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Vision: what the Centre exists to do

The overarching principle of the CCE is to build sustainable partnerships which aim to understand and increase young people’s and teachers’ participation in their own learning, and to further understand how that learning extends beyond schooling, how it connects with prior learning, and with other arenas of learning in informal as well as formal contexts. The ultimate goal is to improve the quality of children’s lives, to enrich the quality of learning and teaching, and to improve the well-being of children and youth within and beyond school. This goal is pursued in a climate of widening participation, with individuals and groups, with voluntary and statutory agencies, so as to widen opportunity, underpinned by common principles of equity and social justice.

Values: the approach of those working in the Centre

The work of the CCE is premised on listening to students, teachers, school leaders, local and national policy makers and related agencies so as to develop intervention strategies which are sensitive to local needs and to broader cultural issues while, at the same time able to offer constructive challenge in a spirit of collaborative inquiry. Research is thus integral, ongoing and formative, serving to build capacity not only of the Centre but of schools and agencies engaged with us in this work. We believe that this is best realised through sharing of expertise, that we have much to learn from one another and that learning is most powerful when it is both socially and culturally aware. The approach is, therefore, one that seeks to build knowledge, criticality, independent judgement and team working, building networks and communities of learning, both face-to-face and 'virtual.' The quality of collaboration will be measured by ways in which it is embedded in thinking and in routine practice, and manifest in its longer term sustainability.

Implementation

The Centre aims to realise this vision and embody these values through helping to build sustainable capacity in Commonwealth countries:

- Working with national policymakers, school leaders and academics to impact directly upon policy and practice in classrooms, schools, networks and policy contexts, so as to enhance the capacity for learning within the countries of the Commonwealth;
- Identifying centres of best practice in primary and secondary education in Commonwealth countries, to distil the essence of that practice and to derive key principles that ‘travel’ across geographical and cultural boundaries;
- Collaborating within and across countries to test and apply principles of practice so as to share a stronger theoretical grounding of what constitutes ‘good’ practice;
- Working in collaboration with groups and communities in the informal educational sector, drawing on their experience to develop initiatives and strategies designed to improve the quality of education for vulnerable youth and marginalised groups;
- Developing policy and practice informed by research, context-specific and adapted to locally-based needs;
- Planning research collaborations with local practitioners, leading to joint publication, co- and multiple-authorship and the dissemination of research regionally, nationally and globally;
- Working with the Commonwealth Education Trust (the Centre’s original funding body) and with Commonwealth intergovernmental associations (the Commonwealth Secretariat, the Commonwealth of Learning, the Commonwealth Foundation), to develop, as appropriate, a coherent approach to educational initiatives within the Commonwealth.
CONVERSATIONS: 1

Leadership in a divided world: transition to democracy
Professor Jonathan Jansen, Rector, University of the Free State, South Africa

What kind of leadership ‘works’ in communities deeply divided by race/religion/ethnicity/culture/class? How does leadership as a collective both correct what is wrong (the reparation imperative) while at the same time bringing people together across social and historical divides (the reconciliation imperative)? Is there a leadership of transition that can be conceptually pinned down and operationally defined in and for a dangerous and divided classroom/community/country/world? Are there lessons to be learnt from South Africa’s difficult transition to democracy? And what can real-life experiences of leadership (the presenter’s own biography) teach about leading in any context where injustice and division threaten conflict? This presentation calls for a broadening of the ways we think about aspirational scripts such as the Millennium Development Goals.

You cannot lead unless you try to understand how the people you are working with came to be how and where they are. Reconciliation and reparation in conflict societies means an acceptance that there are no perpetrators or by-standers, because all are involved and implicated.

What lessons of leadership might apply in different contexts:

- Clarity of purpose matters – have to understand yourself, what you are trying to achieve, and do everything to try to achieve it.

- Needs leadership by example – leadership that commits to the very values that you want others to follow. You cannot tell others how to be when your leadership is not a powerful demonstration. People don’t listen; they watch. The credibility of the leader is all.

- The role of compassion. Leadership must be deeply compassionate across the divides. The script doesn’t allow you to win. The approach must not be condemnation, but compassion. The role of contrition – understanding and consciously aware of own failings and background. Many narratives are so simple- minded and lacking of complexity. When you begin to own and open up, others do. An approach that acknowledges brokenness rather than asserting self-righteousness.

Forces us to ask questions about purpose of education, and our roles as leaders.

Discussion 1: led by Professor John MacBeath, Centre for Commonwealth Education, Cambridge.

How do we understand others until we see ourselves?
• How does the knowledge that we carry inform our thinking, behaviour, leadership? There is knowledge in the blood of the organization, institution; how do we deal with our knowledge problem; we need to seek first to understand.

• What does it mean for us to be in a place we don't understand? How long does it take to understand? Need to become acutely aware of how much we don't understand.

• How do we know ourselves? Leadership has to have the capacity to confront injustice, and to know when to keep quiet. Finding out who you are / what your job is by asking people what your job is. What is at the core of leadership at an organization: individual at apex of organisational pyramid, or at centre of web of human relationships? Waking up and discovering everything you believe is not true; first lesson of leadership – know yourself.

CONVERSATIONS: 2

Education of Quality for ALL – Myth or Reality?
Professor Vinayagum Chinapah, Chair of International and Comparative Education, Institute of International Education, Stockholm University

Guaranteeing human rights to an education of quality for all still remains one of the greatest challenges of the 21st century. Despite our knowledge that “an education of quality for all can empower humankind to make choices, to improve the quality of our life, and to foster our positive attitudes towards each other, in other words, to live better together”, we know that most of the EFA Goals set 10 years ago at Dakar 2000, will not be met, and that there remains a lost generation of children who have been deprived of their chance for an education that might lift them out of poverty. Our world still has 72 million out-of-school children, the majority of them (57 per cent) girls mostly living in rural areas and slums. Indeed, the 2010 Global Monitoring Report suggests that 1.9 million new teacher posts will be required to achieve universal primary enrolment by 2015. Furthermore, there is a broad consensus that the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) will only remain “wishful thinking” if no significant efforts are made to improve the quality of education and students' learning outcomes. Irrespective of gender, regional, socio-economic and cultural differences or disparities, the existing myth about quality education for all should be turned into a reality – be it at international, national, sub-national, and local levels, but most important of all, at the level of the classroom where teaching and learning generally take place.

Evidence from studies and surveys of learning outcomes clearly show that quality education for all cannot be addressed without improving teaching-learning processes. Learners should remain at the centre and as targets for any educational cum pedagogical intervention, be it at the level of curriculum development, teacher education and training, or at the level of learning environment as a whole. In a similar vein, enormous efforts would be needed to have a stable, qualified, better-rewarded and less mobile teaching-force. Critical problems such as scarcity of teaching and learning resources, multiple school shifts, large class size, long distances to school and so on, must be seriously re-addressed in order to improve the quality of education. Such evidence should therefore be used to empower educators, educational policy-makers and practitioners for an education of quality for all through targeted capacity-development modalities and strategies.

