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Report  
on the WGESA Steering Committee Meeting  
held in Windhoek in June 2007

The present is an account of the Windhoek Meeting held from 13 to 15 June 2007 to assess the progress made by WGESA during the first semester of 2007. This meeting focused on the implementation of the recommendations made during the Paris September 2006 Steering Committee session. The meeting in Windhoek was attended by representatives of African Ministries of Education from Tanzania, Niger, Gabon, Lesotho and the host country, Namibia. Representatives of ERNESA, ERNWACA, NORAD, UNESCO/Namibia USAID and WGES also attended. The aim was to assess the progress made, prioritize and fine-tune the activities programmed for the second semester.

One of the key activities assessed during the meeting concerned the Peer Review Exercise, which is currently the WGESA flagship program. It has been conducted in three pilot countries: Mauritius, Gabon and Nigeria.

Other activities examined at Windhoek were related to the Formative Research undertaking, the SWAp/FTI studies, management issues, and the Group’s participation in international platforms.

Considering that all WGESA areas of activities had been subject to specific recommendations during the Paris Steering Committee Meeting of September 2006, the present report is structured as follows. For each recommendation made in September 2006 the report: (a) presents the initial recommendations made in Paris, (b) explains the progress made during the first semester of 2007, (c) summarizes the debates on the points discussed in Windhoek and (d) presents the consensus reached there.
1. The Peer Review Exercise

a. Recommendations on Peer Reviews from the Previous S.C. Meeting

The September 2006 Steering Committee made four recommendations regarding the Peer Review Exercise:

- It expressed a general appreciation of the Peer Review Exercises conducted in the three countries;
- With Mauritius, it insisted that the Coordination Unit contribute to the follow-up and to the implementation of the recommendations, depending on the request from the Government;
- With Gabon, the Committee acknowledged the WGESA contribution to the Biennial 2006 and recommended that the Peer Review process in this country be continued until its completion;
- With Nigeria, the Committee took note of the political context and recommended that the Peer Review exercise be aligned to the political agenda of the country. It also counseled that the continuation of the exercise be contingent upon fund availability. At a first stage, the Self-evaluation process should be completed and the remaining steps be executed after the country’s national elections.

b. Coordination Report on the Progress made on Peer Reviews during the first semester 2007

Regarding Mauritius, contacts with the country’s education authorities were maintained. A follow-up committee was created and several initiatives were made to correct some of the problems observed during the Peer Review exercise. The French version of the final report was edited, and disseminated through the website and other means. Copies were made available to French-speaking African countries.

Regarding Gabon, the review report was slowed down because of funding matters, lack of availability of the expert team leader, and changes in the country’s educational leadership. During the Spring 2007 SC meeting, the abovementioned problems were resolved: funds were obtained from the World Bank, Professor Yenikoye agreed to take the lead of the expert team, contacts were initiated with the new Gabonese team at the ministry. The work was resumed and a first draft of the report was made ready. As soon as the Gabonese are ready, the validation step will be implemented.

Regarding Nigeria, the national self evaluation was completed during Spring 2007 and a report ready. Once the elections are over, the coordination intends to renew the relationships with the new team so that the Peer Review can go ahead.

c. Summary of debates on peer reviews
The Steering Committee discussed the outcomes of the seminar which was centred on Peer Review and reached the following consensus:

- The committee graded the work as "Excellent" and "really useful". (i) The Mauritius Peer Review exercise was accomplished smoothly thanks to a real commitment from the country policy makers and attributable to an effective administration that made things easy once the decisions were made. (ii) With Gabon, the exercise was a demonstration of how the complexity of political settings could influence both the quality of implementation and the outcomes of reviews. (iii) Nigeria was not discussed in Windhoek. Rather, the Namibian ETSIP program was presented, discussed and understood as a work in progress that could be improved.

- The Steering Committee observed that the Windhoek meeting could serve as a prelude to the evaluation seminar to be conducted in 2008. The committee also made the point that the way the Peer Review exercise was implemented appropriately illustrated how the ADEA Working Groups could join forces and strengthen their collaboration.

- The Steering Committee also implied that, regarding the PRE, several things could be done at little to no expense, including: (i) Circulating the proceedings of the meetings to a larger audience; (ii) Documenting the WGESA Peer Review process and lessons learned; (iii) Starting the preparation for the evaluation of the program; and (iv) Preparing for a scientific (scholarly/technical) publication on the topic.

**d. Recommendations on Peer Reviews made in Windhoek 2007**

The Session of the WGESA Steering Committee Meeting held in Windhoek recommends to:

1. Finalize the work conducted in the three countries (Mauritius, Gabon, Nigeria) as advised by the ADEA Bureau of Ministers;
2. Draft a document that draws lessons from the experiences in the same three countries;
3. Pursue opportunities for the ‘scientific’ or scholarly publication of the Peer Review exercise reports;
4. Continue the work on the study regarding the Peer Review Exercise to be presented to the ADEA 2008 Biennale;
5. Prepare the follow-up phase (step 5) of the Peer Review for Mauritius;
6. Complete the Gabon reports;
(7) Finalize the work conducted in Nigeria (see September 2006 Statement in point 1);

(8) Prepare for the CIES International meeting in early 2008;

(9) Start the process for initiating the second round of the Peer Reviews in another two countries. The ADEA 2008 Biennale would be an opportune occasion to solicit participation from other countries for the timeframe of 2008-2009; in such a perspective, Mali could be one of the countries to be considered as a first priority because the Ministry has already manifested interest in working with ADEA and WGESA in such a program. and

(10) Collaborate in “critically checking” the ETSIP program as requested by the country and provided that this demand is formally confirmed.

2. The Formative Research undertaking

a. Recommendations on Formative Research from previous S.C. Meeting

The September 2006 Steering Committee made three recommendations regarding Formative Research:

- It advised that the Oslo Planning Workshop proceed and fund adjustments be made to facilitate it.
- It also advised that the concept paper on formative research be completed and posted on the WGESA website.
- Third, it recommended that the launching of the Formative Research pilot project be delayed, pending on the result of the Oslo Meeting.

b. Coordination Report on the Progress made on Formative Research during the first semester 2007

The meeting in Oslo was postponed because of fund constraints. It could be rescheduled for the second half of the year depending on availability of funds.

