

Japan-United States DIALOGUE SEMINAR

Exploring the Role of Universities in
Japan and the United States in
Educational Cooperation for Development

October 17–20, 2004

Hiroshima Prince Hotel

Organized by
The Center for the Study of International Cooperation in Education
Hiroshima University
The Association Liaison Office for University Cooperation in Development

Supported by
The Japan Foundation Center for Global Partnership
United States Agency for International Development



**THE ASSOCIATION LIAISON OFFICE
FOR UNIVERSITY COOPERATION IN DEVELOPMENT**



**Center for the Study of
International Cooperation in Education**





USAID Cooperative Agreement
HNE-A-00-97-00059-00

American Council on Education • American Association of Community Colleges
American Association of State Colleges and Universities • Association of American Universities National
Association of Independent Colleges and Universities
National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges

1307 New York Avenue NW, Suite 500
Washington, DC 20005-4701 USA
Tel: (202) 478-4700 • Fax: (202) 478-4715
E-mail: alo@aascu.org
<http://www.aascu.org/alo>

This publication was made possible in part through support provided by the
Office of Education, USAID, through Cooperative Agreement HNE-A-00-97-00059-00.
The opinions expressed do not necessarily reflect the views of USAID.



Table of Contents

List of Abbreviations iii

Foreword vii

 Welcome Remarks vii
 Susumu Takahashi, Vice President, Hiroshima University

 Welcome Remarks ix
 Masao Ito, Deputy Director, Center for Global Partnership, Japan Foundation

 Congratulatory Remarks x
 The Right Honorable Howard Baker, U.S. Ambassador to Japan

Executive Summary xiii

Keynote Address 1
Masayuki Inoue, Director General for International Affairs, Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology

Overview 7
Ann Austin-Beck, Michigan State University

Cooperation and the Meaning of Partnership 9
Shoko Yamada, National Graduate Institute for Policy Studies

Summary of Proceedings: Presentations

 University Involvement in Educational Cooperation in Japan and the United States 11
 Japanese University Involvement in International Cooperation for Basic Education
 Development in Developing Countries 11
 Kazuo Kuroda, Waseda University

 Support and Coordination Project for University Cooperation
 in International Development (SCP) 12
 Masaru Osanai, National Graduate Institute for Policy Studies

 What Is the Future of U.S. Higher Education and International
 Development Partnerships? 13
 John Hudzik, Michigan State University

 Case Studies of U.S. Higher Education Engagement in Teacher Education
 in South Africa 17
 Developing Teaching Capacity in South Africa 17
 Marilyn Pugh, Prince George's Community College

 Engagement of Naruto University of Education, Japan, in the
 Mpumalanga Secondary Science Initiative (MSSI) Project, South Africa 18
 Yumiko Ono, Naruto University of Education

Issues and Challenges for Donor Organizations in Supporting Their National Universities for Work in Basic Education in Aid-Assisted Countries	21
JICA-University Cooperation in Education Development: Current Practice, Issues, and Prospects	21
<i>Maki Hayashikawa, Japan International Cooperation Agency</i>	
JBIC-University Cooperation in Education Development	23
<i>Kazuhiro Yoshida, Japan Bank for International Cooperation</i>	
USAID-University Cooperation in Education Development	24
<i>Donald Mackenzie, United States Agency for International Development</i>	
Exploring University Cooperation for Education in Development	26
<i>Paul White, Former Mission Director, USAID/Mexico</i>	
Outline of Issues and Challenges in Forming Higher Education Partnerships with Institutions in Developing Countries	29
<i>Seiji Utsumi, Osaka University</i>	
Opportunities and Issues in Forming Higher Education Partnerships in Developing Countries	31
<i>David Chapman, University of Minnesota</i>	
Summary of Proceedings: General Discussion	35
Closing Remarks	43
<i>Shinji Ishii, CICE</i>	
Appendix A. Agenda	45
Appendix B. List of Participants	49
Appendix C. Japan Participant Biographies	51
Appendix D. U.S. Participant Biographies	55

List of Abbreviations

ALO

Association Liaison Office for
University Cooperation in Development

BEGIN

Basic Education for Growth Initiative

CGP

Center for Global Partnership

CICE

Center for the Study of International
Cooperation in Education

EFA

Education for All Initiative

FDI

Foreign Direct Investment

GLP

Global Learning Portal

ICET

International Council on
Education for Teaching

JAFSA

Japan Network for International Education

JBIC

Japan Bank for International Cooperation

JICA

Japan International Cooperation Agency

JOVC

Japan Overseas Cooperation Volunteers

MCA

Millennium Challenge Account

MCC

Millennium Challenge Corporation

MEXT

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports,
Science, and Technology

NAFSA

Association of International Educators

SCP

Support and Coordination Project
for University Cooperation in International
Development

TELP

Tertiary Education Linkages Project

UNESCO

United Nations Educational, Cultural, and
Scientific Organization

UNU

United Nations University

USAID

United States Agency for
International Development

WEF

World Economic Forum

Foreword

Welcome Remarks by Susumu Takahashi, Vice President, Hiroshima University

Distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, I am Susumu Takahashi, vice president of Hiroshima University, which is hosting this Japan-United States Dialogue Seminar. On behalf of our president, Taizo Muta, who unfortunately cannot be here with you because of an overseas mission, I would like to welcome you all to Hiroshima. It is indeed a great honor and privilege for our university to invite you to this meeting, titled “Exploring the Role of Universities in Japan and the United States in Educational Cooperation for Development.”

On March 4, 2004, our university organized, jointly with the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology (MEXT) and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan, and Tsukuba University, the inaugural meeting of the Japan Education Forum, called JEF for short, in Tokyo. You will find a copy of its report in the documentation folder for the present meeting. As part of this forum, a panel discussion was organized on “The Roles of Universities for the Development of Basic Education in Developing Countries.” Professor David Chapman, who is with us today, was, in fact, on this panel, along with four other education professors from different parts of the world. The discussion at this panel highlighted the opportunities and challenges that existed for interuniversity collaboration for supporting educational development in developing countries, including involvement of universities in these countries.

The present dialogue seminar represents an attempt to carry this discussion further. Its primary purpose is to engage in in-depth exchanges of experiences between Japanese and American university-based and aid agency experts in international educational cooperation and to jointly search for possibilities of building alliances with a specific focus on the role of universities in promoting basic education development in developing countries. Since you are all working in this field, I do not believe there is any need for me to remind you of the importance of the issues we are addressing in this seminar. I would only like to inform you that Hiroshima University will be organizing JEF 2 in February of next year, and we intend to report the results of your deliberations to that forum. So please be productive!

I think it is my task to briefly introduce the two co-organizers of this dialogue seminar, the Association Liaison Office for University Cooperation in Development (ALO) and the Center for the Study of International Cooperation in Education (CICE) of our university. ALO, based in Washington, DC, was established in 1992 to support active engagement on development issues between U.S. colleges and universities and USAID. It represents six major higher education associations, covering more than 2,600 institutions, in the United States.

*Hiroshima University holds
pursuit of peace as its key
guiding principle...building
world peace through
educational development
and cooperation.*

Before introducing CICE, please allow me to say a few words about our university. As a higher education institution based in Hiroshima, which experienced the first atomic blast on the citizenry, Hiroshima University holds pursuit of peace as its key guiding principle. And we are placing particular emphasis on the avenue of building world peace through educational development and cooperation. CICE was established in our university in 1997 as the national focal research unit for promoting international educational cooperation. Through its multifaceted activities—encompassing research, training, demonstration projects, and information dissemination—CICE also serves as the university’s primary vehicle for contributing to educational cooperation. CICE’s particular focus during the past few years has been the development of international collaborative network with higher education institutions in other countries, the present dialogue seminar also being a significant step in this direction.

I know that the co-organizers have very serious intentions about the outcome of this dialogue seminar. Our university is fully behind them. I also know, however, that Hiroshima has a few special things to see and places to visit, such as the Peace Memorial Park and Itsukushima Shrine. I sincerely hope that you will succeed in combining the two missions and enjoy both the meeting, especially the fellowship that goes with it, and the history and culture of Hiroshima.

Thank you,

Susumu Takahashi

Welcome Remarks by Masao Ito, Deputy Director, Center for Global Partnership, Japan Foundation

Ladies and gentlemen, it is my pleasure to have this opportunity to say a few words. The Center for Global Partnership was founded in 1991 as a new center for the Japan Foundation and is now an independent institution to promote cultural exchange between Japan and foreign countries.

Our mission is to contribute to global issues through efforts between Japan and the United States. In our intellectual exchange program, we focus on five domains: international security, political economy, sustainable development, global society, and health care and aging. We have problems for our universities to solve by seeking more profound insights for the solution of these global issues.

This project exploring the role of universities in education cooperation for development is one of the priorities for sustainable development. We are honored to support this important intellectual dialogue. I believe that education cooperation such as assistance to human capacity building for developing countries is indispensable to sustain development. I believe that more ideas are needed to provide a more realistic approach to the problems we are facing. I hope this meeting will be a great success for everyone today to share common concerns and great knowledge as well as to create a network of scholars and practitioners.

Thank you very much.

Masao Ito



Congratulatory Remarks by the Right Honorable Howard Baker, U.S. Ambassador to Japan

At the opening session of the Japan/U.S. Seminar “Exploring the Role of Universities in Educational Cooperation for Development,” I heartily welcome you and encourage you, as university administrators, scholars, and researchers to increase your collaboration and involvement in international development. U.S. and Japanese universities for some time have been providing university education to students from developing countries: some students have come at their own expense; others have been funded by the United States and Japanese governments; others have been funded by the universities themselves. This year the government of Japan has reached their target of 100,000 international students at Japanese institutions of higher education. Congratulations.

The purpose of the U.S. and Japanese universities has been the “education of future leaders, scholars, researchers, technocrats, and civil servants for business and for government.” We have done a good job. One of the most significant changes in our U.S. higher education took place during President Lincoln’s term of office when the Morrill Act instituted Land-Grant Colleges, which focused on serving the states and communities, reaching out to solve their problems. Universities took on the purpose and challenge of “outreach” or “service,” in addition to teaching and research. This monumental change resulted in great support throughout the United States for higher education, resulting in all states having land-grant colleges, and with other institutions mirroring this outreach and service to the state and community.

The University of Tennessee is the land-grant college of my choosing—and I must say the University of Tennessee’s College of Agriculture Sciences and Natural Resources has been reaching out not only to the state and nation, but also to the institutions and the people of Latin America, Africa, and Asia.

This morning at your seminar, I have the opportunity to encourage Japan and the United States to reach out to the developing countries, to serve these nations and communities. I can think of no better group than the institutions of higher education to serve these communities, whether through research, through teaching, through breaking down intellectual and social barriers, and especially through service to the nation and community. New models, methods, and approaches are needed throughout the developing world. In fact, new models and methods are needed in the United States and Japan. Japan has taken a huge step this past year in its own higher education institutions with the government granting the universities “corporate status,” providing the universities independent and autonomous administration.

We—Japan and the United States—need to share resources with the developing world so that the Millennium Development Goals can be accomplished, so that famine and disease can be curtailed, so wealth and resources can be more equitably shared, so the environment can be wisely and productively used, and so economic growth can be realized. Also so that human security concerns can be addressed. When I express “to share resources with the developing world,” I am also including the private sector, not only the public sector. In the United States, the universities and private sector have been involved in the developing world, sharing resources, methods, and approaches. We are encouraging more private sector involvement. One of USAID’s four cornerstones is to involve the private sector through global development alliances. In Japan, this is still new frontier—the university and business partnership reaching out to the developing world. I would encourage you all, both U.S. and Japanese universities, to explore greater collaboration with the business community.

The government of Japan is celebrating its 50th anniversary of official development assistance this year. Fifty years ago in Sri Lanka, the government of Japan joined the Colombo Plan, pledging its assistance to rebuild the developing countries of Asia. Since then Japan has provided more than \$220 billion of development assistance. I personally wish to commend Japan on its 50th anniversary and its commitment to assist the developing world. Again congratulations.

The United States and Japan are number one and two in providing assistance to the world, bilaterally and multilaterally. We have partnered in Afghanistan, East Timor, Iraq, Sierra Leone, Mexico, Ethiopia, and Peru, for example. We have together provided health clinics in Pakistan, water financing in the Philippines, education in Indonesia, energy power stations in Iraq, polio eradication in Africa and South Asia, and road construction and election assistance in Afghanistan.

Yet the Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs and we of the United States are very worried that the Diet will again cut the budget of Official Development Assistance (ODA). Since 1997, Japan has cut its ODA budget by 30 percent. Those of us who promote international development might take the opportunity to speak out against the possible decrease of ODA.

As you explore ways the universities of Japan and the United States can collaborate in reaching and serving the developing world, you will find numerous models and approaches, some perhaps outdated, some needed adaptation to the changing situations. The most effective and efficient approach is to involve the recipient country and institution. Another key to success is to involve the private sector both within Japan and the United States, and the recipient country.

This year, Japan and the United States are celebrating the 150th anniversary of the Japan-U.S. Relationship. Commodore Perry and the Japanese Shogun Tokugawa had a vision for developing better international ties and trade. We have come a long way during these past 150 years, but this relationship and today's partnership started with a vision.

You now have a vision—that through Japan-U.S. university cooperation, you will reach out to the developing world. I wish you God speed in your cooperation, your exploration and implementation, and in achieving this vision.

Executive Summary

The 1990 “World Conference of Education for All,” held in Jomtien, Thailand, heralded a new area in which Japan could become a more active participant: educational cooperation. Of special interest, not only for Japan but also for the United States, which has a long and active history in the arena of educational cooperation for development, is the role of higher education institutions. Universities have long been the center for domestic educational policies, evaluation, and research, and thus bring extraordinary resources to development planning, implementation, and evaluation. There is a growing interest in how professionals working in these institutions of higher learning can encourage more independent, self-sustaining educational development in Third World countries. The Center for the Study of International Cooperation in Education (CICE) of Hiroshima University along with The Association Liaison Office for University Cooperation in Development (ALO) organized a dialogue seminar held on October 17–20, 2004, in Hiroshima, Japan. Participants represented Japanese and U.S. universities, as well as funding agencies and government agencies in the two countries. The purpose of the seminar was to have an open exchange of ideas and to discuss the potential for a tripartite approach (host country-Japan-U.S.) to educational cooperation for development. This report is a brief synopsis of the three-day seminar, and highlights the outcomes and future directions to be pursued through participant networking.

More than 30 professionals in the field of educational cooperation for development attended the seminar in Hiroshima, Japan. Participants included representatives from Japanese universities, U.S. higher education institutions, aid agencies from both countries, and government officials.

Japanese representatives were selected from the various universities through prior involvement with the Japanese Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology’s (MEXT) international education support system. The major aid agencies, the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) and Japan Bank for International Cooperation (JBIC), as well as the recently established Support Center Project (SCP) of MEXT, also were asked to send representatives to the seminar. U.S. representatives were selected by ALO.

The seminar’s objective was to discuss ideas and exchange information on the role of Japanese and U.S. universities in educational cooperation for development and to explore new possibilities through a tripartite approach to university cooperation for basic education development. The inclusion of participants from JICA, JBIC, UNESCO, and USAID provided a concrete foundation for building this cooperation.

The first day of the seminar began with a keynote address by Masayuki Inoue, MEXT’s director general for international affairs. He gave concrete guidelines for what multi-country partnerships should include and challenged the group to discover future possibilities for these partnerships



through insightful discussion. The remainder of the day was spent bringing all the participants to a consensus on terminology and provide the context for how educational cooperation is currently practiced in both countries. Japanese and U.S. representatives presented general overviews, which were followed by two case studies of projects currently underway in South Africa. For the final session of the day, participants divided into national working groups, and each group presented specific topic areas to be further discussed on the second day. Day two included a panel discussion on issues and challenges for donor organizations in supporting their national universities for work in basic education in aid-assisted countries, and an afternoon session outlining issues and challenges in forming higher education partnerships with institutions in developing countries. The second day concluded with bi-national working groups discussing current and future project possibilities in Africa and Asia. On the final day, the seminar *rapporteurs* gave brief summary reports and discussion continued on the seminar outcomes and specific follow-up activities that should be conducted.

The conference was billed as a dialogue, and to facilitate open and meaningful discussion among the participants, the format focused more on verbal reports and small group discussion than formal presentations. Participants sat in a roundtable format in which face-to-face contact was a priority. The language used in the seminar was English without translation. Participants stayed at the seminar hotel, and during breaks and meals, could meet to further discuss topics of shared interest. This allowed participants already working on projects in Third World countries, such as South Africa, Ghana, and Indonesia, to frankly share opinions and information about successful strategies for implementing and sustaining development work in those areas.

Follow up from the Seminar

The last session identified three concrete measures to continue the dialogue seminar's momentum: (1) the creation of a listserv to discuss issues among the Japanese, U.S., and Third World universities via e-mail; (2) a mapping exercise to share information on current projects in Africa and Asia by each university; and (3) the development of a framework to proceed with a pilot project using a tripartite approach. This third measure is realistic because of the availability of funds through USAID. As stated in the summary report of *rapporteur* Ann Austin-Beck of Michigan State University (see p. 7), this is also an ideal time to explore trilateral cooperation, given the new independence of national universities in Japan; growing interest in internationalization in the United States; interest in donor organizations working more closely with universities; and interest among private sector organizations to invest in development cooperation. It is now necessary to move from VISION to REALITY through creativity, commitment, and collaboration. The development of a set of guidelines for how to establish a tripartite collaboration was designated unanimously to David Chapman of the University of Minnesota. Furthermore, Nagoya University, Kobe University, and Hiroshima University will work together on these follow-up measures from the Japan side.

