



United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization



• Twinning
• and University
• Networking



Africa-Asia
University Dialogue for
Educational Development

SELF-EVALUATION REPORT

**“Africa-Asia University Dialogue for Educational Development”
(A-A Dialogue) Network**

June 2009-June 2012

A-A Dialogue Secretariat
*Center for the Study of
International Cooperation in Education
Hiroshima University*

July 2012

Table of Contents

I. Introduction

1. Background -----	1
2. Evaluation Guidelines -----	2

II. Summary of Self-Evaluation Reports of Member Universities

1. Achievement Level of Activities -----	5
2. Impacts of Activities -----	12
3. Other Comments and Suggestions -----	15
4. Lessons Learned -----	15
5. Summary of Activities by Member Universities -----	16

III. Self-Evaluation Reports of Research Groups

1. Group A: Gender and Equity -----	26
2. Group B: Quality of Education and Educational Policies -----	30
3. Group C: Teacher Professional Development -----	38

IV. Self-Evaluation Report of the Secretariat

1. Introduction -----	44
2. Organization of General Assembly and Other Meetings -----	44
3. Liaison with UNESCO and UNU -----	45
4. Maintaining and updating the Network Web Site, Brochure and Mailing Lists ---	45
5. Staffing -----	46
6. Other -----	46
7. Overall Evaluation -----	46

I. Introduction

1. Background

Following Phase I (which was named “Africa-Asia University Dialogue for Basic Education Development”) of the Network implemented from 2004 to 2007, since June 2009 Phase II (which was renamed “Africa-Asia University Dialogue for Educational Development” (“A-A Dialogue”)) has been carried out and just completed in June 2012.

Phase I was conducted in cooperation with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), the United Nations University (UNU), and the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) with the Center for the Study of International Cooperation in Education (CICE), Hiroshima University, Japan functioning as the secretariat. The nature of this initial stage (Phase I) was a joint research endeavor by African and Asian universities to contribute to achieving the international commitment of “Education for All” (EFA) particularly in Africa. Thanks to the cooperation and collaboration of participating institutions, Phase I was successfully completed with the fruit of more than fifteen research papers striving for possible solutions to various issues concerning EFA which were presented at the concluding meeting in December 2007 at UNESCO, Paris, and appeared in the two issues of the CICE journal. Equally importantly, Phase I left another valuable legacy, which was an inter-university researcher-to-researcher network across two continents, Africa and Asia.

The strong willingness and commitment of participating universities has led to the continuation and further strengthening of this collaborative relationship among African and Asian universities. Thus Phase II was officially embarked upon in June 2009 with twenty eight (28) member universities, sixteen (16) from Africa and twelve (12) from Asia, after a preparatory period in 2008. There were at least three distinctive features in Phase II as a development of Phase I.

1) *Formalization of the network:* In Phase I the network had been driven by researchers’ individual relationships, whereas it was more of a formal nature in Phase II with participating universities officially signing an agreement letter to the network Statutes which have been jointly prepared by the universities participating in Phase I. Furthermore since May 2010 the network has been recognized as a UNU-UNESCO UNITWIN program which is an official UNU and UNESCO international inter-university program.

2) *Expanded scope of activities:* In Phase II activities included academic staff and student exchange in addition to joint research projects.

3) *Comparative Study;* While in Phase I research collaboration had focused more on issues related to EFA according to individual countries’ concerns, in the new Phase comparative studies were pursued in three broad areas of educational development; quality, equity including gender issues, and teacher professional development.

The most important and highly emphasized aspect of Phase II was that any member university can and should initiate an activity within the framework of the network with relevant responsibility. In another words, this is not a kind of project with a big sponsor behind.

At the moment when there remained only a year toward the end of the phase, the third General Assembly of the “A-A Dialogue” Network which met in June 2011 at Hiroshima University decided on embarking upon self-evaluation about the Network activities with the following nature and purposes.

- 1) The nature of this evaluation exercise shall basically be formative, while taking into account summative aspects as well.
- 2) Evaluation shall be conducted at the levels of individual member universities, research groups and the secretariat. (Each member university, research group and the secretariat are expected to write and submit a self-evaluation report on their respective activities.)
- 3) Results of the evaluation exercise shall be presented at the wrap-up meeting of the Network which is tentatively scheduled for February or March 2012.
- 4) To prepare for the evaluation an evaluation working team shall be established, consisting of Gilbert Onwu (University of Pretoria, South Africa, representing African universities), Annop Pongwat (Chiang Mai University, Thailand, representing Asian universities) and Shoko Yamada (Nagoya University, Japan, representing Japanese universities) with assistance of the secretariat.

The team met immediately after the Assembly and developed draft guidelines for the self-evaluation report. After consultation with member universities, two guidelines were developed for individual university report and research group report.

