



United Kingdom  
National Commission for UNESCO



**HIGHER EDUCATION AND INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT: THE  
CONTRIBUTION OF UNESCO CHAIRS**

**COLLOQUIUM**

**Thursday 17<sup>th</sup> to Friday 18<sup>th</sup> January 2008**

**UNESCO Chair and Centre for Comparative Education Research  
School of Education  
University of Nottingham, UK**

## Contents

1. Introduction
2. Programme
3. Papers
4. Summaries of UNESCO Chairs in the UK
5. Biographies of Speakers
6. Delegate List

## Introduction

The **UNITWIN/UNESCO Chairs Programme** was established in 1992. It was conceived as a way to advance research, training and programme development in higher education by building university networks and encouraging inter-university cooperation through transfer of knowledge across borders. The Programme has grown into a worldwide inter-university cooperation network operating in all of UNESCO's fields of competence. Today some 630 UNESCO Chairs and 67 UNITWIN Networks have been in the Programme involving over 760 institutions in 125 countries.

UNITWIN/UNESCO Chairs undertake training and research activities in UNESCO's major programmes areas (education, natural sciences, social and human sciences, culture, and communication and information), engaging universities in global development efforts and contributing to achieving UNESCO's goals of peace, mutual understanding and equitable and sustainable human development. The majority of Chairs are interdisciplinary and inter-sectoral. They involve academics, scholars and graduate students, as well as key partners from civil society and the economic sector.

UNESCO Chairs and UNITWIN Networks are very important assets for higher education at large and for UNESCO. The Programme contributes significantly to the quality and development of higher education at large by developing curriculum, conducting courses, and undertaking research in UNESCO's fields of competence, which include subjects that might otherwise be overlooked in a given context. In addition, UNESCO Chairs and UNITWIN Networks can help to strengthen UNESCO's programme implementation, enhance the impact of UNESCO's action, and strengthen the Organization's global and regional outreach.

In the UK, there are currently nine established UNESCO Chairs and the number is set to increase.

This colloquium, hosted by the UK National Commission for UNESCO and the UNESCO Chair and Centre for Comparative Education Research at the University of Nottingham, focuses on 'Higher Education and International Development: The contribution of UNESCO Chairs'.

The colloquium provides an opportunity to examine the role of higher education in international development and to highlight the importance of the UNESCO Chairs network as a think-tank and arena for inter-university cooperation and transfer of knowledge. Presentations will be given by Chairholders of the UNESCO Chairs in the UK, on the contribution of the Chairs to international development, as well as presentations by Professor Alec Boksenberg, Chair of the UK National Commission for UNESCO, and Professor Georges Haddad, Director of the Division of Higher Education, UNESCO HQ.

*W. J. Morgan*

Professor W. John Morgan,  
UNESCO Chair in Political Economy of Education, University of Nottingham,  
Convenor, UK UNESCO Chairs' Group,  
UK National Commission for UNESCO

## Programme

### Thursday 17<sup>th</sup> JANUARY 2008

12.00-13.00	Check In	NCSL Learning and Conference Centre
13.00-14.00	Registration and Lunch	Dearing Building, Rm B37
14.00-14.15	Welcome Addresses	Dearing Building, Rm B33
	<i>Professor W. John Morgan, UNESCO Chairholder, University of Nottingham</i>	
	<i>Professor David Riley, Pro-Vice Chancellor, University of Nottingham</i>	
14.15-14.45	UNESCO Review of Natural Sciences and Social and Human Sciences	
	<i>Professor Alec Boksenberg, Chair, UK National Commission for UNESCO</i>	
14.45-15.30	UNESCO's Vision for the UNITWIN/UNESCO Chairs Programme	
	<i>Professor Georges Haddad, Director, Division of Higher Education, UNESCO</i>	
15.30-16.00	UNESCO Chair in Political Economy of Education	
	<i>Professor W. John Morgan, UNESCO Chairholder, University of Nottingham</i>	
16.00-16.30	UNESCO Chair in Higher Education Management	
	<i>Professor Richard Mawditt, UNESCO Chairholder, University of Bath</i>	
16.30-17.00	Tea and Biscuits	
17.00-17.30	UNESCO Chair in ICT for Development	
	<i>Professor Tim Unwin, UNESCO Chairholder, Royal Holloway, University of London</i>	
17.30-18.00	General Discussion	
19.15	<i>Gather to depart for dinner</i>	NCSL Learning and Conference Centre foyer
19.30-	Dinner	University of Nottingham Club (University Park Campus)

### FRIDAY 18<sup>th</sup> JANUARY 2008

09.00-09.30	UNESCO Chair in Interfaith Studies	Dearing Building, Rm B33
	<i>Professor Jonathan Webber, UNESCO Chairholder, University of Birmingham</i>	
09.30-10.00	UNESCO Chair in Intercultural Studies and Teacher Education	
	<i>Professor Jagdish Gundara, UNESCO Chairholder, Institute of Education, University of London</i>	
10.00-10.30	UNESCO Chair in Education for Pluralism, Human Rights and Democracy	
	<i>Professor Alan Smith, UNESCO Chairholder, University of Ulster</i>	
10.30-11.00	UNESCO Chair in Education as a Humanitarian Response	
	<i>Dr Colin Brock, UNESCO Chairholder, University of Oxford</i>	
11.00-11.15	Morning Coffee	
11.15-11.45	UNESCO Chair in HIV/AIDS, Education and Health Security in Africa	
	<i>Professor Colin McInnes, UNESCO Chairholder, Aberystwyth University</i>	
11.45-12.15	UNESCO Chair in Gender Research Designate	
	<i>Professor Sylvia Walby, UNESCO Chairholder Designate, Lancaster University</i>	
12.15-12.45	General Discussion and Closing Remarks	
12.45-	Lunch	

## Papers

### **“A Strategic Framework for the Future of the Sciences in UNESCO Report of the Overall Review Committee for Major Programmes II (Natural Sciences) and III (Social and Human Sciences)”**

Professor Alexander Boksenberg CBE FRS FInstP *Chair, UK National Commission for UNESCO*

*This paper contains amended extracts from the Report by the Director-General on the Conclusions and Recommendations of the Expert Team on the Overall Review of Major Programmes II and III, presented at the 176<sup>th</sup> session of UNESCO's Executive Board, held in Paris in April 2007.*

#### **Background**

- **General Conference Resolution**

This Review was initiated by a Resolution,<sup>1</sup> adopted by the 33rd General Conference in October 2005, submitted by Denmark, Finland, France, Iceland, Norway, Slovenia, Sweden and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. This requested the Director-General to undertake an Overall Review of Major Programmes II (Natural Sciences) and III (Social and Human Sciences) in light of the Organization's mandate, country and regional priorities, and today's global needs. To undertake the Review, the Resolution requested the Director-General to set up a team of expert scientific representatives of Member States, inclusive of all regions, working in close partnership with the Secretariat. The Resolution further requested the Director-General to submit a report on the conclusions and recommendations of the expert team with a view to integrating the agreed conclusions and recommendations into the Medium-Term Strategy for 2008-2013 (34 C/4) and the Programme and Budget for 2008-2009 (34 C/5).

- **Composition of the Review Committee**

In February 2006, following consultations with the Electoral Groups, the Director-General selected members of the Review Committee, to be chaired by the Deputy Director-General. Fifteen external experts serving in their personal capacities were appointed, together with the Assistant Directors-General for Natural Sciences (SC), Social & Human Sciences (SHS) and the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC) and the Director of the Bureau of Strategic Planning (BSP). The Director of the Internal Oversight Service (IOS) was given an observer status.

#### **Findings of the Committee**

The Committee posed the question – how can UNESCO's Science Programmes make a significant difference in the 21st century? Recognizing the strengths and weaknesses of UNESCO's present strategy, its programmes, and management and administration, the Committee identified the following key findings:

- **The changing world context and resulting challenges for UNESCO**

Although the global context has greatly evolved over the past six decades, UNESCO's mandate in science and in all its Sectors is at least as relevant today as since its founding. Today, the world faces new challenges as a result of unequal economic development, environmental degradation, demographic evolution, political transformations, and globalization. Major threats to natural and human security such as global climate change, emergence and spread of infectious diseases and loss of biological diversity are testing our intellectual capabilities, while humanitarian imperatives and development needs remain as critical as ever. Sustainable solutions, whether at the global, regional or country level, require more advances in scientific knowledge, discoveries and understanding, stronger integration of research and education, and identification of practical measures for action.

---

<sup>1</sup> 33 C/Resolution 2.

- ***New trends in science and technology***

Science and technology have moved forward dramatically, becoming increasingly complex, interdisciplinary and international. New scientific paradigms and conceptual frameworks, and new collaborative approaches are pushing the frontier in all areas of the natural, social and human sciences. Science, technology and innovation are now universally recognized as the drivers of national economic development and as key contributors to poverty reduction, disease prevention and environmental conservation. Sustainability issues have acquired renewed saliency. Thus, it is imperative that UNESCO's Science Programmes reflect and take advantage of the latest advances in scientific research and new conceptual thinking, as well as technological innovations.

- ***UNESCO has a unique role to play in the sciences within the United Nations in today's world***

UNESCO has one real comparative advantage within the UN system: it is the only agency which, through its mission, can integrate science, education, and culture. However, given its limited budget, UNESCO cannot be a funding agency for research or development. It can act as a catalyst for actions performed in collaboration with others, thus providing significant financial leveraging and maximizing the Organization's impact. In this way, it facilitates participation in research, including the development of networks, and in the articulation and application of research results in global, regional and national endeavours. UNESCO's international credibility, special mandate for science within the UN system, intellectual reputation, convening power and global presence provide a solid foundation for its crucial roles as facilitator and capacity builder.

In particular, the Organization can act as a facilitator of global, regional, and country-level science policy development by improving the base of relevant scientific research knowledge and communicating that knowledge by promoting policy work and participating in formulating policy advice, as well as building country capacity in policy making, scientific monitoring and benchmarking. This collective activity fits UNESCO's multilateral standing as a UN agency, its cross-disciplinary capability, and its respected global reach to both governments and civil society.

- ***UNESCO needs a new vision and forward-looking strategy with greater impact for its Science Programmes***

Given its unique mandate for science, UNESCO should be the leading promoter within the UN system for the transformative power of scientific knowledge through fostering dialogue, cooperation, networking and knowledge-sharing with the scientific community, decision-makers and civil society. However, following a series of hearings from scientific experts from both developing and developed countries, the Committee recognizes that UNESCO has over time lost its leadership credibility as an international spokesman for science and that its programmes are now seen by the scientific community as fragmented, overambitious, unfocused, and lacking a clear vision and scientific strategy.

Better priority-setting is needed in UNESCO's Science Programmes, based on relevance, effectiveness, impact, efficiency and sustainability. For example, UNESCO must enhance its efforts in science education and capacity-building at all levels and create opportunities to integrate education and training with research in its programmes. It is particularly important to strengthen national science systems for higher education and research.

The sciences portfolio should be rigorously examined on a continuous and regular basis to determine which activities are marginal, or duplicative of other UN or other international organizations whose efforts are more suited to the role. While long-term continuity is essential to aspects of science, it is also valuable to foster new and innovative activities. UNESCO must make strategic choices based on its mandate, a dynamic analysis of its comparative advantage and of emerging challenges, and on joint and purposeful action by the United Nations system. Linking UNESCO's objectives in the sciences to the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) of promoting international peace and of fighting poverty within the 2015 timeline is crucial to gain credibility within the UN system. Moreover, UNESCO's work should be considered in the context of the current larger debate on UN Reform.

- ***Intersectoral coordination and interdisciplinary thinking are lacking and need to be integrated within the existing activities and any new programmes and activities***

Following extensive briefings from all UNESCO's Sectors, the Committee noted a lack of inter-connectedness in staffing and budget structure, creating a culture of scientific and sectoral isolation which hinders efforts to promote integrated activities, synergies among the sciences, cross-disciplinary collaboration and a focus on challenges and solutions.

For example, aspects of the water cycle are principally in the domain of the Division of Water Sciences within the Natural Sciences Sector. Yet all the global problems linked with water must also be considered from the viewpoint of social and human sciences, education, culture and communication and information – across all UNESCO's Sectors.

The goals of sustainable development and a better managed environment and the mission of increasing societal research capacity are as dependent upon an understanding of human societies, approaches to risk and reward,

cultural and economic influences, and individual and group decision-making, as they are on understanding of the physical world. Thus, neither natural sciences nor social and human sciences can achieve any of UNESCO's goals alone – both aspects are required.

At present, the Natural Sciences Sector and the Social and Human Sciences Sector are unsuccessful in building on their combined strengths to address scientific questions of societal and economic importance. UNESCO's Science Programmes are not planned and structured to integrate these diverse disciplines, even recognizing the differences of methodologies and practices between the natural and social and human sciences. Thus, UNESCO is faced with an organizational challenge, that is, to foster integrated programme planning and project management with flexibility in budgeting and staffing, both at Headquarters and in the field.

The Committee concludes that intersectoral coordination and interdisciplinary action both between the two Science Sectors and across the Organization are at present inadequate and thus require major strengthening.

- ***Improved coordination is needed among the Intergovernmental/International Science Programmes (ISPs) and with other related organizations***

Although the ISPs give UNESCO identifiable focus and long-term continuity for key global issues, the Committee noted that each one has its respective decision-making body and processes and its respective administrations and in general operates too autonomously in its scientific fields. There is considerable overlap between the ISPs, with other UN bodies, and with outside scientific organizations. In the case of the International Hydrological Programme (IHP), for example, there are over 20 bodies working on water issues within the UN alone and coordination is insufficient, even given the UN-wide coordinating body UN-Water. In another case, the International Basic Sciences Programme (IBSP), which is of strong relevance to UNESCO's capacity building role, needs a fundamental change of perspective considering its limited internal funding. Furthermore, while the ISPs are effective partnerships between scientists and governments, their semi-independent natures complicate the development of new initiatives and the setting of new priorities more generally in the Science Programmes. This is particularly difficult in the Natural Sciences Sector, where currently the four environmentally related ISPs (IOC, IHP, MAB and IGCP) together expend over 70% of the Regular Budget for activities. The IHP alone accounts for about 40% of the Regular Budget for activities for the Sector in the current biennium.<sup>2</sup>

Although some joint projects have been initiated, and the ISP Chairs meet at intervals, there are no mechanisms or process to scrutinize how well the programmes collectively relate to UNESCO's mandate and its role, and enables more intensive efforts to exploit the potential both for enhancing synergies among them and for more strategic coordination with the related activities across the UN system and the outside research community. Moreover, substantial savings can be expected from rationalizing their set of separate administrations.

The governing bodies of the ISPs should re-examine their missions, especially in light of the overlap of their research portfolios and of scientific advancements expanding across previously defined disciplines. Questions of sunset clauses and/or evolution to self-sustaining extrabudgetary funding for the programmes and also for specific projects within these programmes should also be considered.

- ***Modernization of management and administrative and budget transparency need to be addressed, including the introduction of a culture of evaluation and a dynamic decentralization policy***

The Committee noted that standard operating procedures are not apparent for project management and administration – including, but not limited to selection of projects, budget itemization at the project level, including staff costs, management of activities and accountability of projects, evaluation of and dissemination of results.

A culture of evaluation is lacking in the Organization. Member States are not provided with a critical evaluation of successful or failing programmes or projects in a timely manner. It is therefore difficult to judge the potential effectiveness of programmes relative to declared aims. Built-in programme monitoring and evaluation, with formulation of meaningful performance indicators and sunset clauses, should be applied throughout to enable decisions about renewing programme funding from one biennial programme and budget cycle to the next.

UNESCO needs a dynamic decentralization policy. UNESCO has a large network beyond Headquarters and Field Offices, which includes the National Commissions, Category I and II Institutes and Centres, ISP National Committees and the globally distributed operational sites (such as MAB's biosphere reserves and Natural World Heritage Sites, etc.), UNESCO Chairs with their networks and UNESCO Clubs. The UNESCO wider "family" should work together more coherently. Work carried out away from Headquarters in Field Offices should be driven by local needs and feed explicitly and concretely into agreed global development goals, policies and standards (e.g. the MDGs) and by the new "One UN" approach at the country level.

---

<sup>2</sup> According to the 33 C/5.

- **UNESCO's Science Programmes would benefit from greater visibility and public outreach**

Science communities, academia, the media in its various forms, the public and especially young people, have insufficient information about UNESCO's work in the sciences. UNESCO needs to interact more effectively with these communities, as well as strengthen the participation of leading scientists in its science programmes to raise their visibility.

However, the real key to increasing visibility will be the overall strengthening of the relevance and impact of UNESCO's sciences portfolio. In addition, UNESCO must put the results of its programmes in a format understandable to policymakers.

UNESCO also needs to interact more closely with its unique network of National Commissions. Some already play a strong role in raising the perception of governments, parliamentarians, private bodies, schools, and the general public to UNESCO's work in the sciences, and in helping to promote UNESCO's programme objectives at country level.

All National Commissions should recognize the importance of including scientists in their membership, in order for them to be effective partners in matching the needs of Member States in the sciences with UNESCO's programmes and priorities. Better links made from UNESCO's Field Offices would play a positive role in this effort.

### **Recommendations For A New Strategy**

The Committee's vision for UNESCO is an Organization recognized for its leadership role within UN system, based on a strategic reorientation of its science portfolio towards contributing to poverty reduction and peace, and consisting of a set of well-managed timely programmes, reflecting cutting edge interdisciplinary science, taking maximum advantage of all of its distributed inscribed assets, demonstrating its comparative advantages, leading in new ideas, ensuring quality and excellence, attracting the best scientists, and demonstrating to governments that investment in science and technology is vital to human, social and economic progress.

In response to its main findings, the Committee made detailed recommendations under the following nine headings for UNESCO's science portfolio.

