilemi Mwiria

**Assistant Minister of Education Science and Technology, Kenya**

Dr. Mwiria obtained his Ph.D. in education from Stanford University. He has been involved in various research and consultancy for the Kenyan Government, universities, and international organizations, including USAID. His publications on various issues on educational development include educational reform, privatization and girls' education.

## Dr. Indra Djati Sidi

**Director-General of Primary and Secondary Education, Ministry of National Education, Indonesia**

Dr. Sidi studied at the Bandung Institute of Technology, Indonesia, and University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, obtaining his Ph.D. and Masters in city planning from the University of Illinois. He has been in his current position since 1998.

## Dr. Emmanuel Jimenes

**Sector Director, Human Development, East Asia and Pacific Region, The World Bank**

Dr. Jimenes obtained his Ph.D. in economics from Brown University. Having worked as a consultation and later as an associate professor at Western Ontario University, Canada, he has been with the World Bank since 1984. He has been involved in economic analysis for policy formation in various fields including education, poverty reduction, and health.

## Mr. Hiroshi Nagano

**Director-General for International Affairs, Ministry of Education Culture, Sports, Science and Technology, Japan**

Mr. Nagano joined the Science and Technology Agency (STA) of Japan after graduating from the Faculties of Engineering and Law, Keio University, Japan. He has served the Government of Japan in various key positions, including: First Secretary of the Japanese Embassy in West Germany, and Director of Research Division, Science and Technology Bureau, STA. He has also worked at Kojima Corporation and Kyoto University (as a visiting professor). He has been in his current position since 2002.

Ernesto Schiefelbein (Moderator),
Visiting Professor, Center for the Study of International Cooperation in Education,
Hiroshima University; Former Minister of Education, Chile

This morning we have had an excellent example, with the presentation of the Minister from Afghanistan, of educational problems, and he has showed us that the problem of the expansion of enrollment can in some way be solved; that we can cope with problems of reconstruction if resources are available. But at the same time, he wisely said that qualitative problems will take longer to solve, probably until 2015. He is therefore saying that improving quality is a more complex topic.

Prof. Utsumi also gave a beautiful example. He says that when he entered school in Tokyo in 1945, his school was also faced physical problems. However, the teachers were so good that they could cope with the problems. And the quality of education in Japan, you know, is one of the best in the world. Unfortunately, many reports are saying that it is quite difficult to improve the quality of education in the developing world.

Both representatives, the Senior Vice-Minister of the Ministry of Education and the Senior Vice-Minister of Foreign Affairs told us this morning that the Dakar meeting was a moment when the world realized that the goals of Jomtien in 1990 were not going to be fulfilled by 2000, and that the problems for increasing achievement were much more difficult than expected. And the reports from UNICEF, from the World Bank, from the donor countries and from development banks, all said the same thing; it's a difficult task.

So, we are lucky to have this afternoon four panelists who are going to tell us the reasons why developing countries are having problems in developing and improving education.

Kilemi Mwiria,
Assistant Minister of Education, Science and Technology, Kenya

Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. As you said, my name is Kilemi Mwiria, I come from Kenya, and I have been working in the Ministry of Education Science and Technology for the last one year. Before that I was a consultant in the area of education whereby I had opportunities to travel in several African countries. And before that I was an academic; I used to teach at Kenyatta University as a lecturer and a researcher.

My comments are therefore limited to African experience with regard to donor-government relations.

Aid conditionality has highlighted the importance of supporting countries that promote pro-poor, pro-democracy and human rights, pro-gender, pro-equity and pro-environment policies that are also sustainable. The emphasis is on genuine partnerships or equality among developed and underdeveloped country governments and follows clearly-agreed-upon national sector plans. This means that countries seeking aid have to prepare sectoral plans which would be the basis of donor support. The idea is for donor support to be based on national goals articulated by recipient countries themselves as opposed to donor imposition.

Donor countries continue to influence the development of sector plans through their field officers and consultants. They often tend to favor specific sub-sectors, such as primary as opposed to higher education. The dominant use of donor country consultants has continued even where there exists a critical mass of African experts. These experts' remuneration packages often account for at least a quarter of the resources voted for particular programs. Such funds could do much to strengthen national institutional human resource capacities; they would remove over dependence on northern experts in the long run. Too much use of international consultants also tends to affect the confidence levels of counterpart civil servants: due to differences in remuneration (a day's wages for these consultants could be equivalent to a local counterpart's monthly salary). Northern experts also enjoy privileges such as superior command of the English language, word processing skills, and easier access to senior politicians and bureaucrats.

Inability by Africans to influence donor supported project designs is also characteristic of decision-making in some donor national field offices. Some of the foreign personnel employed in these offices owe their positions to experience in Africa rather than to academic qualifications. Some supervise Africans who have higher educational qualifications but low remuneration. Africans serving in such positions consider themselves luckier than professional counterparts, working with government; they easily go along with the proposals put forward by the donor representatives. Since success is sometimes judged by the extent projects are funded, new projects are started irrespective of whether they are a priority or not.

Lack of coordination of donor efforts in specific sectors results in expensive duplications of projects at the national level. The much spoken about idea of basket funding, whereby available donor resources for a sector such as education are put in one national kitty, has not materialized. This is because: some countries' laws do not allow for such an investment plan; lack of confidence in African governments' capacity to manage the common basket; and the instinct of competition and visibility among the various donor players. Coordination and harnessing of a variety of available resources has also not been helped by NGOs freely choosing areas of operation irrespective of whether or not such projects already exist.

African governments have however not been entirely blameless. Few have had the courage to refuse donor support when it is not in agreement with national priorities. There are situations where government bureaucrats in some African countries respond “you are welcome” to donor recommendations. Some politicians have also cashed in on such recommendations because projects are either likely to be located in their home areas or they offer opportunities for some monetary benefits. Plans may also not be followed because in many African countries education and policy-making remains heavily politicized with professional judgement not given much of a chance. Experts have continued to dominate national consulting scenes because our governments have not shown commitment to strengthening national institutions that train various cadres of professionals.

Poor organizational capacity, exemplified by lack of relevant, accurate and complete planning data, poses a problem. Inability to prepare and circulate reports on time and failure to act on agreed-upon follow-up activities constitute other phenomena. In some cases, allocation of responsibilities, like overseeing of donor projects, is based on one’s closeness to the appointing superior and not on academic and professional qualifications. Benefits, like attendance of workshops, conferences and, sometimes, overseas trips, make occupants of these positions use all sorts of tactics to conceal information from their colleagues. Such tactics include snap meetings, failure to circulate announcements of events, such as conferences, and refusal to appoint other officers to attend such conferences if the holder of the office is not available. I know of cases where project officers have written back to regret that “there is no qualified person available to participate” just because they themselves cannot attend. We are familiar with sector officers who spend time taking up overseas offers just because they are unwilling to let others benefit from such exposure. Such officers may be well past their prime or lack the relevant knowledge to contribute during conferences in an informed way; they tend to be only passive participants. There are even those who only go in order to go shopping in these foreign cities. There are cases where bureaucrats have not responded to donor requests for proposals or action plans because they do not see any direct benefit for themselves. Many donor projects are a major source of corruption in government ministries, including gender exploitation. But corruption is also a feature in donor offices, where some program officers go to recipients of grants for their share of grant money.

Inability to mobilize local resources will mean continued dependence on donor interventions, even where such involvement may not be in tune with the needs of African states. If national resources were not misappropriated we would have the opportunity to prove that the contribution of donor resources to national development is not that significant after all. We would also be in a position only to accept and support aid that compliments our own national initiative and develop competent teams of indigenous professionals who, if well remunerated, are many times more qualified than foreign experts. The path to genuine and sustainable development should be led by our own physical and human resources. This is unlikely to happen if governments fail to attract the best brains and managers. However, effective competition with international organizations and the private sector for qualified human resources (as in South Africa) will take time to achieve; a great deal of sacrifice is required from all Kenyans, not just those in government employment.

Indra Djati Sidi,
Director-General of Primary and Secondary Education
Ministry of National Education, Indonesia

Thank you very much, Mr. Moderator. I would like to take this opportunity to say a little bit regarding issues and challenges for education in Indonesia, and how important international cooperation is. Mostly I am talking about basic education and how it is linked with collaboration towards greater autonomy in educational development.

My name is Indra Djati Sidi, and I come from Indonesia. I'd like to say a little bit about Indonesia, so that you will have an idea of what kind of country it is. Indonesia has more than 17 000 islands, 210 million people, more than 400 districts, 32 provinces, and about 350 ethnic groups. What else? We have about 43 million students, 2.6 million teachers, and the quality of our 260,000 schools varies greatly; we have people that still live in Stone Age conditions in the middle of Papua. But if you come to Jakarta, you will find a strong focus on IT. Besides this, the educational budget is 8% of the national budget and we are in the middle of big changes.

What is it that is changing so much in Indonesia? We are currently carrying out educational reform, a lot of political changes, including decentralization from the centralized form of government and democratization, and we are also trying to solve our economic crises.

Educational reform is centered around the competency-based curriculum, promoting school-based management and establishing school committees whereby people can participate in education. We are try to move from a teaching to a learning situation and examining how to create a quality-assurance institution.

The kind of activity we are conducting in Indonesia continues to change and we face many challenges. The issues and challenges we face are as follows. We have problems relating to the 9 years of compulsory education, how to improve the quality of education, how to improve mathematics, science, IT, and so forth, because we live in an era when mathematics, science and technology are essential. We also face problems relating to the transition from centralized to decentralized management.

The four basic objectives of our education are still in equity access. About 25% of our junior secondary school students need better access to school. We also need to improve the quality of education, and the relevancy of education within the community, and of course also to improve the efficiency. To this end, of course, we need a lot of international cooperation and collaboration. And actually we do have lots of cooperation in Indonesia in terms of loans, grants, or efforts in partnership. Some of these cooperative efforts have been focused on improving quality and access, and also on assisting in the process of decentralization. This aid has come from Japan with JICA and JBIC, and alsoAustralia with AusAID, the US with USAID, as well as from Austria, Spain, and so on, including ADB and IBRD.

I would also like to mention here our cooperation with Japan and JICA and how we are trying to improve the quality of education in terms of decentralization in the framework of decentralization. We have been cooperating internationally with UNICEF, ADB, IBRD, and so on.

One of the programs currently being implemented is the REDIP program, in partnership with JICA. REDIP stands for Regional Development Quality Improvement Project, and is being conducted in Central Java and Northern Sulawesi. The program tries to improve the quality of education by the empowerment of the people through sub-

district committees and school committees. We are trying to encourage the people to participate in improving the quality of education. We provide the school with the program and the school and the community themselves work on improving the quality of the school, rehabilitating it, and deciding what is needed to improve the quality. The results have been excellent and the community is playing an important role in quality improvement. We are trying now to disseminate this idea to other areas, and also to use our own money or government money to implement these ideas in the safer areas of Indonesia.

