



SIU

2007

## Review of the Teacher Education Programme South-North

INGER ANNE KVALBEIN OG MARIT STORENG



## **Review report, The Teacher Education Programme South-North**

The Teacher Education Programme South-North is a pilot programme for cooperation between institutions for teacher education institutions in Norway and selected developing countries. The time frame of the programme is the years 2005-2007 with a total budget of NOK 13 millions.

This review report is a summing-up of the experiences made so far by the involved teacher education institutions in the South and Norway. The report also includes suggestions for alternative models for a future programme within teacher education.

The review has been conducted by the independent consultants Marit Storeng and Inger Anne Kvalbein. The content of the report is therefore fully the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent SIU's official view.

SIU

Bergen, 28 September, 2007

**CONTENTS**

Abbreviations

Executive summary

- 1. BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE ..... 1
- 2. METHODS AND LIMITATIONS ..... 1
- 3. PROJECT REVIEWS ..... 3
  - 3.1 Zambia ..... 3
  - 3.2 Nepal ..... 7
  - 3.3 Uganda ..... 10
  - 3.4 Malawi ..... 13
  - 3.5 Namibia ..... 14
  - 3.6 Palestine ..... 16
  - 3.7 South Africa I ..... 18
  - 3.8 South Africa II ..... 19
- 4. PROGRAMME REVIEW ..... 20
  - 4.1 Aims of the programme ..... 21
  - 4.2 Applications, criteria and selected projects ..... 21
  - 4.3 Activities in the Pilot Programme ..... 22
  - 4.4 Projects versus Programme ..... 23
- 5. THE WAY FORWARD ..... 25
  - 5.1 The Pre-Appraisal: Collaboration Teacher Education and the South ..... 25
  - 5.2 Support to teacher education in developing countries ..... 26
  - 5.3 Institutional cooperation in support of national policies on teacher education ..... 29
  
- Annex 1 Persons Interviewed ..... 32
- Annex 2 Terms of Reference ..... 35

## ABBREVIATIONS

AUC	Agder University College
CC	Chancellor College
CDC	Curriculum Development Centre
DALICE	David Livingstone College of Education
DANIDA	Danish International Development Agency
DEO	District Education Office
EFA	Education for All
HUC	Hedmark University College
ICT	Information and communication technology
KU	Kathmandu University
KyU	University of Kyambogo
LEA	Language and education in Africa
LINS	Lærerutdanningens internasjonale senter
MOE	Ministry of Education
MOHE	Ministry of Higher Education
MOES	Ministry of Education and Sports, Nepal and Uganda
NCED	National Centre for Educational Development
NGO	Non-governmental organisation
NOMA	Norad's Programme for Master Studies
Norad	Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation
NTNU	Norwegian University of Science and Technology
NUFU	The Norwegian Programme for Development, Research and Education
OCE	Ongwediva College of Education
OUC	Oslo University College
PGDE	Post Graduate Diploma in Education
PTA	Parent Teacher Association
PTC	Primary Teacher College
PTP	Primary Teacher Programme
SAQMEC	Southern Africa Consortium for Monitoring Educational Quality
SF	Sogn og Fjordane
SFUC	Sogn and Fjordane University College
SIU	Norwegian Centre for International Cooperation in Higher Education
STUC	South Trøndelag University College
TA	Technical assistance
TC	Technical cooperation
TED	Teacher Education Department
TOR	Terms of Reference
TPC	Teacher Preparatory Course
TRC	Teacher Resource Centre
TUC	Tromsø University College
UMB	Norwegian University of Life Sciences
UNAM	University of Namibia
UoB	University of Bergen
UoBP	University of Bethlehem
UoM	University of Malawi
UoO	University of Oslo
UWC	University of Western Cape
UPE	Universal primary education
VUC	Vestfold University College
VOUC	Volda University College
ZATEC	Zambian Teacher Education Course

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This review refers to the decision by Norad to create the Pilot Programme “Teacher Education Programme South - North”. The overall goal of the Pilot Programme is through joint projects between institutions of teacher education in the South and in Norway to contribute to strengthen the quality of teacher education in the South, as a means of improving basic education and securing the Education Millennium Goals and Education for All. It has a time span of three years, from January 2005 to December 2007 and started with some start up funding the first year, followed by a two years’ project period. A total of NOK 13mill has been available for the programme, which is administered by SIU. The allocation has been spread over eight projects in seven countries (Malawi, Namibia, Nepal Palestine, South Africa, Uganda, Zambia) over two years, each with an average budget of NOK 1,2 millions.

The launch of the Pilot Programme results from a SIU initiative from 2003 when SIU presented Norad with a proposal for developing a programme for collaboration between teacher education institutions in Norway and in the South. The pre-appraisal of the proposal from 2003 concluded that a programme financed through Norad had to have a development perspective and that the real capacity of Norwegian teacher education institutions to embark upon a major partnership programme conceived as an instrument of development cooperation was weak. It emphasised that a future programme should be fully integrated into national frameworks and priorities for teacher training in the South and therefore be demand driven, based on the needs and problems of teacher training in the Southern partner countries. The pre-appraisal argued that individual technical competence building is never sustainable in isolation. Full attention should therefore be given to both institutional reinforcement and system development in the South.

The aim of this review, which takes place midway in the third year of implementation of the Pilot Programme, one year after the start of the projects in the programme, is to provide documentation of how the goals of the Pilot Programme have been achieved and based on the lessons learned to give advice on a future programme. Accordingly, the projects of the Pilot Programme have been reviewed in relation to the goals of the programme. The findings from the review have, together with data from international research on teacher education in the South and on linkage programs, served as a basis for a discussion of a possible future programme in support of teacher education in developing countries.

The goal of the Pilot Programme is comprehensive and ambitious, not least considering the size, and the timeframe of the programme. One may therefore question the decision to spread a modest allocation thinly over several projects geographically, institutionally, and thematically.

The Pilot Programme was open for applications from both universities and university colleges in Norway. From the universities there were four applications, which were all accepted, while only four of the 13 applications from the university colleges were accepted, totalling eight pilot projects. Two applications from universities in the South were not considered. The strong research perspective of the Pilot Programme may have favoured university applications over those from university colleges.

The Pilot Programme states that projects should be based on the needs of the South. A systematic needs assessment has however not taken place. Instead the themes of the projects are selected on the basis of personal interests in research and issues of education development, experiences from ongoing cooperation, and available Norwegian competency.

The following themes are covered: community studies, environment education, democracy, science and maths, general learning problems, general improvement of teacher education including improvement of teacher education for inclusion.

The projects in the Pilot Programme address both primary and secondary education (five primary education, one both primary and lower secondary education, and three projects address secondary education), while the main goal of the Pilot Programme is to address basic education. The main activities in the projects have consisted of travels from the North to the South, to a lesser extent the other way, to attend short workshops, seminars, and conferences and to make school visits. The review team questions the efficiency of short visits and workshops as instruments in improving basic education in the South.

Through the Pilot Programme development support has been given to institutions of teacher education through institutional cooperation. The cooperation has however predominantly addressed individual competence building compared to institutional development. A subsidiary goal of the Pilot Programme is to internationalise Norwegian institutions of teacher education. The review team takes the position that a future programme has to fall within a development paradigm, and that internationalisation of Norwegian institutions of higher education is not a Norad priority.

It is far too early to assess any results and lasting impact of the Pilot Programme, but by relating the review findings to international research on teacher education and institutional cooperation, recommendations for a future programme can nevertheless be made.

International research on teacher education in developing countries question a borrowing and transfer of perspectives on teacher education from the North to the South which disregard contextual and cultural aspects of education. Research further demonstrates that teacher education can only be improved by applying a systemic approach when innovations are introduced. A reform of teacher education must therefore be seen in relation to other dimensions of teaching. It includes human resources at all levels.

Studies also demonstrate that institutional cooperation, as a modality in development cooperation is problematic. Although it is considered efficient in network building and in personal and professional competency building, institutional cooperation is critiqued for failing to support systemic changes, and of still being too supply driven.

Recommendations for a possible future teacher education programme Norway - the South takes as a premise that the programme is development oriented and that the overall goal is to support the development of teacher education for basic education in a given country.

Implications for a possible future teacher education programme Norway - the South would be:

- The programme has a clear focus geographically, institutionally, and thematically, relative to the size of the program.
- The programme is demand driven and based on the needs of the South.
- The programme is incorporated into overall development policies as one aspect of the wider (sector) support, financially and technically, to the implementation of education policies/reform on teacher education in a given country.

## **1. BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE**

The main goal of the Pilot Programme “Teacher Education Programme South - North” is through joint projects between teacher education institutions in the South and their partners in Norway, to contribute to strengthen the quality of teacher education in the South, as a means of improving basic education and securing the Education Millennium Goals and Education for All. The cooperation is based on the institutional and pedagogic needs of the South partners’ and the competence and capacity of the partners in Norway to meet these needs (TOR 2007).

The Pilot Programme consists of two phases. In 2005 a total of ten projects received start-up funds for development of applications. In the next phase (2006-2007), eight projects were granted funds for various activities such as seminars/work shops, publication and documentation, development of teaching materials and teacher training programmes, teacher and student exchange and training and educational research and development.

The intention is that lessons learned from the different models of cooperation in this Pilot Programme will be used as a basis for the decision whether a long term programme for teacher education South-North is to be established. The Pilot Programme should also contribute to quality enhancement in teacher education in the South through capacity and competence building of key teacher educators in the participating southern institutions. Moreover, the aim was to increase the use of research based knowledge in the planning and pedagogic work of the institutions in the South, and also to contribute to increased internationalisation of Norwegian teacher education.

The total budget of the Pilot Programme is NOK 13 million. The programme was established by Norad and is administered by SIU.

The Pilot Programme should be reviewed midway in the third year of implementation, and the main purpose of the review is to document results so far in the projects in accordance with established performance indicators and to determine whether the programme is advancing towards the achievement of its goals (TOR 2007). The review has concentrated its investigations on the activities in the projects in the years 2006 and 2007.

The terms of reference also states that the review should give advice as to models of future cooperation, indicate educational needs of the South, how projects may increase the use of research based knowledge, and further internationalisation of Norwegian teacher education institutions.

The review was conducted between mid-April and the end of May 2007.

## **2. METHODS AND LIMITATIONS**

This review examines the teacher education projects from three different perspectives:

- the projects in relation to the applications and the projects’ performance indicators
- the projects in relation to the goals of the Pilot Programme, national basic education policies and education plans
- the programme experiences in relation to possible future programme models for cooperation and support to teacher education in the South.

All projects in the Pilot Programme concentrate on formal teacher education in teacher

colleges or in universities. Other arenas for teacher education, e.g. in schools for practice education during pre-service training have also been in focus.

Norad/SIU selected the countries and projects to be visited for closer studies in this review. The consultants visited the project in Zambia together, one visited the project in Nepal and the other the project in Uganda.

SIU provided all relevant documents for the initial desk study. These were supplemented by earlier Norad reports, suitable project reports from Palestine and material gathered during the field visits.

The Norwegian partners in the projects in Nepal, Uganda and Zambia were first visited and through thematic interviews with the project groups, special features of the projects were illuminated and development of the projects more fully explained.

The review's thematic questions may be subsumed under the following headings:

- background for the South-North cooperation
- teacher education in the South
- aims and intentions, rationale for choice of project theme
- activities, interventions
- research
- roles and responsibilities
- institutionalisation
- results
- budget
- sustainability

In the visited countries, the Norwegian Embassy was the first contact. Through thematic interviews focusing the respective projects in relation to overall Norwegian development assistance policy, sector or budget support, or other Norwegian or international projects, the project's place in the general educational support to the country was investigated.

Representatives for relevant ministries were then interviewed to get their experiences and impressions of the project in relation to national educational policy and the main challenges for basic education for all and teacher education in particular.

Most time was spent at the partner institutions where staff members involved in the projects, such as administrators, project leaders, and project groups were interviewed. The interviews were conducted according to the themes used when interviewing the Norwegian project groups. Unfortunately, the teacher students in Uganda and Zambia were on semester break, so only students in Nepal could be interviewed.

Back in Norway, telephone interviews of about one hour with the Norwegian project leaders/academic coordinators of projects not visited, were conducted. According to the terms of reference for the review, the project leaders in the South were not to be interviewed, even if the terms of reference states that the assessment by the involved partners in the South should be taken into account. One of the Southern project leaders from Palestine did, however, make contact and was communicated with through e-mail.