1. Policy advice towards capacity building needs strengthening.
2. Programmes must address new scientific paradigms and "cutting edge" research.
3. Interdisciplinary and intersectoral activities need major strengthening.
4. Science education should be a high priority.
5. The ISPs need better coordination and synergy.
6. Outreach and partnerships need improvement.
7. Rigorous and transparent selection, assessment and evaluation of programmes and projects are required.
8. UNESCO's leadership must be enhanced through new global initiatives.
9. A Science Advisory Committee is required.

### **Concluding Remarks**

The final report of the Overall Review Committee was presented to the Executive Board in its 176th Session (April 2007), which expressed its appreciation, gave it its support, underscored that the recommendations should shape the programmes in 34 C/4 and 34 C/5 and requested the Director-General to continue informed decision-making regarding UNESCO's core functions and competencies in science.

The Director-General then established a Task Force on MP II and III for preparation of an Implementation Plan to guide the 34 C/5 work plans and to increase intersectoral activities. An indicative plan was presented to the 34th General Conference (October 2007). Consultation with the Review Committee external members continues.

## “Higher Education As A Driving Force For Human and Social Development: The Point of View of UNESCO”

Professor Georges Haddad *Director, Division of Higher Education, UNESCO*

It is a tough challenge to summarize the role of higher education in human and social development, and to give the point of view of UNESCO on such a vast subject, because the whys and wherefores are so many, varied and complex.

With its one hundred and ninety-three Member States, UNESCO has the duty to propose - through dialogue and argument - the most objective vision of the realities and prospects of higher education on a world scale.

Such a vision must be based on the three distinct but intimately connected time factors. The first is time past, or history; the second is time present, or actuality and the third is time to come, or the future.

Since the Middle Ages, the University has been the most elaborate form of higher education and an acknowledged pillar of development in its most varied forms by means of what we would now call a “social contract”. This contract has changed over time in tune with socio-economic and cultural evolutions, not to say revolutions; more than that, it has enabled the University to anticipate and prepare for the great changes of recent times. In this respect, it is fair to say that few institutions have so successfully withstood uncertainty and the passage of time. Western Europe’s most ancient Universities, Bologna, the Sorbonne and Oxford, were founded over eight hundred and fifty years ago, in the 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> Centuries, clear proof of their usefulness to man and society.

In a feudal society, the University was a place for the preservation and reproduction of knowledge reserved for the few. In the wake of the Renaissance, the Reformation and the great changes shaped by the Age of Enlightenment and the revolutions of the late seventeenth hundreds, it progressed, in the early 19<sup>th</sup> Century, to the Humboldt model we still know today. The essential characteristics of the modern University and its new “social contract” can be defined principally in terms of democratization, professionalization and innovation.

These three key words will no doubt continue for some time to characterize the three main missions of the University, and more generally, the higher education structures in all their different forms.

The World Conference on Higher Education, organized by UNESCO in 1998, affirmed the premise that higher education should serve both the individual and the community.

Democratization spread slowly but surely through Europe, North America and Japan, to society’s emerging middle class leaders, and reaches out today to all socio-economic groups and especially to new nations freed from the yoke of colonization. Situations vary greatly in this area inasmuch as some countries benefited before independence from the higher education system established by their conquerors, whereas many others had to build such infrastructure themselves from scratch.

Over the past sixty years, UNESCO has held unwaveringly to the principle of higher education as a public good, accessible to every individual in every country, according to merit and inclination. UNESCO and its partners have been working for many years to guarantee the pertinence and quality of higher education, whatever its form or method of transmission.

In the final analysis, it is clear that an education system of quality should be conceived as circular rather than linear, with higher, primary and secondary education all having their proper place.

The principle of education as a training ground for professional life has been established progressively and probably once and for all. For some time, professions such as engineering, teaching and medicine have been taught at University or other prestigious higher education establishments such as the *Grandes Ecoles* of France. The modern notion of continuing or lifelong education as a solution to the changes brought about by scientific and technological progress is everywhere upheld as one of higher education’s foremost duties to the individual and to society alike.

Professionalization is in no way a justification for dehumanizing the missions of the university. On the contrary - and here UNESCO’s message is very clear - the new professions and new ethical responsibilities that go with them make it ever more necessary to have a humanist support based on interdisciplinarity and pluridisciplinarity in

**Papers (cont'd)**

*Professor Georges Haddad*

order to respond to the foreseeable challenges of this new century. It is UNESCO's prerogative to uphold/maintain/defend the principle that the duty of higher education is to prepare students not only for their chosen professions but also to be responsible members of society.

Above all, higher education today justifies its mission to assist development by contributing to innovative research. It is universally acknowledged that higher education is built around basic and applied research and we all know how much university research contributes to development in all its forms. Keeping in touch with research and innovation is the foundation of the university world. Indeed, the teacher of higher education must obey this rule in order to offer pertinent quality education.

UNESCO has pointed out present and future obstacles that university research must overcome in order to renew its social contract to society by building bridges and partnerships with all sectors of socio-economic and cultural activity.

Although universities no longer have the monopoly of research they will retain their privileged central place as long as they know how to affirm their entrepreneurial dimension in the public and private sectors alike.

Although the facts do not bear it out, UNESCO wholeheartedly maintains that research is not the privilege of rich countries alone. We must support scientific cooperation programmes so that every country in every region of the world may play its role in building the knowledge society. It is necessary for their development, a matter of dignity and responsibility for the world as a whole, and one of UNESCO's central concerns. It would take too long to mention all the Organization has achieved in this respect; but it is fitting here to single out for special mention the UNESCO Chairs and UNITWIN programmes, that encourage and support university cooperation in all fields of study in a counter current that gives priority to South-North and South-South cooperation.

In the space of fifteen years UNESCO has sponsored and supported the creation of more than 650 Chairs and almost 70 UNITWIN programmes. Cooperative networks such as these strive together for excellence, thereby offering universities from both hemispheres the chance to face up to an ever more competitive environment that calls into question the humanitarian foundations on which their missions were built.

In short, we can fairly say that higher education everywhere has contributed, and will continue to do so, to human and social development.

And notwithstanding the fast-moving world of today, UNESCO, too, must strive - with the skill and patience of a craftsman weaving together the bright threads of a tapestry - to construct a peaceful future whose harmony depends in no small way on the unique and precious contribution that only higher education in its noblest form is equipped to make.

## “Should Teachers Stay at Home? The Impact of International Teacher Mobility”

### UNESCO Chair in Political Economy of Education University of Nottingham

Professor W. John Morgan FRAI, FRSA *Chairholder, UNESCO Chair in Political Economy of Education*

#### Introduction

This short paper reports on a study commissioned by the UK Department for International Development and carried out in co-operation with the University of KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa, University of the West Indies, Mona, Jamaica and the University of Botswana, Gaborone, Botswana. Other collaborating institutions were the Commonwealth Secretariat, the Institute of Commonwealth Studies, University of London and the teacher trade unions in the countries under review. A good example of the political economy of education and the connections with policy, the report was published in December 2006 (Morgan, Sives and Appleton, DfID, London, 2006).

The present era of increased ‘globalization’ has brought with it renewed concern about the emigration of skilled labour from developing countries. There has been a revival of interest, amongst both policymakers and researchers, in the possibility of a harmful ‘brain drain.’ Emigration of skilled labour was raised as a problem for Africa in the *Commission for Africa* report (2005). Initially, the term ‘brain drain’ was applied to the movement of leading scientists and technicians. More recently, the emphasis has been on skilled workers defined more broadly and including those in the social sectors. The international recruitment of doctors and nurses from developing countries is perhaps the most widely discussed case.

International movements of teachers have not been subject to the same level of scholarly interest, but have provoked passionate international debate amongst policymakers nonetheless. In 2001, the South African Minister for Education accused Britain of ‘raiding’ its resources, ahead of a recruitment visit by four head teachers of UK schools. At the same time, Ministers in Jamaica proposed that developing countries should receive compensation from the UK and US for the loss of teachers due to international recruitment. Concern over international recruitment of teachers was one of the most salient issues discussed at the Commonwealth Ministers of Education conference in Edinburgh in 2003. It led to Commonwealth Protocol on Teacher Recruitment in 2004, which included a recommendation for further research on the issue (Commonwealth Secretariat, 2004; Morgan et al., 2005).

The rise in organised recruitment of overseas teachers has put pressure on developing country education sectors. It is argued that developed countries offering much higher salaries benefit from ‘poaching’ teachers who have enjoyed subsidised training in their home countries. What is the impact of teacher migration on a sample of four Commonwealth countries? While the international migration of teachers has been in operation in the Commonwealth for many years, organized recruitment of teachers from south to north began in the late 1990s and peaked in the early 2000s. In the UK, the main recruiting country in the Commonwealth, organized international recruitment developed in response to a crisis in teacher recruitment. This move increased pressure on developing country governments already wrestling with the need to improve their own education and health services. The research investigated and analysed the experiences of four Commonwealth countries – two ‘receiving’ countries, the United Kingdom and Botswana, and two ‘sending’ countries, Jamaica and South Africa – in teacher recruitment and retention. It aimed to identify the extent of international migration of teachers, the ‘push’ and ‘pull’ factors for migration and the consequences for developing countries.

#### Data Collection

The research was constrained both by budgetary limitations and by a limited time-frame for completion of eighteen months (eventually extended to two years because of the delays to the Jamaican field-work by Hurricane. Different kinds of data were collected, much gathered during visits to around twenty schools in each of the four countries. In each school visited, questionnaires were administered to head teachers, native teachers and expatriate teachers.

The intention was partly to provide a qualitative assessment of the impact of international teacher mobility, so we compared schools which had been affected by such movements with ‘control’ schools that had not.

The samples were selected purposively, so as to include both affected and control schools of a wide range of different types. The fieldwork was not nationally representative, but limited to particular geographic regions—

specifically the area around Gaborone (Botswana), Kingston (Jamaica), London and Birmingham (England) and Pietermaritzburg (South Africa). A mixture of schools was sampled—rural and urban, secondary and primary, government and private. Other criteria for selection were country specific—for example, in South Africa, the racial composition and history of schools are an important source of differentiation and so was used in the selection of schools.

Various means were used to supplement the samples of migrant teachers identified from school visits. In Botswana, postal questionnaires were sent to every expatriate teacher in the country. In England, questionnaires were distributed via a postal survey of 1000 schools, as well as through trade unions and teacher training institutions. It is likely that the English data over-samples long stayers, since these are more likely to want to join English trade unions or to acquire training in England.

Snowballing methods were used in both South Africa and Jamaica to survey teachers who had returned from teaching overseas. This method was successful in South Africa, but not in Jamaica, where our contacts (research counterparts and teachers visited in schools) were unable to identify many people who had returned from teaching abroad.<sup>2</sup> Direct inferences about the prevalence of expatriate or returned teachers should not be drawn from the sample sizes—the samples were not designed to be self-weighting. However, expatriate teachers are more prevalent in Botswana schools than in English ones and we suspect that returned migrant teachers are more prevalent in South Africa than in Jamaica.

Surveys were organised of trainee teachers in Jamaica and South Africa. All teacher training institutions were invited to participate and to survey all of their final year students. In South Africa, 11 out of 24 institutions returned questionnaires and we estimate that we received responses from 19 per cent of all final year trainee teachers in the country. Detailed results for South Africa are available in Bertram et al. (2006). In Jamaica, 150 questionnaires were distributed to three of the ten institutions providing teacher training and 138 were returned. Our surveys were supplemented by semi-structured interviews with around 80 key informants involved in the process of international migration in a variety of different roles—as educational officials, staff at recruitment agencies, representatives of teacher trade unions.

## Research Findings

We found evidence of significant international mobility of teachers in all four countries. A third of trainee teachers in Jamaica intended to migrate, as did a quarter in South Africa. Around a half or more of all teachers in each country were interested in working abroad. However, there were indications that much of the international recruitment was a *transitional response* to disequilibria in the market for native teachers. Both Jamaica and South Africa were targeted for recruitment because of official perceptions of surpluses of native teachers—perceptions that were not long lasting. Demand for foreign teachers has been falling in England as improvements in pay have increased the inflow of native teachers, while Botswana has decided not to renew the contracts of expatriates in order to promote employment opportunities for its own nationals.

International teacher mobility is driven primarily by the prospect of income gains—on average, teachers from developing countries can double their real income by teaching in England. These large income gains—over a fifth of which are remitted or saved—provide the *prima facie* case for a liberal view towards migration. They dwarf the fiscal cost to the government from having to train replacement teachers. Indeed, these training costs are probably in large part covered by taxes paid on repatriated income gains.

A key issue is the impact of international teacher recruitment on the educational systems in developing countries. Botswana clearly gained from teacher mobility, allowing it to expand its educational system more rapidly and more efficiently than could have been done with native teachers alone. Looking at schools directly affected by international migration in Jamaica and South Africa, we found no evidence of serious adverse impacts. Migrant teachers were replaced without serious adverse educational impacts. It is possible that there are 'knock-on' effects on more disadvantaged schools, but again we found no evidence of this. This was partly because there do not appear to be overall shortages of teachers in the two countries and partly because segmentation in the market for teachers stops the effects of migration rippling down to the most disadvantaged schools.

The research found that teacher recruitment and mobility have had a largely positive effect – despite some negative aspects for sending countries – on poverty and international development, mainly due to teachers sending money home and returning home with savings. The study's wide range of findings includes the following:

- In Jamaica, where the state subsidises teacher training by about two-thirds, the loss of qualified, experienced teachers was a serious problem. In South Africa, teachers recruited overseas were rated as above average in effectiveness.
- Professional development and better salaries were the main reasons given for the migration of Jamaican and South African teachers. Jamaican teachers earned three times more in England and South African teachers three to four times more.

## **Papers (cont'd)**

Professor W. John Morgan

- Expatriate teachers in Botswana have made a major contribution to the development of the education system, especially the rapid expansion of secondary schooling.
- In the UK, more than half of secondary schools surveyed had staff shortages. Meanwhile, about 46 percent of UK teachers – 53 percent of secondary teachers – were interested in migrating.

## **Conclusion**

International recruitment of teachers does present challenges to sending countries. However, it is not the main reason for teacher shortages in some developing countries. Primarily, other internal issues need to be addressed. The following policy recommendations were offered by the report:

- Governments need to manage teacher shortages. They could reconsider teacher salaries, introduce special incentives, and improve manpower planning and allow training institutions to expand according to demand.
- While compensation is not recommended, receiving countries could provide assistance to sending countries via their aid budget, for instance by funding teacher exchanges.
- Sending and receiving countries could develop a formal agreement to manage the process of teacher migration. This could include migrant teacher induction and further training, or a two-way teacher exchange programme.
- Sending country governments could allow teachers to take unpaid leave to teach abroad.
- Governments that subsidise teacher training could consider increasing cost sharing or making subsidies conditional on teachers working in a state school for a set period.

## **For Discussion**

- **Is international teacher mobility a positive or a negative phenomenon?**
- **Should it be regulated and if so how?**
- **Should 'source' countries be compensated and if so how?**
- **Should teachers stay at home?**

## **References**

Commission for Africa. 2005. *Our Common Interest—Report of the Commission for Africa*. Penguin Books Limited: London.

Commonwealth Secretariat. 2004. *Commonwealth Teacher Recruitment Protocol*. Commonwealth Secretariat: London.

Morgan, W.J., Sives A, Appleton S. 2005. 'Managing the international recruitment of health workers and teachers: do the commonwealth agreements provide an answer?' *The Round Table* 94(379): 225–238.

Morgan, W. J., Sives, A., Appleton, S., 2006, *Teacher mobility, brain drain and educational resources in the Commonwealth*, Researching the Issues, DfID, London, Research Monograph,xvii and 218p.

## “Leadership and Management in Southern African Universities: What Has Been Achieved by the UNESCO Chair in Higher Education Management”

### UNESCO Chair in Higher Education Management University of Bath

Professor Richard Mawditt OBE, MSc, FCCA, FCIMgt, FRSA *Chairholder, UNESCO Chair in Higher Education Management*

#### Introduction

The Chair was created in the wake of the ‘1998 UNESCO World Conference on Higher Education in the Twenty-first Century – Vision and Action’ and the earlier establishment of the International Centre for Higher Education Management (ICHEM) at the University of Bath in the UK. The Director of ICHEM, Richard Mawditt, had for many years been involved with research and training as both an administrator and academic and was encouraged, by many who had experienced programmes at Bath and around the world, to share an advantage of the influence UNESCO would bring to furthering and enhancing research and good practice in higher education management, particularly in the developing world.

The outcomes and objectives of the ‘World Conference’ have provided a strong platform for the many activities the Chair has developed and been associated with in this past decade and indeed have sound and compelling relevance on matters of good governance and effective leadership today.

The nature and structure of higher education around the world has changed more in the past sixty years than at any time over the six hundred years since the foundation of the university as we know it. Higher education the world over has evolved with the demand outpacing the supply. Progress in science and medicine has had no boundaries and often driven on by the activities of war and disease; technology and engineering has transformed from the industrial to the knowledge revolution; whilst the Arts and Humanities have changed as cultures and politics have been remodelled. All of which has necessitated universities and the technological institutions to dramatically change in the wave of demand with inadequate resource and often human capacity to support them. Although the problems of growth are vastly different in magnitude in the ‘south’ than in the ‘north’ the benefits of international relationships and inter-university seminars, workshops and training programmes has been hugely successful and mutually so to boot. This is where the UNESCO Chair and ICHEM have played their part and the recognition of this activity has been global not just in southern Africa although this has been core to our events and research.

#### Examples of Achievements

- **UNISA**

The Chairholder’s first event in concert with UNISA was to direct a management programme for several hundred senior members of this ‘mega’ university in Pretoria. This programme had the benefit of collaborating with Professor James Maraj who had been the Founding Director of the Commonwealth of Learning and was advising UNISA at the time of the transformation of Higher Education in South Africa. However, the most likely significant programme at UNISA has been the induction seminars for the top management team following the appointment of a new Vice-Chancellor. This Executive Programme, for fourteen of the Vice-Chancellor’s senior officers was devised in collaboration with the UNISA School of Business Leadership and takes place over a twelve month period with specific individual assignments following each of ten modules.

