

Open Floor Discussions, Questions and Answers

Kazuhiro Yoshida (Director, CICE, Hiroshima University)

So the time allocated for this session is up to quarter past four, about 55 minutes or one hour and I would like to propose that the first part of this session, we look at the other panelists faces and try to raise the issues that the you have come up with and throw it to each other, one or two rounds. And if you feel like the keynote speakers, you are also invited to chip in in our discussion or unexpectedly some bombardments may come to you, so please be prepared for that. And after a while, I will open the floor to invite contributions, comments, questions, criticisms from the floor, so please take good notes of what you would like to say later. And that will be the way this session will be handled. So, among ourselves, is anybody ready to raise some issues or responses?

Shyamal Kanti Ghosh (Secretary, Ministry of Agriculture, Government of Bangladesh)

Thank you, Professor Yoshida. You presented very well. You explained everything. Can you give us suggestion for an assessment which can be the international standard for global citizen? If you want to make global citizens, what are the criteria for the assessment at the primary level?

Kazuhiro Yoshida (Director, CICE, Hiroshima University)

In my presentation, I stressed that the culture of student assessment is really expanding and becoming more and more influential. At the same time, what we measure is also becoming an important issue. Throughout today's discussion, we say that not only student's enrollment or participation but what they learn is very important. And putting it in today's context of sustainable development, we also agreed in the new Framework for Action Education 2030 that we would like to promote sustainable development through for example, promoting education for sustainable development, global citizenship education by nurturing the mind of peace and respect the diversity of culture and try to mitigate the conflict situations. So our totality of knowledge is being tested and then we would need to put it into the framework of new concept of shared values and then we are expected to change our attitudinal behavior. So all those are part of stated and adopted targets under the new Education 2030 framework. This gives enormous challenge for us and in the global context as far as I know, the international community is trying to pick up just one global indicator to measure the achievement of that particular new target 4.7. But obviously, it is not enough to be applicable to each and every country that faces different types of problems. So what kind of assessment and the perspectives of assessment would be most relevant to individual countries becomes more important question than what kind of global indicator we are going to have. Of course, that kind of global indicator is, will be a useful one, but I personally believe that the process and efforts that each individual country will make towards identifying the shared vision and the way of assessing the achievement of that shared vision will be more important. That's my quick response and comment.

Any? any? Not limited to the question related to this topic? Any other contribution from that other side of the table?

Nobuko Kayashima (Senior Advisor, JICA)

I also believe that assessment is really important, but there are also other important things such as what is actually taught, what the curriculum is intended to teach, how textbooks are used to teach it, and whether the teachers are able to teach it. When we assess students' academic abilities, we have to consider these questions. Since the quality of education is often discussed, people pay a lot of attention to assessment, but we must not be satisfied with looking into assessment methods and cooperating only with conducting assessments. Based on the assessments, we must continue to do various other things in order to actually improve the quality of education. JICA has conducted teacher-training projects and those on science and math education for many years, but recently, we have seen a rapid increase in requests for projects to improve textbooks and curricula. For about 15 years, we have conducted projects to train teachers in many countries, and we are now addressing the next issue, which is improving textbooks and curricula. As the content of education is closely related to assessment of learning achievement, these two must be dealt with together.

Kazuhiro Yoshida (Director, CICE, Hiroshima University)

I would like to bring us back to the original departure point, session title goes, "What Roles Japan has played in Achieving the Goal of the EFA in Education Cooperation". And from the keynote speakers, Imbuga sensei and Muta sensei talked about Japan's international cooperation in the area of education. And it has been somehow difficult to capture the lessons that we should have learned, not all the beautiful things. But what we could have done differently or from the country's side, we are very happy to hear the voice of appreciation. But we also would like hear different views in comparative sense, for example Japan's unique way of working with you is perceived rather positively but other players are working with you in a different way, so in such comparative context, do you have any suggestions to make so that the Japanese contribution working together in the future can be a more useful one for you. May I invite Imbuga sensei to give some idea about it?