The provision of an education of quality for all requires therefore the holistic approach to teaching and learning. The environmental conditions and contexts at home, in the
community, at school and in the classroom have direct bearings on the quality of teaching and learning and on learning achievement, in particular. The latter is often measured through high-stakes examinations, which in turn, are used to screen out, to select and to push out the majority from the elected few for future educational or occupational opportunities. Monitoring what our children are learning, how and under which conditions is crucial. Such monitoring mechanism can only help ensure the quality and effectiveness of the education offered. There is therefore a greater need to revitalize the quality in education from conceptual, methodological, analytical and empirical standpoints.

**Transformative Models of Practice and Professional Development of Teachers**

Dr Cream Wright, REDI4Change, LLC

If teachers are indispensable to learning and integral to most definitions of quality education, then the global education movement must focus on teachers (numbers and quality) as a top priority for achieving quality basic education for all as outlined in the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs 2 & 3) and the six EFA goals agreed in Dakar in 2000. This paper argues that while the focus on teachers has been impressive in terms of quantum of work and advocacy efforts, this field has been an inadvertent backwater with little strategic progress or any breakthrough solutions for several decades now. This paper reviews efforts through which countries address the need for adequate numbers and appropriate quality of teachers. It identifies a pattern of shortcomings, and contends that critical socio-psychological and socio-political issues have been largely ignored in much of the extensive work being done on teacher education and professional development. The claim is that issues of: who becomes a teacher (profile), why (motivation), and how (preparation); as well as pathways for progress through a career marked by increased expertise and experience, have simply not been a focus for research in teacher education and professional development. Based on this contention the paper uses a new approach to explore trends in the recruitment, preparation, deployment, remuneration, management and forms of support of teachers as key professionals. This approach uses an analytical framework based on three sets of variables:

- **Our emerging knowledge of more EFA-appropriate learning processes, technologies and environments that are helping to redefine teaching and determine successful outcomes.**

- **The broader political, social and economic trends in society that impact on teachers as individuals, as well as shaping the climate in which their profession thrives or withers.**

- **Emerging theories on the social psychology of professional achievement in various fields and what these imply for the "who", “why” and “how” of excellence in teaching.**

This analysis leads to a brief review of current models of teacher preparation and professional development, in order to highlight the career development flaws inherent in these models. The paper then goes on to propose some options for feasible transformative models through which countries can invest in the preparation and professional development of teachers. It contends that such transformative models call for new ways of seeing teaching as a profession, within the realities of the social, political and economic conditions in which teachers work. It also asserts that successful adaptation of transformative models requires strong political will and innovative technical approaches to the preparation, deployment, remuneration, management and support of teachers. It argues that transformative models provide a platform for a robust and affordable professional teaching force, to help countries deliver quality basic education for all.

Finally the paper assesses the viability of these proposed transformative models, particularly in a Commonwealth context. It outlines clear advantages of a collaborative...
approach to piloting, developing and implementing these transformative models of practice for teacher professional development. It explores the role of Commonwealth mechanisms, such as the Commonwealth Secretariat, Commonwealth of Learning, Commonwealth Scholarship and fellowship Scheme, and the Center for Commonwealth Education; in taking this agenda forward.

Assessing the Impact of Education Sector Policy Reform in Low-Income Countries: Developing a Comprehensive, Intervention-Focused Research Programme
Paul Bennell, Senior Research Fellow, Department for International Development, London.

Any education research strategy must directly support the attainment of the education MDGs and other education priority areas such as improved education quality, education provision in fragile and conflict affected states (FCAS), and appropriate post-basic education and training provision. Paul Bennell’s paper focused on two main sets of questions: (i) what are the major research gaps? (ii) what type of research programme or strategy is needed to plug these gaps?

Four questions dominate the current research agenda for education in low income developing countries (LIDCs):

- Why are so many children failing to complete a full cycle of primary schooling? What interventions are required to ensure that all children complete at least primary schooling?
- Why are learning outcomes in both primary and secondary schools so poor? What should be done to improve significantly these outcomes?
- What kind of post-basic education and training provision is necessary for sustained economic growth and poverty reduction?
- What is the impact of education on individual livelihoods, especially the poor?

The similarities in the education sector strategies, goals and specific policy interventions that have been adopted by governments in low-income developing countries (LIDCs) are striking, particularly in sub-Saharan Africa. This is no coincidence since it reflects the increasing involvement of the main international development partners in policy formulation and implementation processes in the education sector in the majority of LIDCs, especially those that are heavily aid-dependent and have adopted sector-wide approaches with budget support funding modalities.

The education MDGs represent a set of global education policy goals, which have been almost universally adopted by Ministries of Education in LIDCs. However, LIDCs not only share the same broad strategic goals especially with respect to Education For All, but most governments have adopted a broadly common set of education policy reforms that cover all aspects of education service delivery. This global education policy reform package has gradually emerged over the last two decades and has been strongly influenced by the World Bank.

Given the ubiquity of this global education reform strategy, a central research question is what is known about the impact and efficacy of the education and training policy reforms that make up the key elements of this strategy? More specifically, how has education research contributed to our understanding of this global education reform process with respect to: (i) the design and implementation of education policies/interventions; (ii) their impact on education service delivery and the welfare of individuals and households; and
(iii) the overall impact on economic growth and the structural transformation of these societies?

This requires a thorough review of the education research that has been conducted, especially during the last five-ten years, which is a major undertaking. A review of the main research that has been undertaken in three core areas of education research, namely access and attainment, education quality and learning outcomes, and livelihood and other impacts concludes, however, that major information and knowledge gaps still exist with respect to the efficacy/impact of these education reforms to date, both individually and collectively.

In terms of key research priorities and types of research programmes that are needed to address these knowledge gaps, Bennell argues that (i) the currently pervasive global education reform model provides an ideal framework for a comprehensive, cross-country, policy-focused research programme; and (ii) the main focus of the research should be on large-scale school studies which can provide the basis for the robust assessment of policy interventions over time.

**Discussion 2: led by Lester Taylor**, Educational Consultant, New Zealand

So why have we achieved so little? Why are we constantly re-visiting issues and themes, and demonstrating little progress?