The review has been designed to assess the quality, relevance, and sustainability of the

programme collaboration between the teacher education institutions in the South and in Norway as basis for an analysis of how and to what extent the experiences can be brought forward into a future model of teacher education cooperation to meet the needs of teacher education in the South.

Teacher educators in the South use different titles. Generally in this report they are, as their Norwegian partners, called teacher educators. At university level they often call themselves lecturers, and in teacher education colleges they have in some countries' the title tutors, but may call themselves tutors or lecturers. In the report the titles they use themselves are used.

The following sections present the findings from our discussions, field visits, and study of documents. There may be factual inadequacies, which may be due to limited time and limited sources of information. The time frame for the review was short, only three of the eight projects were visited, and only the Norwegian partner in the projects not visited were interviewed. We think, however, that the findings give a fair picture of the ongoing collaborative projects and that they may serve as basis for discussions of possible future models of cooperation.

### **3. PROJECT REVIEWS**

The project in Zambia, which was visited by both consultants, is the first project presented. Then the projects in Nepal and Uganda, which each was visited by one of the consultants, are described. The presentation of the last five projects is based on desk studies of project documents complemented with telephone interviews with Norwegian project leaders.

#### **3.1 Zambia**

##### **DALICE/SFUC: Capacity building in Use of Local Knowledge in Multi- and Monograde Schools in Zambia**

The cooperation between DALICE and SFUC started in 2002 as part of the Inter-Ministerial Norway/Zambia cooperation. The project theme then was Multi-grade teaching and general teaching and learning methods, and the project was evaluated in positive terms (Norad 2006). During this period, SFUC decided that Zambia was to be their main partner for cooperation in the South. DALICE has a long tradition of international project support with many partners involved. From Norway OUC, TUC, UoO and Save the Children have been involved. Denmark, Germany, Ireland, Japan and USA have also supported projects at the college. Among the 19 applications to the pilot Teacher Education Programme South-North, three featured DALICE as the Southern partner (OUC, SFUC, STUC).

##### *Teacher education*

In Zambia, both the basic school curriculum and the pre-service teacher education curriculum were radically reformed at the turn of the millennium. DANIDA played a central role in the development of primary teacher education.

Zambian Teacher Education Course (ZATEC) was introduced in all primary teacher colleges in January 2000. Pre-service teacher education should last for 2 years, one year at the college extended by one school-based year when the students work as teachers while continuing their studies. The curriculum introduced the concept of study areas; grouping subjects according to how they are related, and demanded learner-centered methods and practically oriented teaching approaches. Students must have completed upper secondary school to be admitted to teacher education.

The different subjects that are organized together in study areas are in pre-service teacher education somewhat different from the study areas in basic school. Related themes and topics that were spread across the study areas in the basic school curriculum framework (MOE 2000) were later gathered and enlarged into a new area in the basic school syllabi (MOE 2003). This new study area is called Community Studies, which focuses on the development of local curricula. Community Studies shall comprise 20% of the syllabus. The new study area was followed up by the development of a manual to support basic school teachers (MOE 2005) and by offering in-service courses in school districts to motivate and qualify teachers to work with Community Studies and localized curricula (CDC 2006).

Community Studies is not included as an area or a subject in the pre-service teacher education. The main elements of the area are, however, introduced in ZATEC (MOE 2001). Development of life skills, preparation for vocational training, and awareness of entrepreneurship constitute the main part of the study area Technology Studies in pre-service teacher education. Health, transmission of Zambia's cultural heritage, and environment are listed as cross-curricular themes and issues.

Zambia has for a long time intended to reform pre-service teacher education. This reform has not yet taken place, but the intention is still there. In the future, the intention is that teacher education will offer two three-year diploma programmes in primary/basic education, one educating teachers for grades 1 - 7, the other for grades 8 - 9 (Commonwealth of Learning 2005). The preparation of the curriculum for the new teacher education is not yet finalised, and whether Community studies will be a new study area in teacher education is unclear. The DALICE/SFUC project has, however, formed strong ties to national educational authorities who have been engaged as advisors in the project.

#### *Aims and intentions of the project*

According to the application, the main goal of the project is to develop competence among staff at DALICE and at other teaching training colleges in Zambia in how to use local knowledge in multi- and monograde schools and to develop localised curricula, by using the methods designed for multigrade teaching and entrepreneurship with special focus on the incorporation of the local environment with reference to Community Studies. Three sub-projects focus the subject areas History and Health, Music and the Performing Arts, and Religion and Ethics.

The subjects were selected through dialogue with DALICE, but also in relation to the professional competence of the members of the Norwegian project group. Change of staff at SFUC led to more emphasis on the subjects health and gender than on religion.

The reference in the project title to multi- and monograde schools seems more as reference to success from SFUC's former support to education in Zambia than to the design of this project. Here the emphasis is on how staff at DALICE under supervision of SFUC, collect local knowledge/information by one to two days visits to four nearby communities. The substance of the texts, written after the visits, seems at the time of the review to be the important issue at DALICE. Pedagogical issues related to the use of this material in different types of schools were not heavily on the agenda.

A strong motivation for this project at SFUC was the wish to continue the cooperation with DALICE. DALICE also welcomed this cooperation, although they were also collaborating

with two other Norwegian colleges about additional applications to the Norwegian Pilot Programme. During the joint preparation of the application, which was carried out in Sogndal, the representative from DALICE, also suggested themes such as decentralised teacher education and teacher education for lower secondary school as foci for their project. These were, however, themes in which SFUC did not have any special competence or capacity. DALICE had therefore to gauge their demands to what SFUC could supply.

#### *Activities in the project*

The main activities were to be workshops and teacher exchange. The core groups visited each other in the fall of 2006. Key members of the groups had before that had separate visits for planning of the project and its implementation. These meetings lasted for some days up to two weeks. The Norwegian project coordinator has also been to DALICE partly financed from other sources. In 2006 Norwegians visited DALICE three times, and hosted one visit/workshop for the Zambians. In 2007 three visits are planned for the Norwegians, and one for the Zambians. The travel activity weights heavily in the budget. In 2006 close to one third more than allocated in the budget was used for travels.

Two participants from Zambia, one from national level and one from DALICE, attended a week long course in entrepreneurship in USA sponsored by SFUC and SF-county.

The research activities and data gathering refer to the staff at DALICE's collection of local information in nearby towns and villages. 28 of the 43 tutors participated for a day or two in the activity. The Zambian core group's main concern, at the time of the review, was to get the collected information right. Examples of texts showed descriptions of place, population, vocational activities, crafts, services and organisations, activities in schools etc. No teacher education students have so far been involved in the project.

As part of the implementation of the project, some of these texts will be presented for discussion at a local meeting for teachers, head teachers, representatives for DEO, PTA and other stake holders in districts around Livingstone in mid-May. After this meeting, there will be a pre-service/in-service workshop to implement a model for community studies in pilot schools. A workshop for all teacher training colleges in Zambia and senior officers from MOE is planned in December 2007 if MOE finds the project successful. Further implementation will take place when teacher students from DALICE, having been exposed to the material at the college, start their work as teachers in schools.

#### *Roles and responsibilities*

SFUC has played a leading role in the conceptual development and the running of the project, while DALICE has had the main responsibility for the implementation of the project. The project has also included a representative from the Curriculum Division at the MOE.

The project supports an ongoing aspect of Zambian curriculum development. Since DALICE is founded on the philosophy of "Education with Production", a programme which was introduced in Zambia with the Education Reform of Zambia in 1975 (Hoppers&Komba 1995), it might have been interesting to link the project to these Zambian experiences, not least to give it a larger degree of Zambian ownership instead of, or in combination with references to American experiences on entrepreneurship. However, it has not been within the frames of this review team to explore this connection more closely.

Both institutions have established a core group responsible for the academic running of the project. At DALICE a core group of ten persons is responsible for the implementation of the project activities. The SFUC core group consists of seven members with the project coordinator having previous experience from education projects in Zambia. The other group members represent the professional knowledge and experience of the areas of cooperation. The SFUC core group serves as facilitators and discussion partners in the development of the localised curriculum. The expectation is that skills and competence in localised curriculum development will be gained through the data collection of local knowledge, facilitated by their Norwegian partners. The project has created an arena for peers from both countries to meet, to have professional discussions and to be exposed to international, as well as local and regional perspectives on education, which in turn may be reflected in local and national plans.

The progress of the curriculum development has been slow and little progress has been made in between the meetings in the workshops. The DALICE core group explains the slowness with their feeling of uncertainty in relation to the task of developing localised curricula. They also express a feeling of inferiority, as the “experts” from the North come to guide them through this new curriculum development process. Although they describe curriculum development to be part of their core business, research is not part of their brief.

The hesitation at DALICE to visit the communities for the fieldwork is explained with lack of funding for local travels. The possibility of making budgetary adjustments, for example by transferring funds from the many international travels in the project, has not been explored. Generally, however, they see the additional work put into the project, as part of their professional development.

There is a marked discrepancy between the allocation to and account of travel expenses in 2006. This is explained with a transfer of funds from ICT to travel since DALICE is well equipped with computers from other international collaborating partners. As pointed out above, the transfer does not seem to have benefited local travel to the field. The budgetary and accounting responsibilities lie with SFUC. A difference of accounting culture has been experienced between the two institutions. SFUC therefore welcomes a SIU input on how to deal with cultural accounting practices. Moreover, SFUC has experienced it as a challenge to keep the allowances at a reasonable level and has insisted on using Zambian allowance rates, not international ones. On the Zambian side this lack of budgetary responsibility is felt cumbersome in the running of the project.

One may question the decision by the DALICE to select the same persons for more international exposure through international travels than others, even if justifiable reasons are given. Moreover, it may be an indication of a possible “overburdening” of DALICE by Norwegian institutions that one of the DALICE project coordinators is spending the last half year of the project period (autumn 2007) in Tromsø (together with another DALICE colleague) through a collaboration with Tromsø University College and the Norwegian Peace Corps.

### *Sustainability*

The basis of the project is capacity building in local curriculum development. The process of data collection from local communities represents a new role for the involved teacher educators and it is being introduced over a short period of time. Sustainability at college level is therefore vulnerable unless the project continues. The inclusion of the ministerial level is

one of the strengths of the project, as is the plan to present the findings from the projects to all teacher colleges in Zambia.

### *Relevance*

Norwegian support to the Zambian education sector gives priority to the support of basic education. The present project falls within this area of support, and it addresses one of the learning areas of the national curriculum. Moreover, the aim of the project to develop a model on how to implement localised curriculum development in schools in Zambia, aims at reaching the national level. The project falls within the goals of the Pilot Programme in that it supports basic teacher education.

## **3.2 Nepal**

### **KU, UMB, OUC: Developing a Teacher Education Programme in Environment and Sustainable Development in Nepal**

This project is the result of a cooperation between the three institutions, the Norwegian University of Life Sciences (UMB), Oslo University College (OUC) through LINS, and two departments at Kathmandu University (KU)<sup>1</sup>, the School of Education and the Department of Environmental Science and Energy. There is no joint history of collaboration with KU in education. UMB has however had past and on-going collaborative arrangements with KU within the sciences. One of these has an educational component. UMB has obtained funding from different Norwegian funding agencies: Norad, NUFU, the Norwegian Research Association. OUC through LINS has carried out several reviews for Norad in Nepal, but has no history of cooperation with KU.

### *Teacher Education*

Different actors deliver primary teacher training in Nepal through a project mode: MoES, universities, private providers and NGO's. These have not sufficiently filled the need for trained teachers, thus about 50% of Nepalese primary teachers are untrained. Moreover, the effect of training is claimed to have been unsatisfactory. Following the launch of the Education for All (EFA) 2004-2009 National Plan for Action Nepal, adopting the six Dakar goals on education, including access and quality of education, MoES has designed a "Training Policy" (MoES 2005) for the training of teachers. The National Centre for Education Development (NCED), which has conducted teacher training for 10 years, has been mandated to develop a Teacher Training Programme (TTP) for both Primary and Secondary teachers. The Primary Teacher Programme (PTP) consists of a 10 months' training programme offered both as pre-service and in-service. The basic academic admission qualification of primary teachers (grades 1-5) has been a School Leaving Certificate (SLC, after grade 10). This is now extended to grade 12, in line with the introduction of an integrated school system comprising the grades 1-12. After the completion of the ten months' training course, teachers are awarded a licence to teach. The 10 months PTP is implemented in two semesters of five months each. For the primary level, the courses are offered through NCED's network of Education Training Centres (34 in total), or at Private Primary Teaching Centres affiliated to NCED (about 146) ([www.nced.gov.np/trainers.asp](http://www.nced.gov.np/trainers.asp)). Primary school teachers are trained to become class teachers who are enabled and prepared to teach all primary school subjects.