Mabel Imbuga (Vice Chancellor, JKUAT, Kenya /Board Chair, RUFORUM Network)

I think I can start with an example of a case study of JKUAT. In the beginning, it was very difficult to adopt to the hard work that was being shown by the Japanese experts. But with time, we learned how to copy and paste it but at first, you know Kenyans like working 8am to 5pm, but the Japanese experts will go from 6am to probably 8pm. So it was not easy at the beginning but eventually it worked out. But, apart from sending the technical experts, we would also like to have some Japanese students coming to our university to interact with the youngsters. We usually get volunteers coming but they are not many. So we would like to have concerted efforts to have Japanese students coming over to have the classroom experience in Africa. That is the only change I can add there but everything else was really perfect.

Hiromitsu Muta (Professor Emeritus, Tokyo Institute of Technology)

Today I heard many presentations, and it was mentioned that the projects in Kenya and the Philippines were very effective. On the other hand, I often hear that Japanese projects go well

during the projects but that sustainability afterwards is often an issue. I think Kenya and the Philippines have been successful because Japanese assistance has been repeated in different forms and continued over the years. This is not always possible. Many successful methods have failed as soon as people leave, asking the local people to continue. We must seriously consider how good projects take root and grow. Continuing collaboration in different forms as in Kenya and the Philippines is one way. Another way is to position Japanese assistance projects in the medium- to long-term plans of the partner countries. The biggest issue concerning sustainability is a lack of funding although we know how to continue. Funding is, in a way, determined by priorities. Securing enough funds is important. We need to expand projects to include some sort of financial support and to make it possible to use funds from international organizations and other donors. Today success stories were shown. It's nice to hear about them, but there have been many other projects that could have gone well if they had been continued.

Nobuko Kayashima (Senior Advisor, JICA)

Today we heard about the UP NISMED in the Philippines, Jomo Kenyatta University, and the PEDP in Bangladesh. Thank you for saying many positive things about Japanese assistance. As Prof. Imbuga talked about Japanese assistance, may I say something in relation to that question? When I was listening to the story of Jomo Kenyatta University, I had a different impression. I honestly think the project succeeded not so much because Japanese assistance was great but because Jomo Kenyatta University in Kenya is great. The JICA project to support Jomo Kenyatta started a little before 1980, and for about 20 years, a large amount of money including grant aid as well as human resources were invested in this project. So a lot of input had been made, and they thought it was high time to terminate the project, which ended around 2000. The university had grown to provide high-quality education to a small group of select students. The number of students was about 3,000 then. Now it has grown to about 40,000. Sometime after the end of the project, Japanese experts who had participated in the project visited Jomo Kenyatta University again and were astonished to see how big the university had become. They all said they were concerned about the quality of education. They had devoted their time and effort to developing the university, so they could not help but be concerned about the quality of education with 40,000 students. But I realized that with this number of students, the university had created a financial base that enabled the diverse activities conducted today. I understood that people in Kenya had nurtured the seeds planted by Japan. If Japanese experts had stayed, this might not have been possible because there might have been a lot of discussion of the quality of education and the size of the university. But after Japan left in 2000, Kenya created an excellent university in its own way. People in Kenya managed their own university by determining its quality of education. What Japan can do is give a small push at the beginning. Local people continue what has been begun. They don't have to keep on doing the same thing. They can localize it and adapt it to their context. They make it their own and grow on their own. It would be wonderful if Japan could plant a seed to grow in that way. This was discussed in the morning session, too, but I think it's true that the significance of a project is not determined by the amount of funding. Now Jomo Kenyatta University is supporting universities in South Sudan and Eritrea. As a matter of fact, the UP NISMED is conducting training for science and math teachers from Africa in JICA's project. When we sent our counterparts from Kenya to the UP NISMED in the Philippines for training, some people asked why we didn't send them to Japan. But the surveys we have conducted show that the training in the Philippines is more effective as people in the Philippines can speak better English. This is also related to what was discussed earlier. There is now only a small gap between Japan and developing countries. Japan and developing countries are not divided. The Philippines and Kenya are both truly amazing. I hope that Bangladesh will come up with great results, too. I believe it will.

Kazuhiro Yoshida (Director, CICE, Hiroshima University)

Thank you, I will stop the interactive discussion among ourselves here and would like to invite contributions, comments, questions from the floor.

Q1.