A spin off from this seminar series was to influence the South African Universities Vice-Chancellors’ Association (SAUVCA) international capacity building programmes for Senior Higher Education Executives. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor and the University Registrar have on occasion attended UNESCO events with the Chairholder in Paris.

A senior member of the UNISA administration, who enrolled for doctoral study in higher education management at The University of Bath has recently completed his PhD.

The CEO of SAUVCA has attended the ICHEM Summer School programmes (see below) in the UK on several occasions.

- **National University of Lesotho**

Managing NUL has been 'challenging' and since 1995 when the Chairholder first visited there have been four Vice-Chancellors in office. In 1997 Richard Mawditt directed the first of a series of seminars for senior executives in Lesotho for NUL and those from the region and sub region. This first occasion was essentially for Heads, and potential Heads, of Institutions and again provided a basis for successful management and leadership seminars held in Namibia, Malawi and Zambia.

In responding to pressures for change influenced in part by the World Bank's 'Revitalising Universities in Africa' NUL engaged the Chairholder in a comprehensive planning exercise (2002-2007) which has been addressed once again under the leadership of a new Vice-Chancellor (January 2007) who has involved the widest community of NUL in the 'ownership' of the new plan for 2007-2012. The Chairholder has motivated the university to contemplate the university of the future in terms of dramatic change in terms of teaching and funding, both of which have been lacking at NUL as in so many other African nations. This exercise is ongoing with funding from the Commonwealth Secretariat especially to consider curriculum reform.

- **The University of Bath**

Bath is the home and base of the Chairholder. The University has hosted many seminars and events more recently through its International Centre for Higher Education Management (ICHEM). The emphasis on ICHEM programmes is from internationalisation and representation of its students, faculty and other delegates from overseas to these events is a vital component. Seminars, Workshops, Summer Schools etc are held in Bath and around the globe with particular emphasis on the needs of the developing nations. In the southern African region events have been regular in Malawi, Zambia, Mauritius, Namibia in addition to South Africa and Lesotho. In this respect the Chairholder has been most grateful to the British Council and DfID for support and funding to facilitate these events. Parallel seminars etc in other nations, not directly associated with the southern African region, have had a mutual benefit to add experience and value to the effectiveness of HE Leadership; e.g. a programme for sixty-six heads of institutions in Lithuania; the HE sector in Colombia; and conferences in the West Indies and to over a thousand delegates in the Great Hall of the Peoples Republic of China.

From the many who have experienced events directed for the benefit of higher education managers and leaders the outstanding output has been to react to the market force of the delegates for a postgraduate research programme specifically for higher education management.

This most significant and successful milestone to emerge in the period of the Chair in Bath has led to the creation of the Doctor of Business Administration (DBA) degree in Higher Education Management. With the initial cohort being admitted in 2002 there have been in excess of eighty research students enrolled on the programme to date with five already graduated. This innovative research-based degree programme is designed to meet the needs of senior academic and professional staff working in universities and other higher education institutions and in government agencies. The programme combines research excellence with professional practice and is truly international in its content and enrolment. The intake is kept at a level of about fifteen each year.

From these initiatives, and at this point in time, the University of Bath / ICHEM has graduated two doctoral students from South Africa with a third South African completing her PhD elsewhere and a further graduate completing her Bath PhD from studies in Ghana and Mauritius. At present there are students on the doctoral programme from South Africa, Botswana and Lesotho. Not all are finding it easy with their funding I might add and more would enrol if funding was available.

The Chairholder is proud to be able to count at least three African Vice-Chancellors (including one very prominent South African woman) and an Africa Minister of Education who have moved into their top positions having experienced one or more of the UNESCO Chair occasions in recent years.

- **Namibia**

In 2001 the British Government responded to a request from the Minister of Higher Education in the Republic of Namibia, the Honourable Nahas Angula, to fund the Chair (through DfID) to research and develop the feasibility of the Government of Namibia allocating resources to its Higher Education sector by the use of formulae. The Chair carried out this task and at the same time established links with the sector and particularly with the University of Namibia (UNAM). Successive Vice-Chancellors at UNAM have expressed their wish to become formally part of the UNITWIN / UNESCO Chair and this request was submitted to UNESCO with the support of the existing partners. To date, other than an acknowledgement from Paris, sadly nothing has matured for this arrangement to be effected. The Government of Namibia, on accepting one of the Chair's recommendations, has formally established a Council of Higher Education. The Honourable Minister Nahas Angula, has now moved on, to be the Nation's Prime Minister.

- **The Council for Education in the Commonwealth (CEC)**

As a trustee / director of CEC the Chairholder has benefited from joining with the UK delegation of Ministers to Commonwealth Conferences in South Africa to the Prime Ministers Conference (CHOGM) in 1999 and to the Education Ministers Conference (CEM) in 2006. This has brought further recognition of the UNESCO Chair to the major conference arena and to Ministers themselves. CEC has ongoing major projects on open and distance learning in Africa and in the wider aspects of UPE especially in the resource of teachers and other vital professionals educated and trained in the HE sector. The Chairholder's relationship with these projects has the mark of the UNESCO Chair influencing, and taking advantage from, these projects.

- The above activities take no account of the Chairholder's advisory work for the UK Department of Education's 'Analysis of School Performance' and for a consortium of investors establishing a major new university in the United Arab Emirates. Indirectly these consultancies have enabled the Chair to fund many of the activities in Africa.

### **Conclusion**

The UNESCO Chair in Higher Education Management has evolved with the huge benefit from the realisation of many of the outcomes of the 'UNESCO World Conference on Higher Education' and has maintained those aims and objectives to fulfil, the Chairholder believes, some level of success over this past decade.

The disastrous effect on morale and subsequent negative funding opportunities for African universities following the World Bank's condemnation of the efficiency and effectiveness of HE in developing countries (HE The Lessons of Experience, 1994), took many years for funding support and priorities of 'the Bank' to be reversed for (some) favour for higher education. In effect the challenge for the UNESCO Chair to stimulate Vice-Chancellors and Education Ministers in southern Africa has created a stronger and more effective style and operation in their leadership and management and coupled with the recognition for investment in university staff development has seen a marked improvement and turn around in the sector's efficiency as we see it today. There is however, still much to do!

### **For Discussion**

- **Should Universities be more like business in the management of their function?**
- **If so how will this affect the role of their CEO?**
- **Where is the Principal / CEO of a university in a developing country to be found?**
- **What is the likely form of the 'university of the future' especially in a less developed country?**

### **Short Bibliography**

UNESCO 1998. Higher Education in the Twenty-first Century – Vision and Action

World Bank 1997. *Revitalising Universities in Africa – The Partnership for Capacity Building in Africa*

World Bank 1994. Higher Education – The Lessons of Experience

National University of Lesotho 2002. *NUL Strategic Plan – Re-connecting with the Nation : Policy Programme 2002 /2007*

## “Shaping Effective Higher Education ICT4D Partnerships: Challenges and Opportunities”

### UNESCO Chair in ICT for Development Royal Holloway, University of London

Professor Tim Unwin *Chairholder, UNESCO Chair in ICT for Development*

#### Introduction

‘Information’ and ‘communication’ have long been central to ‘development’ practices. However, from the mid-1990s with the rapid transformations that took place in the technologies used to create, store and share information, practitioners and academics alike began to explore ways in which these new information and communication technologies (ICTs) could be used to support specific ‘development’ initiatives. Moreover, with the emergence of new means of communication during the last decade, as with mobile phones, personal video conferencing through Skype (<http://www.skype.org>) or the use of chat rooms on Moodle environments (<http://moodle.org>), people are now able to communicate globally in ways that only a few years ago were unimaginable. Information and Communication Technologies for Development (ICT4D) is the field that explores how these new ICTs can be used effectively in development practices (see for example Weiel and Waldburger, 2004). This short paper provides an overview of the origins and work of the UNESCO Chair in ICT4D, and concentrates specifically on some of the lessons learnt in shaping effective ICT4D partnerships for higher education, especially within Africa.

Before addressing these issues, it is important to stress three introductory points. First, ICT4D is concerned with the entire range of technologies, and not just the use of computers. All too often the value of other ICTs, such as radio, television or mobile ‘phones, has been ignored in contemporary development initiatives, and yet these have a long tradition of benefit in delivering effective change. Second, it must be stressed that ICT4D is open to consideration of notions of ‘development’ from many different perspectives. While the hegemonic model of contemporary development practice is very much driven by economic and governance agendas, designed to encourage so-called liberal democracy and a free market (Sachs, 2005; although for a contrasting view see Unwin, 2007), ICT4D equally explores the value of ICTs in delivering alternative visions of development, driven by different social, cultural and political priorities. This leads on to a third introductory comment, which is that the focus of our work is very much on the ways in which ICTs can most effectively be used to enable the poor and marginalised communities to use the potential of ICTs to transform their lives. While others may concentrate on using ICTs to deliver economic growth as a means of reducing poverty, our concerns are primarily in working with the poor to identify their needs, and then to find innovative ways in which ICTs can be used to help them change their lives.

#### Effective Higher Education ICT4D Partnerships

- **The UNESCO Chair in ICT4D: origins and agendas**

UNESCO, both through the work of its Information Society Division and more widely through its initiatives using ICTs for education has long recognised the global significance of the field of ICT4D. This is directly reflected in the work of UNESCO’s Communication and Information Sector ([http://portal.unesco.org/ci/en/ev.php-URL\\_ID=1509&URL\\_DO=DO\\_TOPIC&URL\\_SECTION=201.html](http://portal.unesco.org/ci/en/ev.php-URL_ID=1509&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html), accessed 4 January 2008), and particularly in its 2005 Major Programme V on Communication and Information, with its sub-programmes V.1 on empowering people through access to information and knowledge with special emphasis on freedom of expression, and V.2 on promoting communication development and ICTs for education, science and culture. As well as cross-cutting activities, the main lines of action of these programmes that are of direct relevance to ICT4D include:

- Promoting freedom of expression
- Strengthening community access and participation in knowledge societies
- Creating and preserving diverse content
- Developing media in conflict areas and post-disaster situations
- Enhancing literacy, teacher training and quality education at all levels through media and ICTs
- Broadening access to scientific and technological information through media and ICT

In 2004, an ICT4D Collective was established at Royal Holloway, University of London, with the aim of exploring how a UK Higher Education Institution (HEI) might contribute to the emerging field of ICT4D. This built on experiences gained by the UK Prime Minister's Imfundo initiative in the Department for International Development (DFID) between 2001 and 2004, which had sought to create partnerships that would lead to innovative uses of ICTs in supporting African education (for the original Imfundo site see <http://imfundo.digitalbrain.com/imfundo/>; for DFID's interpretation see <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/research/imfundo.asp>, accessed 4 January 2008). At the heart of the Collective was therefore an original emphasis on education and partnerships. However, one of the other driving impetuses for the Collective's creation was the observation that, while there was considerable consultancy work in the field of ICT4D, there was rather little high quality research, especially work that sought to bring theoretical understandings together with practical implementation. In essence, the Collective's remit was thus to develop the highest quality research in ICT4D for the benefit of the poor and of marginalised communities wherever they are to be found.

The coalescence of agendas between the Collective's work and those of UNESCO, as well as the possibilities offered by the UNITWIN programme for partnership, networking and research collaboration, made it highly pertinent for the Collective to apply for the status of a UNESCO Chair, and this was awarded with effect from August 2007. The central objectives of the Chair are summarised in Figure 1.

### Figure 1: Original objectives of the UNESCO Chair in ICT4D

#### i. Development Objective (Long-Term)

The overall goal of this initiative is to contribute to ensuring that ICTs are used more effectively to enable poor people and communities to enhance the quality of their lives. This delivers explicitly on Millennium Development Goals 1 and 8, contributes to Goals 3, 4 and 7, and is specifically within the field of specialism of UNESCO's Information Society Division.

#### ii. Specific Objectives (Short-Term) and Outputs

In order to deliver the above overall Goal, the Collective intends to build on its existing expertise and reputation to become a world leader in research, teaching and consultancy in the field of ICT4D. In this context, its outputs will therefore include:

- Delivering World-class **research** of benefit to the interests of poor and marginalised communities
- Developing an innovative and flourishing **postgraduate** research community, including substantial numbers of students from poor countries
- Delivering successful inter-disciplinary **undergraduate** courses in the field of ICT4D
- Training of significant numbers of people from poor and marginalised communities through high quality **short courses** on policy related matters delivered by the Collective
- Provision of cutting edge **consultancy** and **policy advice** for those involved in delivering ICT4D activities to the benefit of poor and marginalised communities.

The Chair has already made significant progress in delivering all of these objectives, but has placed considerable emphasis in the first instance on developing a cadre of postgraduate research students, who now number 15 from 13 different countries. All of its work is made available through its web-site (<http://www.ict4d.org.uk>) which ranks first out of 242,000 links for ICT4D on Google (4 January 2008), and it has also developed a Moodle environment for information sharing, discussion forums, blogs<sup>1</sup>, open educational resources, and wikis (<http://moodle-ict4d.rhul.ac.uk>) that is freely accessible to anyone in the world, as well as a Facebook Group on ICT4D (<http://rhbnacac.facebook.com/group.php?gid=2553350463>) which has some 417 members (4 January 2008).

#### • Partnership in theory

The role of partnerships in development practice has become of growing interest in recent years, in part following the increased involvement of the private sector in 'development' initiatives (see for example Zadek *et al.*, 2002; Cassidy, 2007; Martens, 2007; Draxler, 2008). There nevertheless remains considerable debate about their value, as well as the intention and roles of different partners within such initiatives (see for example the World Economic Forum's and UNESCO's *Partnerships for Education* initiative launched in 2007 <http://www.pfore.org>). One theoretical framework for understanding such partnerships is summarised in Figure 2 (based on Unwin, 2005). This framework is only schematic, and the details for any specific partnership will vary considerably, but it does highlight three crucial aspects of such initiatives: first, they need to consider the demand side as well as the supply side; second, they should reflect a transparent approach to the contributions that partners are willing to give

<sup>1</sup> See for example <http://moodle-ict4d.rhul.ac.uk/blog/index.php?userid=5> which provided regular updates on the crisis in Kenya following the December 2007 elections.

alongside the benefits that they expect to gain from their involvement; and third, that there may be many different kinds of partner involved, including the private sector, civil society, global organisations, donors and research institutions. Typically, contributions that partners are willing to give include human resources, ICT equipment and technology, social networking, physical infrastructure, and finance, whereas the expectations that they have from partnerships can be considered under the headings of corporate identity, networking, economic returns, and research and development opportunities. All too often, though, ICT4D initiatives have been supply led, with insufficient attention being paid to the real needs of poor and marginalised communities, and there being not enough transparency in the expectations of the various partners.

**Figure 2: Framework for understanding and implementing ICT4D partnerships**

Demand		Supply				
End Beneficiaries	Local Partners	Funding agencies	Private Sector	Civil Society Organisations	Research Institutions	International Organisations
****	****	****	****	****	****	****
<b>Partnership Contributions</b>						
Human resources						
****	****	****	****	****	****	****
Physical ICT resources						
****	****	****	****	****	****	****
Social networks						
****	****	****	****	****	****	****
Physical infrastructure						
****	****	****	****	****	****	****
Financial contributions						
****	****	****	****	****	****	****
<b>Benefits of Partnership</b>						
Corporate Identity						
****	****	****	****	****	****	****
Networking benefits						
****	****	****	****	****	****	****
Economic Returns						
****	****	****	****	****	****	****
Research and Development Opportunities						
****	****	****	****	****	****	****
End Beneficiaries	Local Partners	Funding agencies	Private Sector	Civil Society Organisations	Research Institutions	International Organisations

The ICT4D Collective has placed considerable emphasis on partnerships from its earliest days, and has to date undertaken activities in partnership with 24 entities, including the private sector, civil society organisations, international agencies and other HEIs.<sup>2</sup> Given the framework summarised above, it should be clear that working closely with African partner institutions has always been high on our agenda, and the remainder of this paper focuses specifically on one such partnership programme funded by the UK's Development Partnerships for Higher Education (DelPHE - <http://www.britishcouncil.org/delphe.htm>) scheme since early 2007.

- **Partnerships with African Higher Education Institutions**

There has been a long history of support for African higher education initiatives, both internationally (see for example The Partnership for Higher Education in Africa, <http://www.foundation-partnership.org>), and also from UK

<sup>2</sup> It also has nine co-operating organisations, with which it is developing activities that may lead in due course to formal partnerships.

(see for example the work of the Commonwealth Scholarship Commission – <http://www.cscuk.ac.uk>). Not all such initiatives, though, have been as successful as their proponents had anticipated, and this is particularly true of ICT4D based activities. Among the most prominent of these disappointments has been the African Virtual University initially launched by the World Bank in 1997 to facilitate the use of Open, Distance and e-Learning methodologies in African Tertiary Institutions (<http://www.avu.org>). Likewise, attempts to develop national university networks along the lines of JANET in the UK (<http://www.janet.ac.uk>) have also been fraught with difficulty.<sup>3</sup>

Determined to build on the belief that one of the roles of UK HEIs is to support research and teaching in poorer countries of the world, the Collective nevertheless initiated a partnership with institutions in Kenya (Maseno University), Ghana (University of Education, Winneba), Mozambique (Universidade Eduardo Mondlane) and Senegal (Université Cheikh Anta Diop). This explicitly sought to combine Anglophone, Lusophone and Francophone African countries, with objectives as laid out in Figure 3. In part these objectives were directly related to the aims of the DeIPHE programme itself, but as Figure 1 indicates these were nevertheless closely consonant with the Collective's overall goals. The development and implementation of this partnership has highlighted many opportunities and challenges, and it is to a summary of these that this paper now turns.<sup>4</sup>

### **Figure 3. Objectives of the ICT4D Collective's DeIPHE funded partnership**

The central purpose of this partnership is to create an *African ICT4D higher education partnership*, supported by the ICT4D Collective at Royal Holloway, University of London. Its overall objectives are:

- to build research and teaching capacity in African HEIs in the field of ICT4D, focusing initially on the field of education
- to implement collaborative research practice in this field
- to enhance or initiate university courses on ICT4D in all partner countries
- to identify means of sustaining the partnership beyond the initial period of funding
- to link this African partnership with other global initiatives in the field of IT4D
- to mainstream gender in ICT4D in Africa HEIs

#### **• Opportunities for ICT4D higher education partnerships**

The involvement of the UNESCO Chair in this partnership with African HEIs provides a wealth of opportunities for *all* participating institutions, notably:

- Engagement of academics from other universities in undergraduate and postgraduate teaching programmes on ICT4D – it is especially valuable, for example, to have African colleagues contributing to Master's programmes in the UK;
- Opportunities for colleagues to undertake research in partner institutions in different countries – we are currently embarking on a research programme in all of our countries on ICT4D partnerships;
- Development of shared learning resources on ICT4D – made available as Open Educational Resources;
- Improved access to knowledge about ongoing ICT4D activities through our digital environments;
- Holding of workshops through which our research findings can be shared both within the partnership and also with those from other institutions; and
- Joint publications on ICT4D

It must be emphasised here that experience to date has shown that the UK based UNESCO Chair in ICT4D has benefited from these opportunities just as much as have the African institutions, and that this partnership is therefore not simply a transfer of knowledge or technology from Europe to Africa.