REDIP tries to strengthen the planning capability of Indonesian schools. What have the results of the REDIP program been? It can be said that the most important and key point of this program is the quality improvement done by the community and the awakening of the community. The community tries to participate, and the problem of quality improvement is not only attended to by the central government, but also by the local government and the community. It is our hope that capacity building in local districts and schools will continue long into the future. We provide the schools with the program, and by doing so we also promote good school governance. The school committee and the community is aware of all cash flow, and in this way decentralized education is successfully achieved.

So what is the conclusion of my presentation? Decentralization is quite new in Indonesia and we are trying to do a lot of things: improve access, improve the quality in the frame of decentralization. Of course, we need a lot of cooperation and partnerships, so we can learn from the experience of other countries, particularly from developed countries, regarding decentralization. We can also enhance our systems through this. Besides this of course, we are receiving support resources from donor countries in terms of bilateral and multi-lateral cooperation. Thank you very much.

Emmanuel Jimenes,
Sector Director, Human Development, East Asia and Pacific Region
The World Bank

Reports indicate that, without decisive action, the goal to achieve education-for-all (or EFA) by 2015, as most of the world nation's are pledged to do, will not be achieved. While some countries such as Brazil and China have made huge strides, at the present rate of progress, universal primary completion would come only after 2030 in South Asia and not in the foreseeable future for Sub-Saharan Africa.

How can donors help? I cannot speak for all, but from the point of view of the World Bank the two themes featured in this conference - providing assistance so as to promote greater autonomy (or self-reliance) and better collaboration - are prominent ingredients. Let me talk about each in turn.

**Why autonomy or self-reliance is so important**

An important lesson from the recent literature on foreign assistance is that the resources that countries themselves spend and how they spend them have a great deal more impact on educational outcomes than aid money.

There are several reasons for this:

First, for most countries in the developing world, development assistance is a proverbial drop in the bucket compared to what countries themselves spend. The World Bank is one of the largest contributors to educational development (several billion dollars a year) - yet countries spend far far more. Thus, what countries themselves do is key to ultimate outcomes.

Second, even if aid amounts were significant, it still may not go towards its intended target. The issue is not necessarily corruption (although that is sometimes an issue) - it is simply because a country can reallocate its other expenditures to meet its own priorities. What is the evidence of this? In a study of 14 countries about 5 years ago, researchers found that while 8.7 cents of every aid dollar are allocated to education and health, public spending did not go up by 8.7 cents - instead, spending in these sectors actually declined!

So, the safest assumption for donors to make is that they are, more or less, financing whatever the governments decide to do. In deciding the level and method of aid, donors ought to consider and monitor all public expenditures and not just the sector or project they are keen on.

Third, how countries spend money within education is a more important predictor of educational development than the amount of money. Some countries have been able to achieve more by deploying resources effectively. Between the 1980s and the 1990s, total public spending in Ethiopia and Malawi increased by $8 per child (of primary school age), or roughly 75%. The result? The primary completion rate in Malawi shot up from 30 to 50% -- but in Ethiopia, it remained stagnant at around 22%.

Why has increased spending not always led to the expected outcomes? A number of reasons ...

- Allocation mechanisms can fail to direct resources to those who need it the most. The poor are the most disadvantaged in terms of educational outcomes. Yet, in many countries, the rich benefit more than the poor from public spending. For example, in the 1990s in Nicaragua, the poorest 20% received just over 10% of

all spending on education while the richest 20% received over 35%.

- Even when money is spent on basic education, it does not always reach frontline providers. The money allocated by Finance goes to the Central Education authorities which pass it on to provincial or state authorities, which then pass it on to municipal or district authorities, which may or may not pass it on to schools. In Uganda, only 13 cents of every dollar spent for non-wage recurrent items reached the schools for which it was ALL intended in 1990.
- Even when the money reaches frontline providers, the quality of the service provided is very low - and is particularly poor for poor people. We all have stories of this but recently there have been surveys which are based on random visits to schools and found some appalling conditions:
    - In India, among 200 schools visited, teams found NO teaching activity in half of them;
    - In Ethiopia, almost half of the teachers were absent at least one day in the week of the visit.

  Needless to say, there is probably little instruction when there is no instructor.

**What donors can do.**

Most donors recognize the need to help recipients on the road to autonomy. Let me talk about three: working with and strengthening institutions in countries; simplifying and harmonizing; promoting learning through evaluation.

First, working with and strengthening institutions.

The traditional way that aid agencies have tried to strengthen institutions is to build capacity. This is undoubtedly important. But it is not enough. Incentives also matter. For example, a training program for teachers can enthuse them for a few weeks after they return to school. Eventually, better trained teachers will not show up in time if they are paid so little that they have to take jobs elsewhere and if parents or students have no say in how they are evaluated.

Whose incentives matter? There are three important actors -- the ultimate beneficiary (the poor), the service provider at the point of contact, and the policy maker. Their incentives are determined by their "accountability relationships", and will ultimately determine the outcome. Let me explain. In the case of most services, and for very good reasons, society has decided not to use the traditional market mechanism to provide it. In this case, the customer-or client-can exert power over the provider (or hold the provider accountable) through indirect means. Here there are two relationships that are important.

One is the citizen-policymaker relationship. Citizens can exert power over policymakers through elections, and through other means of expressing their "voice." To do so effectively, they must have the institutions to do so (i.e, a pro-poor, rather than a clientilist, government) AND they must have information to make choices.

The other is through the policymaker-provider relationship. Even if the policymaker (e.g., the education minister) gets the right message from the poor clients AND wants to do the right thing, he/she has to get the front-line provider (the teacher in the school) to behave accordingly.

What may this mean for donors? Interventions that give citizens a voice and the capacity to express their wishes may work. Let me give you an example from El Salvador with its EDUCO program. In that country, after a long civil war, the government experimented with a novel approach to scaling up rural education. The traditional

route of cajoling the Public Works Ministry to set aside land and build schools and the Education Ministry to hire teachers as civil servants would simply take too long. The government instead decided to contract out basic education in rural areas to parental community associations in villages and transferred money to them in order for them to: hire/fire teachers, visit schools on a regular basis, and administer the funds. Despite fears that poor villagers, many of them illiterate, would waste these funds, outcomes have improved to such an extent that, now, EDUCO is the primary way that education is provided in that country. A rigorous evaluation compared results in EDUCO to traditional schools. EDUCO was not only able to scale up rural education quickly - it also was able to reduce teacher absences which reduced student absences and led to higher test scores.

In some cases - when the government is not pro-poor and the service is not easy to monitor so that compacts are not appropriate - it may be important to support directly the client's power over the provider by increasing choices and the chance to participate. These strengthen the relationship between *client and provider* by so-called demand-side interventions.

In Bangladesh in the early 1990s there was a 7 percent enrolment gap between males and females. The Female Secondary Stipend Program attempted to stimulate girls' education by setting up accounts in the girls' names and depositing money into the account conditional upon: attendance in school, a passing grade AND staying unmarried (an important criterion in that society even among 11-13 year old girls). This program has not been evaluated yet, but initial results are impressive. Secondary enrolment for girls is rising faster than for boys in Bangladesh. Single-sex schools are cropping up. And other schools are building separate latrines for girls and boys.

What to avoid? Interventions that weaken the relationships. A global fund for a worthy cause such as EFA could undermine the policymaker-provider link if they become off-budget funds for which the frontline providers can lobby donors directly for. This could result in incoherent spending allocations.

So, to summarize, what is needed for sustainable educational reform in countries? Build capacity but also strengthen the accountability relationships:

- By empowering poor people:
    - To monitor and discipline service providers
    - To raise their voice in policymaking
- By reinforcing incentives facing service providers to serve the poor.

Second, minimize the administrative burden and maximize the ownership of the intervention.

As the previous speakers have said, managing foreign aid can be an enormous burden on already strained capacity of countries.

- Until recently Tanzanian government officials had to prepare about 2,000 reports of different kinds to donors and receive about 1,000 donor delegations each year. These requirements tax rather than build provider organization's limited capacities, diverting efforts towards satisfying donor obligations rather than reporting to domestic policymakers.
- Donors sometimes try to solve the capacity constraint by hiring international consultants. This kind of 'ring-fencing' may protect the money directly but it may not build capacity in a country. And it causes bad feelings that Dr Mwiria alluded to because of pay differentials. In Kenya, a World Bank agricultural project

paid eight local staff between $3,000 to $6,000 a month, many times the $250 available to a senior economist in the civil service.

What are ways to alleviate the burden? One is to consider budget support where it is justified. Such an intervention will avoid fungibility and also support the allocation mechanism within countries. AND, it's easy to implement and supervise. Of course this implies that there is agreement between donors and government on priorities - which means a lot of policy dialogue even before the intervention.

In some cases, where budgetary support is inappropriate, there may still be ways to cut costs. One is through pooling of funds. In the last basic education project targeted at the poorest regions in China, the World Bank, the British Government (DFID) and the Chinese Government agreed that funds would be pooled in one basket. This had the following advantages:

- It enabled China to obtain a World Bank loan but to soften its terms by pooling with DFID grants. This was an enormous advantage because the funds were meant for the poorest regions which may (not) have difficulty paying the interest rate.
- It simplified administration for China because they only had to deal with one set of donor rules.
- DFID was concerned with getting 'credit' but this gave them enormous leverage in the dialogue - access they may not have had with MOF directly

Even when pooling is not feasible, it is important to harmonize rules. This has been more difficult than necessary but is being done in Vietnam on a pilot basis. To reduce the costs of aid fragmentation and to build capacity, one must work with other donors to harmonize and align policy procedures and practices around the recipient's OWN systems. Where systems are weak they should be strengthened to meet good standards, not bypassed and substituted with ring-fenced donors systems.

Third, support the learning agenda in the country. One of the important roles of donors is to disseminate best-practice from other countries. But sometimes these practices cannot be imported directly because country circumstances matter. Also, there are some reforms, such as decentralization, which have not been attempted extensively in other countries. In these cases, donors should support the evaluation of programs so that countries can learn from applying the innovations.

This is easier said than done - it requires a special effort. At the World Bank, we have been trying to implement evaluation but it has not been easy because a) our own staff need incentives to pay attention - we are now focusing more on outcomes rather than inputs, b) capacity in countries is limited, and c) learning is a public good that sometimes needs subsidies to support it.

The brochure for this Forum states that Japan's aid policy in supporting human resources' development is to 'enable greater self-reliance in [recipient countries'] development efforts'. In terms of Japan's educational support, this means going 'beyond the provision of scholarships ... to study in Japan and the support for school construction.' (p. 1) I couldn't agree more and I think that the most important lessons for doing so are: strengthening institutions within countries by considering incentives better, using interventions that are simpler for the clients, and supporting evaluation.

Hiroshi Nagano,
Director-General for International Affairs
Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology, Japan

## 1. Introduction

The creation of a System for "cooperation bases" aimed at increasing cooperation in the area of primary and secondary education will be introduced.

With the occurrence of a world trend where international society is increasing its assistance in the area of education, Japan is making use of its past experience of having positioned education as the cornerstone in the building of its country, as symbolized by the "Spirit of the One Hundred Sacks of Rice"**, and is actively involved in providing assistance.