The follow-up activities will determine the long-range outcome of the seminar. For the present, the most important outcome is the degree of consensus that exists between Japanese and U.S. professionals in developing the role of universities in the area of educational cooperation for development. This dedication is further reflected by the governments of both countries, which have strongly supported basic education development in Sub-Saharan African countries (see the reports of the Group of Eight, Africa Action Plan, released in Kananaskis, Canada, in June 2002). The seminar's outcomes also will be discussed in the second Japan Education Forum to be held in Tokyo on February 8, 2005.

Further Evaluation of the Dialogue Seminar

A formal report of the seminar will be presented to Hans J.A. Van Ginkel, rector of the United Nations University (UNU), Tokyo, Japan, for his professional input. UNU is an established organization dedicated to research and capacity building to find original, forward-looking solutions. Ginkel's feedback will suggest further directions to pursue, which may include expansion to other fields of education cooperation such as agriculture education and engineering education. In this way, the seminar's outcomes may bring new possibilities to the field of educational development.

Keynote Address

Masayuki Inoue, Director General for International Affairs
Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology

Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Masayuki Inoue, director general for international affairs, in the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology (MEXT). I am delighted to be present at this three-day seminar jointly organized by Hiroshima University and the Association Liaison Office for University Cooperation in Development (ALO), supported by the Japan Foundation Center for Global Partnership and USAID. It is my great honor and pleasure to be invited to give a few words at the beginning of this seminar.

The purpose of this seminar is for the faculty members of universities, and the members of Official Development Assistance (ODA)-related agencies who have ample experience in educational cooperation to come together from the United States and Japan in order to:

- Share experiences in educational cooperation.
- Exchange views and discuss future possibilities of partnership among universities in Japan and the United States in the field of international educational cooperation.

In the United States, ALO, established in 1992, has assisted the nation's six major higher education associations in building their partnership with USAID in order to enhance participation of higher education institutions in international cooperation.

In Japan, development assistance has been largely undertaken by the government-related organizations. Faculty members of universities have participated in development assistance projects as individual experts; university participation at the institutional level was rare.

Regarding cooperation on an individual basis, Japan has given satisfactory results. For example, cooperation in the field of mathematics and science in primary and secondary education can be mentioned as projects carried out in cooperation with universities in our country. Hiroshima University participated in the project for the improvement of the quality of teachers in the field of mathematics and science in Ghana and Kenya. Tsukuba University has also joined a similar project in Colombia.

Furthermore, MEXT has implemented the "Cooperation Base System" project in cooperation with Hiroshima University and Tsukuba University to strengthen international cooperation in basic education, including the development of teaching materials for mathematics and science. In recent years, various measures have started to change a situation in which faculty members participate in the projects as individual experts. National universities have become independent from the government and were granted corporate status from fiscal year 2004. Such universities have introduced a variety of measures to take advantage of their



strength, uniqueness, and character. Furthermore, with corporate status, national universities are now able to conduct cooperation projects on a contractual basis with aid agencies.

Some private universities are also making efforts at internationalization. For example, in Thailand, Waseda University has established a base called “Waseda Education Thailand,” and offers preliminary education for students wishing to study in Japan.

MEXT strongly urges all kinds of universities (national, public, and private universities) to actively participate in development assistance at the institutional level. For this purpose, the “Support and Coordination Project” was launched in 2003. It provides advice and services for Japanese universities in order to encourage their international cooperation activities in various projects on a contractual basis with aid agencies.

The United States has prior and ample experience of universities’ institutional participation in development assistance. Faculty members of Japanese universities also have been actively participating in international cooperation. Gathering academics and concerned people from both countries here at this seminar is very meaningful. Expectations are high that insightful views will be exchanged and fruitful discussion will take place as a result of this great opportunity.

Since the “World Conference of Education for All” held in Jomtien, Thailand, in 1990, great attention and effort have been placed on international educational cooperation, especially in the field of basic education. In keeping with this global trend, MEXT announced two reports, the first report in 1996 and the second in 2000. These reports recommended more active participation by academics and university faculties in educational cooperation, from the perspective of enhancing Japan’s contribution to international cooperation, and, at the same time, attaining higher levels of domestic education and research.

Six centers have been established as core institutes for enhancing partnership and cooperation among universities, a great achievement of the report. One of them, the Center for the Study of International Cooperation in Education (CICE), was established in Hiroshima University in fiscal year 1997, followed by five other centers, year by year:

- FY 1999: Nagoya University, International Cooperation Center for Agricultural Education (ICCAE).
- FY 2000: Tokyo University, International Research Center for Medical Education (IRCME).
- FY 2001: Toyohashi University of Technology, International Cooperation Center for Engineering Education Development.
- FY 2002: University of Tsukuba, Center for Research on International Cooperation in Educational Development (CRICED).
- FY 2002: Nagoya University, Center for Asian Legal Exchange (CALE).

International cooperation on the part of universities covers not only the education field, but also the broader fields such as agriculture, engineering, and law. I hope that the possibility of implementing “multi-country partnerships” in those fields, other than education, will be discussed in this seminar. Efforts should be made to promote cooperation in the areas of basic education such as introducing a Special In-Service Teacher Participation Scheme to enable in-service teachers to participate in the Japan Overseas Cooperation Volunteers (JOCV).

After the announcement of these two reports, the situation for international educational cooperation changed. This was mainly caused by the Dakar Framework for Action and September 11,

2001. A third report was announced in 2002 proposing Japan's attitude toward the change. The points emphasized in the report are:

- Cooperation in basic education, and application of Japan's educational experiences for educational cooperation, should be emphasized as Japan's contribution for the Dakar Framework for Action.
- After September 11 (9/11) in 2001, the world has dramatically changed because of the outbreak of terrorism and conflicts. In order to respond to such a change, the importance of educational assistance for post-conflict countries is underscored.

The report proposed five points to promote international development cooperation in universities:

1. Creating a foundation for international development cooperation activity in universities.
2. Establishing relations with international aid agencies.
3. Promoting ties between Japanese universities and between Japanese universities on the one hand and firms of consultants and overseas universities on the other.
4. Improving universities' capacity to undertake development projects.
5. Forming field-specific international development cooperation.

According to the report, MEXT launched the "Support and Coordination Project," as mentioned before, in 2003 to encourage international development cooperation activity in universities. SCP's main activities are as follows:

1. Providing advice for establishing internal systems at universities.
2. Gathering and disseminating information concerning contracts.
3. Providing training courses and seminars.
4. Disseminating information both within Japan and abroad.
5. Providing assistance for universities' participation on a contract basis.
6. Maintaining the "University Database for International Development Cooperation."

As for the practical measure of cooperation in basic education, the report recommended establishment of a "Cooperation Base System." This idea was also reflected in the Basic Education for Growth Initiative (BEGIN), announced by Prime Minister Koizumi at the Kananaskis Summit in July 2002.

The Cooperation Base System is Japan's domestic network comprising various cooperation actors, such as national, public, and private universities; NGOs; and the private sector. It was launched in 2003. There are two core institutes, University of Tsukuba and Hiroshima University, both of which have ample experience in international educational cooperation.

By collecting and sharing Japan's cooperation-related experiences and know-how in readiness to respond to requests for cooperation, the Cooperation Base System aims to support cooperation actors and to strengthen Japan's educational cooperation in terms of quality, quantity, and timing of its cooperative efforts. In so doing, it is hoped to enable Japan to provide a suitable and systematic response to requests from developing countries.

The report also proposed the viewpoint that it is necessary to undertake assistance according to the needs of developing countries. Regarding educational assistance for post-conflict countries, Japan is supporting the reconstruction of girls' education in Afghanistan through the training of female teachers in Japan with the cooperation of women's colleges in Japan. In addition, Japan receives researchers and foreign students to re-establish higher education.

As stated above, MEXT treats the report as a basic policy and has taken various practical measures according to this policy.

There are several issues to be considered for further improvement to promote international development cooperation activity in universities:

1. To establish clear roles for universities to participate in international cooperation (how to clarify the relationship between human resource development and research activities).
2. To build internal institutional consensus (how to provide an environment within universities, and to set a strategy and plan of action, for participation at the institutional level).
3. To promote relationship among universities, between universities and private consulting companies, and among aid agencies, both within Japan and abroad (how to create an environment for exchanging information).
4. To enhance development of human resources taking part in international cooperation (how to expand job opportunities for graduates from international cooperation-related higher education institutes, and to line up internationally experienced faculties as teaching staff).

The following points should be considered in the course of implementing “multi-country partnerships” in educational cooperation:

1. Multi-country partnerships as a means of improving efficiency and effectiveness of assistance in developing countries:
 - The educational needs of developing countries vary widely, so it is necessary to render assistance according to their respective needs.
 - It should not be donor-oriented. It is necessary to consider benefits for the recipient developing countries.
 - A multi-country partnership approach should be considered when such an approach is more effective and efficient than assistance implemented by a single country in order to solve a developing country’s issues.
2. Not only joint project implementation but also aid coordination based on shared objectives are effective:
 - There are differences among donor systems, budget schemes, and strong areas of assistance.
 - In such cases, it is more effective to arrange areas for assistance based on shared objectives among donors.
3. In addition to direct assistance, formulation of a “knowledge basis” for best utilization of universities’ knowledge:
 - In order to enhance greater autonomy and self-help efforts in a developing country, it is essential to increase the “knowledge basis” in the developing country.
 - I strongly believe that higher education institutions in the United States and Japan can make a substantial contribution in this area.

Entering the 21st century, which is called the “Century of Knowledge,” Japan intends to build a country rich in talented human resources and creative in science and technology, where the university’s role is extremely important. To this end, the reform of universities has been further accelerated, and efforts are being made toward the creation of universities that are active and internationally competitive.

I believe that, if universities' participation in international cooperation is further expanded, the function of universities as the intellectual resources of the nation will be greatly enhanced. This will ultimately increase universities' international competitiveness.

Expectation is very high for this seminar. I hope that the cooperation-related experiences of each participant are well shared as common precious lessons. I hope everyone will learn from one another. And, through this great opportunity, I hope that insightful views will be exchanged, and that fruitful discussions on the future possibilities of partnership among universities in the United States and Japan will be developed. In doing so, I hope you will keep in mind the following 10 key words beginning with "c." They are cooperation, contribution, comprehension, communication, competence, concentration, cost, complexity, consensus, and challenge.

Thank you very much.

Masayuki Inoue

Overview

Ann Austin-Beck, Michigan State University

The dialogue seminar is the outcome of a number of exploratory meetings in which a consensus emerged that a tripartite approach to university cooperation (host country-Japan-United States) for development should be pursued. The three-day seminar was not an academic conference but an experience-sharing and exploratory meeting of professionals concerned with the involvement of higher education institutions in basic education development in developing countries. University partnerships bring extraordinary resources to development planning, implementation, and evaluation. ALO, UNESCO, and others have had solid successes involving university partnerships, and interest has been expressed in pursuing higher education collaboration to support basic education with participation by USAID, JICA, ALO, and CICE. Representatives of Japanese-U.S. higher education institutions, Japanese-U.S. funding agencies, and government officials from both countries attended the seminar.

The seminar's guiding purpose was to explore potential trilateral collaborations between universities in Japan, the United States, and developing countries with a particular focus on support for basic education. This was accomplished by providing an overview of issues in Japan and the United States concerning involvement in educational development; actual case studies in South Africa; issues and challenges for donor organizations; and concepts and ideas for possible joint Japanese-U.S. higher education partnerships.

The seminar's major themes focused on the following aspects of collaboration: If carried out effectively, it is possible to produce extraordinary results through collaboration; a *quid*

pro quo approach emphasizes that both sides should get something of value; and collaboration should achieve synergies that produce results that wouldn't happen otherwise. Questions posed throughout the seminar included, What can universities achieve through collaboration to address needs in developing countries that is different from what other contributors can do, as well as what can be gained by trilateral cooperation (beyond bilateral cooperation). Key ideas highlighted in Masayuki Inoue's keynote address (see p. 1), which appeared throughout the seminar, included cooperation, contribution, communication, concentration, cost, complexity, consensus, and challenge as important elements of collaborative arrangements.

Participants indicated a desire to get started even on a modest scale with proposals that can be matched with funding sources; mutual interest in short- and long-term teacher training, as well as in building institutional capacity in developing countries for policy analysis and research; interest in monitoring and evaluating collaborative work; and interest in building alliances among interested individuals and institutions.

Seminar presentations reviewed various types of collaboration. A historical review highlighted complementary models in which one donor is primary, parallel models in which common goals are reached through a division of objectives, and joint models that emphasize a common goal and shared resources. These models may not be exclusive of each other, but rather elements of each model may be on a continuum. Also, each model may have advantages and disadvantages, depending on the specific context.

Consider the following set of questions early in the collaborative process:

- What are the goals?
- What are the operational agreements?
- How will personnel decisions be made?
- How can you ensure effective incentive systems?
- How can you balance fiscal constraints with commitment to do a project well?
- How can you conduct a meaningful evaluation of impacts?
- What are the rules of the game when changes need to be made in a project based on a collaborative agreement?

Key issues were discussed that relate specifically to international work within the university context. Participants noted the ability of

universities to offer long-term relationships with initial investments that often lead to sustained relationships. Another issue pertained to the missions of universities: Is international work “core” to institutional missions, and, within a university, how does the concept of “outreach” relate to the teaching and research missions?

Specific issues of relevance to faculty involvement in development work that were discussed include faculty members’ autonomy in contrast to persons in consulting firms; expectations that faculty face to do research and publish; challenges for faculty in combining research and development and doing action research; pressures on early career faculty to explore how international work relates to tenure requirements; the difficulty many

faculty members experience in being away for more than one or two weeks; and questions around intellectual property and copyright issues. Some of the best ways to involve faculty in development work are in research/assessment/policy analysis projects, short-term overseas assignments as consultants, human capacity development, visiting professorships, and providing opportunities for graduate students to gain experience in international work.

The discussions brought out several important issues to address in moving forward with plans for trilateral university collaborations: emphasizing a “host country-driven” approach to projects; organizing scholarly exchange about development work to learn what others are doing; systematically analyzing and learning from earlier projects; monitoring, studying, and testing trilateral collaboration by documenting the process, the expected synergies, and the outcomes of the cooperation; developing strategies to link with various funding sources; and developing plans for better dissemination of what has been learned.

Factors that make this a good time to consider potential trilateral cooperation include the emergence of the 21st century as the “Knowledge Century”; the role of universities as intellectual resources; key international challenges, including peace and security, poverty, sustainable development, and the need for respect for cultural diversity; a growing interest in preparing graduate students for international development work; the new corporate status of universities in Japan; increasing interest in internationalization both within U.S. public opinion and U.S. universities; interest in donor organizations to work more closely with universities; and interest among private sector organizations to invest in development cooperation. Thus, it is time to move from vision to reality through creativity, commitment, and collaboration.



Cooperation and the Meaning of Partnership

Shoko Yamada, National Graduate Institute for Policy Studies

One of the questions that remains for follow-up after the seminar is, Who will be partners? The answer to this question did not emerge during the seminar and perhaps may have been left untackled intentionally. While it may be naïve to make this a given condition, defining actual partnerships will require additional time. Will the partnerships be between universities, funding agencies, NGOs, the private sector, host country governments, or a combination of all of the above? Currently, a common definition for Japanese-U.S. partnerships is lacking. Furthermore, it appears that there are different perspectives on what can be learned from actual collaboration. While everyone is aware of this point, definition of the major focus remains an important precondition for participation in any trilateral partnership. Without focus, it will be impossible for universities to determine if they should align themselves to a scheme or issue and pursue possible funding.

Additional questions to address are whether the partnership is to be field-oriented or Japan-United States-oriented and if field-oriented, who will be in the “driver’s seat.” Also, how will host country institutions be included from the planning stage onwards? Furthermore, while the question of funding first or issues first was discussed, it remains to be seen if projects will be developed to fit an interest area of a funding agency or planned according to the needs in the field and areas of partners’ strengths. Finally, each potential partner will need to assess the costs of coordination and calculate the potential benefit of

collaboration in comparison to opportunity costs.

While there was in-depth discussion centering on the capacity building of universities in developing countries, not much time was spent discussing the actual capacity of specific institutions represented and how they can assist those in developing countries. This is a big issue because it is unclear who can contribute to these kinds of partnerships, who is interested, and what kind of expertise and total number of hours can faculty members contribute. Specific factors, including teaching obligations, regulations, and criteria for rewarding faculty’s work, that could impede faculty members’ participation in overseas activities should be discussed.

There are, however, many areas in which universities appear to have a comparative advantage over either NGOs or the private sector. These areas include policy support, institutional capacity building, teacher training, curriculum revision, student exchange, and research. Other areas in which universities could contribute to improve basic education (both qualitatively and quantitatively) include IT,

Universities have a comparative advantage over either NGOs or the private sector. These areas include policy support, institutional capacity building, teacher training, curriculum revision, student exchange, and research.

HIV/AIDS education, science and math education, education for sustainability, and incorporation of gender issues.

It appears that there are benefits of participation for the “partner” organizations as well as for individual faculty members. These benefits would be shared by Japanese, U.S., and host country universities as well as funding agencies. The partnership would contribute to the educational development in the host coun-

try as well as provide academic or personal satisfaction for individual participants. However, while benefits for collaboration do indeed exist, unless these benefits are clearly visible for the institution, people will be hesitant to participate. Therefore, the benefits for all, including individual faculty members who participate, should be clearly stated prior to the start of collaboration.

University Involvement in Educational Cooperation in Japan and the United States

Japanese University Involvement in International Cooperation for Basic Education Development in Developing Countries

Kazuo Kuroda, Waseda University,
Graduate School of Asia-Pacific Studies

Since 1980, MEXT has provided scholarships for more than 150 primary and secondary teachers from developing countries to study at Japanese universities for one and a half to two years. However, there were little or no basic education projects sponsored by JICA or JBIC in the pre-Jomtien era.