#### **• Challenges in delivering ICT4D higher education partnerships**

Shaping this partnership has not, though, been without its challenges, among the most important of which have been:

- The need to understand the differing expectations of the partners involved – hence the importance of a framework such as that outlined in Figure 2;

<sup>3</sup> See for example KENET in Kenya <http://www.kenet.or.ke>

<sup>4</sup> Details of specific activities are available at <http://www.qg.rhul.ac.uk/ict4d/delphe.html>

## **Papers (cont'd)**

Professor Tim Unwin

- The serious lack of physical ICT infrastructure in African partner institutions that limits their ability to interact effectively – especially issues concerned with bandwidth and cost of connectivity, which limit the use of Skype video conferencing and access to our Moodle environment;
- The different research traditions in the various countries involved, particularly concerning the design and implementation of research projects;
- The need to retain flexibility in management of the partnership, whilst also ensuring that the expectations of the funding agencies are met;
- Debates over intellectual property rights and open educational resources which can delay development of joint resources;
- Difficulties resulting from pressures of time commitments and costs of travel in hosting events and implementing research that involves all partners; and
- Time spent in managing and administering the partnership – any significant expansion in the number of institutions involved will necessitate a considerably increased administrative burden.

## **Conclusion**

This short paper has highlighted the rationale behind the creation of the UNESCO Chair in ICT4D in 2007, and has focused particularly on the implementation of one of its recent activities, the ICT4D Partnership for African Higher Education Institutions. Despite the undoubted desirability of working in partnership, seeking to bring together the needs of our various institutions with our different capacities to help deliver them, there is no doubt that the implementation of such partnerships is costly, both in terms of time and of resources. As discussed at one of our recent workshops, most African institutions are 10-15 years behind European institutions in terms of their ICT infrastructures, and until this fundamental inequality is satisfactorily addressed it is unrealistic to expect substantial 'development' gains to be achieved. Perhaps we should be less ambitious in our aspirations, and merely seek to establish mechanisms whereby scholars and scientists in Africa can have access to the quality of research infrastructure that we now take for granted here in the UK.

## **For Discussion**

- **Is it necessary for partnerships themselves to be 'sustained' if they have put in place ongoing mechanisms for their overall objectives to be achieved?**
- **How can we best help support African HEIs in their aspirations to have sound research infrastructures in place, both in terms of ICTs and of human capacity to implement effective research programmes that will address development objectives in their countries?**
- **How can experiences of other UNESCO chairs, and the UNITWIN network more widely, better be used to ensure that academic research is used effectively in delivering appropriate development activities on the ground in Africa?**

## **Short Bibliography**

- Cassidy, T. (2007) *The Global Education Initiative (GEI) Model of Effective Partnership Initiatives in Education*, Geneva: World Economic Forum
- Draxler, A. (2008) *New Partnerships for EFA: Building on Experience*, Paris: IIEP/UNESCO and World Economic Forum.
- Martens, J. (2007) *Multistakeholder Partnerships – Future Models of Multilateralism*, Berlin: Friedrich Ebert Stiftung
- Sachs, J. (2005) *The End of Poverty: How we can Make it Happen in our Lifetime*, London: Penguin.
- Unwin, T. (2005) *Partnerships in Development Practice: Evidence from Multi-Stakeholder ICT4D Partnership Practice in Africa*, Paris: UNESCO (UNESCO publications for the World Summit on the Information Society).
- Unwin, T. (2007) No end to poverty, *Journal of Development Studies*, 43(5), 929-53.
- Weigel, G. and Waldburger, D. (eds) (2004) *ICT4D – Connecting People for a Better World*, Berne and Kuala Lumpur: Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation and Global Knowledge Partnership.
- Zadek, S. et al. (2002) *Endearing Myths, Enduring Truths: Enabling Partnerships Between Business, Civil Society and the Public Sector*, London: Business Partners for Development.

**“International Development and the Role of Religion:  
Addressing the Need to Develop Programmes  
on Inter-Religious Understanding”**

**UNESCO Chair in Interfaith Studies**

**University of Birmingham**

Professor Jonathan Webber *Chairholder, UNESCO Chair in Interfaith Studies*

**Introduction**

Here is not the place to rehearse the details of how the habit of excluding issues relating to 'religion' from the international development programmes mounted by both Western governments and the Soviet Union after the Second World War slowly came to be re-examined after the end of the Cold War. Suffice it to say that in recent years it has become increasingly recognised that religious leaders and their institutions, faith perspectives and faith-based organizations, and in general an acknowledgement of the importance of the spiritual dimensions of life, all have a key role to play in the formulation and delivery of development programmes to the developing world. The secularist emphasis on economic development and quantifiable material improvement is nowadays beginning to be reworked so as to include the notion of holistic human development—embracing such areas as health, education, literacy, moral awareness, and the 'quality of life'. These are all areas in which faith-based organizations, through their own programmes of social welfare, charitable work, and humanitarian relief, have in any case long been involved, though the importance of the faith component in these activities is only now receiving proper recognition. For example, in the developing world, religious leaders are often among the most trusted individuals in society and are particularly well placed to introduce new ideas into their communities; tapping into their experience and support can significantly increase the viability of development priorities and objectives (for a recent study of this whole topic, see Hayes 2007).

However, religions often impose constraints on their activities (the application of gender bias, for example), and so to move forward to meet the challenges of working together with religious leaders and faith-based organizations—whether in foreign countries or through locally based representative bodies in the UK—requires special training, expertise and capacity building. Interfaith co-operation is a complex and technical field, and—in the formal academic sense of 'interfaith studies'—is still in its infancy. For example, assumed commonalities between faiths, or too great a stress on apparent differences between them, can be profoundly misleading in different ways. The academic study of religion is in fact an interdisciplinary area, extending far beyond the confines of 'theology' in the narrow sense. It embraces the social sciences, politics and economics, psychology, history, law, cultural studies, gender studies, and international relations, among many others. The UNESCO Chair in Interfaith Studies at the University of Birmingham, quite appropriately therefore, consists of a multidisciplinary group of specialists working both in the context of their own particular fields as well as in joint teaching and research projects with specific interfaith objectives. The better understanding of other faiths, and of the relations between them, is the key task of the Chair, with strong potential significance for the work of agencies concerned with international development. In that sense the Chair is merely meeting up to a much more basic responsibility—to provide an essential resource in interfaith education, both for those specialising in the study of religion and for those in other fields who have understood the need to follow through a 'religion dimension' in their work (see Cheetham 2005).

**The international work of the UNESCO Chair**

As a general statement of intellectual principle, the focus here is on the interdependence of religious cultures, i.e. the reciprocal influences and the social contexts in which particular religious systems function. Members of the UNESCO Chair have made significant contributions to scholarly research into these historical and cultural relationships and linkages. I can pick out only a few examples here.

The study of Christian–Muslim relations, most notably by Prof. David Thomas, is of particular importance to the Chair: in fact it was a focus on this field that gave rise to the original desire to establish a UNESCO Chair in Interfaith Studies at the University. The work of Prof. Thomas, who has published on early Muslim anti-Christian polemic (2002) and Christian minorities in the Muslim world (2003), makes plain that to understand any one faith it is necessary to consider its attitudes to the Other (2004); and he is the co-editor of the quarterly scholarly journal *Islam*

and *Christian–Muslim Relations*, a joint project in collaboration with the Center for Muslim–Christian Understanding of Georgetown University in Washington, DC.

The interfaith work of Dr Josef Boehle, Coordinator of the UNESCO Chair, is at the interface between the study of religion on the one hand, and political science and international relations on the other. His main focus is on how present-day inter-religious co-operation, as promoted through the United Nations, can help towards bringing about a shift from the so-called 'clash of civilizations' to a genuine 'dialogue of civilizations' (Boehle 2002, 2007). This is not merely ivory-tower research on the UN seen from afar. On the contrary, Dr Boehle's contribution to dialogue is squarely 'action research', especially through personal work with religious leaders of different faiths. For example, he was a member of the working committee that planned the Conference on Interfaith Cooperation for Peace, held at UN headquarters in June 2005. He was an adviser to the Civil Society Task Force that planned the Interactive Hearing of the High-Level Dialogue on Interreligious Understanding and Cooperation for Peace—a major, unprecedented event held by the General Assembly of the UN in October 2007. He also participated as an expert scholar in a working session on the role of religious leaders and communities in promoting shared security and peace, held at the first Alliance of Civilizations Forum in Madrid in January 2008.

My own work, based in social anthropology, specialises in Jewish studies, Holocaust studies, and museum studies, all of these with a strong research interest in the interfaith context in Poland. Before the Holocaust, Poland, a predominantly Catholic country, was home to the largest Jewish community Europe had ever known, and it was in Poland that the Germans established the main death camps for the systematic murder of the Jews of Europe. Today, the site of Auschwitz—the symbol both of the Holocaust and of Polish Catholic martyrdom—is a huge open-air museum, and I have been privileged to serve for a number of years on its international board, appointed by the Polish prime minister. Through this board, I work rather closely both with the Auschwitz museum and with a group of international specialists on a wide range of problems concerned with appropriate methods of education and memorialisation at Auschwitz (see Webber 2006), and am currently a member of a small working group with the remit to revamp the museum's entire permanent exhibition, which was put in place more than fifty years ago, in communist times, and is sorely in need of updating. After the collapse of communism in 1989, eastern Europe in general, and Poland in particular, needed capacity building in the work of reassessing its own past, and especially in an understanding of the history of its religious and ethnic minorities; Jewish religion and culture constituted an important component of Polish society over nine hundred years. A renewed Polish interest in this subject, specifically as an interfaith concern, has now become a highly visible aspect of the Polish transition, keeping me busy with conferences and lecturing at the local university in Cracow, as well as with a long-term research project in collaboration with its Institute of Sociology on the subject of folk memories of pre-Holocaust Jewish culture among Polish villagers. In conjunction with a British photographer with whom I worked in the small market towns and villages of southern Poland, I have also opened a museum exhibition of my own in Cracow, whose principal mission explicitly includes the task of educating the Polish and the Jewish public out of their respective stereotypes and misconceptions surrounding their own historical relationship, and in particular to reinstate Polish Jewish history as part of Polish history and identity, almost totally suppressed during two generations of communist rule (see Webber 2005). Much of my work intersects with continuous collaboration with senior staff of the Auschwitz museum, and one current project of mine is to coordinate certain aspects of genocide memorialisation in Rwanda (a conflict in which religious leaders were very much implicated) with the expertise available at that museum.

Where the synergy of the various individual scholars in the UNESCO Chair finds its fullest expression is in a project in which all members of the Chair are involved—the idea to establish in Birmingham a Museum of World Religions. Given the widespread public concern over the role of religion in today's world, it is perhaps surprising that there are hardly any museums anywhere that specifically address this subject. The UNESCO Chair is currently developing a proposal to develop a world-class institution of this kind in Birmingham, not only to provide a resource for the West Midlands or the UK but also as a contribution to international education more generally. The initiative for this project, with which the UNESCO Chair is in close collaboration, came from the Museum of World Religions in Taipei, which is the only one of its kind in the world. A multi-faith working group, led by representatives from Taipei, has been developing the concept for over a year now. The decision was reached that this was a project which should be undertaken by the UNESCO Chair (the only Interfaith Chair in the UK) and that it should be located in Birmingham because of its central location in the country, its character as one of the UK's most multi-faith cities (see Stringer 2006), and because the University's department of Theology and Religion, with 500 students and 35 members of staff (including specialists on Buddhism, Hinduism, and Sikhism, as well as the Abrahamic faiths), is the largest in the UK. It is envisaged that the remit of the Museum, in its own purpose-built building, would include the portrayal of the tensions and violence associated with religion, but would do so alongside a robust presentation of the value and good works of religion in general. In this way the Museum would directly address the serious attention currently being paid at the UN and its agencies, especially UNESCO, to the need to develop significant educational programmes on inter-religious understanding and respect for cultural diversity. The neutrality of the UNESCO–University combination in sponsoring the project is a key factor to its success and to the institutionalisation of the strong international links that the Museum wishes to develop not only with the Museum of World Religions in Taiwan but with art museums and faith-community museums around the world. It is an ambitious, visionary project, intended to make a major contribution.

## Conclusion

As a cross-cultural category, religion is notoriously difficult to define. Nor is it self-contained, but rather to be understood (at least by anthropologists) as part of 'culture' (see Geertz 1966). The Birmingham Chair's activities and action research thus fit well with UNESCO's public commitment to the need to develop programmes for inter-religious *and* intercultural understanding, i.e. taking the two together as appropriate. Judaism, for example, straddles the conventional divide between religion and culture, and looking at other faiths in this broader manner is highly desirable, especially given the nature of identity politics in multicultural settings. It means looking at religion as a kind of cultural podium, from which its members seek to address the world. Auschwitz is a particularly telling example: what does the Auschwitz site, recognised as a UNESCO World Heritage site 30 years ago, have to say to the world? There are no self-evident answers, despite the deep political significance of the question: Auschwitz today is nothing less than an intercultural and interfaith construction site. In 2005 the UN General Assembly voted to establish both an Annual International Day of Commemoration for the victims of the Holocaust and a programme of educational outreach, and two months ago, UNESCO in turn passed a similar resolution. The point is that the educational purpose of Holocaust remembrance specifically intersects with the need to warn humanity of the dangers of hatred, bigotry, racism, ignorance, and prejudice. Religion, as is well known, is in a key position here. The challenge for policy-makers, as the former US Secretary of State Madeleine Albright wrote in a recent article (Albright 2006), is to harness the unifying potential of faith, while containing its capacity to divide. Standard textbooks of international relations do not normally provide a sophisticated understanding of religion, even though it is clear that it has an immense power to influence how people think, feel, and act. Effective policy-making needs an understanding of why others act as they do. Religion can lead people to kill, but it also teaches a sense of responsibility towards others, and to provide strong motivation for forgiveness and reconciliation. Faith-based diplomacy and faith-based action research are thus too important to be ignored. As I said at the beginning, the interfaith work that underpins such strategies is complex and technical, requiring competence not only in the sacred texts, rituals, philosophies, and cultural histories of specific religious traditions, but also an understanding of the pitfalls as well as the available scope that they can contribute to improve the world. The UNESCO Chair in Interfaith Studies at the University of Birmingham is profoundly committed to teaching, research, and action in all these areas.

## FOR DISCUSSION

- **Should the University of Birmingham develop a specialised, interdisciplinary MA programme in Interfaith and Development Studies?**
- **Should development studies programmes include courses on the role of religion?**
- **Should the UNESCO Chair be developing in-service training modules for development agency personnel?**
- **How can the UNESCO Chair usefully help overseas agencies to interpret the objectives of development programmes in ways consistent with local religious beliefs and practices?**

## References

[Selected relevant recent publications of members of the UNESCO Chair are marked with an asterisk]

Albright, Madeleine 2006. 'Faith and Diplomacy', *The Review of Faith and International Affairs*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 3–9.

\*Boehle, Josef 2002. 'Inter-religious Cooperation and Global Change: From a Clash of Civilisations to a Dialogue of Civilisations', *Pacifica Review—Peace, Security, and Global Change*, vol. 14, no. 3.

\*. . . . 2007. 'Religions, Civil Society and the UN System', *Studies in Inter-religious Dialogue*, vol. 17, no. 1.

\*Cheetham, David 2005. 'The University and Interfaith Education', *Studies in Inter-religious Dialogue*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 16–35.

Geertz, Clifford 1966. 'Religion as a Cultural System', in Michael Banton (ed.), *Anthropological Approaches to the Study of Religion* (A.S.A. Monographs, no. 3). London: Tavistock Publications, pp. 1-46.

Haynes, Jeffrey 2007. *Religion and Development: Conflict or Cooperation?*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

\*Stringer, Martin 2006. 'Managing Religious Diversity through the Discourses of Ordinary Members of Inner-Urban Neighbourhoods in Birmingham UK', in K. P. Kumar (ed.), *Religious Pluralism in the Diaspora*, Leiden: Brill, pp. 221–34.

\*Thomas, David 2002. *Early Muslim Anti-Christian Polemic: Abu 'Isa al-Warraaq's 'Against the Incarnation'*, Cambridge.

\*. . . . 2003. (ed.), *Christians at the Heart of Islamic Rule: Church Life and Scholarship in 'Abbasid Iraq*, Leiden.

\*. . . . 2004. 'Dialogue with Other Faiths as an Aspect of Islamic Theology', in T. L. Hettema and A. van der Kooij (eds), *Religious Polemics in Context*, Assen.

\*Webber, Jonathan 2005. (with Chris Schwarz), *Photographing Traces of Memory: A Contemporary View of the Jewish Past in Polish Galicia*, Kraków: Galicia Jewish Museum.

\*. . . . 2006. 'Memory, Religion, and Conflict at Auschwitz: A Manifesto', in Oren Baruch Stier and J. Shawn Landres (eds), *Religion, Violence, Memory and Place*, Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, pp. 51–70.