Against this backdrop, the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sport, Science and Technology (MEXT) commenced the creation of a System for "cooperation bases" in April last year to increase Japan's cooperation in the area of primary and secondary education.

## 2. Background and History of the System for "Cooperation Bases"

First of all, I would like to explain the history of events that led to the creation of the System for "cooperation bases".

◦ In June 2002, at the time of the Kananaskis Summit, held in Canada, the Japanese Government made clear its intentions to increase assistance in the area of basic education by announcing that it would provide ODA in excess of 250 billion yen in the area of education for the next five years to assist countries with low incomes, which were having difficulty reaching the goals of the Dakar Framework for Action. It also announced the Basic Education for Growth Initiative (BEGIN), to assist in the initiatives developing countries were undertaking to promote basic education in their countries.

◦ The System for "cooperation bases" is included as one of the initiatives of BEGIN and is a plan to increase Japan's cooperation in the area of primary and secondary education through the promotion of the use of existing teachers and the reinforcement of the systems as the mainstays in cooperation in education in developing countries.

◦ This is a reflection of the final report on the way Japan's International Cooperation for Education should proceed, as summarized by the advisory body of MEXT (the Committee for International Cooperation in Education) in July 2002 as a proposal in response to the Dakar Framework for Action on realizing the objective of "Education for All" (EFA).

## 3. Fundamental Concept and Purpose

Underlying this proposal was the nature of Japan's previous International Cooperation for Education, where Japan responded to individual requests and conducted individual investigations on activities and educational materials for specific regions, and where there was a tendency for the program to depend greatly on the efforts of the individual

specialists and volunteers dispatched to those areas.

A review of the system of cooperation was undertaken and a decision was made to promote cooperation in education on the basis of the following concepts:

1. To organize and systematize Japan's experience and know-how in cooperation first of all and to make it possible for those responsible for assisting in educational cooperation to refer to and use this material in responding to the needs of each developing country.
2. To make it possible to respond appropriately and in a systematic way to the requests of developing countries from the viewpoint of quality, quantity, and speed in cooperation
3. To carry out these objectives by forming a network consisting of national, public and private universities, NGOs, and private sector companies, and place the Center for the Study of International Cooperation in Education of Hiroshima University and the Center for Research on International Cooperation in Education of the University of Tsukuba at the core of the System for "cooperation bases", since both of these university centers achieved previous results in International Cooperation for Education.

**4. Functions of the System for "Cooperation Bases"**

The system for "cooperation bases" has the following four functions:

The first is the sharing of educational experiences in the promotion of cooperation in the area of education, the area where Japan is to devote its efforts. The objective is to develop a model of cooperation (including teaching manuals or teaching materials) for common use by collating and analyzing experiences to date in areas where Japan has copious experience, such as in Science and Mathematics Subjects, Teacher Training Systems, and School Management. In the project plans for this year, seven projects are currently underway, including preparation of visual materials to train science teachers in experimentation skills.

The second is the communication of shared experiences in cooperation to assist in pre-departure training for dispatching in-service teachers. The idea is to use the cooperation model that has been developed for pre-departure training for in-service teachers who will be sent as members of overseas cooperation groups, and during their period of dispatch to provide guidance and advice to them via the internet.

Pre-departure training was conducted on three occasions for 59 in-service teachers who were dispatched last July. The training was conducted using case studies utilizing video tapes of classes in developing countries as well as research on teaching methodology in Japan.

The third is providing assistance in the use of areas where there is little experience in cooperation. We decided to form university and other groups according to subject areas such as Nursery Education, Education for Children with Disabilities, School Facilities, Women's Education, Health Education, Home Economics, and Environmental Education for areas where our experience in cooperation is limited but the needs from developing countries in those areas are believed to be high. We are conducting research and analysis to determine how we can apply our educational experience in developing countries.

Furthermore, we plan to disseminate results by holding workshops and to promote educational cooperation in these areas in developing countries.

In this year's business plan, six projects are being promoted, including the preparation of a database where

practical case studies to assist in environmental education in developing countries will be compiled and collated.

The fourth is to perform the role of a hub function, sending out information within Japan and abroad. In specific terms, this means compiling the results obtained from projects in the System for "cooperation bases" and making it possible for those involved in projects, and users, to view it on the website or other places. In addition, through periodical international forums, that is, by holding forums like this or promoting links with international aid organizations, its function is to enable the widespread penetration and sharing of the outcomes gained to extend to developing countries and aid organizations.

Finally, to make the above four points function effectively, one of the characteristics of this initiative is the establishment of Central Institutes which bring together relevant organizations to participate in activities of the System for "cooperation bases" and which promote the networking of these organizations.

In specific terms, Hiroshima University and the University of Tsukuba, which have achieved previous results in International Cooperation for Education, are positioned as the central institutes in a network consisting of national, public, and private universities, NGOs, and private sector companies. Together they are promoting projects in cooperation with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, JICA and JBIC.

**5. Future Prospects**

The System for "cooperation bases" commenced in April last year and there are plans to complete the results of each project for this fiscal year by the end of March.

The outcomes of the "cooperation model" and "materials related to educational cooperation" projects will be compiled and filed as electronic data in the Database on the System for "cooperation bases" and made widely available both in Japan and overseas.

(We are in the process of building an archive focusing on the ease of use for users to enable them, for example, to conduct searches using key words like "science and mathematics education" and "environment" etc.)

In the future, we will continue to promote further surveys and research that are currently in progress and we will undertake various initiatives including the following:

- Analyze results of cooperation of other countries providing aid in order to develop a model for cooperation
- Hold workshops to expand the provision of information to developing countries
- Conduct local verification of the application of Japan's experience in education in developing countries

While Japan will provide cooperation through the System for "cooperation bases" explained above, making use of its experience of the past, it will respect the independent initiatives of developing countries in their efforts to expand opportunities and increase the quality of basic education, and Japan will continue to support their efforts in self help.

** "Spirit of the one hundred sacks of rice"

At the beginning of the Meiji period, the desperately impoverished Nagaoka fiefdom received one hundred sacks of rice as relief aid. One of the leaders of the clan, Torasaburo Kobayashi, counseled that if they just distributed the rice to the fiefdom's samurai and residents, the rice would be gone in a few days. Instead he proposed using the rice to secure funds to build a school, and in so doing to increase the hundred sacks of rice to thousands or tens of thousands of sacks of rice in the future. The plan was carried out, and as a result, a steady stream of valuable human resources was produced by the school. This foresight is called the "spirit of the one hundred sacks of rice" in Japan, and it emphasizes that investment in education is one of the most vital areas of investment in nation-building.

*Comment 1*

Waheed Hassan (UNICEF)

Both internal and external factors account for issues on the release and use of funds. Many factors have contributed to the low spending on Afghanistan's education: partly due to reluctance on the part of donors, especially due to the onset of the Iraq crises (external), and also the capacity of the country to absolve the resources.

A post-conflict country often has had most of its institutions destroyed. Lessons from Afghanistan are therefore good for other post-war countries, as it came out that the good intentions of an international body's met real limitations. Some things worked well, for example identifying NGOs etc that worked in Afghanistan even during the time of the Taliban -it is difficult to work in Afghanistan (where girls were denied access to school and many boys stayed out of school), without soliciting the expertise of those who worked for a long time on the ground and agencies that have the capacity to take programs to scale within a fairly short time.

We set 4.2 million children as the target number to be in school at the beginning of the school year because we had been able to package the programs well and use whatever local capacities available to meet the logistics challenge to reach this target.

NGOs could also be relied on as many of them had been in the country for a long time and had instituted their own system of education. There cannot be development if the capacity of the country is not strengthened; one cannot rely only on the stronger (donors) partners. The government agencies ought to be strengthened first because they are the main counterparts.

Ethnic conflict in the government, inadequate understanding of the roles of partners, particularly the NGOs, weak political and internal security structures ought to be addressed, though not directly in education, but they are external contributing factors to education.

*Comment 2*

Molly Lee (Malaysia Science University)

Three areas could be looked at when talking about international cooperation:

1. Where do we get the resources?

2. What is the outcome of that cooperation or aid?

3. But the process is the most important; how do we make use of the resources? As indicated by the World Bank representative, important lessons are to be learnt on how donors and recipients make use of the money, work with existing institutions and minimize administrative burdens, but the question is, apart from what has been said, what else can be done to administer the resources and make it work?

*Comment 3*

Tarou Komatsu (Kyushu University, Japan)

Solicit opinion especially from Kenya and Indonesia's educational development for self-reliance.

The promotion of the principle of self reliance is the theme of this forum. Japan's ODA depends on the 'upon

request' concept, which means that the support depends on the country's self reliance; if the country sets its priority and asks for help, then Japan provides. But does the principle work? Does the principle enhance the promotion of self-reliance in education? Are developing countries aware of this Japanese ODA philosophy? If yes, how do developing countries appreciate it and how can they utilize it to their advantage?

*Comment 4*

Takako Yuki (University of Tokyo, Japan)

Japan was mentioned as an example of donors less likely to agree to 'basket funding' as a major tool for more effective cooperation. Dr. Jimenez suggested streamlined, harmonized processes across donors. These two model examples could be important to Japan in giving the go-ahead to those countries ready for considering basket funding, or to join other donors in signing the harmonization process. Japan, however, does not seem to be for such agreements. What are the perspectives of the Ministry of Education on workable conditions for agreeing to these two approaches in the near future?

*Comment 5*

Samuel Murinda (from Zimbabwe, University of Tsukuba, Japan)

Observation on collaboration and greater autonomy in educational development in developing countries is a question of will: donors and stakeholders in host countries are to blame. For instance, the Red Cross acts promptly and urgently to situations irrespective of their support or otherwise of certain principles of the country. In my view the same should apply in the response to educational needs of children by educational providers, be they donors or host countries, I stand to question the sudden acting now despite the long years' delays in responding.

*Comment 6*

Yuto Kitamura (Nagoya University, Japan)

Regarding the question of ensuring autonomy and ownership in selecting and setting priority for the countries, my observation from experience points to the fact that often the international community tends to listen to the bigger/dominant NGOs and donors, but how do we ensure that the voices on the ground are heard?

For instance, the World Bank's Fast Track Initiative tends to concentrate on primary education to the neglect of the other areas in education. Thus, the panelists' views on how to ensure fairness in addressing the various important issues in the educational sector will be very much appreciated.

Nagano

On the Afghanistan, UNESCO and other related questions, the Ministry of Education in Japan several years ago organized an advisory group, which resulted in three outcomes:

1. Operating bases system.

2. The support center, which gives support to universities in Japan so that the universities and JICA can team up, or the schools (universities?) and the World Bank for instance have contracts and together offer support.

3. Also the post-war support to be released very speedily for which reason Japan acted promptly in providing

educational assistance to Afghanistan. The ministry did not foresee these issues until there was personnel, like professor Utsumi, on the ground and was therefore able to make immediate implementation. This has been highly praised in Afghanistan and it is hoped that Japan will be able to take such measures again in the future when the need arises.