The most obvious reason preventing the utilization of ODA funds for basic education was the Japanese policy on economic assistance, which supported infrastructure development. Although this was true in the 1970s, it is no longer the case today. Because of Japan's pre-war experience with colonization and occupation, there was a reluctance to intervene in foreign education. A series of international conferences in the 1990s, beginning with the World Conference on Education for All in 1990, brought about a significant change in Japan's approach. The current policy focus on basic education in international cooperation can be seen in the Basic Education for Growth Initiative (BEGIN) announced at the 2002 Kananaskis Summit. Japan is now committed to providing ODA in the education sector over the next five years in the amount of more than ¥250 billion (approximately \$2 billion U.S.) with basic education as a priority.

In the 1990s, various policy developments were leading Japan toward this new direction.

First, research centers such as the Center for the Study of International Cooperation in Education (CICE) at Hiroshima University as well as the Center for Research on International Cooperation in Educational Development (CRICED) at the University of Tsukuba were created out of policy discussions held at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA) and MEXT. Universities such as Nagoya, Kobe, and Hiroshima established graduate programs in international education development.

Traditionally, MOFA and JICA had been involved with school construction projects, which expanded rapidly in the 1990s. Although important, the construction of schools does not provide an opportunity for university involvement. However, in the late 1990s, JICA began technical cooperation in science and mathematics, which allowed for active university involvement. The universities' role has been to organize training courses, dispatch professionals, and to play an active part in project design, implementation, and evaluation. Also, very recently, policy interventions such as community participatory school construction, school mapping and micro planning, and proposal-based school reform have been conducted by private consulting firms collaborating with university professors.

In 2004, the government of Japan and JICA tried to diversify their activities by introducing new priority areas such as women's education, environmental education, health education, and post-conflict educational reconstruction. This has resulted in an increased demand for

university involvement. Results-based management also presents both challenges and opportunities for universities. Challenges center on the international trend of promoting donor coordination as well as the utilization of local resources. However, the increasing demand for evaluation provides opportunities not only for Japanese universities but also perhaps the involvement of third parties.

A final direction and very recent trend is that of the utilization of the Japanese experience, which may appear to be somewhat contradictory to a non-interference approach. Japanese ODA policy has emphasized ownership and the self-help efforts of recipient countries; however, a recent policy change, one that has steadily expanded during the last decade, involves promoting the Japanese experience in education more and more.

It is important to discuss whether universities really have comparative advantages and original strengths to contribute to basic education development in developing countries as well as to consider if universities can be good partners for donors with the trend toward results-based management.

Support and Coordination Project for University Cooperation in International Development (SCP)
Masaru Osanai, National Graduate Institute for Policy Studies

The mission of the Support and Coordination Project for University Cooperation in International Development (SCP), which began in July 2003, is to support the participation of Japanese universities and other higher education institutions in cooperation projects in developing countries. This support is especially needed for the national universities, which, prior to April 2004, did not have the freedom to develop individual contracts. The only contract model was a standard contract used in research collaboration with private companies, which cannot be used between universities and aid agencies. Through SCP con-

sultation services, Japanese universities can receive needed assistance to help them understand the contract policies of aid agencies. However, SCP is not a perfect replica of ALO as it does not manage grants or provide financial support for projects.

SCP also gathers and disseminates information. Recent foci include how to solve the issue of intellectual property rights and discussions of financial concerns. By the end of this year, SCP will develop a manual for universities, the first of its kind, which will be printed and provided to them by March 2005. SCP is also addressing further issues, including how to provide incentives for university staff to participate in international cooperation activities. This is a rather difficult topic, one on which continued effort is being placed.

A third function of SCP is to provide training courses and seminars to deepen understanding of international development and the basis of contracts with Japanese aid agencies such as JICA and JBIC. To date, several seminars for beginners have been held, and in the coming year, a seminar on contract management will be introduced. SCP also provides consultation and advice for university staff and offers guidance on the necessary procedures to obtain a research grant or a contract with an aid agency.

A final function of SCP is to operate a university database. This has been somewhat troublesome as MEXT had set up the university database before the formation of SCP. There have been instances in which technical problems have occurred in creating a list of faculty members with interests in international work. Suggestions are currently underway on how to make improvements on this important function.

SCP has a three-step approach for Japanese universities' engagement in development cooperation. Many universities are currently at Step 1: voluntary cooperation by professors via Japanese aid agencies such as JICA or JBIC. Some Japanese universities have been entrusted-

ed by JICA to provide training courses. This leads to Step 2: contract-based cooperation via Japanese aid agencies. Although some universities have already had experience with contract-based cooperation, this cooperation has occurred as grassroots technical assistance, and thus has been on a small scale. At the end of last month, Hiroshima University became the first university to qualify as a consulting organization and to sign a contract with JICA. This project will provide teacher training in Bangladesh for secondary school teachers of mathematics and science. A private institution, Ritsumeikan University, has set up a training course of management for universities in the People's Republic of China with JBIC. Nagoya University also will have contracts with JICA and JBIC. Thus, Japanese universities are heading toward Step 3: contract-based cooperation via multilateral organizations such as the World Bank and the Asian Development Bank. Some of these universities have already tried to bid on technical assistance projects but have not yet met with success. SCP believes that it is only a matter of time before such a contract is developed. This will represent a very important step for Japanese universities because it will provide an opportunity to develop future human resources and especially to gain experience in working with developing countries.

Japanese university activity in international development cooperation is best represented by the dispatch of experts, which has been limited to national universities and reached 633 in 2002 and 472 in 2003. Long-term dispatching of experts is decreasing because of budget problems with JICA. The number of foreign trainees accepted under Japanese university programs in 2002 was 557 and stood at 510 in 2003. These participants in international development activities are not counted as international students, and therefore, not included in the 100,000 international students in Japan. The four major fields for national universities in international development include education (50.4 percent), engineering

science (18.4 percent), medical and dentistry (17 percent), and agriculture, forestry, and fishery (13.6 percent). Recent examples of Japanese university activity include a JICA-affiliated project in Ghana, an ASEAN University network project with 11 Japanese universities participating, and a MEXT-inspired project in Afghanistan with Japanese women's universities.

What Is the Future of U.S. Higher Education and International Development Partnerships?

John Hudzik, Michigan State University,
International Studies and Programs

Important challenges that must be faced in U.S. higher education involve finding the financial means to support overseas involvement. The first challenge confronting U.S. higher education and international development is a significant revenue squeeze in both the public and private sectors. As a consequence, universities have had to significantly raise tuition rates, which are now the single largest source of revenue for higher education. International development activity, which had previously been supported by public funds in the amount of 70 percent or more, now receives between 20 and 30 percent of total revenues. Additionally, there is increased pressure for entrepreneurial activity to take the place of public funds as a source of revenue. This leads to the question of whether international activities are a core activity of the university and if so, how these activities will be funded.

Support for international development is seen in the current shift from a fairly parochial concept of U.S. education to a growing awareness of the need to internationalize the curriculum, which cannot be done without international engagement. In a poll conducted in September 2002, close to 70 percent of Michigan residents thought study abroad should be required or strongly encouraged,



and 80 to 100 percent understood that activities happening beyond U.S. borders had an effect on the country.

Two concepts are the essence of partnership: *quid pro quo* and synergy. The missions of higher education and development organizations are compatible, and research can fundamentally contribute to development with work abroad providing the opportunity to broaden learning. For example, of the 550 Michigan State University faculty members who can claim to be experts in certain regions of the world, 60 to 70 percent acquired their expertise through development projects abroad. However, issues such as how to create opportunities to build relationships, how to find the money, and how to unite people on university campuses to develop partnerships need to be addressed.

Further problems in the U.S. higher education community revolve around issues of the university's mission and the fact that some development activities are not regarded as research. This is a false dichotomy. Very good research findings have originated in develop-

Another area of concern is the belief that higher education institutions are highly inefficient partners. While it may be true that a bureaucracy is slow to reach consensus, this ignores the reality that universities educate the next generation of development experts. There is a growing concern in that many of the best development experts joined universities in the 1960s to the '80s and are now facing retirement. The challenge is to replace this talent pool at a time of budget stress when many others are laying claim to the focus of new faculty members. In addition, there is the issue of higher dollar match requirements for engagement in development activity. This results in those interested in development activity having to pay for the experience. A final, more problematic concern is that as higher education provides the infrastructure for development work, more and more contracts and grants are going to the private sector. The critical issue here is that private consulting companies buy consulting time from higher education faculty. Although they pay for the faculty time on the project, they do not pay the infrastructure costs for keeping them as staff. This concern also can be seen in the rising criticism that students are covering the costs of development activity through higher tuition dollars.

Two final areas of concern are lack of interdisciplinary approaches to issues and lack of involvement in strategic planning. There are many examples of narrowly focused disciplines, in which faculty choose not to enter into international activity, while most development projects today require an interdisciplinary approach. Lack of university involvement in strategic planning for the nation's development agenda results in surprises, short lead times to respond to requests for proposals, and an inability to link higher education strategic planning and human resource investment with that of various development agencies.

Funding agencies, NGOs, and higher education communities need to form real dia-

ment work abroad. The obligation is how to support faculty who do this work abroad. The second false dichotomy is that working abroad is serving secondary constituents and not the primary constituents, the U.S. taxpayers. As constituents are defined by borders, this rationale is out of sync given the current state of globalization.



logue. Without an ongoing dialogue to keep focused, projects may result in breakdowns. Second, higher education must be included in long range, continuous strategic planning. This will provide university administrators with a framework for operational program planning and hiring decisions of future faculty. Third, creating long-term learning environments involves a reinvestment in training fellowships to develop expertise that focuses on development.

Institutions can build on partnerships currently in place and devote more attention to resolving budgetary problems. Administrators

will become more engaged as development work provides opportunities for two-way learning for students as well as faculty access for research, two concrete ways to justify higher education involvement in international development activity to tax payers. Partnerships result in collaboration on the best way to apply knowledge and provide a real advantage in building upon the synergy that already exists.

Case Studies of U.S. Higher Education Engagement in Teacher Education in South Africa

Developing Teaching Capacity in South Africa

Marilyn Pugh, Prince George's Community College, Center for Academic Resource Development

In 1998, Prince George's Community College (PGCC), located in a metropolitan area of Washington, DC, and Vista University in South Africa became partners in a project on the use of distance education in teaching computer literacy in South Africa. Because community colleges in the United States serve students who work, PGCC had become an early leader in distance learning and brought more than 25 years of experience in distance learning programs to the partnership. PGCC and Vista also shared many similarities, including number and type of students as well as a need to reach students at different locations. Other partners in the project included The College of Southern Maryland, Garrett Community College, Africare, and the Public Broadcasting Service Adult Learning Service. Corporate sponsors and publishers provided textbooks and other materials.

Vista was trying to solve the problem of how to reach seven campuses in three provinces. The disadvantaged school population had a demonstrable need for IT training, and it was difficult to secure enough computer science faculty. A first onsite visit by PGCC illustrated the challenges facing many campuses in developing countries with limitations on the number of computers, Internet connectivity, and electricity. PGCC had the capacity to help solve the problem through developing the Net\Work Project for distance learning that

involved different modalities, including tapes, voice mail, and online courses that were covered during a one-week seminar at Vista. In addition, Vista faculty enrolled as students in an Internet literacy course to learn about online courses and distance learning pedagogy. Audiotapes, which could be used by virtually everyone, became a preferred mode for the distance learning computer literacy course implemented in January 2000 to 210 students. The course was repeated in 2001 to 350 students. This led to a project motto of "Low tech is better than no tech and in developing countries is often better than high tech!"

The project's long-run objective was to install an "open lab" at each of the seven Vista campuses. A grant from ALO provided funds for installation of one such lab at the Welkom campus and the ability to install a server to run Vista's own online courses.

The original goal of the computer literacy training was to train 840 primary/secondary school teachers during three semesters. However, 477 teachers were trained in the first semester and 550 teachers enrolled in the second semester. As money ran out before the third semester, a decision was made to raise the price of the course. As Vista was supposed to be earning money for the purchase of technology, the presence of so many teacher "students" diverted money from the purchase of technology. The price of the course was doubled to be sustainable and at this higher yet still very reasonable rate, 2,000 teachers and others were trained in two years providing

some extra revenue for technology. A sustainability grant provided by USAID offered additional money for technology enhancement.

The strategies adopted in this partnership effort included training teachers in computer literacy by empowering them to use the computer in the classroom at primary and secondary levels; creating a short course program that could be marketable and generate extra funds for Vista to purchase technology; and developing and presenting a South African History online course for Maryland higher education students. As Vista's computer faculty had already been trained, the idea was to pair a Vista faculty member with a Vista history professor so they could teach the course together. Seventeen students from three Maryland community colleges completed the course.

One interesting result was that the Vista students who were taking the distance learning courses actually did better than the students who studied in a traditional face-to-face learning environment. Furthermore, the 25 Vista faculty members who received the web-based Internet literacy course greatly appreciated the opportunity to have a student experience in addition to the modeling of good pedagogy. Also, IT companies offered eight internships to Vista students, and two of the internships became full-time jobs.

Many lessons were learned from this project. It is necessary to find someone who really wants to make the project work and will become a good partner—it is not sufficient to simply have someone assigned to a partnership. It is important to get to know partners and develop trust through situations outside the business environment. Finally, it is necessary to expect the unexpected. The unexpected in this project included a new ALO grant opportunity which allowed for sustainability, linkage to a TELP grant, and the debundling of the seven Vista campuses to be linked in the future with closer, non-historically disadvantaged universities or technikons.

In May 2002, PGCC recruited a consortium of high schools, the Maryland State Department of Education, and other partners to submit a proposal for a three-year project titled the Leadership Institute for South African Secondary Education (LISASE). The project was funded by the World Bank and during the three-year span, 176 Further Education and Training (FET) teachers, subject advisers, principals, and DoE officials will come to the U.S. for 11 weeks of training in mathematics, science, and computer technology. The first two groups have received the training. However, because of differences in the quality of participants in the two groups, the process for selection has been reviewed and altered prior to the arrival of the third group in spring 2005. Thus, in a period of two and a half years, PGCC and Vista University received grant funding from \$50,000 U.S. to \$1.765 million U.S.

Engagement of Naruto University of Education, Japan, in the Mpumalanga Secondary Science Initiative (MSSI) Project, South Africa

Yumiko Ono, Naruto University of Education

Naruto University of Education (NUE), a small, private university focused on teacher education, has been involved in three different development projects—all having to do with math and science—in South Africa, Laos, and Thailand. It is rather unique in Japan for a small rural program in education to be so involved in international cooperation, especially because prior to 1999 there was no institutional commitment to international cooperation.

The overall goal of the MSSI project in South Africa is to ensure that 8th and 12th grade students in the Mpumalanga Province acquire enhanced skills in mathematics and science. Although this is an easy statement to make, this goal is far more difficult to achieve. The program objectives are to establish a province-wide, school-based, in-service train-

ing system and to improve the quality of teaching in mathematics and science by enhancing the teaching skills and subject knowledge of educators.

Key assumptions of the program are that enhancing teacher effectiveness is the key to success. It is a continuous (not a one-time-only) project. It also is collaborative and tries to keep the focus closer to the classrooms. The project further assumes that in the process of peer-teacher learning through lesson study, the South African teachers will be able to develop their skills and engage in continuous self-initiated professional development after the project is terminated.

A principal approach to the project is to promote partnership among three entities: The Mpumalanga Department of Education (MDE), the University of Pretoria, and JICA. The new curriculum, C2005, is outcome-based and learner-centered and thus teachers need to be able to organize and develop curriculum by themselves and assess student learning. The role of NUE is to aid in the improvisation of learning materials, conduct collaborative lesson planning, conduct study lessons in Japanese school settings, assist in developing workshop materials, and provide a role model of professionalism.

Curriculum implementers (CIs) and classroom leaders were invited to come to Japan for a six-week training course from November to December 2004. The following year, they will be the leaders and facilitators responsible for the CI and Cluster Leader workshops in their home province held three times a year. The project follows the Cascade Model of Training with NUE offering professional, technical, and moral support to the CIs. An agreement signed in 2002 between NUE and the University of Pretoria provides for both student and faculty exchange programs. It is hoped that a cadre of educators and researchers with good understanding of the cultures and educational practices of both countries will be built.

The strengths NUE brings to the project are to provide enriched content and aid in the development of materials. Although there are differences in culture, NUE hopes that a role model for professionalism will evolve without imposition. One of the main contributions is to help CIs grow independent, competent, and confident. However, compared to U.S. partners, Japanese are less confident in cross-cultural communication skills and understanding of differences in learning styles. Japan is more lecture-oriented and South Africans who are used to a participatory workshop format complained about the initial workshops. It was possible for NUE to adapt their teaching mode through the partnership with the University of Pretoria and JICA so everyone learned from and complemented one another.

At the onset, this project encountered some resistance from the technical assistance agency until it was clear that it dovetailed with the mission of the university and that participation in the project led to knowledge creation through conducting necessary research. Some challenges remain as many of the trained CIs have been promoted or have left their jobs and have been replaced by new untrained CIs. Additionally, the revised national curriculum statement (RNSC) requires considerable time for training and thus NUE faces competition with national training programs for workshop time during holidays. A new, more complicated assessment policy takes time in cluster meetings for paper work, not for collaborative lesson plans or sharing of teaching experiences. Thus, the current challenge is how to reach classrooms to make a difference through facilitating learning, supporting active clusters, and being able to visit during the school session in order to assist in the development of best practices and provide examples in conducting lesson study.