## “Intercultural Studies: Issues For Complex Multicultural Societies”

### UNESCO Chair in Intercultural Studies and Teacher Education Institute of Education, University of London

Professor Jagdish Gundara *Chairholder, UNESCO Chair in Intercultural Studies and Teacher Education*

#### Introduction

The year 2008 is the twenty fifth anniversary of the International Association for Intercultural Education. It was set up in 1984 during a conference organised by the UNESCO Chairholder at the Institute of Education, University of London. The Chairholder and a number of colleagues would like to use year as an occasion to chart the journey of this field. It has been a torturous journey because there is no singularity of views about the field. In the first instance most of the English speaking countries use the term ‘multicultural’ as a policy term and is a very powerful critique of the work carried under the usage of this term. Educators and others are accused of dividing children, adults and communities along racial, ethnic, religious and social divides.

In most of the international organisations and non-English speaking countries the term ‘multicultural’ is used as a descriptive term for a school, community or a society. The term ‘intercultural’ is used as a policy term for initiatives in various social and public policy contexts. The Institute of Education under the aegis of the Director, Professor Geoff Whitty and the Chairholder intend to organise a series of events, which include seminars, consultations, publications and conference to enable the development of this field more systematically.

#### Activities

The following are some of the activities which have international dimensions:

- The Chairholder is a founding member and the current President of the International Association for Intercultural Education (IAIE). The IAIE is cooperating with the International Association for the Study of Cooperation in Education (IASCE), The School of Education University of Torino and the Centro Servizi Didattici (Ce.Se.Di.) of the Education Department of the Province of Turin to organise a major international Conference on ‘Cooperative Learning in Multicultural Societies, 21st to 23rd January 2008.
- The Chairholder and Professor Agostino Portera as members of the IAIE Board are editing an issue of the journal Intercultural Education to which the whole Board will contribute articles which will chart conceptual, theoretical and other critical issues in the field of intercultural education.
- The Chairholder is in discussions with the European Comparative Education Society and the Development Education Research Unit at the Institute of Education to hold seminars to explore commonalities between: intercultural, comparative and development education.
- The ICIS and the National Union of Teacher have developed over the last two decades with the Commonwealth Teachers Unions. It is anticipated that during this academic year there will be further work to develop teacher competencies in the fields of intercultural and human rights education within schools in the Commonwealth. The Commonwealth Commission Report ‘Civil Paths to Peace’ will be used as one of the basis for this work.
- ICIS undertook a study for the European Union to set up a South East European Education Cooperation Centre (SEEECC). While very positive noises were made while the team worked with ministerial colleagues in the region, the SEEECC was not set up. The researchers on this project want to explore (in collaboration with others) what are the barriers to such developments in areas of conflict to enhance intercultural understandings.
- A number of Honorary Research Fellows are interested in mapping issues of intercultural education and: multilingual issues; media education; humanist aspects of the sacred and the secular; ethnographic and evidence based research.

## **UNESCO Chair and The Scarman Nova Institute**

The Chairholder has been the Chair of the Board Trustees and the President of the Scarman Trust. The Scarman Trust has been involved in enhancing the work of civil society and active citizenship engagements at grass roots levels. The Scarman Institute is being established in cooperation with the Open and South Bank Universities (UK), with Matthew Pike as the Director. The Institute will undertake research to enhance community level intercultural and community engagements, document good practices and connect these with measures to bring about action for equalities at the national levels. The two following initiatives which have international linkages can be mentioned:

- **CAN DO LEARNING** in multicultural grassroots and marginalised communities to overcome intercultural conflicts, overcome social exclusion. This initiative will deepen learning and training agenda on a longer term basis – opening up the pathways for people pathways to personal empowerment, control, self fulfilment and economically valuable skills. This community learning will take place in Contemporary Urban Centres – really large scale, iconic, highly accessible buildings which are truly inclusive and intercultural and use mediums of enterprise, arts, learning and campaigning. The focus on the arts and the creative and imaginative dimensions of re-engaging the dis-encharmed and the disengaged.
- The Commission for Racial Equality was established under the Race Relations Act 1976 and before it merged with the new Equalities and Human Rights Commission, was going to investigate fifteen government ministries which have failed to deliver racial equality within the remit of many of the government departments. This is partly because the government hired and paid private consultants fees to examine issues of discrimination, inequality and intercultural conflicts, but no action was taken following these reports. The Chairholder is setting up a group consisting of public sector, the civil society sector and the private sector to examine the types of public and social policy interventions can reduce inequalities within public and social policy sectors. The main focus will however, be inequalities to access within the educational domain and will consult with colleagues at national and international levels.

## “Education, Conflict and International Development”

### UNESCO Chair in Education for Pluralism, Human Rights and Democracy University of Ulster

Professor Alan Smith *Chairholder, UNESCO Chair in Education for Pluralism, Human Rights and Democracy*

*‘Violent conflict is one of the biggest barriers to development in many of the world’s poorest countries. Of the 40 poorest countries in the world, 24 are either in the midst of armed conflict or have only recently emerged from it.’*

Education is an essential tool for human development and the eradication of poverty. It is the means by which successive generations develop the knowledge, values and skills for future economic, social and cultural development. This is one reason why the Millennium Development Goals place so much emphasis on achieving universal, free and compulsory primary education through Education for All (EFA). There are many impediments to the achievement of Education for All. These include lack of priority to education on the part of national governments (such as insufficient spending as a percentage of GNP, or inequitable distribution of funding and resources) and lack of effective action from the international community in the use of development assistance. Within countries, poverty, child labour, distance from school, unequal access due to gender or cultural factors, and the existence of conflict are all barriers to the enrolment of children in school.

The first EFA Global Monitoring Report (2002) presented a model of education based largely on quantifiable inputs and outcomes. The problem with a purely quantitative approach is that the ‘quality’ of education we provide also has implications for ‘learning to live together’ in an increasingly globalised world (Delors et al, 1996). Good quality education should also take account of the educational values, content and processes that education systems provide. These values include the statement in Article 29 of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989) that the aims of education involve:

...the preparation of the child for responsible life in a free society in the spirit of understanding, peace, tolerance, equality of sexes, and friendship among all peoples, ethnic, national and religious groups and persons of indigenous origin.

This was acknowledged in the third EFA Global Monitoring Report (2005):

**Although** most human rights legislation focuses upon access to education and is comparatively silent about its quality, the Convention on the Rights of the Child is an important exception. It expresses strong, detailed commitments about the aims of education. These commitments, in turn, have implications for the content and quality of education.

Therefore, arguments have emerged that the right to education is not only about *access* to education. Whilst the right to education is properly concerned with universal access to free and compulsory education on a basis of equality, inclusion and non-discrimination, it is also concerned with the right to an education where the *content and processes* are consistent with human rights and fundamental freedoms.

However, there are a number of problems in turning these aspirations into practice. Whilst there may be international norms and standards concerning the aims and purpose of education, these are mediated significantly by local conditions, customs and practice and governments tend to regard comments on their education system as external interference and encroaching on national sovereignty. Added to this is the likelihood that many of the situations where there might be concern about the type of education being provided are also those caught up in conflict. Nevertheless, from a rights-based development perspective, children do not lose the right to education simply because they live in the midst of a conflict or in a difficult environment.

A number of studies highlight aspects of education that have implications for conflict (Bush & Salterelli, 2000; Smith & Vaux, 2003; Buckland, 2004; Davies, 2004; Tawil & Harley, 2004) and suggest a number of reasons why we should be cautious about how education is provided. Firstly, education may be perceived politically as a powerful tool for ideological development. This can take many forms, ranging from the use of education in the development of liberal ideas, to nation building and in extreme cases, political indoctrination. Secondly, education may be perceived as an instrument for providing the knowledge and skills necessary for economic development and this

may or may not include explicit reference to the implications or ethics of different forms of technological and economic development. Thirdly, education is a means by which social and cultural values are transmitted from generation to generation and depending on the values concerned, these may convey negative stereotypes or encourage attitudes that explicitly or implicitly condone violence or generate conflict.

### **Conflict analysis of education systems**

Systemic analysis of education systems from a conflict perspective is an under-developed area. It is relevant for a range of professionals, including politicians, policy makers, education administrators, teachers, parents, community activists, youth and development workers. There are many entry points to the various levels of an education system and the development of conflict-sensitive education systems involves analysis at each of these. This includes a critical analysis of the political ideology driving a system, as well as its legislative, structural and administrative qualities that have implications for non-discrimination and equal access to education. The most contentious challenge in terms of international development is to find a way of raising critical questions about the form and content of education and its implications for relations between peoples, groups and nations. The difficulty will be in finding ways for this to be accepted internationally as a legitimate concern as part of improving the quality of education.

The extent to which education is a tool for political or ideological purposes may be evidenced by political involvement in operational matters, such as education appointments, deployment of teachers or the determination of the curriculum. In many circumstances political elites will want to use education for their own purposes. Although decentralisation of education systems may carry the potential to increase participation and ownership, it may leave education open to manipulation as part of local politics. This highlights the need for systems and structures that 'insulate' the education sector from political bias, potential corruption and interference in operational decisions to implement policy. Capacity building and training for those working within the public service may therefore be a necessary prerequisite for the success of any overall education sector plan that takes account of conflict. At all levels of the education system *governance* is a crucial issue. The arrangements that are in place for representation and participation in consultation, decision-making and governance may be potential sources of conflict, or they may be opportunities for inclusion and the resolution of grievances. Arrangements for transparency and accountability also reflect an education system's capacity to accept and address inequalities that might otherwise become sources of conflict.

In broad terms, the way in which EFA is implemented may compound inequalities and erode confidence in government's capacity to provide basic services. In such a situation, grievances are likely to become increasingly politicised and this makes it easier to mobilise support for violence and conflict. For example, education may become a source of conflict depending on whether it promotes conformity to a single set of dominant values (assimilation), permits the development of identity-based institutions (separate development) or encourages shared institutions (integration). The extent to which any of these approaches make conflict more or less likely will be highly context-dependent.

### *Curriculum and textbooks*

At the practical level, there are many aspects of curriculum that have a bearing on conflict. When curriculum is conceived narrowly as the transmission of knowledge from one generation to the next, it may be perceived as an extremely powerful tool to promote particular political ideologies, religious practices or cultural values and traditions. The contemporary trend in many countries is to 'modernise' the curriculum so that it is defined in terms of 'learning outcomes' where learning outcomes refer to skills, attitudes and values as well as factual knowledge. They may include the development of 'generic skills' that include communication skills, the ability to draw on multiple sources of information and evaluate conflicting evidence, the development of media literacy, critical thinking and moral development (EFA, 2003). Within international development settings there is a particular emphasis on 'life skills' as a means of providing child protection, social and health education (id21, 2004) and the argument is that these are the type of skills that are also helpful for peace-building (UNICEF, 2005).

Additionally, in terms of 'content', every area of the curriculum carries values with the potential to communicate implicit and explicit political messages. Many of these involve specialised areas of study. For example, the UNESCO position paper on language of instruction highlights the importance of sensitivity to majority and minority languages and distinguishes between 'official' and 'national' languages:

The choice of language in the educational system confers a power and prestige through its use in formal instruction. Not only is there a symbolic aspect, referring to status and visibility, but also a conceptual aspect referring to shared values and worldview expressed through and in that language. (UNESCO, 2003:13-14)

Another area of curriculum is the teaching of history and the extent to which history education may become a vehicle for promoting particular versions of history, revising historical events or confronting the past in a critical way.

Political dimensions in the way that geography is taught and the lexicon it uses for disputed territories can be problematic and the content of teaching material for areas such as culture, art, music and religious education often get drawn into controversy. Such areas are sometimes referred to as 'national subjects', in many instances tightly controlled by governments and regarded as essential tools for nation building.

The values represented in textbooks, and other learning resources, is a further area of specialist concern. For example, the operation of a single textbook policy may offer a Ministry of Education a way of guaranteeing a 'minimum entitlement' for all pupils to basic learning resources, particularly important in low-income countries and where equal access needs to be demonstrated. However, questions may arise about who controls or benefits from the production of textbooks and about their content. In contested societies, arguments over textbook content can also become cultural and ideological battlegrounds. Textbook review processes have a long history. For example, there were joint initiatives on French-German textbooks during the 1920s; German-Polish cooperation following the Second World War; and a US-Soviet textbook project in the 1970s (Höpken, 2003). They raise sensitive issues about what might be considered offensive and by whom. A project reviewing Palestinian and Israeli projects has been underway for some years. Further examples include concerns raised by China and Korea about the treatment of World War II in Japanese textbooks and a critique of international assistance for the replacement of textbooks in Afghanistan (Spink, 2005).

### **Education during and after conflict**

Education systems face exceptional challenges during times of violent conflict. In the midst of conflict, international humanitarian law has a particular importance. The Geneva Conventions make specific reference to protections related to education at times of war. These include provisions that:

- Parties to a conflict ensure that children under fifteen, orphaned or separated from their families are provided with appropriate education;
- Occupying powers should facilitate the maintenance of education;
- Education should be provided for interned children and young people;
- Education should be provided for children throughout non-international conflicts.

A main weakness of such provisions is that, because the Geneva Conventions were developed just after the Second World War, they related to situations where a formal state of war had been declared between countries. Later protocols, UN declarations and resolutions have tried to update accepted 'rules of engagement' to accommodate the more complex nature of modern conflicts, but in these situations, where conflicts are often waged by groups within countries or where there is no sense of accountability to international authority, the main problem is a disregard of the values and norms represented by the Geneva Conventions (Tawil, 2000).

This area has developed significantly since then and has become known as 'Education in Emergencies'.<sup>4</sup> Whilst not defined exclusively in terms of conflict, the disruption of education due to conflict is certainly one set of circumstances that come within the definition of an emergency (Sinclair, 2002). A joint initiative by UNESCO, UNHCR, UNICEF, Norwegian Refugee Council, CARE International and the Save the Children Alliance has led to the creation of an Inter-Agency Network on Education in Emergencies (INEE). INEE does not have the mandate to implement or co-ordinate during crises, but enables network members to share information and encourage collaboration. An important goal for INEE has been to define minimum standards for education in emergencies (INEE, 2005).

There is also a growing appreciation that reconstruction is not simply about replacing the physical infrastructure of schools, but needs to include opportunities for rebuilding human relations and inclusive education systems. In this respect, the contribution of education to processes of peace-building and reconciliation is not well understood. Part of this may be due to a natural desire to avoid revisiting the detail of past hurts and grievances, but part is also to do with our lack of conceptual understanding of what we mean by reconciliation and how education can contribute to the process in practice. Reconciliation may be necessary at many levels (between individuals, between groups in conflict, between peoples or nations at war). There are implications for education in terms of addressing the legacies of conflict and helping future generations understand what took place. Issues include the impact on the bereaved and injured, remembrance and commemoration; debates about forgiveness, expressions of regret or apology and symbolic events; understanding the role of amnesties, prisoner releases, alongside concepts of restorative and transitional justice<sup>5</sup>. These are challenging, long-term tasks that link education to the longer-term goal of conflict prevention.

The contribution of human rights education, citizenship programmes and intercultural education are also relevant. The key point about all these education programmes is that individually, none of them offers a 'magic solution' for the prevention of conflict. Rather they represent a set of education initiatives that address key themes and values which could have a preventative effect in the long term. It is unrealistic to expect that such programmes will have immediate impacts within short periods of time, but the absence of 'key themes' may be indicative of issues that a society is failing to address and these may generate problems in the long term.

## Papers (cont'd)

Professor Alan Smith

Overall then, a consideration of education from a conflict perspective is concerned with both access and quality. It seeks to address inequalities in access and provide a quality of education that challenges discrimination and xenophobia, so that these do not become sources of grievance used to justify violence and conflict.

## Notes

1. This paper draws upon a report for the UK Department for International Development (DFID) on education, conflict and international development (Smith & Vaux, 2003) and a keynote address to the 2004 annual conference of the British Association for International and Comparative Education (BAICE). It was the basis for a briefing paper for the 16th Conference of Commonwealth Education Ministers (16CCEM) in Cape Town (Commonwealth Education Partnerships 2007).
2. Millennium Development Goals (MDG) <http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals>
3. Education for All (EFA) <http://www.unesco.org/education/efa/index.shtml>
4. Inter-Agency Network on Education in Emergencies (INEE) <http://www.ineesite.org>
5. UNESCO IIEP [http://www.unesco.org/iiep/eng/focus/emergency/emergency\\_1.htm](http://www.unesco.org/iiep/eng/focus/emergency/emergency_1.htm)
6. Restorative Justice <http://www.restorativejustice.org>
7. UNHCR <http://www.unhcr.ch/cgi-bin/texis/vtx/home>

## For Discussion

- **To what extent is it possible to maintain the right to education in the midst of conflict? What are the challenges and what sort of actions are possible by the international community?**
- **To what extent are separate schools a potential cause of community division, or are they simply an indicator of mistrust and desire for separate development?**
- **Does our definition of 'quality education' include reference to its form and content? What contribution might it make to 'learning to live together'? How can international norms and standards be established?**
- **What do we mean by post-conflict 'reconciliation' and how might education contribute to this?**

## References

- Bush, K.D. & Saltarelli, D. (2000) *The Two Faces of Education in Ethnic Conflict* (Florence, United Nations Children's Fund, Innocenti Research Centre).
- Buckland, P. (2004) *Reshaping the Future: Education and Post-Conflict Reconstruction* (Washington, DC, World Bank).
- Davies, L. (2004) *Conflict and Education: Complexity and Chaos* (London, Routledge).
- Delors, J. et al (1996) *Learning: The Treasure Within, Report to UNESCO of the International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century* (Paris, UNESCO).
- EFA Global Monitoring Report (2002) *Education for All. Is The World On Track?* (Paris, UNESCO).
- EFA Global Monitoring Report (2003) *Gender and Education for All. The Leap to Equality* (Paris, UNESCO), 84-86.
- EFA Global Monitoring Report (2005) *Education for All. The Quality Imperative* (Paris, UNESCO).
- Höpken, W. (2003) 'Textbooks and Conflicts. Experiences from the Work of the Georg-Eckert-Institute for International Textbook Research' (Washington, DC, World Bank Symposium).
- id21 (2004) Life skills, peace education and aids prevention. Available online at: <http://www.id21.org/insights/insights-ed04/insights-issued04-art03.html>
- INEE (2005) Minimum Standards for Education in Emergencies, Chronic Crises and Early Reconstruction. Available online at: <http://www.ineesite.org/standards/default.asp>
- Sinclair, M. (2002) *Planning Education In and After Emergencies* (Paris, International Institute for Education Planning, UNESCO).
- Smith, A. and Vaux, T. (2003) *Education, Conflict and International Development* (London, DFID).
- Spink, J. (2005) Education and politics in Afghanistan: the importance of an education system in peacebuilding and reconstruction, *Journal of Peace Education*, 2(2), 195-207.
- Tawil, S. (2000) International humanitarian law and basic education, *International Review of the Red Cross* 82(839), 581-600.
- Tawil, S. & Harley, A. (Eds) (2004) *Education, Conflict and Social Cohesion* (Geneva, International Bureau for Education, UNESCO).
- UNESCO (1999) *UNESCO Guidebook on Textbook Research and Textbook Revision* (Paris, UNESCO).
- UNESCO (2003) *Education in a Multilingual World*. Position Paper (Paris, UNESCO).
- UNICEF (2005) Life Skills-based Education programme. Available online at: <http://www.unicef.org/lifeskills>
- Vaux, T., Smith, A. and Subba, S. (2006) Education For All in Nepal: Review from a conflict perspective, London, International Alert. Available online at: <http://www.international-alert.org/publications/250.php>
- World Bank (2004) *The Role of the World Bank in Conflict and Development* (Washington, DC, World Bank).