I believe that links with NGOs are very important. In 1947, the first UNESCO Club was launched in Sendai. After that many NGOs conducted international cooperation projects in education. One such project is called the "*Teragoya* Literacy Movement," and JICA is also now taking part in this effort. A *teragoya* is a kind of small school, which existed in Japan in the Edo period, and which is said to have been very effective in contributing to the attainment of a high literacy rate during that time.

I believe the resources Japan should utilize more include human resources, especially teachers in public schools. For this purpose we established the "cooperation bases system." It is hoped that, through this system, the experiences of dispatched teachers can be utilized to link students to other parts of the world. The Ministry of Education puts money in a trust fund that could be considered as a basket. Regarding streamlining, dispatching school teachers themselves is thought to be more effective in reflecting recipients' voices.

Jimenez

A post-conflict situation could sometimes be an opportunity for reform because real reforms are normally responses to events, which render the status quo untenable. In the case of El Salvador, for example, there had been intense civil war. The new government after the peace process had several choices on education for the rural areas, but they decided to seek support from the international community for the initiative of the rural communities. These communities had their own established schools manned by the educated locals, the education given was poor but at least there were classes. They used that experiment to see how it would work in all the communities. Thus, the personnel involved were trained in school management and budgeting, PTAs were directly given the funds. These schools were found to be better monitored than the traditional schools that coexisted with them. Schools' activities were monitored, teachers were monitored, and student output increased to the extent that almost all schools in the rural areas came to be managed by this approach.

It is hard to balance donors and dominant voices as many institutions and persons are involved, all of whom would want to be heard. A mechanism should be in place to ensure that the country is the dominant voice and the government could be the chair and director of the community. Some agencies necessarily, like the World Bank, have convening power because they have affiliations with the ministries of finance, planning the other ministries. Again, there is need for an agency to manage and see to it that all voices are heard, that is, to ensure a process of harmonization.

Sidi

From the Indonesian experience, there is need to improve capacities before program implementations, or else it becomes difficult to do the latter. There is a need to involve the community and local government in order to ensure that the program is transparent and accountable. They will guide and protect it because there is a sense of involvement. This would also enhance sustainability.

The Indonesian government goes by the request-only principle, but several informal meetings that offer the opportunity to iron out differences usually precede any request.

In 1997, Indonesia needed funds for scholarship to maintain enrollment, and had good cooperation with international donors, which facilitated the institution of the program within two months instead of the usual two years, which brought about the progress of the program. Willingness is important to get things done on time and in time.

On the issue of voices, Indonesia is used to being centralistic-the reason why crises have often been difficult to manage, because the voices of those on the ground are hardly heard. But now being more decentralized, with more involvement of communities, this helps the system to move on better.

Mwiria

On the question of capacity building, the local community knows the terrain, and it is much more easily mobilized. However, there is a need to train the local people and also retain them in the government and utilize them.

Economic ability of a given country: how best to utilize the funds that come in, and what resources are available, human and non-human? What interest does the government have in relying much on the local capacities rather than the external? What are some of the historical links the giving and receiving countries have? Also, there is need to consult those for whom the projects are meant but this has been woefully left out in the developmental process.

The upon-request concept only is important, but donors have had to use direct ways to urge receiving countries to make requests. Sometimes the receiving and giving countries have conflicting or unrelated priorities or interests and it may take a considerable time to settle. Again, donors may require time to implement projects.

Concerning political will, it would be wrong to conclude that nothing was done on education before the Jomtien conference. The question is the extent to which commitments were turned into action; extent of living up to promises, and the political commitment of the receiving countries, because many programs need a political dimension in order to be firm. Kenya for instance believed it a right for all to have free primary education and made it a political promise, and made it a political and national issue, having local, community and international support. There were crises; some teachers were not adequately trained to cope with the challenges, but overall it went quite well.

On ownership and voices; no short cut to consultancy, resources, policy implementations. They should make research and report in simple non-technical language for the understanding of the ordinary persons for good dialogue between the parties. There should be a coordination of affairs so that no single donor is in control.

Schiefelbein

It is worth noting these topics, as they are issues to be discussed for a long time: is there a need for more foreign advisors or more training of local experts? Should there be more sharing of successful experiences or design better experiences? Is it necessary only to react to requests or provide an element of that reaction? Is it necessary to share only local experiences or to share foreign experiences too? What is the evaluation of what are the

most cost effective experiences? Are the problems well defined or are the strategies appropriate or is the implementation required?

Mwiria

The broad issue raised concerns what is important is for donors and recipient countries to reach an agreement on the best way forward in terms of priorities and expected outcomes. If it is consultative in a wider sense including all stakeholders, then there will be greater success.

Sidi

The problems of developing countries are very similar and there is a lot of room for international cooperation for loans and partnership but there should be better communication between donors and recipients so that priorities can be narrowed down in the framework of that country. Good community participation with a good monitoring and evaluation will be a better way of implementing programs for multilateral or bilateral cooperation for Indonesia.

Jimenez

If collaboration is such a good idea like all good ideas, why is not being done already? It is because inputs have had to be monitored. Is that the right metric? The problem is that we have not had the development outcomes orientation and we have not been able to measure the impact of learning on children in the programs. If we had that then we could disseminate that to the taxpayers in the donor countries.

Nagano

Japanese collaboration with developing countries has a long history, whether we have invested enough to take advantage of the local capacity has been high on the agenda for a long time, but it is hoped that the institution of the JEF will encourage the giving of full play to indigenous capacities.

Aside from the “cooperation bases” system there have been major changes in Japan, including the turning of national universities into independent administrative corporations, and the national government will finance them independently. Faculty of the national universities will no longer be civil servants. If it is done, the many faculty members capable enough for Japan’s international capability will have a better incentive for many of the faculty to work with international counterparts. But if we remain in the current framework there will be hardly any incentives for them to get into the field of international collaboration. The support center created last year aims to support capable faculty members, by supporting the center. In cooperation with other international bodies, we can share Japanese experience, skills and know-how, and through this and the changes to come, we can have better ideas of the needs because organizational institution oriented approach caused delays in the past. It is hoped that the changes and the new environment will enable Japan to address more efficiently some of the issues raised. JEF is therefore very timely.

Schiefelbien

The final comment by Mr. Nagano is very relevant for developing countries. It is the ability of a well-

developed country to re-build itself, as Japan wants to do with its university system. With all the achievement in international examinations, Japan is willing to change some of its agencies in a drastic way.

Thank you all for the questions, comments and responses.

Panel Discussion 2

New Issues Panel:
"The Roles of Universities for the Development of Basic Education in Developing Countries"
(Summary)

## Moderator

## Prof. Hans J. A. Van Ginkel

**Rector of the United Nations University**

Prof. Ginkel received his Ph.D. in social sciences from Utrecht University. After teaching there for nearly twenty years at the Faculty of Geographical Sciences, he took the office of Rector Magnificus between 1986 and 1997. His areas of specialization are urban and regional development, and population and housing studies. He has also published books and articles about the internationalization and administration of higher education institutions.

## Panelists

## Prof. Jonathan Jansen

**Dean, Faculty of Education, University of Pretoria, South Africa**

Prof. Jansen received his Ph.D. in education from Stanford University. After his graduate studies, he taught at the University of Durban, Westville, South Africa, first as a professor, and then as Dean of Education, and Acting Deputy Vice Chancellor. He has been in his current position since 2000. His areas of specialization are education policy studies, higher education, and comparative education.

## Prof. Emmanuel Adow Obeng

**Vice Chancellor, University of Cape Coast, Ghana**

Prof. Obeng obtained his Ph.D. in theology (New Testament Studies) from the University of Aberdeen in the United Kingdom. He has lectured at university level in Ghana and other African countries for the past twenty-two years, including Moi University at which he became full professor in 1996. He is currently the second minister-in-charge of the St. Paul's Presbyterian Church, Cape Coast, Ghana.

## Prof. Paitoon Sinlarat

**Dean, Faculty of Education, Chulalongkorn University, Thailand**

Prof. Sinlarat received his Ph.D. in education from Pittsburgh University. He has been teaching at Chulalongkorn University for more than twenty years and was Dean of Education from 1993 to 1996 and from 1999 to the present. He also presides over the Thai Council of Deans of Education. He has authored many books and articles on the administration and reform of higher education institutions.

## Prof. David Chapman

**Chairperson, Department of Educational Policy and Administration, University of Minnesota, USA**

Prof. Chapman received his Ph.D. in education from Syracuse University. He has been in educational planning and program development in developing countries for thirty-five years in various positions at international organizations, consulting firms and universities. His areas of specialization are educational planning in developing countries, governmental involvement for improving education quality, and teachers' activities and their motivations.

## Prof. Morikazu Ushiogi

**Graduate School of International Studies, Obirin University, Japan**

Prof. Ushiogi obtained his Ph.D. in education from Tokyo University, Japan. He had been with Nagoya University for many years and taught at its Faculty of Education and Graduate School of International Development. He took the office of Dean of Education, Director of Nagoya University Library, and become a professor emeritus. His areas of specialization are higher education and educational development, on which he has published many books and articles. He is also a former member of the National Commission for UNESCO.

Hans J. A. Van Ginkel (Moderator),
Rector of the United Nations University

Thank you, Prof. Nagao. Thank you for still being with us. A coffee break is a dangerous moment. People might decide to continue coffee-breaking.

But, we'll have a difficult task. We had a first panel, which is a policy panel, and now we have a issue panel. But policy panel has already been so concrete and we had to see how many issues are left. But I'm sure that this my panel will do a good job. I would just like to remind you of the context in which we will be discussing. The day has been organized under the title: "Collaboration toward greater autonomy in educational development." I think it is a very important issue; so how can we achieve greater autonomy in educational development in each of the countries, and how can collaboration help to achieve this? And second one is for our panel, as our task is in fact to go into the direction of "The roles of Universities for the Development of Basic Education in Developing Countries." Maybe the idea behind it is that you don't import ideas, but ideas have to be generated in the country itself, and maybe universities have something to do with this. But we will have to see how this is perceived, and it is in fact the call of this discussion. I am really happy that we have five very experienced and different panelists.

Jonathan Jansen,
Dean, Faculty of Education, University of Pretoria, South Africa

Much nonsense has been written about universities in developing countries, some of this with tedious repetition before and especially since the end of colonial rule in Africa. Universities are called on to remedy all the ills of developing countries from poverty alleviation, to HIV/AIDS to community development. In South Africa, for example, billions of Rands have already been spent on remedial education programs (academic development) to compensate for 12 years of miserable schooling-an apartheid legacy that continues to bedevil the transformation of the education system. In one "bridging program" students should learn the foundations of language and literacy, as well as science and mathematics, in order to prepare them for advanced studies in a university environment. To be sure, the overwhelming poverty and the devastating legacy of apartheid demands a response from all institutions, including universities. But I will argue that an unthinking response could accelerate the demise of the small number of outstanding universities in Africa generally and in South Africa in particular.