The launching of formative research projects in two pilot countries has also been delayed. Informal contacts with Tanzania and Niger have been made. Formal contacts could be scheduled for the second semester if this is advisable.

The concept paper on formative research has now been completed and posted on the WGESA website.

c. Summary of debates on Formative Research

The Committee suggested postponing the Formative Research activity and focusing on Peer Reviews. It could take place after the institutionalization issue is resolved, with either IIEP or another institution as a lead agency. However, the Coordinator
shall maintain the momentum by officially writing to the two potential countries for
the pilot phase (Niger and Tanzania). Such a mail would summarize the substance
of the debates on formative research, invite the countries to manifest interest on
the exercise and ask them to actually contribute to fund raising for it.

In the same vein, a letter could also be written to Namibia about Formative
Research to let the country know about eventual resource availability within
WGESA, provide information and contribute to evaluating the ETSIP undertaking.

Lastly, the committee acknowledged that the concept paper on Formative Research
has now been completed and posted on the WGESA website.

d. Recommendations on Formative Research made in Windhoek 2007

The committee recommends that formal letters be sent to Niger, Tanzania and
Namibia to remind these countries of WGESA’s position regarding the exercise. The
letter would also remind them that they will have to play a key role in the fund
raising process regarding Formative Research.

A few minutes before the start of the meeting (Ulla, Catherine, Kathryn, Pulane)

3. The SWAP/FTI Studies
a. Recommendations from previous S.C. Meetings

The September 2006 SC Meeting encouraged the SWAP/FTI undertaking and advised that the Case Studies be conducted in two countries instead of one: 1 French-speaking country and 1 English-speaking country; It insisted that the exercise be demand-driven, conducted on an incremental basis, and use a peer approach.

b. Coordination Report on the Progress Made on the SWAP/FTI Undertaking During the First Semester 2007:

The SWAP/FTI undertaking is scheduled for the second semester. Preliminary and informal contacts are made with Burkina Faso and Tanzania. The coordination unit could go ahead with these 2 countries or undertake the exercise in other countries.

c. Summary of debates regarding the SWAP/FTI undertaking

The committee spent little time on the issue since the program was scheduled for the fall semester. It reiterated the September 2006 recommendations.

d. Recommendations made in Windhoek 2007 regarding the SWAP/FTI undertaking

The Steering Committee reiterated its recommendations made earlier in September 2006 (i.e. contacting the concerned countries so that the study could be launched during the fall 2007 semester).

4. The workshop in Africa and the Steering Committee Meeting held on the same occasion

a. Recommendations on the workshop and the SC Meeting in Africa from previous S.C. Meeting

In September 2006, the committee recommended that the capacity building workshop/seminar in Africa proceed as usual. It proposed the topic of the seminar to be on Peer Review. It recommended that the workshop serve as a venue to a Steering Committee Meeting session. The coordinator was to contact a Southern African country, preferably Namibia, to discuss and arrange for the venue of the gathering.

b. Coordination Report on the Progress made during the first semester 2007 regarding the conduct of a workshop and a Steering Committee Meeting in Africa

The Windhoek gathering has been organized with a significant contribution from the Namibian government and the UNESCO cluster. As advised, the focus was on Peer
Review in education in Africa. It focused on identifying ways and means for initiating accurate, country-driven and African-based reviews of education sector reforms.

c. Summary of debates regarding The Workshop and Steering Committee Meeting held in Africa

The discussions confirmed the appropriateness of these workshops (and Steering Committee) Meetings in Africa. It assessed the Workshop on Peer Review as “really useful” and the participatory method it uses, as suitable (see result of the survey). The workshop in particular provides a forum for discussion amongst and with the African educational leaders. It also provides an opportunity to explore in depth contemporary issues that matter to the working group and to the countries (How to best implement the EFA Plans in 2004, How to reconcile research and policy making through Formative Research in 2005 and 2006, and Peer Review as a means for policy dialogue in 2007).

The meeting noted however that the general lack of funds either within WGESA or ADEA could constitute a major hurdle not only for holding similar gatherings, but financing the second Steering Committee meeting usually held during the Fall season in Paris. It was made known that ADEA had received very few funds for 2007 and that the Agencies are awaiting approval of the new strategic plan for 2008-2012 before considering further financing of the activities of both the Association and the working groups.

d. Recommendations made in Windhoek 2007 regarding the workshop and Steering Committee Meeting held in Africa

Despite the lack of funds within ADEA and WGESA, the Steering Committee advised to continue holding these workshops plus Steering Committee Meetings in Africa. The members of the committee together with the coordination unit must find the means to hold both the Spring workshops and the Fall meetings.

The Committee acknowledged the suitability of involving the host country’s MOEs and local UNESCO offices in the WGESA seminars. It extends its appreciation and thanks to the Namibian NATCOM, the various structures of the Namibian Ministry involved in the seminar and to the UNESCO Windhoek Cluster Office. A mail shall be addressed to the authorities to that effect.

5. Institutionalization

Institutionalization covers several important and present-day issues including (i) streamlining the Steering Committee Membership to make it more functional, (ii) Africanization or the relocation of the coordination unit in an African based institution, (iii) the merger issue for the sake of efficiency, (iv) networking through the WGESA website and other means, etc. These issues were discussed at length in Windhoek.
a. Recommendations on institutionalization of WGESA from Previous S.C.M

The September 2006 Meeting advised that the composition of the Steering committee be streamlined in a way to have 15 voting members (5 from the countries; 5 from the agencies and 5 from the sub regional networks). Such a committee would be backed up with 3 non-voting members (the coordination, ADEA and IIEP), the representatives of the 3 working groups with whom the groups cooperate the most, and a 15 member Advisory Group comprising experts with whom WGESA work closely.

As for the relocation to Africa, the September 2006 meeting advised to Review the criteria for Africanization and to continue making worthwhile contacts through informal means before any formal action is taken.

Regarding the merger issue, there was no specific recommendation as the topic was new in September 2006.