The positive impact on NUE by participating in this project is that some professors have changed the way they deliver lectures and have become more active, providing students with

more hands-on activities. Furthermore, NUE is now accepting JICA long-term trainees in graduate programs. There are currently 11 trainees from eight different countries, and NUE hopes that number will increase in the future. The enrollment of JICA trainees inevitably requires instructors to be bilingual in classrooms, where JICA trainees often provide positive interaction among Japanese in-service teachers. In addition to the regular courses, a curriculum workshop has been initiated by a visiting researcher from South Africa. JICA trainees present the curriculum in their

own field allowing for active interaction among trainees and in some cases with Japanese participants. The overall effect has been to globalize teacher education at NUE and connect educators working for the same goal in different circumstances. NUE and University of Pretoria have signed academic and student exchange agreements and both universities have benefited from an exchange of students and faculty. The project has created positive impacts not only in Mpumalanga but also in Japan.

Issues and Challenges for Donor Organizations in Supporting Their National Universities for Work in Basic Education in Aid-Assisted Countries

JICA-University Cooperation in Education Development: Current Practice, Issues, and Prospects

Maki Hayashikawa, Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA)

JICA is a technical cooperation organization, not a funding agency. Currently, JICA does not have a concrete internal policy on how to work with universities. Therefore, there are no set models, systems, or schemes, yet, and the topic is still in the internal discussion phase.

What has been traditionally referred to as JICA-University cooperation has centered on three main areas of activities: education and training, development research and studies, and field-level operations. In development research, there has been more involvement by individual professors or a team of professors. The visiting research fellows to JICA play a major role in research activities. Most projects are at the field level. Responsibility for the project lies with the host country and JICA provides technical assistance upon request of the host country government. There are also grassroots technical cooperation projects, which are given mostly to NGOs, but there have been some cases in which universities also have submitted proposals and implemented projects under this scheme.

A status report for fiscal 2003 on JICA-University cooperation shows 98 trainees placed in 29 universities for long-term coun-

terpart training. A short-term group training program also exists and 45 short-term training courses were offered by 30 universities. Six of the eight visiting research fellows come from universities. Additionally, several research projects have been sub-contracted to universities. However, overall, universities' major involvement has been in the form of the dispatch of professors as advisers and/or as project experts. There is wide variety in the length of assignment for dispatched advisers/project experts, from one to two years for those working for a project or the host government to a couple of weeks for others on a mission basis. These characteristics basically may remain the same over the next few years but with gradual adjustments as necessary. Thus, for JICA, collaboration with universities has been more at the individual level and not at the level of institution-based cooperation. This year, however, JICA signed a contract with Hiroshima University for the implementation of a basic education project in Bangladesh, which is the very first case of an institutional level cooperation with a university. Although this is in fact a joint undertaking by a university and a private consultancy company, it is certainly a concrete step forward in a new type of cooperation with universities for JICA. It is expected that the Bangladesh project will set a model for other projects currently in the pipeline.

The issues and limitations in past cooperation modalities with universities as institutions

are due to the heavy emphasis on cooperation at the individual level. This means that there has been no systematic collaboration with universities nor has there been any clear linkage between different cooperation schemes in which individual university professors have been involved. The absence of systematic collaboration and linkages are more of a problem for JICA than the universities. As a result, JICA has not been able to “exploit” and benefit from the knowledge resource base accumulated in universities and, often, the quality and effectiveness of the activities (especially training) depended on the commitment and personal interest of individual professors in charge. There has been little to no recording of good (or bad) practices in its cooperation with universities and this is an issue that needs further internal inquiry within JICA. Otherwise, it would be difficult to build on what has already been done or to evaluate past cooperation experiences.

Another issue of concern to JICA is the still limited number of universities engaged in development cooperation in the field of basic education. This creates a tendency to use the same experts from the same universities, mainly national ones. Thus, JICA is accustomed to working with people who know JICA well. By following this type of practice, JICA has been limiting itself from exploring new channels of cooperation and cultivating potential partners. Such practice also implies that young potential experts in and from universities are not given the chance to engage in international development work. A final issue of concern is that the intellectual resource base developed by universities has not been fully exploited for reference in work on policy frameworks in developing countries or in improving the quality of projects at the grassroots level.

There are three main advantages in working with universities from JICA’s point of view: the improvement of the quality of JICA’s work as a whole, the development of future experts

and professionals in development cooperation, and the promotion of initiatives for international cooperation at local community levels within Japan. JICA’s expectations for universities’ new role include universities being implementing partners for JICA’s technical cooperation projects at various levels; serving as a training base for the development of human resources in developing countries and for future experts in development cooperation in Japan; creating an intellectual resource base for the further enhancement of Japan’s ODA activities; and serving as a model for popular participation of local communities in Japan in international cooperation.

The possible incentives for universities to work with JICA may include (1) expanding the scope of education and research, (2) making use of the universities training and research results for a humanitarian cause, (3) having a chance to make the university more international, and (4) generating income for the university through undertaking or subcontracting international cooperation work. However, with regard to the last point, the financial incentives are relatively modest compared to the labor and time that needs to be put in by the university in preparing proposals and negotiating administrative matters with JICA, and hence may not be so attractive to universities at this initial stage.

As mentioned at the outset, JICA’s basic policy on cooperation is still in the midst of discussion. JAFSA, which is similar to NAFSA, conducted a joint research study with JICA at the end of 2003 on how to proceed with university collaboration. In May 2004, further internal research was carried out to compile past and current status of cooperation with universities. Based on the findings of these two studies, JICA is looking toward developing a more comprehensive cooperation with university institutions by aligning the interests of both JICA and the universities and strengthening collaboration with universities as partners in projects addressing priority development

issues. Some examples of cooperation with universities that are becoming close to institutional-level collaboration are in such fields as infectious diseases, HIV/AIDS, agricultural human resource development in Africa, basic education development in Africa, industrial human resource development in Indonesia, Asian economic collaboration, and the environment. Currently there are 14 Japanese universities associated with these fields of cooperation.

JBIC-University Cooperation in Education Development

Kazuhiro Yoshida, Japan Bank for International Cooperation

The main difference between JICA and the Japan Bank for International Cooperation (JBIC) is that JBIC operates on a much larger scale than JICA. Therefore, when JBIC provides loan assistance, the average amount may be \$50 million or more. For fiscal 2003, JBIC approved some \$300 million equivalent in loans for education out of \$5,500 million in total loans approved. The trend during recent years has generally been to increase the volume and number of education projects over a period of time. This year, there will be an additional six projects in education, bringing the total number of education projects to more than 20 over the last four years. This is the largest number of education projects in JBIC's history, as well as in total volume of funding.

The trend in the 1970s and 1980s was for Korea to be a major recipient of Japan's loan assistance followed by Indonesia. However, in the late 1990s, this trend changed—Indonesia and now China have become major recipients in Korea's place. This corresponds to the country's economic growth at that time, as its capacity to borrow also will be reflected in the lending pattern. Although, in recent years, JBIC has provided loan assistance to Tunisia, Pakistan, Uzbekistan, and other new countries, the majority of JBIC funds clearly goes to Asian countries, showing a very clear regional focus.

Fund distribution by sub-sector shows that primary education loans and funding for middle school education and technical education projects are very weak. The strongest sub-sector has been higher education and overseas scholarships, which reflects JBIC's strong emphasis on assisting human resources development. While this trend is likely to continue, JBIC needs to strengthen assistance in basic education to contribute more to poverty reduction, an area that Japanese universities have accumulated knowledge and expertise.

Opportunities for university contributions to JBIC's ODA operations exist at every phase of the project cycle, either through the Special Assurances for Project Formation, Project Implementation, and Project Sustainability, or by participating in the project as a contractor. The first forms of special assistance are grant facilities that JBIC has in relation to the loan project, and are provided as technical assistance that requires expertise in specific fields. Thus, this could provide a very strong opportunity for university involvement.

Sustainability of the project is a very important issue for JBIC. An example of the Special Assistance for Project Sustainability is a project that built junior secondary schools in Indonesia. The objective was to improve access by constructing the schools. However, once construction was completed, in order to ensure sustainability, a different set of issues emerged as the country moved to decentralization of service delivery, including education. Without the involvement of key stakeholders such as the local community and local government, the schools could not function well in a sustainable manner. Therefore, it became necessary to have the full participation of these key stakeholders. Decentralization has been only nominally implemented in Indonesia so far, and while JBIC has had successful experiments in school-based management, there are many challenges in operationalizing the model nationwide.

Although JBIC has a very traditional infrastructure orientation, there is a growing need

to pay increased attention to project outcomes and social considerations, and therefore, to increase input from universities and utilize their knowledge and expertise. This is currently insufficient in JBIC operations. There are many projects that can benefit from university assistance, and in general, each project will involve consultancy services for 5 to 10 percent of the total contract amount. Consultancy services are not limited only to projects in the education sector—universities are welcome to contribute to other projects as well.

JBIC also conducts sector studies and usually one or two of these are in the education sector every year. The results of recent studies on education in Indonesia, Bangladesh, and Vietnam have identified main issues in the education sector and will form the basis for building the future assistance strategy. Some of these studies have been conducted by relying on an advisory team comprising Japanese university professors. Such a scheme of working with university people has proven to be very effective. There is another type of opportunity for university experts to fill *ad hoc* needs. Because there is an annual cycle for approving a project, JBIC will suddenly have numerous requests coming from various countries, not always with full preparation of the project's background. In order to manage the process in a timely manner, there is a need to employ a specialist for quick studies that provide basic background information on the project. Therefore, JBIC will form a contract by entrusting (*ishoku* in Japanese) one selected specialist for a small part of a study within a certain ceiling. It is important for JBIC to know who these experts are and thus there is a need to develop an information database, which would include information on possible experts in specialized fields. It is expected that the work of the Support and Coordination Project under the MEXT's initiative will help in this regard.

Finally, two other areas in which JBIC would like to see university staff involved are

in delivery of special sessions for internal staff training and an effective staff exchange program with universities.

JBIC's current focus is on Asia, but it is expanding this focus to include other regions. Because of the strong emphasis on higher education, there are opportunities for increasing the involvement of Japanese universities by assisting in these higher education projects. However, in the context of internationalization of higher education, the strengthening of higher education in developing countries also should include more involvement of universities from abroad. Collaboration between Japanese and U.S. universities is very important.

USAID-University Cooperation in Education Development

Donald Mackenzie, U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID)

Developing countries can be categorized by their different needs and circumstances, which illustrate where USAID may be headed in the future. The top developing country performers will receive funding through the Millennium Challenge Account (MCA), which is an independent corporation and not part of USAID, based on meeting performance criteria in the areas of ruling justly, investing in people, and promoting economic freedom. One of USAID's major roles is to assist candidate countries to become eligible for MCA and its larger sums of development funding. Country performance is measured by absolute performance and trend evidence. The Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC) will give countries the benefit of the doubt if the trend data are moving in the right direction. For example, Madagascar did not meet the education performance criteria but does have a new, transparent government trying to do the right thing. Malagasy intentions were given extra weight because Madagascar was a top performer on other MCA criteria. Therefore, Madagascar became MCA eligible. This performance and results philosophy continues down to the fragile states and

strategic states, although humanitarian assistance will always be provided anywhere when needed. USAID does not have as specific an Asia focus as JBIC or JICA in education. However, there has been a resurgence of USAID education programs in the Asia-Near East region. Three years ago, there were only two education projects and now there are basic education activities in 15 countries. Although the number has increased, USAID unfortunately does not have the numbers or quality of staff in house, so it is necessary to depend more on universities and NGOs to bring in the education expertise for that region.

There are positive trends occurring on a global level in international development. This is especially true since 2000 when the Education for All (EFA) initiative was signed at Dakar and the International Financing for Development Conference was held in Monterrey, Mexico. The latter was notable in that a consensus was reached that the developing country should be in charge of and accountable for its own development. Japan and the United States have been doing projects for years through local ownership, but there are other donors that have continued to focus solely on resources. Japan and the United States have been going against the mainstream on many development discussions, but have continued to urge for local ownership, performance results, and broader alliances. Government is not the answer for education in developing countries and there is a need for involvement on the part of higher education, NGOs, and the private sector. No one group has the resources to take on all the challenges. Collaboration will be necessary in the future to solve problems such as HIV/AIDS, which is an economic and social crisis, not just a health problem.

The United States is beginning to look more and more beyond its borders. For example, the National Science Foundation, which gives billions of dollars for research, changed its charter recently to support research outside

the United States. However, science and technology in developing countries continue to have issues related to lack of human and financial resources. In order to develop these resources to support science and technology capabilities, it will become necessary to increase the cooperation of universities. Other major changes are present in the private sector. Twenty years ago, 70 percent of financial resources to developing countries was provided under government-to-government agreements, but now 80 percent comes from the private sector writ large (corporations, foreign direct investment or FDI, NGOs, foundations, remittances, and so forth).

The private sector movement toward corporate social responsibility is worth noting. Previously, corporations supported individual projects whose purpose was often to “buy off” bad publicity and keep negative articles out of the newspapers. However, within the past three to five years there has been a radical change in that the global private sector sees the benefit of establishing long-term corporate social responsibility programs as part of its good citizenship and long-term engagement in public issues. Japan may be a little behind in the area of corporate social responsibility. A global corporate engagement is now viewed as a long-term effort which never stops and where increasingly large resource commitments are being made. It is not merely a way to give the appearance of being a good citizen but part of corporate strategies to retain the best employees.

Why should business care about education? In South Africa, for example, businesses saw that it took 18 years of investment to produce one 12th-grade high school graduate who still did not have the skills needed by the business world. These companies said they would rather pay for a higher quality and more efficient education system and get better graduates. Business also understands the need for a systemic and holistic approach to the issue. Waiting until late in high school to find that

someone cannot read is too late. Thus, many corporations in the United States are supporting and investing in early childhood education programs.

Business understands that future markets depend on economic development in developing countries and that education is the underpinning of the human capital necessary for growth. At the country level, for example, local private-public partnerships allow business people to talk to primary school students about why education is important while also providing management assistance to school governing boards and administrators. Moving beyond corporate social responsibility, the private sector was invited to attend the EFA Working Group meeting last July for the first time at the urging of UNESCO and USAID, where its representatives were able to present business points of view on the links between education and economic growth. Building on this event, the World Economic Forum (WEF) held an EFA side event in Brazil in November 2004 to bring private sector practitioners together to develop a set of best practices in private-public partnerships in basic education. Thus, education in general, and specifically basic education, is being raised to a higher level and will be on the WEF agenda in January 2005 at Davos. Alliances conducted at a higher level have the ability to change mindsets, while recognizing they are difficult in practice because the private and public partners effectively speak different languages. However, alliances are the wave of the future. USAID is supporting a Basic Education Alliance in Asia that has just started creating partnerships with local and international firms, including Japanese businesses.

One new emerging alliance for educators is the Global Learning Portal (GLP or www.glpnet.org), which addresses scale-up issues through a network rather than a project approach. GLP's focus is on connecting and inspiring educators worldwide by mobilizing all the content and good practices that have

been developed. There are 58 million teachers in the world and 32 million of these are in developing countries. GLP can reach these teachers and make them better educators despite a lack of in-service training and support. Through GLP, teachers have the ability to search and find another person on their own terms. GLP is a personalized portal customized to the user and an alliance of millions of users supporting one another.

Exploring University Cooperation for Education in Development

Paul White, Former Mission Director, USAID/Mexico

A stocktaking exercise of United States-Japan collaboration categorized more than 150 projects as trilateral. The majority were sponsored through the Japan Foreign Ministry's grass-roots grant, small amounts that could be secured in a reasonably quick time frame and could be developed and implemented with NGOs, universities, and other local institutions, and some JBIC and JICA collaborations. Twelve evaluations were sometimes jointly conducted with JICA or JBIC, all involved working with the local USAID, JBIC, and JICA offices as well as the Japanese Embassy and other collaborators. In order to complete the evaluations, countries where the projects occurred were visited, beneficiaries were interviewed, and not only project impacts were evaluated but also what worked and did not work in the trilateral collaboration process was studied and documented. The overall conclusion from the evaluations was that individual effort often creates good results and collaboration and, if done right, produces extraordinary results.

Two main reasons to collaborate are that resources are limited and that there are no monopolies on success. Collaboration is a way to work better with limited resources. It is often said that two heads are better than one and working together is a way to play to each other's strengths and minimize weaknesses. The question then is, with all of the past collaboration, why is this seminar now exploring whether we

should collaborate or not? Where is the literature on what has worked in the past that might inform collaboration? The answer is there is not much out there and with good reasons.

First, project implementers often were not very happy with the idea of collaboration, which was developed at headquarters and mandated for the field. There was a sense that collaboration was something that took up valuable time when implementation of their projects should be their only focus. Project documents often did not include information on collaboration, so when projects were evaluated, only outcomes were studied, not collaboration. However, when case studies were evaluated in the stocktaking exercise mentioned above, a number of things were discovered. One was that collaboration works when certain design and implementation approaches are followed.

Within a collaborate project there are a lot of partners and thus a trilateral relationship often becomes much more than just three partners. It is necessary to get all partners on the same page to achieve success. The good news is if the project is designed in the right way it is possible to avoid some of this additional complexity and to maximize strengths and minimize weaknesses in individual partnership programs.

The stocktaking exercise found three major ways collaboration projects were designed. The first design is that of complementary projects in which a second donor comes in and picks up some specific component of an already established project. Another type of complementary project is where one donor is doing something that seems to be working well and another donor expands the successful project. Complementary collaboration is the easiest to design and implement because bureaucracies do not have to interact very much. The disadvantage is that potential synergy is not as high as in other collaboration modes.

A second design is to have parallel projects. Two agencies identify common goals and objec-

tives, and then provide funding separately to implementation units. Implementation proceeds on a parallel basis. The implementing agencies look for ways to crosswalk and coordinate their parallel activities. The advantage is that in this kind of implementation, the projects do not become too locked down in the respective bureaucracies. At the same time, when attention is provided to collaboration and coordination, significant synergy can be attained. Thus, most United States-Japan collaboration projects follow a parallel project design.