Like most universities around the world, South African institutions regard a trilogy of functions as fundamental to the mission of higher education: teaching, research and community service-or what has more recently been called "service learning." Through teaching, the university clearly has a role to produce skilled labor for a growing economy and the intellectual capacity for deepening a young democracy. Through research the university seeks to position itself as a producer of knowledge and not simply a consumer of knowledge generated in the West; in the applied sciences, such knowledge is invaluable in addressing pressing problems in developing contexts. Through service learning, the university demonstrates its interconnectedness to the community (in all its diversity), offering opportunities for students to learn as they engage with preschool centers in townships, with legal aid clinics in the rural areas, and with business leaders in the corporate world; all of these settings provide, equally, the kinds of exposure that take learning beyond the confines of the seminar room or laboratory.

But there is a danger in over-emphasizing the service learning function at the expense of what Boyer might call the scholarship of teaching and the scholarship of discovery. My major concern in the past decade has been the need to establish African universities in the forefront of knowledge production in the world; and while the primary orientation of the African scholar would no doubt be one that seeks to redress pressing problems on the continent, it should simultaneously seek to locate the theoretical and methodological inventions of African scholarship within the global knowledge production system. There are several reasons for this position.

The African university remains, for all intents and purposes, a marginal player within the global knowledge production system. There are many reasons for this, not least the unstable political conditions in many postcolonial states and the devastating social and economic conditions that are in part induced by Africans themselves. But if Africa is to be taken seriously, it will have to generate once again the original questions, the creative designs, and the institutional cultures that place research and scholarship at the forefront of what a university is about in the first place. Universities are not schools, and they cannot compensate for 12 years of poor schooling; at the same time, universities are not colleges and therefore cannot be reduced to teaching institutions concerned primarily with conveying textbook knowledge to a new generation of students. Universities are also not non-governmental organizations (or even a government agency itself) responsible for the delivery of basic services to deprived

communities. A university anywhere is, in the first place, a site to advance the three kinds of scholarship to which I referred earlier. And unless there is clarity about such a position, the African university is doomed to remaining marginal within what I have called the global system of knowledge production.

In my daily work as an academic leader in South Africa's largest residential university with close to 40,000 students, and as Head of the Faculty that houses a combination of both distance education (about 10,000 active) and on-campus students (about 5000)-I recognize the challenge of development but in ways different from reducing a higher education institution to a service delivery agency of the state. Rather, in keeping with the core function of the university, and in the context of a Faculty of Education, I seek to do the following:

1. produce the highest level of academic and professional training to a new generation of young scholars (new PhDs) who are put through a systematic program of development that in 2003 cost R2.1 million (rands) and covered 180 hours of investment. Such development training includes training for the professorate, training in doctoral supervision, training to write a single-authored monograph that breaks new ground within the field of inquiry of the young scholar. To me, this is the primary development task of a third world university.

2. recruit the most promising black and women scholars in education from around the world (this forms 25% of my self-written job description) to build the development capacity and output of a university that, despite its almost 100-year existence, has until now limited its pool of expertise to white Afrikaners and its intellectual horizons to an inherently conservative way of thinking and theorizing. To me, this is the second task of the new African university in the transitional context of South Africa.

3. train the next generation of teachers (there is an estimated shortage of 25,000 such teachers that is set to increase due to AIDS in the teacher population) for competent and compassionate teaching in especially disadvantaged schools of the country. This has required major investments in the recruitment of black and rural teachers for whom the profession is singularly unattractive-and for reasons that I do not have time to explore in this paper. To me, this is the third task of an African university in a developing context.

4. create productive partnerships based on *reciprocity of learning* with schools (in country) and universities (outside the country) such that both partners gain from the relationship-in line with their core functions. This challenges the hierarchical and self-defeating colonial model of relationships which, tragically, continue to undermine the role of the third world university in Africa and elsewhere. To me, this is the fourth task of the African university and a crucial strategy in breaking the deep dependency on Western resources-material and intellectual.

More could be said. I simply wish to argue that we need to change the terms of the debate on the role of the University in the 21st Century in ways that break intellectual dependency, strengthen indigenous scholarship, seek out productive partnerships, and establish the African university at the center of the global knowledge system. It will not be easy.

Emmanuel Adow Obeng,
Vice Chancellor, University of Cape Coast, Ghana

First of all, let me also say a big thank you to the organizers. This is my first time in Japan, and I'm really amazed by the progress that one sees all around him or her in this country. I want to talk briefly about the role of a university in the development of basic education. And I'm going to draw from my university. First of all, let me post a question: Why do developing countries set up universities anyway? In the first place, why do they do it? They do it to produce human capital for national development, create knowledge through research, and disseminate that knowledge through publication, teaching, and extension. So, basically, we are saying that developing countries establish universities for teaching, research, and extension. Now, holding these functions together at their high levels is a challenge that the universities have to face in developing countries. I wouldn't say that we have failed, but rather that it is a challenge for us to do really high quality research, teaching, and extension. Holding all these together is what we need to look at as universities. And basic education in developing countries is a direct beneficiary of knowledge creation and knowledge dissemination of the universities. In other words, universities do contribute to the development of basic education.

In Ghana, there are two universities which have been set up specifically for education, two universities that engage with education. These are the University of Cape Coast and the University of Education Winneba. The University of Education Winneba is solely concerned with teachers. The University of Cape Coast has a Faculty of Education and that faculty of education is involved in education. And it does so many things to contribute to basic education. The first one is production of teachers. Sometimes this might sound mundane, but, well, universities are training teachers. But if you are not particular about basic education, if your basic education programs and teachers are not good enough, you are going to have a ripple effect and the students that you are going to have at the university, the students that in future you are going to have as top researchers, are going to be poor. So in order to address that, basic education becomes very, very crucial. As for the question that Jonathan raised that universities should be thinking about, you can only get top class students to think about those questions, top class citizens to think about those questions, if you take basic education seriously. I think that is what universities in Ghana are doing. In my university, for example, there are a number of institutes and departments which address issues of basic education. In addition to the production of teachers, they are involved in policy formulation, policies that guide basic education in the country; not just basic education but all levels of education. But since we are talking about basic education, I just want to concentrate on basic education.

For example, university academic staff serve on committees that review the curriculum of basic education and are involved in the training and selection of teachers, and so on. We have university academic staff involved in the examination of the teachers in basic education. So, academic staff are involved in the policy formulation of government agencies in the Ghana education service, that deal with basic education. Universities are also involved in the improvement of the quality of teaching and of the teacher. Our Institute of Education, which has a link with Hiroshima University, for example, is involved in monitoring all the teacher training colleges in the country. There are 42 teacher training colleges in Ghana. And all teacher training colleges are under the Institute of Education, which is part of the University of Cape Coast. And that Institute is responsible for monitoring the examinations and

all the programs that are run in the teacher training colleges. So the kind of teacher that comes out of the teacher training colleges is directly dependant on the action of the University of Cape Coast and the University of Education Winneba. The Institute of Education also is interested in improving the quality of the teachers. Also, it runs in-service training for the teachers. For example, there are some teachers who may not be able to leave their work to come into the university as full time students, so evening classes are run for them. They teach in the morning and the afternoon. In the evening, they attend evening classes to acquire more knowledge and understanding in order to improve on the work that they are doing. So they are not taken out of the classroom, but they are given extra training as they teach. And that raises the standard of the work that they are doing. And it also enables them to get a diploma, or a post-diploma, or a degree, once they engage in the task of teaching. So at the moment, at the evening class that the Institute of Education is running, we have quite a number of students, and from the thrust studies that we have done we can see that these teacher-students are really having an impact in their work. Now, the Institute also organizes workshops. These workshops are on evaluation so that the teachers themselves acquire skills on how to improve their evaluation skills in the classroom, so that they can bring the best out of their students. We also have a Center for Continuous Education, a center which has been sponsored by UNESCO. And the Center for Continuous Education is solely interested in improving the teaching skills of the teacher in the classroom. There are some teachers, if you look at Ghana's education system who are certificate "A" teachers. Now, the government has decided to upgrade all teacher training colleges to diploma-awarding institutions, so as to improve on what they are doing. So, what the Center for Continuous Education is doing is those who do not have a diploma, what they are doing is to try to upgrade them so that they can perform their task better. We have a Center for Research. And all that this center does is quality research in primary and education, and fit the results of their research into basic schools. The research informs teachers and thereby improves basic education and so they are able to improve what the teachers, headmasters and principals are doing.

Along with the Institute of Education and the Center for Continuous Education, we also have another institute: the Institute of Educational Planning and Administration (IEPA). This Institute also concentrates on coming up with programs and summer courses for headmasters and principals concerning school management to help them to manage their schools better and improve their basic education. All these centers are being sponsored, I am proud to say, by some foreign institutions, for example JICA. JICA, I know, is helping with our science programs in Ghana and Hiroshima University is working in collaboration with our Institute of Education. They are doing quite well in improving the basic education in Ghana. Some of the academic staff are also involved in the writing of textbooks; textbooks for basic education and textbooks for teachers to increase their knowledge and to improve their skills. So, in a nutshell, what I am saying is that, yes, the universities in Ghana, specifically the University of Cape Coast and the University of Education Winneba, are contributing effectively to the betterment of basic education in Ghana.

Paitoon Sinlarat,
Dean, Faculty of Education, Chulalongkorn University, Thailand

I would like to thank the organizing committee, especially Prof. Murata from the University of Tsukuba, for inviting me to join your important conference on the roles of universities in the development of basic education. I would like to discuss two approaches to this issue. The first role I would like to mention is the conservative or traditional role. This kind of role is the one whereby it is seen that the role of a faculty of education or university is to produce teachers, to produce administrators, to organize a course or service for teachers, to improve the quality, to improve evaluation skills, or something like that. I think this conservative role/ conservative activity is important, but it is not enough. We have done things in this way for a long time. But still in our country and in our region we have a lot of problems. The teachers are not good as what we expect. So I think in the future, the university especially the faculty of education should play another role. I would like to call it the innovative or progressive role. What is this role? This role is to help the basic education to go to a new direction, to move towards a new way of life and a new way of development in the country. As a faculty of education or as a university, we should develop a new kind of administrator. These administrators should have think in a new way with new approaches to organizing education. And also, I think universities should take the lead in education with new strategies for new aims of the country, rather than just maintaining the status quo and the same way of doing things we have had for a long time. In Thailand and in some other Asian countries, we don't have many activities related to the conservative role. So regarding collaboration, personally I would like to say this to the donor (or the developed countries or industrialized) countries. If you would like to work together with the universities in the developing countries, I would like to encourage you to focus on progressive activities. Make basic education very active and very pro-active. Use education to solve the problems of the country, not just to maintain the status quo. But if we go in this direction, what kind of problems are we likely to meet? If we do go in this direction we will meet several problems. At the present time, one problem being experienced in universities in my country and other South East Asian countries is that we don't have enough research in our country. Mainly, in the past, our universities, just like in some other Asian countries, have been teaching universities or teaching colleges. So if we only produce teachers as we do, then our teachers are just the people who transfer knowledge from foreign countries to the local people. So if we go in this direction, we have to move our colleges of education and our universities to being research universities. And nowadays, like our faculty, our university, we are moving from being a teaching university or a teaching college to being a research college. And also we are trying to move from telling-based teaching. This kind of teaching is that whereby the teacher or lecturer comes to the class and they tell everything they know, mainly simply regurgitating foreign books or something like that. So we are trying to find new approaches. We would like students to learn to find things by themselves and to study more on their own. So we have to move in this direction.