Concerning networking, the website was still considered as critical. Therefore the September meeting advised to make it functional and to reactivate the technical committee.

b. Coordination Report on the Progress Made on Institutionalization during the 2007 First Semester
The Steering Committee membership issue is now well advanced. The committee is functional although a few members have yet to formally confirm their participation in the committee (Finland, Lesotho, SADEC, and UMOA). These members will be contacted as soon as the conditions permit, probably before the end of the second semester. The names of the three group coordinators with whom the WGESA has close contacts will be added as statutory non-voting members.

As for Africanization and the merger issue, the following has occurred during the first semester. WGESA was still anchored to IIEP on a temporary basis. In the meantime, the Group has continued to explore more venues for hosting its coordination on African soil.

Anyway, the relocation of WGESA in Africa is now coming at a very specific time characterized by a major shift of priorities within the group and with its institutional surrounding at IIEP, ADEA and the African Union Commission. These issues have been presented in detail in the Spring 2007 progress report (see annexes).

Considering the context of change, the WGESA drafted a position paper to show where it stands par rapport the new repositioning of IIEP, ADEA and the other working groups with whom it has a close cooperation. This paper is attached in the annex.

As for the networking, the WGESA actively sought to develop more synergy with African programs and institutions of similar interests, especially with CONFEMEN, ERNESIA, ERNWACA, and SACHES. With the Pole de Dakar, problems of timing and others have resulted in fewer contacts in 2006.

The working Group also continued fine-tuning its website which is now functional and is managed with the support of both the ADEA secretariat and the IIEP publishing unit. A committee was created to assist not only the Website inception but provide supervision of the overall process so that the documents posted on the Web are relevant and of good quality. This committee needs however to be reactivated.

WGESA’s site is currently linked to the ADEA website. This help is much acknowledged and appreciated. The only reservation would be that although this serves the purpose of linking our small group to the larger ADEA constituencies, it tends to dilute the effectiveness of WGESA’s internet site. For the long term, it might be useful to think about WGESA creating its own, independent website. In such a case, the question of technical servicing, financing and managing the site must be addressed.

c. **Summary of debates on Institutional Development**

The debates concentrated on the Merger issue. The WGESA Steering Committee raises concerns about the issue of a merger as this would mean a “loss of programmatic and technical integrity”. The Committee disputed the idea that
merging would mean more efficiency. It noted that, a part of finances and statistics, WGESA is also working closely with other groups such as the Higher Education Group (Gabon Peer review) and the Non-Formal Education group (Nigeria Peer review).

The Steering Committee rather advocated the concept of "integration through technical and programmatic cooperation". This would avoid a loss of focus on sector analysis and poor exposure of the group's work and activities. It would also allow continuity of the work started with the reform initiated in 2004 within the group.

One of the ways of implementing this "integrated approach" would be to create a common, overarching, steering committee which would oversee the work done by the 3 groups. A joint steering committee allows to save money, to better rationalize resources, and to let each working group maintain its programmatic focus and its networks of supporters and contributors across the continent.

The Committee suggested that a concept paper be prepared by the 3 coordinators for endorsement by the WGESA Steering Committee and submission to ADEA for its appreciation and guidance. The paper would outline the arguments made in favor of integration through technical programmatic cooperation rather than merging. The paper would also outline how this could be done.

d. Recommendations on Institutionalization made in Windhoek 2007

- The Windhoek Session of the WGESA Steering Committee examined the "Merger" issue between WGESA, WGEF and WGES. It advised that the group opt for "integration through programmatic cooperation" rather than Merging through structural integration. The 3 coordinators are requested to prepare a concept paper on the matter.
- The moving of the coordination unit to Africa is encouraged. Although ADB seems to be a good prospect, it was recommended that the coordinator find more information about all four potential host institutions and report to the committee in September. These potential host institutions are: ADB, ERNWACA, UNESCO Harare Office and Kinshasa IPED. In the meantime, WGESA Coordination remains within IIEP.
- The WGESA has already made its contribution to the development of the ADEA strategic plan and to the "alignment" of the groups to the overall ADEA strategic framework. The Committee recommends that this contribution be reviewed by the members and sent back to ADEA through the coordinator.
- The issue of the coordinator's contract was discussed in length. The committee raised the concern that the current contract ends in November
2007. It advised that this contract be revised in a way as to stabilize the position of the coordinator at this juncture period characterized by major transitions. The committee made a plea to ADEA and to the lead agency for continuity and stabilization of the coordinator’s position. It will address a letter to this effect to the two institutions.

- The Steering Committee acknowledged that the streamlining process of its membership is on the right track. It advised to contact the remaining institutions so that the committee could be completed.

6. Other issues covered during the Windhoek Meeting

The Windhoek gathering was an occasion to address a special thank to Professor Ulla Khan Who has accompanied in the WGESA work for over the last decade. The Steering Committee Members unanimously recognized the tremendous support provided by Ulla and addressed to her a heartfelt appreciation for her efforts, commitments, and enduring support.

On behalf of WGESA, the coordinator hands over a souvenir to Professor Ulla Khan. from left: Koffi (IIEP), Ulla (SWEDEN), Lalya (WGESA).
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Windhoek, June 2007
EVALUATION OF THE SEMINAR

Each year the WGESA organizes, in Africa, a training seminar intended to support African Middle Level managers and Policy makers. The aim is to contribute to strengthening African field expertise and capacities in educational reforms using a sectoral approach. This initiative is also a means for WGESA to play an active role in support of African scholars and their networks as well as to utilize these networks in WGESA undertakings.

This year the workshop was on Peer Review in Education in Africa. It was structured around presentations from colleagues involved in the conduct of the exercise in three selected countries and exchanges with the country representatives invited to the seminar on the ways and means for initiating accurate, country driven and African-based reviews of education sector reforms. The seminar also touched upon other peer review approaches, particularly those implemented within the framework of NEPAD.

The emphasis of the workshop was on:
- The added value of Peer Review as a tool for more relevant and country-owned exercises;
- Preliminary lessons from the WGESA led implementation in the 3 pilot countries; and
- Developing suggestions and recommendations on what steps for the future.

At the end of the seminar an evaluation sheet, comprising of 15 questions, was distributed to assess the extent to which:

1. the objectives of the workshop were appropriate and met;
2. the organization and sequencing of the sessions were conducive to learning;
3. the trainers performed at the level of the trainees expectations; and
4. the logistics were appropriate.