**Challenge 1: Why are we failing to make progress?**

The presentations offer evidence to support the claim that, despite international goodwill and considerable expenditure, the achievement of the millennium goals of basic education for all has not been achieved. In fact, the problem is greater now than it was at the time of the EFA Conference in Senegal in 2000. Clearly the strategies being used are not being successful. One suspects that throwing more money at the problem will not necessarily improve the success, but perhaps research into why efforts are failing might be helpful in enabling us to develop a more informed and focused research agenda for the future.

**Challenge 2: How do we establish effective stakeholder partnerships?**

One of the comments made by Vinayagum Chinapah in addressing the issue was the need for various stakeholders in a country to form a genuine partnership in the development of education strategies. He listed a variety of partners: state government, local and regional governments, civil society, the private sector, teachers, parents and students. To this list, the following might be added:

- Donors (e.g. The AID agencies of developed countries, charitable trusts, benefactors, international aid groups)
- Loan agencies (e.g. World Bank, Africa Development Bank, Asia Development Bank)
- Researchers
- Consultants/Implementers (individuals, civil society aid agencies, private sector companies, public sector organisations and institutions)

While these groups are not stakeholders in the same sense as those listed by Professor Chinapah, they are key players in developing and implementing education strategies. While their participation in the development of a country’s education strategic plan may sometimes be small, their participation in its implementation is considerable. For this reason their participation in any partnership is essential.
The partnership proposed by Professor Chinapah is logical, how each partnership is to be formed and evolved needs to be addressed. Each of the stakeholders has a specific role and outcomes which they wish to achieve. Their actions and ability to participate will have limits, some self-imposed and some imposed by others. At times the desired outcomes of the stakeholders may be in conflict. Initiating and managing the dialogue between the stakeholders and managing the process of establishing an agreed way forward requires a skilled and objective agency which has the trust of all parties. This role needs to be fulfilled by an objective, politically neutral, trusted and respected agency: how far can the Cambridge Centre for Commonwealth Education fulfil this role?

**Challenge 3: Developing a robust education strategy**

For the education strategic plan for a country to have any chance of success, it must:

- **Be built on a realistic goal**
  Obtaining agreement on an overarching goal is relatively easy – the millennium goal of basic education for all by 2015 is an example. However, “easily agreed” goals are often little more than wishful thinking and are often unachievable. They have a feel-good factor but result in failure. They may in fact get in the way of real progress. If a realistic goal is not agreed then failure is inevitable.

- **Be accepted by all**
  The strategic plan must be agreed to by all stakeholders and accepted and adhered to by those implementing it. If appropriate research is available it should be used to inform the plan. Research may be commissioned to answer gaps in the information available. Stakeholders may need to make compromises to get agreement.

  The plan must be robust and meet the scrutiny of donors/funders. At the same time, donors/funders must accept a robust plan and not attempt to change it to meet their own funding criteria – again compromise may be required.

  The plan must be designed to meet the needs of the country. Imported solutions are unlikely to succeed as each country has its own unique culture(s), issues and problems. A model which has been successful in one country will almost certainly need modification before it can be successful in another situation.

  Finding a solution to problems for a country requires an understanding of the culture of the country – its values, social issues, social structures and taboos. In countries with more than one indigenous population, the problems are compounded. Expatriate technical experts are just that – technical experts. Their specialist knowledge can support the development of solutions but cannot solve the problems.

- **Set an adequate time-frame**
  Many education strategies aim to achieve much more than is possible in the time available. The millennium goal to provide basic education for millions of children in the poorest countries in the world within a 15 year time frame was doomed to failure. There were and are simply too many barriers to be overcome in the time available to achieve the goal. The time-frame is wrong for that goal. In the 1990s Malaysia had its 20/20 vision – a 30 year time-frame. While that has now been abandoned for political reasons, it was a more realistic time scale.
Challenge 4: Identifying and managing barriers and risks

- **Barriers to success**
  There may be significant barriers to achieving the success of an education strategy. These must be identified and dealt with if the strategy is to succeed. If they cannot be removed then the education goal/strategy must be modified to address this. For example, there may not be enough teachers and inadequate facilities to train the necessary number. This must be addressed before the number of children in schools is increased. Some of the barriers may have nothing to do with education – they may be social or financial issues. For example, in some communities the family survives only because all members, including very young school age children must contribute to income and food gathering. The parents are not able to send their children to school.

  Barriers may be created by the implementation of the strategic plan. For example, increasing the school population increases the recurrent costs of the education system. Teacher salaries, building construction and maintenance and tuition costs all increase. This increase must be met by the government which may not have the income to do so.

- **Risks**
  Risks are different to barriers. Barriers are real and either exist prior to the implementation of the strategy or arise as a direct consequence of implementation. Risks may or may not occur, can usually be anticipated and managed. The identification and management of risks are a normal part of planning at all levels of education strategy development and implementation. Donors usually insist on this as part of their requirements for funding.

Challenge 5: Developing and following an implementation plan

- **Implementation plan**
  This is often the weakest component of an education strategy. The implementation plan should identify all the activities that need to be undertaken to achieve the goals and objectives of the strategy. Further it must plan the order in which the activities should be undertaken. Identifying which activities are dependent on the successful completion of other activities is critical to overall success.

  Often this important sequence is compromised, resulting in a piecemeal approach to the implementation of the education plan and, maybe, contributing to its actual failure. Most donors have parameters on the activities in which they are prepared to be involved. Many will not contribute to infrastructure development or to recurrent expenditure. Others may limit the nature of their involvement to specific areas of education, e.g. early childhood and primary but not secondary, or teacher education and curriculum development but not resource development. If a donor is offering funding support, their parameters for contribution may not fit the activities required at that time in the sequence. Rather than lose the funding, a project is undertaken that does not fit the logical development of the strategy.

Challenge 6: Where to from here for CCE?

The work to be done in international education is almost limitless. The CCE has made an impressive start in providing support in Africa and the Caribbean. But rather than just being another agency implementing projects and undertaking research there is the possibility for the Centre to develop as the first point of contact for a country wishing to develop its education strategy, strategic plan and implementation plan. The Centre could undertake some or all of the following:
- Provide expertise in all aspects of education strategic planning
- Develop a data base of research on aspects of international education
- Undertake research as required for countries
- Assist countries to develop effective working stakeholder partnerships
- Assist countries to engage effectively with donors
- Undertake projects as appropriate

CONVERSATIONS: 3

*Off The Beaten Track: Bridging The Gap Between Research, Policy And Practice In Africa*

Dr Wim Hoppers. University of Oslo and ADEA.