---

<sup>1</sup> Kathmandu is a private, non-profit university. The Education Programme charges a total fee of RS 7000 (about NOK 700). This includes admission fees, registration and examination fees. Some full and partial scholarships are however available for qualified and deserving candidates.

Teachers for secondary and tertiary education are educated at universities through I.Ed, B.Ed and M.Ed programmes. The School of Education at KU offers a Postgraduate Diploma in Education (PGDE), B.Ed, and M.Ed. The Post Graduate Diploma in Environment Education and Sustainable Development just developed through the cooperation with UMB and OUC is a new specialized interdisciplinary course and does not fall within the existing education programmes at KU.

#### *Aims and intentions of the project*

The main objective of the Nepalese-Norwegian project is “to formulate a teacher education programme focusing on environment and sustainable development as a basis for quality basic education in Nepal”. The main target groups are however secondary and higher education teachers as well as environmental and sustainable development campaigners.

#### *Activities*

The project description presents 10 specific objectives to be implemented through nine activities: 1. assessment of cultural values, indigenous knowledge traditions of Nepal, 2. revision of teacher education curriculum at KU, 3. development of indicators, 4. designing the pre-service and in-service teacher training programme, 5. development of teaching and training materials, 6. implementing the teacher training programme, 7. managing the teacher education programme, 8. monitoring and evaluation, 9. exchange of staffs and students. The design of the teacher training programme and materials, management, monitoring and evaluation are in process and are ongoing activities. Staff and student exchange from the South have not yet taken place due to late disbursement of funds from SIU. There are plans for Nepalese staff to visit Norway in the fall of 2007. At this stage (May 2007) the purpose of the visit is only very generally formulated.

The project has allocated almost equal amounts, 1/3 of the budget, for travelling, for workshops and for ICT and different teaching materials. This seems reasonable in relation to the aims of the project. The workshops that have been organised so far have involved stakeholders from different educational institutions and authorities within Nepal, which therefore had to be held in Nepal, and hence result in a lower travel budget from Nepal to Norway. By the end of 2006 only about one third of the allocated budget for 2006 was spent. This is explained by late disbursements.

The main aim of the project, to develop and implement the education programme, is already achieved. The “Postgraduate Diploma Programme (PGDP) in Environment Education and Sustainable Development (EESDP) has been approved by Kathmandu University as a three terms Post Graduate study of 12 months. It was launched in Jan./Febr. 2007 and the first 23 students were then admitted. The programme is a joint venture between the School of Education and the Department of Environmental Science and Energy at KU, and it is administered by and offered at the School of Education in Kathmandu.

Through the programme two distinct schools of the university are merged. The aim is to bridge pedagogy and content courses in line with the constructivist perspectives that are pursued. Development of skills as well as the development of materials is seen as important to educate teachers as facilitators, not just as lecturers. The lecturers from the Department of Environment and Science describe this as a challenge as they do not have an educational component as part of their professional background. Some students missed a stronger educational presence in the courses offered so far, but the lecturers express eagerness to learn.

Moreover, the CV of one of the initiators of the programme, now on study leave, demonstrates academic proficiency and interest for the didactics of science teaching.

The teaching takes place in the evening to accommodate students who are combining studies and work for financial reasons. Some grants are also offered to deserving students, but it is not clear how many students receive such grants. According to KU, about half of the 23 admitted students in the Programme aim at becoming secondary school teachers. Of the ca. 10 students met, two wanted to go into teaching, while others expressed a wish to continue with a Master Programme in Environment and Sustainable Development if possible. The remaining students aspired for development work.

#### *Roles and responsibilities*

UMB through individual initiative from staff working within the field of environment and sustainable development have played a central role in defining the project in cooperation with KU. OUC has represented the pedagogical competence and also the experience of education in Asia. At OUC, LINS has been the cooperating partner. The proposal itself was prepared as a joint venture between the three institutions as a result of the start-up funding. KU has since taken full ownership of the project and has the overall responsibility for the development, the implementation and the running of the education programme, including disbursement of funds. The School of Education has developed the course content in education, and the Department of Environmental Science and Energy is responsible for the course content in the science related courses. This work has been carried out although the staffs have little time for research or development work.

The Norwegian institutions' main role has been to initiate and obtain funding for the project. Their involvement is motivated by personal and professional interest. At the same time the merits that international collaboration represents is generally important for universities and colleges. In the further development of the education programme, UMB and OUC claim that they have served a minor role as facilitators. The project is closely linked to the involved individuals at the two institutions. At UMB it is also linked to its other involvements at KU. At OUC, the involvement is restricted to the two individuals who have participated in the project. According to LINS, it has not been possible to involve other departments at OUC in the development of the pedagogical component of the courses. Due to unforeseen events at LINS their involvement has been less than anticipated when they entered into the collaboration.

The Nepalese staffs at KU are highly qualified but they nevertheless praise the inputs from their Norwegian partners. In retrospect they do however point out that the project would have benefited from including possible partners from neighbouring countries from the outset. At this stage these are coming in, more specifically KU has received requests from Delhi. The Nepalese further emphasise the importance of the Norwegian contribution in the starting up of the project and in terms of capacity building, technological, professionally and psychologically. They point to how UMB and OUC contributed to the holistic and interrogative approach of the project. They further give the example of how UMB for example has provided the idea of including "global change" as a course in the programme, as well as the "sustainable development" perspective.

So far, the main Norwegian facilitation has taken place through two workshops organised in Kathmandu during the project period (2006-2007). OUC has only been able to attend one of these. The workshops have served to develop the course outline and the revised curriculum.

### *Sustainability*

It is likely that the launched education programme will continue regardless of future Norwegian support, at least as long as it is economically viable for the university. The sustainability is strengthened by the plans to develop the Postgraduate Diploma programme further as a Master's Programme and to apply for funding through the NOMA programme.

### *Relevance*

By itself this is a successful project developed and launched in a short period of time thanks to local ownership. KU maintains that by targeting teachers and teacher trainers the project will through a trickle-down effect impact society and national policies. MoES approves of the project as they see it as providing inputs to the curriculum development process within environmental education. Nevertheless, the project does not address basic education in Nepal.

Also the Norwegian embassy in Nepal raises doubts as to what extent the project is relevant for basic education, which is the focal point of Norwegian support to the education sector in Nepal. Similarly, they question the choice of KU as a private university as a collaborating partner as the university is seen to be elitist. Considering the environmental aspect of the project, it may on the other hand, fall within Norwegian support to another sector.

## **3.3 Uganda**

### **KyU/UoO: Developing Teacher Education for the Inclusive School**

The cooperation between Department of Special Need Education, UoO and Faculty of Special Needs Education and Rehabilitation, KyU, has an extensive past and a future. Since 1994 close to 20 candidates from KyU have received their degrees in special needs education from UoO, and the cooperation has been strengthened through projects as for instance a NUFU project between KyU and UoO from 2002 to 2006 for competence development. From 2007 to 2011 another NUFU project will provide "Capacity building in teacher education for children with disabilities and special needs" by supporting doctoral studies in PhD programmes at UoO for masters at KyU and elsewhere. The prospective candidates have been involved in the reviewed project. Thus the project might be seen as gap filler between NUFU-projects to qualify professors for KyU, and also as a project in its own right, trying out material to contribute to evidence-based critical-constructive attitudes towards teaching approaches in primary teacher education in Uganda.

Research plays a important part in this project. The partners in the South want through research projects connected to introduction of the Norwegian produced material to engage in scientific work and qualify for further studies. Lecturers at the universities in Uganda have research as part of their duties, tutors at PTCs have not.

### *Teacher education*

The main goal of the project, to change teacher education colleges' curriculum so that perspectives of inclusion and needs of children with special needs are taken care of, was already done when the project started. Also the change in curriculum for use of local language in basic teaching of reading and writing was under way. The tutors at PTCs have the last couple of years been busy training for the new curriculum. The syllabus is not yet completed, but according to the representative from MOES, the spirit should be known and the colleges by now should be able to feature teacher education based on pupils' learning and learners' needs.

National education policy in Uganda will ensure “equitable access to quality basic education for all children ... of varied attitudes, disabilities, gender, disparity, socio/economic, cultural, and geographical barriers...” (MOES U 2006, 7). This implies that Special Needs Education is a compulsory component of the curriculum in Primary Teacher Colleges (PTC). Since 2000 a manual from KyU on teacher education for children with special needs has been part of the curriculum of PTCs and should be touched in different subjects but also have special classes at the colleges.

Local language has been used in teaching lower grades in some schools for some time. A new Thematic Curriculum involve the use of local/area language as primary school language for the three first years of schooling in Uganda. The new thematic curriculum for grade 1 was distributed in 2006, this year the curriculum for grade 2 will be ready, and next year the curriculum for grade 3.

Pre-service teacher education is given as two years of training in PTCs with practise periods interspersed. The students have 11 years of schooling before they start teacher education. The universities educate teachers for secondary schools through diploma and bachelor education.

At KyU and the two cooperating PTCs, the material has not yet been included as part of the curriculum, but have been used by tutors and small groups of students in their spare time. The work in introductory sessions at the colleges for staff members and groups of students in October 2006, with video-recording of student work, has not immediately been continued.

The tutors interviewed found the material inspiring, and reported that students had liked it and those who had looked at it, had showed improvement in their practise period. It was stated that he technology has been somewhat problematic because up till now the material could only be shown on small DVD screens. Now they are able to get it on to big TV screens and plan to use it in classes from next term. They will also present it to local teachers at TRC meetings.

The material is also used at the International Master’s Programme at UoO.

The project’s contribution was first and foremost to make the material produced available to be tried out with projects financed equipment at one university and in two PTCs, and to further the sub-goal to develop research competence.

#### *Aims and intentions of the project*

The project has multiple aims, and it ties past and future projects together. DVD/ video material for teacher education, developed in cooperation between KyU and UoO in the project “Fleksibel Læring”/”Teachers for all”, financed by UoO in 2005 and 2006, is the tool to be tried out in this project to develop better teacher education and teacher practice in Uganda. (Kenya Institute of Special Education is also in on the project, but is not included in the review.) Around 50 small “trigger films”, lasting from two to four minutes, have been produced, showing African teachers in strategic educational situations. Some pupils with disabilities are included as part of ordinary class in some of the sequences, and some sequences show the use of local language in class. To these films, questions for reflection and other material have been attached.

According to the application, the project will implement a flexible teacher education programme, developed in collaboration between UoO and KyU. The material is said to have special focus on literacy in inclusive schools. Expected results include improved teacher

education in the collaborating partner institutions, improved capacity for evaluation and development, exchange of knowledge and experience and development of basis for planning, producing programmes and implement flexible teacher education programmes for inclusion and literacy.

#### *Activities in the project*

Most of the activities in Uganda have been done by the three project partners at KyU and one project leader in each of the two PTCs. At KyU, information to the rest of the faculty has been given through an initial seminar and other meetings. Faculty staff has been busy with other university activities, and the actual involvement using the DVD material for teaching is slated for next semester.

At the two PTCs they have introduced the material to their colleagues, and tried some of it out in their free time with small groups of students.

The partners in Uganda have also participated in international research conferences, and they have written and discussed research proposals with their partners in Norway. They have now prepared research designs for evaluation of the material.

#### *Roles and responsibilities*

This cooperation is among partners in the South and the North who have collaborated and known each other for a long time and trust each other. The application process was carried out in collaboration, and in Uganda they especially mentioned the need for travels to secure professional development and ICT equipment. The resources have been split and have been handled by responsible agents at the two universities, though there have been some problems transferring funds from Norway to the Uganda. Most of the budget has been allocated to participation in seminars, workshops and conferences, e.g. the academic LEA conference at UoO in 2006.

There have been more travels from Uganda to Norway than the other way, as stated in the budget. In 2006 only about 10 percent of the travel expenses were used by the northern partner. Participation in the LEA conference in Oslo and the subsequent project seminar for five Ugandans seems to take much of the travel budget.

Both the representative from MOES and the project team at KyU said that the material would have been used and disseminated to teacher training colleges and TRCs without the Norwegian project. The added value was the possibilities for research and evaluation of the project, and through that the capacity building of key Ugandan lecturers and tutors.