## “Education as a Humanitarian Response”

### UNESCO Chair in Education as a Humanitarian Response University of Oxford

Dr Colin Brock *Chairholder, UNESCO Chair in Education as a Humanitarian Response*

#### Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to explain the motivation behind the application for this UNESCO Chair and the rationale on which its formulation, activities to date, and future plans have been based. It is discursive, and has no bibliography.

#### Motivation

The initial motivation behind the application arose from an observation of the first few Global Monitoring Reports on the 'Education for All' dimension of the Millennium Development Goals. These reports appeared to fall short of the claimed objective of education for all in that they virtually failed to recognise the existence of substantial groups of people who were excluded or marginalised - for whatever reason - from mainstream educational policy provision. I made a few interventions at relevant meetings to the effect that EFA was really EFAA - Education for Almost All.

Such observations were either ignored as nitpicking, or explained away by the fact that such groups had their own discrete educational responses serving their needs, such as 'education in emergencies'

This failed to satisfy me, and although my initial observation and concern had been in relation to physical exclusion or marginalisation, I began to think also in terms of cultural exclusion or marginalisation. Put together I see the objective of meeting both the physical and cultural educational needs in terms of providing an *appropriate education*. This is what I see as a humane approach and so I put forward my application to UNESCO under the title of 'Education as a Humanitarian Response'.

In this sense 'humanitarian' is a holistic concept and not confined only to those most in need. However, I am mindful of the educational dictum that if one gets it right for those with special needs, one will get it right for the majority.

#### Application

My application was the first to pass through the newly reconstituted Education Committee of the UK Commission to UNESCO, and the view expressed there was that, while being mindful of the regulations concerning developing countries, this UNESCO Chair should devote some of its time and effort to situations in the UK itself, bearing in mind the significant numbers of refugees and asylum seekers in this country, to say nothing of numerous other minority groups whose educational needs were not being fully met for whatever reason.

The initial plan was to seek to identify a range of relevant problems/groups of people across the main regional components of the developing world that together would cover the most obvious forms of exclusion and/or marginalisation. Then to seek to identify institutions of higher education in certain countries who might be willing to collaborate and form part of the international network of this UNESCO Chair. Examples included: the University of Sierra Leone (post-conflict issues, orphans and vulnerable children), Universidad de Los Andes, Colombia (internally displaced communities), Jamalia Islamia University, India (working children, street children).

Chulalongkorn University, Thailand (refugee communities from Myanmar), Kirovograd State Pedagogical University, Ukraine (orphans, street children and railway children). In addition to developing small projects with some of these institutions or their NGO partners on the ground, the application also set out to hold seminars, create publications and a Masters programme in Education as a Humanitarian Response. Finally there was the need to accommodate the UK context.

#### Activities

By the time that the UNESCO Chair was agreed in May 2005, I had been part-time at Oxford for two years, having been succeeded in my substantive post by a full time lecturer. This meant that the entire funding of my Chair, including my salary and that of a research assistant (both part-time), and the cost of setting up activities indicated

## **Papers (cont'd)**

Dr Colin Brock

above, had to be raised by myself, Oxford providing a room, computer and telephone facilities. Having obtained core funding and established a base in the Department we commenced substantive activities in January 2006.

Our first moves were to set in motion research into the educational problems of refugees in secondary schools in London, which became the doctoral topic of my research assistant, and to organise an *initial seminar*. The seminar was held in April of 2006 in Oxford for an invited group of about 20 participants relating to potential projects in India, Sierra Leone, Ukraine and Thailand. From these discussions two *active projects* emerged, in Ukraine and Thailand. From the autumn of 2006 to the autumn of 2007, several field visits were made to both Ukraine and Thailand. The outcome has been *two research reports*, one in process of being published by our partner in Thailand (the Dutch NGO, ZOA) on the *In-Service Training of Teachers in the Karen Refugee Camps of N W Thailand*, the other in process of editing on *Educational Issues Relating to Orphans and Vulnerable Children in Ukraine*. In the autumn of 2006 the DPhil thesis of my research assistant, Dr Megan McCorrison, was completed on refugees in London schools, and she has formulated articles arising from it. In 2007 we submitted a paper through the EFA sub-committee on *Education as a Humanitarian Response* that is being published by the UK Commission to UNESCO, and formulated a proposal for a publisher for a book series under the same title. This is currently under consideration. In September 2007, funding for my research assistant ceased and she is now working as a researcher with the refugee Council in London.

The next moves, initiated in 2007, are: 1) to develop a proposal for a project in Freetown, Sierra Leone on meeting the educational needs of vulnerable children, especially orphans, in the post-conflict situation there; 2) to organise a second *seminar*, this time on the educational needs of vulnerable children in the UK; 3) to proceed with the *book series* once agreement with a publisher has been reached; 4) to begin to develop a *Masters Degree* programme in *Education as a Humanitarian Response*, an objective of the original application for the Chair in which UNESCO is particularly interested.

All the above are in process, but the Masters Degree objective is not possible at Oxford due to 1) the strategic plan for the department placing a moratorium on new masters degrees in order to expand doctoral and post-doctoral research; 2) there being no credible successor when I retire from holding the Chair (I am nearly 70). Consequently, I am in discussion with the University of London Institute of Education to take the Chair there, work with others to establish a masters programme and in due course hand over the UNESCO Chair in Education as a Humanitarian Response to a suitable member of the IOE staff also acceptable to UNESCO. This will of course involve the UK Commission to UNESCO.

## **Conclusion**

This UNESCO Chair is still quite young, in practice barely two years of activity. It has been under-funded and therefore involved few people. Nonetheless two *field projects* have been carried out, several *reports and other publications* are either extant or in process of becoming so in 2008, the prospective book series will serve to further the concept of education as a humanitarian response, and a second seminar is in planning for summer 2008.

Two key challenges for 2008/9 are the progressing of the *masters degree programme* with a view to a first intake the following year; and the establishing of a real *network* of institutions for this UNESCO Chair that will bring in those in Colombia, India, and possibly Palestine along with Ukraine, Thailand, Sierra Leone and the UK.

I look forward to discussions arising from this presentation and elsewhere during this Colloquium of UNESCO Chairs that will help to realise the objectives of this Chair, some of which may be in the form of collaboration with those other UK Chairs with related interests, which would be most welcome.

## **For Discussion**

- **Why does the vast majority of educational studies concentrate on formal education? Is it merely convenience?**
- **Do the privileged necessarily enjoy a humane educational experience?**

## “HIV/AIDS and Security: Developing an International Network”

### UNESCO Chair in HIV/AIDS, Education and Health Security in Africa Aberystwyth University

Professor Colin McInnes *Chairholder, UNESCO Chair in HIV/AIDS, Education and Health Security in Africa*

#### Introduction

An estimated 20 million people have died over the last two decades as a consequence of AIDS related illnesses. UNAIDS estimates that a further 33.6 million people today are living with the disease, some of them children and many of them young adults. Epidemics such as HIV/AIDS however have consequences beyond individual human health; they affect communities from the local scale of individual families, through larger social groupings such as states, to eventually a potential global impact. Economic productivity, social cohesion, governance and collective self-belief may all be deeply affected by epidemics. HIV/AIDS poses particular challenges however: the scale of the pandemic, the lack of any known cure, the extended period with which people may live with the disease and their social profile creates unusual social pressures. This is especially so in sub-Saharan Africa, where the pandemic has hit hardest in some of the world's poorest societies.

The social consequences of HIV/AIDS are generally presented in terms of security, largely as a consequence of the UN Security Council's intervention in 2000. In January of that year – symbolically at its first meeting of the new millennium – the UNSC discussed HIV/AIDS as a security challenge, especially in the context of Africa.<sup>1</sup> This was the first time the UNSC had discussed a health issue. It was followed by Resolution 1308 which focused on the security challenge of HIV/AIDS in Africa, particularly with regard to peacekeeping. This intervention both changed the nature of the debate over the international response to HIV/AIDS – from one focused on development and public health to one in which security was a key issue; it also set the parameters by which we think of AIDS as a security issue.

Recently however the consensus which emerged as a result of the UNSC's intervention has been challenged – principally by work in Aberystwyth and at the Clingendael Institute in the Netherlands. This work seeks to nuance our understanding of HIV/AIDS as a security issue and, in conjunction with other work, ask how we should best respond to the social challenges presented by the disease. Specifically, this paper identifies a network which is currently being established, led by the UNESCO Chair at Aberystwyth.

#### The science and the network

Bio-medical research on HIV/AIDS is well established, but work on the social consequences is more recent and only now beginning to mature. Work is particularly timely because initial assumptions are now receiving more rigorous examination and assessment at both a theoretical and empirical level. This network will bring together some of the leading researchers on the social consequences of HIV/AIDS worldwide, with a particular focus on one of the most controversial aspects – security. It is a network drawn both from sub-Saharan Africa and the 'north',<sup>2</sup> marrying theoretical and empirical strengths. Much of the conceptual work on security has originated in the West. Similarly, much of the work on the securitisation of HIV/AIDS originates there. However, empirical work is focused

<sup>1</sup> It is widely believed that this was as a result of a growing disillusionment with existing international efforts to stem the spread of the disease, efforts largely a result of a traditional development and public health paradigm. In particular the US Ambassador to the UN Richard Holbrooke – later a major campaigner on HIV/AIDS – visited Africa in late 1999 and saw both the extent of the disease's impact and the failure of international efforts. His individual agency is seen by a number of commentators (eg Prins) as being decisive in the development of HIV/AIDS as a security issue.

<sup>2</sup> Key partners are:

Professor Colin McInnes (UNESCO Chair in HIV/AIDS, Education, and Security in Africa, Centre for Health and International Relations, Department of International Politics)

Professor Alan Whiteside (Director, HEARD/ University KwaZulu-Natal)

Professor Maxi Shoeman (University of Pretoria)

Dr Kevin Kelley (Centre for AIDS Development Research and Evaluation, Rhodes University)

Jennifer Klot (Secretary, AIDS Security and Conflict Initiative, ASCI)

Alex de Waal (Programme Director HIV/AIDS Research, United States Social Sciences Research Council)

Luc Van Goor (Conflict Research Unit, Clingendael Institute for International Relations)

Dr Harvey Feldbaum (Co-director, Global Health and Foreign Policy Initiative, School of Advanced International Study, John Hopkins University)

on Africa and much of the best work has been done by African researchers. Creating a network between South African and British partners will therefore enable the theoretical and empirical dimensions of the problem to be brought together. In addition, policies to alleviate suffering from HIV/AIDS and to mitigate the security risks involved often originate in the West; but their impact is felt in southern Africa. Finally, there have been occasions in the debate on the securitisation of HIV/AIDS where Western perspectives have not only dominated, but have been the only perspectives in play. There is an urgent need to create a dialogue on this issue both to better understand the problem and to assess the effectiveness of policy responses.

The research links the arguments over HIV/AIDS as a security issue with policy responses to the pandemic. The key research question therefore is in two parts: how robust is the case that HIV/AIDS is a security issue, and how has policy been affected by securitisation? These will be addressed initially in four themed workshops with an additional start-up meeting (workshop A). The workshops will be held through 2008-10 in South Africa, Washington DC and London, and will involve the key network partners, aid agencies, AIDS activists and policy practitioners.

#### *Workshop B: HIV/AIDS and National Security*

Through the 1990s, international research on and policy responses to HIV/AIDS focused on health and development issues. In 2000 however, the UN Security Council changed the parameters of the debate, establishing a greater focus on the social consequences by articulating the case that HIV/AIDS was a security issue, especially for Africa. As a consequence HIV/AIDS was recast as an international political issue linked to national and regional security. A consensus soon began to emerge that:

- HIV/AIDS posed a risk to state stability both because of its effects on economies and because those affected are central to the functioning of states.
- That security forces were especially vulnerable, questioning a state's ability to protect itself from threats (internal or external), or placing at risk international peacekeeping missions.
- and that the spread of HIV/AIDS was exacerbated by conflict.

This consensus has recently come under scrutiny, with challenges both to the evidential base of the claims made and the causal reasoning as to why high infection rates might lead to instability or insecurity. The US SSRC with the Clingendael Institute in the Netherlands are engaged in the largest single project to date on this (ASCI), and a key role of the network will be to disseminate the findings, discuss their results and identify the next stages in research on this subject.

#### *Workshop C: HIV/AIDS and Human Security*

From the late 1990s on, a human security perspective also began to gain prominence. Human security changed the focus from the security of states to the lives (and health) of people and communities. It was not solely concerned with military threats but also with deprivation. It provided the logic behind the Millennium Development Goals and other recent policy initiatives designed to lift Africa out of poverty. A key moment came in May 2003 with the publication of the Report of the UN Commission on Human Security which argued that 'health security is at the vital core of human security' and highlighted HIV/AIDS as a source of particular concern.

#### *Workshop D: International policy responses*

Both views of HIV/AIDS stress that the disease causes insecurity and damages prospects for development; but they are divided by different understandings of the dynamics of the disease in Africa and the policy responses required. The human security approach emphasises development and poverty reduction: can the social consequences of HIV/AIDS be mitigated by an emphasis upon development aid and poverty reduction strategies? Moreover, whilst development and security have traditionally been seen as separate issues, a growing body of work has identified a close relationship between the two, with some arguing that development is dependent upon security rather than the reverse. What then is the security/development nexus with regard to HIV/AIDS?

Policy makers now appear to accept that HIV/AIDS is a security issue, but no detailed investigation has been undertaken to examine how this perspective has impacted on policy. Has there been any detectable shift from interventions and strategies that tackle HIV as a problem of poverty or human health in Africa? Has securitisation altered aid and health investments by international donor agencies, and if so, in what manner and what will be the effects on the goals set out in the MDGs? Has the national security perspective demonstrated greater purchase with policy makers (as some such as Richard Holbrooke have argued); or are more traditional development approaches associated with the human security perspective more powerful?

#### *Workshop E: The role of civil society*

Civil society has played an important role in Africa and elsewhere in mitigating the impact of AIDS. The degree to which that role has been affected by security considerations and – crucially – the ability of civil society to mitigate

the security implications of HIV/AIDS has not been fully discussed but may prove to be a key element as the impact of the disease develops.

## **Conclusion**

Traditional international development and public health responses have done little to stop the spread of AIDS. The number of new cases continues to increase each year, while the number of people living with HIV/AIDS continues to grow and have an increased effect upon the societies in which they live. Work on this latter element is at its early stages and this network seeks to understand both the impact of, and the policy responses necessary to deal with, the social consequences of the pandemic.

## **For Discussion**

- **Why have traditional international development efforts failed to stem the spread of HIV/AIDS and to what extent will its 'securitisation' lead to a more concerted international effort?**
- **What are the dangers in presenting disease as a security issue?**
- **Is HIV/AIDS a problem for the state (ie a national security problem) or for the individual (ie a human security problem)?**
- **What role does civil society play in countering HIV/AIDS and in mitigating the effects of the disease? And how important are the efforts of civil society *vis a vis* national and international efforts?**

## **Short Bibliography**

Denis Altman, 'AIDS and security', *International Relations* 17(4), pp.417-27

Laurie Garrett, *HIV and National Security: Where are the Links?* (New York: Council on Foreign Relations, 2005)

Stefan Elbe, *The Strategic Implications of HIV/AIDS*, Adelphi Paper 357 (Oxford: OUP for IISS, 2003).

Peter Fourie and Martin Schonteich, 'Africa's new security threat: HIV/AIDS and human security in Africa', *African Security Review* 10/4 (2001), p.5, available at: <http://www.iss.co.za/Pubs/ASR/10No4/Fourie.html>,

Commission on Human Security, *Human Security Now* (2003), available at: <http://www.humansecurity-chs.org/finalreport/FinalReport.pdf>

International Crisis Group (ICG), *HIV/AIDS as a Security Issue* (Brussels: ICG, 2001).

Robert L. Ostergard Jr., 'Politics in the hot zone: AIDS and national security in Africa', *Third World Quarterly*, 23/2 (2002).

Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs, *HIV/AIDS, Security and Democracy*, Seminar Report, Clingendael Institute, 4 May 2005, available at [http://www.ssrc.org/programs/HIV/publications/hague2005/seminar\\_report.pdf](http://www.ssrc.org/programs/HIV/publications/hague2005/seminar_report.pdf)

Mark Schneider and Michael Moodie, *The Destabilising Impact of HIV/AIDS* (Washington: Center for Strategic and International Studies, 2002).