Four main questions reflecting the four areas listed above were asked. The last one was divided in ten sub-questions. Out of the 20 participants (including the coordinator who did not fill a form), 13 answered to the questionnaire. The following are the main outcomes of the survey:

- The participants to the 2007 WGESA Seminar and SC Meeting were very appreciative of the Namibian hospitality. They qualified it as “Excellent”.
- Generally, the workshop evaluation sheet illustrates that the trainees were satisfied with the purpose of the training, that the objectives were mostly met and the organization was appropriate and logistics quite convenient.
- A few participants believed that the material could have been used more efficiently (Background PowerPoint papers to be blank so that the toner ink could be used more efficiently; Put 4 sliders on one page instead of one slider, etc.).
The survey indicates that the participants followed and understood the sessions. It also indicates that the method was highly participatory and practical. The combination of PowerPoint, lectures and group work facilitated the understanding of the issues at stake when a country conducts a peer review exercise.

There was no complaint about the quality of the materials used, the length of sessions, the venue of the workshop and the durations of the workshops as they were all graded “Excellent”.

The workshop logistics were also good. However there were some complaints on the flight schedules and the heating system in the rooms (it was winter time in Namibia).

The ability of the facilitators to understand the subjects and to tailor their presentation to the ‘trainees’ level of understanding was graded as “Very good”.

Please find below the tabulation of the responses

A. Were the objectives of the workshop appropriate and met,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fully</th>
<th>Mostly</th>
<th>Partly</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Were organization and sequencing of the sessions conducive to learning,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fully</th>
<th>Mostly</th>
<th>Partly</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Were the logistics appropriate, and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fully</th>
<th>Mostly</th>
<th>Partly</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Did the trainers and the training performed at the level of the trainees’ expectations? (This question should be answered through the 10 items below):

1. Were the workshop objectives met?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fully</th>
<th>Mostly</th>
<th>Partly</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. To what extent were you able to participate?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fully</th>
<th>Mostly</th>
<th>Partly</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. To what extent were you able to understand and follow the sessions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fully</th>
<th>Mostly</th>
<th>Partly</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. How do you assess the methodology/approach used in the workshop?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. How do you assess the methods used in the workshop?

- **PowerPoint presentation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Lecture**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Group Work**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. How do you rate the quality of the materials (handouts, flipcharts)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. How do you rate the length of the sessions and duration of the workshop?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>About right</th>
<th>Too long</th>
<th>Long</th>
<th>Short</th>
<th>Too short</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. How do you rate the workshop logistics? (venue, facilities, seating arrangements, etc)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. How do you rate the ability of the Facilitator/s to make presentations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. How do you rate the facilitator’s understanding of the subject(s) presented? (overall)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 2:
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Brazzaville, March 2007
WGESA Preliminary Position on the Cooperation Amongst ADEA Working Groups

1. Introduction

The discussion on restructuring the ADEA working groups for a more effective implementation of activities and utilization of funds has been ongoing at the WGESA host agency. These discussions, however, have not yet been engaged in the WGESA Steering Committee meetings. The WGESA Coordinator will submit proposals for discussions to the WGESA Steering Committee in June 2007 (Namibia) and Advisory Board members for recommendations. In the meantime, and considering the urgency to present the WGESA position on this matter during the ADEA Steering Committee Meeting to be held in Brazzaville, a quick consultation amongst some of the focal persons of the Steering Committee has been undertaken. There is, however, a need for more discussions among the WGESA Steering Committee members and Advisory Board before any firm recommendations can be submitted from the Working Group.

2. Background and Possible Issues for Discussion

The discussions are rooted in the ADEA Evaluation Report 2005, which suggested that a more formalized organizational structure would best suit ADEA future development. This finding would also affect the working groups and not least WGESA, who has an overarching mandate of sector approach, which is somewhat different from many other groups. It is vital, therefore, that the further institutional development of WGESA be embedded in a wider and more explicit institutional agenda for ADEA as a whole. Sustainability of the impact of WGESA initiatives remains a major challenge. These initiatives are meant to strengthen the African education ministries’ ability to handle their own development processes. In this sense, long term planning and predictable funding are essential issues for WGESA. As the funding gap has increasingly become a problem, there is a need to look around for support and cooperation both technically and financially.

Agencies, in particular the lead agency for WGESA and a few others have made two proposals that are likely to affect the future of WGESA. The options are to have some of the ADEA working groups to work closer together or to have them merged into a stronger entity that could be more efficient and would have closer ties to Africa.

The proposals have also analyzed the notion of “graduating from ADEA” together with matters related to “increased Cooperation”, “Merging” and “Africanization”. In these conditions it is essential that WGESA WGESA elucidate its views on the issues at stake.

First, it is important to acknowledge that a spirit of cooperation already exists.
3. A spirit of cooperation amongst the working groups

During the last five years, and thanks to an initiative undertaken by the ADEA Secretariat, the WGESA Steering Committee and its Coordination Unit, the Group has been effectively involved in various cooperative endeavors with other ADEA working groups at two levels:

- at the supervisory and decision making level; and
- at the programming and operational levels.

At the supervisory and decision making level, the Finances, Non-Formal Education, Statistics and Higher Education working groups are statutory members of the WGESA Steering Committee. In this capacity, these working groups are regularly invited to attend the WGESA/SC Sessions. In addition, WGESA participated in other group’s Steering Committee Meetings in particular, the meetings held by Higher Education in Dar Es Salaam and that of Statistics in Johannesburg. WGESA would have participated in more significant ways in other groups’ activities if it were not for financial constraints and, in a few instances, administrative setbacks.

In a situation where the WGESA would have significantly participated in, and contributed to, each other’s activities, the cooperation between working groups would have been much stronger than it is now. For example, the Finances Group had planned to participate in the WGESA Steering Committee’s activities held in both Dar Es Salaam and Paris. Unfortunately, this did not materialize due to lack of funding. In addition, the WGESA plan to participate in the Non-Formal Education Steering Committee Meeting which was held in London in 2005 could not be realized due to a visa issue.

At the operational level, the cooperation was evident at two levels: programming and implementation. To illustrate this point, the advice from other groups such as the Non-Formal group was critical in designing the Peer Review exercise in Nigeria. Also, COMED and the Higher Education group were, together with other regional organizations such as ERNWACA, consulted during the preparatory phase for the Peer Review exercise in Mauritius.