#### *Sustainability*

It seems that national educational authorities are eager to use the material that has been introduced in this project, though there are no immediate plans to make it available to the other 42 PTCs in Uganda. The Norwegian academic coordinator will discuss this with MOES later, and the interest in MOES seems high. There is also money for ICT equipment left on the project's budget, this might benefit other PTCs which will work with the DVD material. There may also be produced more small "trigger films" at KyU. At Kenya Institute of Special Education they are now producing such material. Projects leaders at the two PTCs are eager to use it, their colleagues are more reserved, but interested. How strongly the material will be featured after the project period, will also depend on whether it will be object for Ugandan partners' future doctoral theses. The project is, however, supporting university faculty that is

in strategic positions to influence and contribute to implementation of the Ugandan educational policy.

#### *Relevance*

Inclusive schools are one of the national priorities of Uganda, and the DVD material might give teacher students, teacher educators and teachers input for reflection and practice in this area and as such contribute to improved basic education. The material is, however, produced in earlier project, financed by UoO, and has so far only tentatively been tried out in teacher education. This project has mainly financed conferences, seminars and ICT equipment. The research component may seem a bit dominating, but is within the programmes formulation of goals, performance measures and objectives, even if NUFU might be a more relevant source.

### **3.4 Malawi**

#### **VOUC/CC, UoM: Capacity Building for Democracy in Teacher Education: Malawi and Norway**

The project has allowed for an extended cooperation between VOUC and CC. Since 2003 these institutions have been engaged in a student exchange programme through Peace Corps Young. With start-up funds in 2005 from SIU/Norad, they got the possibility to discuss and develop a common pilot project for which they later were granted support.

#### *Teacher education*

This project in Malawi is based at a university which educates teachers for secondary school, grades 9 - 12. From June 2007 a bachelor program targeting primary education will be launched. The future teachers study selected subjects for bachelor degree and complete with a pedagogical seminar. The main focus in the project is the perspectives of democracy in teacher education and in school, but also in society at large.

#### *Aims and intentions of the project*

Heighten the awareness of democracy among teacher trainers, teacher students, students/pupils and the general public is the project's general aim. The partners have in cooperation worked to define and describe the concept of democracy, and identify perceptions and traces of democracy in selected schools and environments. This shall result in teaching/learning material to be used in both countries. The plan is to include aspects of democracy in the present curriculum in both institutions.

#### *Activities in the project*

Joint seminars and workshops for teacher educators have been the main activities at the cooperating institutions. For the partners to meet and engage in dialogue on democracy and learn with and from each other, and also with staff and students at their home institutions have been a major part of the project. The participating faculty members have formed teams across the two institutions, each focusing their special topic concerning democracy.

The more tangible part of the project is the production of a handbook for use in teacher education and as a resource book for trainees' further teaching. Teacher educators from VOUC and CC have prepared papers on different aspects of democracy for their seminars/workshops, and these papers will constitute part of the planned resource book or a special issue of Malawi Journal of Education and Development.

A survey of knowledge, attitudes and democratic preparedness has been conducted in some secondary schools in Malawi. Two schools, one primary and one secondary, are included as

objects for field studies in the project. The former is starting a student production unit and in the latter students involve in farming production.

The teaching staff at the university has time for research, at least theoretically, but in practice they have a heavy workload which not easily allows research, although research is meriting.

The accounts for 2006 show spending in accordance to the approved budget.

#### *Roles and responsibilities*

VOUC has initiated the collaboration, but the project has been planned in close collaboration between faculty at VOUC and CC. Four different themes were discussed as possible foci. The choice of these was based on previous experience and interests among the collaborating partners and not on an analysis of the specific challenges of basic education in Malawi as such. The selected theme does however address the many challenges to education in the wake of the introduction of democracy in Malawi. The Malawian partners made the final decision on democracy as a project theme.

VOUC has facilitated the development of the project. VOUC has contributed with their thorough knowledge and practical experience of how school democracy is practiced in Norwegian schools, and also from the teaching of the concept at college level. The responsibility for the conceptual exploration has been shared in the spirit of the project theme. Both partners have contributed to the resource book on democracy.

#### *Sustainability*

The intention is that the textbook when it is produced will be included on the reading list for use in teacher education in Malawi. The topic of democracy will be included in the present curricula in both Malawi and Norway.

#### *Relevance*

The topic is relevant to the young democratic nation. As a topic it probably falls within several subjects in basic and secondary education. However, the target group of the project has up till now been teacher educators for secondary education while the aim of the Pilot Programme is basic education.

### **3.5 Namibia**

#### **OCE, UNAM, HUC: Improving the quality of teacher education with regard to reading, writing and mathematics in Namibia.**

HUC has cooperated with Ongwediva College (OCE) since 1999. This has resulted in the development of a joint curriculum, the "International Semester" offered at the two institutions. Since 2000 the University of Namibia (UNAM) and HUC together with two universities in the United States have collaborated. Together they have developed the programme "the Norwegian and Namibian approach to Democracy and Development" and a 2 years in-service teacher training for a marginalised minority group in Namibia.

#### *Teacher education*

In Namibia, teacher education colleges offer teacher education for basic education, while the university, UNAM, educates teachers for senior secondary schools. After independence in 1990, a new teacher education programme, the Basic Education Teacher Diploma Programme was launched in 1993 directed towards the teacher education colleges. The teacher education reform was designed and implemented with Swedish support over a long period of time,

starting before independence.

#### *Aims and intentions of the projects*

The overall aim of the present project between OCE, UNAM and HUC “is to improve the quality of teacher education with regard to reading, writing and mathematics in Namibia”. A second aim “is to improve internationalisation of teacher education in Norway and to broaden the range of research experiences in both countries. “ OCE is the main collaborating partner, with UNAM participating due to their role as educators of teacher educators.

#### *Activities*

The activities of the project have been directed towards the upgrading of “the skills of university and college lecturers with regard to the prevention, identification and intervention of reading and writing difficulties within a multicultural context”, and towards a small scale research study “on the reading culture of Namibian and Norwegian learners, student teachers and primary school teachers”. The rationale behind these objectives is the assumed correlation between the multi-lingual context and the low achievements of Namibian learners documented in the SAQMEC studies.

The means to achieve the stated objectives have been training workshops and seminars to build competencies with OCE teacher educators in inclusive education and in applying a multi-lingual approach to the teaching of English, with inputs of HUC and UNAM. The activities have been organised according to the project plan. The spending is relative to the approved budget for the project. The two UNAM participants have a PhD and M.Ed respectively in special needs education from the University of Oslo from 2003 and 1995. According to HUC, the UNAM competency within the theme of the project field is nevertheless not in accordance with the course content developed by HUC based on their comprehensive competency and experience within the fields of multi-cultural education and special needs and inclusive education in Norway. A 30 credits course in prevention, identification and intervention of reading and writing difficulties within a multicultural context, has been developed and has been organised for five teacher educators from OCE. Hopefully this course will be approved by UNAM as a module in their Masters’ Programme.

The cooperative research component of the project on reading cultures has started, but the analysis of the data remains. Both Norwegians and Namibians have had the opportunity to participate in this joint research project.

#### *Roles and responsibilities*

The collaborating partners have developed the theme of the project jointly. HUC has provided their expertise in the support to OCE and UNAM on how to improve the low learning results in Namibia as documented in the SAQMEC studies. HUC has therefore played a central role as advisors in conducting the courses for teacher educators at OCE, their main collaborating partner. In addition to its facilitating role, UNAM has also conducted some of the courses. On the research project, all three organisations have participated in the data collection, which has taken advantage of UNAM’s research competency and experience. The expectation is that UNAM will take on the future running of the 30 credit course that is developed, while the lecturers from OUC are expected to function as resource persons who can disseminate further what they have learned through the participation in the project.

### *Sustainability*

The development of a course at UNAM aimed at the education of teacher educators suggests that the theme may also be taught in the future. HUC and UNAM have applied for NOMA funds to formalise the project and offer M.Ed. at UNAM in this field. The aim is that the five OCE teachers that are educated through the project will serve as resource persons at OCE.

### *Relevance*

The theme of the project addresses the central challenge of high failures within Namibian education. It is not clear how the multi-lingual issue is addressed in relation to the specific Namibian situation. The project is directed towards competency building of teacher educators and therefore falls within the goal of the Pilot Programme.

## **3.6 Palestine**

### **UoBP/VUC: Best Practice: Improving the practicum component for the primary school teacher students at the teacher training institutions in Bethlehem, Palestine and Vestfold, Norway**

This project stems from cooperation between the project's key persons since 1994. What started as a private initiative has developed through the years to cooperation on in-service courses for Norwegian teacher educators in Palestine/Israel in 1998 and student exchange since 2003.

### *Teacher education*

Elementary school teachers on the West Bank are required to have a four years degree of general or educational education, i.e. educational theory and practice, in college or a first level university degree after secondary school. Secondary school teachers need a bachelor degree and then one year of practicum to obtain teaching qualification diploma. The universities have freedom within national frames to design their teacher education programmes.

The curricula in Palestinian colleges of education and universities have been found theoretical in nature and lacking in education-relatedness (Palestine Economic Policy Research Institute 2006). Up till now, universities or colleges have made their own plans for teacher education more often in cooperation with local school authorities than with MOHE.

### *Aims and intentions of the project*

The objective is to improve the quality of teacher education in both institutions by focusing on the practicum component and also on the use of text books in schools.

### *Activities in the project*

The main activities centre on exchange and dissemination of ideas, experiences and skills through comparison between pedagogical ideas and experiences from practice in seminars, workshops, field work and research in both countries. From these activities, new curricula, textbooks and classroom practices are expected. The main task is to develop a manual which details the aims, organization and content of practicum at UoBP in a practicum package/guide for the students. This will be done by UoBP in cooperation with principals, teachers and supervisors in the district, and in contact with local schools authorities.

The use of textbooks in Norway and Palestine, studied by analyses of textbooks and observation in a few unspecified classrooms in each country, is also part of the project.

The research element is mainly the exchange of ideas and experiences that enhance

comparisons and further new understanding. Field visits to primary schools are included in the workshops. The Norwegian partners have research as part of their work schedule, among the Palestine faculty this seems more unusual.

#### *Roles and responsibilities*

UoBP has played a leading role in selection of the project theme, and is in the process of improving its teacher education. Subject areas are being revised, practicum has been increased from 4 to 6 courses, and courses are spread over 4 semesters instead of 2. In Norway VUC is continuing their 'Best praksis' project which started in 2005 to develop a new approach to the practicum component in their teacher education. UoBP also wanted to improve their practicum and use the ideas and experiences from VUC to assist and improve their project through cooperation and comparison between the two institutions. This is intended to enrich the development of the practicum component.

The two project coordinators feel they equally share the responsibilities. As said from Palestine: "The feeling of symmetry helps the smooth running of the project."

It does, however, seem that the textbook part of the project lacks coherence with the main efforts towards improving practicum, and the role it plays is somewhat unclear.

The project funds were in 2006 used for travels and seminars. According to the Annual Report 2006, the sum used on seminars and workshops is approximately 60.000 NOK more than allocated, and according to the southern academic coordinator the overdraft is reduced in August 2007 to approximately 15.000 NOK. Since salaries may not be included in the budget, participating lecturers, supervisors and teachers get some financial compensation when attending workshops etc.

The cooperation with and visits from VUC are also appreciated as signs of general interest and support in a political difficult situation in Palestine.

#### *Sustainability*

MOHE is planning, in cooperation with international donors and teacher education institutions, to coordinate and specify necessary academic and educational qualifications for teachers. UoBP may be in the forefront when they now revise and develop the practicum in teacher education to implement more advanced didactical approaches, and will present it to the Ministry.

This will to a large extent depend on how the experiences and products of the project at UoBP will be received and included by MOHE in a new national policy for teacher education. There are 11 universities, 13 university colleges and 18 community colleges which give education qualifying for teaching, and they may have different experiences and opinions about the future practicum

#### *Relevance*

An improved practicum is desired by the UoBP, and has also been wanted nationwide by teacher students, teacher educators and national authorities. As such it is a relevant input to a desired development of teacher education. The target group is student teachers who will teach from grade 4 to upper secondary school, and therefore in line with the main goals of the Pilot Programme.

### **3.7 South Africa I**

#### **UWC/UoB: The design of learning packages related to socio-scientific and mathematical issues for teacher education**

The joint research group originated from a former capacity building project at UoB. That project concentrated on PhD education for 22 participating students from ten countries South of Sahara. The project group now consists of five researchers from UoB, UMB, AUC and VOUC and five researchers from UWC. The group has in varied capacities worked together for 10 years with mathematic and science projects.