And also, we are trying to move from the ivory tower to more being community or society-oriented. Some universities are trying to move not only locally, but also to being more regional and more international. And so this is how we can move towards new aspects of collaboration. If we do this, what kind of collaboration should we pursue in the future?

I would like to talk about three words. The first is partnership. What do I mean by partnership? I think we

should tell the universities or colleges of education in developing countries to work together. In Thailand we have the Council of the Dean, a Consortium of the Dean of Education. I think we should encourage them to work together, because if they work individually, they cannot achieve as much. We do not have the necessary facilities and resources. So, we should work together in partnership.

The second word is networking. We should exchange ideas between developing and developed countries. Now, by using IT, for example the internet we can easily network and exchange ideas.

The last word is consortium. I think consortiums are very important for collaboration in the future. What do I mean by consortium? I mean that in regions like South East Asia, Africa, and Latin America, there should be consortiums. There should be regional collaboration between universities, and faculties and institutes of education. Then they can work together in their region. And from that consortium, we could then work with developing countries, and also developed countries like Japan, America, or those in Western Europe.

So, I would like to conclude that we have done many things for a long time in a traditional way and we have experienced a lot of problems. Nowadays, we must think in new and innovative ways to be more productive. That kind of productiveness come out of a combination of partnerships, networking, and consortiums. Thank you very much.

David Chapman,
Chairperson,
Department of Educational Policy and Administration, University of Minnesota, USA

One of the most urgent needs facing many low-income and middle-income countries is to extend access and strengthen the quality of primary and secondary (e.g., "basic") education. As Korea, Taiwan, and other countries in the Asia region have demonstrated, focused, sustained commitment to basic education can yield substantial economic and social returns in national development. This has led many industrialized countries to emphasize education in their international assistance to developing countries.

In the past, international aid to education systems in developing countries has concentrated largely on supporting infrastructure and facilities and providing inputs (money, textbooks) in the hope these contributions would affect the educational process in useful ways. While these remain important, increasing access, improving basic education quality, and strengthening educational institutions through attention to issues of equity, relevance, efficiency, innovation and sustainability, are of even greater concern. Higher education institutions have the intellectual reserves, the cross-sectoral perspective, and the long-term staying power to take on the task of working with the basic education systems of their own countries. Universities in both industrialized and developing countries have the expertise, the human resources and a unique role to play in these areas.

Here is what universities can provide to strengthen basic education: (1) joint research on policy and best practices; (2) curricula enhancement; (3) pre-service and in-service teacher training; (4) administrative transformation and leadership development; and (5) analysis of costs and financing.

Some recent examples involving U.S. institutions help illustrate how university partnerships support the development of basic education by working with institutions rather than individuals, making it possible to tap the resources of the whole institution.

- In Peru the University of Delaware worked with Pontifica Universidad Catolica del Peru to improve the teaching skills of science in math teachers in Peruvian public schools through problem-based learning.
- In EL Salvador Metropolitan Community College and Universidad CentroAmericana have partnered to train early childhood education specialists and informal caretakers to address the needs of rural at-risk children.
- In Ghana the University of South Florida is working with the University of Cape Coast (UCC) to improve teacher training at UCC and revise and implement a basic education curriculum.
- In Malawi, Virginia Polytechnic Institute is working with Domasi College of Education to enhance the research and pedagogical skills of professionals involved in primary teacher preparation programs.
- In Namibia Pacific Lutheran University is partnering with the University of Namibia in a project to enable primary school teachers to strengthen knowledge, teaching, and language skills.

In many developing countries, higher education institutions have remained remarkably detached and disconnected from development problems. One reason is that higher education leaders have been skeptical about becoming too closely involved in the applied aspects of national development, often from a concern about their

universities becoming politicized. But the risks are changing. The growing danger now is that universities will be judged irrelevant by their own national governments and will have increasing difficulty competing for public funds. Entering into a university partnership to support the development of a stronger basic education system offers universities in developing countries an important opportunity to reengage in their own national development.

University partnerships represent a substantial change from previous ways many governments have involved universities in development. In the past, development organizations - such as the United States Agency for International Development (USAID)- have often involved individual university academic staff or administrators as individual consultants who were involved only on a piecemeal basis. USAID's university partnership program moves away from this model, to emphasize institutional relationships that are larger than any one individual participant. For this reason, these partnerships often have a life beyond the availability of particular faculty members. This contributes to the possibility of longer-term sustainability. As part of its search for more sustainable development strategies, USAID sought mechanisms that would shift greater responsibility for development assistance from international experts to a country's own institutions. University partnerships do this by vesting more responsibility in colleges and universities in developing countries. They are the ones who determine the development need and can envision the desired outcomes from such collaborations.

A variety of university partnership arrangements have been supported with USAID funding. Partnerships can be between individual institutions -one in the U.S. and one in the participating country, between groups of institutions working in partnership, or between universities working in alliance with private sector businesses or organizations. The partnerships can (and do) involve a wider range of institutional types - both public and private colleges and universities.

At a practical level, how do universities get involved? To create a network of international university partnerships, USAID entered into an arrangement with six of the major national higher education associations in the United States. These six associations agreed to collaborate in establishing a single office, the Association Liaison Office for University Partnership in Development (ALO), which would draw on the knowledge and contacts across all six associations in setting up international partnerships. USAID provides ALO with funds to operate its office and for awards that ALO makes on a competitive basis to universities for partnership proposals.

Interested administrators and academic staff in U.S. colleges and universities develop proposals, each in collaboration with their counterparts from their partnering institutions in USAID-assisted countries. USAID-supported university partnerships are not necessarily limited to strengthening basic education. The collaboration can be in virtually any field - environment, health, business, agriculture. University partnership projects have been formed around such topics as watershed management, health care delivery, assistance to small business owners, development of tourism, and better agricultural practices. The common element is that the partnership activities are aimed at helping higher education institutions in developing countries reach beyond themselves to engage in issues that directly affect the development of their nation. One or more universities in the United States and one or more universities in a developing country agree to work together for a 2-3 year period on a project of mutual interest and benefit.

The ALO university partnerships program has made a significant contribution to both international development and to the development of higher education. In the last six years, ALO has awarded $26,000,000 in

USAID funds to fund 189 proposals.

USAID likes these university partnerships because they produce development results and they have positive fiscal and political benefits for the US government. USAID can show the U.S. Congress that its funds are highly leveraged. That is, the funds USAID awards through ALO for international higher education development lead to additional matching funds contributed by the partner institutions themselves. Two dollars of development may occur for every one dollar that USAID contributes. The positive political payoff is that, by funding programs that involve U.S. universities, the program builds domestic political support across the U.S. for the work of USAID.

To illustrate the wide range of partnership activities that have been undertaken though the ALO program, I am handing out a list of recent awards. I am also handing out some other materials that further describe the ALO university partnership program. Finally, I would point out that Ms. Christine Morfit, the Deputy Executive Director of ALO, is attending this meeting today and can answer questions about ALO that you might have.

Morikazu Ushiogi,
Graduate School of International Studies, Obirin University, Japan

Almost 130 years ago, Japan abandoned its isolation policy of many long years and embarked on the road to modernization. The drive to modernize the country was promoted across wide and diverse areas extending to politics, economics, law, transportation, communications and medicine. In this process, one of the most important areas singled out by the government for dedicating its efforts to was education. In 1872, for the first time, Japan began to create a modern school system. Thirty years later, the attendance rate for primary education exceeded 90%. The reason why the prevalence of primary education became so widespread in such a short period was above all because the drive to spread it nationally was spearheaded by the government, and because the people responded enthusiastically to the government's call, providing the necessary funds and labor generously. Primary schools were built in regions throughout Japan and a large portion of the funds needed for this purpose was provided by the local population. The people held great expectations for the schools, believing them to be the gateway to progress and the place where their children would acquire new knowledge to prepare them for their future roles in a new society. Of course, Japan faced a number of difficult issues in the process of developing its primary education system. In every area of Japan for a time there was a degree of chaos and confusion. However, overcoming these various issues one by one, Japan succeeded in making the availability of primary education a reality. The history of this time holds many useful lessons.

I believe that all of you attending today are well aware that the goal, "Education For All" was chosen as the goal of The World Conference on Education for All 1990 Jomtien. Today making primary education available to all children on earth is an issue shared by every society of humanity. Japan has until now expressed its position to cooperate in a positive way, utilizing its experiences of the past in reaching this goal. At the Kananaskis Summit in 2002, Prime Minister Koizumi announced the Basic Education for Growth Initiative, or BEGIN, and made clear Japan's intentions to increase assistance for the promotion of opportunities in education and for improving its quality and administration.

To date, Japan's ODA has been utilized mainly for the development of the economic infrastructure in various countries, but since the Social Summit in 1995, emphasis has gradually shifted to the area of social development, and there have been requests for international cooperation in the areas of medical care, welfare and education. In addition, there has been an increasing demand for personnel involved in practical affairs of international cooperation and the need to train such personnel in an organized way has been recognized. At just that time, universities in Japan were searching for a new direction. Since 2001, from such reform efforts by universities, graduate schools for international development were established at Japanese universities, one after the other. Currently there are six universities in Japan with centers for international cooperation.

To comment on the situation in Japan in regard to today's theme, "The role of universities in the development of primary education in developing countries", I would like to report that currently a System for "Cooperation Bases" with the aim of building a network linking universities is being created with Hiroshima University and the University of Tsukuba at the center. The purpose of this System for "Cooperation Bases" is to organize and utilize the experience Japan gained in the area of educational cooperation and to share it. This Japan Education Forum

represents the first outcome of this System for “Cooperation Bases”. Making use of JEF as an opportunity, we plan to create a network linking various universities in Japan and utilize the knowledge, information and know-how gathered there in the area of international cooperation and international development.

However, it is not our intention to limit this network to stay within Japan’s borders. It is our plan to promote actively a network with other universities outside of Japan as well. Already Hiroshima University has launched the “African Higher Educational Institute Network Project for the Improvement of Basic Education” and is actively involved in the creation of a network with African higher educational institutes as well as linking its network with Asian universities to improve basic education in Africa. The concept of this project was the result of an agreement reached at the Third Tokyo International Conference on African Development (TICAD 3) held in Tokyo in September 2003. At this conference, participants from Africa reconfirmed their conviction that for the people of Africa to reach their potential fully it was vital to promote development that centered on people and, to achieve this, improvement in education was essential. At this same conference, the Japanese government proposed the examination of a scheme using higher educational institutes in regions of Africa as a measure for improving the quality of basic education in African countries, and a large number of African countries agreed with this proposal.

Under this project, plans are being made to link Japanese and African universities to enable them to share their experiences mutually and conduct policy research in order to promote the spread of primary education in Africa. In addition to Japan and Africa, there are also plans to maintain links with universities in Thailand and promote research.