The basic argument of Wim Hoppers’ paper is that there is still little impact of African generated research on policy and practice. This is less because of low volume of such research, associated with declining capacity of state-supported research institutions, but foremost because of (a) the bias of the EFA/MDG agendas towards national systems’ reform in line with international ‘good practice’ in educational development; (b) the overwhelming influence of donor-sponsored consultancy-type research on the formation of policy and sector-planning; and (c) the difficulties African scholars face in constructing their own narratives in the context of reform work. Schools, rather than being arenas for autonomous participatory action at local level, informing national policy directions, are often at the receiving end of policy prescriptions. While ADEA is in the process of developing a more ‘praxis’- oriented approach to policy/practice review it faces significant challenges in changing both attitudes and institutional practices.

The paper focused on new ways of linking research, policy-making and practice development within changing conditions facing stakeholders involved in education in Africa. It examined some new initiatives in finding new and more effective ways in which research and policy-making have come to interact, their significance for educational development work and the challenges they are increasingly throwing up for changing policy and practice.

Much attention is given in the paper to the work of the Association for the Development of Education in Africa (ADEA), involving ministers of education, bilateral and multilateral funding and technical agencies, civil society organisations, centres of expertise and education practitioner communities in sharing and dialoguing on policy and practice development around the continent. Its experiences in developing an evidence-based approach for promoting dialogue and capacity development, using research to explore new ideas and experiment with innovations, are highlighted and assessed.

The paper showed that across different countries in Africa sustained efforts are being made to move away from an exclusive attention to the EFA/MDG agenda as a basis for educational reform to a much more contextualised and holistic agenda which is more demand than supply driven and which aims to respond more adequately to dramatically changing needs and conditions in the socio-economic and cultural environments of African education systems.
It argued that the agenda of EFA/MDG, dominated by perspectives brought in by international agencies, have constrained a country-based national understanding of issues and problems in African education, the formulation of ‘what works and what does not work’, the role of national research and the scope of policy measures taken to promote education for all. It is ADEA’s experience that moving beyond these constraints - interrogating policy frames, institutional structures and pedagogical processes - is not only possible but also conditional so as to enable countries to meet needs for individual development and for national sustainable development following principles of equity and inclusivity.

The paper explored the lessons that have been learned, new strategies that are being put in place and implications for future interactions between research work and policy/practice development. It also refers to challenges that ADEA faces in promoting educational transformation, through changing mindsets, new approaches to knowledge development, stimulating new frames for policy development, resource mobilisation and leadership development.

The interface between monitoring performance and how data is used
Ms Elizabeth Archer. University of Pretoria, South Africa

Monitoring of education systems has become a major policy issue in the last couple of years as monitoring and feedback of learner performance provides important information to politicians and the public alike. The cornerstone of monitoring performance is obtaining data from which inferences can be drawn. However, the way in which the information is presented to schools and teachers is of utmost importance if the information is to be used for improvement purposes. The aim of this research was to explore the type of information schools felt they needed based on two monitoring systems used in this South Africa Netherlands research development Programme on Alternatives in Development (SANPAD) project, namely the South African Secondary School Information System (SASSIS) and the South African Monitoring System in Primary Schools (SAMP). A further aim was to explore how schools used the information provided to inform change in teaching and learning.

A design research approach was employed in this study, which included the systematic design, development, trialling and evaluation of feedback interventions. This design approach resulted in the development of both a research based feedback intervention and knowledge about the characteristics and process of designing the feedback intervention. Twenty-two primary schools and twenty secondary schools participated in the project and were purposively sampled for maximum variation. Data were gathered in collaboration with schools, teachers and academic experts with data collection including baseline and follow-up assessments for learners on a primary (n=1700) and secondary (n=1874) school level, Delphi questionnaires (n=40), interviews (n=10), evaluation questionnaires (n=30), school observations (n=3) and journals (n=6).

The idea of data literacy, the ability to ask and answer meaningful questions by analysing and making sense of data, emerged strongly during the project. Of importance for the researchers working on this project, was the manner in which schools and teachers identify information needed for decision making, interpret the information and then use the information for improvement purposes. Focus was placed on how the reporting of monitoring information should be accessible to meet the needs of the schools and teachers, implying that the way in which feedback was provided evolved. Optimising how monitoring information is fed back to schools is an essential process if schools are to act on the information to implement instructional strategies. In addition, it is also imperative to put support structures in place to assist the schools and teachers, where the focus is on
how to use the data for improving teaching and learning. Therefore, the research team used the opportunity to explore different forms of feedback.

The level of data literacy varied from primary school to secondary school as well as amongst primary and secondary schools. While adequate support was provided to assist schools in interpreting and using information, the aim was to change the way feedback is presented so that it would adequately meet the needs of the schools. This is a departure from what is evident in literature where the feedback is provided to schools and teachers are trained to interpret the feedback but the way in which feedback is provided does not necessarily change in accordance with teacher needs. In the context of this research, it was crucial to treat the schools and teachers as experts who had valuable insights and contributions to offer to the process.

Several data paths, how and when the data travels to key role players, were possible but were dependent on the culture of the participating schools. The various data paths also illustrated who within the school was included and excluded from the decision-making process. Undoubtedly, data utilisation can be difficult to ascertain, but what was evident, was that the use of performance data for improvement purposes is a gradual process of uncovering obvious as well as less obvious forms of use. Adoption and implementation was clearly illustrated, including the dissemination of data, evaluation of applicability and incorporation of the data into practice. It was also noted that although different data paths were represented, it was not necessarily the case that one data path was better than the other. On the contrary, the different data paths identified were functional within the contexts in which they were found.

**Discussion 3:** led by Sue Swaffied, Cambridge Centre for Commonwealth Education.

- The discussion reiterated the crucial involvement of teachers in collaborative research: in the South African context, the teachers were vital to the development of the research. They were reflective about their practice, and the researchers changed their own perspectives and approaches in the light of teachers’ responses. What emerges here is the strength of practice-based research to reflect on and respond to teachers' emerging concerns and perspectives (LA).

- The ‘power of the purse’ is evident throughout; it was suggested that agency-driven research had three dominant models (collaborative, ‘ivory tower’ and exotic) which leaves little or no real capacity for in-depth research. The problem is one of research culture – in many contexts, it was suggested, outsiders (from the Global North) are respected and regarded more highly than indigenous researchers in the Global South (VC).

- The ADEA model might be seen as offering an alternative approach which is relevant, appropriate and fit for purpose. Research and policy used to be very close, with actors in both knowing each other very well and usually interacting in a concerted harmony. More recently, however, researchers and policy-makers have drifted apart and policy has begun to be developed on the basis of political goals, not within an evidence-based context. Donor research is still being carried out, but in response to a political, ministerial-driven agenda (similar to the UK, perhaps?). ADEA is attempting to build a dialogue with policy-makers, such that they accept more readily the idea of the need to use data to inform decisions – an idea that is still foreign to them. Decision-making is a political act, and we cannot pretend that research will inform policy (WH).