Furthermore, these groups provided expertise for all the key activities of WGESA. Basically, the Peer Review in the three pilot countries benefited considerably from the inputs of other groups. For example, the lead experts of the three peer reviews were proposed by groups other than WGESA while, the experts for specific fields like finance were identified through consultation with the other groups. Moreover, experts designated through consultation with other groups drafted the Formative Research concept paper. In the end, the WGESA benefited from expertise provided by three other groups to carry out the programmed activities.

In the same spirit of cooperation and coordination, WGESA contributed not only to the WG on Statistics planning workshop in Johannesburg to decide on the fate of the WGES future activities, but also participated in the evaluation of the NESIS program that is currently underway.
4. Moving to a higher level of cooperation between the groups

The newly revised WGESA strategy is based on the following principles: from henceforth, WGESA undertaking will be predominately field oriented and will focus on resolving specific agreed-upon problems that are encountered during policy making and implementation at country levels. Such an endeavor will be based on the African countries’ expressed needs and grounded in approaches that see education challenges from an African perspective. The following questions, for example, could be raised to help guide how the WGESA would operate in future: Where do the African education problems lie? What should be done to meet the African education related challenges? What methodologies should the WGESA employ to meet the identified challenges? All these issues as well as others should, in the new WGESA strategy, be understood from the receiving end and not only from the donor’s ends. In other words, WGESA new approach is aimed at putting the decision making pyramid upside down.

Even though this approach may not necessarily lead to a perfect product, it will have more potential for consideration by the clients i.e., the African countries. For example, the Peer Review exercise implemented with WGESA was run and owned by the African Ministries of Education with a significant contribution from the nationals who were involved in the design of the study, the planning of the work and all the different stages of implementation. Furthermore, the nationals conducted their own self-evaluation with less interference from WGESA and they drafted part of the final report. The guiding principle as far as the working group was concerned, was that a less donor dominated process would lead to high possibilities for implementing the recommendations with the nationals taking the lead/playing a significant role.

Another guiding principle of the WGESA new approach was to use, as much as possible the African expertise. All the Peer Review teams have at least two thirds of their memberships drawn from African expertise. In the three Peer Review cases the team leader was either a former minister of education or Rector of a university.

Regarding policy orientation and considering the nature of policy analysis and the level of funding, the new approach strives to make an impact on the policy formulation instruments that were to be employed by the lead practitioners. It is hoped that by using the trickle down effect, the policy makers would influence the way implementation proceeds at the lower levels of governments.

The next section puts into perspective, to a large extent, the possibilities of collaboration, networking and relocating to Africa for the various ADEA working groups.

5. Increasing Cooperation, Merging, Africanizing, Graduating
Before these issues are discussed in length within WGESA Steering Committee and the Advisory Expert Board, and in the present situation three interesting options might considered: continuing with the status quo, joining CODESRIA and the 2 other groups, or moving to Africa with ADEA.

1. With the **status quo** option, IIEP would continue to host WGESA, on a temporary basis, during the search for a convenient niche in Africa. This would allow the group to continue the rebuilding and renewal process started in 2003. At the same time, the Peer Reviews, the SWAPS studies, the distance learning program to initiate with IIEP, the Formative Research undertaking and other WGESA activities already in the pipeline could be completed under the current conditions. WGESA will benefit from its proximity with the IIEP Sector Analysis/ diagnosis unit and vice versa. At the same time the spirit of cooperation with the other groups will be maintained.

2. With the second option, the Working Group on Finance has proposed to **merge with Statistics and Sector Analysis, graduate from ADEA and fully Join CODESRIA**. This merger has the potential for synergizing with the three groups, reducing the number of working groups at ADEA, and building a stronger and comprehensive institution at the service of African countries.

   However, it also entails WGESA joining the team under the conditions set by the Finance Groups. Considerations regarding the WGESA specificity and new orientations it has embarked on in 2003-2004 may need to be taken into account.

   This also means graduating from ADEA, which WGESA is not prepared for, just a few years after engaging into a renewal process that has led to a complete rethinking of its goals, main objectives, strategies, and flagship activities.

   Third, WGEF is experiencing funding difficulties as well as WGESA. In this situation, one wonders if the merging would be sustainable once both groups have left the ADEA umbrella.

3. Option III, could be envisaged in the current context where ADEA is negotiating its relocation to Africa (Ethiopia? Tunisia?). Taking into account that the finances of WGESA as well as its programming are done through the ADEA Secretariat, the group could **approach both ADEA and the potential host institutions and ask to be included in the deal**. This would ensure a smooth continuity for the renewal process of WGESA. The group would be relocated in Africa. Graduating
would be envisaged once the group is ready. Cooperation with the other groups would be strengthened with no difficulty.

In all scenarios -- I, II and III-- the contribution of WGESA will be such that data matters relating to data collection would be handled by the Statistics and Finance groups while analyzing policies to assess their causes, would naturally be the main domain of the sector analysis group. Thus, the three groups would work closely together on a project such as the Peer Review exercise or the Formative Research. By doing so, they will strengthen the cooperation that already exists.

6. Conclusion

We need to determine the best options for better coordination and collaboration in our work assisting to improve education in Africa. WGESA will discuss this in length during the next Steering Committee Meeting. So far, it seems that close collaboration on agreed and practical initiatives, under option III, seems to be a feasible and viable option given the objectives of the various groups. Institution-building dimensions need to be more explicitly built into programs and initiatives of ADEA, which is particularly relevant to WGESA. This would imply that the working groups receive financial support with a focus on longer-term results which is in line with the overall policy of ADEA and contrary to ad hoc and fragmented approaches to education development in Africa.
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REPORT for the  
Spring 2007 WGESA Steering Committee Meeting

Introduction
Beginning in 2003, the WGESA programs and workplans have been structured around eight clusters (or main activities), namely:

1. Knowledge development in Sector Analysis;
2. Capacity building;
3. Information/advocacy to make its products known and used;
4. Institutional development;
5. Follow-up to the Biennial recommendations: the Peer Review;
6. Forward looking research;
7. Coordination/management; and
8. Emerging Issues and Contingencies, which was added in 2005 to account for activities that were unforeseen at the beginning of the year’s calendar but are important to integrate in the Workplan.