Masato Noda (Associate Professor, Ibaraki University, Visiting Fellow, CICE, Hiroshima University. Visiting Fellow, CRICED, University of Tsukuba)

Thank you Prof. Yoshida and the presenters. My question is about the inclusive education under the globalization in the 21st century. In the 1990s, there was a lot of discussion of using Japanese development experience in developing countries. The use of Japanese experience in education in developing countries was discussed, too. But I think in the process of globalization, the situation has changed. First, Japan now faces the issue of poverty. One out of six children in Japan is living in relative poverty. This is a new issue we face in the process of globalization. Poverty is becoming a serious issue in Japan. Another issue is multi-ethnicity and, the multicultural society in Japan. I used to live in Aichi Prefecture. In Homi Danchi housing estate in Toyota City, for example, half of the elementary school children were Brazilians. Japan has children's poverty and the issue of multi-ethnicity. How can Japan use these experiences in international assistance to overseas? How can Japan also learn from the experiences of developing countries that have tried to overcome the issues of poverty and multi-ethnicity? Ms. Kayashima was explaining inclusive education, so may I ask her these questions? And if possible, I'd like to appreciate comments on these issues from other speakers, too. Thank you.

Kazuhiro Yoshida (Director, CICE, Hiroshima University)

I would like to collect some more questions or comments from the floor first before we turn over to the speakers. I will take a couple of turns so if you could be patient.

Q2.

Arisa Oishi (Master's course, Graduate School of Asia-Pacific Studies, Waseda University)

Thank you for your presentations. Today we discussed about the mainly formal education, but I would like to think about the non-formal sector because the word of literacy still exists in the SDGs, as Yoshida sensei mentioned. Or life-long learning or adult learning declaration or something. So, I have two questions for, the first one is mainly for Yoshida-sensei. You explained "literacy" remaining in the SDGs clearly and concisely. Although it was marginalized in the EFA, it has been included in the SDGs. Did UNESCO and the international community include literacy in a proactive manner? Or was it included in line with UNESCO's tradition? I'd like to ask Prof. Yoshida the background as I'm sure he is familiar with the situation.

My second question is about the new financial mechanism, and I'd like to ask not only the panelists but other participants as well. Considering the new financial mechanism in the sector

of non-formal education, the World Bank, for example, their expenditure to the sector was very small during EFA period. I understand it was partly because of the difficulty of assessing and conducting quantitative research. I'd like to ask you whether there are any key factors or ways to increase financial assistance for non-formal education.

Kazuhiro Yoshida (Director, CICE, Hiroshima University)

Thank you very much. We still have around half an hour so I will stop taking questions for now and then give ourselves a chance to respond to some of the questions, comments raised among ourselves, panelists. If you are ready to or should I myself respond?

The question was about the background in which literacy and numeracy were once again highlighted in the process of formulating the SDG 4 by UNESCO and others. As you know, in the Dakar Framework for Action, the progress toward achieving the global target to improve literacy was actually disappointingly less than expected, but the international community is not giving enough warning about it. I don't think the international community is aware that we are overlooking something important. When we refer to "literacy," it does not just mean the ability to read words and understand what they mean. For quite some time, people have been paying more attention to "functional literacy," which means the ability to utilize the information gained by reading words and to turn it into knowledge that is useful in daily life. In this way, the effectiveness of literacy is now emphasized more. It is, however, very difficult to measure the effectiveness of life skills with uniform indicators. Therefore the term "literacy" has been used based only on the conventional definition of literacy. In considering "non-formal literacy education," which has been mentioned, who are the people who have not been able to get enough school education? When we discuss literacy, we are not only talking about school-aged children but also about young people and middle-aged people and those in my generation as well. If I may use the word "investment," the government faces a difficult challenge of deciding priorities within the limited budget. Anyway, unless literacy is improved in various ways, the welfare of each citizen of a nation cannot be improved. Unless everyone's welfare is improved, we cannot achieve sustainable development, which is our shared goal. In this way, everything is connected. Numeracy means not only the ability to add, subtract, multiply and divide but also the ability to use mathematical thinking in daily life. In this sense, "numeracy" was also included in the SDGs. I believe it was included because the international community has recognized its importance. UNESCO could not have done this alone.

Mabel Imbuga (Vice Chancellor, JKUAT, Kenya /Board Chair, RUFORUM Network)

I would like to add an additional comment. As far as touching on why MDGs interact so well, first of all, you realize that the MDGs did not focus on university education at all. They left universities out. But the universities are now involved in the SDGs. So definitely, SDGs are going to work because universities can have different intervention strategies that can go right up to the common country person, we can go to the lower levels through community social responsibilities where using university students when they go back home. Now through ICT, we can train many of these people even through mobile phones, through television and through radio. So to me, I'm really optimistic by the universities being involved now and being mentioned in the SDGs. This time round, it's going to work.