The third design is joint projects in which donors pool funding and implementation actions. These projects are difficult to develop and implement because the two bureaucracies must interact together in a seamless way. Small differences in the bureaucracy can cause gridlock. A few projects have tried the joint mode of collaboration but they reverted to parallel funding and implementation.

Selecting the appropriate collaboration mode is perhaps the most important thing contributing to success. Deciding how to collaborate must come early in the process because all subsequent planning and implementation decisions will depend on the collaboration mode. While it is possible to change modes during a project, this usually results in confusion that negatively affects project success. Except in the most unusual circumstances, parallel funding and parallel but coordinated implementation yield the highest project success and synergy.

Overall, the most successful projects evaluated during the stocktaking exercise began from joint formulation missions. A joint U.S.-Japan team would decide on a sector for cooperation, and then select target countries. A joint team would then travel to the country or countries to work with local authorities on project identification and design. The stocktaking exercise found that this mode of project identification and development was the most efficient, and that when NGOs and the private

sector were brought onto the team as well, it worked even better. Because of this broader base, post-project sustainability was enhanced.

In donor collaboration, a better understanding about how each partner operates improves collaboration. Keeping field staff involved and focused on the collaboration aspects of the project is important to success. Another lesson learned is that it is necessary to carry out in-country project identification and to have oversight personnel who can keep all partners focused on implementation collaboration. Third, synergy should be programmed and not incidental. While two advisers working together might find ways to develop synergy, if it is not documented or reported on, program managers sitting in capital cities may not become aware of or appreciate the synergy that has developed. It is important to include in project documentation a clear formulation of what collaboration is expected, how it should happen, and what synergy should emerge from that collaboration. If only project outcomes are documented, implementers will focus on these alone and evaluators will not study collaboration either. That has been a major failing of past collaboration projects.

In all the cases evaluated in the stocktaking exercise, the host country saw benefits in collaboration. It did away with overlap and redundancy in donor programs and there were financial savings as the recipient institutions were able to standardize procurement, and

sometimes even reporting and monitoring approaches. USAID is a three- to five-year project donor, however Japan often is a much longer-term donor. United States-Japan collaboration led to higher levels of combined donor funding over a longer timeframe than USAID normally provides. Also, USAID tends to provide “soft” assistance; Japan often provides “hard” or infrastructure and equipment assistance. Together, the two systems complemented each other very well. There were many examples of successful results with more sustainability than would have been achieved in a bilateral assistance context alone.

Where possible, avoid the temptation to start new activities. Rather, seek to strengthen on-going activity through enhanced collaboration. Starting from zero is much harder than building on what one or the other side is already doing. It also is important to develop a formal synergy agreement that moves from simply documenting expected project results to documenting expected synergy so that the synergy resulting from collaboration can be reviewed. Finally, deciding on a collaboration mode early in the process and ensuring that subsequent design and implementation decisions are congruent with that mode is a critical factor that can either contribute to success or create continuing problems.

Outline of Issues and Challenges in Forming Higher Education Partnerships with Institutions in Developing Countries

Seiji Utsumi, Osaka University

The Japanese-U.S. collaboration project in Guatemala on girls' education was an extremely difficult project. This project also had an NGO component and thus there was a myriad of partners. USAID focused on supporting the NGOs that were supporting girls' education on a community level. The Japanese side sent experts to provide technical equipment and work with the government of Guatemala. Materials also were developed and distributed to the region. Why was this project so difficult? The most important reason is the differences that exist between JICA and USAID; the philosophies of the two agencies are quite different.

Another joint Japanese-U.S. project focused on Indonesian faculty development. This project created a faculty development center to help faculty members earn their doctorates. At that time, it was implemented by the government and almost all universities in Indonesia, with participation from one counterpart university. This project was designed as a parallel program: Japan supported the engineering faculty and the United States supported the agriculture faculty. The project was just completed two or three years ago. For the Japanese, it was a 10-year project and one that was very difficult because Ph.D. training is quite different in the United States and Japan. The United States wanted to invite all the fac-

ulty members to the United States to give them master's degrees. JICA decided to send faculty members to Jakarta and then, when they had almost finished their degree, invite them to Japan. Now the project is more flexible.

Both of these joint projects shared similar issues or problems. First, each country's own political interest always came first, which made it difficult to harmonize ideas and agendas. Second, there were differences in the approach to cooperation and the necessary skills required. For example, staff members of Japan's Ministry of Foreign Affairs were not aware of the skills on the U.S. side. Third, there were differences in how projects were implemented. Although the time lag before implementation for USAID is very quick and flexible, its approach is very concrete. On the Japanese side, things move more slowly and sometimes the Japanese mission is not able to reach a decision, as project implementers need to go back to Tokyo for negotiations. The Japanese side is very creative. The scheme is very concrete, but the implementing officer has lots of ideas and various kinds of resources to put into one project. Because of this, JICA looks concrete but is very flexible. Project implementers can do a great deal, and also obtain money from other sources. Also, when the Japanese embassy offers grassroots monies, decisions are very slow in coming and

these time lags make parallel projects very difficult to harmonize.

Lastly, Japan and the United States viewed project results differently. Take, for example, the Guatemala project, which researched why girls do not attend school. The U.S. side thought this was a result of the teachers' attitude toward the girls. Teachers did not allow girls to answer questions, and would only teach to the boys. Therefore, the U.S. participants concluded, girls do not enjoy learning. However, the Japanese participants thought the main issue was the support of parents in encouraging and teaching language ability to girls at home. Because of this, the Japanese surmised, girls cannot catch up to the boys' comprehension level, and are less likely to engage in formal education.

Despite the difficulties, there are some good points to working on joint projects. Joint projects increase the diversity of input and this is good for the organizations involved. Also, in order to collaborate, a great deal of time is devoted to personal study, which results in a deeper understanding of the situation in the country as well as an understanding of international cooperation. This aspect is very important. Because of joint projects, there also is the possibility for future projects.

Japan has begun the first reconstruction work of schools in Afghanistan since 9/11 and is trying to start a girls' school in Logal Province. There are 6,000 12-year schools in

Afghanistan with about 5 million students. The number of girl students is far less than the number of boy students, especially in rural areas. Furthermore, there is a need for 110,000 teachers but now there are only 73,073. There are fewer women teachers and almost all of them are in the urban areas. While Japan is providing teacher training for women, it is very difficult to invite them to Japan for the training. There are 17 higher education institutes in Afghanistan and 14 two-year colleges. The number of students is 16,000, which is a huge number, as all higher education is free of charge under the constitution and this includes tuition, dormitory fees, and meals. Because of this, the Afghan government does not have any money, which results in very low pay for professors. Therefore, there is a need for faculty development and local university development. Although aware of this, the United States is interested in supporting basic education. Now the World Bank and Japan, as well as other countries and agencies, are focusing on basic education.

Possibilities of partnerships with institutes in Afghanistan exist and teacher training is being conducted with Columbia University and agriculture with Purdue University and Kyoto University in Japan. Osaka University has a relationship with the medical institute and thus important partners for reconstruction already have a good rapport with foreign universities.

Opportunities and Issues in Forming Higher Education Partnerships in Developing Countries

David Chapman, University of Minnesota

There is a saying that “the devil is in the details.” That is often true for university partnership projects. The challenge in developing university partnerships often is not in developing the overall conceptualization of the project. The challenge often comes in clarifying the operational details. A main reason is that planning and proposal development is often done over e-mail under tight time constraints, among partners who may not know each other well. The proposal is won mostly on the quality of the larger conceptualization. Many of the operational issues are deferred, to be resolved later if the proposal is funded.

Characteristics of higher education partnerships

A partnership involving a U.S. university and a Japanese university working in a sub-Saharan African country in the area of teacher training will have multiple stakeholders who may have differing views about the relative value of different outputs and outcomes. For example, partner university faculty may value institutional development impacts within their own institution over the development impacts in the off-campus community. Not only do the multiple stakeholders differ on what they believe important to accomplish, they also may differ in the credibility they assign to different types of indicators that signal their success.

The most successful projects occur when partners agree on what they are trying to accomplish and how they will know if they are being successful.

Designing university partnership projects

USAID experience suggests six considerations that need to be addressed when designing university partnership projects:

1. Developing a shared vision of the project.

Within the United States, there are at least two distinctly different types of university partnership projects. Both are valuable, but they seek different goals. Those funded by the U.S. Department of State are focused mainly on public diplomacy. The goal of this type of project is to familiarize citizens of other countries with life in the United States and U.S. higher education. Emphasis within these projects is on encouraging contact among personnel of the participating universities, building friendships, and fostering collaborative working relationships. The substantive focus of each project is of somewhat less importance than the strength of the relationships that are built. Emphasis tends to be on study tours and exchanges, which maximize the number of participants who have an opportunity to experience the partner culture.

USAID-sponsored university projects seek a different goal. These partnership programs are viewed as a mechanism to engage universities in low- and middle-income countries in their own national development in productive ways. Their goal is to promote national development through increased involvement of their higher education institutions in the development of their own countries. While there are other payoffs from these arrangements, the central concern of USAID is the

national development that occurs. While these partnerships are expected to contribute to the institutional development of the partner institutions and the internationalization of the curriculum in the U.S. institution, these are secondary considerations to USAID.

While USAID is primarily interested in national development in the partner country, the participating institutions may have other agenda that are equally important to them. The U.S. institution may be interested in further internationalizing its curriculum; the partner institution may be interested in capacity building of its own faculty. While all partners may acknowledge the multiple goals of partners, they may each harbor different priorities.

As we think about tripartite partnerships, it will be important to agree on what our collaborators are expecting to accomplish. Partners may have different ideas about what the project activities should accomplish. Is national development the primary goal? Or, is capacity building at the partner university enough of an accomplishment? How will differences among partners be resolved?

2. Developing shared operating procedures and rules

USAID requires a relatively high level of financial accountability for the use of project funds. Developing country partner institutions do not always have the same type or level of requirements for tracking expenditures, providing receipts, and accounting for people's time and effort. They sometimes do not have a tradition in which that level of accountability is valued. Indeed, some of the U.S. requirements seem odd and unnecessary to partners. However, failure to meet oversight and accounting requirements of the funding agency is a fast road to trouble.

On the other hand, local partners sometimes feel that their international partners do not trust them or may think they are being dishonest when they cannot meet international

accountability requirements, especially concerning the handling of money. International partners are sometimes troubled by the casualness with which financial commitments are made or the inability to clearly explain where money went.

This issue gets further complicated in a trilateral partnership, in which the accounting and oversight requirements of the Japanese funding agency, USAID, and the local partner institution would all have to be met. In planning a three-way partnership, we need to ensure that we find ways to meet the needs of all partners so that operational issues do not get in the way of the collaborative spirit and substantive work of the partnership.

In a U.S.-Japan trilateral partnership, whose contracting and accounting rules will apply? Typically, one institution will be the primary contractor and the other institution will then be a subcontractor. How will this be decided in a Japan-U.S. collaboration?

If there were a tripartite project, how will awards be made? Will a U.S.-Japan joint review panel meet together to review all the proposals and make a joint decision? Alternatively, will there be parallel review panels, in which the lists of finalists from each review team are then examined for overlap? If there is to be a single, coordinated, face-to-face review process, then the extra funds to support that travel needs to be budgeted, raising the cost of the review process.

3. Exploring why individuals want to participate

Some partner faculties are very committed to the substance of the partnership activities. They would be undertaking the same type of activities with or without a project to support them. Others participate for more specific personal reasons. While they might have some interest in the larger goals of the partnership program, it is not their primary motivation for participation. Yet others see these partnerships as a way to secure desperately needed resources for their institution or unit. Their

interest in the actual activity is secondary or nonexistent. These different levels of commitment can translate into different levels of performance and, in turn, to different levels of project success.

Ideally, individuals with little or no interest in the large project goals should be screened out and eliminated at the point of project design. But that seldom happens. Rather, people are chosen for their language ability, their availability, or their role in the institution—not necessarily their interest or commitment in the project. Since we have to work with the people available to us, this situation is unlikely to change much. However, to the extent we understand how much poor selection of personnel can undercut a project, the more careful we are likely to be in making those choices during the design phase.

In a tripartite project, the issue of personnel selection is complicated. Key faculty from the Japanese and U.S. institutions may not all know each other well enough to really understand each other's motivations for participating in such a project. This can be resolved through more personal contact. But that contact needs to be built into the project design and adequately funded.

Should the partnership program pay for travel costs of potential collaborators to meet in order to prepare their proposal? This approach would imply some level of pre-selection. Should proposals be submitted in a two-phase approach? Perhaps Japanese and U.S. institutions should propose partnership arrangements? U.S. and Japanese funders could then pre-select two or three groups as "finalists" and fund travel associated with proposal development. In developing proposals, how much contact among Japanese and U.S. collaborators should be built into the budget?

4. Ensuring effective incentive systems

For some participants, an important incentive is the opportunities a partnership creates for research and scholarly publications. While this

is a realistic goal, agreeing on who shares in the authorship is often a sensitive issue.

Tripartite partnerships will increase the number of faculty who may see this as an important outcome of their participation. How should this be handled? Issues of access to data, ownership of data, and authorship need to be clearly addressed early in the planning process to ensure that misunderstandings do not develop later.

5. Balancing the need to save money with the need to do the project well

USAID-sponsored university partnership projects generally involve a substantial institutional financial commitment (e.g., "cost sharing"). Across university partnership projects sponsored by USAID, institutional cost sharing has been about 100 percent. That is, the individual colleges and universities contribute about as much as they receive in actual funds from USAID. The cost sharing from the universities is often in the form of contributing faculty time, waiving indirect costs, providing classroom space, and providing housing for visiting team members. The money from USAID is typically spent on things that require cash, such as the purchase of air tickets, food, and participant housing.

Pressure for savings comes from two directions. USAID wants as much as they can get for their money. They want to show that the U.S. universities are contributing a large proportion of the expenses. The U.S. universities, having secured an agreement, hope that it will not draw their faculty away at key times or for long periods. They support the idea of these partnership projects, but they also have a larger university program to run, and they do not want these programs to get in the way of other agenda.

Pressed from both sides, partnership directors sometimes feel a tension between being frugal and doing the project well. Their fear is that they will lose the support of their own institution if their activities are seen as expensive and detracting from other institutional priorities.

One implication for a tripartite working relationship is that the three-way partnerships are likely to be more expensive to operate. They will involve more time and probably more travel than a two-way partnership.

In a U.S.-Japanese partnership, how will cost sharing be shared among the partner institutions? Are Japanese universities able to contribute faculty time to this type of project? Is it necessary that the level of institutional contributions be similar? What are the implications of different patterns of support among partner institutions?

6. Conducting meaningful evaluation of impacts
Funding agencies typically want evidence that the partnership projects they fund are having a meaningful impact on development. All USAID-funded projects require systematic evaluation. We can learn from some of the issues that USAID has discovered in its evaluation of the partnerships it has funded. Five factors need to be considered in evaluating partnership programs:

Some partnerships suffer from weak elaboration of the logic (and, often, weak logic) that connects the partnership activity with the intended outcome (for example, what is the realistic linkage between improving a computer based data system and raising student achievement?). Often, this weakness is a by-product of over-promising by applicants during the proposal phase in an effort to make their partnership appear attractive. Over-promising establishes expectations that often cannot be met, even by otherwise successful projects. When intended outcomes were not achieved, it was sometimes difficult to know whether this represented a weakness in the activity or over-optimism in planning.

Many anticipated outputs of university partnerships are long-term and unlikely to emerge within the life of the project funding. This is quite reasonable. Funders (e.g., USAID) want results long before many of the

important results will emerge. However, meaningful efforts to assess the impacts of partnership programs generally cannot be conducted within the life of project funding.

Good evaluation often requires good baseline data. One reason is that partnerships are sometimes funded with the expectation that baseline data will be collected once activities are underway, without a clear idea of what types of baseline data would be most useful. Program managers do not fully anticipate what questions may be asked in subsequent evaluations. A contributing factor is that, typically, few resources are committed to collecting baseline data and there has been little press to do so from USAID or ALO.

Many evaluations focus on attitudes of participants toward the partnership activities. The attitudes of constituent groups toward the project in which they are involved may be useful, but must be interpreted with caution. Beneficiaries are often reluctant to criticize the programs responsible for their benefit stream. While it is important that partnerships be positively regarded by their constituencies, some evaluations offer little insight as to the real consequences of university partnerships on national development.

A successful collaboration will require that funding agencies and all of the university partners agree on what constitutes a successful university partnership project, how and when the impact of the partnership project will be evaluated, and who will do it.

Conclusion

The opportunity for U.S. and Japanese universities to work together in partnership with universities in developing countries to improve the quality of basic education offers exciting possibilities. While the devil may indeed be in the details, these details can be resolved by working together.

Summary of the Proceedings: General Discussion

University Involvement in Development Cooperation

Japanese participants stressed the importance of university involvement in development cooperation. Universities have expert knowledge, not only in education development, but also in agriculture, engineering, and many other areas. Conducting research is the strength of the university. It is an area that needs to be further developed so that everyone can benefit from the lessons learned in international cooperation development projects. Collaborative research is a possible starting point for Japanese and U.S. institutions to consider.

The Japan national group discussed the possibility of organizing a consortium among Japanese universities to engage in development activity. As each professor has a research grant, this money could be used for cooperative projects. In this way, funds could be readily acquired and increased. Japanese universities are becoming increasingly involved in project consulting through private firms or JICA. After a project ends, there is typically no further direct involvement. Universities can provide an opportunity for continuing linkages and longer-term relationships under partnership arrangements.