Colin McInnes, 'HIV/AIDS and security', *International Affairs* 82/2 (March 2006).

## “An Agenda For Gender Research”

### UNESCO Chair in Gender Research Designate Lancaster University

Professor Sylvia Walby *Chairholder Designate, UNESCO Chair in Gender Research Designate*

#### Introduction

The UNESCO Chair of Gender Research is new; it is still undergoing the final stages of its ratification.

This paper is in two parts. First is a description of the intended programme for the UNESCO Chair of Gender Research at Lancaster University. Second, is an account of one current research project of the Chair Designate. This is selected from a range of programmes of research, including comparative gender mainstreaming<sup>1</sup>, gender and globalisation<sup>2</sup>, and comparative gendering of the knowledge economy<sup>3</sup>.

#### Programme for the UNESCO Chair of Gender Research at Lancaster University

The purpose of the Chair shall be to promote an integrated system of research, training, information and documentation in the field of gender research. It will serve as a means of facilitating collaboration between high-level, internationally recognized researchers and teaching staff of the University and other institutions in United Kingdom and elsewhere in Europe and North America, and in other regions of the world.

The specific objectives of this Chair are to:

- a. facilitate the development policy-relevant research on gender equality around the world objectives;
- b. support and develop international networking to facilitate the exchange of ideas, research and policy developments, especially between the North and South, using seminars, exchanges of students and faculty, reports, ICT and other means;
- c. support research on policy-relevant gender equality issues;
- d. build capacity in policy-relevant gender equality research; curriculum development, student training at graduate level; staff exchanges;
- e. facilitate exchanges between researchers and policy makers, in the context of UN instruments for promoting women's rights and the Millennium Development Goals;
- f. collaborate with UNESCO in the implementation of its Gender Equality policy and strategy.

#### Gender-based violence

Violence against women is a violation of women's human rights. This was explicitly recognised by the UN in 1993<sup>4</sup>. Gender-based violence against women is not isolated from the rest of society, but is rather an integral part of the social system. It is part of gender inequality, and linked to other aspects of human and economic development.

<sup>1</sup> Walby, Sylvia (2005) 'Measuring women's progress in a global era', *International Social Science Journal*, June, 184, 371-387. Translated into French, 2007. Walby, Sylvia (ed.) (2005) *Gender Mainstreaming*. Editor of special issue of *Social Politics*, 12, 3, 321-452. Walby, Sylvia (2005) 'Gender mainstreaming: Productive tensions in theory and practice', *Social Politics*, 12, 3, 1-25. Walby, Sylvia (ed.) (2005) *Comparative Gender Mainstreaming*. Editor of special issue of *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 7, 4, 453-638. Walby, Sylvia (2005) 'Introduction: Comparative gender mainstreaming in a global era', *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 7, 4, 453-471. Walby, Sylvia (2006) *Gender Budgeting: What is it? How to do it? Why do it?* Paper presented and circulated to Public Hearing on Gender Budgeting at the European Parliament, organised by the Women's Rights Committee, 4 October 2006. Walby, Sylvia (2007) *Gender Statistics: What is gender; Why we need gender statistics*. Contribution to the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe *Manual on Gender Statistics*, funded by the World Bank.

<sup>2</sup> Introduced new MA module at Lancaster University on 'Gender and globalisation', 2006. Forthcoming book: Walby, Sylvia (2008) *Globalization and Inequalities: Complexity and Contested Modernities*. (London: Sage).

<sup>3</sup> S. Walby, H. Gottfried, K. Gottschall and M. Osawa (eds) (2007) *Gendering The Knowledge Economy: Comparative Perspectives*. (London: Palgrave). One of the coordinators of GLOW: an international research network comparing gendered work transformations in UK, US, Japan and Germany.

<sup>4</sup> United Nations General Assembly (1993) *Declaration on the Elimination of Violence Against Women*. UN General Assembly 20 Dec 1993. UN Doc. A/RES/48/104. (New York: UN).

Yet, despite the widespread acknowledgement of the importance of violence against women, with the introduction in many countries of innovative policies and laws, the knowledge base needed to assess and evaluate the effective implementation of existing standards and laws is inadequate. There has been much work describing the forms of violence, but there is as yet no internationally comparable data on the extent and nature of the violence.

So, for example, although Goal 3 of the Millennium Development Goals is 'to promote gender equality', the only indicator concerns education, omitting violence against women, despite its known detrimental impact to development for women. Violence against women undermines women's health, their capacity to work, and to contribute to their children's well-being and education. An indicator of the extent of violence against women would improve the programmes and priorities underpinning the Millennium Development Goals.

There has been much innovative policy development, passing of new laws, and proclamation of new standards in many countries around the world in order to reduce and eliminate violence against women. The amount of gender-based violence can be reduced by such changes. However, it is hard to know which policies, laws and standards have made a difference, since there is little systematic measurement of the extent of violence against women over time. Regular collection of data over time is needed in order to know if the new policies and laws are having the intended effect. There have been much rhetoric and policy initiation, but how much is concerted and effective action? Only if there is a measurable outcome can there be an effective assessment and evaluation of what works to reduce and eliminate violence against women. Only if these measures are repeated year after year, will we know if the policies are effective and if violence against women is being reduced. There is a need to close the knowledge gap between rhetoric and policy initiation on the one hand and actual reduction in violence against women on the other hand.

The report by the UN Secretary-General to the UN General Assembly in 2006<sup>5</sup> summarised work so far and laid out an agenda for the next steps. This included developing indicators and a knowledge base for explaining the violence and evaluating policy.

The goal of this part of my programme of work on gender-based violence is to develop the techniques needed to build a systematic and internationally comparative knowledge base of gender-based violence. This requires surveys of the extent and nature of gender-based violence using the same definitions and comparable methodology; and the development of indicators to summarise the complex data in a form that is easily meaningful for policy makers and the public.

The work started with a review of the newly developing field of surveys of gender-based violence, evaluating the methodology, published in the *British Journal of Criminology*. This was followed by an invitation to contribute to the further development of the British Crime Survey, so as to make it the state of the art survey in this field. The findings from the innovative special module of around 200 questions was published in 2004. The methodology of surveys in this area is challenging: these are sensitive and potentially distressing questions to ask; the questions need to be worded with care and the approach and method of presentation to the respondent carefully considered. I was also commissioned to estimate the economic impact of domestic violence by the Department of Trade and Industry, also published in 2004.

I have been invited and commissioned to apply and develop this knowledge to the development of international standards for surveys, statistics and indicators in this area by various UN bodies, including the United Nations Division for the Advancement of Women (UNDAW) and the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE), sometimes with World Bank funding, and am a member of the UN Taskforce on statistics and indicators on Violence Against Women.

One part of this work is to assist in the development of agreed indicators. An indicator is a single figure that summarises complex quantitative data into a form that policy makers and the public can easily grasp. Busy policy makers do not want to wade through complex statistical findings from surveys; there is a need for a simple summary. An indicator is also intended to be comparative: both over time within a country, and between countries. These comparisons are key to the evaluation of policy innovations.

The task of defining an indicator is more complicated than it might initially appear. There are issues in the definition, for example, in the range of forms of violence (is non-physical abuse violence; should regionally specific forms be included in an international indicator), the thresholds at which an act is considered to be violence (does it need to lead to an injury), severity (how to take notice of the multiple repetitions often found in domestic violence). In particular there is concern as to whether the focus should be 'prevalence', the proportion of the population affected, or the number of incidents per population unit in a period of time (as is in crime statistics). Should the indicator be close in form to those in adjacent fields such as crime, or should it engage with the specificity of gender-based violence at the expense of the ease of mainstreaming? Each alternative has implications for the profile of gender-based violence that is presented to the public and policy world and hence for the policy priorities that might follow, as well as for the data made available to researchers to analyse.

---

<sup>5</sup> United Nations General Assembly (2006) *In-Depth Study on all Forms of Violence Against Women: Report of the Secretary-General* A/61/122/Add.1 <http://daccessdds.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N06/419/74/PDF/N0641974.pdf?OpenElement>

**Papers (cont'd)**

Professor Sylvia Walby

**Publications and reports on gender-based violence by Sylvia Walby**

Walby, Sylvia (2007) Rapporteur to Expert Group on Indicators to Measure Violence Against Women, drafting the group report. Author of the lead background paper. Organised by UNDAW and UNECE. 8-10 October 2007, Geneva.

<http://www.unece.org/stats/documents/ece/ces/ge.30/2007/mtg1/wp.1.e.pdf>

Walby, Sylvia (2006) *Towards international standards for data collection and statistics on violence against women*, presented to United Nations Economic Commission for Europe meeting on gender statistics; translated into Russian; published on UN website at: <http://www.unece.org/stats/documents/ece/ces/ge.30/2006/7.e.pdf>

Walby, Sylvia (2005) 'Improving the statistics on violence against women', *Statistical Journal of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe*, 22, 4, 193-216.

<http://www.lancs.ac.uk/fass/sociology/papers/walby-improvingstatisticsUN.pdf>

Walby, Sylvia (2005) 'Violence against women and the Millennium Development Goals'. Paper presented and circulated to UN Consultation on 'Galvanizing action to combat violence against women', 6-7 September 2005, United Nations, New York.

Walby, Sylvia (2005) 'Improving statistics on violence against women'. Presented to UN Expert Group Meeting on 'Violence against women: A statistical overview, challenges and gaps in data collection and methodology and approaches for overcoming them', 11-14 April 2005, Geneva, and published on the UN web-site at:

<http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/egm/vaw-stat-2005/docs/expert-papers/walby.pdf>

Walby, Sylvia (2005) *Developing Indicators on Violence Against Women*. Report for the United Nations Division for the Advancement of Women. Contribution to the UN Secretary-General's Report on Violence Against Women to the September 2006 UN General Assembly.

Walby, Sylvia (2004) *The Cost of Domestic Violence*. (London: Department of Trade and Industry Women and Equality Unit).

[http://www.womenandequalityunit.gov.uk/research/cost\\_of\\_dv\\_Report\\_sept04.pdf](http://www.womenandequalityunit.gov.uk/research/cost_of_dv_Report_sept04.pdf)

Walby, Sylvia and Jonathan Allen (2004) *Domestic Violence, Sexual Assault and Stalking: Findings from the British Crime Survey*. Home Office Research Study 276. (London: Home Office).

<http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs04/hors276.pdf>

Walby, Sylvia and with Andy Myhill (2001) 'Comparing the methodology of the new national surveys of violence against women', *British Journal of Criminology*, 2001, 41, 3, 502-522.

<http://www.lancs.ac.uk/fass/sociology/papers/WalbyBJCmethodology.pdf>

## Summaries of UNESCO Chairs in the UK (Alphabetical by University)

### UNESCO CHAIRS

#### UNESCO Chair in HIV/AIDS, Education and Health Security in Africa (established 2007) Aberystwyth University

For much of this decade there has been a consensus that HIV/AIDS has the potential to significantly affect national and regional security, and that securitising AIDS not only brings this into sharp relief but may also leverage additional funds and political attention to the AIDS crisis in Africa. More recently this orthodoxy has been questioned on two grounds: that the relationship between HIV/AIDS and security, and the consequences for development, are more complex and nuanced than originally believed; and that securitising AIDS creates problems as well as attracting additional attention. Almost all of this work has been done in the north. The primary purpose of the UNESCO Chair is to engage with researchers and policy makers in southern Africa working on these questions, to exchange knowledge, to examine and develop the empirical data, to consolidate the analysis, and to consider the policy consequences.

#### UNESCO Chair in Higher Education Management (established 2000) University of Bath

The objectives of the Chair in Higher Education Management have been:

- To develop twinning and other co-operative linking arrangements between the parties (the University of Bath; the University of South Africa (UNISA); and the National University of Lesotho);
- To develop sub-regional and regional cooperation networks based at the participating institutions;
- To develop centres of excellence of specialised postgraduate studies and advanced research by agreement between the parties, with international support. These centres could assist in bridging training and research needs across national frontiers;
- To foster scientific advancement through research in relevant disciplines, and to increase the availability of outstanding specialists within the participating institutions.

In order to achieve these objectives, the universities:

- Facilitate the transfer of knowledge to promote independent educational research capabilities;
- Develop joint advanced postgraduate study programmes and advanced research;
- Focus on 'higher education management'.

#### UNESCO Chair in Interfaith Studies (established 1999) University of Birmingham

The UNESCO Chair in Interfaith Studies at the University of Birmingham was established in 1999 in the Department of Theology and Religion, at the initiative of the Centre for the Study of Islam and Christian-Muslim Relations. The objectives of the Chair are:

- To establish long-term cooperation among the participating institutions in the study of the encounter between the three Abrahamic faiths and their interaction with culture and society;
- To participate in developing an international network of cooperating academic institutions working on the interaction between different religions and between religion and society;
- To promote an equitable exchange of expertise in a spirit of peace and tolerance, solidarity, and intercultural and interfaith dialogue;
- To identify research priorities and training opportunities for young researchers and make the results available to governments and international agencies, NGOs, the educational sector, and the media.

The Chair is today part of a UNITWIN Network on Inter-religious Dialogue for Intercultural Understanding that currently includes 16 Chairs at universities around the world.

### **UNESCO Chair in Intercultural Studies and Teacher Education (established 2000)**

#### **Institute of Education, University of London**

The Chair in Intercultural Studies at the Institute of Education University of London was established in September 2000 and was the first Chair in this field in Europe (although there was a Chair in Fiji prior to this.) The Chairholder has been the Head of the International Centre for Intercultural Studies (ICIS) since September 1979. This was the first institutional Centre of its type in Britain and had the support of the Institute of Education staff and five directors of the Institute over the last thirty years. The Centre has worked across the institutional departmental and disciplinary divides and engaged in teaching, research and developmental work at theoretical, conceptual and practical levels. The Chairholder and the ICIS had educational links at many local levels in Britain and subsequently worked with institutions in Europe and internationally

The ICIS was setup to address intercultural educational challenges in increasingly complex multicultural societies, where globalisation and marginalisation of groups was adding pressures in denying access to good education to the poorer social classes and different types of minorities. The UNESCO Chair was established in recognition of the need to deepen this work in educational institutions by implementing measures in the areas of: curriculum, teaching methods, teaching materials, language teaching, school life and governance, teacher education and school and community relations. In addition to national legislation which related to intercultural education there are a range of international standard setting instruments which have informed the many areas of work in this field.

### **UNESCO Chair in Gender Research (to be formally established 2008)**

#### **Lancaster University**

The purpose of the Chair shall be to promote an integrated system of research, training, information and documentation in the field of gender research. It will serve as a means of facilitating collaboration between high-level, internationally recognized researchers and teaching staff of the University and other institutions in United Kingdom and elsewhere in Europe and North America, and in other regions of the world.

The specific objectives of this Chair are to:

- facilitate the development policy-relevant research on gender equality around the world objectives;
- support and develop international networking to facilitate the exchange of ideas, research and policy developments, especially between the North and South, using seminars, exchanges of students and faculty, reports, ICT and other means;
- support research on policy-relevant gender equality issues;
- build capacity in policy-relevant gender equality research; curriculum development, student training at graduate level; staff exchanges;
- facilitate exchanges between researchers and policy makers, in the context of UN instruments for promoting women's rights and the Millennium Development Goals;
- collaborate with UNESCO in the implementation of its Gender Equality policy and strategy.

### **UNESCO Chair in Political Economy of Education (established 2005)**

#### **University of Nottingham**

The purpose of the Chair is to develop the political economy of education within the context of international development objectives. Its focus is on joint research and on staff and post-graduate student development at the higher education and advanced policy levels. The building of human resource capacity and the sharing of knowledge and expertise in these areas are crucial to international, regional and national development. The Chair contributes to such capacity building through the building of an international network of research and higher education institutions with a focus on the comparative political economy of education. This is a crucial area of research and of academic exchange in the era of globalization and rapid political, economic and social transition.

### **UNESCO Chair in Education as a Humanitarian Response (established 2005)**

#### **University of Oxford**

The UNESCO Chair sees 'education as a humanitarian response' as a fundamental purpose of education whether formal or non-formal. These are the two forms of organised educational delivery and therefore susceptible to policy formats whether political, social, economic, religious or otherwise formulated and implemented. To be humane they would need to take account not only of the fundamental human rights of individuals but also of their individual circumstances, which inevitably involves informal education. While most obviously and immediately applicable to individuals and their communities at risk, marginalised or even excluded from normal educational provision, this approach is applicable to the mainstream and even the privileged in educational terms. However, in view of the required focus of UNESCO Chairs on developing countries, the work of this Chair is mainly concerned with issues of education as a humanitarian response in such countries, while not neglecting issues of marginalisation, exclusion and disadvantage in Europe and the UK. The key underlying concept is that of providing an *appropriate* educational response at any time and place, and this is inevitably dynamic, accepting and accommodating frequent contextual change.