Also, in Fall 2005, the Steering Committee decided that the capacity building undertaking (2) be on Formative Research (6). This resulted in combining clusters 2 and 6.

The eight clusters (or main activities) structure was retained for 2007. Therefore, the present report comprises of 8 sections. Three aspects are considered for each of them, namely:

(a.) Presentation of the main objectives of the cluster to set the debate in motion;

(b.) Presentation of the activities planned in 2007; and

(c.) Progress made during 2007.

1. Increasing knowledge of the education sector analysis: the publication issue

a. Objective:
To clarify basic concepts, develop and disseminate methodological tools for African decision-makers, compile inventories of studies and recent trends, support the implementation of educational reforms undertaken in Africa in the context of EFA and prepare suitable training and learning modules on education sector analysis.

b. Activities in the pipeline by the end of 2006
c. Progress made in 2007

- The annotated bibliography is posted as an information note with a web link
- The editing committee for the Maputo proceedings is still to be nominated. As of Dar-Es-Salaam, Spring 2006, the report made by Ms Pulane Lefoka and amended with the notes of Dr. Joshua Baku and Bah-Lalya is already posted on the website.
- Concept paper is posted on the WGESA website and amended with the notes of Dr. Kristin Tornes.
- The English as well as the French version of the Mauritius report are edited and published on the WGESA Website and CD-ROMs were made and distributed. At this stage, I need your green light in order to authorize the Mauritius Government to publish it.


Objectives sought:

To contribute to strengthening African field expertise and capacities in educational reforms using a sectoral approach.

To undertake an active role in the support of the African scholar networks as well as utilizing these networks in WGESA undertakings.

1. Activities in the pipeline by the end of 2006

- The 2006 seminar on Formative Research was organized in Dar Es Salaam, Tanzania. It was attended by African decisions makers from such countries as Kenya, Niger, Tanzania and Zambia. The local team, under the leadership of the former Permanent Secretary (Mrs. Jasmine Mwatumu Malale) and the current PM (Dr. Hamisi Dihenga) and their collaborators and staff, considerably contributed to the success of this gathering.
The seminar recommended that a pilot exercise be launched in 2 countries (Eastern-Southern English-speaking country Africa and Western-Central French Speaking Africa). Norway would facilitate the process by organizing a preparatory meeting to this effect in 2007. The seminar also recommended that WGESA move cautiously on this matter and that the countries be effectively involved in the process, especially as it regards the funding of the exercise.

Regarding the joint IIIEP/WGES A long distance course on sector analysis the issue is still under consideration for both short-term and long-term perspectives.

Regarding WGESA’s involvement in other group activities, the contribution of WGESA to the Policy Dialogue undertaking was effective and well appreciated by both the organizers (BIE and ADEA Secretariat) and participants from several African countries. The WGESA module will be ready by December 2006, with various practical exercises and case studies so that the module could be solidly grounded to actual challenges encountered on the field. The module is part of a Tool Kit that ADEA and BIE are making available for African education leaders and practitioners.

As for the African Journalism Award, COMED is in a re-structuring phase. Therefore, the award was not organized this year.

c. Progress made in 2007

The Formative research has been the activity that WGESA focused on in 2005 and 2006. In both years, successful seminars were organized and well attended. Still one major setback is that the formative research process is not generating enough interest on the part of African decision makers. If this activity is to be adopted by the Africans educational system, there might be a need for a clear backup from a agency. A meeting was proposed in Oslo to discuss this as well as other issues. However, finance is still a constraint. See revised budget.

As for the Windhoek, the seminar was on Peer Review in Education in Africa. From preliminary lessons drawn, from three Peer Review exercises, implemented under the supervision of WGESA, the Workshop focused on identifying ways and means for initiating accurate, country driven and African-based reviews of education sector reforms. It is expected that the seminar will help the African decision-makers to initiate other Education Peer Reviews using the WGESA model.

The WGESA involvement in Policy Dialogue did not progress much during the first semester as the BIE is changing leadership and the WGESA was rather involved in the ADEA two important gatherings that took place in Brazzaville and Accra.

With the African Journalism award a similar issue of a change in leadership occurred and, caused the Award program to be cancelled this year.

3. Information / advocacy: WGESA Website and WGESA contribution to the newsletters

a. Objectives sought:

To disseminate WGESA’s products and publications to Ministries of Education, other governmental organizations, civil society and other stakeholders interested in ESA.

To also provide a higher profile to the group activities, support implementation processes at the country level and advocate best practices.
b. Activities in the pipeline by the end of 2006

- The website is made functional, the homepage redesigned, the content regularly updated with information regarding the group’s activities (see the Website).

  Also, the technical committee is following up the progress made with the Website with particular attention on updating and managing the content and, at the same time considering the legal aspects and the costs.

- An account of the progress made on the peer review exercise in Mauritius has been prepared and published in the ADEA newsletter (see annex).

c. Progress made in 2007

Website

The WGESA website is now functional and managed with the support of both the ADEA secretariat and IIEP publishing unit. A committee was created to assist not only the Website inception but provide supervision of the overall process so that the documents posted on the Web are relevant and of good quality. This committee did not function. Maybe we should think about reshuffling its membership and examine how it should be made operational.

WGESA’s site is currently linked to the ADEA website. This help is much acknowledged and appreciated. The only reservation would be that although this serves the purpose of linking our small group to the larger ADEA constituencies, it tends to dilute WGESA’s internet site. For the long term, it might be useful to think about WGESA creating its own, independent website. In such case, the question of technical servicing, financing and managing the site must be addressed.

3. Institutional development: anchoring WGESA to Africa

a. Objectives sought:

To increase the group’s effectiveness through re-orienting its activities on areas of comparative advantage, expanding its co-ordination capacities, improving its monitoring practices and overall, streamlining its mission, mandate and coordinating structures.

Objectives also include anchoring the group to Africa and supporting African scholar networks.

b. Activities in the pipeline by the end of 2006
The Steering Committee membership was discussed during the Spring Meeting and the decisions regarding its composition formalized (during the Fall meeting SC Meeting).