- The assumption of ‘rational man’ (sic), of someone who is very sensible and takes account of data, needs to be challenged. This is as untrue in the Global South as in the Global North, especially where the political stakes are so high. A pressing need is to generate research on how people make decisions on the ground; in the South
There was a call, too, for more ‘commonsense’ in policy-making; it was asserted that the power of the Minister is always in the background, and that frequently many policies are implemented, without the evidence that they can work (RB).

Frequently, too, data in Africa are often not used, and several participants questioned how ADEA’s programme will influence development. Individuals collect data, but it is often not used. What happens to the data collected in sector analysis? (GO)

How can one get policy-makers to bring about change? Through action research? Through the influence of practitioners? Need the Department of Education to come down to the level of the school: at present the process involves rhetoric, text, practice. Policy is made on the basis of untested practice by bureaucrats. (KK-M)

We need better links between policy-makers and researchers, with policy-makers involved in the reality of research. Local education is important, with schools linking up together and with others who have a bearing on education– a common dialogue (WM).

CONVERSATIONS: 4

Gurukulums: Equity and Excellence in Educating Scheduled Tribes in India
Professor K. Sujatha, National University of Educational Planning and Administration, New Delhi

Tribes constitute about 9% of the total population of India. They are one of the most disadvantaged and marginalized groups occupying low socio-economic level. The Constitution of India has envisaged special provisions for socio-economic development of tribes. Ensuing national and state governments adopted special policies and practices encompassing affirmative, welfare and equity measures to overcome inherent constraints. However, education of tribes characterizes low participation, high drop-out rates and poor achievement levels. To improve participation and impart quality education a policy practice of equity and excellence through Gurukulums (Residential Schools) has been adopted by one of the states (Andhra Pradesh) in India. This paper examines the effectiveness of Gurukulums in providing quality education to tribal children. The first part of the paper presents a brief overview of the tribal context, policies and programmes for their education. The second part explains the concept and objectives of Gurukulums followed by discussion of unique features and management of Gurukulums including teaching learning process and teacher accountability. The paper also elucidates significant factors that help Gurukulums to achieve distinction and efficiency in their performance. While discussing critical issues, challenges and lessons that can be drawn, the author concludes by arguing that the role of Gurukulums needs to be beyond academic performance and public examination results as tribal children need more soft skills to be successful in wider society.

Gender Equity, School Leadership, and National Development in the Commonwealth contexts
Dr Kapa Kelep-Malpo, University of Goroka, Papua New Guinea

The Pacific island nations have unique traditional cultures which have bound them together over the many centuries despite the intrusion of western values and practices.
Matrilineality, which is about tracing one’s lineage through the female ancestral line, is one of these. In traditional indigenous cultures as practised in North America, among the indigenous Indians, some parts of the African continent, Asia and the Pacific islands, women have property rights, decision-making powers and they also perform other significant roles in society. Male members, especially the maternal uncles are also important as they are the orators of the clan. Power in such societies is portrayed as being shared between the genders, which is in contrast to patriarchy and patrilineality where there is a tendency for males to dominate females.

Schools are strategic and powerful organizations in societies where the future leaders and citizens of a country are nurtured and exposed to values, beliefs and practices through the curriculum and the kinds of leadership practices modelled by those in authority. The organization of the school, school pupils’ mindsets about the leadership potential of both women and men and their attitudes towards the full utilization of the human resources in schools can also be shaped by organizational cultures that promote, recognize, and utilize the strengths of feminine and masculine leadership qualities as practised in matrilineal cultures.

Studies of female and male head teachers of secondary and primary schools in Papua New Guinea and abroad have revealed how school organizations benefit when male and female school administrators collaboratively lead and manage. These studies have also shown that both female and male school principals have potential to produce effective and responsive schools that make a difference to society regardless of their gender.

The literature informs us that developed countries are reaping the benefits of amalgamating the best of both masculine and feminine leadership qualities in the workplace. This has influenced policy making at the local, provincial and national government levels. Likewise, developing countries in the Commonwealth that are searching for means to help them transform their societies through their educational institutions should also follow suit. The missing link in many of these countries has been the promotion and effective practice of gender equity in all sectors of society including school organizations.

Gender equity is an essential building-block in sustainable development at all levels of society and government. Such development cannot be achieved in a country if only half of its population is involved in the process. Similarly, a bird cannot be in full flight to its destination if it only has one wing, it needs both wings. Some societies have been practising gender equity since the traditional era although these have been challenged by the introduction of western values and practices which are closely aligned with patrilineal practices and beliefs. However, the positive effects of matrilineal practices have blended well with the contemporary global targets set by the United Nations Millennium Goals for gender equality and the empowerment of women.

Policy makers in developing countries of the Commonwealth which are not seriously addressing the under-representation of women in leadership positions at all levels of society, in particular, in educational institutions, have no excuse not to appoint more female leaders. These appointments should be on merit. Working together with male colleagues both can transform schools and the attitudes and values of staff, students and the communities at the micro as well as the macro level in society. The paradigm shift in a leadership and management focus from the scientific management approaches to the contemporary leadership styles which are closely aligned with the feminine leadership qualities is another boost to promote gender equity as a vehicle for national development.
This study reconceptualises some of the critical policy initiatives to “democratize education” and the convergence of successive governments in educational reform that makes Mauritius a showcase for Africa. In particular, it presents the factors that have prompted the incremental policy changes in curriculum, the teaching learning transaction and the replication of good practice nationwide. In recent times, the focus has been in the transformation of education into a world class system directed towards a sustained change that ensures high level achievements for all students irrespective of their diverse socio-economic and cultural backgrounds. Education has a moral purpose, a “compelling drive” to do right for and by students, to raise the bar and narrow the gap and learn from each other in a multicultural setting in Mauritius and grow in this world we live in.

The Mauritian curriculum is the focal point and different ways are adopted for integrating culture and new technologies with learning. Government is pursuing its action towards the creation of a “Knowledge Hub Nation” with a “knowledge-rich profession” where teachers have the opportunity to participate as “knowledge worker[s]” (Drucker, 1989) which enables them to have an informed professional judgment on the prescription and delivery of the curriculum.

The extent to which the leadership style, the restructuring process and even decentralized activities in a tiny island, give greater freedom and authority to school heads are also highlighted. Our schools are being supplemented by leadership and informed decision-making based on high quality data on schools. Politics and governance are critical for aligning the intellectual, spiritual, financial and social capital to achieve its goals.

The strength of formal and informal emerging partnerships with their shared vision and social networks with research groups, civic groups and private agencies, are considered critical in building up an inclusive society and aligning the few fundamental goals and principles. Our main resource is our people.