Nobuko Kayashima (Senior Advisor, JICA)

With regard to multi-ethnicity, I think multi-ethnicity is an example to show there are many similarities between the issues we face in Japan and those in developing countries. Japan has not been able to solve these issues fully in this new globalization. How can we solve them, then? NGOs, governments and experts are doing activities similar to those of aid organizations dealing with these issues, but these actors are usually working separately. Those who are addressing domestic issues in Japan say that they are trying to solve domestic issues and cannot really think about issues outside Japan. But when we share the activities in developing countries, we can probably learn a lot. Japanese experience may be used, too, and we may be encouraged. For example, the issues related to children of Japanese ancestry and those of the aging society can be shared. There are many challenges we commonly see, so instead of being donors and recipients, it would be great if we could create an environment in which we could learn from each other, understand each other, sympathize and collaborate to solve our shared issues.

About the multi-ethnicity, though we're always talking about inclusiveness, multi-ethnicity but in a true sense, inclusiveness is really a big problem due to mindset. People who have grown within close environment and were home schooled, rarely think about the diversity and their mind is not open enough to accept the inevitable reality. If we really want to create inclusive society, we can consider to include this sort of things in the curriculum and also to do something more to motivate the society as a whole. Thank you.

Soledad A. Ulep (Director, UP NISMED)

Regarding non-formal education, in the Philippines, our Department of Education has the Alternative Learning System (ALS), where those who belong to this sector can still study and learn by going through a set of learning modules and finishing them in their own time specifically for example, for those who are in the advanced elementary and secondary levels. There are agreed meetings with the teachers for discussion of whatever concepts are being developed in those modules. The contexts of presenting the concepts as what our Bangladeshi friend has already said, relates to their daily lives, so they see what they are learning as relevant to their needs. They are also given an examination – the ALS Accreditation and Equivalency Test. And once they pass this, then they are given a comparable certificate of rating and/or diploma. So, they are not left out. Those who are in this sector are still included in the main goal of providing quality education for all.

Kazuhiro Yoshida (Director, CICE, Hiroshima University)

Now, I would like to re-open the floor and invite comments.

Q3.

Bong-gun Chung (Research fellow, Instructor, College of Education, Seoul National University/ Visiting Professor, CICE, Hiroshima University)

What is the success factor of Kenya project? The discussion gave me an impression that it's the hardworking of the Japanese work ethic and the dedication of the local people. So in more detail, what are the success factors of this preliminary case? On the other hand, what are the failure factors that you mentioned in Japanese ODA, there are many suspended grants.

The other question is in the past two months while staying in Japan, I feel like there are many discussions and concerns about assessment, evaluation, understanding the consequences, and thinking about the outcomes. And I think all these are related to big changes in the scenes. From my understanding, I feel that we are turning away from the neo-liberal quantified approach to education to some kind of philosophical, ethical issues. In UN SDGs, there are expressions like human dignity, decent work in their life. And so things are changing in terms of assessment. We need to think more about the unseen part, unmeasurable part, some invisible quality or invisible aspect of outcomes accumulated. So in your discussion, what do you really have in your mind? What does it really mean? Is it evaluation or quantified indicatorization that we have doing the past decades or are we going to do something different from now on? Or, maybe we cannot perfectly escape from the quantification and numbered tradition but I think we need at least some add-on to the other quality part. And in that regard, I just want to know what Japan are talking about assessment, evaluation, appreciation or understanding of the holistic outcome on their life. If it is possible in the education sector, it could be a big signal to the people out there in the economic development part or the ministry of finance. In that regard, I want comments from the panelists. Thank you.

Q4.