Anchoring WGESA at IIEP before finding an appropriate host in Africa was well underway in 2006. The new Director is very keen to strengthen the cooperation between ADEA and IIEP through effectively hosting the Working Group in the Institute facilities. He has indicated his willingness to have the group more involved and better integrated in the institute life. The group needed now to be granted with the basic legal status as an entity within IIEP.

The Group continues to explore more venues for hosting its coordination in African soil. It actively sought to develop more synergy with African programs and institutions of similar interests, especially in countries where it is conducting the Peer Review exercises.

(i) With ERNESA, the coordination is in contact with our colleagues from this network although it is still restructuring. Dr. Villet is the new coordinator of the Group.

(ii) As for SACHES, the network is willing to work with WGESA. WGESA will benefit from it because of the strength of the SACHES network and the high caliber of the scholars involved in this society. Unfortunately, SACHES is not in a financial and institutional position to host WGESA. WGESA will, accordingly, adjust the level of it cooperation with the network.

(iii) With CONFEMEN and the Pole de Dakar, problems of timing and others have resulted in fewer contacts in 2006. The other problem, of course, is the difference in the schools of thought regarding the three programs, WGESA being more qualitative-oriented and more attuned to consider the broader picture at the country and regional levels. It would be beneficial for the parties to meet in 2007 and discuss how to cooperate so that our approaches could synergize for the best interest of education in Africa. Please advise.

(iv) CONFEMEN in particular, has indicated its desire to continue being a member of WGESA Steering Committee.

c. Progress made in 2007

The Steering Committee membership

Anchoring WGESA to IIEP on a temporary basis

Finding an appropriate host in Africa. The relocation of WGESA in Africa is coming at a very specific time characterized by a few significant challenges related to the internal situation of the group, the evolution and the present context of sector analysis in Africa.

Within the group, WGESA has made an internal assessment which led to the drafting of Strategic Priorities in 2005. These priorities are in the process of being implemented however, the activities have been slowed down by such factors as funding and participation of international agencies.
As it regards the changes occurring within the mother institution, ADEA there is a profound restructuring of the association’s mission, goal and strategies. And this has a significant impact on the destiny of the groups. Actually, the SC/ADEA has already recommended that the group’s be restructured with the aim to have more relevant, more efficiency and more effectiveness. A third factor, from ADEA is of course the relocation of this group to Africa. After thorough process, it has been decided that the group move from IIEP and find its new location at the African Development Bank in Tunis. The mission goals and strategies of this new host institution is likely to affect the destiny of the groups.

As it regards the context of sector analysis in Africa at least two factors are likely to affect decisions regarding WGESA. The Pole de Dakar’s sector analysis program has increased its activities in Africa because it is well funded by both the French cooperations and the World Bank. But the philosophy of the Pole de Dakar to sector analysis and education development is quite different from WGESA’s approach which is more quality oriented, more African

At the same time, the African Union Commission is entering into cooperation endeavor with ADEA in which the working group’s are to play a fundamental role. In this context, it is suggested that WGESA join two or three other groups to develop a bigger institution that could answer to the need of the AU. One of the problem, however, is that the WGESA identity, mission and new priorities set in 2005 (and in full gear implementation in 2007) could be lost in the process.

- considering both the internal and external context spelled out above, the present meeting may have to reflect on the following fundamental questions.

Is the group activity still needed?

How much can the group accomplish?

Is the group strong and mature enough to fly by its own wings? Or should it be linked to a more extensive network? In such a context should it stay with IIEP, join the finance section of CODESRIA, merge with Statistics in Harare, move together with ADEA in Tunis? Join ERNWACA in Bamako or other solutions.

Before the present meeting, I made contacts with some of you and drafted a position paper on that was submitted to the ADEA SC meeting in Brazzaville. This document was a just a draft that the present meeting need to amend, complete and validate so that we have a clear stand on the destiny of the working group. See attachment.

4. The Peer Review Exercise

a. Objectives sought

To provide a truly African perspective on the way education reform initiatives are formulated, planned and implemented. In this perspective, the Peer Review Exercise is perceived as an adequate approach to analyzing and supporting educational sector reforms in Africa and strengthening African networks of scholars specializing in education.

b. Activities in the pipeline by the end of 2006
The group contributed to the substantive debates that take place during the March 2006 Biennial. The focus of the WGESA contribution was on the Peer Review exercise.

(i). Presentation of the progress was made to the ADEA Forum of Ministers with the contribution of the Mauritius national team;

(ii). The Gabon contribution to the Biennial was effectively supported by the Group;

(iii). A side meeting mainly centered on the Peer Review exercise, was organized; A display of WGESA products was made and the stand well attended.

Regarding Peer review in Mauritius: The Peer Review in education is in the process of being piloted for the first time in Africa in this country. Therefore, particular attention was paid to it. The national self-evaluation (Step II) was successfully conducted by a very good national team in 2005. The product of their work was formatted and integrated to the overall report in 2006.

A qualified international team was assembled in a very short time and sent to Mauritius to review the educational system achievement with a special attention to the issues raised by the national team. A substantive report resulted from their work which was presented to the Forum of Ministers at the Biennial in Libreville. The product was integrated to the overall report and validated, in Mauritius, by all major Mauritian stakeholders. The document that resulted from the exercise is ready and available. WGESA wanted to have it published. However, unfortunately, there was not enough funds for it.

2. As explained earlier, Gabon prepared its keynote address to the Biennial based on the Peer review exercise and WGESA contributed to this. The speech made a strong impression during the Biennial. As a result, Peer Review -- and retroactively, WGESA -- received considerable exposure. Since then, Gabon has progressed on the exercise and has completed its national self-evaluation as well as the international visit. WGESA is hopeful that the product will be ready on time to satisfy the request made by the Minister of Gabon who has asked that the process be completed in his country as soon as possible because he would like to use it for the design of a national policy reform. If funding is secured, the WGESA could meet the country’s deadlines.

Regarding Nigeria, the Framework for Cooperation is signed and the country may complete the national self evaluation process before December. They are waiting for an OK from WGESA, and probably the start-up funds that habitually comes with it (about USD 10,000).