#### *Teacher education*

Teacher education in South Africa has with the education reforms undertaken since independence been transferred to the universities as separate entities in faculties of education, and the previous teacher education colleges have been closed. Teacher students, who aim to qualify for teaching in upper secondary school, must first take a bachelor degree. In this project, the target groups are teacher educators for this level and their students.

A special challenge for all teacher education colleges is the implementation of Curriculum 2005. This was introduced in 1997 and the implementation should be completed by 2005. According to this curriculum, the pupils/students shall through schooling among other goals become "able to display a developed spirit of curiosity to enable creative and scientific discovery ... use a variety of effective problem-solving techniques" that requires teachers to apply more reflective and critical approaches to learning content and methods (South African Government Information 1997). The Curriculum has later been supplemented by subject-specific National Curriculum Statements.

#### *Aims and intentions of the project*

The aim of the project is to design learning packages related to socio-scientific and mathematical issues for teacher education. The project is a research and development project which involves teacher educators for upper secondary school. The main perspective is to improve the link between theory and teaching practice in science and mathematics by developing capacity of teacher educators in the design of learning material in socio-scientific and mathematical issues through use of exemplary lessons, developed by the research team. Even if these lessons will be structured in detail and step by step give the content and methods to be utilized, their basis in real life situations are intended to foster critical and reflective students.

#### *Activities in the project*

As part of the learning packages for initial teacher preparation, design of exemplary lessons and video recording of these, implemented in school classrooms, will be objects for research and main means to improve teacher education.

The lessons and the videos are part of the learning packages, the lessons are for teacher educators, the videos primarily for the researchers. So far the planning of lessons has been in focus. In two seminars at UWC the research group has worked to find topics for the learning packages, plan and develop teaching modules within the topic and discussed how to implement them in teacher education. The research group is central in this work, but the group wants to draw teacher educators into the processes. Teacher educators are planned to be trained in design and implementation of lessons, also in electronic recording and use of the package of exemplary lessons in their work with teacher students. They do, however, not have research time in their job allotted to this work.

One teaching module has been created as detailed instruction for two units; ten classes of mathematics and ten classes in science for upper secondary school. These outlines for each lesson, with information of substance and how to present it, reading lists for teacher educators and students, and various assignments for students are collected in a teachers' manual.

The status of the video recordings is not quite clear. There are plans for recording the lessons of one module, primarily to be used for research, but also for use in teacher education. Some work is done by recording teacher students teaching 10th grade. The research based evaluation will examine what the teachers as students have grasped of the exemplary lessons.

#### *Roles and responsibilities*

Highly qualified researchers in Norway and South Africa who have known each other for years continue and expand earlier research collaboration in this project. The main activities are in South Africa, as illustrated in the budget by substantial travelling costs in the South and no travels from South Africa to Norway. Norwegian researchers have participated in a couple of seminars at UWC. The collaboration in this project seems to be primarily between the researchers in the South, though the project draws on work done by project members in Norway.

The main value of the Norwegian contribution seems to be academic exchange by visits and current communication as well as providing funding for work of partners in the South.

#### *Sustainability*

There is no account up till now of how these lessons and modules have been tried out or received by teacher educators, teacher students, national authorities or other stake holders.

#### *Relevance*

The theme is chosen because of qualifications and interest among the researchers. There is no specific link to national education policy, although the attitudes among teacher educators and students that the project will develop are in accordance with those of Curriculum 2005 and National Curriculum Statements. With target groups in upper secondary school, the relationship to the Pilot Programme goals is questionable, even if the students as teachers may teach at all levels of the schooling system in South Africa..

### **3.8 South Africa II**

#### **KwaZulu- Natal/NTNU: Enhancing the Quality of Teacher Education through School-University Partnerships**

The collaboration between the institutions has grown out of personal interest and circumstance since 2003. This was developed into an institutional collaboration through the application for start up funds to the present Pilot Programme in 2005. The project is part of a collaboration between NTNU, Programme for Teacher Education, and the University of KwaZulu-Natal, School of Education and Development. The School of Education at the University of KwaZulu-Natal educates teachers for both primary and secondary levels. The present project targets the Post Graduate Certificate of Education, which qualifies for grade four upwards.

#### *Teacher education*

See section 3.7 for a description of South African teacher education.

### *Aims and intentions of the project*

The project goal is “to establish a long-term co-operation in the field of research based development in teacher education and school development”. Supported by international trends, the project rests on the assumption that teacher education is a joint responsibility between the institutions of teacher education and the schools where the teachers practice.

### *Activities*

Through an action-research project developed at NTNU and practiced in Trondheim, the cooperating partners have developed a model for strengthening teacher education in South Africa to meet the escalating demand for well prepared teacher trainees in South Africa. 11 schools are included in the project in which teacher students do their school based studies, each with a liaison mentor working together with the other mentors with the aim of supporting the professional development of the school-based mentors.

The project is implemented through a number of workshops, with specifically stated aims related to the study of the Norwegian model and to the discussion of the knowledge base and the conceptual framework of the project. This has served as a basis for the design of the plan of action for the implementation of the project. The formal collaboration with the mentoring schools has been established and between 60 and 70 mentors from the collaborating schools have been trained.

The expenses for travelling to participate in workshops and seminars represent the major part of the budget, in accordance with the objectives of the project. Importantly, the aims of the travels are very specific, directly related to the aims of the project.

### *Roles and responsibilities*

NTNU has played an important role in advancing the model in South Africa. The model is based on partnership through joint action research, with a focus on development and not on research. This is carried out by the involved actors in South Africa. The training of the mentors has been the responsibility of the University of KwaZulu-Natal.

Formally faculty staff from KwaZulu-Natal has a research component, but practically it is difficult to set aside time among all other pressing tasks.

### *Sustainability*

The piloting of the model has had short time for implementation and as a new model it is fragile according to NTNU. The experience is however that the faculty is increasingly interested in the model.

### *Relevance*

The project supports the aims of the Pilot Programme as it addresses teacher education from grade four upwards. It demonstrates a link to education policies in South Africa as the project is based on an analysis of teacher education in the country. The piloting of a model to strengthen the tie between theory and practice addresses the importance of acknowledging that teacher education is a joint responsibility between institutions of higher education and the practice schools.

## **4. PROGRAMME REVIEW**

The main reasons that Norad decided to create a pilot teacher education cooperation programme was to focus upon improving teacher education in the South in accordance with Education for All, and to develop existing partnerships between Norwegian teacher education

institutions and partners in the South. In the tentative plan for partnership (SIU 2003), teacher education in university colleges, not universities, seems to be the focus. An attached survey showed that eight university colleges in 2002 had established partnership projects with institutions in the South. This plan was followed by a pre-appraisal (Carron, Storeng 2003) which addresses the need for a separate programme to secure the role of Norwegian university colleges in future South-North projects and concludes that such partnerships should follow a project model. Projects should be based on serious diagnosis of the needs and problems of teacher training in the Southern partner countries, and be fully integrated into national frameworks and priorities for teacher training in the South.

#### **4.1 Aims of the programme**

When the Pilot Programme was launched in 2005 with call for project proposals, the main aims of the projects should be to strengthen the quality of teacher education in the South as means to improve basic education and secure education for all. From this perspective, teacher education and teacher education for basic schools should be in focus. Basic education means different types of schooling in different countries in the South. In some countries basic education refers to primary school education, others include lower secondary, and others upper secondary as well. Even if basic education is a broader concept than the Norwegian “grunnskole”, it might be questionable if general higher secondary education or further education for university faculty will be within the programme, even if this may improve basic education in the long run.

#### **4.2 Applications, criteria and selected projects**

The programme was open to both universities and university colleges in Norway as the northern partner, and pedagogical research- and development work was stated both as subsidiary goal, performance measure and one of the objectives. The projects should be based on institutional and pedagogical needs in the South.

Invitations to apply could be found on SIU’s webpage, and paper invitations were also sent to around 40 Norwegian institutions which give teacher education of one kind or another. Norwegian institutions with former experiences in South-North cooperation, were to be preferred. For the Pilot Programme 19 applications were received, two from universities in Uganda for projects without a Norwegian partner. Kyambogo University, Uganda, also had an application with UoO which was accepted, and Makerere University, Uganda’s largest, has for years cooperated with the Norwegian embassy on institutional development and exchange programmes, though not in education. These applications were not considered. From the Norwegian institutions four applications came from universities and 13 from university colleges. Most of the partner countries were in Africa, four were in Asia, and one in South America.

All the four applications from universities were accepted and four from university colleges, totaling eight pilot projects, 7 with African partners, one with Asian. The applications were assessed by academic experts on two groups of criteria; one group focusing history of cooperation between the partners, the plan to achieve academic goals, research- and development, and incorporation in extensive professional/academic cooperation. Relations to needs in the South, competence in research and development, objectives, academic and scientific quality etc. were criteria in group 2. The project’s relevance to national educational policy and priorities in the South or to Norwegian development assistance policy were not criteria. All the selected projects deal with teacher education, though in some of the projects teacher education play a minor part so far. And since universities in Norway and also in the

South mostly qualify teachers for upper part of primary and secondary education, university projects tend to focus education for teachers who will work with grades above 4th.

Looking at three of the projects based in Norwegian universities, it seems that research and development concerning or connected to the selected topics, have played the main role.

The Southern university partner in Nepal has worked with content and methods to establish a postgraduate diploma programme in Environment Education, in Uganda they have used the discussion and introduction of teacher education material to also further postgraduate research projects. In West Cape, South Africa, the efforts have been shared between developing exemplary lessons for use in teacher education and preparing for postgraduate research on teacher educators' and students' use and understanding of the learning packages created.

Common for these three projects is that the partners in the South work rather independently with their development of courses and research, something that is reflected in the budgets. Compared with travels between partners in the South (West Cape), travels from Norway might be sparse. Travels abroad might be financed for the Southern partners to countries also outside Norway (Uganda).

The EFA goals are directed towards basic education. The projects address primary education through improvement of basic teacher education (Zambia, Uganda, Namibia, KwaZulu-Natal, Palestine), of teacher education for lower secondary (Palestine) or secondary schools (Nepal, Malawi, West Cape).

The project themes are connected to specific subjects or themes (Community Studies/Zambia, Environment Education/Nepal, Democracy/Malawi, Science and mathematics/West Cape) and to more general learning problems (Inclusive School/Uganda, Inclusive education/multi-lingual teaching of reading and writing problems/Namibia) or improvement of teacher education in general (Inclusive School/Uganda, Practicum/Palestine, Classroom practices/KwaZulu-Natal).

#### **4.3 Activities in the Pilot Programme**

Most of the activities in the Pilot Programme have consisted of travels from the North to the South and from the South to the North to attend seminars and workshops, visit each other's institutions and schools in the district, and attend conferences.

The cooperation between peer institutions is dependent on establishing human bond through direct cooperation, and mutual visits may help to develop an attitude of equal partnership with a common interest in engaging in dialogue and practice and in learning from one another. Evaluation of the inter-ministerial cooperation between Norway and Zambia observes that "the use of 'colleagues' as facilitators and intermediaries appear to be a crucial element ... which makes for a significant different kind of learning experience" (Norad 2006, 2, 29). One might, however, question the efficiency of short visits and workshops for improving basic education in the South. Longer stays of partners from the North in the South might give better technical cooperation and assistance.

In the call for pilot project proposals, SIU mentions activities such as teacher exchange, fieldwork, scholarship funds for post-graduate/in-service training (limited to short courses) of teacher trainers from the South and research and development.

Terms of Reference for this review lists 13 different activities for which the partners could apply for support (see Annex 2). The programme does not, however, cover salaries, and many of the activities will primarily require staff's time and effort, e.g. development of new teacher training programmes, curriculum development, and development of teaching material. Partners from the North may be able to use their allotted research time for such activities, partners in the South seldom have such time and have to do the work in addition to their regular assignments. Travels and seminars might give some compensation. It is also possible to purchase necessary teaching aids/material and ICT-equipment for institutions in the South.

Budgetary it seems easier to find room for travels, seminars, student and teacher exchange, and publication and documents than for fieldwork and research in the programme. It is a serious problem that although partners from the North may comply with the programme's repeated call for research both as subsidiary goal, performance measure and objective for the pilot projects, this is not so in institutions of basic teacher education in the South. Even in Norway not all teacher educators have time for research as part of their duties. In the South, teacher educators seldom have time for research in their job, and due to lack of training they may not have the capacity and competence for research. The programme's request for research may lead to rather special activities in the area, e.g. the gathering of data on local conditions so far without pedagogic perspectives in Zambia. These might be time-consuming activities, which may take time away from more relevant educational activities. The strong research perspective is not as relevant for this programme as it might be in other programmes administered by SIU. This perspective may also have favoured applications from universities with strong research traditions and capacity, and by that, projects not focusing education for lower grades in primary education.