Kenneth King (Professor Emeritus, University of Edinburgh)

This is Kenneth King again. I couldn't say this I think in UK, but let me say it here. There are two stories I've heard today. Story one starts in 1977 in Kenya with the JKUAT, it goes through to the Philippines 1994 with lesson study, and it goes through a whole series of different activities including Bangladesh in PEDP. So there's a story about Japanese investment in a small number of very specific educational activities through 1977 or 1982 and right up to now. And the second story, put together very brilliantly by Yoshida sensei, is a story at the global level from 1990, Jomtien, then EFA at Dakar and then, 2015. That story doesn't mention science and maths, you won't find those words in the EFA or Jomtien Declarations, you won't find lesson study, you won't find laboratory based education or monozukuri or all those Japan-specific terms in the global story. But my question is this. At the end, if we listen to Kayashima san and what the MoFA people who are in the room have done, they put together the two documents and those documents try and look back at story one because those documents, although they are quite short, are full of 'Japaneseness' or what Japan does well. But they also try and connect to the Yoshida story. They also ask what is Japan doing about 2015? So my question is this. How does Japan with its dramatically reduced budget for education look at Muta's paper. How does it support the continuation of story number one and Japan's comparative advantage in education and how does it do what our friends in MoFA, MEXT and JICA are saying, which is to try and make education relate to all the other 16 goals? So it's a very ambitious agenda if you look at these papers. I don't know how many people have read the JICA position paper or the MoFA paper. But they start with a very ambitious agenda but they also want to continue with what I'm calling story one. So that's my analysis of what I've enjoyed listening today and what we couldn't hear in the UK. I couldn't tell that story as a DFID story because that story about UK's comparative advantage in specific educational aid activities is over. We can't tell that story any longer.

Kazuhiro Yoshida (Director, CICE, Hiroshima University)

Ok, I see a few more hands. So I will collect the few more questions first before I give voice to keynote speakers and panelists. In view of time constraint, please make it concise and to have your name first please.

Q5.

Keita Niwayama (Graduate School of Applied Linguistics, Meikai University)

Thank you for your wonderful presentations. First, I'd like to ask about Japan's contributions. I think there are areas in which Japan has not been able to contribute enough. I study linguistics. There are language problems behind the issue of science and math education. I'd like to ask your opinions on the difficulties children of Japanese ancestry face, which was mentioned earlier.

Q6.

Leyla Radjai (Graduate School of Asia-Pacific Studies, Waseda University)

I'd like to ask Prof. Yoshida about the program-based approach. Is it correct to say that the world is shifting to financial assistance while Japan is mainly implementing projects? In that case, will Japan also shift to a greater focus on financial assistance as the global trend in international education cooperation shifts in that direction? ODA plays an important role in showing the presence of Japan and in building friendly relations with other countries. If Japan shifts to financial assistance, I'm concerned that the assistance will be invisible. It is often said that Japanese-style cooperation focuses on local needs. What does "local needs" mean? Are they the needs of the country or the citizens' needs? Are the needs of a country different from the citizens' needs? If the citizens' needs can be addressed through the cooperation, how are they addressed?

Kazuhiro Yoshida (Director, CICE, Hiroshima University)

Thank you very much. Already, rather a long and heavy list of questions posed on us.

- What do we know about the success and failure factors? This is not really directed to Kenya's case, but I think it's a general question to what we collectively known about the success and failure factors of the way Japan has been working to improve the education in our partner, developing countries.
- The question was raised about how we understand the assessment. I think the imbedded question is also what we are trying to measure. What does that assessment really mean vis-a-vis the meaning of the results we are trying to achieve?
- And the other question, very different question. On one hand, Japan has been consistently assisting in such a manner as we have been assisting in developing countries on one hand. And on the other hand, there is the global discourse being evolved from the decades of Jomtien, Dakar and now the SDGs. How do we compare this and put Japanese way of assistance to such context and what is the Japanese-ness? Is this the word you would like to use? In that changing context,

if you have any answer.

- The meaning of language as a background of promoting or not so successfully promoting math and science education, do we have anything to say about the importance of the language?
- And also, a series of questions raised on program-based approach, so anybody on the floor enlighten us?

Mabel Imbuga (Vice Chancellor, JKUAT, Kenya /Board Chair, RUFORUM Network)

Thank you for the questions. I'll just respond to in a small way on the first question about the success factors and failure factors of the Japanese assistance. I think I would recommend you to read the reviews of JICA. Because after every five years, there were reviews. It's not something that we can answer in one sentence. It is a whole lot of things, there were very many successful things that were mentioned there. The failures were very few and I think if you continue focusing on failures, then you can never move. So the best is that to look at the successes and learn from them. And I would recommend you read the reviews. They are very important. There must be some in the JICA headquarters.