Our inspiration is our heritage of four diasporas. We have an African, Indian, Chinese and European heritage to anchor our pride in. The Mauritian civilization is characterized by its openness: an inclusive or internal openness that allows each ethnic group to live together with people of different ancestral backgrounds with an expanding dialogue with diverse ethnic, political and linguistic groups; dialogic openness where there is mutual learning, one has the right to disagree and to communicate freely within a multi-racial society; interactive openness where different communities enjoy a constructive relationship, adopt a philosophy of tolerance, share and demonstrate respect for differences in languages, cultures and traditions.

Developing a global base for intercultural education through tolerance, democracy, human rights and peace. Inter-culturalism is a must against war and violence. The multi-cultural component is an integral part of our academic programmes at all levels. Specifically, the multidisciplinary postgraduate programmes focus on current development and challenges, namely international cooperation to adjust in a globalised world, peace and interdependence of societies, transculture- relationship between culture, tolerance and mutual learning and working towards a complementarity of cultures.

The National Development Plans for Socio-Economic Development are intended to:

- democratize education to ensure that education does not only serve a public but it also creates a public. Public education should have credibility in which the community can place its trust and confidence
• spread schools evenly: to reduce differential access and opportunity

• diversify the curriculum to expose the child to different styles of pedagogy where process creativity is considered more important than product creativity

• enhance lifelong learning: to adapt to multiple differences and prepare children to negotiate the digital revolution

• reduce the mismatch between schools and the world of work: to make the system more flexible and adaptable so that the children working in hundreds of countries, in jobs not yet known, will be able to “unlearn” and “relearn”.

Our schools are focused on three themes: results, equity and community. They perform a limited set of functions effectively. Major decisions relate to school performance and practices but many critical decisions are still taken at the head office. There has been a breakthrough in leadership and genuine devolution of power and responsibility and accountability. The wider community is seriously getting engaged in supporting education at all levels. New schools have been built to make them suitable for teaching and learning in the 21st century and hold pride of place in the community. The Curriculum reflects the need to preserve and promote cultural values. The way forward will be determined by the extent to which the Minister of Finance engages with education to keep the economy afloat.

**Discussion 4:** led by Professor Maurice Galton, Cambridge Centre for Commonwealth Education.

These three case studies pose questions about the critical issues and challenges facing schools developed to integrate isolated and marginalised groups (KS), about whether gender equity could be the missing link that developing countries in the Commonwealth could all pursue to fully utilize the human resources in the country (K K-M), and about the nature of school leadership in ‘world-class’ schools and what new knowledge and skills are needed by teacher in such contexts (RB).

A number of issues were raised in discussion:

• What can be done when there is little government support for educational initiatives?

• What does equity look like in the context of 84 million students in central India?

• How have countries such as Mauritius successfully reconciled diversity and equity, while offering a broader curriculum? What lessons can be learnt from the Mauritian case study which might have wider applicability? The contrast with Singapore, where there has been a failure to implement significant change in practice despite sustained support, might be salutary and worth exploring.

• MG suggested that (i) there are classroom strategies with considerable potential to improve the quality of teaching and learning; (ii) the need to recognise the limitations of traditional PPD ‘courses’ and the potential of ‘communities of practice’; (iii) asked: if changing teacher practice is so difficult, what does this suggest about teacher educators, those who provide initial teacher programmes: coping with initiation periods, but also developing the necessary mindset whereby NQTs see the necessity for subsequent phases and they move from novice to expert.
Historically Malaysia has been a multiracial country with a recent census showing the indigenous Malays and natives at 66.8%, Chinese 24.5%, Indians 7.4%, and others 1.3%. Strategically, education has often been deployed as a vitally instrumental medium to build and preserve unity and solidarity among the different races. However, in 1969, a civil riot broke out in the country indicating that the calm and peace that was taken for granted after independence in 1957, was illusive. Subsequently, the government introduced the New Economic Policy (NEP) in 1970, with the belief that the socioeconomic disparity amidst the races was the cause for the racial tension. The NEP aimed at restructuring the capital ownership of the races and targeted a number of education reforms to support its national aspiration.

By the 1980s and 1990s, the adverse development of race relations had become a national phenomenon with racial segregation and polarization becoming a way of life, and a growing trend especially among the younger generations. At the same time more non-Malay parents started enrolling their children in the vernacular schools. The government had to act with fresh education reforms focused more on bringing the people together, becoming comfortable in each other’s company, and becoming more multicultural. As a result, the ‘Vision School’ policy for ‘racial integration’ was implemented.

The Vision School policy was initiated in 1995, which aimed to house the vernacular schools of the Chinese and Indians within a common compound where a Malay national school was located. The idea was to create opportunities for the students to mingle, share, and take part in co-curricular and cultural activities that would be jointly organized by the school people. The end result the government aimed for was that the students would be able to socialize, become culturally aware of each other, and learn to cooperate and coexist.

When the Vision School policy was first introduced it raised a great deal of mixed feelings and suspicion among the non-Malays. They perceived it as a ploy by the government to do away with the wholly Mandarin and Tamil medium schools, which they feared would undermine their identity and continuance of their traditions, culture and ethnic languages. The Chinese were so opposed to the idea of the Vision School policy that they limited their participation to just one school.

This study involved three of the Vision Schools situated in the northern, central, and southern regions of the country, and investigated if and how the culturally oriented teaching-learning was carried out in the Vision Schools; how the teachers were prepared and supported for it and if there was a general scope of conduct and behaviour for them inside the school; and, what kind of role the school principals had to play and how they were prepared for it. The study was carried out on the assumption that the Vision School policy was a nascent experiment in multicultural education, as indicated by all the printed materials available on it. However, it turned out that not much was going on with regards to multicultural education per se in the Vision Schools. In the process, attention was drawn towards examining and understanding the Vision School policy itself only to find that it was indeed inadequately processed and executed.

The study revealed numerous pitfalls in the policy, in its conception, formulation,
execution, and evaluation. There was a lack of coherent and sequential alignment of the policy cycle, policy instruments and critical action domains in line with the Vision School policy objectives that affected practice. Questions did arise as to why the government did such a shoddy job of an immensely important policy.