More relevant than research perspectives, and not reflected in the Pilot Programme documents, is that teacher education development projects must be in accordance with national educational policy if they shall have sustainable impact. In most countries, basic education and teacher education are seen as central for national development, both taking care of traditions and culture as well as adapt to future challenges, and are regulated by national laws and curricula. Universities both in the South and the North have freer positions, they may themselves design their studies and their degrees, and their successes and failures will to a large extent be judged by the international academic community. The success of teacher education development projects will depend on how well they fit into national plans for educational development and how they are received by national authorities, teachers, parents, and pupils.

A programme evaluation of activities in two year projects is, however, of limited value. It is not possible to fairly assess results or outcomes or to determine lasting results or change in classroom teaching, which is the overall objective of the programme.

#### **4.4 Projects versus Programme**

The programme for the pilot projects declares that the projects should be based on needs of the Southern partners. How these needs are assessed in the South is an open issue. There does not seem to be any activities in the projects to assess needs directly related to EFA goals, or more formal assessments in this perspective of teacher education. It rather seems that topics have been selected from interest, current work and according to what the Norwegian partners have to offer. Therefore the relation to the overall goal of the programme might seem to be implemented through numerous layers before the basic school classroom is reached.

The relation between the partners in the projects are supposed to be equal, though the Pilot Programme might be read as assuming a hierarchical relation where the Norwegian partners have the competency and capacity while the partners in the South have institutional and pedagogical needs. Even if this is a dominant feature of the situation today, this overlooks that the South may have traditions and practices beneficiary for the North to learn from. To foster the desired collegial cooperation, it is necessary that both parties feel that they have something to offer in working out common challenges and problems.

The extent to which the projects are institutionalised also differ, but as in earlier reviews (e.g. Caron, Storeng 2003), there is still a predominance of individual competence building compared to institutional development. In some institutions in the South, the great number of donor projects and the faculty's participation in these may result in competition between projects and little time for sharing of experiences. In Norway it seems like a few dedicated persons who have worked with international issues for years still are the key persons and main actors in the projects. There is, however, a tendency to enhance cooperation between members of different departments or faculties (e.g. SFUC, UMB, VUC).

In the actual project work most of the Norwegian coordinators who feel responsible for the budget, have taken care to include seminars and visits from the South to the North and not only for Norwegians travelling for workshops in the South. At times these visits might seem more as a manifestation of reciprocal activities, and the reasons and programmes for visits especially from the South to North do not always seem well deliberated or integrated into the goals of the project.

The relation of the Pilot Programme project to national educational policies and priorities in the South differ. Three of the projects work in or have close relations with national authorities (Zambia, Uganda, Nepal), other projects seem to have weak links to education plans or policies in the South. The driving force for the choice of the projects' topic seems to be based on the interests among the partners and capabilities in the North. That means that topics more closely connected to basic challenges to achieve EFA goals are not as widespread in the programme's projects as might be expected.

The Norwegian embassies have a key role to play in such harmonisations. In this programme the embassies have played a rather subdued role. According to the minutes from the meeting between SIU and Norad in 2005 when the applications were treated, the relevant embassies and the applicants were notified of accepted projects and not generally contacted in advance. In four instances were embassies contacted before the projects were approved. One of the applications, which was considered promising, was not granted support because an embassy reported that it was "doubtful according to sector programme". Except for this, the influence of Norwegian representatives abroad, were not predominant.

In the Norwegian embassies visited in Zambia, Nepal and Uganda, representatives in two of the embassies did not know these specific projects very well. In Nepal, the first secretary was well informed about the project. One of the reasons for little engagement in two of the embassies was said to be that education no longer is job no.1. This implies that embassy personnel do not have so much time as before to use on educational questions. In Zambia, Norway is part of a harmonised arrangement for support to the sector plan of MOE, and thus not directly involved in educational projects. The Norwegian development assistance policy has led to a shift of focus for education, from sector plan and pool funding, to education as part of the dialogue on poverty reduction. In Uganda, the embassy has withdrawn from the

donors' harmonisation group for education. The Norwegian development assistance policy of the current government was said to be the reason for less engagement in educational issues.

Summing up, it might be said that the Pilot Programme Teacher Education South-North does not seem to have been specific enough to avoid discrepancies on several issues. The projects seem to give many different answers to the questions of who are the most suitable partners in co operational projects, who are the most important target groups to benefit from the work in the projects, what kind of activities are most efficient to establish sustainable cooperation between the South-North partners and to further the EFA goals, which topics and themes are more important in this respect than others, and how to secure that projects will be linked to partner countries' education policies.

It must, however, be underlined that the Pilot Programmes' projects shows interesting work that might benefit individuals, institutions, teacher education and pupils' and students' school experiences in the involved countries.

## **5. THE WAY FORWARD**

The overall goal of the Pilot Programme Teacher Education Programme South – North is “To contribute to strengthen teacher education in the South, as a means of improving basic education and training, securing education for all”. This would be an ambitious aim for any bilateral donor, and more so considering the modest financial means made available to the Pilot Programme. Moreover, the means have been thinly spread over a variety of projects in a number of countries, to be implemented over a short period of time.

This raises the question of how to best channel Norwegian development support to institutions of basic teacher education in the South, and what the role of Norwegian teacher education colleges should be in this regard. The question was also addressed in the Pre-Appraisal of the Pilot Teacher Education Programme the South-North in 2003. The following therefore first discusses the main recommendations of the appraisal before turning to a discussion of a possible approach to a Norwegian support of basic teacher education in the South. Although this review has emphasised that it is far too early to assess results and lasting impact of the Pilot Programme, the review team argues that it is possible to make recommendations for a possible future programme when the findings from the review are related to international research on teacher education in developing countries and to studies of institutional cooperation.

### **5.1 The Pre-Appraisal: Collaboration Teacher Education and the South**

The Pre-Appraisal pursued a development perspective and made a distinction between a “partnership approach”<sup>2</sup> and a “development approach”. The first was described to have the potential of being quite beneficial from an international learning perspective, but was not seen to be a Norad priority. Instead internationalisation of Norwegian teacher education institutions was considered to fall under the responsibility of the Ministry of Education. A development approach presupposes that the Northern institution is knowledgeable about education in the South. In particular it requires country specific knowledge, both of education and culture. At the time of the Pre-Appraisal this was found to be weak with the Norwegian teacher education institutions. The appraisal further presented three conditions for a successful programme with a development perspective:

---

<sup>2</sup> The pre-appraisal used the term “partnership”. For the sake of clarity, the more neutral concept “linkages” is used in the discussion in this chapter.

*Relevance:* linkages would be based on an analysis of the educational needs of the South. A support would have to consider contextual and cultural aspects of education. The Pre-appraisal found a lack of such relevance within the ongoing collaborations between Norwegian and Southern institutions four years ago. The guidelines for the present Pilot Programme address this issue. They explicitly state that the projects are to be based on the educational needs of the South, but also on the competence and capacity of the Norwegian institutions. This opens for ambiguity and a supply driven approach in the selection process as is reflected in the findings from this review. It has proved difficult within the limited timeframe of the Pilot Programme to base the cooperation on an analysis of what the needs of the southern institution would be. Therefore an assessment of the needs of the South has not been a systematic part of the selection process.

*Efficiency:* in order to make sure that resources, time and money are used efficiently, there is a need to have clearly defined goals to avoid the tendency to loose and open ended agreements. The invitation in the present Pilot Programme to apply for funds states as the first criteria that an application should include “Specified goals/plan for the project with the particular focus on how the project will contribute to improve the quality of teacher education”. The overall goal of the Pilot Programme itself is however comprehensive and ambitious, not least considering the size and the time frame of the programme.

*Sustainability:* The Pre-Appraisal stated that a successful linkage programme which has a lasting effect on the teacher education in the country concerned, has to make sure that capacity building is not only taking place on the individual level. It also has to include the institutional level. As the findings from this review show, the ongoing collaboration predominantly supports individual competence building.

The present Pilot Programme also aims at improving teacher education in general. Since teacher education mostly is the mandate of a MOE, one cannot expect an institutional cooperation with one teacher education institution to have an effect on the national level.

The Pre-Appraisal recommended a concentration of support to a linkage programme between teacher education institutions in Norway and the South by starting on a small scale with a pilot programme. A time span of five years was indicated. In the appropriation document for the present Pilot Programme the time span was however reduced to three years with some start up funding the first year, followed by a two year pilot programme, with a total financial support of NOK 13mill. Moreover, the Pilot Programme has spread the allocation over eight projects in seven countries over two years, each with an average budget of NOK 1,2 millions. Given limited financial resources it is important to concentrate Norwegian support to teacher education in developing countries to certain areas. This may also increase sustainability.

## **5.2 Support to teacher education in developing countries**

The extent and nature of Norwegian support to teacher education in the South must be seen in relation to the political will in Norway to make teacher education a priority area within development cooperation. Although the present government has shifted its focus from education to other areas, the recent signals given by the Minister of Development Erik Solheim at the European high-level aid meeting, “Keeping our promises” in Brussels 2 May this year (2007) are promising for teacher education. Solheim emphasised the need for teacher training and qualified teachers to reach the EFA goals. His closing words “We do not need more words, what we need is action”<sup>3</sup> may be seen as an indication that the Norwegian government will give priority to the support of teacher education in the South. In turn, this makes it imperative to examine how to best channel Norwegian development assistance to

---

3 <http://www.promises-on-education.org/pdf/Mr%20Erik%20Solheim,%20Norway.pdf>

teacher education for basic education in the South. The following first briefly examines research on reform initiatives directed at teacher education in developing countries, and then explores different modalities of support within development cooperation.

#### *Teacher education and support of quality enhancement*

Internationally, numerous initiatives have targeted teacher education in developing countries aiming at quality enhancement. This raises the question of what constitutes quality teaching and who is to determine what is good teaching. In its definition of quality teaching, the global discourse emphasises a “learner-centred” as opposed to a “teacher-centred” teaching. Such a global definition tends to disregard culture and context. Thus the comparative education researcher Fox has asked, “What is good for me, is it also good for you?” This raises the whole debate on educational transfer and borrowing of educational policies and practices, a central aspect of development aid. Research within this area questions the role of the North in setting the agenda for educational development and reform and findings demonstrate how global approaches are negotiated, transformed and localised (Anderson-Levitt 2003, Steiner-Khamsi 2004, Steiner-Khamsi & Stolpe 2006). Likewise, research from Namibia (Storeng 2001) explores the cultural contextual complexity within which teaching takes place. Reform initiatives in Namibia that aimed at transforming a teacher-centred teaching into a learner-centred one conflicted with a number of frame-factors that conditioned teaching. These were cultural but also economic, and represented hindrances in achieving the expected changes based on different perceptions of what constitutes teaching and what the role of teachers is. The frame-factors included timetabling, classroom organisation, resources, class size, and teaching load, but also rules that regulate adult/children relationships. Global reform initiatives may therefore result in new and unexpected challenges locally for teachers and pupils. It means that teacher education cannot be seen in isolation from the context within which it operates. In the same vein, Volan (2003) based on findings from Zambia notes the significant role of culture in the change process and holds that innovations have to be anchored in the reality of the pupils.

Torres (undated) emphasises that teacher education must be seen in relation to other dimensions of teaching (e.g salaries, working/living conditions, organizational arrangements) and includes also principals, supervisors, and other human resources at all levels. She therefore warns against a disassociation of administrative and pedagogical issues. Importantly, she notes that teacher education must be seen as a continuum where pre-service and in-service are seen as a single process (p.4).

Research does in other words show that teacher education cannot be improved by addressing only one aspect of the system. It requires a holistic and systemic approach. The challenge is how and to what extent these experiences can be incorporated into a Norwegian support to teacher education in developing countries.