And my friend from Scotland, how can Japan continue in assisting, we all know, we all talked about comparative advantage and the product life cycle. And when it becomes the maximum, it can either go up if you add something or it can go down if you don't do anything. So what Japan needs to do is that it does not need to put in money or the time. It can just put in ideas. And I think now, they are promoting regional dynamism which is coming up very well. And we have even finished in Kenya, under the Africa ai program. They are linking up with Japan, African Union and JKUAT. And they are reaching the rest of Africa. So it doesn't always mean just funding and money. It can just be ideas. And also just to focus the country in the right way. So yeah, just think about the product life cycle. Thank you.

Hiromitsu Muta (Professor Emeritus, Tokyo Institute of Technology)

With regard to the question on evaluation, it is not possible to measure all the effect of education, but there are some aspects that can be measured. Nowadays, everything needs to be quantified, and it may seem impossible to do so. In the past, not much effort was made to measure results, and instead, they used fancy words. If I may say this, it was something like prettifying the results. As has been mentioned, the amount of ODA is being reduced. Unless we explain the actual benefits of ODA, we cannot increase the ODA budget. The same applies to university budgets and to everything else. Unless many people understand how much has been done with the money used, we cannot continue projects. Thus it is important to measure whatever can be measured. It is, however, wrong to believe that everything can be measured. There are many things that cannot be measured. I think it will help a lot if we know clearly what can be measured. If we are aware that there are, for example, 10 items and that we are measuring one or two items that can be measured out of the 10, it would help us a lot. As Ms. Kayashima said, I think we can somehow measure the effect of developing curriculum. There are difficulties, however, in the area of education because there are other assessments such as graduation examinations and university admission tests, which are extremely influential. I think we can measure the effects of changing curricula, changing locations and conducting teacher training using assessment methods suitable to measure these specific actions, but the results must be linked with university admission tests or other assessments that have a major impact on the country. If university admission tests only measure students' ability to memorize, even if curricula are reformed to improve students' ability to think, the results of the projects will not be widely used under the bigger influence of the existing system. When an assistance project aims

at curriculum reform to improve students' thinking ability, we must also reform the existing system of university admission tests and other related factors in order to make the curriculum reform effective. When we carry out assessments, we must also consider what we measure. Are we measuring the effects of the project or the link with other factors measured from other perspectives? With regard to quantification, which was mentioned earlier, nothing can be zero. Everything can be quantified in some way. But, of course, we must remember the limitations of measurement. It would be a big mistake to think we can measure everything. At the same time, making efforts to measure results and to show them in clear ways has become a condition for continuing any project.

Soledad A. Ulep (Director, UP NISMED)

I'll talk about the success factors and these will be based on our own experience. I think that one factor which contributed to the success of the JICA project in the Philippines was that, right from the very beginning, the Japanese experts already made us aware of how to sustain the project once it ended. So they had this "long term" thinking. For example, when we were still preparing for the national training programs where we needed to develop the activities and instructional materials, they already had sustaining the project in mind. The Japanese experts were thinking long-term: What if this project ends already? What will be left behind? So they thought of-putting all these instructional materials together and come up with sourcebooks for teacher trainers. It's not easy to develop these materials because they needed to be tried out first. We had to take into account for instance, the content background of the teachers and other relevant considerations such as whether or not the activities were doable ~~or~~ and whether or not they were appropriate to the level of the teachers. So, despite its being not easy to do, in a span of five years, we were able to develop 8 plus 8, 16 volumes of sourcebooks on practical work for teacher-trainers. In mathematics, the sourcebooks have lessons that exemplified teaching mathematics through problem solving. I think that the view of sustaining the project after it ends was a success factor. Another factor was the clear communication between the two parties, the Japanese experts and the UP NISMED staff regarding the expected outputs of the project. ~~So~~ We knew what we were supposed to be accountable for. The Japanese experts had very good work ethics. They were hardworking. The UP NISMED also worked hard, so that together, we can produce the outputs. I think that clear communication was a very important factor, too. So the success ~~can~~ may partly be attributed to these factors.