The study also elucidated that the Vision School policy was absolutely necessary, relevant, and timely for the country. Originally, in the Seventh Malaysia Plan (1995-2000), the government had projected establishing fourteen Vision Schools throughout the country. However, by 2005/2006 when this study was undertaken, it had instituted only eight of them, which number remains to date. Has the policy been stalled; or, put on hold for the policy makers to take a second look at it? Certainly, there are lessons to be derived from the Malaysian Vision Schools but more so from the point of policy formulation and execution rather than the actual practice and challenge of implementing multicultural education.
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<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tr>
<th>Tuesday 29 June: afternoon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Keynote 2:</strong> Professor Vinayagum Chinapah, Chair of International and Comparative Education, Institute of International Education, Stockholm University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education of Quality for ALL – Myth or Reality?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Synergies in Research, Policy and Practice I</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations in which key players from the various lead countries / projects currently involved with the Centre for Commonwealth Education reflect on the issues raised and identify challenges and possible next steps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender, Poverty and Achievement in Africa and the Caribbean</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Molly Warrington, Dr Sue Kiragu and Dr Alicia Fentiman, CCE, in discussion with Dr Patricia George (Ministry of Education, Antigua) and Martha Muhwezi (FAWE, Uganda)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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</tr>
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### Paper 4
Dr. Wim Hoppers, ADEA, Visiting Professor, Comparative and International Education, University of Oslo, Norway

**Off the beaten track: Reviewing research and policy-making in Africa**

### New Synergies in Research, Policy and Practice II

**Grappling with Hurdles of Educational Reform: the Case of Teacher Supply in Tanzania**

Dr Ciaran Sugrue and Dr Alicia Fentiman, CCE, in discussion with Dr Hilary Dachi, University of Dar-es- Salaam

### Wednesday 30 June: afternoon

**Paper 5** Professor K. Sujatha, Head of Comparative Education, National University of Educational Planning and Administration (NUEPA), New Delhi

*Gurukulums: Equity and Excellence in Educating Scheduled Tribes in India*

**Paper 6** Dr Kapa Kelep-Malpo Dean of the Faculty of Education at Goroka, Papua New Guinea

*Gender Equity, School Leadership and National Development in the Commonwealth Contexts*

**Paper 7** Rajesh Bhowon, Consultant and iNet (International Networking for Educational Transformation)

*A Case Study: Educational Reform in Mauritius*

### Thursday 1 July: morning

**Keynote 3:** Professor Suseela Malakolunthu, Department of Educational Management, Planning and Policy, University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.

*Multicultural Education in Primary Vernacular Schools: Lessons from the Malaysian ‘Vision School’ Policy*

### New synergies in Research, Policy and Practice III

**Transforming School Leadership Policy and Practice in Sub-Saharan Africa: Does Research Matter?**

Sue Swaffield and John MacBeath, CCE, in discussion with Dr George Oduro, Institute for Educational Planning and Administration, University of Cape Coast, Ghana

### Thursday 1 July: afternoon

**Open Forum: Emerging Challenges: Perspectives from the Conference Proceedings**

**Closing Remarks** Judy Curry, Commonwealth Education Trust
Centre for Commonwealth Education: Current and Continuing Priorities, 2011-2012

In its first two years of existence, the Centre has developed collaborative partnerships in the areas of school leadership, effective pedagogies and initial and continuing teacher education, aiming to explore synergies across these key themes. Within these themes, a number of programmes focus on specific aspects of individual and social learning, on the social and cultural conditions which support or constrain change, and the implicit role of leadership in that process.

ASKAIDS African Sexual Knowledges of AIDS

This three country study in sub-Saharan Africa is focusing on understanding how primary aged pupils acquire sexual knowledge, in what contexts and how this relates to the HIV education received in schools. On the basis of this research, the programme aims to develop a Tool kit for AIDS education … to be available initially to pilot schools and subsequently to schools and to teacher education establishments throughout East Africa and South Africa. In the development phase (2011-12), the research will be focused in different locations to establish a locally-based curriculum development process for HIV education which schools and teachers which may address the issues of teacher ownership, cultural value clashes between the community and the school and the stated needs of pupils.

Gender Equity within East Africa and the Caribbean

The project aims, in collaboration with FAWE and UNICEF, to develop an understanding of practice in relation to gender and education in East Africa, to develop research and intervention projects that are focused around the needs of girls in Kenya and Uganda, and to impact positively and directly on educational policy and practice. In the Caribbean, the emphasis in the first instance is on identifying strategies which have the potential to raise achievement of primary age pupils in government schools in Antigua, and to develop school-based communities of practice in order to enable headteachers and senior teachers to engage in dialogue about pedagogy and leadership for learning.

Planning for Leadership and Learning, Ghana

Through discussions with a range of partnership bodies, the three key aims of this programme are to strengthen the leadership capacity of basic school headteachers in Ghana, to improve the quality of learning through school and classroom leadership, and to influence policy making so that school leadership is centred on pupil, professional and organisational learning. It is planned that developing principles for practice will both guide the appointment of basic school headteachers and provide the framework for continuing leadership development. This is currently being approached through an extensive, multi layered network of local participants at regional and local level, with professional development leaders, circuit supervisors and school headteachers, as key ‘players’, supporting the Ghana Education Service in taking forward the leadership for learning principles and practice, and in developing the GES’s headteacher’s handbook.

Promoting enquiry-based learning through ICT use in Zambian primary education

The OER4Schools project assessed the feasibility of supporting interactive forms of subject pedagogy, through the use of Open Educational Resources and ICT in computer- and Internet-enabled primary schools in Zambia. The second phase of the project aims to help teachers and learners develop activities which use digital technology and resources
in effective, interactive ways, and to share their new subject practices and curriculum resources with others. The proposal uses technology to support teachers to support learning, and develops a multimedia resource, embedded in a teacher education programme, to stimulate change in thinking and practice.

**Pedagogy and Leadership in Tanzanian Primary Schools**

This intervention programme has been based initially in a typical urban school in a high density, heterogeneous community with high levels of poverty and unemployment, in Dar es Salaam. The intensive case study research has focused on the teaching of English, with the aim of improving the quality of teaching, learning and leadership throughout the school. In partnership with the District Education Office, plans for 2011-12 envisage the consolidation and dissemination of the findings from the pedagogy-leadership initiative to other urban schools within Dar es Salaam and to scale up in other regions of East Africa.

**Caribbean Poetry Project**

The Caribbean Poetry Project aims to promote achievement through learning and teaching of Caribbean poetry in schools in the Caribbean and UK, to develop a joint research element between the University of West Indies (UWI) and Centre, and to incorporate element of the national UK Poetry Archive within the project. At the heart of this endeavour is the desire to instil knowledge, understanding and, ideally, a love of Caribbean poetry in young learners (of secondary school age in the first instance) and, where appropriate, to link it with the wider arts. Shared areas of interest and concern in the teaching and learning of Caribbean poetry have been identified and a shared focus has been developed in the form of a Teaching Caribbean Poetry Course to be delivered and evaluated in the Caribbean and the UK.