Although there are many advantages to Japanese university participation in international cooperation projects, Japanese universities have both strengths and weaknesses. One weakness is that when projects involve JICA, or a similar funding agency, universities do not have the capacity to write effective proposals, as this is a new area for Japanese institutions. While experts in many fields, Japanese professors and university administrators are not yet

proficient in the necessary skills of managing project funds. The group saw the advantage of involving U.S. universities in trilateral development projects; this would be one way that Japanese universities would benefit from working in tandem with U.S. academic institutions.

Participants recognized new opportunities for international cooperation because of the recent privatization of Japanese universities. The introduction of a competition-based system for bidding on contracts has already met with some success despite initial difficulties. They identified a need for a common definition of “contract” and “contract based” between the U.S. and Japanese participants. Universities contracting with aid agencies for the first time need support during the process, as there is no shared knowledge base between universities and the funding agencies.

There is domestic pressure in Japan for universities to find revenue to engage in the business of development cooperation. As universities become more familiar with the process, and support for writing proposals and contracts becomes more widely available, it is likely that development assistance will increase as a social contribution function of Japanese universities. Problems of bureaucracy in the newly privatized national universities as well as a lack of communication and/or collaboration between small national colleges need to be addressed before the desired social contribution can be achieved. Questions were raised on the availability of funds for non-national Japanese universities. As the development field is just opening up for institutional participation by universities in Japan, funding agencies are more familiar with national universities and thus they are seen as

the starting point. Eventually funding will be available to any university with the necessary expertise and commitment to a policy of participation in development. It was suggested that alternative funds such as grassroots grants, Ambassador funds, and private sector involvement should be made available for cooperative projects. The corporate status of universities creates an ideal time for discussion on how Japan can be involved in overseas development assistance.

An issue common to both U.S. and Japanese universities is the limitation on faculty time. Overseas activity places a burden on faculty even when international cooperation is a core activity of the university. Faculty need to do the same amount of work at the home university regardless of time spent abroad. There also is a need for flexibility when involved in projects in developing countries; adjustments are often required once projects have begun. In this case, cooperative agreements rather than contracts ought to be considered as these allow both greater flexibility and opportunities for learning during the process, and are particularly suited for work in human capacity development.

U.S. participants proposed the following principle: “There is no point in collaborating unless there is a point to collaboration.” In other words, collaboration should add value to the educational development activity. Any collaborative efforts should be host-country driven and based on the synergy derived from institutional cooperation.

Two possible basic models for collaboration were proposed. The first involved one set of partners collaborating in the other set’s existing project. For example, if the current personnel working on the JICA-sponsored project in Ghana were to collaborate with U.S. faculty with expertise in assessment. Another example would be the benefit that could be derived from applying the Japanese “lesson study” approach to U.S. teacher education projects in developing countries. The U.S.

group felt that by getting to know more about Japanese university involvement in international development cooperation, future possibilities for collaboration could develop.

The second model discussed was a top-down model in which the first step would be to invite project proposals from host-country institutions. This would be followed by an invitation to U.S. and Japanese universities to apply for partnership funding to carry out a project. A two-phase process, the first phase would be the requests for projects and the second phase would be inviting applications from new partnerships or existing collaborations. Collaboration should not be a matter of forcing two groups together, but rather having interested parties working together because they see a benefit in collaboration. The U.S. group was concerned that the bureaucracies of the U.S. and Japanese development agencies could create strong challenges for collaboration.

Lessons Learned from Past Projects

Three major points emerged during the discussion on past educational development projects. First, how to set boundaries or a “zone of feasible innovation,” the area beyond what a person already knows but what he or she can realistically master given support and training. Projects should not be overly idealistic but rather have the potential for success given the capacity of the situation, the system in which they are embedded, and the amount of available resources.

Related to this idea, a second topic of concern was how lessons learned from prior projects are built upon in future projects. Specifically, this focused on the potential role for universities, because of their research capability and expertise, to systemize project outcomes and best practices into a knowledge base for others to access so that future projects can build upon and enhance previous outcomes.

The third topic centered on the importance of evaluation and from what viewpoint project

outcomes are assessed. Evaluation needs to address whether the project has been useful for the people for whom it was designed and whether it meets the requirements of the funding agency. JICA is beginning to address some of these issues through a national conference.

Modest expectations of an initial project can lead to determining zones of feasible innovation for future projects. Questions on how to meet the expectations of all stakeholders were raised. For example, how do projects approach working on changing classroom instruction while addressing the needs of the shared stakeholders for whole school improvement? Schools are not in a vacuum but in a multi-layered community with the classroom at its center. Questions were raised on how best to negotiate with and receive agreement from funders to respond to developments after the project has begun, and how, if only successful projects receive funding whether opportunities have been missed to learn from what did not go well? A final point was consideration of the additional benefits that might occur from synergy because of multilateral involvement.

Participants underscored the importance of maintaining a forward-looking perspective in cooperative projects. Although alliances of university partners and funding agencies may share the same goals and objectives, people who implement the alliances sometimes miss out on the opportunity to utilize new ideas, develop new knowledge, and create innovation. The reason this occurs is that at the start of a project this new knowledge is yet to be defined and things may look very different at a later stage. Concerns about bureaucracy were raised as each agency has its own unique corporate culture, which is made very clear in the evaluation criteria employed for the project. Sometimes bureaucracy can make it difficult for newcomers to participate.

On the topic of innovation, participants felt that there was a need for balance between trying out a new model involving a trilateral arrangement versus purposive involvement in

a complex model of innovation. A suggestion was to test a new collaborative arrangement first rather than chose a new way to innovate. One participant felt that the point of collaboration is to address complexity. This is illustrated in a very simple story of how the wheel came into being. First, the wheel was square in shape, which made transportation uncomfortable because of excessive bumping. A solution was to make the wheel triangular in shape, the “one-less bump” reform. While this looked good, as there was one less bump, the reform did not improve anything. Thus, it is necessary to beware of simplification. Rather the way to achieve a smooth ride was to make the square more complex by increasing the number of sides until it actually became a circle. Only through increasing complexity, can reform be successful.

The Specific Role of Universities in Educational Cooperation for Development

On the types of projects particularly suited for universities, policy research, evaluation, and assessment were thought to be appropriate, as universities are institutions that work in strengthening human capacity development. NGOs are particularly suited to project implementation. Various forms of collaboration with host institutions in developing countries could provide a starting point or basis for cooperation. For example, a long-term faculty placement could be supported by other researchers in the same area and by involvement of universities in other countries. While this might not develop into a project, it would enhance scholarly research on the campuses involved, and outside contact would help the in-country researchers thrive.

Onsite training can be carried out collaboratively. There are mechanisms available for including Japanese colleagues as potential consultants and U.S.-based Americans as potential JICA consultants. Short-term expert assignments lessen the burden on individual participants in a project and can use Ph.D. stu-

dents who are well versed in the topic of the project, or who are currently in the area doing research.

There is a need for universities to be more business-oriented in outlook. Universities should look at their strengths and weaknesses more on a longer-term business plan that includes new opportunities because of recent changes in the development landscape.

Research funds for professors include publication responsibilities. The real dilemma at present is how to share research knowledge. While copyright may belong either to the university or the consultant, the need for publication of results will need clearance from the borrowing government in the name of knowledge sharing. A risk here would be publicizing country specific data that would be seen as irresponsible for stakeholders.

Issues in Forming Higher Education Partnerships with Developing Countries

Participants discussed different type of models for possible partnerships. They concurred that all parties from the very beginning should agree upon the results of a partnership. There should be some kind of agreement on the expected synergy from the onset and this should be documented.

While joint projects between the United States and Japan are possible, in the past, parallel projects have offered more opportunity for agreement on goals and objectives and less involvement in detailed implementation. The group tried to determine if joint projects and parallel projects encompassed all the alternatives, and whether these were ideal models or necessarily mutually exclusive. It was suggested that the characteristics of each may exist on a continuum. In order to test the ultimate model it will be necessary to be prepared to link projects to the local environment in which they will occur and this would determine which model to use.

It will be necessary to establish rules for adapting a partnership project to take advan-

tage of the synergy, new knowledge, and innovation discovered during the process. The time required to create a successful partnership will depend upon the place where the project is to take place and results may not be immediately apparent. Thus, a realistic approach to prepare for a trilateral project may be for Japanese and U.S. universities to begin by working together first. Preparation time for a trilateral project will be substantial and needs to be thought about very carefully. Joint financing requires compromise. If the universities want to work together first, maybe something smaller should be attempted to test the model. Designing a joint project while monitoring and accessing the new activity will provide for longer-term trilateral institutional arrangements.

Approaches for Partnerships in Asia

The group came to a broad consensus on two related approaches that could be pursued to develop trilateral partnerships on education in Asia. The first of these was to develop a few good proposals and then seek funding. This approach would focus on development issues, involve the host-country institution, and be demand driven. The second approach would be to develop proposals that are relatively small, and focused, and concentrate on developing partnerships. A topic of mutual interest and concern would be chosen to pursue a trilateral partnership. In developing proposals, it will be important to test the trilateral model and examine the various conditions under which this can be successful.

Four areas were identified for further discussion. The first involved development and implementation of active learning models, which could include teacher training. A specific area for collaboration on this idea could be the Lao PDR or Bangladesh projects undertaken by Japanese universities. A second area would be to address the remaining unresolved issues in achieving universal basic education, especially in regard to gender. Although most Asian coun-

tries have reached universal primary education, lower secondary education projects, including the gender aspect, continue to have relevance in the Lao PDR and Cambodia. A third area would be in secondary math and science education because Japanese counterparts have experience in creating knowledge networks and may be able to identify funding sources such as the Japan Trust Fund for Large Scale Studies administered by the World Bank. A fourth area to consider would be to combine the expertise both U.S. and Japanese university systems possess on policy research to help a host university develop their own research capacity with an emphasis on basic education.

Throughout the discussion, two points continued to emerge. First, the necessity to create an alumni network so that ownership can be in the hands of those responsible for ensuring sustainability. Second, the problem to be addressed should be general enough to be of interest to all the partners.

While no model currently exists for trilateral partnerships, the process could be solved by developing two or three proposals involving Japanese, U.S., and host universities. These proposals should be reviewed either jointly by the United States and Japan or by the United States, according to criteria approved by both sides.

A final concern raised during the discussion was ensuring the equity of future partners. This could be accomplished by letting institutions find one another, rather than by starting from an announcement by a government agency asking for participation in an upcoming project.

Approaches for Partnerships in Africa

A set of clear principles emerged from the discussion focusing on Africa. First, projects should be host-country grounded, even if projects were initiated from the outside. There is a clear need to consider the process of developing trilateral relationships and universities are uniquely situated to foster long-term, three-

way partnerships in and across Africa.

Institution building is both an important process variable as well as an outcome. Ideally, this would include both institutions and the relationships among them. To realize these objectives, several members felt the need to begin work, rather than “just keep talking.”

Critical to success, the group felt, was the host country’s commitment. At the same time, external organizations needed to consider existing host-country capabilities and organizational arrangements. There was less consensus on the actual countries in which to pursue such projects, South Africa emerged as a good place to begin, along with several other countries such as Ghana, Kenya, and Rwanda.

A series of questions before moving forward were discussed. Should a single best model be developed first, or should a variety of small projects be started to see what might work and then build from these little projects a successful initiative? Second, should a comprehensive or incremental approach be adopted? Third, what does a high level of host-country commitment mean? Does this refer to a project being host-country initiated, driven, or grounded? Fourth, what is the capacity building focus? Should a host country university be the focus, or can U.S.-Japanese universities collaborate on other development projects? Fifth, should initial projects be targeted to one country or open to a variety of countries? Finally, is the primary focus of these efforts to get a trilateral partnership going, to address a developmental problem, other issues, or some combination of these? Closely related to this is whether initial projects should be large and engaging or smaller and more technical in focus.

Participants also discussed whether the process should begin with a concept paper developed by African institutions or with a good U.S.-Japanese university proposal. Should the project try to undertake a major social problem in a university needing a great deal of work, or should it build on existing

efforts with a relatively well-established university? Should projects be led by opportunities for funding or largely independent of ODA at first? The two South African teacher-training projects represented at the seminar offered possibilities for expansion and good synergy between these ongoing efforts. There also was substantial interest in projects to build policy research capacity at African universities.

The group agreed that the dialogue begun at the workshop was useful and discussed ways of enhancing this dialogue by including African colleagues either in Africa, the United States, or Japan. They saw a number of upcoming meetings in Africa, Europe, and elsewhere that may provide for such opportunities.

Consensus on Next Steps

One concrete suggestion made by participants was to have CICE take the lead in the creation of an alliance, building on the connections and collaboration represented at the seminar. The committed individuals present at the seminar have already created the beginnings of an alliance and could utilize current available resources so that collaboration continues. An alliance allows new institutions to join and would provide for a long-term Japanese-U.S. collaboration to help developing countries. Initial activities would take into account questions raised, and have a focus on Asia and Africa. Cooperation would be in three areas: 1) policy analysis and research; 2) long- and short-term training; and 3) monitoring and evaluation of programs and projects.

Another suggestion was the creation of a forum attached to upcoming meetings attended by host-country participants. One suggestion would be to collaborate at the July 2005 ICET meeting in South Africa, an institutional alliance of teacher education for in-service and pre-service training, hosted by the University of Pretoria (UP). The Dean of the Faculty of Education at UP could be approached with the idea of generating research knowledge by host-

ing a forum for all the interested institutions or people to attend after the meeting.

Engagement in current projects can complement new partnerships. One example is the Africa/Asia University Dialogue for Basic Education jointly organized by UNESCO, JICA, and the United Nations University (UNU) with major funding by JICA. The project consists of a study mission to Asia (India and Japan) for African-based university experts as well as policy makers working in the Ministry of Education. The three-year project is inviting three participants for the first year and increasing numbers in the second year. The focus is on implementation of a project that will create a self-reliant approach in Africa for African education. This is host-country driven. Workshops will be held in November 2004 with five participants from African countries. The focus will be on international education cooperation to produce greater autonomy for a self-reliant approach. U.S. universities and/or European universities would be welcome to join initiatives that arise out of this project as it is currently in the preparatory stage of creating further work.

To begin the partnership process, it was suggested that universities should put forward ideas and then concentrate on mobilizing the available resources. Both ALO and the appropriate Japanese organization should be involved in the formulation of a set of steps to be taken to pursue partnership between Japanese and U.S. universities. Alliances between Japan and the United States could be developed first through activities grounded in an African or Asian country. As a beginning, this could include two projects in Africa and one in Asia, which would be preferable to beginning with a trilateral commitment that could slow down the process as the third partner is yet to be defined. By creating inclusive alliances, the group has an opportunity to decide the rules by which they will operate and figure out an acceptable modality. One graduate student from both Indiana

University and Kobe University were proposed for a study of the process in developing a trilateral model for development assistance over the upcoming year.

The Support and Coordination Project for University Cooperation in International Development (SCP) is a new organization that can be greatly enhanced through U.S. support and might be able to develop a set of guidelines, principles, or some way of articulating what makes a good partnership for the universities through a set of established criteria.

Extensive networking is already in place so the next step is to begin to formalize an idea that could be funded. By the end of September 2005, it would be advantageous to have two or three workable projects in chosen countries. CICE is prepared to facilitate ideas if given guidance on how to continue the discussion beyond this meeting. ALO could engage top U.S. administrators in this activity through a communiqué of the dialogue session that would include institutions not represented at the seminar. All participants in the seminar could bring the communiqué of the session to their individual university administrators.

The George Washington University, Indiana University, Nagoya University, and Kobe University expressed interest in instigat-

ing the formation of a listserv. This will provide an opportunity to get started by posting an issue for follow up and letting people respond, which would lead to the emergence of new issues. It will provide continuity to keep ideas flowing between the participants in the dialogue seminar once they return to their home institutions. One further suggestion was for one or two individuals to develop a concept to post on the listserv, allow others to comment, and then summarize the comments, which would identify key issues and perhaps lead to the development of a partnership framework.

A mapping exercise was suggested to identify where universities are currently working. This would allow collaboration to occur very quickly and universities could build on some of the existing project activities to get things started quickly.

The old way of doing business is not going to solve current problems. New solutions may be possible by calling upon the higher education institutions of the two most powerful economies in the world through alliances, joint research, and the leveraging of venture capital to engage with institutions in developing countries in educational partnerships to contribute to national development.

Closing Remarks

Shinji Ishii, Director of CICE, Hiroshima University

Dear colleagues, ladies, and gentlemen, time has passed so fast. All good things also must have an end. So, time has come for us to conclude this very enjoyable seminar. In closing, please allow me to make a few brief remarks on behalf of the host institution, CICE.

In organizing this dialogue seminar, our intention was to initiate a dialogue between our two countries to let a new wind blow in the area of international educational cooperation, with a particular focus on the role of universities.

I think we have been very successful in achieving this primary objective. The success of this seminar is due to your participation and kind cooperation. We have really made a new beginning, all of us together, and I can promise you that CICE will do its utmost to translate new ideas and schemes generated during the meeting into concrete actions. To keep us honest in this endeavor, please come and visit our university for more joint work discussion, or just to see us at our university campus, which is 30 miles away from here. As my colleagues have already mentioned before, we would like to offer our four-month Visiting Professorship engagements to our American colleagues. We also would like to effect more frequent exchanges with our Japanese colleagues.

I am actually very optimistic about the future of our collaborative efforts, because CICE has been able to work so harmoniously and productively with ALO. I would like to express my most sincere appreciation to Ms. Christine Morfit and Ms. Michelle Wright for being so patient and understanding in dealing with us. I hope that USAID will provide a lot of financial support to ALO so that our efforts may continue to realize trilateral university cooperation to support basic education in developing countries.