The next crucial issue for the Peer Review Exercise, which has become the WGESA’s main trust activity, is eventually the pre-selection of other countries to be considered for the second round. This is contingent upon a decision made from both the WGESA Steering Committee and the ADEA Sub-Committee. It could be the main trust activity for the medium term plan of the working group. Here, re-sourcing could also be a major hurdle to overcome.

There is also the issue of broadening our partnership regarding Peer Review. Contacts have been made, during the Biennial, and later on during 2006, with the UNESCO Assistant Director General for Education, Dr. Peter Smith. He seemed interested in a cooperation between WGESA and his services.
C. Progress made in 2007

As you may recall, the Peer review is WGESA’s main thrust activity. During our last meeting in Paris, it was recommended that WGESA make it a priority. The following is the state of progress made on this particular front.

- Gabon Peer Review: The Gabon report was thwarted due to funding matters. After this had been resolved, I held discussions with the expert team leader Minister Steven Obeegadoo and with Rector Alhassane Yenikoye to determine how best to proceed. As a result, it was agreed on two actions: (i) to have the National self-evaluation revisited by a Gabonese attached to the Ministry of Education, under the supervision of the Coordinator, in order for the report to be more consistent with the actual situations observed in the Gabonese educational system; and (ii) to have Professor Yenikoye invest more time on this work so that he could fill the gap resulting from Obeegadoo’s unavailability owing to his new appointment as the Provisional Coordinator of Post Secondary Education. Professor Yenikoye accepted to take over the continuation of the work in April 2007 and since that date the work has evolved significantly and a report is ready for validation by the Gabonese authorities.

- Mauritius Peer Review: As mentioned above, the English and French versions of the report are completed and posted on the WGESA and ADEA websites. The first draft of the French translation was made ready thanks to Professor Hountondji who assisted in the editing it. Currently, I am ensuring that all the Peer Review documents are available for WGESA’s Francophone friends (especially Mali), who are often frustrated that such documents and reports are not available in a language that they could relate to.

I am in contact with the Mauritian educational leaders to follow through the implementation of the recommendations. I have been told that, as a result of the report, the Ministry has already taken several initiatives to correct some of the problems observed.

- Nigerian Peer Review: The national teams have completed its report. Now that the elections are over, I am in the process of renewing the relationships so that the international team could go ahead and conduct the international team visit. I will keep you informed as the situation develops.

3. Forward looking Research with a focus on Formative Research

a. Objectives sought

To contribute, in a timely manner, to on-going debates on themes that have the potential of making a major impact on education sector programs in Africa. For 2005, WGESA identified Formative Research as a valuable tool for policy implementation for decision making at MOEs and decentralized levels. It was also perceived as a means for facilitating the passage
from policy to practice through strengthening the linkage between the worlds of research and policy making.

b. Activities in the pipeline by the end of 2006

As explained earlier (see above, point 2), the capacity building exercise that WGESA hold each year in Africa was, this time, on Formative Research. Due to this particular circumstance the outcomes of formative research are, actually presented under the rubric “Capacity Building”. A video and a report are also circulating.

c. Progress made in 2007

4. Management duties, including periodic meetings, networking and coordination

a. Objectives sought

To improve management in such areas as financing, co-ordination, and the functioning of the Steering Committee and the unit put in place at IIEP to facilitate the coordination and management duties of WGESA
To facilitate networking and the flow of information and know–how among education stakeholders in Africa and elsewhere
To represent WGESA between Steering Committee Meetings and defend the Group interests
To conduct daily activities.

b. Activities planned for 2006

A part of the daily activities, the group had to concentrate, in 2006, on the following:

o Publishing Peer Review final reports and disseminating them was one of the main focus for 2006. Also a particular emphasis was made to introduce the Formative Research approach in African education.

o Diversifying financial support to the program

o Attending a few carefully targeted international conferences and other similar platforms to expose the group to major debates regarding education in Africa at an international level.

o Participating in various regular meetings of the ADEA Secretariat, the ADEA Steering Committee, IIEP, and the other partner working groups.

c. Progress made in 2006
The daily management of the group activities was conducted in better conditions in 2006, compared to the previous two years. In particular:

- The issue of the Steering Committee Membership was discussed in close session and recommendations made for: (i) new and old membership, (ii) the functioning of the committee including the focal point issue, (iii) partnership with OECD, (iv) the 3-years-plan, (v) institutionalizing Peer Review, (vi) piloting Formative Research, and (vii) finances.

- The group’s coordinator, focal persons and selected experts have participated in various regular meetings of the ADEA Secretariat, the ADEA Steering Committee, IIEP, and the other partner working groups. This was done in conformity with the Work plan, and in accordance with the priorities set by the WGES Steering Committee, the ADEA Steering committee, and the Co-ordination unit for matters that need immediate decision.

Despite this progress however, a few matters were still pending:

- The issue of diversifying the sources of finance and increasing the level of financing was a major concern throughout the year. It has yet to be resolved. Regular financial shortages of funds have made the Group’s activities very difficult to plan and implement in 2006.

- Linked to this, there is the relatively low level of participation of the agencies to the Group’s events: New policies, lately adopted by these agencies made it complicated for them to get involved beyond a certain level. Actually, the trend in 2006 was to put the funds in a common basket and have them redistributed by the ADEA Secretariat. Despite the advantages of such approach in term of rationalizing better the use of the funds, this has the inconvenience of lessening the substantive and programmatic involvement of the Agencies in the group’s activities;

- Contact was maintained with outside partners including the OECD which participated in Gabon and Mauritius Peer review undertakings. However, this organization has started conducting, in 2006, its own peer reviews in Africa (presumably in South Africa, Kenya and Ethiopia).

a.  Progress made in 2007

5. Emerging issues and contingencies

a. Objective

To explore new possibilities for the development of the group
To contribute to expanding knowledge in sector analysis
To provide more international visibility to the group.

b. Activities in the pipeline by the end of 2006
Due to the financial situation of the group, the WGESA did not participate in the CIES meeting.

It used the opportunity of the meeting on Statistics held in Johannesburg to meet with SACHES representatives and further discuss cooperation with them.

c. **Progress made in 2007**

These are the major points of the report to this meeting. The annexes below are attached to help with issues raised. Thank you.

-----------------------------

**List of Annexes**