**Youth Poverty in the Commonwealth**

This project focuses on aspects of young people’s lives in three urban centres (Cape Town, Mumbai, and Vancouver). It will seek to identify and analyse the relationship between 21st century forms of rising social anxiety in large urban centres and excluded low income youth’s perceptions of heightened surveillance regimes at the fringe of the urban core. Interviews with young people will assess how they conceptualize issues of identity, belonging, risk, safety and security in relation to new expressions of moral panic and economic disadvantage, and in response to the spatial re-organization of urban inner city life. A teacher education/social services practitioner textbook will showcase the significance of visual methods, geographical approaches and oral histories for educating the public about economic disadvantage and young people living at the urban fringe of the twenty first century metropolis in Africa, India and Canada.

**New Directions for the Future**

**By 2013-14, the Centre will have:**

1. Identified a new Director to develop independently-funded research and intervention programmes which embody the vision and values of the Centre.

2. Established sustainable, reciprocal partnerships in current projects, which contribute to improving the quality of children’s lives, enriching the quality of learning and teaching, and improving the well-being of children and youth within and beyond school in countries of the Commonwealth.

3. Consolidated synergies and links across existing programmes, within the broad themes of effective pedagogies, teacher education and leadership for learning.
4. Developed a set of publications which have showcased the work of the Centre and its partnership with the Commonwealth Education Trust, and which have in turn generated new revenue streams.

5. Established new partnerships with other Commonwealth intergovernmental associations and with interested partners within the University of Cambridge, develop inter-disciplinary synergies consistent with the aims and ambitions of the Centre, so enabling the Centre to offer a high profile, highly visible consultancy service to Commonwealth governments.

6. Acquired new funding streams to complement that from the Commonwealth Education Trust, so enabling the further development of the Centre through the period 2012-15.

7. Increased research and development capacity within the Centre, through broadening of links with other specialist staff within the Faculty of Education which contribute to sustaining a new range of programmes, some specifically in the field of teacher education (see elaboration below).

8. Developed a cohort of funded doctoral students from Commonwealth countries, in collaboration with Cambridge Commonwealth Trust, to work on country-specific programmes which have been identified in collaboration with national governments and NGOs.

9. Widened the sphere of influence of its work to establish new collaborative initiatives in Commonwealth countries in South Asia, the Pacific Islands and the Caribbean, and will have established links with key universities in Australia, South Africa and Canada.

To realise these ambitions, the Centre needs to …

- **Develop a Teacher Education programme in one or more contexts:** the Centre is able to draw upon the extensive experience of the University’s Faculty of Education in establishing strong teacher-education partnerships with schools and education authorities / ministries over the last two decades. It benefits from, and contributes to, the extension of intellectually rigorous study of teaching to Masters / doctoral level. This has helped the Centre to support a well-developed range of school- and classroom-based research, and to develop participatory models of learning by students, by teachers, at classroom, school and systemic levels. Implicit in these is a revisiting of the nature and roles of leadership for learning. The Centre intends to develop the teacher education initiatives within the various programmes outlined above, to consolidate a model of initial and continuing teacher education which unifies school-based practice and research within a partnership framework, and to trial and further develop this model for teachers’ developing professionalism. These rely on effective partnerships with teacher education institutions in appropriate contexts. The Centre is looking to develop this initiative in 2011 and 2012 with partner institutions in (for example) the UK and parts of East Africa, South Asia, the Caribbean and Singapore (cross references to points 3, 5, 7, 9 above).

- **Refine its model of effective pedagogies:** many of the current programmes have learning and teaching as their core concern. The Centre needs to explore and identify, within these different programmes, the essence of effective pedagogies, which support learning in local contexts in different parts of the Commonwealth, often in challenging conditions of very large classes, limited resources and variable teacher professional development and expertise (points 2, 3, 4, 9).
• **Disseminate outcomes from the Leadership for Learning programme**: consolidate the current programme in Ghana, in order to create and sustain supportive networks within the regions of Ghana of headteachers and critical friends, publish the toolbox of ideas, strategies and techniques developed within the Ghanaian context, sharing this approach to capacity building / sustainable development with other centres to test the transferability and applications of this approach to leadership for learning. (points 2, 3, 4, 7, 9)

• **Explore potential links with other organisations within the University of Cambridge**: the Centre is well-placed to be a major focus for the ‘education for development’ agenda, and can achieve more through liaison with academics in the University’s Area Studies Centres, allied social science departments and organisations such as the Humanitarian Centre, Cambridge International Examinations and Cambridge University Press (point 5), and through links with the Cambridge Commonwealth Scholarship Fund (point 8). As part of a drive for visibility, the Centre will sponsor a series of high profile public lectures.

• **Consolidate the role of the CCE within the Faculty of Education**, to achieve greater synergy with the Centre for Education and International Development, and to increase the participation of other University Teaching Officers in the work of the Centre (points 1, 6, 7, 9).

• **Develop a more effective fund-raising capacity** through identification of resource within Centre to develop links with funding bodies, and to develop bids for grants; explore developing links with Cambridge International Examinations and with Cambridge University Press (points 1, 5, 6).

• **Contribute more effectively to the education agenda within the Commonwealth**: The Centre shares common concerns and interests with both the Commonwealth-Secretariat (C-S) and the Commonwealth of Learning (CoL). The Commonwealth Secretariat’s operational work plan (2010-12) has a central focus on access and inclusion in education, with project plans which relate to gender, the education of marginalised populations, enhancing the delivery of multi-grade projects and the feminisation of the teaching profession; these are all central concerns for the CCE. The C-S also makes reference to working in liaison with ADEA (*the Association for the Development of Education in Africa*), with which the CCE also has close links. CoL has a central concern with open and distance learning and with teacher education, both major themes of the CCE. There is an implicit imperative in working in closer liaison with these organisations, if only to avoid duplication of effort and energy. The possibilities for more integrated and collaborative working is compelling. The CCE would also hope to contribute papers and inputs to 18CCEM, in June 2012, and to UKFIET (UK Forum for International Education and Training) (September 2011) (points 2, 4, 5, 9).

• **Develop a range of publications** which arise from the work of the current programmes, and publish these in different formats, as appropriate for different audiences: toolkits, teachers’ resource handbooks, multi-media resources, journal articles. Establish a systematic data base of research and teaching interventions which inform and arise from the current programmes, and which can be accessed by teachers, learners and researchers across the Commonwealth (points 2, 3, 4).

• **Develop effective stakeholder partnership** with NGOs, ministries, university faculties, donors, teachers, parents and students, to advise and support the development of education strategic plans within different Commonwealth countries. This will enable the Centre to offer an objective, politically neutral, trusted and respected agency in such contexts, with possibilities for the Centre to develop as the
• **Develop a more effective public relations and communication strategy** in order to disseminate outcomes, widen our reach and partnerships, maintain relationships with other relevant organisations and communicate in a dynamic and timely manner.