#### *Changing modalities within development cooperation<sup>4</sup>*

Within a development paradigm one partner (the South) has a need for capacity building, which is addressed by the North. The Norad Evaluation Report No.1/2006 points to that there has been a continuous search for effective ways of providing technical assistance to meet southern needs and to build capacity within development cooperation. It points to that, historically there has been a move from technical assistance (TA) to technical cooperation (TC), which in turn has seen the rise of institutional cooperation, and that this may take the

---

<sup>4</sup> The discussion is based on the conceptual discussion of “Capacity Development and Institutional Cooperation” in Norad Evaluation report 1/2006 *Inter-Ministerial Cooperation. An Effective Model for Capacity Development?* Part 1. Synthesis Report, pp.16-21.

form of both technical assistance and technical cooperation. Technical assistance was from the outset meant to fill a gap in developing countries for specific technical expertise. Through technical assistance knowledge and skills would be transferred to the institution or organization in the recipient country since the assumption was that such knowledge/skill “resided largely within the rich, donor countries” (ibid). TA has been critiqued on several grounds: the costs are high, it is too supply driven, it has not been efficient in contributing to the development of institutional capacity building, and it has increased dependence on foreign experts. This critique has led to a shift of focus within development cooperation towards technical cooperation, implying a change from an implementing role, towards an advisory role which is assumed to support ownership and a recipient driven development.

The Norad Evaluation Report notes that TA and TC still dominate among the leading donors, but that in Norway there has since the 1990’s been a move towards offering TA and/or TC through institutional cooperation as linkage arrangements at the expense of individual experts. These have typically included staff exchange, job-training, study tours, support for equipment and also the use of short- and long-term experts. Institutional cooperation is considered efficient in network building and professional and personal development. It is however critiqued for failing to support systemic changes, and of still being too supply driven. The Norad Evaluation refers to the evaluation of institutional collaboration carried out by the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs from 1998<sup>5</sup> that recommended a careful use of institutional cooperation. It was not seen as “the only or the ultimate model for capacity building”(ibid). More specifically it found that although individuals had a range of reasons for participating in institutional cooperation, the institutional commitment was not as strong. Further, although the institutions’ professional competency was considerable, their proficiency in pursuing Norwegian development goals was weaker. The evaluation also found that projects mostly targeted aspects such as technical competence, improved technology and equipment, administrative routines, but less strategic management and systemic development. Finally, the evaluation stated “public institutions were not development institutions and that NORAD should make a close assessment of their competence and capacity for development work.” (UD Evaluation Report 1.98 quoted in Norad Evaluation Report 1/2006:21)

This brief literature review clearly demonstrates that there is no common understanding among donors about the best modality for support in development cooperation. A central problem with institutional cooperation is that while the aim is institutional strengthening, international research shows that such cooperation remains on the personal level. It does not become institutionalised. Moreover, in a linkage programme between teacher education institutions South-North the aim is to improve teacher education in a given country while institutions of teacher education are not autonomous but operate within the mandate of a ministry of education. A stand-alone linkage programme is therefore problematic. It cannot be expected to achieve a comprehensive goal like the one found in the Pilot Programme. A possible future linkage programme would therefore have to consider such limitations and explore the possibilities.

#### *Internationalisation, institutional cooperation and development support*

The Pre-Appraisal of 2003 dismissed internationalisation of Norwegian teacher education institutions as a Norad task. The ToR for the review does not see increased internationalisation to be among the main goals of a possible future programme, but it does ask for advice on how to increase internationalisation. The review does not see this as a Norad

---

<sup>5</sup> UD Evaluation Report 1.98 quoted in Norad Evaluation Report 1/2006:21.

priority. However, participation in an international linkage programme automatically gives international exposure and experience. A linkage programme between institutions of teacher education in Norway and in developing countries could be implemented with modest financial means. A continuation of the present programme but with less ambitious goals could therefore be envisaged if Norwegian financial support to teacher education does not allow a more comprehensive support as discussed in section 5.3.

For an institutional linkage programme to fall within a development paradigm, the aims have to be focused towards specific aspects of teacher education as identified by the southern institution in order to be both relevant and efficient. As shown above, linkages can be useful for network building and for personal and professional development, but not equally useful for institutional development. Moreover, they could provide a foundation to further build Norwegian competency on teacher education in developing countries through the experiences gained and through Norwegian research. A stand-alone linkage programme does not fall within a wider bilateral support to teacher education in a given country and would not have to be restricted to Norway's main partner countries. It should however be reserved institutions of teacher education for basic education if it is to target basic education. Specific guidelines would have to be established to ensure a demand-driven approach since data show that institutional cooperation South-North is too supply-driven. The modalities of cooperation would have to be determined relative to the goal of the collaboration.

### **5.3 Institutional cooperation in support of national policies on teacher education**

This discussion of a possible future teacher education programme takes as its starting point that teacher education for basic education falls within national education policies as part of the education sector of a country. Institutions of basic teacher education are therefore not autonomous; they operate under the mandate of a ministry. The discussion also builds on the assumption that a future programme is development oriented and that the overall goal therefore is to support the development of teacher education for basic education in a given country. Importantly in this regard, it is acknowledged that institutional cooperation through linkage programmes demonstrates a poor record of institutional development. These conditions serve as both the limitations and the possibilities for a strategy to the support of teacher education in developing countries. As already stated, a stand-alone linkage programme is not useful in itself if the aim is to contribute to the development of a national teacher education programme for basic education in pursuance of national education policies. If the aim remains the same, the linkage programme has to be incorporated as one aspect of the wider (sector) support, financially and technically, to the implementation of education policies/reform on teacher education in a given country. In pursuing a development perspective the linkage programme is therefore seen as a form of technical cooperation under the wider umbrella of bilateral development cooperation. The linkage programme complements and is an integrated part of the total support to teacher education as a necessary element to reach specific goals to address specifically identified needs, which means there is a need to focus the support. Similarly, the review of the Pilot Programme demonstrates the need to focus and to adjust the goal to the size of the programme, and to make goals specific to be efficient. A programme set within such a context would be based on the following considerations:

#### *Geographic focus*

The institutional linkages would be made with institutions in Norway's main partner country/ies. If the programme remains small it could be restricted to one country, or even one province of a country. If it is substantially increased, the programme could operate in several

countries.

#### *Institutional focus*

The institutional cooperation would be limited to institutions of teacher education for basic education or to a network of training institutions if regular institutions of teacher training do not exist. Teacher education has both a theoretical and practical component. A model of cooperation could therefore comprise one teacher education institution and a number of practice schools and tutors at these schools. This would contribute to a wider perspective and support a view of pre-service and in-service as a continuum. Also teacher resource centres could be included in an institutional agreement, where such exist, if this would fall within the overall aim of the support to the teacher education programme in question.

#### *Thematic focus*

The themes to be addressed would be determined by the identified needs of the South and could include: pre-service, in-service, curriculum development, textbook production, classroom teaching, inclusive education, multi-grade teaching, English as a second language, parent-teacher cooperation, practice teaching (school based teaching). The list is not exhaustive. This also means that Norwegian institutions of teacher education would have to identify their comparative advantage(s), which some already have, and offer these on demand (see below), relative to the educational, cultural and contextual setting within which they would work.

#### *Research*

Research is normally not within the brief of teacher educators at institutions of teacher education for basic education in the South. It is therefore not realistic to incorporate joint research as an aspect of a linkage programme. Action-research or development projects for example directed at teaching practice as part of the mentoring role of the teacher educators could however be envisaged.

#### *Time-frame*

The support should be long-term and continuous to show results and have lasting impact.

#### *Roles*

The role of Norwegian teacher education institutions would be relative to the demands of the South and would be part of the more comprehensive Norwegian support to teacher education offered over a continuous period of time. The institutional cooperation would generally constitute a technical cooperation where the Norwegian institution has an advisory role relative to the local counterpart, whereas the local institution is responsible for the implementation. Depending on the aim of the cooperation, the Norwegian institution could also be given the role as technical assistant in support of the implementation of policies or practices. TC or TA require a more lengthy presence in the institution(s) in the South than what has been practiced in the Pilot Programme, not least to be familiar with the working situation of the teachers and to attune advice to the cultural and economic frame-factors of the institutions/schools and to role expectations of teachers, pupils and parents. It would also require knowledge of education and teacher education in the given country.

#### *Needs based support*

Support to improve the teaching in the basic education classroom based on a development approach has to consider what research has found, namely that support aiming at enhancing the quality of teaching and thereby learning has to be based on a systemic needs analysis, which incorporates all the three levels that teacher education in most countries operates

within: the national (ministerial), the total cluster of teacher education institutions, and each teacher education institution. Needs should be met by Norwegian teacher education institutions but it cannot be left to the cooperating Norwegian institution(s) to determine these.

When institutional cooperation falls within the framework of technical cooperation or technical assistance as part of the broader bilateral support to teacher education in a given developing country, needs analysis and identification could be part of bilateral discussions whether these are carried out in cooperation with embassies, Norad or with the use of consultants. Institutions in the South could also be invited to submit individual applications (which were received in the Pilot Programme).

Alternatively, the southern country chooses the Norwegian institution/consortium of teacher education institutions that fulfill their criteria, for example through a tender process. A similar approach has been used in Norway's support to teacher education other places. Norway has provided financial assistance, while the country in question has selected the institution that could best meet their technical needs.

Norwegian teacher education colleges interested in education in developing countries would have to develop a strategy of how to build competencies within development cooperation and also to define their comparative advantage. By linking support from institutions in Norway to the South, aid would however be tied, which is problematic from a perspective of development cooperation.

## **Annex 1**

### **Persons interviewed**

#### **ZAMBIA**

##### **Norwegian Embassy, Lusaka, 25., 26.4.07**

First secretary Anne Glad Fredriksen

Programme officer Dorothy Hamuwele

**Irish consultants:** Education consultant Terry Allsop

Development education specialist Cathal Higgins

##### **Ministry of Education, CDC, Lusaka, 25.4.07**

Chief curriculum specialist Mutina O. Mweembe

Curriculum specialist Jones Nkole

##### **Ministry of Education, TED, Lusaka, 25.4.07**

Senior Education Officer Edward Tindi

##### **David Livingstone College of Education, Livingstone, 26., 27., 30.4.07**

Principal Sikwela J. Howard

Lecturer Georgina Halale Sitali

Lecturer Moonga Syamukonka

Lecturer Chongo Fewdays

Lecturer Havuluma Bornwell

Lecturer Lilly Kalapa

Senior lecturer Fidelis Mumba

Senior lecturer Mike R. Kaniini

Senior lecturer Kayawe C. Patrick

Lecturer Barbara Mumba

##### **Kazungula District Education Office, Livingstone, 27.4.07**

District Education Standards Officer Mainza Kaampa

District Resource Centre coordinator Michelo Kaliba, Senior teacher

#### **NEPAL**

##### **Kathmandu University, School of Education, Katmandu, 4.5.07**

Professor Tanka Nath Sharma, Head of Department,

Assistant professor/project coordinator Laxman Gnawali

Associate professor Roshan M. Bajracharya, Dep. Environment, Science and Energy

Course director Subodh Shavma, Ecology, Environment and Sustainable Development

Faculty member Shashidbar Belbase, School of Education.

Group of students

##### **Kathmandu University, Faculty of Science, Katmandu 6.5.07**

Assistant Professor Laxman Gnawali

Associate Professor Roshan M. Bajracharya

Associate Professor Subodh Shavma

**Ministry of Education and Sports, Foreign Aid Coordinaton, Kathmandu 7.5.07**

Under Secretary Lava Deo Awasthi  
Under Secretary Sunita Malakar  
Education Adviser Peter Raid,  
Assistant Professor Laxman Gnawali

**Ministry of Education and Sports, National Centre for Education Development,  
Kathamandu 7.5.07**

Mr. Navin Kumar Singh  
Mr. Madan Nath  
Assistant Professor Laxman Gnawali

**Save the Children, Norway/Katmandu 8.5.07**

Team Leader Education Bhola Prasad Dahad

**Norwegian Embassy, Katmandu, 9.5.07**

First Secretary Elin Gjedrem,

**UGANDA**

**Norwegian Embassy, Kampala, 2.5.07**

Programme officer Olive Bwanika

**Ministry of Education and Sports, Department of Special Needs and Career Guidance,  
Kampala, 2.5.07**

Commissioner Martin Omagor-Loican

**University of Kyambogo, Faculty of Special Needs and Rehabilitation, Kampala, 2 &  
3.5.07**

Faculty dean Lawrence Eron  
Lecturer/academic coordinator Stackus Okwaput  
Lecturer Eriah Paul

**Sancta Maria Primary Teachers College, Nkokonjeru, 4.5.07**

Tutor/coordinator Rita Nakitende  
Tutor Josephine Nakaggwa  
Tutor Bbosa Daniel

**PALESTINE**

**E-mail interview:** Professor/academic coordinator Sami Adwan

**NORWAY**

**Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation , Oslo 21.5.07**

Senior advisor Betzy Heen  
Senior advisor Tove Kvil  
Senior advisor Bente Nilson