Shyamal Kanti Ghosh (Secretary, Ministry of Agriculture, Government of Bangladesh)

I would like to respond about why I think development activities are better in program-based approach than many individual projects. A program-based approach is good for the development of the whole sector. It ensured the continuity, it ensured transparency, ownership, it avoids the duplication as well, above all, the usefulness. I'll give an example in the education sector. We have a project for curriculum development, but there is no provision for teacher's guide, teacher training. After the development of curriculum, it could not bring any change in the school level due to lack of teacher's knowledge about that changed materials. There was another project for infrastructure building, they built school building as well as the furniture. Everything was there, but there was no blackboard because it was not included in the project document. If it happens in the case of program-based approach it could be solved easily, because there is flexibility. In the program-based approach, you will find everything together, what you need to develop your sector according to need (considering resources). From the financial management perspective, it is more transparent because money is coming through the

government treasury. On the other-hand all the money from the development partner is also going to the government treasury, so you have to maintain only one account. Though the money is coming through government treasury, still you have to be accountable to the development partners, how much money you are spending and for what purposes you are using that money. You have to give the accounts to the government people also. If we have the demand from the citizens, and we develop the project or the program, then it is useful. If we develop the project or the program without knowing the demands of the citizens, it has no use. If a project or the program is developed for the political purpose, that is different issue. Most of the donor agencies give the aid or loan to the government and not the citizens directly, government in the power negotiate the matter, that has to be bear in mind. Still it is a big question and also a matter of debate.

In response to the question related to language, I think it is needless to mention that language is very vital for overall learning of every individual. Without proper knowledge of language, nobody can learn anything it may be math or science, whatever it., communication creates huge barrier on proper understanding as well as learning. That's why, it is very vital to know the language. In my opinion it is better first, mother tongue and then the other languages. And the people like me who have grown through the colonial administration and educated under the colonial education system, they have second language, English for us and then the third one may be Arabic, Sanskrit, French, Spanish or something like that. We have a huge population and not so much natural resources. If we want to develop our country, we must educate our people and impart skills to them then they convert into resources and they can be citizen for the world and serve for the world. To serve the other nation of the world people need to know their language culture etc. If they earn mastery in their own language, then only they can learn the second or the third language. So, language learning should be emphasized most. Thank you.

Kazuhiro Yoshida (Director, CICE, Hiroshima University)

With regard to a program-based approach, which is becoming a mainstream modality, there was a question on what education cooperation Japan should offer and whether Japan can provide education cooperation with ODA while maintaining its visibility. I think people have different answers. In relation to a program-based approach, it is said that donors' aid should be better harmonized based on the principles of the Paris Declaration. The declaration includes various terms such as "alignment" and "ownership" to emphasize the importance of the systems of the recipient countries. "Sector-wide approach" and "financial assistance" are now used rather than "program-based approach" because many people involved in education cooperation discussed it and came to the conclusion that these are important in order to maximize the benefits of cooperation. There are, however, critical studies on the benefits of financial assistance to improve education in developing countries. For example, some findings show that financial assistance for the educational sector has been quite effective in improving access to education but that it has not been always effective in improving the quality of education such as learning outcomes. The DFID conducted a strict evaluation in the U.K. on financial assistance, and the findings of the evaluation also show this tendency. The U.K. and the European Union, which have focused on financial assistance, have similar findings. The problems that can be solved with money can be solved with money, but regardless of the availability of money, educational effects must be achieved. Therefore, projects have been the mainstream modality for international cooperation. In other words, projects provide a process for the people in developing countries to gain the technical expertise lacking in their countries, and their overseas partners can join them in this learning process. If a program-based approach as the form of financial assistance is given more power, it becomes more important to jointly study how to

improve educational benefits with that money. In fact, some of the organizations that believe that financial assistance is the most effective modality are actually investing in research on how to improve education. As a result, assistance will be given not as individual activities in the form of conventional projects but as part of the effort to improve the entire sector. JICA's actions are well positioned in the improvement plan for the educational sector, and, in that sense, they are well aligned with the program-based approach. I think JICA has been promoting such actions for quite a long time. This is my first answer. But is it OK as it is? I don't think so. We must take responsibility for analyzing whether a program-based approach is really effective in improving the quality of education. I think unless we question the effectiveness of the program-based approach and redefine this approach, we cannot improve learning outcomes in education. Japan can provide this input as Japan has experience both in its own educational development and in international educational cooperation. I believe that people expect Japan to promote the process of redefining the program-based approach. I would like to say more about this in the concluding discussions, so I'll stop here.

And this will bring us to the time limit of this slot of session. I know there are many other issues to deepen the discussion but let me take a pause here and turn over the mike to the MC for a moment.