This dialogue seminar also has allowed Japanese universities to interact very closely with JICA, JBIC, MEXT, and the Support Center Project. Their comments and observations have been very helpful in making us realize our relative strengths and weaknesses and in showing how we may work with them in the area of educational cooperation. We do not want to be passive service providers, but active contributors of new ideas and innovative schemes for them. In this respect, we were quite inspired by the encouraging remarks made by Mr. Masayuki Inoue of MEXT about the role of universities on the first day. I believe, together with our American university-based colleagues, we can evolve our engagements in development cooperation, which will not only take advantage of, but also enrich, the research and education functions of our universities.

As for CICE, we will pursue our commitment to the support of basic education development in Africa through cooperation with their higher education institutions. Our particular focus will be to help strengthen the policy research capacity of these institutions and improve the scope of utilization of such capacity. Building a viable research network is our primary strategy for this work and, hence, the present dialogue seminar. As some of you may know already, we are initiating an Africa-Asia university dialogue project to extend such a network in cooperation with UNESCO, JICA, and the United Nations University. After further reflection on the present meeting, we may propose a similar dialogue seminar between Japanese and European universities next year. Furthermore, we will be suggesting to our Japanese and American university colleagues working in such areas as agricultural and engineering education to consider the application of dialogue seminar modality to their possible joint search for collaboration opportunities.

We look forward to seeing you all again, especially together with a third partner from universities in developing countries. So until then, sayonara!

Shinji Ishii

Appendix A

Agenda

Sunday, October 17

Participants arrive in Hiroshima

6:00 p.m. Informal reception/greetings

Monday, October 18

9:00–10:30 a.m. Opening session
Welcome remarks
by Hiroshima University Vice President, Susumu Takahashi
Welcome remarks
by representative of the Japan Foundation's Center for Global Partnership, Masao Ito
Congratulating remarks from U.S. Ambassador to Japan
Self introduction by participants
**Keynote address: Masayuki Inoue; Director General for International Affairs,
Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology**
Introduction of the seminar program
Introduction of the *Rapporteurs*
Moderator: Masafumi Nagao, *CICE*

10:30–11:00 a.m. Break

11:00 a.m.–12:30 p.m. **Session 1: Presentation of general overview of university involvement in educational
cooperation in Japan and the United States**
Kazuo Kuroda, Waseda University
Masaru Osanai, Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology
John Hudzik, Dean, International Programs, Michigan State University

Open Discussion
Moderator: Christine Morfit, ALO

12:30 p.m. Lunch

2:00–4:00 p.m. **Session 2: Case study of U.S. higher education engagement in
teacher training in South Africa.**
Marilyn Pugh, Prince George's Community College
**Case study of Japanese university engagement in basic
education in South Africa.**
Yumiko Ono, Naruto University of Education

Question and Answer Session

Moderator: Norihiro Kuroda, *CICE*

4:00–4:30 p.m.

Break

4:30–6:00 p.m.

Session 3: Working group session in national groups to prepare for Day 2.

Group A Moderator: Keiichi Ogawa, *Kobe University*

Group B Moderator: Margaret Sutton, *Indiana University*

Tuesday, October 19

9:00–9:30 a.m.

Reporting out of working groups.

9:30–10:30 a.m.

Session 4: Panel discussion on issues and challenges for donor organizations in supporting their national universities for work in basic education in aid-assisted countries.

Maki Hayashikawa, *Japan International Cooperation Agency*

Kazuhiro Yoshida, *Japan Bank for International Cooperation*

Donald Mackenzie, *United States Agency for International Development*

Paul White, *Former Mission Director, United States Agency for International Development, Mexico*

Moderator: Conrad Snyder, *University of Montana*

10:30–11:00 a.m.

Break

11:00 a.m.–Noon

Open Discussion (*session 4, continued*)

Noon–1:30 p.m.

Lunch

1:30–3:00 p.m.

Session 5: Outline of issues and challenges in forming higher education partnerships with institutions in developing countries.

Seiji Utsumi, *Osaka University*

David Chapman, *University of Minnesota*

Moderator: Yasuko Minoura, *Ochanomizu University*

3:00–3:30 p.m.

Break

3:30–5:00 p.m.

Session 6: Working session in bi-national groups on opportunities and modalities for U.S.-Japan university cooperation in basic education.

Group A Moderator: Yasushi Hirotsato, *Nagoya University*

Group B Moderator: James Williams, *George Washington University*

5:00–6:00 p.m.

Working session for *rapporteurs* to prepare draft report.

6:30–8:30 p.m. Farewell Dinner hosted by the Director of CICE

Wednesday, October 20

9:00–10:30 a.m. **Session 7: Presentation of concepts for a joint Japan-U.S. higher education partnership to support basic education in a developing country.**

Discussion

Moderator: Sharon Siverts, *UNESCO*

10:30–11:00 a.m. Break

11:00 a.m.–1:00 p.m. Closing session
Discussion: Follow-up on the seminar
Presentation of draft report by rapporteurs
Discussion to finalize the report
Closing comments by the participants
Closing remarks by Prof. Shinji Ishii, CICE
Moderator: Christine Morfit, *ALO*
Masafumi Nagao, *CICE*

1:00 p.m. Seminar Adjourns

Appendix B

List of Participants

Japanese Universities

Yasuko Minoura, Ochanomizu University
Yasushi Hirosato, Nagoya University
Keiichi Ogawa, Kobe University
Takuya Baba, Hiroshima University
Seiji Utsumi, Osaka University
Yumiko Ono, Naruto University of Education
Kenichi Nakabayashi, Miyazaki University
Kazuo Kuroda, Waseda University
Shoko Yamada, National Graduate Institute for Policy
Studies
Yutaka Ohara, University of Tsukuba

Japan Aid Agencies

Maki Hayashikawa, JICA
Kazuhiro Yoshida, JBIC
Masaru Osanai, Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports,
Science and Technology

CICE Representatives

Shinji Ishii, Director
Norihiro Kuroda
Masafumi Nagao
Nobuhide Sawamura
Yuki Kashima
Sachiko Tomohisa

U.S. Universities

Ann Austin-Beck, Michigan State University
David Chapman, University of Minnesota
John Hudzik, Michigan State University
Marilyn Pugh, Prince George's Community College
John Rogan, Hiroshima University
(Visiting Professor from the University of Pretoria)
Conrad Snyder, University of Montana
Margaret Sutton, Indiana University
Paul White, Consultant
James Williams, George Washington University
Sharon Siverts, UNESCO Headquarters

U.S. Aid Agencies

Charles Aanenson, Embassy of the United States in
Japan
Donald Mackenzie, USAID

ALO Representatives

Christine A. Morfit
Michelle Wright

Appendix C

Japan Participant Biographies

Dr. Takuya Baba

Dr. Takuya Baba obtained a bachelor of science in math (1984) at the Osaka University, and a master of education (1998) and a doctorate (2003) from the Hiroshima University in Japan. He has been dispatched in the field of mathematics education to the Philippines as a JOCV volunteer for two and half years and to Kenya as a JICA expert for five and half years. He is currently the manager of JICA Primary Education Project in Bangladesh. He has conducted many lectures to JICA counterpart trainees on mathematics education and lesson study. He has published many research articles in the areas of mathematics Education. His areas of research interest include mathematics education, ethnomathematics, and international cooperation in education.

CONTACT

HIROSHIMA UNIVERSITY

1-5-1 Kagamiyama, Higashi-Hiroshima, 739-8529, Japan

Tel: +81-(0)82-424-6905

E-mail: takuba@hiroshima-u.ac.jp

Dr. Yasushi Hirosato

Dr. Yasushi Hirosato obtained a bachelor of arts (1981) in Luso-Brazilian Studies and a master of arts (1983) in International Studies, both at Sophia University, Japan, and a doctorate (1987) in international and development education at the University of Pittsburgh, USA. He has accumulated his academic and professional experiences in educational development for about 20 years mainly at the University of Pittsburgh, USA. (1983-1987), the World Bank, USA. (1988-1989), the Asian Development Bank, Philippines (1989-1991 and 1998-2004), Chulalongkorn University, Thailand (1992), and Nagoya University, Japan (1994-1998). He is currently serving as a professor of educational development at the Graduate School of International Development, Nagoya University. He has worked and published in the areas of education planning, policy, management, and cooperation focusing on

Southeast Asian countries. His research interests include the political economy of education reforms, capacity development in education sector governance, international cooperation in education, and human resource development in the sub-regional context (e.g., Greater Mekong Subregion).

CONTACT

NAGOYA UNIVERSITY

Furo-cho Chikusa-ku Nagoya-shi 464-8603, Japan

Tel: +81-(0)52-789-4968

E-mail: hirosato@gsid.nagoya-u.ac.jp

Dr. Kazuo Kuroda

Dr. Kazuo Kuroda obtained a bachelor of arts (Economics) from Waseda University in 1989, a master of arts (International Education Development) from Stanford University in 1992, and a doctorate (Education and Development Sociology) from Cornell University in 1996. He worked at Overseas Development Council as a researcher (1996-1997) and at the Center for the Study of International Cooperation in Education of Hiroshima University as assistant professor (1997-2000) and associate professor (2000-2003). He is currently associate professor at the Graduate School of Asia-Pacific Studies of Waseda University. He has lectured “Educational Development in Developing Countries and International Cooperation” and “Policy Analysis of Comparative and International Education” at Waseda and other graduate-level institutions. He also is actively involved in Japanese educational cooperation being a member of several research committees and taskforces of MOFA, MEXT, JICA and JBIC. His area of study is research methodology in educational development study.

CONTACT

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF ASIA-PACIFIC STUDIES,

WASEDA UNIVERSITY

Sodai-Nishiwaseda Bldg. 7F 1-21-1 Nishiwaseda,

Shinjuku-ku Tokyo 169-0051, Japan

Tel: +81-(0)3-5286-3975

E-mail: kakuroda@waseda.jp

Dr. Yasuko Minoura

Dr. Yasuko Minoura obtained a bachelor of arts in psychology (1962) from the University of Kyoto, a master of arts in sociology (1975) from the University of Victoria in Canada and a doctorate in anthropology (1979) from the University of California at Los Angeles in the United States. She became an assistant professor of social psychology at Okayama University in 1980 upon obtaining her doctorate. She was a full professor of comparative education at the University of Tokyo from 1993 to 1999 and then became a professor of socio-cultural studies of clinical problems at Ochanomizu University. She has continued to work, on a part-time basis after her retirement in 2004, with The Cooperation Center for Developing Countries in Women's Education at Ochanomizu University. Her main interest is in bridging psychological and anthropological approaches in the field of human development and education. She has been engaged in fieldwork in Bangladesh, Northeast Thailand, and Northern Vietnam since 1993. She has published extensively in the areas of psychological anthropology, intercultural experience, and education and childcare in developing countries. She is an author of *Intercultural Experience During Childhood*, *Cultural Perspectives on Childhood*, *Education for Global Citizenship*, and *Fieldwork: Basics and Applications of Micro-Ethnography*.

CONTACT
 OCHANOMIZU UNIVERSITY
 2-1-1 Otsuka, Bunkyo-Ku, Tokyo 112-8610, Japan
 Tel: +81(0)35978-5161
 E-mail: QYV01173@nifty.com

Dr. Kenichi Nakabayashi

Dr. Kenichi Nakabayashi was born in Miyazaki in 1960. He received his master of arts in 1985 and his doctorate in 1993 from Osaka University in photochemistry. He is now associate professor at the University of Miyazaki. He spent two years in total as an overseas researcher at Hahn-Meitner Institute (1996, Berlin, Germany) and Columbia University (2000, New York, USA). His current research interests focus upon the Photochemistry and Chemical education. He is now member in the STM (Science, Technology and Mathematics for Ghana) project (2000-2005).

CONTACT
 MIYAZAKI UNIVERSITY
 1-1 Gakuenkonohanadainishi Miyazaki 889-2192, Japan

Tel: +81(0)985-58-7500
 E-mail: nakabys@cc.miyazaki-u.ac.jp

Dr. Keiichi Ogawa

Dr. Keiichi Ogawa is an associate professor in the Graduate School of International Cooperation Studies at Kobe University in Japan. His research topics include economics of education, education finance, and education policy and planning. He is particularly interested in issues related to public policies in the education sector linked with macro-economics, public finance, and labor market in African and Asian countries.

Prior to joining the faculty of Kobe University, Ogawa served as an education economist at the World Bank (1998-2003) where he got involved in policy-oriented research and education projects in Lesotho, Mozambique, Namibia, South Africa, Turkey, Zambia, and Yemen. Ogawa holds a doctorate in comparative international education/economics of education from Columbia University in New York City, USA.

CONTACT
 GRADUATE SCHOOL OF INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION
 STUDIES, KOBE UNIVERSITY
 2-1 Rokkodai, Nada-ku, Kobe 657-8501, Japan
 Tel: +81(0)78803-7267
 E-mail: Hogawa35@kobe-u.ac.jp

Mr. Yutaka Ohara

Mr. Yutaka Ohara holds a bachelor of arts in education (1992) from Tokyo Gakugei University, a master of arts in education (1995) from Yokohama National University, and a master of arts in education (1998) from University of Tsukuba. His area of study is "Didactics of Mathematics" and "Educational Methodology." He worked at Department of Network and Information, Senshu University, as a lecturer (part time, 2003-2004). He is currently a research fellow at CRICED, University of Tsukuba, where among other things, he contributes construction of Cooperation Bases System, a project sponsored by Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology in Japan to support developing countries systematically. In addition, he contributes to the in-service Japan Overseas Cooperation Volunteers teacher training. His current research interests focus on numeracy and e-learning.

CONTACT

CENTER FOR RESEARCH ON INTERNATIONAL
COOPERATION IN EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT (CRICED)
University of Tsukuba
1-1-1 Tennohdai, Tsukuba-shi, Ibaraki-ken, 305-8572,
Japan
Tel: +81-(0)29-853-7286
E-mail: ohara@criced.tsukuba.ac.jp

Professor. Yumiko Ono

Prof. Yumiko Ono obtained her bachelor's in education and master's in education from Hiroshima University, and joined the faculty of Naruto University of Education in 1993. Since 1999, she has been involved in a JICA project in South Africa, and also coordinates the program for the JICA long-term trainees enrolled in graduate program of the university. Her research interests include teacher professional development, teacher effectiveness, and effective schools.

CONTACT

NARUTO UNIVERSITY OF EDUCATION
Takushima, Naruto, Tokushima, 772-8502, Japan
Tel: +81-(0)88-687-6331
E-mail: onoy@naruto-u.ac.jp

Dr. Seiji Utsumi

Dr. Seiji Utsumi was born in Tokyo 1946. He obtained a bachelor of science in agriculture (1969), a bachelor of arts in pedagogy at Kyoto University, and a doctorate in international cooperation in education) from Osaka University (2000). Utsumi had been working as the educational expert and development specialist at JICA in various developing countries for past 25 years. He has been staying Malaysia, Turkey, and Afghanistan. He became a professor at Osaka University, in 1996, and is currently professor of the Graduate School of Human Sciences. He worked as international cooperation adviser in the Ministry of Education, Japan (MEXT) from 1996 to 1999.

He has published extensively in the areas of educational development and ODA. His areas of research interest include educational development and cultural change, and also recently, international educational cooperation for post-conflict or unstable nation or societies. From 2002 to 2003, he had been staying in Afghanistan as the adviser of the Minister of Education. In 2004, he did his

research in Kenya, Rwanda, Eastern Timor, Sri Lanka, and Mongol. He is responsible for JICA Technical Cooperation Projects in Education at Bolivia, Guatemala, Mongol, and Afghanistan.

CONTACT

OSAKA UNIVERSITY
1-2 Yamadaoka Suita, Osaka 565-0871, Japan
Tel: 81+6+6879+8064
E-mail: seiji@hus.osaka-u.ac.jp

Dr. Shoko Yamada

Dr. Shoko Yamada is associate professor, National Graduate Institute for Policy Studies in Tokyo. She obtained a bachelor of arts (law) from Waseda University (1991), a master of arts (international development) from Cornell University (1997), and a doctorate (international comparative education) from Indiana University (2003). Yamada has accumulated her academic and professional experience in the field of education and human resource development since her first career as associate program officer of Sasakawa Peace Foundation. She has been involved in various aid projects funded by JICA, JBIC, and USAID as a consultant. From June 2003 to January 2004, she was a research fellow of the Center of International Cooperation in Education (CICE), Hiroshima University. Yamada's academic interest is social formation of the value of secondary education in Africa. She also initiates research on the impact of international standard-setting and aid modalities on the quality of education.

CONTACT

NATIONAL GRADUATE INSTITUTE FOR POLICY STUDIES
2-2 Wakamatsu-cho, Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo 162-8677,
Japan
Tel: 81-3-3341-0367
E-mail: syamada@grips.ac.jp

Aid Agencies**Professor Masaru Osanai**

Prof. Masaru Osanai, graduating from the Faculty of Law, University of Tokyo, entered the Ministry of Education, Sports, Science and Culture (MESSC) (1983), then the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT). With a variety of experience in international exchange at MESSC and MEXT, he was director of the Life-Long Learning Division at OITA

Prefectural Board of Education (1990–92), cultural attaché of Japanese Embassy in France (1993–96), director of the Student Exchange Policy Office in MESSC (1996–98), chief of Broadcast Planning and Programming Division at the University of the Air (Japanese Open University) (1998–2000), director of Office for International Exchange (then Cooperation) Policy in MESSC (then MEXT) (2000–01), director of the International Science and Technology Affairs Division in MEXT (2001–02), and director of Competitive Sports Division in MEXT (2002–03). He joined GRIPS (National Graduate Institute for Policy Studies) in 2003 as a professor, and is managing director of a new project initiated by MEXT: “Support and Coordination Project for University Cooperation in International Development.”