## **Summaries of UNESCO Chairs in the UK (cont'd)**

### **UNESCO Chair in ICT for Development (established 2007)**

#### **Royal Holloway, University of London**

UNESCO has long recognised the global significance of Information and Communication Technologies in development practice, and the UNESCO Chair in ICT4D is designed to develop this agenda. It builds on the work of the ICT4D Collective at Royal Holloway, University of London first established in 2004. This focuses on research, postgraduate training, the delivery of workshops and short courses, and the provision of externally funded scholarships, thereby facilitating the objective of ensuring that ICTs are used more effectively to enable poor and marginalised communities across the world to enhance their livelihood aspirations. Key facts about the ICT4D Collective and Chair are as follows:

- Membership of the Collective
  - 13 staff and research associates at Royal Holloway, University of London
  - 16 PhD students at Royal Holloway, University of London
  - 32 associate members across the world
- Partnerships
  - 24 academic, private sector, civil society and government partners
  - 9 co-operating organisations
- Digital environments
  - <http://www.ict4d.org.uk>
  - <http://moodle-ict4d.rhul.ac.uk>

### **UNESCO Chair in Education for Pluralism, Human Rights and Democracy (established 1999)**

#### **University of Ulster**

The UNESCO Chair in Education for Pluralism, Human Rights and Democracy was established at the University of Ulster in 1999. UNESCO Director-General, Mr Koïchiro Matsuura visited the University in 2001 to mark the inauguration of the Chair and the establishment of a university research centre that concentrates on the themes of education for pluralism, human rights and democracy, in local, national and international contexts. Over the five-year period 2002-07 the centre has completed more than 30 research and development projects with funding of £5.8 million from the British Council; the Department of Education for Northern Ireland; European Union; Gordon Cook Foundation; the International Fund for Ireland; Ministry of Education in Bosnia and Herzegovina; Ministry of Education, Sri Lanka; Northern Ireland Council for the Curriculum (CCEA); Northern Ireland Human Rights Commission; Nuffield Foundation; Citizenship Foundation; UK Department for International Development (DFID); UNESCO; UNICEF and The World Bank.

## Biographies of Speakers (Alphabetical by Last Name)



### **Professor Alec Boksenberg CBE FRS FInstP Chair, UK National Commission for UNESCO**

A physicist and astrophysicist, Professor Alexander Boksenberg is a Fellow of the Royal Society and associated with several other national and international scientific bodies, Chair of the United Kingdom National Commission for UNESCO and Chair of its Natural Sciences Committee, Honorary Professor of Experimental Astronomy in the University of Cambridge, Fellow of Churchill College, Visiting Professor of Physics and Astronomy and Fellow of University College London, and Executive Editor of *Experimental Astronomy* (Springer). In Cambridge he researches on the evolution of galaxies and the intergalactic medium. Formerly he was Director of the Royal Greenwich Observatory and the Royal Observatory, Edinburgh, and Professor of Physics and Astronomy at University College London. Mainly he has been engaged in developing and establishing major ground-based and space observatories, and the use of such facilities for his work in observational cosmology. He has over 250 scientific publications in learned journals and books. He was Master of the Worshipful Company of Clockmakers and President of the British Horological Institute and has been member or chair of more than sixty Councils, Courts, Committees and similar bodies. He has been awarded the CBE, several prizes and honorary doctorates and has an Asteroid named after him. For UNESCO, he is a member of the Scientific Council of UNESCO's Regional Bureau for Science and Culture in Europe (BRESCE), a member of its Task Force for Reconstruction of Scientific Cooperation in South-East Europe, Chair of its Working Group on Restoring Human Potential, and personally established regional cooperative projects in science, linking eleven countries. He was involved in establishing the new International Basic Sciences Programme and the UNESCO World Heritage Centre's Astronomy and World Heritage, served on the adjudicating panel for UNESCO's Science Prizes, and is a member of the expert international committee for the Overall Review of the Natural and the Social & Human Sciences programmes.

### **Dr Colin Brock Chairholder, UNESCO Chair in Education as a Humanitarian Response**

Dr Colin Brock is Chairholder of the UNESCO Chair in Education as a Humanitarian Response at the University of Oxford where he has been on the staff of the department of education since 1992. A graduate in geography and anthropology from the University of Durham, he was a high school teacher for 8 years and lecturer in geography (Reading) for 5 years before moving to a lectureship in international educational development (Leeds) in 1974. For the previous two years he had been seconded to the Caribbean Development Division of the FCO as Education Adviser. In 1977 Dr Brock moved to the University of Hull becoming Chair of the International Education Unit with over 100 students from developing countries each year, and developed overseas programmes in small countries in the Caribbean, Mediterranean and Asia-Pacific regions. He moved to Oxford in 1992 to help set up the MSc in Comparative and International Education, becoming part-time in 2003. Since the early 1990s, Dr Brock's overseas work has been mainly in West and Southern Africa, South Asia and Latin America, both academic, and also for a range of the multinational and bilateral aid agencies and NGOs. He is a former Chair of the British Association of International and Comparative Education, Editor/Co-Editor of the journal *Compare* (1988-98), author or editor of 30 books and author/co-author of about 90 chapters, articles and research reports.



### **Professor Jagdish Gundara Chairholder, UNESCO Chair in Intercultural Studies and Teacher Education**

Professor Jagdish Gundara is an Emeritus Professor of Education at the Institute of Education at the University of London. He has been Chairholder of the UNESCO Chair in International Studies and Teacher Education at the School of Culture and Lifelong Learning since September 2000. He is the founding member and the current President of the International Association of Intercultural Education which is based in Brussels. He was the Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Scaman Trust, based in London and following the death of the first President of the Trust – Lord Leslie Scaman, he was elected as the second President of the Trust. Professor Gundara is a founding member of the International Broadcasting Trust (IBT), and Vice-Chairman of the Board of IBT and was a Commissioner of the Commission for Racial Equality before its closure in August 2007. He is the President of the Evens Foundation, Antwerp, Jury on Intercultural Education Awards. His research interests include intercultural social and public policies, curriculum studies; development studies; comparative education; citizenship education; multilingualism and asylum and refugee issues. He is the author of *Interculturalism, Education and Inclusion* (Paul Chapman, 2000) and co-editor of *Intercultural ISocial Policy in Europe* (Ashgate, 2000) and has published extensively in the fields of human rights and education in multicultural studies.



**Professor Georges Haddad**  
**Director, Division of Higher Education, UNESCO**

Born in 1951 and a graduate of the École Normale Supérieure, Mr Haddad has an Master's degree in Mathematical Sciences from the University of Paris VII and a Diplôme d'études avancées (postgraduate diploma) in Mathematics from the University of Paris VI. He also holds the Agrégation in Mathematics and a Doctorat d'Etat in Mathematical Sciences. Mr Haddad started his career in 1976 as an Assistant Lecturer, spending a year at the University of Tours, followed by six years at the University of Paris-Dauphine. In 1983, he was appointed Lecturer at the University of Paris I Panthéon-Sorbonne and the following year a full Professor at the University of Nice. In 1987, he returned to the Sorbonne as a full Professor, and was elected the University's President from 1989 to 1994, as well as Premier Vice-président (Chair) of the French Conference of University Presidents (1992 to 1994). He was appointed Chairperson of the Steering Committee of UNESCO's World Conference on Higher Education (1994 to 1998), and a member of the World Bank-UNESCO Task Force on Higher Education in Developing Countries from 1997 to 2000. An Honorary President of the Sorbonne, Mr Haddad is also a member of several scientific councils and the jury of the Eugénie de Rosemont Prize for the Sciences (fellowships and prizes awarded by the Chancellerie des Universités de Paris). He is the author of many publications in the field of applied mathematics, founded the Marin Mersenne Laboratory for Mathematics, Informatics and Interdisciplinary Applications, and has written a number of articles on education, higher education and research. Mr Haddad is a member of the International Scientific Council of the Ecole polytechnique fédérale de Lausanne, and the Scientific Council of the World Knowledge Dialogue, also in Switzerland. Mr Haddad was made a Chevalier de la Légion d'Honneur and an Officier des Palmes Académiques in recognition of his contributions to Scientific Research and Education respectively. Since April 2004, he has been Director of the Division of Higher Education at UNESCO, and is the Organization's Representative on the Board and Council of the United Nations University.



**Professor Richard Mawditt OBE, MSc, FCCA, FCIMgt, FRSA**  
**Chairholder, UNESCO Chair in Higher Education Management**

Professor Richard Mawditt is Chairholder of the UNESCO Chair in Higher Education Management at the University of Bath. His recent appointments include Director of the International Centre for Higher Education Management at Bath, Honorary Professor at the National University of Lesotho, Honorary Visiting Professor, University of Zambia, Chairman of the Higher Education Advisory Board, Mills and Reeve Solicitors, Honorary Treasurer and Director of the Council for Education in the Commonwealth, Adviser to the (proposed) new University in Dubai, and Chairman of Bath Rugby Football Club. Professor Mawditt has previously held various appointments at the Universities of Bristol and Sussex, and at the University of Bath where he was Secretary, Registrar and Head of Administration for a number of years. He has directed many programmes for the British Council, World Bank and UN in many countries and conceived and designed the Doctor of Business Administration in Higher Education Management degree at the University of Bath. He was the founding Chairman of the International Meeting of University Administrators (IMUA).



**Professor Colin McInnes**  
**Chairholder, UNESCO Chair in HIV/AIDS, Education and Health Security in Africa**

Colin McInnes is Head of the Department of International Politics at Aberystwyth University and Chairholder of the UNESCO Chair in HIV/AIDS, Education and Security in Africa. He was formerly a lecturer in the Department of War Studies, The Royal Military Academy Sandhurst; Visiting Research Fellow at the Centre for Defence Studies, King's College London; and Special Adviser to the House of Commons Defence Committee. Professor McInnes has published widely and his most recent book, *Spectator Sport War: The West and Contemporary Conflict*, was a Choice 'Outstanding academic title'. Over the past few years he has been working on the relationship between health and foreign and security policy, especially in relation to HIV/AIDS. He is a member of The Nuffield Trust's advisory board on global health policy and has contributed extensively to the debate in the UK and overseas. He is currently working on a major study on the relationship between health, foreign and security policy, and is writing a book on the securitisation of HIV/AIDS. He is Director of the Centre for Health and International Relations at Aberystwyth, Chair of the British International Studies Association, and a member of the ESRC's Strategic Research Board.

## Biographies of Speakers (cont'd)



**Professor W. John Morgan FRAI, FRSA**  
**Chairholder, UNESCO Chair in Political Economy of Education**

John Morgan is a member of the Board of Directors of the UK National Commission for UNESCO, interim Chair of its Education Committee and convenes the UK UNESCO Chairs' Group. In 2006 he organized the UK National Commission for UNESCO's inaugural conference. Professor Morgan has conducted research and evaluation studies for both national and international agencies, including a comparative study of vocational and technical education in the East Midlands and Alsace, contributing to a recent World Bank report on adult education and training in Poland and, most recently, leading studies of international teacher mobility for the Department for International Development, and of the conditions of rural teachers, for the UNESCO Institute of Statistics and the Food and Agricultural Organization. He has served on the executive committee of the British Association of International and Comparative Education and as Hon. Treasurer of the United Kingdom Forum for International Education and Training (UKFIET). A member of the Commonwealth Scholarship Commission in the United Kingdom, he chairs its Professional Fellowships' Committee. He has published numerous articles, reviews and books and supervised many doctoral students.

### Selected Recent Publications

Teacher mobility, 'brain drain' and educational resources in the Commonwealth (with A. Sives and S. Appleton), *Researching the Issues*, DFID, London, Research Monograph, 2006, xvii & 218p. .

*Communists on Education and Culture 1848-1948*, Palgrave-Macmillan, Basingstoke, London and New York, 2003, xiv & 250p. Nominated by the publishers for the 2004 George Orwell Prize and for the 2004 Isaac and Tamara Deutscher Memorial Prize.

*Law and Opinion in 20<sup>th</sup> Century Britain and Ireland* (ed. with S. W. Livingstone), Palgrave-Macmillan, Basingstoke, London and New York, 2003, xiv & 222p.

*Post School Education and the Transition from State Socialism* (Ed. with J. Muckle), The Continuing Education Press, Nottingham, 2001, xxvi & 216p.



**Professor Alan Smith**  
**Chairholder, UNESCO Chair in Education for Pluralism, Human Rights and Democracy**

Professor Alan Smith is Chairholder of the UNESCO Chair at the University of Ulster and an Advisory Professor at the Hong Kong Institute of Education. His work includes research on education and conflict, young people's understanding of human rights and the development of social, civic and political education. He was a UK representative to the Council of Europe and a British Council visiting fellow to Nigeria and Indonesia. He has completed a report on 'Education, Conflict and International Development' for DFID and has been a consultant for International Alert, UNESCO, UNICEF and the World Bank in Bosnia, Nepal and Sri Lanka. His current research includes an ESRC project on teacher education and a three-year International Development programme at the University of Ulster funded by DFID.

**Professor Tim Unwin**  
**Chairholder, UNESCO Chair in ICT for Development**



Tim Unwin (born 1955) is Chairholder of the UNESCO Chair in ICT for Development (ICT4D) and Professor of Geography at Royal Holloway, University of London. From 2001-2004 he led the UK Prime Minister's *Imfundo: Partnership for IT in Education* initiative based within the Department for International Development, and he is currently Senior Advisor to the World Economic Forum's *Global Education Initiative*. He was previously Head of the Department of Geography at Royal Holloway, University of London between 1999 and 2001, and has also served as Honorary Secretary of the Royal Geographical Society (with The Institute of British Geographers) (1995-1997). He has written or edited 13 books, and over 170 papers and other publications. His recent research has concentrated especially on ICT4D, focusing on its use in the context of teacher training in Africa, on a critique of budget support mechanisms in international aid, and on the use of partnerships in ICT4D practice. The UK's Secretary of State for International Development appointed him as one of the Commonwealth Scholarship Commissioners in 2004, and in 2006 he was elected as a High Level Advisor for the UN's Global Alliance for ICT and Development.

**Professor Sylvia Walby**  
**Chairholder Designate, UNESCO Chair in Gender Research Designate**

Sylvia Walby is a Professor in the Department of Sociology at Lancaster University, UK. She has been Professor of Sociology in the Universities of Leeds and Bristol, and Reader at the LSE; and was the founding President of the European Sociological Association. She was the founding Director of the Lancaster Women's Studies Research Centre and of the LSE Gender Institute. She was the Rapporteur for the UN Expert Meeting on Indicators to Measure Violence Against Women in Geneva in 2007; and is a member of the UN Taskforce on Violence Against Women. She has been a research consultant to the Home Office, Women and Equality Unit, Equal Opportunities Commission, and the United Nations Division for the Advancement of Women. Publications include: *Domestic Violence, Sexual Assault and Stalking: Findings from the British Crime Survey*, with Allen, (Home Office Research Study 2004), *The Cost of Domestic Violence* (Department of Trade and Industry 2004) *Gender Transformations* (Routledge 1997), *Theorizing Patriarchy* (Blackwell 1990), and *Gendering the Knowledge Economy*, co-edited with Gottfried, Gottschall and Osawa (Palgrave 2007). Her next book is *Globalization and Inequalities: Complexity and Contested Modernities* (Sage 2008).



**Professor Jonathan Webber**  
**Chairholder, UNESCO Chair in Interfaith Studies**

Professor Jonathan Webber trained as a social anthropologist at Oxford University, where he taught for twenty years before moving in 2002 to the University of Birmingham, where he is Chairholder of the UNESCO Chair in Jewish and Interfaith Studies. His principal research interests include the sociology of the contemporary Jewish diaspora, Holocaust studies, biblical studies, museum studies, and Polish-Jewish studies. He has been a member of the International Council of the Auschwitz Museum since it was founded in 1990, and in 1999 he was awarded the Gold Cross of the Order of Merit by the President of the Republic of Poland for services to Polish-Jewish dialogue.

**List of Delegates**  
(*Alphabetical by Last Name*)

<b>Name</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
<b>Dr Chris Atkin</b>	Associate Professor	University of Nottingham
<b>Ms Natasha Bevan</b>	Programme Secretary	UK National Commission for UNESCO
<b>Professor Alec Boksenberg</b>	Chair	UK National Commission for UNESCO
<b>Dr Colin Brock</b>	UNESCO Chairholder, UNESCO Chair in Education as a Humanitarian Response	University of Oxford
<b>Dr Patrick Dolan</b>	Director, Child and Family Research Centre	National University of Ireland, Galway
<b>Professor Christine Ennew</b>	Pro Vice Chancellor	University of Nottingham
<b>Professor Henry Etzkowitz</b>	Chair, Management of Innovation, Creativity and Enterprise	Newcastle University Business School
<b>Professor Luciano Floridi</b>	Research Chair in Philosophy of Information	University of Hertfordshire / University of Oxford
<b>Professor Jagdish Gundara</b>	UNESCO Chairholder, UNESCO Chair in Intercultural Studies and Teacher Education	Institute of Education, University of London
<b>Professor Georges Haddad</b>	Director, Division of Higher Education	UNESCO
<b>Professor John Holford</b>	Robert Peers Professor of Adult Education	University of Nottingham
<b>Dr John Kirkland</b>	Deputy Secretary-General	The Association of Commonwealth Universities
<b>Professor Stephen Martin</b>	Visiting Professor, Sustainability Institute	University of Gloucestershire
<b>Professor Richard Mawditt</b>	UNESCO Chairholder, UNESCO Chair in Higher Education Management	University of Bath
<b>Professor Simon McGrath</b>	Professor of International Education and Development	University of Nottingham
<b>Professor Colin McInnes</b>	UNESCO Chairholder, UNESCO Chair in HIV/AIDS, Education and Health Security in Africa	Aberystwyth University
<b>Professor John Morgan</b>	UNESCO Chairholder, UNESCO Chair in Political Economy of Education	University of Nottingham
<b>Dr Liana Marina Ranga</b>	Lecturer in Innovation Management	Newcastle University Business School
<b>Professor David Riley</b>	Pro Vice Chancellor	University of Nottingham
<b>Professor Mike Robinson</b>	Director, Centre for Tourism and Cultural Change UNITWIN International Network on Cultural Tourism and Development	Leeds Metropolitan University
<b>Professor Suzanne Skevington</b>	Director, WHO Field Centre for the Study of Quality of Life	University of Bath
<b>Professor Alan Smith</b>	UNESCO Chairholder, UNESCO Chair in Education for Pluralism, Human Rights and Democracy	University of Ulster
<b>Professor Peter Stone</b>	Professor of Heritage Studies	Newcastle University
<b>Professor Tim Unwin</b>	UNESCO Chairholder, UNESCO Chair in ICT for Development	Royal Holloway, University of London
<b>Professor Sylvia Walby</b>	UNESCO Chairholder Designate, UNESCO Chair in Gender Research Designate	Lancaster University
<b>Professor Jonathan Webber</b>	UNESCO Chairholder, UNESCO Chair in Interfaith Studies	University of Birmingham