To proceed with these activities, there are a number of issues which first need to be overcome. For example, for university instructors to participate in projects related to international development, the major obstacle is the issue of making their participation compatible with their teaching activities at university. Teaching is the foremost mission and responsibility of instructors and they cannot abandon their classes. Furthermore, in Japanese universities instructors are expected to be involved in classes and other university-related activities, including exams, for 12 months of the year. The system is not like that in the United States where university instructors receive only nine months’ salary and are free to choose what they do for the remaining three months of the year, such as writing, research, or field work.

Therefore, even if there is a request for cooperation from organizations like JICA or JBIC involving university instructors, their availability to go to overseas areas is extremely limited to times such as winter or summer vacations. In Japanese universities, the system of sabbaticals is also not very well defined and it is not easy for university instructors to go abroad as JICA specialists for extended periods, like 1-year terms. Consequently, the position of university instructors has come to be viewed by international cooperation organizations such as JICA or JBIC as a profession that is hard to utilize.

However, the situation in Japan is changing constantly year by year and an environment where instructors can be available to participate in international cooperation is gradually evolving. It is always the responsibility of universities to give shape to new knowledge, to apply it in a practical way and further develop it into knowledge that is useful. To create knowledge that is useful, engaging in dialogue dealing with the actual situation, is essential. Recent theories on knowledge teach that “without participation, there is no learning”. It is therefore my sincere wish that this forum will provide ample opportunities for very stimulating discussion and participation.

Van Ginkel

The discussions could be described as attempts to engage universities one step further. The conference has been reminded that now is a time when universities are not only looking at the context of developing countries and principles of learning and joining in partnership, but also when governments are forcing universities to adopt a new model of knowledge export. In the new model, universities are required to attract students from other countries who will pay their own fees and fare. It is thought that this too should be considered as universities enter into partnerships.

*Comment 1*

Molly Lee (Malaysia Science University)

The universities should be a public critique of society to bring about social transformation and political development.

Training teachers for primary and secondary schools is one of the direct links between universities and basic education. Universities should provide the right kind of teacher education in order to put the right kind of teachers into schools. However, there is a problem for this in developing countries, especially in Asia. Education is known to be examination oriented, focusing on memorization of facts to pass examinations. If teachers are educated in such a way, there will be a vicious circle. Universities are challenged to make sure that teachers are taught to be critical, to ask questions, and to take issue with what is happening in society.

*Comment 2*

Akemi Bando (Osaka University, Japan)

The conference was informed by Prof. Utsumi of the many children with disabilities in Afghanistan. He has testified to a situation whereby the majority of children cannot go to school but are confined to their homes because there are no teachers to teach. The Japanese government is now assisting this country to train teachers for children with disabilities. So the situation may change, although in Japan, children with disabilities have only been catered for as part of regular compulsory education since 1979. Thus the conference is asked to ensure that children with disabilities are always part and parcel of education irrespective of the demands of the society. Such children should be thought of from their own perspective, and their unique talents ought to be developed just like any other children. Teacher training universities are also challenged to do further research bearing in mind the need for training teachers to be able to teach both disabled as well as able-bodied children.

*Comment 3*

Samuel Murinda (University of Tsukuba, from Zimbabwe)

A typical university in a developing country is based on a model of a university in a developed country, where the developing country university educators are educated. It would not be fair to say that the developing country universities are not doing enough to support basic education. There are needs to be met as in any educational process, but they are not problems.

*Comment 4*

Komlavi Seddoh (UNESCO)

This JEF meeting reminds me of the world conference on higher education held in 1998, which devoted a systematic debate to the contribution of higher education to the education system as a whole. Following that, UNESCO and the UN University have been trying to make the evidence a single reality, but it has not been easy. The Dakar Education For All framework of action, which forms the background of the support given to Education For All, is in line with the declaration adopted by the world conference on higher education. The goals of the two declarations harmoniously complement each other. Whereas basic education seeks to attain for learners the means for effective participation in social and cultural life, higher education caters for youth in a more advanced stage of life, where more complex teaching oriented towards more specialized training and more advances in the edification of personality are required. All these stages must converge towards a bigger system, allowing the individuals to acquire lifelong knowledge encompassing scholastic, extra-curricular and non-scholastic programs. Nonetheless, governments are not ready to put higher education as a priority in their programs despite the knowledge that achieving the goals of basic education is not possible without a good higher education.

*Comment 5*

Max Stephen (University of Tsukuba, from Australia)

Basic education should not be seen as a fixed notion in developing countries as well as developed countries in areas of science and mathematics; the notion of what constitutes basic numeracy has changed significantly. For example, the mathematics that emphasized basic numeracy, assuming that most would drop out at the middle school level, and that allowed only a few students to go for higher education, belonged to an agricultural/industrial society where many were engaged in simple, labour-intensive tasks. If basic education, that is minimal, were to be imported into developing countries, this would mean certain assumptions about the ongoing economic structures of those countries, their lack of competition, and their lack of informed citizenship that should drive their growing economies, education and international competitiveness. While this is not to argue that basic education is not important, when developed countries are looking critically at basic literacy and numeracy, nothing less should be advocated for developing countries.

*Comment 6*

Charles Aarnenson (US Embassy/USAID)

USAID has been working with the Support Centre in Japan. Underway is a plan seeking to partner USAID, the Support Centre, a US university, and a Japanese university with an Asian or African university. This program will be announced in the next 2 months. USAID seeks to work with HEPAD (Higher Education Partnership for African Development) and Asian Universities. The key is reciprocity, as Prof. Jansen stressed. Private sector involvement and community participation will be important. Interested countries and universities were asked to check the USAID. GOV website.

Jansen

I agree with Molly Lee. Universities in developing countries should change questions -from whether or not they should be involved in development or train more teachers, which is one of the questions belonging to the 20th century, to those for redressing the serious problems to be faced in the 21st century. One such question universities in Africa have failed in addressing concerns special needs education. They have failed to provide the infrastructure for active participation of disabled students and staff in university life. This is not only a moral or technical issue of providing equal access, but touches on the value base of education for the 21st century, which should be education for compassion. One of the reasons why the world has become a more dangerous place is that we have focussed narrowly on education for skills. Hence there is a need for special needs education for broader human values commitment. Similarly how to provide education in universities for students/people with HIV/AIDS is a major issue in South Africa and Botswana. Finally, I agree with the view expressed by our Australian colleague. We should ask what constitutes basic education and if the schools are really fulfilling the needed functions.

Oben

In Ghana, poaching of teachers by developed countries has contributed to the shortage of quality teachers. Poor remuneration offered to teachers discourages the best students from enrolling to be trained as teachers and, even if they do enroll and complete the training, they go into other sectors. So we are forced to upgrade those teachers who remain in the system through in-service-training. They should be given an opportunity to acquire new skills.

Universities have to engage in research that is relevant to societal needs. How to capacitate teachers in the classroom is a cutting edge issue, whose research will benefit the existing teachers and the education system as a whole.

In Ghana two universities train teachers and in these universities they have departments of special education, where students are trained to teach disabled children. Some blind students too are trained as teachers among others.

Sinlarat

Thailand focuses on the CCPR (Critical thinking, Creativity, Productivity and Responsibility) model of teacher training. Teachers are expected to be critical, but not only to question existing situations and information, but also to be creative, that is to think in a new way. But just thinking is not enough; it should lead to a product, to productivity. And finally, teachers must be responsible to the community, the school and to the family.

Research on education has to be relevant to the society; it has to be touching the real situation on the ground. It is very important to learn about and understand the society before creating new strategies in a new direction. New development for society should not be merely following foreign knowledge and foreign models, but should be based on research concerning the real situation in the society, especially its rich diversity. Only then can what is learned from abroad become useful.

Chapman

There should not necessarily be a tension between my call on universities to be more involved in national

development with Dr. Jansen's call for universities not to lose sight of their important role in doing research. What is important is to know that often too much research has been devoted to researching problems already well understood and that, there is not enough research focused on investigating the solutions to those problems and testing alternative strategies for solving the problems. Perhaps too much time is spent on admiring the problems and not enough for exploring solutions.

Ushiogi

Although Japan is a top donor country, I sometimes wonder if Japan is a developed country or a developing country. Perhaps it is time for the world to think in terms of a common framework. Whereas there could be something good in Japanese education system, it would not necessarily be equally good if placed in other countries. What is important is dialogue to impact one another in a positive way. It should be noted that both developed and developing countries have something to learn through the dialogue process. Japan does have a number of problems in its own education system for which it hopes to find solutions by learning from other countries through collaboration.

*Comment 7*

Jairam Reddy (UNU)

I have a question for Dr. Chapman. You have talked about research partnerships between developed and developing countries' universities. Have there been any rigorous and robust studies which indicate that the partnerships have in fact had some kind of impact on improving the quality of teacher education or any other impact?

And I have a question for Dr. Jansen. Many teachers in South Africa were trained in education colleges. However, in 1997 the education colleges were incorporated into the universities or technicons. When this recommendation was made in 1997, it was quite heavily criticized on the grounds that the teacher education colleges over a number of years developed a particular ethos and expertise in teaching at the classroom level, but when they are transferred to the universities and technicons, they are elitist institutions focusing on research and have little expertise on the classroom situation. What has happened to this incorporation? Is there evidence of improved teacher education? If it had improved, then would it have had a direct impact on improving the quality of basic education?

*Comment 8*

Dimity Podger (Macqvaire University, Australia)

Do universities have a role in developing research skills in teachers to undertake their own reflections on practice to improve basic education and, through their learning, feedback into the university system in terms of what the curriculum is for teachers/for training teachers, so that there may be a reciprocal relationship between teachers and the universities, whereby the universities themselves learn from teachers?

*Comment 9*

Christine Morfit (ALO)

Regarding inter-universities collaboration, the panel has mentioned three forms; partnerships, consortia and

networks. Are there any examples of or ideas for new ways of fostering such collaboration, particularly in Asia and Africa?

*Comment 10*

Yu Osanai (Graduate Institute for Policy Studies, Japan)

Japanese universities have been engaged in sending people on JICA sponsored projects. Professors/faculty members under their own initiative have been extending services to JICA sponsored projects. But from April 2004, the national universities will become incorporated and also JICA will also be promoting reforms. From then on, service provision will be on contract basis, meaning that universities will enter into contracts. The support centers will play the role of a counselling centre.

The support center learnt a lot from ALO; partnership programs exist in the USA but not in Japan. Japanese universities and the developing nation universities have to cooperate to contribute to the development of the developing nations. To achieve this, a funding scheme is required, and so the Japanese Ministry of Education (MEXT), JICA and the foreign ministry are asked to help.