CONTACT

NATIONAL GRADUATE INSTITUTE FOR POLICY STUDIES
2-2 Wakamatsu-cho Shinjuku-ku Tokyo 162-8677,
Japan
Tel: +81-(0)3-3356-8031
E-mail: osanai@scp.mext.go.jp

Ms. Maki Hayashikawa

Ms. Maki Hayashikawa obtained a B.Sc. (Econ) Honours degree (1990) in international relations at the London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE), University of London, and a master of arts (Education) (1992) in educational planning from the Institute of Education, University of London. She worked as an associate researcher at the International Development Center of Japan (IDCJ) in Tokyo before joining the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) Headquarters in Paris in 1993 as an associate expert in education. She was transferred to the UNESCO Cluster Office for DPRK, Japan, Mongolia, ROK and P.R. China in Beijing, P.R. China in 1998, where she served as the education officer and head of the education unit. Since April 2003, she has been working at the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) in Tokyo, Japan, as an education sector advisor under a special personnel exchange programme between JICA and UNESCO.

CONTACT

JICA INSTITUTE FOR INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION (IFIC)
10-5 Ichigayamotomura-cho, Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo 162-8433, Japan
Tel: +81-(0)3-3269-3851
E-mail: Hayashikawa.Maki@jica.go.jp

Mr. Kazuhiro Yoshida

Mr. Kazuhiro Yoshida is director, social development division, Sector Strategy Development Department of Japan Bank for International Cooperation (JBIC). He has been responsible for education and human resources development operations at JBIC and has written the organization's strategy on educational development. He was an associate researcher at two of Japan's focal centers of international cooperation in educational development at Hiroshima and Tsukuba Universities. From 1993 to 2001, he was a human resources economist in the Africa Region and operations officer of Human Development Network of the World Bank where he was involved with projects, studies, and strategic issues on the education sector. Yoshida received his master of philosophy in development studies from the University of Sussex.

CONTACT

WORLD BANK
1-4-1 Otemachi Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 100-8144, Japan
Tel: +81(0)3-5218-9689
E-mail: k-yoshida@jbic.go.jp

Others**Ms. Soisik Habert**

Ms. Soisik Habert, programme officer at UNU's Office of the Rector, joined UNU in 2001, and was appointed to her current post in December 2003. Prior to joining UNU, she completed a one-year postgraduate course in development and international cooperation at the Sorbonne (France), followed by an internship at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of France. She also worked at the World Bank for the Development Gateway Project. Habert studied public law at the Sorbonne. She worked for four years for Save the Children (UK) in China, where she was actively involved in the implementation of Basic Education and HIV/AIDS Prevention Programmes as well as Training Programmes on the Children's Rights Convention, targeting both local authorities and civil society's representatives.

CONTACT

PROGRAMME OFFICER, OFFICE OF THE RECTOR,
UNITED NATIONS UNIVERSITY
5-53-70 Jingumae, Shibuya-ku, Tokyo, T 150-8925,
Japan
Tel: +81(0)3-5467-1220
E-mail: habert@hq.unu.edu

Appendix D

U.S. Participant Biographies

Universities

Dr. Ann Austin

Dr. Ann Austin is a professor in the Higher, Adult, and Lifelong Education (HALE) program at Michigan State University and a core faculty member of the African Studies Center. In 1998, she was a Fulbright Fellow in South Africa and worked in the Centre for Organisational and Academic Development, leading seminars and consulting about teaching and learning and organizational change. Austin also visited and led seminars at one dozen other universities and technikons in South Africa. Austin's research interests concern organizational change and transformation in higher education, faculty careers, roles and professional development, reform in graduate education, and the improvement of teaching and learning processes in higher education. Currently, she is co-principal investigator of the Center for the Integration of Research, Teaching, and Learning (CIRTL), a five-year National Science Foundation-funded center focused on improving postsecondary teaching and learning in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics. Her two recent books are *Paths to the Professoriate: Strategies for Enriching the Preparing on Future Faculty* (co-edited with D. H. Wulff, 2004) and *Higher Education in the Developing World: Changing Contexts and Institutional Resources* (co-edited with D.W. Chapman, 2002).

CONTACT

HIGHER, ADULT, AND LIFELONG EDUCATION
Michigan State University
417 Erickson Hall
East Lansing, MI 48824
Tel: (517) 355-6757
Fax: (517) 353-6393
E-mail: aaustin@msu.edu

Dr. David Chapman

Dr. David Chapman is professor of Comparative and International Development Education and

chair of the Department of Educational Policy and Administration at the University of Minnesota (USA). His specialization is in international development assistance. In that role, he has worked in more than 45 countries for the World Bank, the U.S. Agency for International Development, UNICEF, the Asian Development Bank, the InterAmerican Development Bank, UNESCO, and similar organizations. He has authored or edited seven books and more than 100 journal articles, many of them on issues related to the development of education systems in international settings. His books include *Adapting Technology for School Improvement: A Global Perspective* (2004, with L.O. Mahleck, Eds. Paris: UNESCO) and *Higher Education in the Developing World: Changing Contexts and Institutional Responses* (2002, with A.E. Austin, Eds, Greenwood). His research has examined, among other things, the impact of national policy on school practice, the impact of teacher training on teachers' classroom behavior, and the role of higher education in national development.

CONTACT

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
Department of Educational Policy and Administration
College of Education and Human Development
330 Wulling Hall
86 Pleasant Street SE
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Tel: (612) 626-8728
Fax: (612) 624-3377
E-mail: chapm026@tc.umn.edu

Dr. John Hudzik

Dr. John Hudzik is dean of International Studies and Programs and a professor at Michigan State University. He has administrative and leadership responsibility for the university's diverse international programming efforts, including development of external funding and linkages; assistance to faculty and staff and building multi-college partnerships and linkages for the development of

international projects; enhancements to the international components of undergraduate and graduate curricula; review of international research, project, and linkage agreements; negotiation of university-level contracts and cooperative agreements with institutions abroad; strategic development and leadership for the university's study abroad initiative, including program and curricular development, financial planning, site development, and collaborative engagement of colleges, departments, and faculty; recruitment of and services for international students and scholars; administrative oversight of six international studies area and thematic centers, the Office of Study Abroad, the Office of International Students and Scholars, and the Visiting International Professional Program; and administrative coordination with the colleges and their international institutes. He was the onsite negotiator for university contracts and cooperative agreements in Costa Rica, Mexico, Singapore, Malaysia, Thailand, Vietnam, Australia, S. Korea, Japan, and other countries. He is a member of the Advisory Council for the Association Liaison Office for University Cooperation in Development and has been a member of several boards, including the board of directors of the Australian Education Office; president of the Association of International Education Administrators; chair of the CIC Senior International Officers group; the board of directors of the Midwest Universities Consortium for International Activities (MUCIA); a member of the NASULGC International Education Taskforce; and a member of the AAC&U "promising practices task force" on internationalizing education. He was a Fulbright Senior Scholar to Australia.

CONTACT
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
Office of the Dean International Studies and Programs
209 International Center
East Lansing, MI 48824-1035
Tel: (517) 355-2352
Fax: (517) 353-7254
E-mail: huzdik@msu.edu

Dr. Marilyn Pugh

Dr. Marilyn Pugh is a professor at Prince George's Community College in Largo, Maryland, and currently the director of the Center for Academic Resource Development, a faculty-led center that focuses on seeking and acquiring resources for the

college, particularly through grant proposals. Pugh was the proposal writer and project director of three USAID/ALO-funded higher education partnership grants, in the areas of distance education and teacher training in South Africa. She authored the proposal and serves as project director for the Leadership Institute for a South African Secondary Education project funded by the USAID Mission in South Africa. Prince George's Community College was competitively awarded a co-operative agreement by USAID/SA to provide short-term training opportunities for 176 South African teachers, school administrators, and Department of Education officials in the United States over a three-year period. Pugh earned her bachelor's and master's degrees in economics from Ohio State University, and completed her doctorate in Community College Education with a concentration in economics at George Mason University. She was the recipient of the Outstanding Faculty Award in 1996.

CONTACT
PRINCE GEORGE'S COMMUNITY COLLEGE
301 Largo Road
Largo, MD 20774
Tel: (301) 322-0477
Fax: (301) 336-2851
E-mail: pughmb@pgcc.edu

Dr. Conrad Snyder

Dr. Conrad Snyder is professor of education, University of Montana, assistant vice president for research and director of international projects in the Office of International Programs. Over the last 16 years, Snyder has been responsible for the national curriculum reforms in Botswana (junior secondary), Lesotho (primary), and Namibia (lower primary in science, math, and social studies) in Africa. For four years (1996-2000), Snyder was at the Harvard Institute for International Development where he worked on educational planning and reform in Ghana and Namibia. He has written, edited, or co-written many articles and books related to curriculum, learning, statistics, and evaluation. Recently, Snyder has served as psychometric technical assistant for the Office of Public Instruction in Montana and the Ministry of Education in Ghana (Africa). In Africa, he is assisting the General Educational Services Division develop a comprehensive assessment system for Primary 1 to Primary 6. He is also the head

of NASA's Northern Rockies Consortium for Space Privatization (NRCSP) and the lead researcher on the development of the outreach and teacher support program for the inland Northwest. He earned a bachelor of arts in psychology from Gettysburg College in Pennsylvania a master of arts in psychology from Temple University, and a doctorate in measurement, evaluation, and experimental design from the University of Pennsylvania

CONTACT

DINNY STRANAHAN RESEARCH INSTITUTE
P.O. Box 17262
2925 North Reserve Street
Missoula, MT 59808 USA
Tel: (406) 541-3130, Extension 3004 (Work);
Fax: (406) 541-3131
E-mail: Conradwsnyder@aol.com

Dr. Margaret Sutton

Dr. Margaret Sutton is an associate professor of educational leadership and policy studies at Indiana University. She earned her master of arts in philosophy of education at the University of British Columbia, Canada, and doctorate in international development education at Stanford University, where she also served for two years as an instructor and director of the Master's program. Prior to joining the IU faculty, Sutton was the director of Research, Evaluation, and Gender Issues for the Academy for Educational Development in Washington, DC. In this position, she contributed to the design and evaluation of programs in basic education in Asian and African nations. At IU, Sutton teaches graduate courses in international education policy processes as well as courses on education and society for pre-service teachers, and has received numerous awards for excellence in teaching. Sutton publishes in the fields of global and multicultural education; gender, education, and development; and sociocultural approaches to education policy analysis. Recent publications include "*Policy Research as Ethnographic Refusal: The Case of Women's Literacy in Nepal*" in *Policy as Practice: A Sociocultural Approach to the Study of Educational Policy*, 2001. She is co-editor of *Civil society or shadow state? State/NGO relations in education* (forthcoming).

CONTACT

INDIANA UNIVERSITY
WW Wright Education Bldg rm. 4254

Bloomington, IN 47405
Tel: (802) 856-8368
E-mail: msutton@indiana.edu

Dr. James Williams

Dr. James Williams is an assistant professor of International Education and International Affairs at The George Washington University in Washington, DC, where he develops and teaches graduate courses in international, comparative, and development education. From 1996 to 1998, Williams was assistant professor in education research and evaluation at Ohio University in Athens, Ohio. He served in the Africa Bureau for USAID as education policy advisor from 1994 to 1996 through a Science, Technology and Diplomacy Fellowship of the American Association for the Advancement of Sciences. Williams provided technical support to USAID missions and the Africa Bureau in Washington DC, and led Bureau efforts to develop programmatic links among education, health, nutrition, and population sectors, contributing, in part, to incorporation of school-based health/nutrition activities into at least two basic education projects in and beyond Africa. Earlier in his career, Williams was an assistant professor at Obirin University in Tokyo, Japan. He has published widely on the topic of education reform in developing countries and served as a consultant to UNESCO, World Bank, CARE, UNIVET, American Institutes for Research, International Institute for Educational Planning, and other international organizations. He obtained a doctorate in international education from Harvard University.

CONTACT

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
2134 G Street, NW
Washington, DC 20052
Tel: (202) 994-0831
E-mail: jhw@gwu.edu

Mr. Paul White

Paul E. White was mission director for USAID Mexico before retiring from the U.S. government after 35 years of service in November 2003. In Mexico, he was responsible for developing and implementing a complex portfolio of democracy, health, environment, energy, micro-enterprise, education, and training activities in partnership with Mexican institutions. Before Mexico, White

was assigned to Tokyo, Japan, as minister counselor for development cooperation. He established USAID's office in Tokyo in 1991, and developed and coordinated the foreign assistance aspects of the U.S.-Japan Common Agenda. White has served as acting deputy assistant administrator for the USAID Asia-Near East Bureau, has served in Guatemala as USAID's deputy director, and in Peru as director for USAID's Health, Education, and Nutrition program. From 1976-1979, he was director of the Health and Education office in USAID/Panama. White received a degree in psychology from Valparaiso University, and studied in graduate programs at the East-West Center, University of Hawaii, and at Stanford University. He was awarded the Order of the Million Elephants in Laos, and has received three Presidential Awards and a Distinguished Career Award from USAID. He has a Foreign Service ranking in five Asian languages and Spanish.

CONTACT

Annandale, VA 22003
3919 Moss Drive
Tel: (703) 914-2150 or (703) 946-4910 (Cell)
E-mail: PEWhite@msn.com

Aid Agencies

Dr. Charles Aanenson

Dr. Charles Aanenson, with over 30 years of international development experience, presently serves as the U.S. Embassy/Tokyo Counselor for International Development. His professional experience includes positions with the Ford Foundation and in higher education (Indiana University, Oklahoma State University, and the East West Center). Aanenson created and implemented the Cochran Middle Income Country Program at the U.S. Department of Agriculture. With the U.S. Agency for International Development, he has served in Indonesia, Pakistan, Poland, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia, and Japan. He has held the AID positions of mission director and regional mission director within the Europe and Newly Independent States Bureau. Aanenson, a member of the U.S. Senior Foreign Service, attained his doctorate from Indiana University.

CONTACT

AMERICAN EMBASSY TOKYO
Counselor Development Cooperation
Agency for International Development
Tel: 81-3-3224-5015
Fax: 81-3-3224-5880
E-mail: aanensoncr@state.gov

Mr. Donald "Buff" Mackenzie

Mr. Donald "Buff" Mackenzie is currently a senior education advisor, focusing on the private sector, innovation, and alliances. Previously, he was director of USAID's Office of Education. A member of the Senior Foreign Service, he was regional director for East and Southern Africa, including managing humanitarian programs in Sudan, Somalia, and Burundi while based in Nairobi, and mission director in Madagascar. He also has served in Kenya, El Salvador, Panama, and Burkina Faso during his 29-year career with USAID and the Peace Corps.

CONTACT

USAID
Washington, DC 20523-1000
Tel: (202) 204-2599
E-mail: BMackenzie@usaid.gov

Dr. Sharon Siverts

Dr. Sharon Siverts is senior programme specialist at UNESCO, Paris, France, in the Education Sector, Higher Education Division, working in higher education and teacher education. While the programs are global, emphasis is on Africa, specifically higher education institutions and teacher training colleges in effort to stem the teacher crisis and improve quality. She also is working with post-conflict countries, with the use of technology in education and with HIV/AIDS. From 1998-2003, she worked in Africa as vice chancellor of the University of Botswana, the national university of Botswana. This was followed by a short assignment as vice chancellor of Kampala International University, Uganda. Prior to work in Africa, she worked in higher education administration in the U.S. as head of department, academic dean, dean of academic resources planning, vice president for academic affairs, and provost at Oregon State University, University of Nevada, Reno, Humboldt

State University, North Dakota State University, and Metropolitan State College of Denver. She holds a PhD from The Pennsylvania State University, and a BS and MS from Ohio University. She was an ACE Fellow in academic administration and has held two Fulbrights, one in Germany and one in the Philippines.

CONTACT

UNESCO

Senior Programme Specialist
Teacher Education

7, place de Fontenoy
75352 Paris 07 SP France
Tel: 33 (0) 1 45 68 09 68
Fax: 33 (0) 1 45 68 56 26
E-mail: S.Siverts@unesco.org

ALO Representatives

Ms. Christine A. Morfit

Ms. Christine A. Morfit is the executive director of ALO. She joined ALO as a senior consultant in 2002 and as deputy executive director in 2003. She was deputy executive director of the Council for International Exchange of Scholars (CIES) responsible for U.S. and visiting scholar programs for the worldwide Fulbright Senior Scholar Program. While at CIES, she created and directed the ASIA Fellows Program, a new regional faculty development program in South, East, and Southeast Asia funded by the Ford Foundation. She has more than 14 years overseas experience establishing international education and international affairs programs in Hong Kong, Thailand, India, and Indonesia. Morfit holds a master's degree in international public policy from the Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced International Studies, the Johns Hopkins University, and a master of arts, a postgraduate certificate in education, and bachelor's degrees from universities in Britain.

CONTACT

ASSOCIATION LIAISON OFFICE

1307 New York Avenue, Suite 500
Washington, DC 20005
Tel: (202) 478-4700
Fax: (202) 478-4715
E-mail: morfitc@aascu.org

Ms. Michelle Wright

Ms. Michelle Wright is a program associate with ALO primarily focusing on partnerships in the Europe/Eurasia and Asia/Near East regions. She has a bachelor of arts in political science and French from the University of Georgia and a master of arts in International Affairs from George Washington University. Her previous professional experience has included work at the International Science and Technology Institute overseeing USAID-sponsored training programs in Central and Eastern Europe and Eurasia, and at the Consulate General of Japan in Chicago as a political analyst.

CONTACT

ASSOCIATION LIAISON OFFICE

1307 New York Avenue, Suite 500
Washington, DC 20005
Tel: (202) 478-4705
Fax: (202) 478-4715
E-mail: wrightm@aascu.org