**Norwegian Centre for International Cooperation in Higher Education, Bergen, 20.4.07**

Senior adviser Kurt Løvschal  
Adviser Benedicte Solheim  
Higher executive officer Ragnhild Berg

**Norwegian University of Life Sciences, Noragric, Aas, 18.4.07**

Professor Ruth Haug  
Professor/academic coordinator Bishal Sitanla

**Oslo University College, LINS, Oslo, 14.5.07**

Centre leader Roald Skøelv  
Associate professor Titus Tenga

**University of Oslo, Department of Special Needs Education, Oslo**

Associate professor/academic coordinator Siri Wormnæs  
Associate professor Bjørn Skaar

**Sogn and Fjordane University College, Sogndal, 19.4.07**

Assistant professor/academic coordinator Ane Bergersen  
Assistant professor Jon Farestveit  
Assistant Head of Studies Randi Jebsen  
Associate professor Jan Julsmoen  
International Coordinator Helga Kalhagen  
Associate professor Kristoffer Melheim  
Assistant professor Elisabeth Oltedal  
Dean Rasmus Stokke  
Rector Johs. Taule

**Telephone interviews:**

**Hedmark University College, Hamar, 22.5.07**

Associate professor/academic coordinator Gerd Wikan

**Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Programme of Teacher Education Trondheim, 21.5.07**

Associate professor/academic coordinator Peter van Marion

**University of Bergen, Department of Chemistry, Bergen, 22.5.07**

Professor/academic coordinator Øyvind Mikalsen

**Vestfold University College, Tønsberg, 22.5.07**

Assistant professor/academic coordinator Øyvind Wistrøm

**Volda University College, Volda, 21.5.07**

Associate professor/academic coordinator Odd Ragnar Hunnes

## **Annex 2**

# **Terms of Reference Review of the Teacher Education Programme South- North**

### **Background**

Norad and SIU signed an agreement (GLO 3573/GLO 05/070) on 1 May 2005 concerning a pilot programme for a Teacher Education Programme South-North (hereafter the Programme) for the years 2005-2007. The Programme is administrated by SIU.

The main goal of the Programme is through joint projects between institutions for teacher education in countries in the South and their partners in Norway, to contribute to strengthen the quality of the teacher education in the South as a means of improving basic education and securing the Education Millennium Goals and Education for All. The cooperation is based on the South partner's institutional and pedagogic needs and the Norwegian partner's competence and capacity to meet these needs.

The Programme consists of two phases: In 2005 a total of ten projects received start-up funds for development of applications. In the next phase (2006-2007) eight projects were granted funds for various activities such as seminars/workshops, publication and documentation, development of teaching materials and teacher training programme(s), teacher and student exchange and training and educational research and development. The total budget for the Programme is NOK 13 million.

According to paragraph 5.2 in the agreement between Norad and SIU, a review should be undertaken midway in the third year of the agreement. The review is planned and approved by Norad and SIU in cooperation.

The Programme should be reviewed by two external consultants that are appointed jointly by Norad and SIU. SIU will administrate the review that will be financed by funds from the Programme.

### **Purpose**

The main purpose of the review is (i) to document results in accordance with established performance indicators so far in the project period and (ii) to determine whether the program is advancing towards the achievement of its goal.

### **Scope of work**

The review should mainly concentrate on the activities in the projects in the years 2006 and 2007, since the start-ups funds in 2005 were directed toward coverage of travel costs for the institutions developing joint applications for the years 2006-2007.

### ***Efficiency***

When applying for funding from the Programme, the partners could apply for support to the following activities:

- Seminar/workshops
- Publication and documentation (incl. scientific journals, chapters in books etc, contribution to conferences etc, other scientific results, report)
- Curriculum development
- Development of teaching materials

- Development of new teacher training programme(s)
- Educational research and development
- Fieldwork activity
- Teacher exchange
- Post-graduate training of teacher trainers from the South
- In-service training of teacher trainers from the South
- Other collaborative activities
- Meetings for academic team
- Student exchange

Not all the supported projects involve all the above activities. The review should therefore look individually into the central feature of each project supported by the Programme with a possible focus on efficiency and possible deviations between the activities planned for and the activities that have taken place so far in the projects. Challenges faced by both the institution(s) in the South and Norway in putting the planned activities into practice, should be given a special emphasis.

### ***Effectiveness***

An assessment should be made of the effectiveness of the programme in terms of quality and relevance to the stated goal of the program. The assessment of these aspects should be based on interviews with the involved staff members at the institutions in the South and in Norway, where especially the assessment by the involved partners in the South should be taken into account.

### ***Relevance***

The review should look into if, and in case to what degree, the projects are of relevance and integrated and/or related to institutional, local and national plans for teacher education in the partner countries in the South. The degree of institutional integration should be assessed especially in relation to the needs for capacity building in the South.

### ***Sustainability***

Even through the main programme period is for two years only, the review should look into the potential for institutional and economical sustainability in the programme. This should be done by focusing on the institutions' willingness to reserve staff and economical resources for the projects.

### ***Type of control/audit requested***

The review should look briefly into the budgets for the projects and give overall comments on the degree of adequate correlation between planned expenses and activities. Further auditing of the projects and programme is the responsibility of SIU.

### ***Type of advice requested***

The review should give advice as to:

#### **a) Models of future cooperation**

The review team should give advice as to how a future programme can be designed to be institutionalised into national setting and which programmes have potential to fit into existing education sector programmes. Models strengthening institutional capacity and education development shall be presented. By looking into the project plans in the application documents and the results gained so far at project level, the review should suggest models for cooperation based on the experiences made by the

institutions both in the South and Norway.

**b) Strengthening of the educational needs of the South**

An important element of the Programme is that the content and setting for the projects should be defined and implemented on the foundation of the institutional and educational needs of the South partners, and the competence and capacity of the Norwegian institutions to meet these needs. The review should make suggestion on how these aspects can be taken care of in the planning, implementation and completion of the projects in the programme.

**c) Use of research based knowledge**

The review should give advice on how projects in a teacher education programme can base their activities on educational research and development work, among other things on studies of framework conditions for learning. Particular emphasis should be put on how the projects may increase their use of research based knowledge in the planning and pedagogic work at the partner institution in the South.

**d) Increased internationalisation at Norwegian teacher education institutions**

Increased internationalisation at Norwegian teacher education institutions is not among the main goals of the Programme. Still, the review should give advice on how to increase exchange of Norwegian staff members and students to their Southern partner institution(s).

## **Implementation**

The review involves the following sources of information and methodology:

- a) Desk study: see appendix 1 for documents to be revised
- b) Field visit to three of the involved institutions in the South. The consultants should visit the project in Zambia together. In addition, one of the consultants should visit the project in Nepal and the other the project in Uganda. The consultants should agree upon a questionnaire or similar to be used during the interviews at the institutions in the South
- c) Personal or telephone interviews with involved staff member at the Norwegian institutions. The consultants should agree upon questionnaire or similar to be used during the interviews at the institutions in the North
- d) Personal or telephone interviews with involved personal in Norad and at SIU

SIU will provide the consultants with all relevant documents for the desk study. SIU has in cooperation with Norad and the institutions in the South and Norway an overall responsibility to make sure that the consultants have access to the necessary information needed for the review.

The time frame for the review is set to approximately 29 days divided between:

Preparation- 6 days for each consultant

Field work- 11 days in the South, 4 days in Norway

Travelling: 2 days for one of the consultants, 5 days for the other consultant

Finalisation- 8 days for each

A draft report shall be completed and sent out for comments by stakeholders by Friday May 25, 2007. A final report should be presented to the stakeholders at the latest 10 days

after the consultants have received comments to the draft report.

The consultant team will consist of two consultants with extensive knowledge to teacher education in general and teacher education and development cooperation in the South in particular. The consultants will divide the work between them in the most suitable way within the given timeframe and budget.

### **Reporting**

A separate budget for the assignment is to be elaborated by the external consultants in accordance with agreed conditions. The report in English should have an introduction summarising what is being studied, major findings, conclusions and recommendations. The report should not exceed 30 pages.

The final report shall appear both in electronic format and in paper version.

### **Reference documents consulted**

Carron, G. & Storeng, M. (2003) Collaboration: Teacher education Norway and the South

NORAD (2006). Inter-ministerial cooperation. An effective Model for Capacity Development

#### *From Zambia*

CDC (2006). Localised Curriculum Syllabi for Basic Education Course

Commonwealth of Learning (2005). The Future of Teacher Education in Zambia - A Strategy 2005 - 2015

MOE (2000). The Basic School Curriculum Framework

MOE (2001). Zambia Teacher Education Course Guide on ZATEC

MOE (2003). Zambia Basic Education Syllabi

MOE (2005). Guidelines for the development of the localised curriculum in Zambia

#### *From Uganda*

MOES U (2006). Basic Education Policy for Educationally Disadvantaged Children

#### *From Nepal*

MoES (2005) *Human Resource Development for Ministry of Education and Sports. Training Policy*. Kathmandu, Ministry of Education and Sports

MoES (2006) *Teacher Training Programme*. Kathmandu, Government of Nepal, Ministry of Education and Sports, National Centre for Educational Development  
<http://www.nced.gov.np/training.asp>

MoES (2006) *Curriculum, Primary Teacher Training*. Kathmandu, Government of Nepal, Ministry of Education and Sports, National Centre for Educational Development  
<http://www.nced.gov.np/resources.asp>

MoES (2007) *Concept Paper on School Sector Reform Programme. School Sector Approach*. Kathmandu, Ministry of Education and Sports, February 2007

NCED (2006). *Effectiveness of Primary Teacher Training Programme-2063 (Executive Summary)*. [www.nced.gov.np/research.asp](http://www.nced.gov.np/research.asp)

EFA,Nepal,Plan. [http://portal.unesco.org/education/en/ev.php-URL\\_ID=30125&URL\\_DO=DO\\_TOPIC&URL\\_SECTION=201.html](http://portal.unesco.org/education/en/ev.php-URL_ID=30125&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html)

#### *From Palestine*

Palestine Economic Policy Research Institute (2006). Policies to Improve the Quality of the Teaching Profession in Palestinian Territory

#### *From South Africa*

The South African Government Information (1997) Curriculum 2005

*Documents for the review from SIU:*

- Agreement between NORAD and SIU signed on the 1<sup>st</sup> May 2005 concerning the administration of the Programme
- Document from NORAD (“Beslutningsdokument”) concerning the establishment of the programme
- Tripartite contract for each project, signed by the institution in the South, the institution in Norway and SIU
- Annual report 2006 (including accounts) from the projects that are to be submitted to SIU in March 2007
- Financial reports from the institutions on the use of start-up funds in 2005
- Call for proposals, ordinary funds 2006-2007
- Applications from the institutions for the programme period 2006-2007
- External evaluations of the applications for the programme period 2006-2007
- SIUs assessment of the applications for the programme period 2006-2007
- Budget for the projects (revised after the applications were approved)
- Programme and minutes of meeting from a seminar on development of the Programme, October 2004

**Other references**

- Anderson-Levitt, K. (ed.) *Local Meanings, Global Schooling*. New York, Palgrave Macmillan
- Bhandari, A. B. (2006). “Teacher development initiatives in Nepal by Teachers'Professional Development: Perspectives and Models”. In: *Teacher Education, Vol. 4, No.1, July, 2006*. Kathmandu
- Bista, M.B. (2006) *Status of Female Teachers in Nepal*. Kathmandu, UNESCO
- Hoppers, W. & Komba, D. (1995) *Productive work in education and training. A state-of-the-art in Eastern Africa. CESOPpaperback no. 21*. The Hague, Centre for the Study of Education in Developing Countries (CESO)
- Shrestha, K.N. (undated) “Training of Primary School Teachers. Analysis and Proposal.”
- Steiner-Khamsi, G. (2004) “ Globalization in Education: Real or Imagined? In: Steiner-Khamsi (ed.) *The Global Politics of Educational Borrowing and Lending*. New York, Teachers College, Columbia University
- Steiner-Khamsi, G. & Stolpe, I. (2006) *Educational Import. Local Encounters with Global Forces in Mongolia*. New York, Palgrave Macmillan
- Storeng, M. (2001) *Giving Learners a Chance. Learner-Centredness in the Reform of Namibian Teaching*. Doctoral Thesis. Stockholm University: Institute of International Education
- Torres, R.M. (undated) *The learning of those who teach. Towards a new paradigm of teacher education*. Unesco/Unicef
- Volan, S. (2003) *Educational Reform and Change in the South: A Matter of Restructuring as well as Reculturing from Zambia*. Doctoral Thesis. University of Southampton