*Comment 11*

Maki Hayashikawa (JICA)

Having a panel composed of men only to discuss the contribution of higher education to basic education is worrying. If the major call for EFA (Education For All) is to reduce gender disparity, which means growth in women's education, such an arrangement should not happen. Higher education is expected be a model, a place to present a model for men and women. Women and girls cannot be convinced that education is important for their lives when the female participation rate in higher education is low. Questionable too are the kind of opportunities available for women who complete their higher education. Such conferences have to give the correct image; lest the wrong impression should be sent to the society at large. There considerations lead me to ask what kinds of constraints or limitations face universities in contributing to the policy dialogue in the development of basic education. Lack of or low participation rate of females in universities or other institutions of higher education is already a kind of constraint or limitation in making up very valid policy contributions to girls' education.

*Comment 12*

Aya Okada (Nagoya University, Japan)

An example of collaboration is that of joint research conducted by a Cambodian University with a Japanese University. Having a long-standing experience in providing international cooperation in the education sector in Cambodia, Nagoya University conducted joint research with the Royal University of Namben. The two universities researched the effects of literacy programs on the lives of women in rural Cambodia under the sponsorship of UNICEF. During the research, which was funded by the Japanese Government through UNESCO, both faculty members and students from two institutions participated in the research, visiting a total of 75 villages in rural Cambodia. In the research team, the universities incorporated local education administrators from the districts in Cambodia. It served as a great opportunity for them in terms of capacity building and the universities learnt a great

deal from the joint activities. However, sustaining such initiatives is difficult because of limited funding. Therefore a question directed to Dr. Chapman: In partnership programs how can sustainability be ensured?

Comment 13

Terumasa Akio (Minsai Center, Japan)

I am wondering if South-South Cooperation is possible in teacher training. Khon Kaen University in Thailand accepts Laos masters teachers to study for their Ph.D. Since the countries are very close, there is no problem of language and culture. In one such program, Japanese NGOs provided the funds, and Thai universities provided the knowledge, and the benefits went to Laos. Cost performance is good for this kind of cooperation. For the students, it is better for them to learn in a neighboring country with certain cultural similarities than to go to a far away country with a very different education system. I would like to know if something like this may be tried elsewhere in Asia or Africa.

Comment 14

Takako Yuki (University of Tokyo, Japan)

A question to Dr. Chapman: In ALO's role to support US colleges and universities in policy analysis and dialogue in primary and secondary education in developing countries, what were the difficulties encountered, if any, during the process of development over the decades and how were they solved?

Ushiogi

When two countries get together in collaboration, the donor and the recipient have to act on the same time schedule. However, their timing does not always coincide and this is usually beyond the capacity of the university that is involved in the program. However, once a framework is established, dialogue has to be used to put things straight.

Sinlarat

An example of a consortium or partnership is the ASEAN University Network, which can work with universities outside the ASEAN area, as well. Another example is ASIO, which promotes collaboration. Thirdly, there is a network between Thailand and her neighbouring countries (Cambodia, Laos and Myanmar) which basically have a common culture based on Buddhism. The universities in the four countries cooperate in exchanging ideas, by organising seminars and inviting experts from Europe, Japan and America.

In Thailand, teachers are encouraged to do simple action research, such as observing students and writing a kind of report. This forms a basic form of constructivist research, which has been found to be very constructive.

Thailand has no problem with the availability of opportunities for women; in fact, there are many more women than men in universities. It seems that women are better than men when it comes to taking examinations. So in some areas, they are more than amply present.

Chapman

As for the evidence/studies of impact from university partnership programs; each partnership is required to do an evaluation of the success of its own activities. Although some partnerships work better than others, generally those evaluations suggest that the partnerships have been able to accomplish their goals. Whereas this conference is about basic education, the partnerships to be examined for evaluation at a national meeting in the United States shortly will cover many areas, such as basic education, health, watershed management, tourism and human rights. Attempts are being made to develop some estimate of the impact that cuts across all the different kinds of projects.

One problem facing partnerships is when the sponsor, such as USAID, wants to see results more quickly than the result could be developed. This is especially so in those kinds of partnership projects that hinge on human relationships. It is not a major problem perhaps, but it is an issue. Partnerships come about often from very strong relationships and friendships built between the faculty collaborators in the institutions in the United States and in the developing countries. The partnership develops and becomes sustainable when these friendships lead to new research projects and other kinds of collaborations that go beyond the funding.

Oben

At the two legally mandated teacher training institutions in Ghana more women are encouraged to get into teaching through deliberate admission policy. That is how the garden issue is addressed. As an example of international collaboration, I would mention the example of the collaboration between the University of Cape Coast in Ghana and Florida A&M University in the United States. It is focused on the joint development of new programs, of research and teaching. After four years, the new program becomes a program of our university. One new program developed was on educational leadership. In three years of joint work, the program allowed us to develop our teaching staff and to adopt it fully in our country.

Reading the question of research by teachers, in Ghana teachers who pursue masters' degrees are asked to do research on issues that affect them in their schools while teaching. And usually they pick research areas where they are very conversant. This way not only the quality of research is assured but also the relevance of its results.

Jansen

Incorporating colleges into universities and technicons in South Africa was a mistake because of the incredible knowledge of the classroom and teaching experience of people in the colleges. In the past, although there was pressure to fire them, at my university 30% of the teachers who have been teaching in those colleges were taken as university academics. They were selected based on their teaching good practice and willingness to pursue a PhD.

Research should not be seen as something theoretical and abstract. It is indeed a practical activity. At the University of Pretoria, in the very first year of the 4-year training program for teachers, students learn about research. They do not learn theories of research but learn how to think, how to orient themselves in asking good questions about things around them. When students go for their teaching practice, they enter into a very powerful partnership--between an established, really good teacher, an academic and the student-teachers themselves. The good teacher provides wisdom of practice; the academic provides the theory that goes with it, while the student-teacher comes with idealism. The partnership is preceded by 6 months of preparatory work. The program is action-oriented and

focused on specific problems. The current problem of interest is to know the kind of model of teaching that can create inclusive education in classrooms, for children with disabilities, black children, and girls, among others.

For a regional model for cooperation, Africa could explore one through NEPAD (New Partnership for African Development). Already Mozambique has started, instead of sending her academics to the Netherlands for their PhD training, they bring them to my university in South Africa. It costs less, is nearer, and the academics do not need to leave their families behind. If four or five regions of Africa were to collaborate and establish a top university with a really good library, one center of excellence, that would draw people from all over Africa, it would save a lot.

As far as the gender issue is concerned, the role, modelling and images sent are really a crucial part of development. The only credibility in development work is the credibility of your own personal example. So I am embarrassed to sit among the male-only panellists. This is something to which the organizers should really pay attention.

Van Hinkel

I would like to close the discussion by mentioning some of the keywords and concepts which highlighted it. Maybe it is time to rethink basic education; be innovative; reciprocal; education for compassion; have the basic things right and sit together, and have dialogues to work with neighboring countries to have a real partnership. Thank you.

# Closing Session

Remarks by Taizo Muta,
President, Hiroshima University

His Excellency Mr. Younous Qanooni, Minister of Eudcation, Transitional Islamic State of Afganistan, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen; my name is Taizo Muta, president of Hiroshima University. On behalf of the four hosting organizations, I would like to extend my remarks in closing this meeting.

First of all, I would like to express my deep appreciation to all the participants for your contribution to the organization and successful completion of this inaugural meeting of the Japan Education Forum (JEF).

Since the early 1970's, for more than 30 years, Japan has assisted developing countries in fostering human resources for the goal of self-reliance. In the field of education, assistance focused mainly on construction of schools and on accepting international students. However, under the slogan of "Education for All," complete enrollment of all the children on the earth has become the common goal of all the countries in the world. Accordingly, Japan is also expanding the assistance that is directly related to the contents and quality of education in the developing countries, as represented by science and mathematics education and school management. The forum today is the first step to send out information to the world from this focal point regarding the relatively new commitment of Japan in the arena of international educational cooperation. The forum was very rewarding and worthwhile as we were able to listen to speakers responsible for educational administration in the government of developing countries, as well as to hear future outlook from speakers affiliated with universities, and we discussed actively how we, as an international society, should address these issues. It is a great joy as an organizer if this forum results in an increased awareness in international educational cooperation across Japan, and a greater stride is made in Japanese international cooperation.

Personally, the panel discussion on the new issues "The Roles of Universities for the Development of Basic Education in Developing Countries" which just finished, were very close to home as I work for a university. Japanese universities are currently at a crossroad and are undergoing a big transformation. As universities are turning into independent administrative institutions, contributions to the development of society are increasingly called for, in addition to their commitment to advanced research, diversified education, revitalized management, and internationalization. In fact, a substantial number of universities are strengthening and increasing contributions to international cooperation in the field of education. I found the personal opinion addressed by Prof. Ushiogi also representative of the intentions and desires of Japanese universities.

Hiroshima University, that I represent, has five guiding principles. We place pursuit of peace as the first principle. As a higher educational institution in Hiroshima, which experienced the first atomic bomb in the world, we believe it a task that our university bears from a historical perspective, to highlight and make much of the spirit of pursuing peace. However, as the world becomes more diversified and complex in the 21st century, the concept of peace has also started to require multi-tiered and composite understanding. It became necessary to explore a wide-range and in-depth understanding of peace: not only peace from the perspective of international relations, namely to avoid war, conflicts and friction, and to suppress the production and use of weapons of mass destruction, but peace from a regional and national perspective to protect society from poverty and environmental deterioration, as

well as ensuring security at the individual level must be explored. As a university that seeks to become a leading university in the world, we would like to strengthen the intellectual infrastructure to become a research and education base, to understand the modern concept of peace, and to work towards the realization of peace. We would also like to collaborate with institutions for higher education around the world, and to be able to assume a role that understands and supports activities directed towards world peace.

As a part of activities that pursue peace at Hiroshima University, we have been exploring the possibility of building peace through educational development. I personally believe that educational development is the foundation of social development, poverty eradication that could become causes of war and conflict, and guides society to sustainable peace in the end. In 1997, the Center for the Study of International Cooperation in Education (CICE) was established as the first center among all the institutions for higher education in Japan for the purpose of promoting practical developmental research and for exploring the way international cooperation is provided to assist educational development in developing countries. Together with its brother institution, the Center for Research on International Cooperation in Educational Development (CRICED), University of Tsukuba, this center has developed into a core organization of higher education institutions which promotes international educational cooperation. We are also collaborating with research institutions around the world to promote unique research for educational development. We are confident that we are steadily contributing to world peace through our small-scale but continuous and strenuous activities.

Last but not least, I would like to extend my gratitude once again to all of you who attended this forum. My special thanks also go to the co-organizers; the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and the University of Tsukuba, as well as the sponsors; the Japan International Cooperation Agency, the Japan Bank for International Cooperation, and the United Nations University. I would like to conclude my closing remarks by wishing that this forum be held every year and lead to further development of Japanese international educational cooperation.

**Japan Education Forum (March 4, 2004)**

Edited and Published by Center for the Study of International Cooperation in Education, Hiroshima University
1-5-1 Kagamiyama, Higashi-Hiroshima
739-8529 JAPAN
TEL +81-82-424-6959
FAX +81-82-424-6913
E-mail：cice@hiroshima-u.ac.jp
URL：http://home.hiroshima-u.ac.jp/cice

Printed by Mihara Print Corporation