Following the guidelines member universities and research groups sent in their self-evaluation reports to the secretariat and the secretariat also prepared its report. These reports were summarized and compiled by the secretariat. The initial draft report was discussed at the wrap-up meeting of Phase II in March 2012 for revision and finalization. The revised report was adopted at the first General Assembly of Phase III in July 2012.

This report is an edited version of the final report approved by the General Assembly of the Network.

2. Evaluation Guidelines

As mentioned above, there were two different guidelines prepared, one for individual member universities and the other for research groups. While the former covered a wider range of activities including research, student exchange, staff exchange, etc., the latter mainly focused on research activities done by the three research groups. Shown below is the guidelines for the which more or less cover items for the latter as well.

(1) Purpose of the Guidelines

The guidelines are aimed at providing a common framework for compiling a self-evaluation report. As was decided at the third General Assembly this evaluation is primarily for feedback in reflecting upon the Network’s past activities with a view to initiating any adjustments for further improvement and development of network activities and its structure as well. It was also agreed that the network needed to inform people outside the network of “A-A Dialogue”

accomplishments so far, consistent with the network goals/objectives/aims. Thus the proposed evaluation exercise has elements of both formative and summative evaluation.

(2) Processes (Time span) of the evaluation

(Development of self-evaluation guidelines)

- 1) Draft prepared by the secretariat in consultation with the evaluation working team (by the second week of July, 2011)
- 2) Draft sent to representatives of member universities for comment (by the third week of July)
- 3) Comments collected from representatives of member universities (by the end of July)
- 4) Guidelines revised by the secretariat in consultation with the evaluation working team (by the middle of August)

(Self-evaluation report by member universities)

- 1) Guidelines sent to representatives of member universities (by the end of August)
- 2) Report writing (September–October–November)
- 3) Reports collected from representatives of member universities by the secretariat (by the end of November)

(Analysis and synthesis of the reports by the secretariat in consultation with the evaluation team (by the middle of January))

(Comments on the analysis and synthesis collected from representatives of member universities by the secretariat (by the end of January 2012))

(Final report prepared by the secretariat in consultation with evaluation working team (by the middle of February))

(Final report presentation by the evaluation working team and the secretariat (late February or early March 2012))

(3) Scope of evaluation

- 1) Any activities undertaken under the framework of the “A-A Dialogue” during the period under review, 2009 – 2011, either initiated by the relevant university, other member university, research group or the secretariat.
- 2) Management aspects of these activities to be included such as creation of a research team, fund raising effort, obtaining of accreditation for the activities from the head office (vice-chancellor and other), mobilization of staff and students for the activities, etc.
- 3) If any important and related preparatory work was done prior to the period under review, such activity may be included.

(4) Contents of report

(Factual description of activities)

- 1) Brief description of all activities undertaken and/or participated in by respective universities under the framework of the “A-A Dialogue”, according to the following categories; a) research, b) student exchange, c) staff exchange, d) experience sharing/capacity development and e) other activity (if any)
- 2) Put the activities in time sequence

- 3) The description to include a) title, b) date and venue, c) organizer(s)/host(s) (those initiating the activity), d) participant(s) from the relevant university and e) contents

(Description of management of organization for implementing A-A Dialogue activities)

- 1) Brief description of the kind of management or organizational arrangement(s)/effort(s) that has (have) been made within respective universities for implementing A-A and/or A-A related activities such as fund raising, obtaining of accreditation for the activities from the head office (vice-chancellor and other), mobilization of staff and students for the activities, etc.

- 2) Put the activities in time sequence

(Self-evaluation: The extent of achievement)

- 1) On the basis of the two exercises above, the respective universities are to provide a self-evaluation rating on the following activities: a) research, b) student exchange, c) staff exchange, d) experience sharing/capacity development and e) other activity, f) management and g) overall performance

- 2) For each item, rate according to the scale below:

Rating 1: Achieved not at all

Rating 2: Achieved less than expected

Rating 3: Achieved somewhat as expected

Rating 4: Achieved as expected or more

Rating X: Not applicable/don't know

- 3) Explain each rating, including positive and/or negative reasons for the rating

(Impact evaluation of the "A-A Dialogue" Network)

- 1) The self-evaluation report to include the impact of participating in the "A-A Dialogue" Network on respective member universities in terms of strengthening and promoting: a) collaboration among member universities in organizing and participating in network activities, b) sense of ownership in organizing and participating in network activities and c) a self-reliant approach to educational development which are the overall goals of the Network

- 2) For each of the three overall goals above, rate according to the scale below.

Rating 1: No or negative impact

Rating 2: Some impact

Rating 3: Significant impact

Rating 4: Great impact

Rating X: Not applicable/don't know

- 3) Explain each rating by providing reasons.

(Indicate any comments and suggestions for further improvement and modification of the Network in possible Phase III (Free description))

(5) Format of report

As long as the guidelines above are followed, there is no specific format for reporting.